



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

SENATE—Thursday, July 30, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, enthroned above all other powers, thank You for the gift of this day. Use our lawmakers for Your glory. May they find obedience to You not a burden but a delight. May they find the cost of loyalty to Your precepts not a trial but a privilege, as they discover in Your Words wings to uplift our Nation and world.

Lord, inspire our Senators to make decisions that will build monuments of moral excellence and courage for generations to come. Open their eyes to Your wisdom, as You continue to uphold our Nation with Your powerful hand.

We pray in Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The majority leader is recognized.

NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 236, which was submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 236) designating July 30, 2015, as “National Whistleblower Appreciation Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The resolution (S. Res. 236) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, many thought we would never get here, but we have. Later today, the Senate will pass a multiyear highway bill that does not raise taxes by a penny, and we will do it on a broad bipartisan basis. This is more than just another accomplishment for the Senate. It is a win for our country because the bill would cut redtape and streamline regulations, it would modernize infrastructure and advance research and innovation, it would enact new transparency measures to empower Americans to see how much of their tax money is actually being spent, and because it is a multiyear bill it would give States, cities, and towns the certainty they need to better plan road and bridge projects well into the future.

The multiyear nature of this legislation is one of its most critical components. It is also something the House and Senate are not united on. We all want the House to have the space it needs to develop its own bill because we all want to work out the best possible legislation for the American people in conference later this year. So we will take up a measure this afternoon to give them that space, while also delivering important relief to veterans.

The bill will extend a helping hand to heroes who need it by covering unfunded requirements the administration failed to budget for. I hope we will

rally in support of veterans when that measure is considered, just as we continue to rally in support of a multiyear bipartisan and fiscally responsible highway bill we will pass today.

Some never thought this day would come, but thanks to the enduring dedication of Senators on both sides of the aisle—in particular, Senator INHOFE, Senator BOXER, as well as Senator THUNE, Senator NELSON, and Senator HATCH—it is here.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, on another matter, the purpose of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is to ensure Congress has a fully informed understanding of any comprehensive agreement reached between the administration and Iran. These are principles both parties endorsed when they voted overwhelmingly to pass that measure earlier this year. These are principles President Obama endorsed when he signed it into law. These are principles that need to be upheld.

That is why I recently joined Speaker BOEHNER, Senator COTTON, and Congressman POMPEO in calling on the administration to comply with the terms of this law by providing the Senate with the text of the two side agreements reached between Iran and the IAEA. That was more than a week ago, but we still have yet to receive it. Without this critical information, Republicans and Democrats in Congress may not be able to properly assess such a highly consequential deal with Iran. That is simply not acceptable. The administration needs to turn over the side agreements without delay. Let me say that again. The administration needs to turn over the side agreements without delay.

Even considering all this, the Senate has already begun its necessary oversight of the deal that will soon be before us. The Armed Services Committee held a hearing yesterday on the strategic and military implications of the deal. The Foreign Relations Committee also held a hearing yesterday to consider the alternatives to this agreement.

Today it will consider the implications of sanctions relief for Iran, along with Congress's ability to impose additional sanctions if Tehran persists in its support of terrorism. The Intelligence Committee has already embarked on a series of briefings and hearings that will help Congress determine whether the deal can even be verified.

As the review moves forward, we will continue working to assess the relative threat posed to the Greater Middle East and to the United States by an Iranian regime empowered with a threshold nuclear program and billions of dollars of additional resources. I know this worries a lot of Members in both parties.

Consider what the top Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee said just this week:

I'm troubled that what this essentially does is after fifteen years it legitimizes Iran as a nuclear threshold state. After fifteen years Iran can produce weapons-grade highly-enriched uranium without limitations and that is disturbing because what that means to me is it really doesn't prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon. It just postpones it.

That is the top Democrat on the House Foreign Affairs Committee. He is not the only Democrat or Republican with these types of concerns. We will keep working for answers.

We will also keep pressing for a more fulsome revelation of the true extent of the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.

Understanding Iran's relative trustworthiness in the past will be critical to determining Iran's potential for trustworthiness in the future—whether, for instance, it can truly be trusted to live up to its commitments in today's agreement. Getting a fuller picture of Iran's past nuclear activities and research will also be important to ensuring the U.N. Security Council, which rushed to approve the comprehensive deal, has a more comprehensive understanding moving forward.

We will continue working hard to assess this agreement on behalf of the American people who absolutely deserve a say in a deal of this magnitude. At the end, Congress will take a vote and answer a simple but powerful question: Will this agreement actually make America and its allies safer?

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Republicans called it “the beginning of socialized medicine.” The Wall Street

Journal accused Democrats and the President of “politicking with a nation's health.” One Republican Senator called the health care law “brazen socialism.”

Further:

It is not needed. It is socialism. It moves the country in a direction which is not good for anyone, whether they be young or old. It charts a course from which there will be no turning back. . . . It is not only socialism—it is brazen socialism.

You would think that based on the 50-plus times of trying to overturn ObamaCare, that is what the Republican Senators were talking about, but, no, that was Medicare. They weren't talking about ObamaCare; Medicare is what they were talking about.

Fifty years ago, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law Medicare and Medicaid. At that time, conservatives believed that access to health care through government was the worst possible decision any elected official could make—and so many Republicans, the same thing. In fact, Republicans still do feel that way. Even after decades of Medicare's success, they are still clamoring for the program's elimination or massive changes.

Jeb Bush—a frontrunner for the Republican Presidential nomination—called for “phasing out” Medicare. Where did he do this? At a Koch brothers rally in New Hampshire. Jeb Bush—a frontrunner for the Republican Presidential nomination—said let's phase out Medicare. How about that one?

For half a century, Republicans have continued to attack Medicare, despite all the good it has done. They have tried to privatize Medicare and turn it into a voucher system and reduce benefits for seniors. Republicans attacked the closing of the prescription drug doughnut hole and elimination of cost-sharing for preventative coverage simply because they were improvements made by the Affordable Care Act.

Republicans have repeatedly sought to destroy Medicaid, and Republican Governors have turned back millions of Federal dollars and denied their citizens, the most needy of all, coverage simply because of ideology.

This week they renewed their never-ending assault on women's health by trying to defund Planned Parenthood in reaction to a radical rightwing crusade by an extremist group. American women value Planned Parenthood because they know Planned Parenthood provides vital health care services to millions of women, but Republicans are choosing to disseminate access to the health services of women. Women need this health care to stay healthy.

Why are they doing it? I guess, to further their political agenda. When will the Republican attack on effective health care programs end?

Medicare and Medicaid have positively affected and even saved millions of Americans' lives. Before Medicare,

nearly half of all seniors age 65 and older were uninsured. The elderly were discriminated against simply because of their age. If you were fortunate enough to have health insurance, you paid over 50 percent of the cost straight out of your pocket.

My first elected job was from Clark County. That is in Las Vegas, NV. I was chosen to be a member of the board of trustees of Southern Nevada Memorial Hospital—the largest hospital district in Nevada. After a year or so, I became chairman of the board of trustees. I was there when Medicare came into being. Prior to Medicare, more than 40 percent of all seniors who came into our hospital were required to have a brother, a son, a daughter, a mother, a father, a husband, a wife or a neighbor sign on the dotted line, saying: If that bill is not paid, we will guarantee it is paid.

We had a collection department in that hospital that was very aggressive and went after these people. That is how bad it was for seniors, but today, 50 years later, about 99 percent of seniors are insured and go to the hospital when they need care.

The cost during their working years is a small amount of out-of-pocket costs. The program that we call Medicare is a lifeline. Before Medicare and Medicaid, health care for millions of younger Americans was subject to racism and discrimination. A White American was 30 percent more likely to be admitted to a hospital than an African American. In fact, in many cases emergency response calls were subject to race confirmation before action. They wanted to know where you lived, and if the color of your skin wasn't just right when you were brought to the hospital, you went on your way. Today the disparity in hospitalization rates between minorities and White Americans has decreased significantly.

Medicare and Medicaid have protected the health and well-being of millions of seniors, individuals with disabilities, low-income individuals, and millions of children.

In the past 50 years, Medicaid has grown to be the Nation's primary health insurance program for low-income individuals and families. Medicaid has grown to cover nearly 70 million Americans, including more than 40 million children.

Today Medicaid covers nearly half of all births in the United States and ensures that children receive the health care they desperately need in the early stages of their lives. By providing early childhood health care to millions, Medicaid has improved the long-term health of children and contributed to their overall quality of life.

Medicaid has also provided health care and long-term services to 16 million low-income seniors and individuals with disabilities. Medicaid pays for services that Medicare does not cover.

It ensures that low-income seniors and individuals with disabilities have access to a wide variety of services. These options allow them to remain in their communities rather than relocate to nursing homes. But when they do have to go to a nursing home, the vast majority of people in convalescent centers in America are Medicaid recipients.

Sadly, 22 States have chosen not to expand Medicaid coverage, and this decision has hurt millions of people who can't afford health care any other way. Why do States and the Republican Governors of those States oppose this? Because it is part of ObamaCare.

To his credit, the conservative Republican Governor from the State of Nevada, Brian Sandoval, was one of the first Governors to sign on to this program. He didn't care if it was a Democratic program or a Republican program; it helped people in Nevada who needed help. I truly admire him for doing that. The expansion of Medicaid in States throughout the country would boost States' economic activity—and Brian Sandoval knows that—and create job growth, in addition to providing quality, affordable health care to vulnerable Americans. The State of Nevada is a relatively sparsely populated State. Almost 200,000 people are receiving the health care they need and would not have but for ObamaCare and Governor Brian Sandoval.

Medicaid expansion would benefit every State. The Affordable Care Act transformed Medicaid into a true safety net for vulnerable Americans. We should be expanding this coverage, not restricting it for partisan gain.

Medicare and Medicaid have protected Americans for 50 years, and our Nation is healthier and stronger because of its existence. But despite 50 years of undeniable Medicare and Medicaid success, Republicans remain committed to ending access to health care for those who need it the most.

We will be celebrating ObamaCare's success 50 years from now while Republicans call for the Affordable Care Act to be phased out, like Jeb Bush wants. In 50 years, will there be a Republican Presidential wanna-be out there saying "Let's get rid of ObamaCare; let's phase it out"? I hope not.

Republicans have repeatedly engaged in politically motivated attacks designed to undermine the law that transformed our Nation's health care system. The Affordable Care Act has helped millions of Americans to gain access to quality health care. Since the Affordable Care Act was signed into law, 16.4 million Americans have gotten quality health care—many of them for the first time in their lives. The United States has seen the largest decline in the uninsured rate in decades, if not forever. In the last 18 months, the uninsured rate for nonelderly adults has fallen by 35 percent. Health

care costs have grown at their slowest rate in 50 years. Patient safety initiatives are keeping Americans safe.

The Affordable Care Act is working. It is the law of the land, and that is not going to change. There have been more than 50 votes to repeal or undermine the Affordable Care Act and there have been repeated challenges to this law before the courts, but we have won on every level. The American people have won twice with the stamp of approval by the Supreme Court. Last month we witnessed the Supreme Court rule, as I have indicated, again for the second time in favor of the Affordable Care Act. It is here to stay. It is here to stay because the American people want affordable health care.

American seniors need affordable, accessible health care coverage, and they need it right now.

Five decades ago—50 years ago—President Johnson said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years. No longer will young families see their own incomes, and their own hopes eaten away simply because they are carrying out their deep moral obligations to their parents, and to their uncles, and their aunts.

The Republicans have spent the last five decades fighting against President Johnson's dream. The Republicans are determined to roll back access to health care for Americans. It is hard to believe, but it is true. Just this week the Senate held a vote on whether to repeal this lifesaving program—again. It is clear that after 50 years, the Republicans have learned nothing.

We should be building on the success of Medicare, Medicaid, and the Affordable Care Act. We need to be expanding coverage to all Americans. We should be encouraging States to expand Medicaid access. Democrats are committed—just as President Johnson was half a century ago—to giving Americans the health care they need and deserve.

Will the Chair announce the schedule for today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.R. 22, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 22) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into

account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12 p.m. will be equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, soon we will vote on final passage of a bill that will provide a long-term solution to the shortfalls of the highway trust fund. If enacted, this bill will provide the longest paid-for authorization of highway and transportation spending in nearly a decade.

This bill is the result of an incredible amount of work by a number of Senators, including our distinguished majority leader as well as the chairman and ranking member of the Environment and Public Works Committee. I commend them for setting aside partisan differences to find a solution despite the cynicism and naysaying from some of our colleagues and others here in Washington.

I am also pleased to have been able to play a part in these efforts, working with Leader MCCONNELL to identify suitable offsets to pay for the reauthorization of the highway and transit programs. While the Finance Committee, which I chair, has jurisdiction over the funding stream for the highway trust fund, we had to cull together offsets from other areas and other committees in order to pay for this multiyear highway bill. This required the cooperation of multiple chairmen and committees, all working together toward a common goal.

One of the most remarkable things about this bill is that it provides 3 full years of highway funding without raising taxes or adding to the deficit. We have heard time and again that a long-term highway bill would only be possible if we included a big tax increase. With the upcoming final vote on this bill, the Senate is about to prove otherwise, and it will do so with bipartisan support. This is how the Senate should operate, particularly when we are dealing with something as big and important as highway funding.

As I said last week, this bill represents a victory for good government and is yet another bipartisan win for the Senate under the current leadership. Like many of my colleagues, my hope is that eventually the House of Representatives will follow suit and work toward passage of a similar long-term highway bill so that we can come together, reconcile differences, and finish the job. While I know there are some divisions on the other side of the Capitol about the Senate's overall strategy and maybe even some of the particulars in our bill, I think we have shown that a long-term bill is a realistic goal and a preferable option to yet another short-term highway patch.

Once again, I am well aware of the desire of some in Congress and in the administration to marry long-term highway funding to some kind of tax reform. As the chairman of the Senate's tax-writing committee and its most outspoken supporter of tax reform, I think that idea has a lot of merit. I commend those who are thinking in those terms. Fortunately, this bill will provide just that opportunity while giving added certainty to our States as they plan their highway projects and to our builders and job creators looking to expand and hire more workers.

Put simply, the Senate's highway approach is a win for everyone. The House should consider our approach, and I hope they will.

Long story short, today is a good day. Today the Senate will accomplish something few thought possible. While the process has been a bit more difficult and divisive than many of us would have liked, I personally am very pleased to see the Senate function properly and govern responsibly.

There are a lot of things we can fight over here in Congress, but I think we can—or at least should—all agree on the need to come together to pay for our Nation's infrastructure. I am pleased to join with my colleagues—Senators from both parties—in taking a major step toward that goal today.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I thank the Presiding Officer.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE

Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Medicare. Fifty years ago, on July 30, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the legislation to create Medicare. I say thank God for Medicare. It was a great idea 50 years ago, 50 months ago, 50 weeks ago, and 50 minutes ago.

I stand on the Senate floor to say that we must keep Medicare as Medicare and keep the integrity and solvency of Medicare. We cannot turn Medicare into a voucher; we cannot dilute it, phase it out, or eliminate it. And until my last vote is cast in the Senate, I will defend Medicare.

I saw what it meant. In the summer of 1965, I had just graduated from the University of Maryland School of Social Work. Change was in the air. The civil rights movement was making its progress toward history and moving forward. There were beginning doubts about the Vietnam war, and the Nation was recovering from the assassination of President Kennedy. President John-

son wanted to lead in a bold way, having had a landslide victory, and he said he wanted to create a great society. He knew that a great society meant that we had to have a great heart.

What we knew then, as we know today, is that people feared financial bankruptcy because of health care costs. They were terrified that a heart attack that resulted in hospitalization would bankrupt the family. They delayed the idea of getting cataract surgery, which then needed to be done in the hospital, not because they were afraid of the surgery but because they were afraid of the cost of surgery. If you were a small, independent business person over 65, you often had no health insurance. It didn't matter whether you were in agriculture or an urban small business.

Medicare changed all of that. Medicare protected people from two things. No. 1, it protected them so that they could go to a doctor when they needed to and have health care when they needed it. No. 2, it protected them from financial disaster.

Today, 55 million Americans—nearly every senior—have access to Medicare, including 1 million seniors.

What was so significant about that bill is that it provided universal access to doctors.

No. 2, it had no barriers because of preexisting conditions.

No. 3, it was portable because it was national. Whether a person was in Maryland or Utah or whatever State, Medicare was the national program, and it was viewed as an earned benefit.

America at that time had many things going for it. One was that we had a sense of self-confidence that we could really solve problems and meet the compelling needs of our country, and the other was that we had compassion.

One of my guiding principles, which I believed then as well, and that guided the Nation at that time was the guiding principle of honor thy father and mother. We knew that it was not only a great commandment to live by, but it was a good policy to live by. Therefore, we ensured that all Americans had access to health care, regardless of their income.

As I said, in the 1960s—1965 was the year that I actually graduated from the school of social work. I worked for a program called “responding to the elderly's abilities and sicknesses otherwise neglected.” It was called Operation Reason. Our job—a social worker and a nurse, one of my oldest friends from school—was to help elderly people know about the program and sign up for the program and help them use the program. It was the joy—the sheer joy—people experienced when they heard about this program, knowing that simply because they were American citizens, their needs would be taken care of, with a modest premium.

Part A was hospitalization—a safety net. In those days, care for significant illnesses had to be done in the hospital. The advances of medicine and medical technology has allowed us now to do less in the hospital, such as cataract surgery and other surgeries being done on an outpatient basis. Those advances weren't there in the 1960s. So people no longer had to fear the cost of hospitalization.

Then there was this program called Part B. That meant seniors had access to see a doctor, to see if they had diabetes, to see if they had high blood pressure, to see why they couldn't see those grandchildren or do their work on the family farm, the small business or in the factories that we had in those days. What they needed was maybe better eyesight—that cataract surgery. Maybe they were feeling old and slow not because of age but because they had diabetes or other issues. Then, of course, there was the cost of the dreaded “c” word—cancer.

My colleague and I worked in the neighborhoods to make sure we took care of how people could get to the facilities, know about those services, and know about those barriers. In those days, Baltimore seniors were struggling. When they retired, it was often the end of health insurance. It meant nearly half of the seniors were uninsured. They went to clinics, standing in very long lines, often shuttled back and forth from one clinic to another. They got their blood work here, they looked at their kidneys there, and they looked at their eyes here. Their concept of primary care was fragmented.

Before Medicare, millions of seniors, as I have said, were just one heart attack away from bankruptcy or one cancer diagnosis away from destitution. That was before Medicare.

Many were skeptical about Medicare. Once again, the other party fought it. They were wondering what it would mean. People were skeptical. Was this a big government move or was it a big opportunity? My job was to show them that this program was not about big government, but about government with a big heart.

After four months of operation, we had enrolled hundreds of people into this much needed program. And what has it meant? Before Medicare, 48 percent of seniors had no health insurance. Today, only 2 percent are uninsured. Out-of-pocket costs have decreased. Before Medicare, seniors paid 56 percent of health care costs out of their pocket. Imagine what that meant if you were hospitalized in those days. Life expectancy is now 5 years longer. Death from heart disease has dropped. Our elderly poverty rate has declined. Seniors have access to more affordable drugs.

This isn't about numbers, and it isn't about statistics. It is about people. It is about the compelling needs of human

beings. It is about government that says: I am on your side and at your side, and we are going to use our national resources, our national brain power, our national know-how to be able to create a program that you can participate in and that at the end of the day, your life will be better and our society will be improved.

I am really proud of what the Congress and the President did 50 years ago. I hope we have that same attitude again. It is not about big government; it is about government with a big heart.

I will say this: There are those who continue to talk about ending Medicare. Most recently, a Presidential candidate who I think has incredible ability—Jeb Bush—said he wanted to phase out Medicare. I don't get it. How do we phase out Medicare? Do we start first with age? Do we phase out 90-year-olds, and then the next year we phase out 80-year-olds? How do we phase it out? Do we phase it out by disease? OK, this year, no more diabetics; OK, this year, no more cancer patients—they really cost a lot of money. What does it mean to phase it out, and what are we phasing it out to?

Medicare cannot be privatized. We must continue it as a guaranteed benefit. Do we need to reform it, take a look at it, refresh it? The answer is yes. We have done that, such as when we added Part B. But I will say this: No matter what, thank God for Medicare.

When we go around this country, no matter how they feel about government or about Congress, people love Social Security and they love Medicare. We have to defend it. We have to make sure it is there as we need it.

So on this 50th anniversary of Medicare, let's come together to make sure we continue to be focused not on big government but on a sense of self-confidence and a belief in our country to solve big problems and that we continue to act like a country with a big heart. We can do it because we have done it in the past.

I will conclude by saying: Thank God for Medicare, and I thank God for the ability to be here on the floor of the Senate to defend it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have a unanimous consent request, but I am waiting for Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, to propound it, so I will speak first and then do the request.

I rise today to address the growing crisis of judicial vacancies in our Federal and district courts.

There are no values more American than the speedy application of justice and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Frankly, neither of those can be achieved without justices and judges on the bench.

It is the job of the Senate to responsibly keep up with the need to confirm judges. Yet we have a 10-percent vacancy in judicial positions throughout the United States. We have 28 districts that are considered "judicial emergencies." In my home State of New York, in the Western District, there is not a single active district judge—zero. The Western District has one of the busiest caseloads in the country. It handles more criminal cases than Washington, DC, or Boston or Cleveland. The delays for civil trials are by far the worst in the country. Yet they don't have a single active Federal district judge. If not for the efforts of two judges on senior status who are volunteering to hear cases in their retirement, the Western District would be at a full judicial standstill.

How have we gotten to this point? My friends on the other side of the aisle slowed the pace of confirmations when the Senate was under Democratic leadership, creating these backlogs, but we still pushed as many through as we could. Now, under the new Republican Senate, more than half the year into this new Congress, the Republican leadership has scheduled votes on only five Federal judges. It is July. They have scheduled votes on five Federal judges. That is a disgrace.

For context, in the seventh year of President Bush's Presidency, the Democratic Senate—we were in charge then—approved 25, compared to 5 here. That is a direct one-to-one comparison, apples to apples. At this point in President Bush's term, Democrats had confirmed five times the amount of judges that this Republican Congress—this Republican Senate—has confirmed. That is unacceptable.

Right now, there are 14 non-controversial judges on the Executive Calendar, including 3 highly qualified judges for New York. I know these nominees. They are brilliant legal minds, experienced jurists and, above all, they are moderate.

Larry Vilardo and Ann Donnelly are two whom I have recommended, and LaShann DeArcy Hall was recommended by my good friend, the junior Senator from New York, KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND. They should all be confirmed, but we don't know if they will ever come up for a vote.

I wish to spend a moment telling my colleagues about these qualified judges.

Mr. Vilardo is a true Buffalonian and will be a credit to the bench in his hometown. He went to Canisius College, Harvard Law School, and was a clerk on the Fifth Circuit. He is fundamentally and classically a Buffalonian—salt of the Earth, honest, and grounded. Buffalo is in his bones; it is part of who he is. As with so many other people from the region, the city

has made him tough, levelheaded, fair, and decent. As the first in his family to graduate from college, he adds an important element of socioeconomic diversity to the court. The people of the Western District of New York will be incredibly lucky to have him on the bench.

As perfect as Larry Vilardo is for the bench in Buffalo, so are Ann Donnelly and LaShann DeArcy Hall perfect for the bench in Brooklyn.

Judge Donnelly has dedicated her life to public service. She spent a quarter decade as a prosecutor in the prestigious Office of the District Attorney of New York County under DA Morganthal. I could tick off more of her accomplishments. The list would be long. She is more than a brilliant resume. She is at her core a kind, thoughtful, and compassionate person.

Let me say a word about LaShann DeArcy Hall. I can't take credit for her nomination to the Eastern District of New York. That goes to Senator GILLIBRAND. But I am proud to offer my strong support. She too has accumulated extensive and impressive legal experience as a partner in the international law firm of Morrison & Foerster. She is a veteran, having proudly served in the Air Force. She is a graduate of Howard University School of Law, and she is member of the board of visitors there.

Now, all of these nominees meet and even exceed my standard for judicial nominations in his or her own way. My standards are three: excellence—legally excellent, no political hacks; moderation—not too far right but not too far left; and diversity. Whenever we can get diversity on the bench, we should.

But they are not the only outstanding nominees we have on the floor. We have judges pending—candidates—for Missouri, California, represented by Republican Senators as much as by Democrats who are experiencing the same judicial emergencies and heavy backlog caseloads. Yet we have no indication they will ever be moved off the calendar.

This is about governing. In January, the distinguished and newly minted majority leader came before this body and said it was time to govern. We would do the budget by regular order. Things would return to normal in the Senate. We wouldn't fill the tree. Yet here we are, 7 months later, and we have approved five judges. That is it—five. Ten percent of the Federal and district judgeships across the country are vacant.

Confirming judges is part of the business of government, and right now the majority party is failing that responsibility to the American people. It has real consequences. In the Western District of New York, Judge Skretny, on senior status, has admitted that he is encouraging all cases to settle in pre-trial mediation to lower caseloads.

Criminal trials are prioritized while civil trials languish. The two retired judges in western New York are the only ones reading cases at the moment and spending far less time on each individual case than they would under normal circumstances. And defendants may be inclined to settle, admit guilt, and take plea deals rather than wait out a lengthy trial process. The same story line is playing out throughout the country. That is not how our justice system is supposed to work. As many of my colleagues have said so eloquently, the harsh truth of the matter is that for these petitioners, companies, and communities, justice is being delayed and thus denied.

In the Senate, we often invoke the principles upon which our country was founded: principles of individual liberty, justice, and equality in the eyes of the law. These words have to mean something. There shouldn't be political games standing in their way. The equal and fair application of justice is necessarily tarnished by a courtroom without a judge. It is as simple as that.

In conclusion, Democrats will not stand to watch our judicial system brought to its knees by the death of a thousand cuts. We have one week of legislative session before a month-long recess. I submit that we should not—cannot leave town having confirmed only five judges in what would be 8 months of this Congress.

Today I rise to request we move to New York's pending judicial nominations, but I also hope we will move the other Justices before and after New York's on the calendar. I would like to make this request, but I know my colleague from Iowa would like to answer it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 139, 140, and 141; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Before I speak about reserving the right to object, I would like to have the floor immediately after the Senator from New York gives up the floor, if I could. Is there any objection to that?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. OK. I want to reserve the right to object, and I will object.

I would like to make a few comments on the pace of judicial nominations. First of all, during President Obama's Presidency thus far the Senate has confirmed 313 judicial nominees. In contrast to that, there were 283 judicial nominees that the Senate had confirmed at this very same point of the previous Presidency. That is 30 more judicial nominees confirmed at this point than in the year 2007.

Concerning this year's pace, the Senate is simply following the standard that my colleagues on the other side established in that year, 2007. By this point in 2007, the committee had held six hearings for a total of 20 judicial nominees. So far we have held 7 hearings for a total of 21 nominees, 5 executive nominees, and 16 judicial nominees, including hearings on both the Attorney General and the Deputy Attorney General.

I would like to remind my colleagues that the Attorney General and Deputy Attorney General nominees took significantly more time to process on both staff and Members. So we are doing a little bit better than the pace that was set on the other side during the last 2 years of the previous Presidency. And I am trying to compare to the last 2 years of that Presidency to this Presidency.

I would also note that the nominees from New York are below other Article III judges on the Executive Calendar. As I understand it, our side has agreed to vote on the next judge on the calendar when we return.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, would my colleague yield for a brief question?

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will yield. Of course, I will yield.

Mr. SCHUMER. I very much appreciate his courtesy.

I understand my colleague has talked about what has been done in the Judiciary Committee which he chairs. Does my colleague deny the fact that confirmed on the floor of the Senate in the year 2007, which he referred to, there were 25 at this time and only 5 have been confirmed by this Senate? Does my colleague deny that fact?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I would agree to that, and I will speak to that point right now. It is very appropriate that my colleague would know exactly what I was going to say to answer his question.

Mr. SCHUMER. Great minds think alike.

Mr. GRASSLEY. With respect to the judges on the Executive Calendar, everybody knows at the end of last year the Senate rammed through 11 judges, which under regular order—and regular order is very important in the U.S. Senate—should have been considered at the beginning of this Congress. That is what happened in 2006 when 13 nomina-

tions were returned to the President instead of being returned to the U.S. Senate in the next Congress. The end of 2006 is comparable to what was done at the end of 2014. Had we not confirmed those 11 judicial nominees during the lame duck last year, we would be roughly at the same pace for judicial confirmations this year compared to 2007. So put that in your pipe and smoke it, Senator SCHUMER.

We are moving at a reasonable pace. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Without smoking, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

GOVERNING IN THE SENATE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from New York gave very good words that I want to follow up on. He said that we were promised when Republicans took over we said things would be different in governing. They are different. I would just like to show the Senator from New York that promises made are promises kept. I think the best example of promises made was a January 2014 speech by the leadership of the Republicans where a speech was given that if there were Republican control of the United States Senate, then we would govern.

I think the best way to show that Republicans are governing is this: there were 370 House bills that died in the U.S. Senate under the leadership of the Democrat majority. We had 15 amendments with rollcall votes. So far this year, we have had over 160 rollcall votes on amendments.

We have passed over 40 bipartisan bills, reported over 160 bills out of committee, had 29 bills signed into law, and balanced the first budget for over a decade. Under Republican leadership, we had a budget agreement for the first time in 6 years, whereas under the Democratic majority we had one budget in 6 years. The law requires that we adopt a budget every year, and we have done that.

We made a promise that the Senate was going to function as a deliberative body, unlike the way it was run under the Democratic majority for the 6 years of this Presidency. From that standpoint, we have done that with the statistics that I just gave you.

The Senator from New York says we were promised a Senate that would govern, but the only metric he is using is whether judges are moving at the same pace as they did when they took over the U.S. Senate in 2007. And that is an inadequate way to measure how well the Senate is governing. We must look at all the work the Senate is doing. And the Senate is doing the good work we promised we'd do before the election. We have delivered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, thank you.

We have had some interesting back-and-forth here this morning. We had a great message from our good Senator from Maryland, and we had the colloquy we just saw here on judicial nominees. I want to move in a little different direction to something I think is important.

As the previous speaker talked about, the current majority is getting things done. I want to talk about for the first time in 10 years what is going to happen on this floor today, and that is for the first time in 10 years we are going to pass a multiyear transportation bill without raising taxes.

Keep in mind, we have done short-term transportation efforts 33 times before we finally got to the next multi-year bill that will be passed on this floor today. I believe one of the core constitutional functions of the Federal government is to create the infrastructure necessary to conduct commerce, trade, and allow general transportation. I sit on three of the four Senate committees tasked with developing this highway bill that we will vote on today—the Finance Committee, the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee, and the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee. Because of this, infrastructure development is one of my top priorities while here in this Congress.

It has been a pleasure to work with Chairman INHOFE, to work with Chairman THUNE, SHELBY, and HATCH over the past several months on this highway bill. I am very appreciative of our leadership team, particularly that of Leader MCCONNELL and Senator CORNYN for working to advance it before the authorities expire and the Congress adjourns for the August recess.

Moving forward with a highway bill that invests in our Nation's crumbling infrastructure, reduces congestion, and increases safety without adding to the national debt will create short-term jobs and long-term economic growth.

Western States like Nevada, which have experienced an unprecedented amount of growth over the past couple of decades, have the most to gain from this highway bill. Nevada is one of the fastest growing States in our Nation, adding nearly 850,000 people to that State in the last 15 years. In fact, the Silver State was the fastest growing State in the Nation in the decade of the 2000s, experiencing a 35-percent population increase. This growth, while exciting for the State, has posed additional strains on our transportation infrastructure system. From 1990 to 2013, vehicle travel on Nevada's highways has increased 141 percent.

It is also important to note that the Silver State's economy relies heavily on tourism. Travel spending adds nearly \$60 billion to Nevada's economy annually, accounting for about 13 percent

of the State's GDP. Safe and reliable roads and bridges in our State and throughout the country are crucial to growing our economy.

Our rapidly expanding State has a long list of infrastructure priorities to address. A multiyear highway bill will provide the resources and tools that will benefit high priority projects such as the Boulder City Bypass, the Carson City Freeway, and the I-15 widening in Las Vegas—which, by the way, is Nevada's busiest freeway. Under Nevada's most conservative budgetary plans, our Department of Transportation has identified over \$9 billion of capital improvement projects over the next 20 years. Short-term patches will not put a dent in that work plan. Additionally, it is important to cut bureaucratic red tape that will speed up permitting and ensure that our Nation gets more roads, more bridges, more rail projects and other infrastructure developments for every dollar that we invest.

Over the past couple of months, I have worked diligently on my committees and with the Environment and Public Works Committee in a bipartisan manner to include a variety of Nevada and national safety priorities in the highway bill, which are included in the Senate bill that we will vote on today.

First and foremost of those priorities is the expansion of Interstate 11 to northern Nevada. I have been working for years with my colleagues in both the Nevada and Arizona delegations on Capitol Hill to move I-11 forward. In the 112th Congress, we were successful in including language in the last highway bill, MAP-21, to officially designate an interstate route connecting Phoenix and Las Vegas. These are the two largest cities that are not connected by an interstate highway system.

Let me say that again, Mr. President. Phoenix and Las Vegas are the two largest cities in America that are not connected with an interstate highway system.

I have been working diligently to extend the proposed highway to I-80 in northern Nevada. Earlier this year, I introduced the bipartisan, bicameral Intermountain West Corridor Development Act to extend the route north and worked with Chairman INHOFE to include it in the DRIVE Act. This full north-to-south, Canada-to-Mexico interstate system is a project of national significance, critical for our Nation's mobility, economy, and national defense. This extension will open even more markets for tourism and trade, create jobs and improve the economy for the entire Western United States.

I have also worked to include policies in the bill that will greatly benefit the Lake Tahoe region's transportation efforts. The Tahoe Basin is a unique area, shared by the States of Nevada and California but also heavily con-

trolled by the Federal Government. In fact, the Feds are the largest land managers of the Lake Tahoe Basin, controlling 77 percent of the land. Under current law, Tahoe is not considered as one area, from a transportation perspective, because the size of Lake Tahoe separates the individual communities that surround the lake.

The growing tourism industry greatly benefits the local economy but also poses additional strains on the region's transportation system. The language included in both the EPW and banking titles ensures the population of California and Nevada communities surrounding the lake is considered a singular entity. This will greatly benefit local leaders as they seek additional resources to implement the Basin's innovative 21st century highway and transit plans.

As a member of the commerce committee, I also worked with Chairman THUNE on the Comprehensive Transportation and Consumer Protection Act, which was approved earlier this month in our committee and is also part of this bill. It includes important reforms that will enhance the safety of our roads and our railways.

I am pleased legislation I introduced with my friend from Massachusetts Senator MARKEY, Safety Through Informed Consumers Act, commonly referred to as the STICRS Act, was included in the commerce bill. This policy promotes the purchase of safer cars by requiring the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration to integrate crash avoidance technology information, such as active braking and lane tracking technology, onto the safety ratings listed on your car's stickers.

Consumers have a right to the most accurate and up-to-date information possible when making decisions on what cars to purchase. A separate five-star rating for crash avoidance technologies or an adjustment to the current rating system that would preclude a new car from getting five stars unless it has at least one of these new crash avoidance technologies will make it clear to every buyer whether the vehicle they are considering has the latest and the best in safety technology.

Senator SCHATZ and I have also teamed up on a safe streets amendment, aimed at improving pedestrian safety. Threats to pedestrian safety are increasingly becoming a problem in my State. The number of pedestrian fatalities has nearly doubled in the Silver State in just the last 3 years. In total, pedestrian fatalities are nearly one-quarter of our overall traffic fatalities. Nevada is the sixth most dangerous for pedestrians over the age of 65 years. I know our State regional transportation organizations are working diligently to address the pedestrian safety concerns. I hope our initiative will spur innovative transportation planning

throughout the Nation that aims to improve bike and pedestrian safety.

Finally, I had a provision included in the bill that restores some sanity to the Department of Transportation's hours of service regulation. Under the existing rule, drivers of commercial motor vehicles are required to take a 30-minute break after most 8 hours of consecutive work. Industries such as the ready mixed concrete industry, whose products are perishable, find it difficult to implement the HOS regulation given the unique conditions of their work.

Concrete is needed on a just-in-time basis. Once a delivery is started, it must be completed or the concrete may harden in the truck, causing thousands of dollars of damage in that vehicle. Concrete delivery often takes more than 2½ hours to complete. Mixer drivers are also unique in the commercial truckdriving industry, in that they typically spend only 40 percent of their time on duty actually driving. The other 60 percent is spent at the plant waiting to be dispatched, at the job site waiting on the contractor to receive the concrete or unloading the concrete itself. This one-size-fits-all regulation does not make sense. I am pleased my provision making this existing administrative exemption for perishable goods permanent has been included in the commerce bill.

I would be remiss if I did not mention some important rail infrastructure policies also included in the commerce bill. Freight rail plays a major role in Nevada's economy. The Silver State has 1,192 miles of rail track, and nearly 43 million tons of freight moves through the State each year via rail, supporting over 700 high-paying jobs. I was proud to team up with my friends Senator BLUNT and Senator BOOKER on two stand-alone proposals that are in the rail title.

First, the Track, Railroad, and Infrastructure Network Act, which streamlines permitting for the development of new railroad structure, is critical to ensure scant infrastructure dollars are spent efficiently and spent wisely. Additionally, the Railroad Infrastructure Financing Improvement Act implements a variety of good government reforms to the revolving loan program utilized to spur development of railroad infrastructure. The program is notoriously underutilized. I believe it is important that we ensure this valuable tool is reworked so it can be used for new freight and passenger rail development.

I strongly supported the rail reform title when it was approved by the commerce committee and believe it is important that we include rail as part of the surface transportation bill. Improving rail safety, expanding both passenger and freight rail infrastructure are critical components of Nevada's and our Nation's long-term economic

development plans. A long-term surface and transportation bill is extremely important to the State of Nevada and also to our Nation.

Transportation efficiency and reliability is critical for our Nation's economic competitiveness, and the policies in the bill will help address the need to maintain, repair, and expand the national transportation system, but none of these important policies will get done if Congress kicks the can down the road.

Passing a strong multiyear bill in the Senate sends an important message to our colleagues in the House. I urge my colleagues to support the DRIVE Act. Again, I thank Leader MCCONNELL and Chairmen INHOFE, Senators THUNE, SHELBY, and HATCH for working with me on my priorities. They know how important it is that we enact policies that increase infrastructure efficiency, improve safety, and create jobs throughout the Nation. By passing this bill, we show the American people the Senate is back to work supporting policies to create jobs and spur economic development across our Nation.

I yield the floor.

PRIVATE SECTOR ENGINEERING AND DESIGN SERVICES

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Environment and Public Works Committee on an amendment that I have filed to H.R. 22, the DRIVE Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, as the chairman of the committee is well aware, private sector engineering and design services can play an important role in the development and maintenance of our Nation's transportation infrastructure. By supplementing the capabilities of engineers at State DOTs, private sector engineering and design services enable State and local governments to deliver projects more efficiently and with long-term cost savings.

In order to make better use of these private sector resources, I have introduced an amendment which will provide incentives to States that make use of innovative engineering and design approaches by bringing in the expertise of private sector companies. This amendment is intended to streamline and improve the efficient delivery of highway and bridge projects and would not increase Federal spending. In the last Congress, working with Senators BOXER and VITTER, the committee included this identical provision in the highway authorization bill that was unanimously approved by the Environment and Public Works Committee.

The language has not been included in the bill we are debating today, and while I recognize that many hard decisions have had to be made in order to

achieve a bipartisan consensus on this bill, I ask for Chairman INHOFE's commitment to work with us as the DRIVE Act progresses to conference.

Mr. INHOFE. I thank the Senator for raising this issue and for his commitment to helping to pass a long-term surface transportation bill. The Senator is correct about the time constraints the Senate is under, as we must pass this bill before July 31. Unfortunately, that means we have been unable to include many worthy provisions in the DRIVE Act, such as his amendment, which I support as a means of improving the efficient delivery of Federal taxpayer dollars.

I share the Senator's enthusiasm for fostering the use of private sector expertise in transportation construction. While this expertise is useful at all times, it is particularly useful in the aftermath of natural disasters, when a State must act quickly to rebuild its infrastructure. This is something we are very familiar with in my home State of Oklahoma.

I thank the Senator from Arkansas for his leadership on this issue and he has my commitment that I will work with the Senator on this matter during our bipartisan conference negotiations with the House.

Mr. BOOZMAN. I thank the distinguished chairman for taking a moment to discuss this issue and I look forward to working with him on this bill.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today the Senate will approve a comprehensive, 6-year authorization for our Nation's transportation systems. It will give our States and local communities the ability to plan for investments in the critical infrastructure that supports our cities and towns, enables inter- and intrastate commerce, and creates jobs for American workers.

This bill is far from perfect; I have strong concerns about the lack of safety measures in this bill. The battle on whether to allow mammoth tractor trailer trucks—the equivalent of wheeled eight-story buildings—to drive alongside all the other motorists on some of our roads will come up again in the fall and so I will continue to fight to put safety first. I am concerned that this bill will undermine the goals of the National Environmental Policy Act. And I am concerned that, while we have before us a needed 6-year authorization, this transportation bill is funded only through 2018. I hope that as the Senate and the House conference a long-term transportation authorization bill, these concerns will be adequately addressed.

It is regrettable that some in Congress, for several years now, have done their utmost to undermine what used to be strong bipartisan support for responsible and timely reauthorizations and funding of the highway trust fund and our transportation infrastructure. The result has been a continuing era of

stop-gap, short-term fixes, which hobble State and local transportation planning and which impose unending uncertainty on their vital work. How short-sighted, and how irresponsible. We must get back to that kind of consensus, and that kind of forward-thinking action.

A series of short-term patches do not provide States like Vermont—where the construction season is short, and the infrastructure needs are many—with the certainty they need to make needed repairs to the bridges, roads and byways that keep business moving and connect our rural towns and villages. This legislation, however, is the result of compromise on all sides. This bill protects the MAP-21 funding formula, which will benefit Vermont and maintain a level stream of Federal funding for Vermont. I am also pleased the bill includes a 20 percent revenue provision dedicated to highway and transit growth, despite previous attempts to decrease it to 6 percent. I am also gratified that, in working with the relevant committee chairs, we were able in this final bill to remove unnecessary and harmful exemptions to the Freedom of Information Act, which remains the public's first line of defense in the right to know what their government is doing. Nowhere is the free flow of information more important than when the safety and wellbeing of every Vermonter—of every American—is at stake.

The House of Representatives now has an opportunity. They can kick the can down the road, beyond this year, or they can get to work, to devise a meaningful, reasonable long-term transportation authorization bill. Short-term authorizations will not adequately address our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. After investing billions of dollars in infrastructure development overseas, it is well past time to invest right here at home, in our own people and their communities, and in our own country. We need this certainty, and we need it now.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I support the bipartisan DRIVE Act because we can't make the perfect the enemy of the good. This bill will provide 3 years of funding and stability to States that want to plan major multiyear construction projects. This means badly needed jobs in construction for labor unions, contractors, engineers, and manufacturers of transportation materials. This is good news.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, Maryland's infrastructure has a C- rating. Our roads and transit have a C- rating and our bridges a B- rating. Nearly a quarter of Maryland's major roadways are in poor condition and 317 of our 5,291 bridges are structurally deficient.

In addition, Marylanders face some of the worst traffic congestion in the Nation. I commute every day from Balti-

more to Washington and know how bad it has become. The Washington region is the No. 1 most congested area in the Nation and the Baltimore region is the fifth. These conditions cost Maryland's commuters between \$1,200 and \$1,500 per year.

We need at least \$4 billion to replace the B&P and Howard Street tunnels in Baltimore. If we want to double stack these major rail arteries for the Port of Baltimore, we need \$8 billion.

In 2013, the State of Maryland was forced to pass a gas tax. Sadly, today our statewide transportation needs still remain unmet. If we add up every Maryland county's No. 1 transportation priority, it equals \$20 billion. Yet, we still have competing job corridor needs in the urban and rural parts of the State.

That is why I was hoping for a more substantial bill—a true shot in the arm to tackle our aging infrastructure and ease congestion. But I will vote for the DRIVE Act because doing nothing is unacceptable and short-term extensions do not provide the planning and funding certainty States need to put millions of workers on the job. These are jobs in construction, engineering, and manufacturing right here in the United States.

Bright spots in this bill for Maryland include the new formula-based freight program. These additional dollars will help the class I railroads in Maryland, CSX and Norfolk Southern, and our short line railroads. It also is good news for the operations at the Port of Baltimore.

I also appreciate the strengthened transit safety oversight role of the U.S. Department of Transportation for the Nation's metro systems. While I would have liked the Metro Senators' stronger amendment to be debated and adopted, the underlying bill is a good step in the right direction for safety. Safety is our collective No. 1 priority for the riders and workers of the Washington Metro system.

The bill gives the Secretary of Transportation the authority to establish minimum safety standards for the safe operations of metro systems. This builds upon what I was able to accomplish in MAP-21 working with Senators Dodd, SHELBY, and MENENDEZ. We gave the department new authority to establish and enforce Federal safety standards focusing on railcars.

The bill also requires the Secretary to review the existing safety standards and protocols of metro systems. It requires a report to Congress with the findings, list of recommendations, needed legislative changes, and the action the Secretary will take to establish Federal safety standards.

Before I conclude, I would like to voice my disappointment that the DRIVE Act is not stronger on safety. I am a cosponsor of the Feinstein-Wicker amendment on double 33 truck

trailers. Because of the parliamentary procedures to prevent consideration of amendments, including germane amendments, this amendment was not considered.

I am opposed to extending the length of double truck trailers. The State of Maryland prohibits operation of these trucks. I have heard from Maryland families who have lost loved ones in truck crashes. The Slattery family lost Mrs. Slattery and the crash left their son, Matthew, with severe brain damage. Mr. Slattery and Matthew came to the Appropriations Committee markup of the fiscal year 2016 Transportation, Housing and Urban Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill. Sadly, this same amendment failed by a tie vote of 15 to 15.

I also heard from Don Bowman, owner of D.M. Bowman, Incorporated, a family-owned trucking company in Williamsport, MD, and our State's fire service community. They all think double 33 truck trailers are a dangerous idea.

I commend Senator BOXER for her hard work on this bill. Passing this bill is the right thing to do for jobs and our economy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I do appreciate the comments from the Senator from Nevada. It is a reminder that a lot of people think almost all of this act is from the Environment and Public Works Committee. About 75 percent is, but we do have the commerce committee, we have the banking committee, and the other provisions. A lot of people have been working on this, not just our committee.

I am glad we got a good vote yesterday. I think it is important that we have a strong vote because we certainly want to encourage the House—and I think the House will be taking up our bill. In fact, I think a lot of the staff people are working on that right now over on the other side. Anyway, the importance of this is significant. If we do not pass the DRIVE Act out of this Chamber, then what we are doing is reinforcing current law.

What is current law? Current law is short-term extensions. That means it is the worst possible outcome. It means no big projects, for one thing. We spent yesterday—most of the day yesterday, our comments were on the big projects, the big bridges, and those things that need to be done.

But the big projects—normally you are talking about between \$700 million and \$1.4 billion. They can't be done on short-term extensions. Logically, everybody knows that. They are not done. Our problem is, the last bill we passed was in 2005. It ran out in 2009. Since that time, it has been short-term extensions. So we have not gotten into any of the projects that have to be done.

The tendency, I guess, to do the hard things, is to wait until something collapses and a bunch of people die, such as happened in Minnesota. That could have been done before. That was done in the 2005 act in my State of Oklahoma, however, not until after a young lady was driving her car under one of our bridges and a bunch of concrete fell off and killed her, the mother of three children.

Why wait until a disaster occurs? The current law fails to provide the long-term certainties the States and cities are going to have to have on their big projects to get them off the ground. Current law funding has no growth, not even for inflation. The DRIVE Act provides growth in highway and transit programs to each State. The current law gives States and local governments no certainty. There have been 33 short-term extensions since the SAFETEA-LU bill was passed—that is 33. When you pass those extensions, as I said, it takes 30 percent off the top. Clearly, the conservative position is to have a long-term bill. You would not have the project delivery. The DRIVE Act eliminates the duplicative review and expands categorical exclusions. We cannot do that with short-term extensions.

Transparency. That was a lot of work. What we don't want is, as we are spending money as the years go by and the months go by and the weeks go by—we have transparency built into this so people can have faith and know exactly what programs there are.

Innovation. The DRIVE Act prepares our Nation's transportation system for the future by promoting innovation across all aspects of the program. The transportation system will be stuck in reverse if we stick with the current law. The current law, now this is what we have been doing since 2009.

I think it is also worthwhile for us to keep in mind that there are some things I wanted in the bill that we could not get in. I wanted to change this 80-20 Federal match program. First of all, we had 60-40—that was not acceptable—and 70-30. I have to admit it was not the Democrats; it was the Republicans who objected to that. Consequentially, we had to go ahead and go back to 80-20. If this legislation does not pass, then it is still going to be 80-20 because that is current law. So that would not change.

Anyway, the freight section of this directs new funding toward freight transportation projects that provide the platform for our businesses to compete globally. The freight program sometimes does not get the attention. One of the good things about a transportation bill and the way we do this, and have done it historically, is we go to the States.

I can assure you that the Arizona Transportation Department knows a lot more about what their needs are

than we do in our infinite wisdom here in Washington. So they don't get as concerned about freight programs and freight expenditures because they do not directly benefit the particular State it goes through, but they benefit the entire country.

We actually have a freight section in this that is very good. It hasn't been done before. I will go into greater detail about the new National Freight Program and what it means to America's economy. Today, the National Highway System carries more than 55 percent of the Nation's highway traffic and 97 percent of the truck freight traffic. Of the 4 million miles of public roads, the National Highway System represents only 5.5 percent. So what we are saying is, 5 percent of the roads out there transport 55 percent of the highway traffic and 97 percent of the freight traffic.

Americans depend on the well-maintained National Highway System that provides a critical connection between the urban areas and the rural areas. American businesses pay and estimate \$27 billion a year in extra freight transportation costs due to the poor condition of the public roads, which increases shipping delays and raises prices on everyday products. Recognizing that this is the foundation for the Nation's economy and the key to the national ability to compete in a global economy, it is essential that we focus efforts to improve freight movement on the National Highway System.

The DRIVE Act includes two new programs to help the States deliver projects and promote the safety in that delivery. The bipartisan freight program levies its Federal investment by encouraging public-private partnerships and other creative financing approaches.

It also will create the first-ever freight-specific investment program, prioritizing investment in our commerce-moving network. The first new program is the National Freight Program. It is distributed by a formula that will provide funds to all States to enhance the movement of goods that go through their State.

This is something, as I have said, that has not been done before, and I haven't heard any objection. In fact, this isn't just State specific because this goes to the whole Nation, and so it is very popular. The program expands the flexibility for both rural and urban areas to designate key freight corridors, and it will help identify projects with a higher return on investment.

The second program that is new is the Assistance for Major Projects Program. It creates a competitive grant program to provide funds for the major projects. This is what we have been talking about the past several days, the very large projects that can't be done with short-term extensions. They are just neglected.

These new freight programs will only exist with the passage of the DRIVE Act, when it is enacted by Congress. It is time for us to become innovative and forward-thinking in how the Federal Government is using taxpayer dollars.

In talking about this type of program for States to improve the National Highway System, the DRIVE Act is the answer. It directly helps to relieve the freight bottlenecks around the country.

This is a chart of Chicago I-290, I-90, and I-94, the three intersections. This goes between those three. Look at it. It is all of these. I haven't even counted the lanes. Traffic is stopped, and it is just one of the congestions. When this happens, the average speed in this case is 29 miles an hour. In the morning and evening rush hour, it is 20 miles an hour. Then it talks about all of the pollution that is there. People are idling their engines while they are waiting in traffic.

There is a very similar situation in Houston, TX, the I-45. I have been on this one quite often, quite a few times. It is I-45 at U.S. 59. If you look at the chart, it is home to five of the top freight bottlenecks in the Nation. Texas is home to nine of them. The overall cost in conjunction with this to individuals in Texas is \$671 million annually and 8.8 million hours of delay. The I-45 is ranked third by the congestion index.

We have an index, and people know how bad it is and how it compares to other States. That is why this has been so popular.

I-45 at U.S. 610 is ranked 15th. The average speed is below 39 miles an hour. For morning and evening traffic, of course, it is much less than that.

Fort Lee, NJ, I-95. Anyone who is in Washington and wants to go anyplace on the north coast—New York, Connecticut, and on up—they have to go all the way up on I-95. This particular intersection, which is in Fort Lee—this is the George Washington Bridge. It connects Fort Lee, NJ, to New York City. By congestion index, it is the second worst freight bottleneck in the Nation. The average speed is 29 miles an hour. I have been on that one before, and it is a very old bridge. When you drive over it, you worry about whether you are going to make it. The George Washington Bridge is the world's busiest motor vehicle bridge, carrying over 106 million cars a year.

The DRIVE Act, with the newly formed freight program, will make targeted investments in the infrastructure critical to moving commerce and alleviating these bottlenecks I just mentioned. These new programs invest in the infrastructure needed to move goods across the Nation.

When you look at the corridors and you look at the bridges—we actually had one presentation where we went over the 20 busiest of all the traffic-congested areas in the country.

We are going to have a vote in 40 minutes. It is going to be one of the most critical votes of the year. I have no doubt that it is going to pass. But I wanted to send the signal across America, to the House of Representatives, and to everyone else that we really care about infrastructure.

I repeat—I feel compelled to do so—there are a lot of people who don't realize that the conservative position is to vote for a long-term infrastructure bill because it costs about 30 percent off the top—and that is a figure no one has debated, no one has talked about—if you do it piecemeal with short-term extensions, along with not getting this.

The other thing is, we have that old document nobody reads anymore; it is called the Constitution. If you look up article I, section 8, it says—you know, we do a lot of things around this Chamber that our forefathers never envisioned. They said what we ought to be doing—and it says so right in the Constitution—is two things: defend America, and roads and bridges.

Well, that was foreseen by Dwight Eisenhower. I have here in the Chamber a picture of Dwight Eisenhower. Many of us who are old enough to remember or those of us who have studied World War II know what a hero this guy was when he came in as President of the United States. He wanted the first national system to be primarily for defense, for defending our Nation. He said: Yes, it will help the economy. Here is the quote he makes. He talks about how this will be helpful to the economy. We all know that. There will be jobs, and people will be put back to work. But he also said—this was after World War II—that we have to move our goods and services around this country to defend this Nation.

I kind of have a dual role in this. The two major committees that I have—and I have served as the ranking member on both of them—are the defense committee, the Senate Armed Services Committee—and so I am very sensitive to the fact that there is a defense component to this bill we are going to be voting on today—as well as chairing the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

This is what he said back then. He said it is for defense purposes and it is something we have to have so that it goes in a uniform way across the Nation, not just for defense but for our economy. I would make one comment. You hear people say, and I used to say it myself—they talk about the program called devolution. Devolution is what a lot of people have looked at, and it sounds so good on the stump. Confession is good for the soul. I remember when I was the father of devolution, along with Connie Mack from Florida when we were both serving in the House. What that says is you repeal the Federal highway taxes and then you make them local taxes, you make them

State taxes so the States are participating.

But there are two problems with that. One is, how do you get a uniform program across the country? Take Wyoming, for example. If they repeal their Federal tax, in order to make up for it, since there are very few people in Wyoming but there are a lot of roads, they would have to pass a 48-cent tax increase. That is not going to happen. Devolution is based on the assumption that all States will pass a tax increase, and that isn't going to happen.

So that is the other reason we really need to have this, and we will. We are going to pass this bill. I think in the final analysis the House will too.

I will share with you, I say to the Presiding Officer, that when we had our last bill, it wasn't all that good. It was only a 27-month bill.

I can remember going over there, after we passed that on the floor of the Senate, and I requested an audience with the members of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee at the House, with the Republicans because there were a lot of them who were tea party Republicans, a lot of conservatives. I explained to them the same thing I just went over—the constitutional aspect of it as well as the cost of it and the fact that you cannot get projects done if you continue to do short-term extensions. When this came up in the House, every one of the 33 Republicans—all 33 of them—voted for it. I think that is what gives me confidence that when they see that there is a bill that we have passed out of this Chamber—you know, I was disappointed that the House was only going to be in session until Thursday; that is today. But they left last night; they moved it up a day. And I am not saying they did that so they wouldn't have to make a decision on this bill, but nonetheless that did happen.

I understand there are other Senators who wish to speak before the vote, and I certainly want to give them the opportunity. So I will conclude by saying that this is arguably one of the most important votes we will have. We are doing what the Constitution tells us to do. We are going to pass it, and it is going to happen.

I know there are two Members—one from the majority and one from the minority—who wish to speak. I think the majority leader will be coming in a matter of minutes too. So we do have several who want to be heard on this bill.

I think it is worth stating that 75 percent of the bill is in the Committee on Environment and Public Works. That is the committee I chair. When we developed this bill, we developed it over a period of time. They took about 4 months, and we worked on it. We took amendments, and we had major changes. In fact, I can remember going to the Republican conference and say-

ing: If you have amendments, before this is passed out of our committee and goes to the floor, I think it is important for you to get your amendments in so we can make them a part of the bill and then later on part of the managers' package. Well, the managers' package didn't work as we wanted it to, and everyone knows there are problems that caused that.

But we argued. We discussed this bill. We put it together for about 4 months in the committee. On June 24, we passed that out of the committee unanimously. All 20 members of the Environment and Public Works Committee—all Democrats, all Republicans—all voted for it. That doesn't happen very often.

The ranking member, the ranking Democrat on the committee is Senator BOXER from California. Senator BOXER and I don't agree on very much, but we do agree on this. I mean, she is a very proud liberal, and I am a very proud conservative. What we have in common is this bill; that is about it. As soon as this bill is over—I was joking with a group this morning—I said then we will go back to fighting again. Maybe that is more fun.

But with all of the problems we have in this country right now, a lot of people don't realize that one of the greatest problems is the overregulation by the bureaucracies, the unelected bureaucracies. We have watched that coming. We have seen it particularly in this administration. Just look at what the EPA is doing to harm businesses that are trying to do the American thing and hire people out there. We have all of these regulations that are coming online. We have the water regulations.

This is kind of interesting because historically the regulations over water have always been a State function, with the exception of navigable waters. Well, I understand that. I think everyone else understands that. But there are always the collectivists, the liberals who want to bring all of that power into Washington and take it away from the States. In my State of Oklahoma, we do a lot better job than the Federal Government does, so we have been in a position to be able to continue to have that regulation of water as a State function.

About 5 years ago, Senator Feingold in the Senate and Congressman Oberstar—they are from Wisconsin and Minnesota—introduced a bill to take the word "navigable" out, which means then the Federal Government would have regulation over all the waters. We have areas in Oklahoma that are very arid. The other day, I was out in the panhandle, Boise City. You don't get anyplace drier than Boise City, OK. I was out there and I told them that if the Federal Government were doing this, they would probably find the time after a rain to declare the panhandle of

Oklahoma a wetland because that is what they do. They want power. They want to expand their authority.

Anyway, they had this bill, and not only did we defeat the legislation to take the word “navigable” out, but we also defeated both the Senator and the House Member who were the sponsors.

I see my good friend from New York has arrived.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise to strongly oppose this cynical and opportunistic ploy to fulfill a longtime ideological goal to defund Planned Parenthood.

Let's talk facts, not rhetoric. The fact is no Federal funds can be used for an abortion. No Federal funds can be used for an abortion, except in the dire circumstances of rape, incest or the life of the mother.

Here is another fact. Only 3 percent of Planned Parenthood's work is dedicated to abortion services. The other 97 percent of their work is dedicated to preventive women's health services, such as STD testing and screenings, contraception, Pap tests, breast exams, cancer screenings, and other services, such as adoption referrals, pediatric care, and immunizations. So when someone says let's defund Planned Parenthood because they never liked that it ever existed, what they are saying to women, particularly low-income women, women in low-income communities, and many women of color is that they won't have access to a wide range of essential services because of an ideological desire to control what choices are being made by women and their doctors.

I fail to see the logic here. This exploitative movement, advanced by special interests, would effectively tell a half million American women: Sorry, you can't have a breast exam this year. Of all the issues that we are going to debate on the floor right now, why are we debating this? Why are we telling 400,000 American women: Sorry, you won't be able to have a lifesaving screening for cervical cancer.

We have kids in all 50 States who are going hungry during summer vacation because their parents can't afford to have that extra lunch they normally got from school. We have college graduates who can't afford to start their lives, buy a home, get married, and have kids because they are drowning in student debt. We have men and women in this country who work 40 hours a week, with no vacation days, no sick days, and are still stuck in poverty. That is not my vision of the American Dream.

We have millions of hard-working Americans who have to quit their jobs and lose paychecks every time they have a family emergency. It doesn't

matter if it is a new baby. It doesn't matter if their husband is dying of cancer. It doesn't matter if their mother is on her deathbed. They don't have access to paid family and medical leave. We are literally the only industrialized country that doesn't have paid leave.

This makes no sense in a country that believes if you work hard every day, you will be able to get into the middle class. That is simply not true for low-wage workers who are working 40 hours a week and are still below the poverty line and cannot meet those family needs because they have no paid leave.

But the issue this body wants to debate is defunding Planned Parenthood. This body wants to make sure that millions of women don't get basic access to health care. Whether or not to maliciously hurt an organization that provides vital health services to millions of American women—this is the issue our colleagues are using to threaten yet another government shutdown—controlling women's choices about their health, about their families, about their reproductive health care.

It is clear that some of my colleagues just want to roll back *Roe v. Wade*. That is their goal. That is their mission in life. It is ideologically driven and funded by special interests. That is their mission. But we should not return to the days when women had no medical independence.

Some of my colleagues will use any excuse they can to overreact and force this same tired old Planned Parenthood debate on us. But here is the fundamental truth about Planned Parenthood. Millions of women in this country—women in low-income communities, women of color, women in every State—rely on Planned Parenthood for basic health care—mammograms, cervical screenings, access to contraception, and family planning. They rely on it to prevent disease. They rely on it to detect disease. They rely on it to treat disease. We cannot and will not defund Planned Parenthood.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, over the last couple of weeks we have been discussing some pretty basic and important work that we need to do when it comes to our Nation's infrastructure—specifically, the highway bill that we will vote on and pass out of the Senate today.

I am very encouraged by the fact that the House of Representatives has now taken up the challenge of coming up with their own highway bill, and we are going to pass a 3-month temporary extension to give them the chance to do that and then to give all of us a chance to get to a conference committee and come up, hopefully, with an even better bill.

That is the way the Senate and the House are supposed to work, and that is why I am encouraged. I think the debate we have had over the highway bill is a good one, and I am glad to see, as I say, that we are on the right track.

In my State of Texas we know that good infrastructure and a working highway system are important for a number of reasons. First, it is important for public safety. Second, it is important for the environment. Third, it is important for the economy because when goods can flow freely across the roads and the highways and the freight lines in our State, it helps improve our economy and creates a more favorable condition for jobs.

When you come from a State such as mine, which is a fast-growing State, that growth requires the improvements, repairs, and modernization of our roadways to accommodate the visitors who come to our State, as well as those who move there—some 1,000 more each day. So that is why I am pleased this legislation will include resources that will make the lives of everyday Texans better.

Resources in this bill—which I should stress involves no tax increases—invest in interstates and freight routes and provide for much-needed border infrastructure projects to promote legitimate trade and travel flowing across our international border, while supporting economic development and improved quality of life.

WORK IN THE SENATE

This bill is just another reminder of the Senate's progress we have made in the 114th Congress under new management. This year, the Senate has made a lot of progress on key pieces of legislation. The fact is we are finally back working again in a bipartisan manner that provides real solutions for the American people.

I am proud to say that work includes things on a wide spectrum of priorities, including passing a budget for the first time since 2009, legislation that fights the scourge of human trafficking, a trade bill that will open up new markets for American-made products, and of course earlier this year, the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which was signed into law and freezes the administration's ability to lift sanctions on Iran until representatives of the American people have had a chance to carefully examine President Obama's deal.

As I mentioned a number of times, I have many concerns about this deal, and I will continue to remind the President of his own words when he said that no deal is better than a bad deal. I couldn't agree more, even though he and the rest of the administration are actively suggesting that the only real alternative to this deal is war—a statement which is demonstrably false.

I think, unfortunately, that is a scare tactic. I hope people of goodwill will be

persuaded by the facts and not scare tactics, and I hope we will have that debate in September after all the Members of the Senate and the House have had a chance to thoroughly immerse themselves in the terms of this deal and are prepared to debate that on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of the House.

But our work is not over. Earlier this week, I cosponsored legislation, along with a number of my colleagues, which would provide additional money for women's primary health care services while at the same time defunding Planned Parenthood. I know I speak for many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say I was shocked, saddened, and disgusted at the several recent videos that depicted human life being reduced to spare parts for sale. This is a heartbreaking practice, and we cannot let it stand. We must stand up to protect the most vulnerable.

This bill does that by defunding Planned Parenthood, which has made a practice of taking aborted children and then selling the body parts for compensation. The one reason why this is so important is that, beyond the immediate disgust at these videos in the way that somehow this trafficking in human body parts has become a commercialized practice that Planned Parenthood engages in, since 1976 there has actually been a prohibition in U.S. law against the use of tax dollars to pay for abortion, except in some rare circumstances, and that is known as the Hyde amendment, named after Congressman Henry Hyde. This has been part of the law of the land since 1976.

What Planned Parenthood has done is taken tax dollars and claimed they have separated those tax dollars from the privately raised money they use that then finances abortion. They say: Well, we use the tax dollars for women's health services, and we don't use any tax dollars to pay for abortions. Well, we all know that is a convenient fiction, because money is fungible. The tax dollars paid by you, me, and all of us in the United States who are taxpayers goes into a single fund that pays for the operation of Planned Parenthood—the largest abortion provider in America.

So this legislation is very important because it does take care of the primary care women's health services, but it defunds Planned Parenthood's abortion practice, consistent with the Hyde amendment, which has been the law of the land since 1976.

By doing it in this way, I would say that we are actually improving and increasing access for women to health care services through places such as our community health clinics. In my State alone, there are almost eight times more community health centers that could provide these primary care

services to women than there are Planned Parenthood outlets. So this actually will increase access to primary care for women, while defunding Planned Parenthood's abortion practice, consistent with the Hyde amendment.

I hope this is legislation we can all unite behind. I would implore all of our colleagues, when we vote on this next Monday afternoon, to join us in getting on the bill by voting for cloture and then debating it and passing it.

While I am glad Congress has a clear way forward to meet our Nation's infrastructure needs on this bill, we have a lot more we need to do to protect and serve the American people.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, just one quick comment before Senator BOXER makes some remarks.

We have talked about this. We have talked about the significance of the upcoming vote. I just want to reemphasize to my conservative colleagues on the Republican side that this is something which is a conservative position. The only alternative to this is short-term extensions, which cost about 30 percent off the top.

So let's do in this vote what the Constitution tells us to do and take care of one of the two assignments that are given to us in article I, section 8 of the Constitution; that is, roads and highways.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased to be here today. This has been a long and winding road to get to the point where we can pass a transportation bill which is a very good bill and which is very bipartisan. According to a formula, each and every one of our States will get more than they have in the past.

This is what our States are facing. This is a bridge between Arizona and California. I am sure my friend knows what happened. People commuting between our States have had to go 400 miles out of their way.

We cannot turn away from this vote today. I know and my friend from Oklahoma knows that each one of us would have written a different bill, but the process means we have to come together. This person says "I don't like the process" and this one says "I don't like the pay-fors." Well, I am sure Senator INHOFE and I feel the same way, but we know that if we run into a con-

struction worker who is unemployed and we say "Well, we didn't vote for this because we didn't like the process," they would say "I need a paycheck."

So I am going to ask our colleagues to vote aye for three reasons.

First, let's get our construction workers back to work. We have so many of them—hundreds of thousands—who are out of work. The general contractors told us last week that in 25 States they are seeing layoffs of construction workers because we are not doing a long-term bill. So let's help our construction workers get back to work.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three letters of support from the Nation's leading construction unions and additional letters of support I received from the Transportation Construction Coalition and the Highway Materials Group.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Infrastructure Alliance, July 22, 2015]

H.R. 22—SENATE CLOTURE VOTE
(By Raymond J. Poupore, Executive Vice President)

The leading construction unions building our country's surface transportation infrastructure strongly urge a "YES" vote on the Motion to Proceed to debate H.R. 22—The DRIVE Act.

As persistent high unemployment still plagues the construction industry, we need a well funded, multi-year infrastructure bill to put hundreds of thousands of our members to work building critical highway and transit projects. It is our understanding that the transit title in this bill actually exceeds its traditional 20 percent share, despite rumors to the contrary.

Through this legislation, we can begin to address the most pressing needs facing our transportation infrastructure. Please support your constituent construction workers by voting to proceed on the DRIVE Act.

LABORERS' INTERNATIONAL UNION
OF NORTH AMERICA,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LIUNA), I urge you to support the motion to proceed to consideration of a long term reauthorization of the federal highway and transit programs.

Last month, the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee unanimously approved S. 1647, the Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy (DRIVE) Act. Now is the time for the rest of the U.S. Senate to join together and embrace a bipartisan effort to invest in this Nation and reject the politics of division.

A long term highway bill will help provide necessary funds to improve America's crumbling transportation infrastructure. Our economy requires a functioning transportation network and with bridges literally falling apart and highways unable to handle current traffic volumes, America's transportation infrastructure is in dire need of a robust and sustainable investment.

Under the current extensions, the Highway Trust Fund is unable to fully fund these necessary repairs, making our highways and bridges more susceptible to further deterioration. A long term federal commitment to invest in the Nation's infrastructure and safety needs is essential.

I urge you to end the delays on political games and pass a long term highway bill before Congress leaves for vacation.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHARLES E. SCHUMER,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. DICK DURBIN,
Hart Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PATTY MURRAY,
Russell Senate Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS REID, DURBIN, SCHUMER, AND MURRAY: At this critical moment for America's transportation infrastructure, the International Union of Operating Engineers respectfully requests the support of Senate Democratic Leadership for immediate passage of a long-term highway and transit bill. Passage of the cloture vote today is a necessary step in order to have a debate on revenue options to fund the nation's biggest, most important infrastructure programs.

The model developed by the Environment and Public Works Committee in the DRIVE Act (Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act), both procedurally and substantively, should serve as the framework for Senate floor consideration. The bipartisan process led to a consensus and unanimous committee vote. The substance of the policy issues ensured that extreme measures from both the left and the right were rejected.

Aspects of the Commerce Committee markup were a serious disappointment, as you know. Similarly, consistent references to partisan revenue-raisers understandably make policymakers reluctant to engage in serious debate. While the sensitive nature of negotiations and legislative strategy leaves us with precious few details, we are assured that "real revenue" could be available to the program with bipartisan support. Serious revenue options must be on the table, and egregious, partisan provisions must be off the table. It is that simple, if we have any chance of success.

The DRIVE Act addresses what is perhaps the most pressing domestic economic issue of our time: reauthorization of a multiyear highway and transit program. The Act's legislative framework provides a six-year certainty to transportation planners, the construction industry, and its supply chain. It builds on important successes in MAP-21 by expediting project delivery and making the approval process more transparent. Additionally, it creates a new, national emphasis on freight movement, and it targets resources at projects of national and regional significance.

As you know, we need a long-term solution. We cannot afford to wait. Thousands of Operating Engineers depend on these investments for their livelihoods. We cannot rely

on "aspirational thinking" about comprehensive agreements that could include funding for this essential program.

The transportation advocacy community believes wholeheartedly that now is the time to build on the bipartisan momentum generated in the Environment and Public Works Committee to move a robust, long-term bill through the Senate before the summer break. We look forward to working with you to enact such a long-term highway and transit bill as soon as possible.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

JAMES T. CALLAHAN,
General President.

JULY 29, 2015.

DEAR SENATOR: The 31 national associations and construction trade unions of the Transportation Construction Coalition (TCC) urge you to support passage of the "Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy (DRIVE) Act." The bipartisan surface transportation reauthorization bill would guarantee three years of increased highway and public transportation investment and provide further certainty to states by distributing six years of contract authority.

The Highway Trust Fund has suffered five cash flow crises requiring \$65 billion in temporary cash infusions since 2008. With a sixth trust fund revenue shortfall less than a month away, seven states have delayed or canceled projects valued at \$1.6 billion. Furthermore, the Congressional Budget Office projects the trust fund will be unable to support any new highway or transit spending in FY 2016 without remedial action.

This repeating cycle of uncertainty and piecemeal management undermines the ability of state transportation departments to implement multi-year transportation plans and discourages the private sector from making investments in new capital and personnel. By supporting the DRIVE Act, senators not only have an opportunity to stabilize surface transportation investment, but to do so as part of legislation that would enact a series of meaningful policy reforms to help grow the economy and promote improved mobility for all Americans.

The DRIVE Act includes provisions that would streamline the transportation project review process to expedite the delivery of needed highway and bridge improvements. The measure would also create a dedicated freight program and a major projects assistance program—both of which would help enhance U.S. economic competitiveness.

The members of the TCC remain concerned about the need to enact a permanent solution to stabilize and grow Highway Trust Fund revenue. The Senate surface transportation reauthorization construct would provide ample time to develop and enact such a plan while federal highway and transit investment is unthreatened over the next three years.

We strongly urge all senators to support the DRIVE Act to provide your states with the stable and growing resources they need to help them deliver the highway and public transportation improvements the U.S. economy and all Americans need.

Sincerely,

THE TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION
COALITION.

JULY 29, 2015.

STATEMENT OF THE HIGHWAY MATERIALS
GROUP (HMG) AS THE DEADLINE NEARS ON
HIGHWAY FUNDING REAUTHORIZATION

The Highway Materials Group applauds the efforts by all Senators—notably Majority

Leader McConnell, Chairman Inhofe and Ranking Member Boxer and their staffs—in support of a long term reauthorization bill that increases funding for the nation's highways and transit systems.

We fully support final Senate passage this week and urge a YES vote on the bipartisan, multi-year Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy (DRIVE) Act which offers great hope to the modernization of our nation's infrastructure.

We urge House Transportation and Infrastructure Chairman Shuster and House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Ryan to utilize the hours of hearings, site visits and stakeholder input they have held and bring together their Committees soon after the August recess to produce a multiyear, fully-funded bill that warrants House support.

Most importantly, before departing for the August recess, we urge House and Senate leadership to unequivocally state their commitment to send to the President a well-funded, multiyear highway bill by the end of October.

The Highway Materials Group (HMG), comprised of nine national associations listed below, represent companies that provide the construction materials and equipment essential to building America's roads, highways, and bridges. We employ tens of thousands of men and women in well-paying American jobs, and we stand in support of this important legislative action.

American Coal Ash Association, American Concrete Pavement Association, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Associated Equipment Distributors, Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, National Asphalt Pavement Association, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association, Portland Cement Association.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is rare to have the National Association of Manufacturers and the Chamber of Commerce in agreement with the entire structure of the construction industry workers, all of those unions. I put their names into the RECORD. It is unique to have Mothers Against Drunk Driving in that coalition and to have the National Governors Association in that coalition and to have the mayors organization in that coalition.

My friend from Oklahoma and my friend from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, whom I thank from the bottom of my heart—we were kind of smiling the other day because we had the mayor of Oklahoma City and the mayor of New York ask us for a long-term bill; no more short-term extensions. That is the kind of coalition building we are seeing out in the country and one that I think we are living proof of here today.

So I will close with where I started. To me, this is the poster child for why we have to act today. There are more than 60,000 bridges that are obsolete or deficient. If we don't pass this bill today and the House doesn't take it up and pass it or something else similar to it or get to conference, we are back to, I think it is, the 34th short extension. That is doomsday—doomsday.

I am sad the House went out for a 5½-week break. It is the first time in 10

years they went out for an August break before August. I find it ironic that they went out even a day earlier so they are not there if we do, in fact, pass our legislation and send it over.

Why are they doing this? They need to act. I am encouraged that Speaker BOEHNER said that he has asked his committee to act. If we can do it over here, they can do it over there.

I will close with this: I am very pleased that we have reached this point. It has taken a lot of work and a lot of compromise. We had to give some ground, but we found common ground. We all believe this bill is so important for our Nation.

I urge everyone, regardless of how we voted before, to understand this is not what we want to see in America. We can't have more of these bridge collapses, and we can't have more of these streets falling apart. Now, 50 percent are in disrepair. This is the day.

I thank Senator INHOFE. I thank Senator DURBIN. I thank Senator MCCONNELL. I thank Senator NELSON. And later, when we finish with this, I will thank many others. The staffs have been unbelievable. We were working into the wee hours of the morning for the last week.

I also thank you, Madam President, for your role in this and your help in this. I am proud that I serve on the committee with you. We have worked well together. I hope we have a good vote, a solid vote for this bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). All postcloture time is expired.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 65, nays 34, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 260 Leg.]

YEAS—65

Alexander	Boxer	Cochran
Ayotte	Burr	Collins
Baldwin	Cantwell	Coons
Barrasso	Capito	Cornyn
Bennet	Cardin	Daines
Blunt	Cassidy	Durbin
Boozman	Coats	Enzi

Ernst	King	Roberts
Feinstein	Kirk	Rounds
Fischer	Klobuchar	Sanders
Franken	Leahy	Schatz
Gardner	Manchin	Sessions
Grassley	McCain	Shaheen
Hatch	McCaskey	Stabenow
Heitkamp	McConnell	Sullivan
Heller	Mikulski	Tester
Hirono	Moran	Thune
Hoeven	Murkowski	Tillis
Inhofe	Murray	Vitter
Isakson	Nelson	Whitehouse
Johnson	Peters	Wicker
Kaine	Portman	

NAYS—34

Blumenthal	Heinrich	Rubio
Booker	Lankford	Sasse
Brown	Lee	Schumer
Carper	Markey	Scott
Casey	Menendez	Shelby
Corker	Merkley	Toomey
Cotton	Murphy	Udall
Crapo	Paul	Warner
Cruz	Perdue	Warren
Donnelly	Reed	Wyden
Flake	Reid	
Gillibrand	Risch	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The bill (H.R. 22), as amended, was passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 169, S. 1881.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 169, S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Rand Paul, Pat Roberts, Ben Sasse, James Lankford, Joni Ernst, Daniel Coats, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Lindsey Graham, Michael B. Enzi, Jerry Moran, Tim Scott, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

THE HIGHWAY BILL

Mr. INHOFE. Madam President, I know the Senator from California, Mrs. BOXER, and I both want to thank a lot of people who worked very hard. People don't realize how many people are in-

volved. Quite frankly, a little bit of guilt always comes to me, because this is my sixth highway reauthorization bill, and it always ends up that I don't work as long as all the staff works. They are up many nights until midnight and many nights all night long.

This was a good bill. It was tough doing it. From this point forward, we have the opportunity to send it to the House. I have already had communication with some of the House Members who do want a multiyear bill. The staffs are working together as we speak to pull it together so we can pass one and get out of this long string of short-term extensions. They don't serve any useful purpose.

I wish to mention the names and to get them in the RECORD of those people who really put in the long hours. In my office is Alex Herrgott. He has been with me—we have been together, I guess—over a dozen years. He is the leader on our side. He put together a great team, including Shant Boyajian, who is the guy who was the transportation expert on our end, and he did a great job. We have had others just about as good as he is in the past, but they all sweat. This guy doesn't do it. He does it with a smile on his face. We have Chaya Koffman. She came with incredible experience. We couldn't have done it without her. It is equally important to thank David Napolitano and Andrew Dohrman. David and Andrew work for Senator BOXER and are experts within the office, working on this alongside our staff.

It is kind of interesting because Senator BOXER and I can't get any further apart philosophically. She is a very proud liberal, and I am a very proud conservative. We would be fighting like cats and dogs over these regulations that are putting Americans out of business. But, today, we think alike, and we are working together. I am so proud of her staff working with my staff.

Bettina. There is Bettina, and she is probably the No. 1 hard working person, sitting in the back here on that side, and whom we really appreciate. Some days I don't appreciate her, but I have all during this process.

So many others have made contributions to the success today. It is important to thank on my staff Susan Bodine, for her work on environmental provisions, and also Jennie Wright and Andrew Neely. I wish to thank my communications team, including Donelle Harder, Daisy Letendre, and Kristina Baum. They have to get the message out as to what we are doing, how significant it is.

People who are witnessing this today are witnessing the most popular bill of this entire year. We can go back to any of the 50 States, and they are all going to say the one thing we want is a transportation system. It is not just that they want this bill. This is what the Constitution says we are supposed to

be doing. Article I, section 8 of the Constitution says to defend America and provide for roads and bridges, and that is what we accomplished today.

There are some others outside of our committee I want to thank: Chairman HATCH, Chairman THUNE, Chairman SHELBY, and their staffs, including Chris Campbell, Mark Prater, David Schweitert, Shannon Hines, and Jen Deci. I want to thank our leader, MITCH MCCONNELL, who really came through to put this at top priority. Without that priority, we couldn't have done it. I know Sharon Soderstrom, Hazen Marshall, Neil Chatterjee, Jonathan Burks, and Brendan Dunn were all involved.

If my colleagues would just permit me, 10 years ago today is the last time we passed a significant, multiyear bill. I remember standing right here at this podium, right when this moment came, and it was time to thank all of these people who worked so hard. All of a sudden the sirens went off and the buzzers—evacuate, evacuate; bomb, bomb. Everyone left, but I hadn't made my speech yet. So I stood there and made it longer than I probably should have. There is nothing more eerie than standing here in the Chamber when nobody else is here and everybody else is gone. After a while, I thought that I had better get out of here.

As I walked out the front door and down the long steps—they had already shut off the elevators and all of that; it was dark—I saw a bulk of a man walking away very slowly. I saw that it was Ted Kennedy. I said: Ted, we better get out of here; this place might blow up.

He said: Well, these old legs don't work like they used to.

So I said: Here, put your arm around my shoulders. And I put my arm out to steady him. Someone took our picture. It was in a magazine, and it said: Who said that Republicans are not compassionate.

I always think of that when I think of these bills. I say to my friend, Senator BOXER, with whom I have worked so closely during this time—and I actually enjoyed it: Any time we get a coalition between your philosophy and my philosophy, it has to be right. It was, and it is over.

I yield the floor to Senator BOXER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam President, my friend and I have long worked together on infrastructure, and we did it this time under very difficult conditions. I would say to him that with his leadership on EPW, going to a markup, proving to the rest of the Senate that, in fact, our committee could work together, we got a 20-to-nothing vote. As a result of that, and as my friend has often said, our committee is really responsible for about 70 to 75 percent of the funding. So we were the key committee, and we proved that we could work together.

It was a little tougher on the other committees. That is when it took Leader MCCONNELL's leadership, Senator DURBIN's leadership, and we came together.

But I must say that those top staffers from Senator INHOFE's team, MCCONNELL's team, BOXER's team, including Bettina Poirier, Neil Chatterjee, and Alex Herrgott really—friendships forged—worked on, and it was a pleasure to work with them. I will never forget this as long as I live. This has been a highlight of my career, and I have been here a very long time.

I want to thank Andrew Dohrmann, David Napolliello, Tyler Rushforth, Jason Albritton, Ted Illston, Mary Kerr, Kate Gilman, Colin MacCarthy, and Kathryn Backer in addition to Bettina, on my team. I want to thank Ryan Jackson, Shant Boyajian, Susan Bodine, Andrew Neely, and Chaya Koffman, along with Alex, on the Inhofe team. I want to thank Alyssa Fisher on the Durbin team. I want to thank Shannon Hines, Jennifer Deci, and Homer Carlisle on the Banking Committee team. I want to thank Kim Lipsky so much. What a job she did for BILL NELSON, and her team, Devon Barnhart and Matt Kelly, and Dave Schweitert on the Thune team.

Notice we said "team." This was about teamwork. This was not about me, me, me or I, I, I. It was all of us in friendship, in sincerity. We never surprised each other. When we couldn't do this, something happened, we would tell each other, and we never left the room until we figured it out.

I will have more to write about this and say about it because truly these moments don't happen often around here. In my career this will stand out as truly spectacular—spectacular—the people who were so dedicated, and my friendship with my friend is just extraordinary. It stood the test of time. My new collegiality with MITCH MCCONNELL, which has not existed until now, this is a miraculous thing that has happened.

One of the things I have learned in life is it goes so fast and sometimes you don't mark those special moments. This moment will be forever marked with me and with my friends.

We now are going to look forward to working with our friends in the House. We are going to infuse our spirit over there. We are going to make sure they know we can work together and be friends, and it has already started, as ALEX has stated today.

So we are ready for the next phase, the next step. What is most important? We are going to make sure we have infrastructure that works for this Nation; that you and I, JIM, don't have to stand here and show tragic photos, bridge collapses, and hear terrible stories about construction workers who can't make it and have to have food stamps, and businessmen who have lit-

erally cried in my office because they have no certainty, they can't function, and they may have to shut down. This is not what we want.

We did the right thing for the country. It wasn't about us—we were the ones who made it happen—it was about America, and I couldn't be more proud.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING REVEREND CLEMENTA PINCKNEY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, before I start my prepared remarks, I did want to note that today would have been the birthday of Pastor Reverend Clementa Pinckney, a friend of mine, who was the pastor of Emanuel 9, the Emanuel Church, the Mother Emanuel Church in Charleston, SC. Today being his birthday, I thought it would be a good opportunity to share with the public that we miss him. We thank God for the family and the amazing roles they have played in South Carolina and around this country.

Certainly, as we tackle issues going forward, I think we should keep in mind, bear in mind, the civility, the grace, and the compassion we saw from Reverend Pinckney and the way he tackled issues with such an important ingredient to keeping our communities together.

I hope as we discuss other challenging issues, we will have an opportunity to remember that civility, that notion that we are better together. The desire to build a bridge should be seen and displayed in the public forum as we discuss issues that sometimes pull at the very fabric of who we are as a nation.

SAFER OFFICERS AND SAFER CITIZENS ACT
OF 2015

Mr. President, I rise to offer a solution. I will tell you solutions are hard to find at times, but today I think I have found a solution that will help law enforcement officers and our citizens go home safely. That solution is body-worn cameras to be worn by our law enforcement officers throughout this country. Just yesterday, in Cincinnati, we were unfortunately given yet another example of how important body cameras are when they are worn by law enforcement officers.

We, those of us who viewed the video, watched in disbelief as the officer shot the driver in the head. Difficult, difficult video to watch. Cincinnati officials said in their investigation of the death of Samuel Dubose, after being shot by the University of Cincinnati police officer, that body camera footage was invaluable. I want to say that

one more time; that the police chief said, without any question, what allowed them to find conclusion, to actually arrest the officer, was the presence of a video that was undeniable.

Unfortunately, we have seen too many of these incidents around the country. I will tell you that I struggle with this issue sometimes because I have so many good friends who are officers, who serve the public every single day with honor, with dignity, and amazing distinction. I am talking about guys and young ladies who put on the uniform with pride. I see that pride as I walk through the neighborhoods as I talk to folks.

So many of our officers serve this Nation, serve their communities so well, keeping all of us safe, but sometimes, and too often we have seen recently, the videos suggest we have to take a deeper look. Our citizens deserve for us to take that deeper look. I think that without any question a body-worn camera will protect the public, but it will also protect the officer. That is why I am here today.

I have said a couple of times that if they say a picture is worth a thousand words, then a video is worth a thousand pictures. Let me say that one more time. If a picture is worth a thousand words, then a video is worth a thousand pictures. I believe strongly that an important piece of the puzzle to help rebuild trust with our law enforcement officers and the communities they serve is body-worn cameras.

I say it is only one piece of that very important puzzle because I do not know that there is a single solution. I have looked for a panacea, but I do not know if there is a panacea. As a matter of fact, I think there is not a panacea, but there are many critical steps we must take to tackle an array of issues confronting the distressed communities and challenging circumstances, whether it is poverty, criminal justice reform or, as we have seen on the video, instances of police brutality.

With body cameras, we have seen some amazing studies. At least one study has confirmed there is a 90-percent drop in complaints against officers. That is an astounding number, a 90-percent drop in complaints against officers. The same study shows there is a 60-percent drop in the use of force by officers. This should be good news for everyone on every side of the issue—if there are sides of the issue. I would suggest there are not sides to this issue.

There is not a Republican side, there is not a Democratic side, there is not a Black side, there is not a White side, there is only a right side and a wrong side. If we can find ourselves in a position where officers go home at night to a loving family, arms wide open, and citizens within the community go home at night to loving families and warm embraces, that perhaps the body-

worn camera by officers will make this happen more every day someplace in our country.

With those sorts of numbers, how can we not figure out the best way to get these devices into the hands of our police officers? This does not even touch on the fact that when we ended up with the video, a very unfortunate video, on April 4, this year, my hometown, North Charleston, SC—a video of Walter Scott being shot in the back, it helped bring clarity to an incredibly painful situation.

That is why, after months of meetings with dozens of police organizations, civil rights groups, privacy groups, and others, yesterday I introduced the Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015. My goal is simple. It is to simply provide local and State law enforcement agencies with the resources to equip their officers with body-worn cameras. My legislation creates a dedicated grant program, fully paid for—I know there are those in the Senate, such as myself, who like those words “fully paid for”—to help local law enforcement agencies purchase body cameras.

I am opposed, very opposed, to any notion that we should federalize in any way, shape or form local law enforcement. I believe local law enforcement should be in charge of local law enforcement and State law enforcement should be in charge of State law enforcement. But if we can provide some tools, some resources, to make sure the situation I described earlier from a positive standpoint of an officer going home to their house and members of the community going home to their houses after having an interaction, if there is a solution and/or an opportunity to see that happen more often, we should go there.

My grant program would provide \$100 million over the next 5 fiscal years: \$100 million each year, 2016 through 2021, and only requires a simple 25-percent match. It certainly suggests that we will give preferences to departments that are applying for grants. They will need to have their own policies in place regarding data retention, privacy requirements, and other areas because I believe local and State departments, as I have said, can best determine their own procedures around the body cameras.

As States and localities around the country implement body-worn camera programs, I believe this is the best way we can help—not take over but provide that seed capital, the resources to start a brand-new conversation all over the country about how many lives have been saved, how many folks get to go home.

I will say this on some other points. I had the privilege of speaking at the graduation of who I call my brother, who is the son of my mentor, John Moniz, who helped change my life when

I was a kid on the wrong course for a long time—I had the privilege of speaking at Brian Moniz's graduation from the police academy just 2 years ago, July 18—a couple of years ago. He is an amazing young man who wants to serve his community. His brother Philip is also a fellow sheriff's deputy.

So when I think about the words I am speaking today, I don't think about it in legislative terms, I think about it in terms of real places and real people, such as my brothers and others who want to serve the country. But I also think about it in terms of real people who have suffered through those violent interactions.

I am thankful that cosponsors such as Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina and CORY BOOKER of New Jersey have joined me in making sure we start the conversation that I hope to continue with Senator GRASSLEY on this important topic.

I ask that we all remember the words of Mrs. Judy Scott, the mother of Walter Scott, who lost her son in my hometown of North Charleston. I have had the chance to speak to her on a number of occasions since the incident. She has taught me a lot. She has taught me the power of forgiveness. Very quickly afterward she showed no animus toward the officer. She was praying for the officer. She forgave the officer. But her request to me was a very simple request. It was simply that no more mothers have to unnecessarily bury their sons the way she did. That is a very simple request.

I think my body camera legislation will help us achieve that goal. I believe this legislation will protect citizens and law enforcement officers. It will bridge the gap that seems to be growing in some communities around the country. It will provide resources without taking over local law enforcement. I believe this is critically important, and the sooner we get there, the better off our Nation will be.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

TRANS-PACIFIC PARTNERSHIP

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, as we speak, there are American trade negotiators in Hawaii from the Pacific Rim and South America negotiating the final terms of the Trans-Pacific Partnership, or TPP.

I rise today to speak about an element of those negotiations which I find troubling and which I believe, if it goes on its current path, will produce a gross injustice that will be harmful to American job creators and could potentially threaten the passage or ratification of the TPP.

I understand that the current proposal of the Trans-Pacific Partnership calls for discriminatory treatment of tobacco—specifically singling out an entire industry. It is an industry that is vitally important to my home State of North Carolina. Tobacco continues

to be vitally important among North Carolinian agricultural exports, and the only path to sustaining this industry is to preserve the place for the American leaf in the world. The industry supports more than 22,000 jobs in North Carolina, my home State.

I rise today to defend farmers, manufacturers, and exporters from discriminatory treatment in our trade agreements. Today it happens to be tobacco, but I will do this for any crop for as long as I am in the Senate. I am well aware that many States aren't touched by tobacco farming or tobacco product manufacturing, but this is not just about tobacco; this is about American values and fairness.

I believe free trade is good, and a balanced free trade benefits all parties. For those who think free trade is bad for America, I don't agree. When America and Americans compete on a level playing field, we win the vast majority of the time. It is what we do.

But the United States, over the years, has tried to do more with these agreements than just haggle for market access and tariff productions. Over the past 30 years, the United States has commonly negotiated what is called the investor-state dispute settlement—or ISDS—language in a number of international agreements. The ISDS provisions are fairly simple. They give someone who believes their trade agreement rights have been violated by another government trading partner the ability to bring a claim against that government before an international arbitration panel.

All kinds of offenses can be addressed through the ISDS process—protecting American-owned businesses by requiring our trading partners to meet minimum standards of treatment under international law; protecting American-owned businesses from having their property taken away without payment or adequate compensation; and protecting American-owned businesses from discriminatory, unfair, or arbitrary treatment. That is a fundamental protection. If these sound like American ideals, it is because they are. American ingenuity, combined with these values and ideals, has produced the world's greatest economy, the American economy.

Regions of the world that do not share the same views of due process, equality under the law, and protection of private property rights would do well to follow our model. It will make them a better trading partner, and it will help their economies thrive.

Yet, even the U.S. negotiators apparently want to be selective in applying these ideals, and that is really the root of the concern I have with the discussions going on now in Hawaii. We cannot afford to be selective when it comes to fairness. Our negotiators have concluded that while some investors are entitled to equal treatment under

the law, others aren't. It is odd to me that this would be the posture of any nation, but it is particularly troubling that this is the current posture of the negotiators who were responsible for negotiating the Trans-Pacific Partnership.

It is ironic that the ideal of equal treatment and due process is being peddled with our trading partners as equal treatment and due process for everyone but some members of the minority. So let's say, my fellow Senators, that you are not from a State that is harmed by the current negotiations. You may feel comfortable that this could never happen to you, to a sector in your State's economy, but I believe you should be worried. The current proposal on the TPP creates an entirely new precedent, a precedent that will no doubt become the norm for future trade agreements where the negotiators get to pick and choose winners and losers and American businesses and American industries will suffer as a result. Once we allow an entire sector to be treated unfairly in trade agreements, the question is, Who is next?

I hold a sincere belief that unfair treatment for one agricultural commodity significantly heightens the risk that more unfair treatment for another commodity lurks right around the corner.

I have not spoken with a single organization, agricultural or otherwise, that believes this sets a good precedent—quite the contrary. I encourage my colleagues to speak to their State's agricultural community and simply ask them what they think about setting this kind of standard.

To my fellow Senators—and, incidentally, I should say for those of you in the Gallery, we are working today; we are just outside of the Gallery. I know this is kind of like showing up at the zoo and one of your favorite animals being off of an exhibit. But they are out working; they will be back at about 1:45.

To get back to the script, if you believe that this unfair treatment is OK because it is about tobacco and that it is a fair outcome, I think you ought to think again because I will remind you—and our fellow Senators need to understand this—that Congress has spoken on this issue. We exist to make sure we take care of the voice that may not be heard, the minority who may be cast aside because of some agenda or because of it just being an easy negotiating tactic.

But in this particular case, Congress has spoken loudly. I will remind my Members that Congress has said opportunities for U.S. agricultural exports must be “substantially equivalent to opportunities afforded foreign exports in U.S. markets.” Now, with this trade agreement, if you have a trading partner agree with the behavior or decisions made in the United States, they

are going to be subject to due process. But this trade agreement would actually allow our trading partners to not allow us to be held to that same standard in their country of jurisdiction and not go to international arbitration. Congress has stated that dispute settlement mechanisms must be available across the board, not selectively.

I also voted to give the President trade promotion authority to allow trade agreements like the TPP to move through Congress in a quick, orderly, and responsible process. That is the process we are going through right now. I did not vote to give our negotiators the freedom to indiscriminately choose when fairness should be applied and when it shouldn't be applied. The Congress has already spoken. I hope you will at least share the expectation that our negotiations carry out our will.

I applaud the efforts of the U.S. negotiators. I know it is difficult work, and I congratulate them for getting closer to completing the Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement. I hope, however, that they will consider the risk of losing support for the Senate to ratify the agreement.

In closing, I would offer this to anyone who believes my sticking up for tobacco or for equal treatment and American values is shortsighted: I want you to know that I would do this for any commodity, any category, and any industry. I hope our trade negotiators will work hard to ensure that American values are upheld in the final agreement they bring before Congress, and that goes for language in the entire agreement, even that which appears in the annexes and the footnotes.

I, for one—and I think many of my colleagues—am concerned with the current status of the trade negotiations in this particular area. There are a number of good things in it. This needs to be worked out. And I will not support and I will work hard against any trade agreement that departs from our core values.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I wish to address the status of VA health care and the Department's current budget shortfall.

I am grudgingly supporting the bill before this body to extend highway funding for 3 months and to provide budget transfer authority to VA because, without it, highway contracts in Vermont and all across the country will be halted and VA will be unable to provide health care services to our veterans. These initiatives are too important not to support, but I want to be on record as saying this is a very dangerous path to be treading down—playing politics with the VA's funding. It is disingenuous and is a disservice to the brave men and women who have served our country.

On July 31, 2014, 1 year ago tomorrow, the Senate passed the Veterans

Access, Choice, and Accountability Act to address the crisis at the Department of Veterans Affairs. As chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, one of my top priorities during the negotiation of that legislation was to ensure VA had the resources needed to prevent a similar crisis in the future.

I believed then—and I believe now—that, overall, the Department of Veterans Affairs provides high-quality health care; health care that veterans consistently give high satisfaction scores. But the crisis at VA last year was real—too many veterans were waiting far too long for care. And some VA employees were manipulating data to make it appear these wait times did not exist.

At the time, we took serious, important steps to address the crisis. We gave the Department tools to hold staff accountable, provided funding for veterans who had trouble accessing care at VA to get that care in the private sector, and gave VA resources to ramp up capacity—to hire health care providers and make improvements to the agency's crumbling infrastructure. The bill we passed last year was to ensure that a similar crisis wouldn't happen again.

But here we are, 1 year later, facing another crisis in VA health care. But this crisis is different. This is a funding crisis. A crisis Congress could have prevented.

Given the increased demand for care and volume of veteran patients, I hoped Congress would have understood the need at VA and provided the funding needed by the Department. But that hasn't happened. Instead, this Republican-led Congress underfunded VA by \$1 billion in their budget resolution. And they have continued the bad policies of the Budget Control Act, subjecting VA to funding caps that hamstringing the Department's ability to provide needed care.

And let me be clear about something here: these caps are arbitrary spending cuts and have nothing to do with how much money VA actually needs to operate. And, despite common misconception, VA is subject to these caps just like every other Federal Department. I believe we must lift these caps. Lift them so VA has the money it needs to take care of veterans, period.

And if we are unwilling to lift the budget caps, we should at least be providing this funding through an emergency appropriation. We should be acknowledging that the caps mean we are coming up short—that Congress has insufficiently funded VA, tying their hands so they are left unable to pay for the health care services veterans want and need.

But instead, we are considering transferring money from one bucket at VA to another. The bill we are considering today will move money from the Choice Program to the general oper-

ating budget. Congress created the Veterans Choice Program to address a specific problem. And we provided \$10 billion to fix that problem. And now, instead of lifting the budget caps or providing emergency funding for VA, we are just going to use the Choice Program as a piggy bank. We are simply robbing Peter to pay Paul. This approach is a short-term fix, keeping VA's doors open for the next 60 days. But it does nothing to address the long-term budget shortfall VA will face next year, and the year after that. And I worry, if we fail to act responsibly now, we'll be right back here in 2016 and again in 2017, when we will no longer have the luxury of being able to raid billions from the Choice Program, and our veterans will be no better off.

Not only is this method of funding VA irresponsible, my Republican colleagues are using this funding crisis to jam bad policies down our throats without careful consideration or a real debate. With just days to go before we adjourn for the August recess, and with our colleagues from the House having already skipped town, we are being backed into a corner—told the only way to get VA the money they need is to pass a bad piece of legislation filled with unrelated policies.

Last week, during a markup of legislation in the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Chairman ISAKSON stated multiple times that he wanted new policies to go through regular order, to be considered by the committee in a legislative hearing before being voted on by committee members and certainly before being voted on by the full Senate. He also stated numerous times that we should not be passing legislation without paying for it.

The Congressional Budget Office score of the bill appears to show the legislation is paid for. However, the reality is there are \$1.2 billion in lost revenues included in the VA title of the bill that are being swept under the rug. These enormous, unnecessary costs are being covered up by offsets intended to pay for transfers from the general fund to the highway trust fund. These are not savings or revenue that will actually pay for the lost revenues in the VA title. They are savings and revenue intended to make much-needed repairs to roads and bridges. And I fully support those funds being used the way they were intended. But what I do not support is that we are turning a blind eye to \$1.2 billion in costs in the VA title of this bill that have nothing at all to do with the funding shortfall at VA. So what are these policies that are so important that they should not be considered through regular order and take money out of critical transportation infrastructure projects?

They are anti-veteran, anti-small business provisions that threaten to strip veterans of their access to affordable health care and treat them as sec-

ond-class citizens in the workplace while putting new administrative burdens on small business owners.

If Members really believe these unrelated policies are necessary, we should spend time on them. We should use the committee process that Senator ISAKSON talked about just last week in the Veterans' Affairs Committee markup to consider them through regular order. We should debate them on the Senate floor. But we should not link these politically motivated provisions to must-pass legislation to provide critical health care services to millions of veterans who need it.

It used to be the case that Congress kept veterans above politics. Despite fierce debate over going to war, we all agreed that when servicemembers came home from war, we would take care of them.

It is sad to say, that is no longer the case. Today, powerful political contributors like the Koch brothers are using veterans to push forward anti-worker, anti-union legislation under the guise of caring for veterans. They want to strip away the rights and protections of workers and will use any means necessary to accomplish those goals, even if it means using VA employees who serve veterans every day—and many of whom are veterans themselves—as the target.

Congress should stand up and be honest with the American people about the reason for the VA budget crisis—that members of this Chamber would rather stand here trying to score political points. They would rather use veterans as pawns to promote their anti-worker, anti-union, anti-health care agenda, even if it means closing hospitals and local clinics.

Let us not do that, instead let us say to the brave men and women who have served our country in uniform that we will put aside our differences and give VA the funding they need. Just as our veterans promised to fight for our country, we promised to take care of them when they came home. They fulfilled their promise to us. It is time for us to fulfill our promise to them.

Mr. TILLIS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, in a couple of minutes we will be voting on a bill that includes a transfer of \$3.4 billion within accounts of the Veterans' Administration to make possible, literally enable VA to continue providing health care for millions of veterans across the United States. We are in this situation because of, quite

frankly, gross ineptitude in planning that can be characterized only as management malpractice.

This crisis emphasizes the importance of accountability, and I thank the chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, Senator ISAKSON, for his leadership in addressing the shortfall and also in his cooperation in meeting the crisis and accountability of management that the VA continues to face.

This crisis must stop. Congress cannot be expected to continue to bail out the VA because of mismanagement and management malpractice.

In the longer term, there is a need for fundamental reform. There are some good ideas in this bill. I have supported many of them. I thank Senator TESTER for his leadership as well in framing a proposal that addresses these issues.

But make no mistake. This bill is only one small step toward the reform that I have been advocating and will continue to champion, and hope to continue to work on specifics to advance, as the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee.

Again, I thank my colleagues and our chairman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate has a previous order at this time.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. I thank the ranking member for his comments.

This is the first step for reform in the VA. We are beginning to move in the right direction.

I urge a "yes" vote.

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION AND VETERANS HEALTH CARE CHOICE IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 3236, which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3236) to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass?

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the

Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea" and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 91, nays 4, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 261 Leg.]

YEAS—91

Ayotte	Fischer	Murray
Baldwin	Flake	Nelson
Barrasso	Franken	Paul
Bennet	Gardner	Perdue
Blumenthal	Gillibrand	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Rubio
Capito	Inhofe	Sanders
Cardin	Isakson	Schumer
Carper	Johnson	Scott
Casey	Kaine	Shaheen
Cassidy	King	Shelby
Coats	Kirk	Stabenow
Cochran	Klobuchar	Sullivan
Collins	Lankford	Tester
Coons	Leahy	Thune
Cornyn	Manchin	Tillis
Cotton	Markey	Toomey
Crapo	McCain	Udall
Cruz	McCaskill	Warner
Daines	McConnell	Warren
Donnelly	Menendez	Whitehouse
Durbin	Merkley	Wicker
Enzi	Mikulski	Wyden
Ernst	Murkowski	
Feinstein	Murphy	

NAYS—4

Corker	Sasse
Lee	Sessions

NOT VOTING—5

Alexander	Moran	Vitter
Graham	Schatz	

The bill (H.R. 3236) was passed.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I unequivocally support the passage of a 3-month extension to the Federal highway program. I would like the Record to reflect my support for the 3-month extension, as well as for a long-term highway bill. Unfortunately, I will be notably absent for the vote on the 3-month extension—but not without just cause. A week ago today, Lafayette, LA—a vibrant, wonderful city in the heart of Acadiana—was rocked by a senseless tragedy that took the lives of two of its residents. I believe it is imperative Louisianians come together as a community, and I will be in Lafayette today to stand with and support family members of the victims. Earlier today, the Senate passed its version of the highway reauthorization bill, known as the DRIVE Act. With the passage of the DRIVE Act and the 3-

month extension today, the Senate has laid the foundation for Members of both Chambers to work together and produce a long-term highway reauthorization bill.●

PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, as you may have heard, today marks the 50th anniversary of both Medicare and Medicaid. While the last half century has seen a pretty robust debate about the merits of these programs, today there is no question that they provide significant and vital elements to our Nation's safety net.

This week many are celebrating the lives that have been saved and improved by Medicare and Medicaid over the last 50 years. While this is appropriate, I hope that we will also take the time to look at how these programs will function over the next 50 years.

Let's start with Medicare. Medicare is, quite simply, a massive program designed to provide care to our Nation's seniors. Currently, it covers more than 50 million beneficiaries—roughly one-sixth of the current U.S. population—and processes more than 1 billion claims a year.

Last week the Medicare board of trustees issued its report for 2015, which once again detailed the fiscal challenges facing the Medicare Program. For example, in 2014 alone, we spent roughly \$613 billion on Medicare expenditures. That is roughly 14 percent of the Federal budget and 3.5 percent of our gross domestic product for a single health care program. In coming years, these numbers are only going to go up as more baby boomers retire and become Medicare beneficiaries.

Over the next 10 years, the trustees project that the number of Medicare beneficiaries will expand by 30 percent. We will spend roughly \$7 trillion on the program as it expands, and by the end of that 10-year period we will be spending more on Medicare than on our entire national defense. Over the next 25 years, spending on the program as a percentage of GDP will grow by 60 percent, and by 2040 about \$1 out of every \$5 spent by the Federal Government will go to Medicare.

As spending on the program expands, so does its unfunded liabilities. Using the most realistic projections of the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services—remember, this is the government agency's most realistic projections—Medicare Part A by itself faces long-term unfunded liabilities of nearly \$8 trillion. The story is even worse with Medicare Part B and Part D, which unlike Part A, do not have a dedicated

revenue stream. Medicare's trustees estimate \$24.8 trillion in additional taxes will need to be collected over the next 75 years to pay for Medicare Part B and Part D services.

When we look at the entire Medicare Program over the next 75 years, once again using CMS's most accurate projections, we are looking at \$37 trillion of spending in excess of dedicated revenues. Those numbers are astronomical. They are too large to even comprehend. So rather than talk about the numbers in broad terms, let's talk about what they mean for seniors and beneficiaries.

As I mentioned, Medicare Part A, which includes the Hospital Insurance, or HI, Program has a dedicated funding stream. It is paid for by a 2.9-percent payroll tax split between employers and workers, and under ObamaCare that rate went up by an additional 0.9 percent on wages over \$200,000 for single tax filers and \$250,000 for married couples.

Due in large part to the financial downturn, Part A ran a deficit—meaning that expenditures for the program exceeded income from the tax—every year between 2008 and 2014. Last year that deficit reached \$8.1 billion in just 1 year.

Because of the economic recovery and the increased tax rates, Part A is projected to generate surpluses between 2015 and 2023. However, after that, deficits are projected to return, and by 2030 the Part A trust fund will officially be bankrupt and the Medicare Program will be unable to pay full benefits to seniors. Let me say that again. In 15 years, Medicare Part A will be bankrupt.

All of this, of course, assumes that current law remains unchanged and Congress is unable to reform the program. I don't think I would be going too far out on a limb to suggest that reforms to Medicare are absolutely necessary if we are going to preserve the program for future generations. Furthermore, I don't think it would be outlandish to suggest that Congress should begin working on such reforms immediately to avoid future cliffs, standoffs, and the usual accompanying political brinkmanship. I am not the only one saying that.

The Medicare trustees themselves said in last week's report that "Medicare still faces a substantial financial shortfall that will need to be addressed with further legislation. Such legislation should be enacted sooner rather than later to minimize the impact on beneficiaries, providers, and taxpayers."

These are not the words of fiscal hawks in the Republican Congress. The Medicare board of trustees is comprised of six members, four of whom are high-ranking officials in the Obama administration, including Treasury Secretary Jack Lew, Labor Secretary

Thomas Perez, Health & Human Services Secretary Sylvia Burwell, and acting Social Security Commissioner Carolyn Colvin.

All of these officials signed on to a report recommending "further legislation" to reform Medicare and suggesting that it happen "sooner rather than later."

Let's keep in mind that we are only talking about Medicare. I haven't said anything yet about Medicaid, our other health care entitlement program, which also faces enormous fiscal challenges. Currently, Medicaid covers more than 70 million patients, and that number is growing thanks to expansions mandated under the so-called Affordable Care Act. Since the passage of ObamaCare, more than a dozen States have chosen to expand their Medicaid Programs and enrollments have surged well beyond initial projections. This has a number of people worried about added costs and additional strains on State budgets, particularly when the Federal share of the expanded program is set to scale back in 2 years. Already, without the expansion under ObamaCare, Medicaid took up nearly one-quarter of all State budgets. That is right: Nearly \$1 out of every \$4 spent at the State level goes to Medicaid, and that number is going to get much higher.

In the recent years, combined Federal and State Medicaid spending has come in around \$450 billion a year. By 2020, that number is projected to expand to around \$800 billion a year or more, and with all of this expansion—that increased fiscal burden and instability—we are not seeing improvements in care provided by the program.

Put simply, Medicaid is probably the worst health insurance in the country and the President's health care law did nothing to improve the quality of care provided by the program. Fewer and fewer doctors accept Medicaid because it pays them so little, and the program's reimbursement formulas for prescription drugs limit beneficiaries' access to a number of important medications.

Ultimately, we are going to be spending more and more on Medicaid in the coming years—and as a result expanding our debts and deficits—without providing better care for beneficiaries.

Between Medicare and Medicaid, we will spend more than \$12 trillion over the next decade with precious few improvements to show for it. Former CBO Director Doug Elmendorf referred to these two programs as "our fundamental fiscal challenge." If you look at the numbers and the dramatic expansion projected in the coming years, he was right. Keep in mind, we still have Social Security, which faces nearly \$11 billion in unfunded liabilities over the long term as well as the exhaustion of one of its trust funds, the disability trust fund, by the end of next year and complete exhaustion by 2034.

Separately, these three major entitlement programs present unique challenges that have to be addressed in order to preserve them—and our Nation's safety net—for future generations. Combined, they threaten to swallow up our government and take our economy down with it.

Once again, these aren't doomsday scenarios. No one seriously disputes the fact that absent real and lasting reforms, our entitlement programs present real threats to our fiscal well-being. The disputes typically arise when we begin talking about the specifics of reform. Some would just as soon use the looming entitlement crisis as a political weapon to scare current and near beneficiaries into believing the other side wants to take their benefits away. Others support the idea of entitlement reform in principle but are too afraid to sign on to any specific proposals out of fear it would be used against them in the next election cycle.

This dynamic has resulted in a long-standing stalemate, where the possibility of real reform has, for years now, seemed remote. However, recently we have seen signs that it may in fact be possible to overcome this stalemate.

Earlier this year, Congress passed the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, a bipartisan bill, which among other things repealed and replaced the Medicare sustainable growth rate, or SGR, formula. Now, repealing SGR was, in and of itself, a significant improvement to the Medicare Program, but there are other Medicare reforms in the law as well. These include a limitation on so-called Medigap first-dollar coverage and more robust means testing for Medicare Parts B and D.

These aren't fundamental Medicare reforms, and they will not move the program from its massive projected deficits into future solvency, but keep in mind that for years the idea of bipartisan Medicare reform seemed like a pipedream. Yet with passage of the SGR bill, we were able to take a meaningful first step toward this all-important goal.

Of course, the first step is only a first step if it precedes additional steps, and that is what we need now. Congress must take additional steps to improve these programs and preserve them for our children and grandchildren. As the chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over these programs, I have been actively engaged in the effort to reform our entitlement programs.

In 2013, when I was still the ranking member, I put forward five separate proposals to reform Medicare and Medicaid. All of them were serious, commonsense ideas that had received bipartisan support in the recent past. I shared these ideas at every opportunity. I put out documents, fact sheets, and gave numerous speeches on

the floor. I even passed them along directly to President Obama, although I didn't ever get a response from him. Two of those ideas were, at least partially, included in the legislation we passed to repeal SGR. The other three ideas, as far as I am concerned, are still on the table.

I have also teamed up with leaders in the House to call on the disability community and other stakeholders to help us come up with ideas to address the impending exhaustion of the Social Security disability trust fund. I have introduced legislation to improve the administration and fiscal integrity of the disability insurance program.

In other words, I stand ready and willing to work with any of my colleagues—from either party or from either Chamber—to address the coming entitlement crisis before it is too late. I have put my own ideas on the table, but I don't think the debate should be limited to my ideas. I invite all of my colleagues to come forward so we can work together to find solutions to these massive problems.

I know that when I think about these problems, my thoughts turn to my 23 grandchildren and 16 great-grandchildren—and everybody else's grandchildren and great-grandchildren—who will suffer from any promises we fail to keep and will pay the price of any mistakes we fail to correct.

On this landmark anniversary of the Medicare Program, I urge my colleagues to also consider future generations of Americans and the costs and burdens we will pass on to them if we fail in this endeavor.

With that, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the important agreement that we are debating here on the Senate floor—the Iran nuclear agreement. I want to begin by saying that there seems to be, as we debate this and as we hold hearings, a growing sense of frustration as we do what is really our sacred duty here in the Senate—to review, debate, and, ultimately, to vote on this agreement as to whether it is something that is going to keep our country secure or undermine the national security of the United States and our allies. This frustration stems from a number of sources. Let me just name a few.

First, I think many Democrats and Republicans feel there has been a dismissive attitude from the adminis-

tration with regard to this agreement and a dismissive attitude, actually, towards the American people on whether the Congress should weigh in on this agreement, should represent their constituents on something that is this important to the national security of the United States of America.

I mention this because if you look at the last several months, every step of the way the administration has tried to cut out the role of the Congress. Initially, they said it was an Executive agreement and Congress would have no role. Well, I don't think our constituents liked that, and certainly, the Senate didn't like that. So we started debating the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

The President said he was going to veto it. Again, that was dismissive of this body and the American people. Fortunately, this body had a very strong veto-proof majority. We are debating it—but not because they wanted us to but because we are representing our constituents who know how important this is.

Then the agreement is taken to the United Nations before we weigh in on it at all. Members of the United Nations, citizens from other countries, are voting on this agreement before we had the opportunity. Again, bipartisan Democrats and Republicans said: Secretary Kerry, don't do that. It is an affront to the American people. But they did it. So we are debating it, and that is important. But that attitude of dismissiveness of this body and the people we represent is frustrating.

There is a second reason there is frustration in the Senate, and it stems from the fact that we are not sure that we are getting the straight scoop. We are not sure we are getting all the documents. The law requires every document to this agreement come to this body. Yet we found out 2 weeks ago that there is a very important agreement, the agreement between the IAEA and Iran on implementation of this agreement. How did we find out about that? One of my colleagues, Senator COTTON, got on a plane, went to IAEA headquarters in Vienna, and found that out—again, frustration. We are not receiving all of the documents, as required by law, to be able to review.

Third, in terms of frustration, there is a sense that as we are doing our duty here, as we are digging into this agreement, as we are reading it, as we are reaching out to experts, as we are trying to understand it, as we are questioning administration witnesses at hearings, as we are doing our required and sacred due diligence, we are told time and again that the plain language of the agreement doesn't appear to mean what it means. This is frustrating. This is particularly true with regard to sanctions.

Let me give you a few examples. First we had a closed briefing. Almost

every Member of the Senate came to that briefing a couple of weeks ago. There was a big question. Was there a grandfather provision with regard to sanctions; meaning, if you are a company and you rush to Iran right now and cut some deals and sanctions are later imposed, does the mere fact that you jumped in early mean that you are grandfathered away from these sanctions? Well, a lot of people had questions.

The Secretary of State looked at 100 Members of the Senate and said: There is no grandfather clause in this agreement. There is no grandfather clause in this agreement.

This is paragraph 37 of the agreement. I am just going to quote it, because it certainly sounds like a grandfather clause to me: "In such event [that sanctions are reimposed], these provisions"—in this paragraph—"would not apply with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party and Iran or Iranian individuals and entities prior to the date of application . . ." That is when the agreement starts to be implemented.

That sounds like a grandfather clause. Now, maybe there are elements here, maybe there are special circumstances that make it not a grandfather clause, but the Secretary of State was in front of all of us saying that there is no grandfather clause. It is hard to square that with the plain language of this agreement.

Let me give another example—the much-touted snapback provisions in the agreement. Secretary Lew, the Secretary of the Treasury, has talked about how we have a strong snapback provision, how it is going to be prompt, and how it is powerful. These are terms that he has been using in testimony. In many ways I think Members of this body, Democrats and Republicans, see that the effectiveness of this entire deal might hinge on this so-called snapback provision. The more I read about our sanctions and how they work in this agreement, the more questions I have, because to this Senator the snapback provision seems to be an illusion. It actually seems to be aimed back at the United States. I don't think we should be calling it a snapback provision. Maybe it should be called the boomerang provision, because it is aimed at us.

Let me talk a little bit more in detail about this. First, the term "snapback" was not in the agreement. It is a good term—catchy—and sounds good. It is actually a term used in trade negotiations when a party violates a trade agreement. Trade agreements will have snapback provisions where we raise tariffs on goods immediately. That is a snapback. But that is not what is going on here. That is not what is going to happen here. The practical reality of sanctions, particularly economic sanctions, is that there is no snap when you put them in. It is a slog.

Let me give you an example. In my experience, I worked with many people at the beginning of our efforts in the Bush Administration, during 2006, 2007, and 2008, to start economically isolating Iran. What does that mean? Well, what we did is we leveraged the power of the U.S. economy in close coordination with the Congress of the United States, and we went to countries and companies that were big investors in Iran, say, in the oil and gas sector, and we told them that they needed to start divesting out of the largest sponsor of terrorism in the world or the Congress of the United States might look to sanction their company or limit their access to the American market. We were leveraging the authority of the Congress and the power of our economy to get countries—yes, many of which were our allies—such as Norway, Germany, France, and Japan to divest and economically isolate Iran. That took months and years to accomplish. It was a slog. There was no snap.

What do we see today? European companies—it is in the newspapers every day—European CEOs, senior administration officials in Germany, and government officials are already in Tehran. Already, there are companies looking to set up shop, looking to invest billions, as they did before. They are there now. This deal is not even done yet. They are there. They cannot wait, licking their chops to reinvest in one of the—not one of the biggest, the biggest terrorist regime in the world, which has done more to kill Americans than probably any country in the world in the last 30 years. Of course, this is disappointing, but this history is a reminder to all of us that the sanctions regime Secretary Kerry talks about—and we certainly did have Iran surrounded in terms of sanctions—which was a 110-percent-American-led sanctions regime, involving Democrats, Republicans, this Congress, and the Bush administration. Yes, a lot of credit goes to the Obama administration on this economic isolation of Iran, which is what brought them to the table to begin with.

If we reimpose sanctions, there certainly won't be a "snap" when it happens. It will be slow. It will be a slog again trying to convince reluctant Europeans, Russians, and Chinese to pull out of the market once again.

Finally, I just want to say one other thing, and it goes back again to the plain language of the agreement, where again the snapback provision, so-called snapback provision, seems aimed back at us, the boomerang provision.

I posed a hypothetical to Secretary Kerry, Secretary Lew in a closed session, in a Senate Armed Services session yesterday to try and get specifics on what would happen in certain situations. I gave them this hypothetical: Let's assume sanctions are lifted in the

next 6 to 9 months. These are called Annex II sanctions. It is a huge list of sanctions, the most powerful sanctions our country has placed on Iran. All of them—financial, oil, market—are going to be lifted in 6 to 9 months. Let's assume that happens.

As we are already seeing, European companies, other countries, certainly the Chinese, Russians, Japanese, are going to be rushing into this market, investing billions once again. Assume the Iranian economy is going to start humming with all of this new investment, the lifting of sanctions. A senior Iranian official recently said they are looking for \$120 billion of new investment by 2020. They are likely going to get a lot of it, and they are abiding by the deal—no violations of any of the nuclear aspects of this deal. Then, what I think is very likely, sometime within the next 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 years, Iran commits a major act of terrorism. Let's say they kill more American troops. Let's say they blow up a consulate or embassy somewhere. They are the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. It doesn't look as though they want to do anything but continue to do that, so that is a very likely scenario. When that happens, this body reappplies sanctions. It looks at Annex II, some of our most powerful sanctions. We are very upset—bipartisan. We reapply sanctions. The President, whoever that is, signs it because that President, he or she is very upset, and we reimpose serious Annex II sanctions.

Now, what happens then? I think what is going to happen, very likely at that point, is Iran is going to look at this agreement, and they are going to cite either paragraph 26 or paragraph 37. Let me read you both of those. Again, this is the plain language of the statute.

Paragraph 37. Iran has stated that if sanctions are reinstated in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitments under the entire agreement.

Another provision. Iran has stated it will treat the reintroduction or reimposition of the sanctions specified in Annex II as grounds to cease performing its commitments under the agreement.

That is in the agreement. So, you see, if we reimpose sanctions as part of the snapback, Iran can look at this agreement and say: I'm done. I'm walking. I can legally leave this agreement. They can legally leave this agreement with a humming economy, on the verge of a breakout of a nuclear weapon, still being the largest state sponsor of terrorism, and they can say: Hey, I complied with the agreement. The United States reimposed sanctions. I told them what I was going to do, and they do it.

Again, bottom line, if we use the so-called snapback provision, it certainly appears from the language of this

agreement that the deal is done. So I have asked Secretary Kerry and Secretary Lew twice now: How is that an improper reading of the agreement? Secretary Lew, the Secretary of the Treasury, is trying to argue we are reading that language wrong. He says Annex II sanctions—the big American sanctions, which are what has kept Iran down and what has brought them to the table—can be reimposed if they are reimposed for nonnuclear violations like terrorism.

When I read this agreement, that seems to be a bit of a stretch. Certainly there is a lot of ambiguity, but it is also clear the Iranians clearly won't agree with that reading. They don't agree with that reading. This was filed—I ask unanimous consent to have this printed in the RECORD. This is the Iranian letter dated 20 July 2015, to the United Nations Security Council. It is their interpretation of the agreement.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL,
New York, NY, July 20, 2015.

Re Letter dated 20 July 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to enclose herewith a text entitled "Statement of the Islamic Republic of Iran following the adoption of United Nations Security Council resolution 2231 (2015) endorsing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action" (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would arrange for the circulation of the present letter and its annex as a document of the Security Council.

GHOLAMALI KHOSHROO,
Ambassador, Permanent Representative.

Re Annex to the letter dated 20 July 2015 from the Permanent Representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council

STATEMENT OF THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN
FOLLOWING THE ADOPTION OF UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2231 (2015) ENDORSING THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

1. The Islamic Republic of Iran considers science and technology, including peaceful nuclear technology, as the common heritage of mankind. At the same time, on the basis of solid ideological, strategic and international principles, Iran categorically rejects weapons of mass destruction and particularly nuclear weapons as obsolete and inhuman, and detrimental to international peace and security. Inspired by the sublime Islamic teachings, and based on the views and practice of the late founder of the Islamic Revolution, Imam Khomeini, and the historic Fatwa of the leader of the Islamic Revolution, Ayatollah Khamenei, who has declared all weapons of mass destruction (WMD), particularly nuclear weapons, to be Haram (strictly forbidden) in Islamic jurisprudence, the Islamic Republic of Iran declares that it has always been the policy of the Islamic Republic of Iran to prohibit the acquisition, production, stockpiling or use of nuclear weapons.

2. The Islamic Republic of Iran underlines the imperative of the total elimination of

nuclear weapons, as a requirement of international security and an obligation under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The Islamic Republic of Iran is determined to engage actively in all international diplomatic and legal efforts to save humanity from the menace of nuclear weapons and their proliferation, including through the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, particularly in the Middle East.

3. The Islamic Republic of Iran firmly insists that States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons shall not be prevented from enjoying their inalienable rights under the Treaty to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without discrimination and in conformity with articles I and II of the Treaty.

4. The finalization of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) on 14 July 2015 signifies a momentous step by the Islamic Republic of Iran and the E3/EU+3 to resolve, through negotiations and based on mutual respect, an unnecessary crisis, which had been manufactured by baseless allegations about the Iranian peaceful nuclear programme, followed by unjustified politically motivated measures against the people of Iran.

5. The JCPOA is premised on reciprocal commitments by Iran and the E3/EU+3, ensuring the exclusively peaceful nature of Iran's nuclear programme, on the one hand, and the termination of all provisions of Security Council resolutions 1696 (2006), 1737 (2006), 1747 (2007), 1803 (2008), 1835 (2008), 1929 (2010) and 2224 (2015) and the comprehensive lifting of all United Nations Security Council sanctions, and all nuclear-related sanctions imposed by the United States and the European Union and its member States, on the other. The Islamic Republic of Iran is committed to implement its voluntary undertakings in good faith contingent upon same good-faith implementation of all undertakings, including those involving the removal of sanctions and restrictive measures, by the E3/EU+3 under the JCPOA.

6. Removal of nuclear-related sanctions and restrictive measures by the European Union and the United States would mean that transactions and activities referred to under the JCPOA could be carried out with Iran and its entities anywhere in the world without fear of retribution from extra-territorial harassment, and all persons would be able to freely choose to engage in commercial and financial transactions with Iran. It is clearly spelled out in the JCPOA that both the European Union and the United States will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the sanctions and restrictive measures lifted under the JCPOA. It is understood that reintroduction or reimposition, including through extension, of the sanctions and restrictive measures will constitute significant non-performance which would relieve Iran from its commitments in part or in whole. Removal of sanctions further necessitates taking appropriate domestic legal and administrative measures, including legislative and regulatory measures to effectuate the removal of sanctions. The JCPOA requires an effective end to all discriminatory compliance measures and procedures as well as public statements inconsistent with the intent of the agreement. Iran underlines the agreement by JCPOA participants that immediately after the adoption of the Security Council resolution endorsing the JCPOA, the European Union, its member States and the United States will begin con-

sultation with Iran regarding relevant guidelines and publicly accessible statements on the details of sanctions or restrictive measures to be lifted under the JCPOA.

7. The Islamic Republic of Iran will pursue its peaceful nuclear programme, including its enrichment and enrichment research and development, consistent with its own plan as agreed in the JCPOA, and will work closely with its counterparts to ensure that the agreement will endure the test of time and achieve all its objectives. This commitment is based on assurances by the E3/EU+3 that they will cooperate in this peaceful programme consistent with their commitments under the JCPOA. It is understood and agreed that, through steps agreed with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), all past and present issues of concern will be considered and concluded by the IAEA Board of Governors before the end of 2015. The IAEA has consistently concluded heretofore that Iran's declared activities are exclusively peaceful. Application of the Additional Protocol henceforth is intended to pave the way for a broader conclusion that no undeclared activity is evidenced in Iran either. To this end, the Islamic Republic of Iran will cooperate with the IAEA, in accordance with the terms of the Additional Protocol as applied to all signatories. The IAEA should, at the same time, exercise vigilance to ensure full protection of all confidential information. The Islamic Republic of Iran has always fulfilled its international non-proliferation obligations scrupulously and will meticulously declare all its relevant activities under the Additional Protocol. In this context, the Islamic Republic of Iran is confident that since no nuclear activity is or will ever be carried out in any military facility, such facilities will not be the subject of inspection.

8. The Joint Commission established under the JCPOA should be enabled to address and resolve disputes in an impartial, effective, efficient and expeditious manner. Its primary role is to address complaints by Iran and ensure that effects of sanctions lifting stipulated in the JCPOA will be fully realized. The Islamic Republic of Iran may reconsider its commitments under the JCPOA if the effects of the termination of the Security Council, European Union or United States nuclear-related sanctions or restrictive measures are impaired by continued application or the imposition of new sanctions with a nature and scope identical or similar to those that were in place prior to the implementation date, irrespective of whether such new sanctions are introduced on nuclear-related or other grounds, unless the issues are remedied within a reasonably short time.

9. Reciprocal measures, envisaged in the dispute settlement mechanism of the JCPOA, to redress significant non-performance are considered as the last resort if significant non-performance persists and is not remedied within the arrangements provided for in the JCPOA. The Islamic Republic of Iran considers such measures as highly unlikely, as the objective is to ensure compliance rather than provide an excuse for arbitrary reversibility or means for pressure or manipulation. Iran is committed to fully implement its voluntary commitments in good faith. In order to ensure continued compliance by all JCPOA participants, the Islamic Republic of Iran underlines that in case the mechanism is applied against Iran or its entities and sanctions, particularly Security Council measures, are restored, the Islamic Republic of Iran will treat this as grounds to

cease performing its commitments under the JCPOA and to reconsider its cooperation with the IAEA.

10. The Islamic Republic of Iran underlines the common understanding and clearly stated agreement of all JCPOA participants that affirms that the provisions of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015) endorsing the JCPOA do not constitute provisions of the JCPOA and can in no way impact the performance of the JCPOA.

11. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran is determined to actively contribute to the promotion of peace and stability in the region in the face of the increasing threat of terrorism and violent extremism. Iran will continue its leading role in fighting this menace and stands ready to cooperate fully with its neighbours and the international community in dealing with this common global threat. Moreover, the Islamic Republic of Iran will continue to take necessary measures to strengthen its defence capabilities in order to protect its sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity against any aggression and to counter the menace of terrorism in the region. In this context, Iranian military capabilities, including ballistic missiles, are exclusively for legitimate defence. They have not been designed for WMD capability, and are thus outside the purview or competence of the Security Council resolution and its annexes.

12. The Islamic Republic of Iran expects to see meaningful realization of the fundamental shift in the Security Council's approach envisaged in the preamble of Security Council resolution 2231 (2015). The Council has an abysmal track record in dealing with Iran, starting with its acquiescing silence in the face of a war of aggression by Saddam Hussain against Iran in 1980, its refusal from 1984 to 1988 to condemn, let alone act against, massive, systematic and widespread use of chemical weapons against Iranian soldiers and civilians by Saddam Hussain, and the continued material and intelligence support for Saddam Hussain's chemical warfare by several of its members. Even after Saddam invaded Kuwait, the Security Council not only obdurately refused to rectify its malice against the people of Iran, but went even further and imposed ostensibly WMD-driven sanctions against these victims of chemical warfare and the Council's acquiescing silence. Instead of at least noting the fact that Iran had not even retaliated against Saddam Hussain's use of chemical weapons, the Council rushed to act on politically charged baseless allegations against Iran and unjustifiably imposed a wide range of sanctions against the Iranian people as retribution for their resistance to coercive pressures to abandon their peaceful nuclear programme. It is important to remember that these sanctions, which should not have been imposed in the first place, are the subject of removal under the JCPOA and Security Council resolution 2231 (2015).

13. Therefore, the Islamic Republic of Iran continues to insist that all sanctions and restrictive measures introduced and applied against the people of Iran, including those applied under the pretext of its nuclear programme, have been baseless, unjust and unlawful. Hence, nothing in the JCPOA shall be construed to imply, directly or indirectly, an admission of or acquiescence by the Islamic Republic of Iran in the legitimacy, validity or enforceability of the sanctions and restrictive measures adopted against Iran by the Security Council, the European Union or its member States, the United States or any other State, nor shall it be construed as a

waiver or a limitation on the exercise of any related right the Islamic Republic of Iran is entitled to under relevant national legislation, international instruments or legal principles.

14. The Islamic Republic of Iran is confident that the good-faith implementation of the JCPOA by all its participants will help restore the confidence of the Iranian people, who have been unduly subjected to illegal pressure and coercion under the pretext of this manufactured crisis, and will open new possibilities for cooperation in dealing with real global challenges and actual threats to regional security. Our region has long been mired in undue tension while extremists and terrorists continue to gain and maintain ground. It is high time to redirect attention and focus on these imminent threats and seek and pursue effective means to defeat this common menace.

Mr. SULLIVAN. You want to know what the Iranians say about the reimposition of so-called snapback sanctions? Here is what they say: It is clearly spelled out in the agreement that both the European Union and the United States will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the sanctions—now they are talking about Annex II sanctions—and restrictive measures lifted under the agreement. It is understood that reintroduction or reimposition, including through extension of the sanctions and restrictive measures, will constitute significant nonperformance which would relieve Iran from its commitments to this agreement in whole or in part.

My colleague Senator AYOTTE from New Hampshire yesterday asked Secretary Kerry and Secretary Lew about this provision. They did not give a clear answer because there is no clear answer. Right now there is huge disagreement between the United States and Iran on the language in the agreement on whether, to what degree, these so-called snapback provisions will work or will undermine our national security interests, which is what I believe they will do.

I have asked the administration to quit using that term. It is not in the agreement. The language makes clear that it is going to take years. There is no “snap.” If we ever use it, that is it for the agreement. They have not given the Members of this body a straightforward answer on that issue. We need to keep asking these kinds of questions. We need to keep doing our due diligence, but we need clarity. The American people need clarity, not spin, on critical issues such as this side IAEA agreement, which nobody seems to have read, and we certainly have not seen; the grandfather clause, which certainly looks like a grandfather clause, but now we are told by Secretary Kerry is not a grandfather clause; and perhaps, most importantly, this so-called snapback provision which I believe is illusory and is aimed at us, not at the pariah state that we are all concerned about, and that is Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Delaware, Mr. COONS, and I be permitted to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS and Mr. COONS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1911 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, 50 years ago today, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Social Security Act amendments that created Medicare and Medicaid. Our country slammed the door on the days when far too many older people languished in poverty without the financial security that comes from affordable, high-quality health care. It was a day when sick, older people were warehoused on poor farms and in almshouses. Just picture that. On the edge of town we had older people, literally without a shred of dignity, in what came to be known as almshouses. But Lyndon Johnson and others said that had to be changed, and five decades ago it did. Today, more than 100 million Americans have access to high-quality health care thanks to Medicare and Medicaid.

We can measure the remarkable success of these programs in so many ways, but in my judgment, one of the most important and most appealing aspects of Medicare and Medicaid is their ability to grow, their ability to change, and their ability to evolve to meet the needs of our country. The reality is that Medicare in 2015 is very different from Medicare in 1965. Medicare in 1965 was about something like a broken ankle. If it was a serious break, you would be in the hospital—Part A. If it was not a particularly serious break, you would go to the doctor—that was Part B. That was Medicare circa 1965. Today, Medicare is about chronic illness, it is about cancer, it is about diabetes, it is about stroke, and it is about heart disease. You put Alzheimer's in, and that is well more than 90 percent of the Medicare Program. So it is a very different Medicare Program today than it was in 1965.

One of the aspects of Medicare and Medicaid I find so appealing is they have shown a certain ability, a sense of creativity, to always evolve with the times.

What I would like to do is take a few minutes to describe how I think Medicare and Medicaid are going to change in the next 50 years because I think there are some remarkable developments ahead. I see my wonderful colleague from the Senate Committee on Finance. She has been very involved in

a number of these changes that have been so exciting in Medicare and Medicaid.

What I am going to do this afternoon is just take a few minutes to talk about four or five trends that I think are going to be led by these two programs that have done so much for seniors and vulnerable people in our country.

The first is, I believe Medicare and Medicaid are going to lead a revolution in caring for vulnerable people at home. Our health care programs are going to give seniors more of what they want, which is to secure treatment at home where they are more comfortable. I think people are going to be amazed to see that seniors will get more of what they want, which is treatment at home—in Michigan, in Oregon, in Nebraska—and we now have hard information that it will be less expensive for older people to get what they want.

In the Affordable Care Act, I was able to author a provision with our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. MARKEY, the Independence At Home Program. This program has already shown it can save more than \$3,000, on average, for every patient who takes part.

So picture that. This is not an example of reducing the Medicare guarantee—these guaranteed secure benefits that older people in every part of America rely on. This is about protecting the Medicare guarantee and doing it in a way that keeps seniors happier and costs less money. That is a pretty good package by anybody's calculation.

In my home State of Oregon, the Medicaid Program also has a smart policy that tracks this focus on caring for the vulnerable at home. In effect, what Oregon Medicaid has done is allow health care providers to offer services that go beyond what many might consider the textbook definition of a medical service. It is all about keeping people healthier at home and out of the emergency room. So instead of waiting to treat broken ankles or wrists, perhaps in a hospital emergency room, after a senior falls again and again and again, what we are now doing in Oregon Medicaid is saying the staff of this program will visit the senior's home and perhaps replace the broken floorboards or the dangerous rugs that are causing the seniors to slip again and again and go to the hospital emergency room.

Think about that. You could help a little bit at home by replacing a dangerous rug or you could have somebody slip and fall again and again and again and go to the hospital emergency room. Again, replacing that dangerous rug wouldn't probably meet the clinical definition of a medical service as it was always determined in years past, but now we are seeing it as part of having older people in a position to be at

home, where they are more comfortable, for less money.

The second significant development where I think Medicare and Medicaid are going to lead is on pharmaceuticals. I think the pricing of prescription drugs in the future is going to be connected in some fashion to the value of treatment. We have seen remarkable changes in pharmaceuticals. The reality is that in the last 10 years we have seen real cures for illnesses where there was a death sentence perhaps a decade ago, but the sticker prices on some of these pharmaceuticals are astronomical. For so many working-class families and seniors of modest means, they look at these prices and say this just defies common sense, and they seem to get more expensive over time. Sometimes there is a six-figure pricetag.

The reality is Medicare and Medicaid weren't set up for these kinds of costs. The experts at the Congressional Budget Office are starting to ring the alarm bell, particularly about the health of Medicare Part D. Addressing this issue is going to take a lot of vigorous debate in the Congress, but it can't be ducked any longer.

Senator GRASSLEY and I have been working for about a year now in looking into SOVALDI, one of the hepatitis C drugs, which has had enormous ramifications for health programs—Medicare, Medicaid, and others—and we are continuing our work.

Third, in addition to pharmaceuticals and home care, I think Medicare is going to lead the revolution for open access to health care data. Again, Senator GRASSLEY and I have put a lot of sweat equity into the issue of data transparency in Medicare. It paid off in 2014, when the Obama administration, to its credit, opened up a massive trove of information. The wave of disclosure that began, particularly with doctors—and the Wall Street Journal reported this very extensively—must keep rolling forward.

The next step is turning open data into valuable tools and getting them into patients' hands. Health care data, packaged the right way, ought to help seniors and others choose doctors and nursing homes. It ought to help figure out which hospitals and specialists excel in certain areas, and it ought to help show exactly what you get for your dollar with various treatments or doctors.

Fourth, I believe Medicare is going to lead the debate on improving end-of-life care. All the roads with respect to end-of-life care, in my view, point toward patients having more choices and a better quality of life. In my view, we ought to make sure patients are in the driver's seat. In this regard, I was very pleased the Obama administration announced just a few days ago a real breakthrough in terms of end-of-life care. I think we have all had the de-

bate. We certainly had that debate in the Affordable Care Act, where we heard about seniors not being given the opportunity to choose life, to choose cures, and they were going to, in effect, be receiving what amounted to death sentences.

In the Affordable Care Act, I was able to get included a provision that made it clear that is not what this debate would be all about. For the first time it would be possible for an individual who is receiving hospice care to also have the option for curative care. In other words, they would not have to sacrifice one for the other. That is very important to patients because even when patients are contemplating the prospect of hospice care, they want to know—because it is almost in our gene pool as Americans, as Nebraskans, and Oregonians—whether there may be a cure. Maybe our ingenuity will come up with a cure, and they want to have that hope. Now they are going to have it.

The result of the change is called concurrent care—the Care Choices model. For the first time patients and families will be in the driver's seat and they will not have to give up the prospect of curative care in order to get hospice. For the first time we are giving those who want treatment in hospice some real flexibility.

Next, I think Medicare is going to go further to protect Americans with catastrophic coverage. The reality is that millions of Americans who are younger than 65 are protected against the huge expense of an accident or serious illness. This is an area where I think Medicare, having led in so many areas with the kind of creative genius I have described—going to show the way on home care, pharmaceuticals, end-of-life care, and more access to data—that most advocates for seniors say Medicare has a little catching up to do. Seniors ought to have the safety of an out-of-pocket maximum in Medicare.

I know this is an area I very much look forward to talking to my colleague from Michigan about. She has been a wonderful advocate for seniors throughout all her career in public service. I think colleagues on the Committee on Finance of both political parties are going to say, if there is catastrophic protection in the private sector, it is high time we have it for seniors on Medicare. I think this is an area we will also be talking about.

I want to wrap up with one last point; that is, about Medicaid. I also believe more States are going to come around and expand their Medicaid Programs. It took nearly two decades for all 50 States to adopt Medicaid initially, so there is already a history of this unfolding over time.

When we look at the numbers, we see the proposition and the benefit of expanding Medicaid is not exactly some kind of theoretical notion. A new study shows there is a gulf opening in terms

of access to health care between States that have expanded Medicaid and States that have not.

In our country, everybody should have access to medical care, regardless of their ZIP Code, but it is not only a question of what is best for the health of our people, it can often be pretty important to a State's economy. A recent study found that Kentucky and their cost of covering new Medicaid patients will be far outstripped by the other economic benefits of expanding the program. In my view, more States are likely to do the right thing by their citizens and their economies, and the gulf between those States that cover individuals on Medicaid and those that do not will narrow.

Mr. President, I am going to close on a little bit of a personal note. My background is working with older people. Years ago I was director of the Oregon Gray Panthers. It was an extraordinary honor to be able to do this. Those were the days when if a town had a lunch program for older people, it was considered a big deal. Senator STABENOW was starting her career in the Michigan Legislature, and she remembers those days. It was a big deal when a town just had a lunch program where older people could congregate. That was considered a pretty serious array of senior services because you could get a few things there where older people got lunch.

So as we have heard, now we are looking at the opportunities for extraordinary innovation.

Elizabeth Holmes was here today and had a chance to visit with several Members. She has taken the whole notion of personalized medicine—and personalized medicine where in effect an individual could order their own test, and it costs only a few dollars. The State of Arizona has already embraced it. She is talking to government officials about something that would empower patients and would make sense from a health quality standpoint and from the standpoint of cost.

She is a young, very gifted woman. I believe she is a graduate of Stanford, my alma mater. I talked yesterday to her about this. I could just see the enthusiasm for the future of health care and what she has already been able to accomplish and what she is going to be able to do in the days ahead with this new focus on personalized medicine and tests that empower patients to make their own decisions about health care. As to the sums of money that are involved for the tests, I am not sure they are even going to be able to be processed by government computers because they are too small. We are going to save too much money. So there are going to be very exciting developments ahead for Medicare and Medicaid.

The last 50 years have been an extraordinary run for these programs. It is a personal thrill for me to have been

involved in the early years of these programs. Now they are essential to the well-being of more than 100 million Americans.

We take this special day to kind of savor how much progress has been made from the days when America had poorhouses and almshouses for seniors to today, where Medicare is leading the way on home care and disclosing data and looking at new approaches with respect to health tests, such as what Elizabeth Holmes has been here to visit on. We can see that with Medicare and Medicaid, their particular genius is that they are always keeping up with the times and looking to new approaches that better meet the needs of older people and do it in an affordable fashion.

I will close by way of saying that I don't think there is a single area I have talked about—I know my colleague and the Chair are members of a different political parties—or I don't think there is a single issue that I have brought up here in the last 15 or 20 minutes that Democrats and Republicans can't find common ground on. In fact, Chairman HATCH in the Finance Committee, to his credit, has said that by the end of the year he wants Democrats and Republicans on our committee to produce a bill dealing with chronic illness—which, as I suggested, is what Medicare is all about and is responsible for 90 percent of the spending. So on that hopeful note, after an incredible 50-year run, I think the next 50 years are going to be even better. In the four or five areas that I have been talking about for a few minutes, I don't think there is a one of them where Democrats and Republicans can't find common ground.

I know my colleague from Michigan is waiting to speak. I will note as I wrap up that she has really been a leader in this field, particularly in getting Democrats and Republicans together. By the way, as she begins her speech, I would note that many Americans are going to receive better mental health care services in the years ahead largely due to the work—the bipartisan work—of my colleague on these issues.

So I am happy to wrap up my comments and look forward to hearing from my colleague from Michigan.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, before my friend from Oregon leaves, I wish to make a couple of comments about our leader on the Finance Committee. Sitting and listening to him about his optimism and hopefulness really helps me have optimism so we can actually come together and get things done.

I can't think of anybody who, first of all, is more creative or willing to look at all kinds of ideas in order to be able to strengthen health care—Medicare,

Medicaid—for quality and cost containment issues. Back during health care reform, I was proud to join Senator WYDEN on what I believe was an extremely thoughtful approach around health care. Again, I very much appreciate all that he does.

I have to say that I know he has reminded me many times about coming to the Senate and elected office from the early years with Gray Panthers and organizing for seniors. I come to public-service elected office after a big fight to save the county nursing home in Ingham County, Michigan. So we both came to public service fighting for health care for older Americans. It is my honor to continue to serve with him and also with the Senator from Pennsylvania, who has joined us on the floor as well.

I do in fact come to recognize the 50th anniversary of the signing of Medicare and Medicaid into law. I view these as great American success stories and the best about us in terms of our values. I think it is important, though, when we look at this, to sort of say: This is Thursday; we are going to do a “Throwback Thursday” moment here, and look at the context in which these programs were created.

There was the early 1960s. It was a time of great social upheaval. It was a time, frankly, of segregation and Jim Crow laws and a time also when there was no safety net for older Americans or Americans with disabilities when it came to the possibility of going to the doctor or getting the medical care that people needed. If someone was living in poverty, they simply could not afford to see a doctor to be able to get medical care for them or for their family.

But within the civil rights movement, our Nation became more attuned to the injustices of society for people of color as well as those in society who were struggling with illnesses—just basic health care needs—or with poverty.

In 1963, in his “I Have a Dream” speech, Martin Luther King challenged Americans to live out the true meaning of the creed of our Nation, the Declaration of Independence: that all men and women are created equal, and that all of us are entitled to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness. I think that includes access to health care for ourselves and our families. Our country responded to that challenge through the passage of the Civil Rights Act and through the passage 50 years ago of legislation that created Medicare and Medicaid. This was a momentous event in our Nation's history. It demonstrated our willingness to take action to ensure that our Nation's laws were in line with our core values as a country. It is so important that we be working together to do that again. That is what we should be doing every day.

Let's remember that before the creation of Medicare, only half of our sen-

iors had health insurance or could even find health insurance. That meant half of them were struggling probably to get the medical care they needed or they were going into an emergency room—which, by the way, is the most expensive way—to be treated rather than going to the doctor and getting preventative care and so on. We saw about half of our seniors and people with disabilities in that situation.

President Lyndon B. Johnson was the strong principled leader we needed in that moment, and 50 years ago he signed the Medicare bill into law. When he did, he said:

No longer will older Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years.

The Medicare Program really is a great American success story that connects all of us together—each generation—and each generation has done its part to strengthen that, including our own. That is why it is so important that we not go backwards at this time. This is where, unfortunately, we see a real difference here in the Senate and the House and in the political discourse more broadly, because we have seen, unfortunately, a Republican budget—House and Senate—that has passed this year with almost \$500 billion in Medicare cuts, efforts to turn the system away from a universal program into something that—whether we call it vouchers or whether we have other names for it—would take away the confidence and ability for older people and people with disabilities to know they have health care, which is what Medicare is all about.

What we need to be doing instead of those things—and we even have Presidential candidates saying we should phase out Medicare. We should not be doing that. We should be working to ensure the programs' health and longevity so people are confident that, as they work and pay into the system—because, by the way, people are paying into this system—it will be there when they retire in terms of a health care system for them.

I also very much appreciate our ranking member in the Finance Committee talking about the new things we need to do. I will just mention one. When we look at Medicare, \$1 out of \$5 today is spent on Alzheimer's, as our ranking member knows. So many of us are working together. There are bipartisan efforts going on to tackle this question. Senator COLLINS from Maine and I have what is called the HOPE for Alzheimer's Act. Senator COLLINS is also working very hard and has in fact increased research, which is so important. But we need to know that we are doing everything we can to support Alzheimer's patients and their families and to find cures.

The exciting part is that we are seeing more and more opportunities through research. I have had so many conversations with researchers in Michigan and across the country. We are so close in so many areas to be able to break through if we don't go backwards on research funding, as unfortunately happens if we are not coming together and appropriately funding the budget.

So there are a lot of things we need to do: save dollars, increase quality, and make sure we are tackling the challenges right now of health care for older Americans. I am constantly reminded that in my State there are nearly half a million people right now who get their health care through Medicare and some 40 million nationwide.

I will talk for a minute now about the other path on that legislation, which is Medicaid. Now, that program came in response to a crisis in health care for low-income Americans and those with disabilities as well, and it has been nothing less than a lifeline for people, saving lives now for 50 years. During this last great recession that we had, there were so many families struggling to pay for basic health care needs that Medicaid literally was the saving grace that helped them and their families get back on their feet.

Medicaid is especially vital to women. Nearly half of all births in our country are funded through Medicaid. It gives young women access to preventative services such as cancer screenings.

I would also again thank our ranking member and our chairman for including legislation on Medicaid and a series of bipartisan bills that just passed the Senate Finance Committee. The Quality Care for Moms and Babies Act is about making sure we have quality standards across the country for low-income moms who are pregnant, going through prenatal care, delivery, and for babies. Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa is my partner in that effort.

It is also critical to note that on Medicaid, actually 80 percent of the dollars goes to long-term care for low-income seniors. As I said in the beginning, when I got involved in this whole process of public service and elected office, it was because of a nursing home that took Medicaid and helped low-income seniors be able to have a nursing home. In fact, 80 percent of Medicaid goes for seniors in nursing homes and long-term care.

Unfortunately, as with Medicare, what we have seen in the budgets is this: Rather than working together to strengthen Medicaid, we have seen countless attacks over and over to cut funding, to block grant the program. Over \$1 trillion in the next 10 years to cut Medicaid was actually passed by the Republican majority in the House and the Senate.

That is not the direction we need to go in as we are celebrating the 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid. We still have Governors who refuse to use funding that is available to them to cover their seniors in nursing homes under Medicaid or moms and babies, families—low-income working families.

We put into the Affordable Care Act the ability for people who are working in low-paying jobs to be able to have access to health care through Medicaid. Yet we still have 3.7 million Americans who can't get health care. It is not because the money is not there but because of politics. I think that is pretty outrageous.

Of the 3.7 million, 2 million are women. That is 2 million women who can't get health care services, whether it is screenings or mammograms, they can't get coverage for labor, delivery, and prenatal care. It is available. It is right there. It is not happening because of politics.

I am determined—as I know our ranking member is and my Democratic colleagues are as well—to make sure we are standing up for Medicare and Medicaid every single day. Medicaid is a program that allows 72 million Americans—including nearly 13 million working Americans, low-income working Americans who have gotten coverage because of the Affordable Care Act—to be able to go to bed at night with the knowledge that if their children get sick, they will be able to take them to the doctor or for any of us, if our parents or grandparents need a nursing home, they will be able to have one.

Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program together provide 33 million children with the ability to see a doctor, to get the operation they need, to be able to have their juvenile diabetes taken care of or other health care issues.

Today is not just an anniversary of programs. I think it is an opportunity to recommit ourselves to the ideals that created these programs, the values that are behind these programs, and to say that health care is pretty important to families.

Now, 50 years ago we decided for our seniors we were going to make sure they could live in dignity in retirement and know they were going to be able to get the health care they needed. People are living longer and healthier lives. People are living today because of Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, all together. That is a great thing. We should be celebrating the fact that President Johnson, working with the Congress, got that done.

I believe this is the kind of approach we need to continue to strengthen for future generations. There is a huge divide right now about what to do on these programs, unfortunately, but I can say that we as Democrats are recommitting ourselves to a strong Medi-

care Program and a strong Medicaid Program for the future for American families.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I rise as well—as the senior Senator from Michigan just told us—to highlight and celebrate this anniversary, 50 years for both Medicare and Medicaid.

I am going to focus my remarks on Medicaid and to say, first, that contrary to what we often hear about an important program such as this, Medicaid is working. Medicaid is helping tens of millions of Americans. We can all come up with ways to make changes, and we probably will over the next couple of years, but Medicaid is maybe one of the most underrated health care programs in recent American history, for sure, and it is not simply millions who are benefiting from Medicaid but tens of millions. There are 68 million Americans who are Medicaid beneficiaries nationally and 36 million of them are children.

When folks talk about families and children and the priority we place on helping our families, I hope that means strengthening Medicaid, not slashing it, not destroying it, and not taking some of the steps that have been proposed in Washington over the last couple years.

It is interesting, about 45 percent of all births in the country are paid for by Medicaid. So 45 percent of the babies born in America are on this Earth because they have the Medicaid Program to pay for the cost of the birth, which is not inexpensive. On the other end of the age spectrum, about 60 percent of nursing home placements in the country come through Medicaid. This isn't a program for someone else far away. This is a program that affects most of America. A lot of lower middle income families and others have the opportunity to place a loved one in a nursing home because of Medicaid, as well as what I said about the births.

Another way to think about Medicaid is the impact on children across the country—not only children in urban areas or children in communities where most families are low-income. When you examine both health care for children as it relates to Medicaid and to children who receive health care through the Children's Health Insurance Program—which in Pennsylvania we call CHIP—in rural areas that number is very high. There was a study done last fall that 47 percent of rural children get their health care from either Medicaid or from the CHIP program—actually, a higher percentage of the children in rural areas than in urban areas.

This is serious business when we talk about highlighting the benefits of Medicaid—not just celebrating an anniversary but celebrating working and having a sense of purpose and solidarity

about preserving Medicaid for our families and strengthening it where we can.

One of the reasons Medicaid has been so successful over time is because of some of the strategies that were embedded in the program many years ago, especially as it relates to children. We know Medicaid serves children. It serves individuals with disabilities. In fact, that is a big number as well. Now, 8.8 million nonelderly individuals with disabilities are Medicaid beneficiaries nationally. It serves individuals with disabilities. But when you focus just on children as a segment of Medicaid, here is what we find in one of the strategies put in place years ago: The so-called EPSDT—Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment Program—that benefit is of substantial significance for the future of our children and therefore the future of our country. Early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment is responsible for making sure vulnerable children receive quality and comprehensive care. Private insurance companies should emulate in their care what is provided in the so-called EPSDT.

Twenty-five million low-income children have access to this important program through Medicaid. What is it? I think it is evident from the name, but it is good to highlight what it means. First of all, the “early” part of it is the early access in identifying problems early. The second word is “periodic,” which means checking children’s health at periodic age-appropriate intervals. “Screening” is self-evident, but maybe you don’t remember what is behind the screening. It is providing physical, mental, developmental, dental, hearing, vision, and other screening tests to detect potential problems. The “screening” part of early periodic screening, diagnosis, and treatment is vital. “Diagnostic” is performing a diagnostic test to follow up when a risk is identified. “Treatment” is control, correct or reduce health problems when they are found.

This isn’t just vital to the life of that child and his or her family and his or her ability to grow and learn in school and then succeed and get a job and contribute to our country, it is also important to the rest of us. We are going to be a much stronger country if children are the beneficiaries of preventative health care. We all know that. The data has been telling us that for decades. We are just starting to get about the business of finally, at long last, doing more preventative work in our health care system, just like Medicaid has been doing on behalf of children for many years. I think we are learning some lessons from Medicaid that can be applied to the rest of our health care system.

I know we are short on time because we have a number of people who want to make presentations today. I will re-

duce my remarks in this fashion. I will tell one story from my home State. Here is one example of a particular family, the Sinclair family. In this case, Owen Sinclair was born with a genetic defect with wide-ranging effects. His aorta wraps around his trachea and esophagus. He has trouble swallowing, jaundice, and has other organs that are malformed because of his condition. He needed extensive treatment at a specialized unit of the local children’s hospital in Pennsylvania. After birth, he had to stay in the hospital on and off for most of the first 6 months of his life, but his parents’ insurance only covered him for 30 days after birth. The tests and treatments and the surgeries and medications were far beyond the income of his parents. In the first 30 days, their copays alone were more than \$15,000—30 days, \$15,000. Medicaid literally saved this child’s life. Owen Sinclair needs continuing testing, treatment, and nutrition support. The Sinclairs worry about their little boy, but at least they don’t have to worry about going bankrupt because they love him and want him to get the medical care he needs.

That is the real world of the substantial and immeasurable benefits that Medicaid provides in the life of a child, the life of a family, and obviously in the life of our Nation’s future.

We have to do more today than just celebrate 50 years. That is nice. We should all take time to celebrate, but we have to be committed and recommitment to the future of Medicaid, to strengthen it, to support it—not to undermine it and not to destroy the benefits we all know are vital to our children, vital to their future development, and vital to help them learn. If kids learn more when they are young, they are going to earn more later. We are all better off for that.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I also rise to celebrate this important anniversary. Fifty years ago today, President Lyndon Baines Johnson signed into law Medicaid and Medicare with my favorite President sitting next to him, President Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, I came up and asked you a question, and I am proud to tell the whole Chamber, as everybody is listening, there is only, I think, one Member of the current U.S. Senate who was at the inauguration of LBJ, and it is the Presiding Officer, the Senator from Wyoming, who was at that inauguration in January of 1964.

Clearly, the signature of Medicare and Medicaid was one of President Johnson’s and one of our Nation’s proudest legislative achievements. Medicare is the landmark program which makes sure seniors have access to health care, and Medicaid is equally critical. It helps low-income seniors,

children, and people with disabilities get their necessary health care.

Today I wish to talk about Medicaid. Others have spoken about Medicare earlier. Senator CASEY did a good job speaking about Medicaid, and I want to do the same because I have seen the success of Medicaid as a mayor and as a Governor, and now as a Senator, it is absolutely critical.

In 2014, as Senator CASEY mentioned, Medicaid provided health coverage to nearly 70 million Americans, including 1 million Virginians. In Virginia, about 600,000 children, 2 out of every 7 kids, are covered through Medicaid or its companion program CHIP. Medicaid is important. The Presiding Officer is a physician, so he knows that Medicaid is not just coverage to get health care when you need it, it is also about financial security because health care bills are often what push families into bankruptcy or into financially stressful situations, so the Medicaid coverage that covers 70 million Americans gives them financial stability.

Medicaid is about peace of mind. If you are completely healthy, but you are going to sleep at night wondering what will happen if your wife is in an auto accident or if your child becomes ill, that is a source of anxiety that is helped a little bit by having the coverage that Medicaid provides.

It is also for people with disabilities. This is important to note. It is about independence. A lot of citizens with disabilities, because they are able to be on Medicaid, are able to work part time because Medicaid provides them with coverage that enables them to live independent lives. That is what Medicaid is about.

Now, today at 50, we think Medicaid is a given, but let me remind everybody that Medicaid was controversial when it was passed 50 years ago. In the House and Senate there were a lot of “no” votes, and Medicaid was an opt-in program, not a mandate. States could decide whether to opt-in or not. A lot of States chose not to be a part of Medicaid. They were the slowpoke States.

I think every family knows what I mean. Every family probably has a slowpoke. Frankly, I have a sister-in-law who is a slowpoke. If we are trying to go to church, a restaurant, or anywhere, we can always know that whatever time we say we will go, we will have this one family member who will likely be the slowpoke and hold everybody back.

Well, States were like that in 1965. A lot of States wouldn’t sign on to Medicaid. By 1972, 7 years later, 49 States had embraced Medicaid, but the 50th State, Arizona, didn’t embrace Medicaid until 1982. It took them 17 years to embrace Medicaid. Arizona was the original Medicaid slowpoke. So Medicaid is now 50 years old. It was controversial at first, increasingly accepted, and later embraced. It kind of sounds familiar to me.

The biggest change in the health care system since the signing of Medicaid and Medicare was the Affordable Care Act. The Affordable Care Act has so many benefits, such as protecting people with preexisting conditions, rebating premiums back to folks if they have to overpay their health insurers, making sure women don't have to pay different premiums than men, and there are so many other benefits. But the biggest benefit of the Affordable Care Act is that in the United States right now there are 16 million people with health insurance coverage who didn't have it before and are now able to walk around, go to work, and be with their families because of the expansion of Medicaid. Sixteen million is a very big number. I will put that in perspective. There are 16 million people who didn't have health insurance before and now have health insurance coverage because of the ACA. Sixteen million is the combined population of Alaska, Delaware, the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Idaho, Maine, Montana, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming. The combined population of 15 States, plus the District of Columbia, has health care coverage because of the Affordable Care Act. But there is more to do.

One piece of the ACA is the ability of States to expand Medicaid to cover those who make up to \$16,000 a year. It is optional, just as Medicaid was in 1965. Thirty-one States have embraced the Medicaid expansion, but as of today, we have 19 slowpokes, and I am sad to say that Virginia is one of the slowpokes. Despite the best efforts of our current Governor, working so hard to try to get the State to accept Medicaid expansion, so far the legislature has blocked him from doing so.

This is just like 1965, 50 years ago. There are States that get it and embrace the program, and then there are the slowpoke States.

I am here today not just to say happy birthday to Medicaid and Medicare, but to urge Virginia and the other slowpokes to get with the program. Here is what it would mean in Virginia: If Virginia accepts the Medicaid expansion, it will open up the possibility of health care coverage to another 400,000 people. It would provide health care, financial security, independence for those with disabilities, and peace of mind even when you are well. If all 19 slowpoke States get on board, an additional 4 million Americans would get health insurance, which would take the ACA coverage number up to 20. Those are all the States I mentioned earlier, plus the State of Nevada—16 States and the District of Columbia.

Now, you shouldn't be consigned to second-class health status in this country because you live in one of the 19 slowpoke States, especially since your

taxpayers are paying taxes to provide you coverage.

Senator BROWN and I have authored a letter, which has been signed by many in this body, to the 19 slowpoke States. We asked them to join the program during Medicaid's 50th year. The program has an amazing legacy and a bright future. Don't be a slowpoke.

Remember how I said that Arizona was the original slowpoke? It was the last State—17 years later—to embrace Medicaid in 1982. Well, they may have been the original slowpoke, but when it came to the ACA, they learned something. Arizona—with a Republican Governor, two Republican Senators, a Republican State legislature, an overwhelmingly Republican congressional delegation, and votes for Republican candidates in Presidential elections—is not a slowpoke. Arizona has embraced the ACA. They are now a jackrabbit. Good for them. I hope Virginia joins them soon. I hope that all remaining 19 States join them soon, and I hope that 4 million more Americans can have health insurance coverage with the health, financial security, and peace of mind that that will provide.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DRINKING WATER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about the Drinking Water Protection Act. This is commonsense, bipartisan legislation. Nobody opposes it on the merits, and it is urgent we get it done for my home State of Ohio and States all around the country.

What could be more important than having access to clean drinking water? There are a lot of pollutants in the water that contribute to not having clean drinking water. Of particular concern to us right now in Ohio are the toxins in the harmful algal blooms. This is blue-green algae that appears in both fresh water and saltwater. In the case of drinking water, unfortunately, it is finding its way into more and more fresh water bodies that provide drinking water.

This is something that is a big concern, not just for drinking water, but it can also cause illness or death in humans, pets, wildlife, and it is doing so, unfortunately, in my State of Ohio and around the country. If not confronted, these toxins will continue to contaminate our lakes and other fresh water bodies. Unfortunately, in Ohio we are all too familiar with this.

About a year ago, last summer, Toledo had to actually shut down the use of their water supply. They had to tell people there was a ban on drinking water. It was a big deal. Up to 500,000 people were affected. I was actually back home in Ohio because this happened over a weekend, and I filled up my pickup truck with bottled water and made a beeline for Toledo because

people were desperate. I was able to pass out bottled water and also work with the local officials to try to get the testing done by EPA and to be sure that we could clean up the water supply.

It took a while, and you can imagine the impact on Toledo and the impact on so many other people now all over the northern part of Ohio who depend on Lake Erie for their water supply because they are wondering—again, this year we have a heavy toxic algal bloom forming. What is going to happen to their water supply?

Unfortunately, it not just Cleveland, Toledo, and cities along the lake. Celina, OH, which is further south but gets its water from Grand Lakes St. Marys, which is another fresh water lake. It is actually a reservoir and the water supply for Celina, among other things. Celina has spent over \$400,000 annually just to combat the algae in Grand Lakes St. Marys.

Columbus was forced to spend over \$700,000 to mitigate an algae outbreak at the Hoover Reservoir in 2013. Buckeye Lake in Ohio has also been affected by this. Again, it is not just Ohio; it is happening, unfortunately, around the country.

These harmful algal blooms continue to put public safety and health at risk. We have to keep our fresh water resources safe so our drinking water isn't threatened, and natural habitats and echo systems are protected.

By the way, this isn't just about drinking water either. Our waterways are important economic engines as well. Lake Erie, as an example, brought in \$1.8 billion in business activity last year just through the fishing industry, and \$226 million in taxes in 2013 alone. Tourism around the lake now supports one in four private sector jobs.

I was at Lake Erie last weekend, and I had the chance to go out on Lake Erie. I was out there with Captain Dave Spangler. This is Dave Spangler. Dave was the charter boat Captain of the Year in 2014, and the reason he became the charter boat Captain of the Year is not only because he is a great fishermen and knows how to find the fish, but he is a good steward of Lake Erie. He gets out there, along with other charter boat captains, and they actually monitor the quality of the water, including taking samples.

This is one of the samples that he took. This is what I saw when I was on Lake Erie. If you look at it, you can see that it is a jar. I was told I couldn't bring it on the floor today because I brought it back to DC with me from Ohio, but I wanted to have a photograph of it.

This is what it looks like. This is the blue-green algae that are in that water. This is the stuff that is cutting off the oxygen supply for the fish, creating toxins so you can't swim in it, and it is

also contaminating the drinking water if you get too much of it, as we did last year. We are fearful that it might happen again this year because it is another bad year. The weather patterns were all wrong. There was a lot of rain early on; therefore, a lot of runoff, and now a lot of heat and stillness on the lake which creates the algal bloom. This is a real problem for us right now, and it is a real concern to the people I represent in Ohio but also to places all over the country that are dealing with this issue.

After we were out on Lake Erie, we hosted a townhall meeting where people came in from the area. This included not only fishing boat captains, but also small business owners, marina owners. It included people who are living along the lake, residents who are very concerned about the future of the lake. We had a bunch of experts there. We talked about the algal blooms and how to deal with it. It all came back to the fact that we have to take action at the local, State, and Federal levels.

We have passed legislation on this. We passed it last year. It has been helpful at the Federal level. We have come up with a new bill that will help to deal with this issue by forcing the Federal departments and agencies to work better together to come up with a report on how to better monitor what is happening, how to ensure that we have a strategic plan that actually identifies the human health risks from contaminated algal toxins and recommends feasible treatment options, including procedures on how to prevent algal toxins from reaching these local supplies in the first place, and of course to mitigate adverse public effects of algal toxins.

This is an appropriate role for the EPA. It is an appropriate role for NOAA, by the way, to do the monitoring because they have satellites that can help us to monitor what is happening on Lake Erie and other fresh water supplies for drinking water around the country.

This is a critical piece of legislation. It was introduced in the House by Congressman BOB LATTA. It was supported on a bipartisan basis in the U.S. House. They have already passed it in the House of Representatives. They passed it in February. It passed by an overwhelming vote of 375 to 37.

It then came over here to the Senate where SHERROD BROWN, my colleague from Ohio, and I had drafted legislation on this. I commend Senator BROWN, who was just down here on the floor. We were just talking about this legislation. We put it into the process here to begin getting it cleared by Democrats and Republicans back in March. So for 4 and ½ months, we have been trying to clear this legislation.

This week, I learned that the legislation is cleared, that nobody has substantive concerns with it, and we can

finally move forward with it, and none too soon. We need this help, and we need it now. The people who live along the lake and get their drinking water from these reservoirs and other lakes I talked about are worried, and for some very good reasons. By the way, they are closing down beaches in my area because of this. There are pets and people who are seeing negative health effects from it.

We need to get the EPA more engaged and involved. We have a bipartisan way to do that. Again, it passed the House by an overwhelming 375 to 37 vote.

I am hopeful we can get this legislation passed tonight by a voice vote. We need to do everything we can to bring the Federal resources together, along with State and local governments and local conservation groups to combat this threat.

This is something, again, that is a no-brainer, as they say. It is one that everybody supports. It is one that is an urgent matter for us in Ohio. It is a matter that is of great concern to us right now. We need to get it moving, and it is one where we have bipartisan and bicameral support.

If we act tonight to clear this legislation and get it done, it will go to the President's desk for signature. And, of course, the President will sign it. Why? Because it is good, commonsense, bipartisan legislation that engages the EPA in an appropriate role to ensure that we can deal with these harmful algal blooms before they cause more damage and before we have another huge drinking crisis, just as we had last summer, in Toledo, OH.

So tonight I am going to ask my colleagues to pass this legislation. I am going to ask that there be a voice vote on it. I hope that this will go smoothly and that we can get this done.

Again, for 4½ months we have had this out there. Everybody has had a chance to look at it. There are no substantive concerns with it.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212

So at this time I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to this legislation, which is H.R. 212, which is at the desk; that the bill be read a third time; and that the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, with great respect for my colleague from Oregon, I object. But I object because there is an additional bipartisan proposal that is out there and another unanimous consent request where this bill is paired with another bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212 AND S. 1523

I ask unanimous consent that the EPW Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 212, a bill

to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and S. 1523, a bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program; further, that the Senate proceed to their immediate consideration en bloc; that the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bills and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard to the request of the Senator from Ohio.

Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I don't know what the Senator from New Mexico is talking about, to be honest. He is my friend and colleague. I will say that I am from Ohio, not Oregon.

We just talked about the importance of this bill to Ohio. It is also important to Oregon and to the Senator's State of New Mexico and to other States around this country. There is no paired bill with this. I am talking about a bill that has been around here for 4½ months. It has been cleared. There are no substantive concerns. My understanding is that the Senator from New Mexico is talking about a bill that is still in committee. It has not even come out of committee. It is not a House bill. In other words, it hasn't been passed in the House. It is not going to go to the President's desk for his signature.

I would be shocked if my colleagues on the other side of the aisle say they are going to block this commonsense, bipartisan bill that Senator SHERROD BROWN and I have worked steadfastly on with both sides of the Capitol to get this done tonight on an urgent basis because we have to get it done. Ours has been out here for 4½ months; we didn't hear about yours until 45 minutes ago—45 minutes versus 4½ months.

If the Senator from New Mexico wants to block this for other reasons, he ought to say so. But if he is blocking it because there is a pairing—there is no pairing. Maybe he is trying to pair it with something in committee.

But let's get this done. This is not a difficult issue. This is one where we have total agreement. There is no substantive concern. I would urge my colleague to allow us to get this done tonight, and then I am happy—happy—to work on this other bill, whatever it is—of course, we don't know because I just heard about it 45 minutes ago. In fact, I just directed the staff, because I just heard about it when I came here, to go ahead and run the hotline on the other bill. So we have already done that, and we will see what comes back. I know what is going to come back, which is people are going to say, probably on both sides of the aisle, we haven't had a chance to look at this. It hasn't been

out for 4½ months; it has been out here for a couple of minutes. It was just a couple of minutes ago that we heard about it.

So I can't believe we are going to block this tonight in order to say we have to move something that is in committee, has not been passed by the House, will not go to the President for his signature, and has not been through any process, as this has been.

I urge my colleague and my friend to withdraw his objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection from the Senator from Ohio? Mr. PORTMAN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, just to clarify, the bill that it is being paired with is S. 1523. It is a bipartisan bill in the same committee. The proposal to pair them has come from the committee chairman, Chairman INHOFE. So that is the reason for the pairing. They are both sitting in the EPW Committee. The chairman believes this is the way to proceed.

That is the state of play as it is right now. I would say that with all due respect to my colleague from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I find it very strange that Senator INHOFE has somehow objected since he has signed off on this. It has been totally cleared. This has been cleared to have a voice vote and to have it done tonight. There is no objection from Senator INHOFE. He has cleared it. So I would check the Senator's sources on that.

I would just say I am really disappointed that this legislation that makes so much sense, that is needed right now in my home State of Ohio, is being blocked, and I don't know why it is being blocked. I assume there are some reasons that aren't being discussed tonight. This is very disappointing to me.

We are going to try this again on Monday. We are going to try it again on Tuesday. We are going to try it again on Wednesday. I would urge my colleagues on that side of the aisle to please allow us to get this done. Allow us to provide some relief right now.

If my colleague was up there with me in Lake Erie talking with these people—talking to the folks who had to go through this water crisis last summer; who are worried about what is going to happen this summer; who are being told they can't use the beaches; the fishing captains are worried about their businesses; the small businesses; the marinas; the folks who are not allowing their pets to walk along the lakes and drink the water—I think he would feel differently about it.

Let's get this done. This is not an example of something that should require

some sort of partisan exercise. Let's do this in a nonpartisan way. Senator SHERROD BROWN and I have been working on this for 4½ months. I am disappointed we can't move it tonight—very disappointed—but I am very hopeful we can move it on Monday or Tuesday. We are going to keep trying, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for as much time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, today we are considering a diplomatic agreement about the future of a nuclear-armed Iran. Most of us in this body have strong opinions about that agreement. Some believe it will weaken our position. I believe the opposite, and I have come to the floor to express my support.

Republican and Democratic Presidents have all at times used the tools of diplomacy. Those efforts made us stronger and in some cases brought us back from the brink of nuclear disaster. President Reagan negotiated disarmament with the Soviet Union. President Nixon reengaged with China. President Kennedy used diplomacy—not war—to resolve the Cuban Missile Crisis. These were heroic initiatives. In each case, they were attacked for weakness, and in each case they made us safer.

I begin my remarks with the power of diplomacy because I want to echo points Senator DURBIN made so well last week. I urge my colleagues to review his remarks, to better understand the history and importance of diplomacy in our country. None of the historical deals we reference was perfect. All were fiercely attacked. But they made the world a safer place. They moved us forward. And this agreement will also move us forward.

When it comes to our relationship with Iran, there is much we need to do, but there is one thing we must do: Stop Iran from building a nuclear weapon, period. That is our priority. That is our goal. And that is what we all agree on.

The sanctions did what they were intended to do—they brought Iran to the table and enabled our diplomats to effectively stop Iran's nuclear weapons program. The results are clear: multiple centrifuges—ready to be disconnected; uranium levels—insufficient for a nuclear weapon or a quick breakout; and no access to plutonium.

This is a historic moment. This agreement has profound impact if we approve it and, make no mistake, if we fail to approve it, because let's be clear on one reality: This is a multilateral agreement. It was confirmed by the U.N. Security Council just last week. The sanctions regime cannot be sustained by U.S. action alone.

This is a time for careful review, and I hope we can take a step back and take a clear view. In this debate, we need to consider three basic points of the agreement: No. 1, what it does; No. 2, what it does not do; and No. 3, what it will require of us in the future. I wish to start by talking about what this agreement does.

To build a nuclear weapon, we need either weapons-grade uranium or plutonium, and we need infrastructure. Those are the pathways, and this agreement will block them all.

Before the negotiations began, Iran was well on its way to enough uranium, enriched to nearly 20 percent, for breakout to weapons grade—possibly within 2 to 3 months. With this agreement, the breakout time would increase to 1 year, giving the United States and the international community more than enough time to respond. Under this deal, Iran's uranium stockpile is cut by 98 percent. I will repeat. This is a surprising development. Under this deal, Iran's uranium stockpile is cut by 98 percent. Enrichment is limited to 3.67 percent for 15 years. Centrifuges are reduced by two-thirds. Enrichment capability at the Fordow facility will also be limited and closely watched. The International Atomic Energy Agency will be able to verify that Iran is abiding by its uranium limits by monitoring every stage of the nuclear supply chain. Plutonium will be blocked. The reactor core at Arak is a heavy water reactor and can produce plutonium. The core will be removed. Its openings will be filled with concrete in a way that the IAEA can verify—those international inspectors can verify—so it will not be used for plutonium application.

Critics rightly ask: How will we be sure? Iran has cheated before, and they may cheat again. That is why the P5+1 will be closely involved in the redesign and rebuilding of this reactor. If it has plutonium, we will know it. A modernized reactor will not use heavy water and will be limited to 3.67 percent enriched uranium. A violation at Arak would be nearly impossible to hide.

It doesn't stop there. Iran will have to abide by and ratify the additional protocol of the nonproliferation treaty before the deal is finalized. Contrary to detractors, this is not an 8-year or 10-year or 15-year deal but a deal that lasts.

We all agree on one thing: Verification is key. I don't think any of us have any illusions here. Iran has had a long and troubling history of deception.

I am pleased the administration included Secretary of Energy Moniz in these discussions. The Department of Energy is one of the world's foremost experts on nuclear energy and nuclear weapons. Any agreement on nuclear weapons must be guided by science—not politics, not speculation, science.

Our scientists at New Mexico's two National Labs, Los Alamos and Sandia, and scientists at Lawrence Livermore and Oak Ridge National Laboratories—all have played a key role in these negotiations.

The physics of nuclear weapons is complex. You can't make a bomb out of thin air. I have met with our scientists. I have listened to the experts at the Department of Energy. Iran may be able to break the rules of the deal, but it can't break the rules of physics. Nuclear materials give off telltale signatures. The radioactive decay of uranium and plutonium is detectable even in the event of delayed access. Uranium in nature has a half-life of 4.5 billion years. Enriched uranium 235, which can be used in a weapon, has a half-life of 700 million years. In effect, you can delay, but you still can't hide.

Verification will be strong, and that means continuous monitoring, it means tamper-proof electronic seals, and it means dedicated facilities to inspect the Iranian nuclear program. It will include up to 150 inspectors with long-term visas. We will have the best inspectors in the world in Iran. They will have unprecedented access 24/7 to all declared sites. I would add that they are all trained by nuclear experts at our National Laboratories. I may not trust Iran, but I do trust the science and our National Laboratories.

This is a serious debate and one of the greatest challenges of our time. This agreement will meet that challenge ongoing and for years to come. But let's not kid ourselves. There are other challenges. There are continued dangers posed by the Iranian regime. We all know this. That is why sanctions against Iran's support for terrorist groups will remain and we will stand by our allies in the region. The President has made this very clear.

This agreement will take the nuclear threat off the table. That is what it will do, but here is what it will not do: It will not diminish our resolve to combat other threats or to defend our allies in the region. That resolve will be and must be stronger than ever.

To my colleagues who argue that we should walk away from the agreement which has already been approved by the world's leading powers, I would ask, walk away to where, to what end, to what alternative? Has an alternative been proposed?

I would make two proposals:

First, I urge my colleagues to support this agreement. We have a choice between this deal or no deal. I do not believe we will get another chance.

Second, I ask that we be open to ways that Congress can reinforce the agreement—and that should be part of this process, too—with investment in people and technology to support non-proliferation enforcement with strong oversight of the implementation plan—not to embarrass or score political

points but to ensure Iran is abiding by its part of the deal—and with increased support for our allies in the region and with a clear provision for a quick snap-back of existing sanctions should that be necessary.

We have a strategic opportunity, just as Presidents Kennedy, Nixon, and Reagan did with adversaries in the past. We need to act now from a position of strength and not wait until another day when the danger may be greater and our options may be more limited.

I began my remarks with a reference to history. I would conclude with one other, closer in time and devastating in consequence, and that is Iraq. Instead of exhausting our diplomatic options, we opted for war. Instead of measured resistance, we opted for regime change. The result was and is tragic.

Diplomacy takes time. It is often imperfect. But there are times when it is our best option and our best course, and this is one of those times.

Mr. President, I yield the floor to my colleague from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. President, at a time when we have so many urgent issues on our national agenda—our economy, jobs, all the issues we need to address, such as making sure every American has a fair shot to get ahead after college, has retirement security, and all of the other issues we know Americans care about—unfortunately, we are revisiting a very old debate that doesn't seem to want to go away, and that is whether we will provide funding for preventive health care for women, specifically for family planning clinics that provide essential primary health care services for women and men for things such as wellness visits, mammograms, and breast cancer screenings.

In 2013, Planned Parenthood performed 500,000 breast exams, including 15,000 for women in Michigan. Planned Parenthood provides screenings for cancer, heart disease, and HIV. In 2013, 400,000 Pap tests and 4.5 million STI tests and treatments were conducted. Women go to Planned Parenthood for cervical cancer screenings, for life-and-death cancer screenings, for vaccines, and for blood pressure checks.

In States where Republican Governors have refused to use the funding that is available to expand Medicaid health care under the Affordable Care Act, Planned Parenthood provides services critical to low-income Americans.

In 2013, more than half the people seeking health services at Planned Parenthood clinics were covered by Medicaid. Nearly 80 percent of these men and women have incomes at or below the poverty level. We are talking about all across the country, many places where there is no other access to health care, no other place to get a mammogram or a breast cancer screen-

ing, where these services that are literally life-and-death are being provided.

So when we talk about Planned Parenthood, we are talking about the full spectrum of women's health care, including contraception and family planning services that serve both women and men. One out of five women has been to a Planned Parenthood clinic at some point in her life. In 2013, 2.7 million women, men, young people, relied on Planned Parenthood for preventive care, and about 70,000 of those were in my State of Michigan.

In my State, 40 percent of the Planned Parenthood health clinics are located in areas we call medically underserved. There isn't access to other kinds of clinics or health care. There may not be a hospital nearby or there may not be many doctors nearby. We are talking about basic health care.

Unfortunately, we see politics played with women's preventive health care and family planning over and over again in attacks on Planned Parenthood. As I see it, this is really an attack on every woman who needs preventive health care services.

This is what this is about. Instead of focusing on jobs and closing loopholes that are causing our manufacturing jobs to go overseas; instead of making sure we are focussed on equal pay for equal work or a standard of living that will allow everyone to be successful and economically independent and care for their families; instead of focusing on robustly moving forward as a country in a global economy; instead of focusing on that or continuing to focus on making sure people have access to college without getting out of college with so much debt that they can't buy a house because they can't qualify because they already have so much debt, it is as if they have a mortgage—instead of focusing on all of that, one more time we are seeing an attack on Planned Parenthood and women's preventive health care.

Fortunately, the vast majority of the American people recognize the value of having health clinics like Planned Parenthood that are dedicated to serving women's health care needs in every community across the country. That is why a poll shows that 64 percent of voters oppose the move by congressional Republicans to defund Planned Parenthood and therefore preventive health care services such as mammograms, cancer screenings, blood pressure checks, and access to birth control. Unfortunately, what is the majority view of the public is not what we see debated in the House and in the Senate.

We have come a long way in actually strengthening our health care system, making sure that women and men, older people and younger people, can get preventive health care services, annual wellness visits without having to pay a copay. We have seen a lot of

strengthening of access to health care for women through the Affordable Care Act.

Finally, actually being a woman isn't viewed as a preexisting condition anymore. In too many cases, that had been the situation. Women in childbearing years had to pay higher rates, or someone who survived breast cancer or cervical cancer or some other kind of challenge in their life. Under the Affordable Care Act, we are finally able to say: No, you don't carry that with you as a preexisting condition for the rest of your life. That is a good thing. A lot of women are sleeping better at night as a result of that.

When it comes to basic preventive health care, access to birth control, access to screenings, and so on, it seems that somehow we have to speak out over and over again to defend these basic health care services. One more time we are headed for a big debate, a big fight on the budget. We are hearing people say they won't allow the United States of America to have a budget for next year unless we defund Planned Parenthood and health care access for millions of women in this country. It doesn't speak well for what the priorities are of Congress.

I challenge colleagues across the aisle to join with Democrats, to join with the majority of the American people, who support the ability of women to get a full range of health care services through clinics—where they don't have any other kind of access—through Planned Parenthood and other community clinics that allow them to get the basic health services they need. Women should not be treated as second-class citizens. We have come too far, as we look at the Affordable Care Act and health care access, and it will be incredibly disappointing, disheartening, and maddening, frankly, if we end up in a fight one more time. I have seen it before, and I have had to participate in holding back efforts to say we are not going to fund anything unless we defund women's preventive health care. It is wrong, and this Senator can state as one woman—as well as all of the Democratic women and men who are here—that we don't intend to allow that to happen.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I rise today to speak against the bill to defund Planned Parenthood. I see this bill and others like it as nothing less than an assault on women's health. What else can you call it when defunding Planned Parenthood will result in 2.7 women in this country—that is more than twice the population of the State of Hawaii—not getting the cervical cancer screenings, mammograms, treatment for sexually transmitted diseases, and other health care they need.

For over 100 years Planned Parenthood has been a leader in improving the health and well-being of women throughout the United States.

For many women, especially low-income women, survivors of domestic and sexual assault, young women, and others, Planned Parenthood health centers are their primary health care provider that they go to for lifesaving cancer screenings, birth control, disease testing, and other essential health care services.

One out of five women in this country will pass through a Planned Parenthood health center for health services at some point in her life. These numbers matter. One out of five women in this country will go to a Planned Parenthood center, and here we are debating whether or not to close these centers. I find it astounding that some—especially on the other side of the aisle—think this is a good idea. Six out of ten women who access family planning services rely on Planned Parenthood as their primary point of care.

In the State of Hawaii, my State, over 7,000 women annually have relied on Planned Parenthood for their basic health services—services that help individuals maintain their health so they can live full, productive lives.

This latest attack—basically fear-mongering by the fringes of some on the other side—against Planned Parenthood is unwarranted and unnecessary. This Senator considers it mean-spirited, on top of that. Defunding one of the largest health providers to women shows how far some of my Republican colleagues will go to restrict women's access to basic health care. As previously noted, this latest attack on women's access to care will impact nearly 2.7 million women across the country who benefit from Planned Parenthood's services. Some 2.7 million women—that, again, is nearly double the entire population of the State of Hawaii. Lots of women are going to be impacted by this drive to defund Planned Parenthood.

These 2.7 million Americans do not deserve to have their access to health care terminated just so politicians can score political talking points. If these women can't go to Planned Parenthood, where will they go? Women who rely on Planned Parenthood for essential health care services will be forced to find medical care elsewhere or, tragically, go without.

Defunding Planned Parenthood means there will be 400,000 fewer cervical screenings. There will be 500,000 fewer breast exams. There will be 4.5 million fewer tests and treatments for sexually transmitted disease like HIV.

In Indiana, when the State defunded Planned Parenthood, several clinics closed. The clinic in Scott County was the only testing facility for STDs. Scott County today is in the middle of an HIV outbreak, and the State had to

open a popup clinic to offer such services. Defunding led to residents in Scott County being unable to get services due to partisan statesmanship. We do not want these results replicated throughout the United States.

On behalf of the thousands of women in Hawaii and millions across the country who rely on Planned Parenthood for health care services, I oppose this politically motivated attack that will set women's health care back. I will stand vigilant against those attempts to defund Planned Parenthood and will continue to defend the good work this organization does for women across this country every single day.

Planned Parenthood has long been on the ideological hit list of those who want to block abortion. That is the reality. That is being honest. So, today, we are talking about defunding Planned Parenthood as a way to get to that goal of stopping abortions, and tomorrow we will be talking about some other way to limit a woman's right to choose. This bill is dangerous to women's health. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting against this bill and any like it that come our way.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, later this week we are going to have our first Republican Presidential debate, the official one that is on TV, and a lot of people are going to be watching. There has been a lot of speculation as to who is going to be in the debate, who is not going to be in the debate, who will do well, who will not, who will rise in the polls, and who will fall in the polls.

Frankly, we don't need to wait for that debate because the Republican Presidential primary campaign is playing out right now on the floor of the Senate, I think, to the detriment of the institution. How else would you explain a threat from Members of this body and frankly from Members of the House—many of whom are not running for President—to shut down the government over the issue of funding for Planned Parenthood. We have been through this before. We have been through government shutdowns prompted by ideological politics before, and a lot of people got hurt—a lot of people got hurt.

The life of a woman in Bridgeport, CT, was torn apart because her Head Start Program was shut down because of the Federal Government shutdown. She was just beginning a new job, and she had to make a new choice between

continuing in this new place of employment that was going to lift her out of poverty, essentially sending her kids out on the street while they didn't have care, or leaving the job and taking care of her kids while Head Start was shut down. Those are the consequences of a government shutdown.

So if you are going to shut down the government, your reason for doing it better be pretty good. The reason a couple of years ago was a miserable one—taking health care away from millions of Americans who are getting it because of the Affordable Care Act.

But this one is just as insidious. I don't know where women in my State would be without Planned Parenthood. My wife is one of tens of thousands—probably hundreds of thousands—of Connecticut women who got their preventative care from Planned Parenthood. She did that when she was young, didn't have a lot of income, and needed to find a primary care provider who could get her access to basic health care services. There are 2.7 million patients all across the country who receive their health care, their preventative health care, from Planned Parenthood. More than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does all across the country is engage in preventive health care.

In 2013, 400,000 Pap tests, 500,000 breast exams, 4.5 million STI tests and treatments, including HIV tests. In Connecticut, there are 17 Planned Parenthood centers and they serve—here is the number—64,000 patients in the State of Connecticut.

So we are going to shut down the government in order to take health care away from 64,000 women in Connecticut, all in order for a handful of people to make an ideological point that may get some additional votes within a Republican Presidential primary, despite the fact that since the 1980s the law in this country has been clear: You can't use Federal dollars for abortions.

I oppose that law because I believe abortions are part of a panoply of medical services that should be available to people in this country at their choice. Frankly, I think the government should stay out of the business of deciding what medically necessary health care choices women can make. I don't think we should be involved in that. So I don't actually support the underlying law that prevents those dollars from being used, but it is the law of the land, it has been the law of the land, and it will be the law of the land.

We are saying we are going to shut down access to 64,000 women in Connecticut because the place they are getting health care also performs a health care service that is objectionable to people who are running for President, but let us take that logic to its natural extrapolation. Let's take it to its logical end point. If you believe

no one should be eligible to get health care services from any institution that has anything to do with abortions or the full array of reproductive health care services, then you can't actually stop at Planned Parenthood. You have to stop funding any hospital that has anything to do with offering a full array of health care services. You have to stop funding for health care centers that do the same.

Why wouldn't you stop sending Medicaid dollars to States such as Connecticut that have codified *Roe v. Wade*? What is the logical end to this policy if all of a sudden an organization that spends 90-plus percent of its resources simply engaging in the good stuff of preventive health care now all of a sudden can't serve anybody because they engage in a service that is a politically hot topic in Congress, despite the fact that there is a law on the books that says they can't use any of their Federal dollars for that particular service.

Take this to its logical end, and we cut off Federal funding for not 64,000 patients in Connecticut but virtually every patient in Connecticut if any association with the provision of abortions all of a sudden denies you Federal funding. I don't concede the fact that the Hyde amendment is the law of the land, but I acknowledge that it is and it will be.

This is just Presidential Republican primary politics finding its way onto the Senate floor. What this could lead to is not the defunding of Planned Parenthood, because they will not get the votes nor the Presidential signature to defund one of the most important primary and preventive health care providers in our States—I will not do that. I will not deny health care to 64,000 Connecticut women. So all they do by creating this line in the sand, once again, is shut down the Federal Government, sucking thousands of jobs out of our economy, leading to tens of thousands of stories of individual misery, such as the woman from Bridgeport who all of a sudden awoke to find her kid couldn't go to his Head Start Program and so she had to think about quitting her new job in order to take care of her child.

I get it that threats about shutdowns make good headlines. They play to a slice of a Presidential primary electorate, but they are big headaches for real people. We are not playing with politics when we talk about shutting down the government over defunding Planned Parenthood or over repealing the Affordable Care Act. We are playing with people's lives.

So I hope this is just the issue of the week in the Republican Presidential primary. I hope when we come back in September we are not seriously talking about another government shutdown. I hope we seriously are not talking about an attack on women's health

care all across this country. I hope we are not entertaining the idea that tens of thousands of women in my State are all of a sudden going to lose access to services or tens of thousands of women and men are going to lose access to programs such as Head Start, job training, and all the other things that get affected when the government shuts down.

I am sick of shutdowns. I have only been in the Congress for less than a decade, and I have been through more of them, real and threatened, than I care to remember. I am certainly not going to stand for a shutdown threatened on the basis of denying health care to women in the State of Connecticut or anywhere else across this country.

I hope we can spend some time after this vote next week—that even my Republican friends in the Republican Presidential primary will admit is a showboat—and get down to the real business of passing a budget that respects the values and priorities of this country, that keeps our government operational, and separates, to the best we can, the business we do on the Senate floor from the business of sorting out who is going to be the next Republican nominee for President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF DUCHESNE COUNTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today, I pay tribute to Duchesne County—a remarkable Utah county that is celebrating its 100th birthday.

Located in northeastern Utah, Duchesne County is rich with natural resources and home to some of the State's most majestic scenery. Thousands flock to the region each year to fish its streams, which include the Strawberry, Duchesne, Lake Fork, and Yellowstone Rivers. Even more enjoy its mountains, including Utah's highest, King's Peak, which is 13,528 feet above sea level. Its vistas are breathtaking and its valleys are serene and beautiful.

The county has a meaningful history that traces its roots to Native American culture. In fact, much of present-day Duchesne County was originally part of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservations. In the early 1900s, other settlers began arriving in the region after Congress passed the Dawes Act. To farm and make improvements to the land, the government offered these individuals 160 acres under the Homestead Act. Today, approximately 18,000 Utahns live in Duchesne County and contribute to its quality of life.

Livestock and farming along with oil and natural gas resources continue to drive the local economy. Just like its early pioneers, Duchesne County's citizens work hard not only to support their families, but also to make their communities and our State a wonderful place to live.

Duchesne County captures the best of small town America. Its towns are charming and its people are dedicated and patriotic. I have always enjoyed visiting the many wonderful towns in Duchesne County and getting to know its citizens.

Again, I wish to congratulate Duchesne County on the marking of its centennial. This is a noteworthy time indeed, and I want to wish the many Utahns who call this place home many more years of happiness living and working in this beautiful county.

REMEMBERING ERMA ARVILLA RUPP FRITCHEN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the life of Erma Arvilla Rupp Fritchen. Ms. Fritchen devoted her life to justice, notably as a Freedom Rider in the summer of 1963.

Ms. Fritchen was born and raised in Reno, NV. She strove to be the first in her family to graduate from high school, but nothing was handed to her. Erma worked to pay the rent and still managed to graduate from Reno High School in 1948. Following high school, she pursued adult education classes in psychology before moving to Fort Benning, GA, as a military wife. When she arrived in Fort Benning, she was shocked by the racial disparities in her new city.

After moving back to Nevada, Erma began attending college while also raising her two children on her own. Education and family were important to her, but she was never too busy to take a stand for the principles she believed in. When she had the opportunity to make a difference by joining a civil rights caravan headed for Washington, DC, in 1963, she jumped at the opportunity and added her voice to the Freedom Rider demonstrations that were taking place throughout the country.

Through her years of fighting for justice and equality, Ms. Fritchen proved that everyone can do their part if they work and fight hard enough. I appre-

ciate her dedication to her five sons and contributions to making our country a better place.

RECOGNIZING NEVADA PEP

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Nevada PEP for its more than 20 years of service to children with disabilities and their families.

Nevada PEP was founded more than two decades ago by a handful of families who wanted for their children what every parent wants for their child: the opportunity to learn, grow, and succeed in all areas of life, regardless of their ability. Since then, this organization has helped children with disabilities by increasing opportunities for home, community, and school success. Although Nevada PEP started as a small organization with meetings around a kitchen table, the organization has now served more than 17,000 people throughout the State and has had a positive impact on many more Nevadans through its greater advocacy efforts.

The "PEP" in the organization's name has a number of meanings, including, "Parents Encouraging Parents," "Parents Educating Professionals," and "Professionals Empowering Parents." Nevada PEP truly embodies all of these meanings through the services it provides. The organization offers support groups, webinars, and other skill-building activities to help the families of children with disabilities become effective advocates for their child. Nevada PEP also works to connect families to essential community resources, including organizations and professionals in the fields of education, health care, housing, and employment. Additionally, the organization raises awareness and engages the community through events, such as the "Baldy Bash," the "Run, Walk, Roll Against Bullying," and an annual art show.

I applaud Nevada PEP for their years of dedicated service to children with disabilities and their families. Their work is truly appreciated and admired. I also commend Karen Taycher, a parent and passionate advocate, as well as founding member and the executive director of Nevada PEP, for her fine leadership throughout the past two decades. As Nevada PEP begins the next chapter, I wish them continued success for years to come.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today we celebrate a true milestone in our Nation's history, and we mark this reminder that basic health insurance is not a privilege for the wealthy, but a right, for every American. On July 30, 1965, President Lyndon Johnson signed the Social Security Amendments of

1965 into law, establishing the Medicare and Medicaid programs. For 50 years, these two programs have offered health care and economic security to millions of Americans and their families.

The debate over the right to basic health insurance began in the 1940s with President Harry Truman. At a time when just one in eight seniors had health care and were earning less than \$1000 on average annually, President Truman sought to create a safety net to meet the needs of a growing population. It may be difficult for all of us in the generations of Americans born since that era to fully understand today, but before Medicaid and Medicare, when private health insurers could still discriminate against individuals based on their health, many seniors were either denied coverage entirely or priced out of health insurance. And for Americans living in poverty, health care was simply out of reach.

The Social Security Amendments of 1965 offered a path forward. Today, Medicare and Medicaid cover a combined 110 million Americans, including seniors, persons with disabilities, and low-income Americans and their families. From cancer screenings to hospital coverage, yearly well-visits, flu vaccinations, pediatric dental care and caregiver support, Medicare and Medicaid provide access to the basic health care services that all Americans deserve. And what a dramatic and tangible difference that has made and continues to make in the lives of millions of people.

Through the Affordable Care Act, Medicare and Medicaid took a step further. States that expanded Medicaid under the law saved nearly \$2 billion in health care costs while extending coverage to many, many more Americans. Closing the coverage gap known as the "donut hole" saved seniors on Medicare \$15 billion in health care costs—a savings to seniors of \$28 million in my home State of Vermont alone. The Affordable Care Act strengthened Medicare for future generations, extending the trust fund an additional 13 years as a result of savings to the program.

It is worth remembering as well that in the early years of Medicare and Medicaid, as these programs were established and went through some growing pains, public opinion at first was tentative in supporting these major reforms. Over time, public support for and appreciation of the benefits of these programs has grown significantly. We can see some parallels in the way public opinion about the Affordable Care Act has continued to grow, as its benefits have become more widespread and more apparent in our daily lives.

As we celebrate this important anniversary, I hope we all will remember how far these programs have come and

commit to keeping them strong for future generations. Strengthening Medicare and Medicaid is an economic investment in the well-being of our country, and I will fight for these programs for my children and my grandchildren.

I am proud to celebrate an anniversary marking the Federal Government's promise of providing reassurance and stability for our Nation's most vulnerable citizens. I look forward to celebrating the success of Medicare and Medicaid for generations to come.

DRIVE ACT

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I am pleased by Senate passage today of the DRIVE Act, a long-overdue, multiyear surface transportation bill to authorize and fund our Nation's highway, bridge, and transit programs. This bill would provide the certainty needed for State and local planning organizations to set transportation priorities and begin long-term investments to modernize our Nation's aging infrastructure.

This bill is also a win for the State of Arizona. Included in the DRIVE Act are critical measures, sponsored by myself and Senator FLAKE, that would pave the way for the establishment of the Sonoran Corridor and the future Interstate 11, I-11, ensuring Arizona has the critical infrastructure it needs to develop significant international trade routes for the Western United States. These provisions would designate the Sonoran Corridor as a future interstate to connect I-19 to I-10 south of the Tucson International Airport and extend the future I-11 through the State of Nevada to I-80 and south toward Arizona's southern border.

As the population in Arizona continues to grow and innovative businesses increasingly settle in our State, we must ensure that we have the infrastructure in place to foster economic development, international trade and job creation. These two top-priority transportation projects will make Arizona a key part of an international trade route that reaches all the way to the southern border. I appreciate Chairman INHOFE's support of these important provisions, as well as Senator FLAKE, Governor Doug Ducey and leaders from across the State of Arizona for their strong partnership in advancing these designations that will connect Arizona businesses and communities to major domestic and international trade partners.

I am proud of the bipartisan effort that went into this bill. It is unfortunate that we ultimately had to pass yet another short-term highway extension today to avoid a transportation shutdown across the country. This stop-gap measure should be the last. When we return following the August break, I urge the House to take up and pass this bill and send it to the President's desk for signature.

REBUILD ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I join with my House colleague from Baltimore, Congressman ELIJAH CUMMINGS, to introduce the REBUILD Act. The people who live in our most distressed neighborhoods deserve a government on their side—one that works as hard for them as they work for their own families and communities. This bill is about rehabilitating neighborhoods, making them healthier and safer, and creating jobs today and jobs tomorrow for communities that need it most. By supporting small businesses, rebuilding infrastructure, expanding opportunity for our young people and tackling crime, we will lay the foundation for a brighter future.

The REBUILD Act is an emergency supplemental bill for fiscal year 2015 to help inner-city neighborhoods across the United States. It focuses on four key areas: physical infrastructure, meeting compelling human needs, community safety, and assistance to small business owners.

This bill provides robust funding for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development programs that will remove blight, rehabilitate aging housing properties, including those with lead paint, and fund youth and senior centers. I especially want to highlight the Community Development Block Grant funding to help those communities most impacted by violence and civil unrest this year. That includes my hometown of Baltimore. This bill also extends the moving-to-work contracts through 2028.

For meeting compelling human needs, this bill funds U.S. Department of Labor's job training and apprenticeship programs to help dislocated workers, veterans and youth make a living wage and learn new job skills. It also funds the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Healthy Start Initiative. This program helps moms and infants get access to primary and preventative health care to reduce infant mortality rates.

In the area of community safety, there is significant funding for targeted U.S. Department of Justice grant programs. This funding will help reduce youth violence, tackle crime hot spots controlled by gangs and rampant with gun violence, and reduce methamphetamine and heroin trafficking. There is additional funding for drug, mental health and veterans courts to break the cycle of drug use and criminal behavior.

For our small business owners and entrepreneurs, this bill provides loans, grants, training and counseling services. There also is money to help underserved businesses with Federal contracting.

Recent events like the riots in Baltimore remind us of the unmet needs of our Nation's inner city neighborhoods. We must do more. This means imme-

diately getting to work on a sequel to the landmark Murray-Ryan budget deal to replace sequester. The impact of the status quo and deep cuts to our Federal programs on the mission to lift up these communities is unacceptable. The opportunity of the American Dream should be within every American's reach.

VETERAN HOUSING STABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, yesterday, as ranking member of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I introduced S. 1885, the Veteran Housing Stability Act of 2015. I would like to thank Senators SANDERS, BROWN, and HIRONO for joining me to introduce this bill, and the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans and the National Alliance to End Homelessness for their support of this legislation. At a time when the Department of Veterans Affairs, VA, has taken on an aggressive initiative to end homelessness among veterans by the end of 2015, much progress has been made yet there is still more progress needed.

The VA initiative has led to a 33 percent decrease in the homeless veteran population since 2010. These declining numbers are a reflection of the combined efforts of VA and its Federal, State, local, tribal, and community partners as they continue aggressive efforts to decrease veteran homelessness and implement a system through which veterans who become homeless can be rapidly placed in appropriate housing situations that meet their needs. The statistics are staggering—49,000 veterans are homeless in America today, 1 in 10 of all homeless men and women—a searing failure in the greatest, strongest Nation in the world's history. It reflects a failure to keep faith that this legislation will help correct. We cannot allow another veteran to slip through the cracks. We must give communities the flexibility and tools they need to create housing systems that can maximize existing resources collaboratively in order to identify and sustain appropriate housing placements for vulnerable veterans.

The legislation would reaffirm this Nation's commitment to safe and affordable housing for veterans by improving and expanding upon VA's programs to prevent and end homelessness among veterans. VA's housing programs for homeless and at-risk veterans must modernize to ensure that they are meeting the needs of the very veterans they are intended to serve. One of the challenges many identify as causing difficulty is one that mainstream housing programs also struggle with—insufficient availability of safe, affordable, permanent housing options.

This measure will address the egregious, abhorrent problem of veteran homelessness with several common-

sense, effective steps to increase housing for homeless and at-risk veterans. The Homeless Veterans Prevention Act of 2015 would expand access to housing by requiring VA to collaborate with U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and other entities to conduct more robust landlord outreach and encourage more landlords to rent to veterans.

Further, this bill would modify a VA program that provides critical savings to transitional housing providers, allowing these groups to spend limited funding to provide high-quality services rather than to retire the debt they would take on to acquire a facility in which to operate. VBA's Acquired Property Sales for Homeless Providers Program sells homes from VA's foreclosure inventory at a discount to non-profit organizations for use as transitional housing for homeless veterans. As VA continues to shift its homeless programs into an approach that meets veterans at their point of need, rather than choosing a one-size-fits-all solution, more services are being provided under the housing-first model, which pairs housing with appropriate levels of case management. This pairing allows veterans to deal with the underlying issues that caused homelessness, rather than attempting to work through them while simultaneously looking for housing. It is critical that programs that offer more than transitional housing be allowed to benefit from this discount as well.

As VA focuses on resolving homelessness, instead of just managing it, housing stability is increasingly a focus across the continuum of programs VA offers to eligible veterans. This bill will also modify VA's Grant and Per Diem Program, its largest transitional housing program, to allow VA to incentivize grantees to increase their focus on permanent housing and housing stability in support of the transitional housing program. More specifically, this bill provides VA with much needed authority to allow transitional housing providers to utilize their facility for permanent housing, and to receive a reduced per diem payment to provide case management for participating veterans. This would allow communities that are reaching critical junctures in the fight to end homelessness to repurpose existing transitional housing capacity for more pressing needs, such as permanent housing opportunities for veterans.

As many initiatives across VA have faced performance challenges, it is paramount that we continue to examine all VA initiatives and identify metrics that can be tracked to keep the Department accountable. This legislation includes a provision that would require VA to set national performance targets for entities that receive per diem funding for transitional housing and examine them to deter-

mine whether the grantee's performance merits continued funding. Further, this bill also contains a provision that would prompt VA to utilize the data it collects to better target interventions offered by its assertive community teams engaging homeless veterans on the street. Requiring a more targeted effort focused on homeless veterans who are health care "super-utilizers" will reduce unnecessary utilization of health care and, subsequently the costs for care.

Research has indicated that housing can be an effective health care intervention when paired with appropriate services and resources. At its very simplest, homelessness among veterans is preventable when there is coordination among the many services and resources available to lift a veteran up. We cannot sit by idly and allow another veteran to slip through the cracks. We must reach out and let them know when, where, and how to get the help that they need and that they have earned.

This is not a full recitation of all the provisions within this legislation. However, I hope that I have provided an appropriate overview of the major benefits this legislation would provide.

SAFER OFFICERS AND SAFER CITIZENS ACT OF 2015

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I join Senators TIM SCOTT and LINDSEY GRAHAM in introducing the Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015. This critical legislation moves our Nation a step forward in rebuilding the trust gap between law enforcement and communities by creating a Federal grant program to supply local, State, and tribal law enforcement with body-worn cameras. I thank Senator SCOTT for his work on this bill and his leadership on such a critical issue.

Trust between law enforcement and communities is critical to the foundation of our democracy. It reinforces the legitimacy of the State to the people that the State serves. It assures the public that the people sworn to protect them will do so honorably or be held accountable when they don't. It builds transparency and promotes open government by shining a spotlight on police-citizen interaction so that no misconduct occurs in the dark. It ensures police officers that the community will see their side and not cast unmerited aspersions.

But recent police-citizen encounters in our Nation have created a trust deficit between law enforcement and the communities that they serve. Over the past year, troubling use of force incidents have occurred between police officers and citizens in places like Ferguson, MO, Baltimore, MD, and North Charleston, SC. These events spurred a national dialogue about the state of policing in America, and created an urgency for body-worn cameras.

When I served as mayor of New Jersey's largest city, I saw firsthand the difficulties law enforcement faced in keeping our communities safe. The overwhelming majority of police officers in the United States are decent and hardworking Americans who have dedicated their lives to a greater calling. But let us not mistake ourselves—we have a problem in our country. Over the past few years, trust has eroded between law enforcement and the communities they serve. The unfortunate actions of a few have cast a long shadow over the good work of many.

I am also concerned that systemic issues have contributed to eroding the trust between communities and police. It comes from decades of a failed War on Drugs. Minority communities are routinely subject to stop and frisk policies. People are stopped for "suspicious" activities like acting too nervous, acting too calm, dressing casually, or wearing expensive clothes or jewelry. The fact is that five times as many Whites report using drugs as African Americans, yet African Americans are sent to prison for drug crimes ten times that of whites. Of course a lack of trust will exist when our criminal justice system as a whole disproportionately targets minorities.

It is time we start rebuilding that trust. This bill is about transparency. The Safer Officer and Safer Citizens Act of 2015 would require that the Department of Justice give priority to States, localities, and tribal areas that have developed comprehensive body-worn camera policies that address such issues as privacy, data retention, and victim protection. It would also give priority to jurisdictions that consult victim and juvenile advocacy groups, labor organizations, civic leadership, law enforcement professionals, and the defense bar. The bill requires States, localities, and tribal units to collect data on the effectiveness of body cameras.

Body-worn cameras will protect communities from police abuses of power and simultaneously protect police from false complaints. I am proud to join with Senators SCOTT and GRAHAM in introducing the Safer Officer and Safer Citizens Act of 2015, and I urge its speedy passage.

25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, this week we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the passage of landmark civil rights legislation, the Americans with Disabilities Act. The ADA outlawed discrimination on the basis of physical or developmental ability and sought to grant those with disabilities the same opportunities as other Americans.

In the past quarter century, this law has changed our social fabric as well as

of our physical surroundings. Every newly built building or sidewalk with basic accommodations lets more and more of our fellow citizens live fuller lives as self-sufficient members of our communities.

Before there were curb cutouts, some Rhode Islanders couldn't cross the street. Before there were wheelchair lifts on public buses, some Rhode Islanders couldn't commute to work. Before there were assisted listening devices, some Rhode Islanders couldn't follow a professor's lecture or a pastor's sermon. Before there were Braille signs, some Rhode Islanders couldn't find a doctor's office or a child's classroom without assistance. Before there were accessible voting systems, some of us couldn't even exercise our most basic rights as citizens.

My colleague in Rhode Island's congressional delegation, Congressman JIM LANGEVIN, has a special perspective on this groundbreaking law. "As someone who has lived with the challenges of a disability both before and after the enactment of the ADA," he has said, "I have experienced firsthand the profound changes of this law on our society."

JIM was only sixteen when an accidental injury left him paralyzed. In an amazing example of optimism and courage, JIM went on to serve the people of our State in the Rhode Island House of Representatives and as our Secretary of State. Today he is the first quadriplegic to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. On the day he was the first person ever to preside in the House in a wheelchair, I trooped over from the Senate to watch history made.

JIM LANGEVIN is living proof of the promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act and a champion of expanded opportunity for people with disabilities. He fought hard for the ADA Amendments Act of 2008. He is founder and cochairman of the Bipartisan Disabilities Caucus in Congress. And he is a living example to his colleagues that a disability need not be a limitation. Americans of every level of ability are better off for JIM's passion and determination.

For 25 years, as the Americans with Disabilities Act removed barriers to buildings and transportation, it eliminated obstacles that once kept people from contributing to our society, growing our economy, and realizing their dreams. The equality of opportunity embodied in this law is at the very heart of our American notion of liberty. There is still work to be done, but we should cheer how far we have come, and rededicate ourselves to fulfilling the promise of the ADA. This is truly the work of forming a more perfect union.

RECOGNIZING THE KEEP THE SPIRIT OF '45 ALIVE COALITION AND BRIGADIER GENERAL JAMES B. THAYER

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as our Nation commemorates the 70th anniversary of the end of World War II, I would like to recognize and honor the achievements of the Keep the Spirit of '45 Alive coalition, as well as the remarkable legacy of BG James B. Thayer, Sr. I am proud to speak today in recognition of the devotion exhibited by the Oregon Spirit of '45 organization, and by one of Oregon's finest.

Over the past 5 years, the Keep the Spirit of '45 coalition has been instrumental in convincing Congress, and various State legislatures, to designate an annual Spirit of '45 Day in August. I am incredibly proud that Oregon is our Nation's first State to legislate a permanent State Spirit of '45 Day to honor the valiant men and women who served on the battlefields and on America's home front. However, I am even more proud of Governor Brown's recent decision to designate the week of August 9–16 to be WWII 70th Anniversary Spirit of '45 Commemorative Week, a period of profound appreciation and reflection for the actions of a truly inspirational generation.

It has been wonderful to witness the hard work of Oregon's Spirit of '45 organization this year. From six performances across the State by Oregon's 234th Army Band to wreath laying ceremonies, all of the events took an extraordinary amount of planning and initiative. Oregon has truly developed a unique State plan to commemorate the end of WWII; a plan that not only involves an unprecedented concert tour, but that also includes a worldwide tribute coordinated with WWII allies. I also look forward to what is unfolding on the national level: the flyovers by WWII aircraft, the swing dances and concerts, and the performance of "Taps" during a wreath laying ceremony that will bring many great Nations together. Across Oregon and the United States, younger generations will truly appreciate our Nation's successful efforts to defend freedom worldwide, as well as the 70th anniversary of VJ Day—which marked the end of the conflict on August 14, 1945.

As I recognize the efforts of the Keep the Spirit of '45 Alive coalition, I must also express my gratitude for General Thayer, who serves as the coalition's ground forces spokesperson in Oregon. He has served as a guiding force behind the Spirit of '45 organization in Oregon. The recipient of numerous military awards, including the Silver and Bronze Stars, General Thayer helped save the lives of over 15,000 Hungarian Jewish refugees. But his legacy does not end there. Following his heroic liberation of the Nazi Death Camp Gunskirchen-Lager, General Thayer served in the Oregon State Defense

Force, eventually ascending to the rank of commander. His willingness to serve his country after WWII, and work his way through the ranks, as well as his distinguished civilian career, speaks highly of his character.

It is our Nation's responsibility to ensure that the men and women who stand by our country are honored for their individual and collective sacrifices. Observing the Spirit of '45 Day begins the process of properly commemorating the sacrifices of our Nation's veterans and home front, at a time when democracy and human rights were threatened around the world.

It is also an opportunity for us to remember the shared sacrifice, commitment to service to community and country, and national unity of our WWII generation so that their example will continue to inspire future generations of Americans, especially the youth of our country.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL LEON PARROTT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, today I would like to recognize the outstanding career of COL Leon Parrott, District Commander of the Huntington District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Since the beginning of his tenure, Colonel Parrott has dutifully served our great State and was honored earlier this month during a Change of Command ceremony in Huntington.

As District Commander, his jurisdiction encompassed an area of approximately 45,000 square miles in 5 States—West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Virginia, and North Carolina. The District's staff of more than 800 employees supports their mission of operating and maintaining 35 multi-purpose reservoirs and 9 dams in addition to providing flood damage reduction, commercial navigation, recreation, and water supply protection. Colonel Parrott and his staff oversaw significant planning, design and construction efforts that imitated the replacement of outdated navigation structures, dam safety measures and other significant water resource challenges including emergency management.

Throughout his career, Colonel Parrott has held a variety of command and staff assignments including: platoon leader, company executive officer and construction officer with the 94th Engineer Battalion, 18th Engineer Brigade and 249th Engineer Battalion; battalion maintenance officer and company commander with the 37th Engineer Battalion, 20th Engineer Brigade; assistant construction and operations officer with the 416th Engineering Command; environmental project officer and district executive officer, Europe District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; battalion operations and executive officer with the 1st Battalion,

395th Engineer Regiment; group engineer with the 5th Special Forces Group, deputy and then chief of the Emergency Operations Center for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; Commander of the 326th Engineer Battalion; deputy engineer for installations, Environment and Civil/Military Operations, U.S. European Command; chief of engineering at the Defense Intelligence Agency; and, most recently, as corps engineer of the XVIII Airborne Corps.

Colonel Parrott is an outstanding soldier, friend, husband, father and student. A 1988 graduate of the Citadel, he holds a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering as well as master's degree from the University of Phoenix and the U.S. Army War College. In addition, Colonel Parrott has received numerous awards for his heroism and military duty.

I have had the honor to work with him as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and now in the U.S. Senate. During that time, I have come to admire his dedication and selfless commitment to the mission of the Huntington Corps and its employees. I would like to wish Colonel Parrott and his wife Judy well in his next command at the North Atlantic Division of USACE in Brooklyn, NY, where he will serve as deputy division commander. I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Colonel Parrott for his service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CONGRATULATING MICHAEL HERNANDEZ

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Michael Hernandez on his retirement after serving as Reno fire chief for over 5 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize his years of hard work and dedication to creating a safe environment throughout Reno.

Mr. Hernandez stands as a shining example of someone who has truly devoted his life to serving his local community. He earned a bachelor of science in government and a master of education from Texas A&M University. He later obtained his executive fire officer credential from the National Fire Academy. Mr. Hernandez began his fire service career over 30 years ago as a firefighter medic. Throughout his tenure, he worked in every division of fire services, including emergency operations, training, emergency medical service, emergency operations center management, and the fire prevention bureau. He advanced in his job with diligence, applying knowledge from each division to his work. Mr. Hernandez is truly a role model in the fire services community throughout Reno and across the silver State.

In March of 2010, Mr. Hernandez was named Reno fire chief. Along with the

position, he gained responsibility for the department's response to fires, natural and manmade disasters, and emergency medical calls. He worked tirelessly to ensure that the Reno Fire Department maintained excellent fire services for Nevada residents, even in some of the most tumultuous economic times. As chief, Mr. Hernandez provided fellow firefighters with the training and tools necessary to keep our local community safe. Mr. Hernandez is also a member of the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Fire Academy Executive Fire Officer Alumni Association, the National Fire Protection Association, and the Nevada Fire Chiefs Association. I am grateful for all Mr. Hernandez has done for the City of Reno.

It is the brave men and women who serve in our local fire departments that help keep our communities safe. These heroes selflessly put their lives on the line every day. I extend my deepest gratitude to Mr. Hernandez for his courageous contributions to the people of Reno and to the silver State. His sacrifice and courage earn him a place among the outstanding men and women who have valiantly put their lives on the line to benefit others.

Mr. Hernandez has demonstrated professionalism, commitment to excellence, and dedication to the highest standards of the Reno Fire Department. I am both humbled and honored by his service and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. Hernandez on his retirement, and I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done to make Nevada a safer place. I offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DR. GERALD M. CROSS

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, today I recognize Dr. Gerald M. Cross, a dedicated public servant who will be retiring from the Department of Veterans Affairs at the end of August.

Before joining the VA, Dr. Cross served in the U.S. Army for nearly 30 years. While in the Army, Dr. Cross was honored with several awards, including five Legion of Merit medals, the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, USUHS, Commandable Services Medal and the Order of Military Medical Merit. His final Army assignment was as the U.S. Army Forces Command, FORSCOM, Surgeon at Fort McPherson, assembling medical support for overseas operations.

Inspired by his experience working with servicemembers and their families, Dr. Cross began an 11-year career at the VA after retiring from the Army. His work as Principal Deputy Under Secretary for Health and Acting

Under Secretary for Health earned him the Exceptional Service Award in 2010, awarded by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs. Among his many accomplishments, Dr. Cross's work at the VA includes increasing the number of Vet Centers throughout the country, and adding over 1,000 physicians and over 3,000 nurses to the VA staff nationwide, and leading the VA Central Office Task Force that implemented the Suicide Prevention Hotline. His legacy at the VA will live on, helping veterans for years to come.

Dr. Cross is a truly inspirational public servant. I thank him for his many years of serving his country serving those who have served, and I wish him the best in his retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH A. VIOLANTE

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to recognize Joseph A. Violante, national legislative director for the Disabled American Veterans, DAV, who will be retiring at the end of this week after over 20 years of service to DAV.

Joe's career of service started long before his tenure at DAV. As a U.S. Marine, he served in combat in Vietnam. Following his honorable discharge from the Marine Corps, Joe began practicing law in California, and in 1990, Joe joined the DAV Washington staff in its appellate work before the VA Board of Veterans Appeals, lending his legal expertise to serve his fellow veterans. Joe became DAV's national legislative director in 1996.

It is an incredible service to defend the United States in combat. Joe went above and beyond that. He came home and started fighting for others who served, helping countless veterans through his work at DAV. Over the past 2 decades, he has played a role in crafting major veterans legislation, and his work has affected policies at the VA, the Department of Labor, the Department of Defense, and other Federal agencies. Joe has helped spur internal VA reforms, establish increases in VA's annual appropriations, expand primary care for veterans, expand the National Cemetery system and establish caregiver benefits for wounded veterans. These accomplishments, just few of many, will continue to help veterans for years to come.

Joe served as national legislative director for three Presidential administrations and testified at my very first hearing as chairman of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It was an honor to work with him, and I know I am not alone when I say I am sad to see him go. His retirement is well-deserved, and I wish Joe and his wife Debbie all the best.●

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD DEAN ROGERS

• Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, as a representative of Kansas in the U.S. Senate, it is my honor to celebrate the public service of Richard Dean Rogers, a Kansan who has dedicated his life to serving his community, State, and country. Richard's professional achievements are as plentiful and diverse as they are impressive. Born in Oberlin, KS, in 1921, Richard Rogers went on to serve in the U.S. Army Air Corps during World War II and then moved to public life as a county attorney for Riley County, city commissioner and mayor of Manhattan, KS, State representative, State senator in the Kansas Legislature. In 1975, President Gerald Ford appointed Rogers to serve as a U.S. district judge for the District of Kansas, beginning a lasting tenure that will soon reach 40 years.

Judicial colleagues describe Judge Rogers as a role model whose long public life is marked by an amiable spirit, an unpretentious fortitude, and an unmitigated desire for the advancement and protection of all segments of society. Americans thank Judge Rogers for his service and contributions to the State of Kansas and the United States of America and wish Judge Rogers and his wife Cindy well as he moves to inactive senior status on August 7, 2015 and begins a new chapter of his most admirable life.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawals which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:43 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1300. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1994. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3236. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 4:29 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 3236. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1300. An act to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

H.R. 1994. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-2463. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the text of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA); the Secretary of State's verification assessment report; and additional documents, received in the Senate on July 19, 2015; pursuant to Sec. 135(h) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2011, et seq.) to the Committees on Finance; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; and Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BOOZMAN, from the Committee on Appropriations, without amendment:

S. 1910. An original bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-97).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 313. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to add physical thera-

pists to the list of providers allowed to utilize locum tenens arrangements under Medicare (Rept. No. 114-98).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 349. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts (Rept. No. 114-99).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 466. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to improve the quality, health outcomes, and value of maternity care under the Medicaid and CHIP programs by developing maternity care quality measures and supporting maternity care quality collaboratives (Rept. No. 114-100).

S. 599. A bill to extend and expand the Medicaid emergency psychiatric demonstration project (Rept. No. 114-101).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 607. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for a five-year extension of the rural community hospital demonstration program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-102).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 704. A bill to establish a Community-Based Institutional Special Needs Plan demonstration program to target home and community-based care to eligible Medicare beneficiaries (Rept. No. 114-103).

S. 861. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to curb waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare and Medicaid programs (Rept. No. 114-104).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1253. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide coverage of certain disposable medical technologies under the Medicare program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-105).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1347. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-106).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1349. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals (Rept. No. 114-107).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1362. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs) (Rept. No. 114-108).

S. 1461. A bill to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015 (Rept. No. 114-109).

By Mr. CORKER, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 1875. A bill to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KING:

S. 1899. A bill to permit aliens seeking asylum to be eligible for employment in the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. Kaine:

S. 1900. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1901. A bill to help small businesses access capital and create jobs by reauthorizing the successful State Small Business Credit Initiative; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1902. A bill to provide for the treatment and extension of temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 1903. A bill to provide for a study by the National Academy of Medicine on health disparities, to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to develop guidelines on reducing health disparities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL:

S. 1904. A bill to protect our Social Security system and improve benefits for current and future generations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROBERTS (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 1905. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the reduced recognition period for built-in gains for S corporations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1906. A bill to clarify the exclusion of orphan drug sales from the calculation of the annual fee on branded prescription pharmaceutical manufacturers and importers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. REED, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1907. A bill to reduce the Federal budget deficit by closing big oil tax loopholes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 1908. A bill to amend the Higher Education Opportunity Act to restrict institutions of higher education from using revenues derived from Federal educational assistance funds for advertising, marketing, or recruiting purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. VITTER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. ENZI, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 1909. A bill to protect communities from destructive Federal overreach by the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BOOZMAN:

S. 1910. An original bill making appropriations for financial services and general government for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Appropriations; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1911. A bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. HEITKAMP, and Mr. UDALL):

S. 1912. A bill to protect the rights of Indian and Native Alaskan voters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TOOMEY (for himself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1913. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to establish programs to prevent prescription drug abuse under the Medicare program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. 1914. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GRASSLEY, and Mr. CORNYN):

S.J. Res. 21. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. KIRK, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. McCASKILL):

S. Res. 236. A resolution designating July 30, 2015, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 237. A resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for continuing to perpetrate crimes against humanity, war crimes, and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government, the African Union, and governments and regional organizations in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield and promote protection and recovery of affected communities; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CRUZ:

S. Res. 238. A resolution expressing the determination of the Senate that the 60-calendar day period for congressional review of

the nuclear agreement with Iran did not begin with the transmittal of the agreement on July 19, 2015, because that transmittal did not include all materials required to be transmitted pursuant to the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. Kaine (for himself and Mr. WARNER):

S. Res. 239. A resolution commemorating the 75th anniversary of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science of the College of William & Mary; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

S. 303

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 303, a bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide that individuals having seriously delinquent tax debts shall be ineligible for Federal employment.

S. 471

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 471, *supra*.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 713

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 713, a bill to prevent international violence against women, and for other purposes.

S. 743

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 743, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to recognize the service in the reserve components of the Armed Forces of certain persons by honoring them with status as veterans under law, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 862

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 862, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor an-

nuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 1085, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes.

S. 1498

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1498, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to require that military working dogs be retired in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1509

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1509, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coordination of programs to prevent and treat obesity, and for other purposes.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1578

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1578, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance taxpayer rights, and for other purposes.

S. 1579

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1579, a bill to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1707

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1707, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House".

S. 1731

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1731, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to waive the minimum period of continuous active duty in the Armed Forces for receipt of certain benefits for homeless veterans, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans

Affairs to furnish such benefits to homeless veterans with discharges or releases from service in the Armed Forces with other than dishonorable conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 1760

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1760, a bill to prevent gun trafficking.

S. 1775

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1775, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER), the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1789, a bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S. 1808

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1808, a bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to conduct a Northern Border threat analysis, and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1872

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1872, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes.

S. 1876

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN)

were added as cosponsors of S. 1876, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

S. 1881

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. CORKER), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH) were added as cosponsors of S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 228

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 228, a resolution designating September 2015 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month".

S. RES. 232

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 232, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that August 30, 2015, be observed as "1890 Land-Grant Institutions Quasiquicentennial Recognition Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 2289

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2289 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, an act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2456

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2456 intended to be proposed to H.R. 22, an act to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. KAINÉ:

S. 1900. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. KAINÉ, Mr. President, by 2020, it is estimated that 65 percent of all jobs will require at least some form of postsecondary education and training. The National Skills Coalition estimates that nearly half of all job openings between now and 2022 will be middle skill jobs that require education beyond high school, but not a 4-year degree. While the number of students pursuing postsecondary education is growing, the supply of skilled workers still falls short of industry demand. According to one estimate, the U.S. faces a shortfall of as many as 4.7 million new workers with postsecondary certificates by the year 2018 and according to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 3.7 million U.S. jobs are currently vacant because of a shortage of qualified workers.

Our current Federal higher education policy could be improved to help solve this problem. Pell Grants—the primary form of Federal tuition assistance for low-income and working students—can only be awarded towards programs that are over 600 clock hours or at least 15 weeks in length. These grants cannot be used to support many of the short-term occupational training programs at community and technical colleges and other institutions that provide skills and credentials employers need and recognize. When it comes to higher education, Federal policies need to support the demands of the changing labor market and support alternate career pathways that align with industry demand. According to the Georgetown University Center on Education and the Workforce, shorter-term educational investments pay off—the average postsecondary certificate holder has 20 percent higher lifetime earnings than individuals with only a high school diploma.

I am pleased to introduce the Jumpstart Our Businesses by Supporting Students or JOBS Act. The JOBS Act would amend the Higher Education Act by expanding Pell Grant eligibility to students enrolled in short-term skills and job training programs that lead to industry-based credentials and ultimately employment in

in-demand industry sectors or careers. Since job training programs are shorter and less costly, Pell Grant awards would be half of the current discretionary Pell amount. The legislation defines eligible job training programs as those providing career and technical education instruction at an institution that provides at least 150 clock hours of instruction time over a period of at least 8 weeks and that provides training that meets the needs of the local or regional workforce. These programs must also provide students with licenses, certifications, or credentials that meet the hiring requirements of multiple employers in the field for which the job training is offered.

The JOBS Act also ensures that students who receive Pell Grants are earning high-quality postsecondary credentials by requiring that the credentials meet the standards under the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act, are recognized by employers, industry, or sector partnerships, and align with the skill needs of industries in the States or local economies.

We need to make sure that Federal student aid supports the demand of a 21st century economy. As Congress works to reauthorize the Higher Education Act, I hope that my colleagues ensure that Pell Grants are accessible for individuals participating in high-quality, short-term occupational training programs that are leading to industry-recognized credentials and certificates.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1902. A bill to provide for the treatment and extension of temporary financing of short-time compensation programs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Layoff Prevention Extension Act. This bill would extend the financing and grant provisions for the successful work sharing legislation I authored and worked to include in the Middle Class Tax Relief and Job Creation Act of 2012.

The concept of work sharing is simple. It helps people who are currently employed, but in danger of being laid off, to keep their jobs. By giving struggling companies the flexibility to reduce hours instead of their workforce, work sharing programs prevent layoffs and help employers save money on rehiring costs. Employees who participate in work sharing keep their jobs and receive a portion of unemployment insurance benefits to make up for lost wages.

Since becoming law, work sharing has helped save over 110,000 jobs, including 1,200 jobs in my State of Rhode Island, according to estimates from the Department of Labor. And it has saved States \$225 million by reimbursing them for work sharing benefits they paid out to workers—benefits that helped keep people on the job.

Before my bill became law in 2012, only a handful of States had work sharing programs. Now, these programs enjoy broad bipartisan support and have been established in 29 States and the District of Columbia. However, the \$100 million in implementation grants expired at the end of 2014, and the 100 percent Federal financing of these work sharing benefits will expire next month.

The legislation I am introducing today would extend these deadlines by 2 years so that states with existing work sharing programs, and those that are looking to enact a program, can qualify for Federal support.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting passage of this bill to keep American workers on the job, save taxpayers money, and provide employers with a practical, positive, and cost-effective alternative to layoffs.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. COONS):

S. 1911. A bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, today I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague from Delaware, Senator CHRIS COONS, in introducing the Reach Every Mother and Child Act of 2015. The purpose of our bill is to improve the health and well-being of women and children in developing countries. Every day approximately 800 women will die from preventable causes related to pregnancy and childbirth.

In addition, more than 17,000 children under the age of 5 will die each day of treatable conditions such as prematurity, pneumonia, and diarrhea, with malnutrition being the underlying cause in nearly half those deaths. While progress has been made in improving the health of mothers and their children, it is a tragedy that so many preventable deaths still occur, especially given that there are many effective and established lifesaving maternal and child health protocols and policies.

These lifesaving interventions include clean birthing practices, vaccines, nutritional supplements, hand washing with soap, and other basic needs that remain elusive for far too many women and children in developing countries.

Our legislation would strengthen the American government's commitment to ending preventable deaths of mothers, newborns, and young children in the developing world. There are simple, proven, cost-effective interventions which we know will work if we can reach the mothers and children who need them to survive. Our bill will also allow us to leverage greater investments from other parties, especially the private sector, partner governments, private foundations, and multinational organizations.

According to USAID, a concentrated effort could end preventable maternal and child deaths worldwide by the year 2035. However, U.S. leadership and support of the international community are critical to meeting this goal.

The U.S. Agency for International Development—USAID—has set an ambitious interim goal of preventing the deaths of 15 million children and 600,000 women in the next 5 years to ensure steadfast progress toward the ultimate goal. Due in part to American leadership and generosity, many lives have already been saved. Since 1990 the annual number of deaths of children under the age of 5 has been cut in half. Nevertheless, far too many mothers, newborns, and young children under the age of 5 still succumb to disease and malnutrition that could easily be prevented. The deployment of interventions that have proved to be successful must be accelerated.

Our bill would require the administration to develop a 10-year strategy to achieve the goal of preventing these deaths by the year 2035. Our bill would charge USAID with meeting that goal.

One provision of our bill would establish a maternal and child survival coordinator at USAID who would focus on implementing the 10-year strategy and verifying that the most effective interventions are scaled up in target countries. Our bill would also establish an interagency working group to assist the coordinator in promoting greater collaboration among all the Federal agencies involved in this effort.

To promote transparency and greater accountability, our bill requires that detailed reporting be published on the Foreign Assistance Dashboard, where it can be assessed by the public, Congress, and nongovernmental organizations to track the implementation of the strategy and the progress being made.

Finally, the United States cannot and should not take on the goal of eradicating these preventable deaths alone. Our bill recognizes this reality and requires the administration to develop a financing framework which would allow the use of U.S. Government dollars to leverage additional commitments from the private sector, nonprofit organizations, partner countries, and multinational organizations. As other investments grow, the need for U.S. Government assistance would decline. At a time when we must make very difficult decisions regarding Federal priorities in our budget, this is an important and responsible provision that ultimately will reduce the reliance on U.S. Government contributions.

Improving the health and well-being of mothers and children around the world has far-reaching social and economic benefits as well. An independent group of economists and global health experts from around the world, known

as the Lancet Commission, indicated that the return on investment in global health initiatives is very high. In fact, for every \$1 invested, there is a return of \$9 to \$20 in growing the gross domestic product of the country receiving the investment.

Other global health initiatives, such as the successful President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, or PEPFAR, which was started by President George Bush, demonstrate that results-risen interventions can turn the tide for global health challenges such as maternal and child survival. Taking lessons learned from past initiatives, our bill would provide the focus and the tools necessary to accelerate progress toward ending preventable maternal and child deaths.

I urge my colleagues to take a close look at the bill we are introducing today and to join Senator COONS and me in supporting this bill to save the lives of mothers and children around the world.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I join my colleague from Maine on the floor this afternoon to talk about what we can do to save the lives of newborn children and their mothers in some of the poorest communities around our globe.

I wish to start by thanking Senator COLLINS for her impressive leadership and for the energy she has brought to this work. I share her belief that our bipartisan bill, which is called the Reach Every Mother and Child Act or just the REACH Act, will go a long way toward eliminating preventable maternal and child deaths and will do so in an impressively targeted and cost-effective way.

The preventable death of newborns, their mothers, and children under 5 is a genuine tragedy that remains a widespread reality in far too many places around our world today. As Senator COLLINS said, 17,000 children a day lose their lives to preventable diseases such as pneumonia, diarrhea, and malaria—illnesses we know how to not just treat but prevent—and worldwide, 3 million children will lose their lives to malnutrition this year. Nearly 3 million newborns die every year, 1 million of whom don't live to their second day, and 300,000 women don't get to experience the joy of raising their child as either pregnancy or birth takes their lives. I doubt it would come to any surprise to those in this Chamber today that it is the families who are living in the poorest communities in the developing world who are most at risk.

So what brings Senator COLLINS and me to the floor today is the fact that there are things we can do to prevent these deaths from ever happening and to do so in a cost-effective and transparent way. Since I first entered office, I have been confronted with challenges

both at home and around the world that demand our action but where real solutions remain out of the reach of this Senate or our government. This is not one of those issues.

Some doubt that we can make a lasting and meaningful impact on the poorest of the poor in the developing world, but the fact is, we have made real progress. It was time spent in east Africa 30 years ago that first really changed my life and engaged me passionately in these issues. What is striking is how much progress we have actually made. Over the past 25 years, we have cut in half the number of children and mothers who have died, the number of children under 5, and mothers who die in illnesses associated with childbirth. Mortality rates are now declining faster than ever. And while we do face real and seemingly intractable challenges across the international landscape, our progress on this issue remains a telling sign of what is possible when we pull together and apply thoughtful interventions.

Just last year the administration took an important next step, laying out a new strategy with ambitious goals—saving the lives of 15 million children and 600,000 women by the end of this decade. Think about the scope and reach of the change that would mean for families and for communities in some of the poorest places on this planet. These goals are based in the lessons we have learned about what really works. Providing neonatal care to expectant mothers works. Vaccinating young children works. Providing access to clean water so that children don't die from diarrhea works. Providing HIV-positive mothers with antiretroviral drugs works.

I am hopeful about our ability to find cost-effective solutions because many of these remedies are simple things which are already at work here in our own country and which we as Americans take for granted. In the United States, what would be a fairly routine complication of childbirth would, in many communities in the developing world, be a life-or-death situation.

For example, let me talk for a moment about something called a resuscitation bag—a simple piece of plastic that costs just a few dollars. Most American parents have either seen one used or ready to be used in the delivery room. We know that in an American hospital—and it should be in the hospital of any developed country—when a nurse needs a resuscitation bag for a newborn who is struggling to breathe, it is right there and waiting. But in the poorest communities, where newborns are losing their lives at astounding rates, a significant factor is the simple absence of these bags to save the lives of newborns. When a nurse—if there is even a nurse—reaches for one, there is none to be found. Yet these simple devices that cost just a few dollars could

save literally hundreds or thousands of lives.

So what our bipartisan REACH Act does is recognize that many of the steps we can take are very much within our grasp, and our bill would take these solutions a step further by reforming them and scaling them up so they have a larger, longer term impact.

Our bill would increase coordination to better implement U.S. strategies with the goal of ending preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths within 20 years. It would build new partnerships with the private sector, improve coordination across agencies, and insist on real targets and transparent and measurable progress. It would also, as Senator COLLINS referenced, allow U.S. Government dollars to be leveraged. And I love it when we leverage our resources with the private sector, with multilateral donors, and with our partner countries in the developing world. Critically, it would focus on the most effective interventions in the poorest and most vulnerable communities and put in place targets that can be effectively tracked.

These communities in the poorest parts of our planet face many challenges, but when it comes to saving the lives of young mothers and children, we know exactly what it will take to make a meaningful difference. Today, together, we are offering a strong path forward.

I close by urging my colleagues to follow the real leadership of Senator COLLINS and to join both of us in ensuring that American ingenuity and leadership can continue to save lives and to offer communities around our world a brighter future.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Delaware for his very eloquent statement. I know how passionate he is about helping people, particularly in Africa. He has extraordinary expertise about that region of the world, about that continent, and has been there many times. I look forward to working with him to make this bill a law. It is bipartisan, and it should bring people together across party lines. I hope we will be able to get it signed into law this year.

By **Mr. Kaine** (for himself and **Mr. Warner**):

S. 1914. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, today, I am pleased to join my bipartisan Virginia colleagues Senator MARK WARNER and Congressmen ROBERT HURT and MORGAN GRIFFITH in introducing the Commonsense Permitting for Job Creation Act of 2015, a bipartisan, bicameral piece of legislation to address

an aspect of water permitting law that has touched several economic development projects in Virginia.

Southern Virginia has seen great economic challenges in recent years due to the overall economic downturn compounded by fundamental changes to the region's traditional industries such as manufacturing, textiles, and tobacco. Throughout this region there are several business park sites that could be developed to accommodate one or multiple manufacturing operations. County economic development authorities have worked to secure all necessary permits and authorities to develop these sites but have encountered an issue pertaining to Clean Water Act Section 404 permits.

Several of these counties have had difficulty securing approval from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for 404 permits because the Corps is reluctant to issue a permit without a company that has committed to the site and prepared detailed development blueprints. In speaking to potential companies, county officials have heard that it is difficult for a company to commit to a site without assurance that all government permits are secured. This has created a "chicken and egg" conundrum—a company will not relocate to the site without an approved permit, but a permit cannot be approved without a company willing to relocate.

This legislation simply addresses that regulatory ambiguity by specifying that the lack of a committed end-user shall not be the sole reason to deny a Corps permit that meets all other legal requirements under Section 404.

I believe Federal, State, and local stakeholders can work in good faith to follow all laws protecting our water resources, while taking reasonable steps to make it easier to pursue economic development opportunities in economically distressed communities. My colleagues and I introduced a version of this bill in the previous Congress, and we were pleased to help speed the process that led to the approval of a permit for the Commonwealth Crossing Business Center in Henry County, VA, last year.

I am optimistic that this bill will help expedite approval of important economic development projects in a manner that is acceptable to all stakeholders. We are proud to be able to work across the aisle and with state and local officials on this common-sense, bipartisan solution.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 236—DESIGNATING JULY 30, 2015, AS "NATIONAL WHISTLEBLOWER APPRECIATION DAY"

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr.

KIRK, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. CARPER, and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 236

Whereas, in 1777, before the passage of the Bill of Rights, 10 sailors and marines blew the whistle on fraud and misconduct harmful to the United States;

Whereas the Founding Fathers unanimously supported the whistleblowers in words and deeds, including by releasing government records and providing monetary assistance for reasonable legal expenses necessary to prevent retaliation against the whistleblowers;

Whereas, on July 30, 1778, in demonstration of their full support for whistleblowers, the members of the Continental Congress unanimously enacted the first whistleblower legislation in the United States that read: "*Resolved*, That it is the duty of all persons in the service of the United States, as well as all other the inhabitants thereof, to give the earliest information to Congress or other proper authority of any misconduct, frauds or misdemeanors committed by any officers or persons in the service of these states, which may come to their knowledge" (legislation of July 30, 1778, reprinted in *Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774–1789*, ed. Worthington C. Ford et al. (Washington, D.C., 1904–37), 11:732);

Whereas whistleblowers risk their careers, jobs, and reputations by reporting waste, fraud, and abuse to the proper authorities;

Whereas, when providing proper authorities with lawful disclosures, whistleblowers save taxpayers in the United States billions of dollars each year and serve the public interest by ensuring that the United States remains an ethical and safe place;

Whereas whistleblowing is generally defined as the lawful disclosure of information reasonably believed to evidence a violation of law, rule, or regulation, or gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a danger to public health or safety—and is in contrast to the unlawful disclosure of classified information that threatens the national security of the United States and that violates criminal law; and

Whereas it is the public policy of the United States to encourage, in accordance with Federal law (including the Constitution, rules, and regulations) and consistent with the protection of classified information (including sources and methods of detection of classified information), honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, and other crimes to the appropriate authority at the earliest time possible: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates July 30, 2015, as "National Whistleblower Appreciation Day"; and

(2) ensures that the Federal Government implements the intent of the Founding Fathers, as reflected in the legislation enacted on July 30, 1778, by encouraging each executive agency to recognize National Whistleblower Appreciation Day by—

(A) informing employees, contractors working on behalf of United States taxpayers, and members of the public about the legal rights of citizens of the United States to "blow the whistle" by honest and good faith reporting of misconduct, fraud, misdemeanors, or other crimes to the appropriate authorities; and

(B) acknowledging the contributions of whistleblowers to combating waste, fraud,

abuse, and violations of laws and regulations in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 237—CONDEMNING JOSEPH KONY AND THE LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY FOR CONTINUING TO PERPETRATE CRIMES AGAINST HUMANITY, WAR CRIMES, AND MASS ATROCITIES, AND SUPPORTING ONGOING EFFORTS BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT, THE AFRICAN UNION, AND GOVERNMENTS AND REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN CENTRAL AFRICA TO REMOVE JOSEPH KONY AND LORD'S RESISTANCE ARMY COMMANDERS FROM THE BATTLEFIELD AND PROMOTE PROTECTION AND RECOVERY OF AFFECTED COMMUNITIES

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 237

Whereas the Lord's Resistance Army, which first formed in northern Uganda, continues its reign of terror in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the Central African Republic, and South Sudan, destabilizing the region and deliberately killing at least 2,400 civilians since 2008, many of whom were targeted in schools and churches;

Whereas atrocities committed by the Lord's Resistance Army have resulted in the rape and brutal mutilation of countless men, women, and children; the abduction of over 70,000 civilians, including at least 30,000 children, many of whom were forced to become child soldiers or sex slaves; the continued displacement of more than 200,000 civilians from their homes, many of whom do not have access to essential humanitarian assistance; and the general deterioration of governance and security in affected areas;

Whereas insecurity caused by the Lord's Resistance Army has undermined efforts by the African Union and governments in the region, which have been supported by the United States and the international community, to consolidate peace and stability in each of the countries affected by the Lord's Resistance Army;

Whereas the Lord's Resistance Army engages in elephant poaching and the violent pillaging of natural resources in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the Central African Republic, using the profits from its sales of ivory, gold, and diamonds to fund its operations and the purchase of munitions;

Whereas the senior core command structure of the Lord's Resistance Army remains functional and the 2005 arrest warrant issued by the International Criminal Court against Joseph Kony for war crimes and crimes against humanity remains pending, as testimony to the continued threat faced by the region;

Whereas the Senate remains dedicated to the commitment established in the Lord's Resistance Army Disarmament and Northern Uganda Recovery Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-172; 22 U.S.C. 2151 note) by working with regional governments toward a comprehensive and permanent resolution to the conflict

in northern Uganda and other affected areas through the provision of political, economic, military, and intelligence support to protect civilians, apprehend or remove Joseph Kony and his top commanders from the battlefield, and disarm and demobilize the remaining Lord's Resistance Army fighters;

Whereas, in June 2012, the United Nations Security Council endorsed the Regional Strategy of the United Nations to bring an end to the Lord's Resistance Army by focusing on the implementation of the Regional Cooperation Initiative of the African Union and to support the governments affected by the ongoing conflict;

Whereas, on September 18 and 19, 2012, the Governments of the Central African Republic, South Sudan, and the Republic of Uganda dedicated contingents of their armed forces to a unified African Union Regional Task Force mandated to permanently end the Lord's Resistance Army threat, with the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo following suit on February 14, 2013;

Whereas Joseph Kony remains a Specially Designated Global Terrorist and, on January 15, 2013, the Department of State under its Rewards for Justice Program announced a reward for information leading to Kony's arrest or conviction;

Whereas, on December 10, 2014, the United Nations Security Council issued a presidential statement welcoming the continued advisory and logistical support provided by the United States to the African Union Regional Task Force, while noting continued reports of the presence of senior Lord's Resistance Army leaders in the disputed Kafia Kingi enclave and reports of opportunistic collaboration between the Lord's Resistance Army and ex-Seleka forces in the Central African Republic;

Whereas, on March 25, 2014, President Barack Obama notified Congress of the increased commitment of approximately 250 members of the United States Armed Forces to the Regional Task Force to assist regional forces in their efforts to protect civilians, encourage defections from the Lord's Resistance Army, and bring Joseph Kony and his senior leadership to justice;

Whereas reports from nongovernmental organizations operating on the ground indicate that local communities and civil society leaders in the region have welcomed and continue to support the presence and continued assistance of United States military advisors;

Whereas, due to the continued efforts of the Regional Task Force of the African Union and United States military advisors, killings carried out by the Lord's Resistance Army have dropped 90 percent since 2011 and approximately 25 percent of the core fighting force of the Lord's Resistance Army has defected or been otherwise removed from the battlefield since January 2013;

Whereas over 120 women and children held in long-term captivity by the Lord's Resistance Army escaped from the rebel group in 2014;

Whereas reports from nongovernmental organizations and the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs demonstrate an increase in attacks and abductions by the Lord's Resistance Army in 2014 compared to 2013, as well as an increase in internally displaced persons in the northeastern region of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in late 2014;

Whereas the African Union Regional Task Force reported in January 2015 that Okot Odiambo, a senior Lord's Resistance Army

officer indicted by the International Criminal Court on charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity, was killed in battle in 2013;

Whereas, on January 5, 2015, Dominic Ongwen, a senior Lord's Resistance Army officer indicted by the International Criminal Court on charges of war crimes and crimes against humanity, defected to forces from the United States and African Union Regional Task Force;

Whereas the inability of the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo to defuse violence, establish legitimate and effective governance, or achieve basic development objectives throughout their countries has provided safe haven for the Lord's Resistance Army and the failure to immediately de-escalate and resolve the broader national crisis risks eclipsing gains made by United States efforts to prevent atrocities in the southeastern region of the Central African Republic; and

Whereas targeted United States assistance and leadership has made a significant impact on preventing further mass atrocities and curtailing humanitarian suffering in central Africa and must be reinforced to maintain these gains: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) condemns Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for continuing to perpetrate crimes against humanity and mass atrocities, and supports ongoing efforts by the United States, the African Union, the international community, and governments in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield and promote protection and recovery for affected communities;

(2) commends the continued efforts by the African Union, the United Nations, and regional partners to end the threat posed by the Lord's Resistance Army;

(3) supports efforts to provide the Regional Task Force with the logistics support and authorizations needed to access all areas of suspected Lord's Resistance Army activity in the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

(4) urges the President to reauthorize the deployment of United States Armed Forces personnel in support of Operation Observant Compass until senior Lord's Resistance Army commanders are removed from the battlefield and the group no longer poses a significant threat to civilians;

(5) urges the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to support the African Union and the Regional Task Force, as well as regional partners, in their efforts to deny the Lord's Resistance Army safe haven in Sudan and in the disputed Kafia Kingi enclave, by expanding defection messaging initiatives, urging the African Union to engage more proactively in diplomatic outreach to the Government of Sudan, and removing Joseph Kony and his top commanders from the battlefield through the sharing of intelligence and other military assistance;

(6) urges the African Union and the Regional Task Force, with the support of the European Union, as well as the Governments of Uganda, South Sudan, the Central African Republic, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to implement the Regional Strategy of the United Nations by—

(A) fully implementing the Regional Cooperation Initiative developed by the African Union to bring an end to the Lord's Resistance Army;

(B) enhancing efforts to promote the protection of civilians in all areas in which the Lord's Resistance Army operates; and

(C) broadening current efforts of disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement, and reintegration to all areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army, as well as humanitarian and child protection efforts;

(7) welcomes the continued defections of men, women, and children from the Lord's Resistance Army, and calls on governments in the region and the international community to support their demobilization and safe return;

(8) calls on the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development, and the heads of other relevant United States Government agencies to utilize authorized and appropriated funds—

(A) to continue efforts to enhance intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance support to the African Union Regional Task Force, and specifically to encourage additional enablers and actionable intelligence to increase the effectiveness of partner operations;

(B) to work with the United Nations, the African Union, and regional government partners to encourage and help non-indicted Lord's Resistance Army members, abductees, and noncombatants to defect safely from the group through the distribution of aerial leaflets, the broadcast of "come home" radio programs, and the continuation of flights utilizing helicopter-based speaker systems over known areas of Lord's Resistance Army operation;

(C) to expand efforts to prevent the Lord's Resistance Army from funding its operations through the theft and trade of illicit ivory, gold, and diamonds; and

(D) to support rehabilitation and reintegration programs led by nongovernmental organizations and regional government partners for children, youth, and adults that have been abducted and indoctrinated by the Lord's Resistance Army;

(9) commends those members of the United States Armed Forces previously or currently deployed to serve in support of Operation Observant Compass for their critical contributions to efforts to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield, protect civilians, and encourage members of the Lord's Resistance Army to peacefully defect; and

(10) urges the President, with input from United States Government agencies, regional governments, multilateral partners, and nongovernmental organizations, to develop a strategy aimed at supporting sustainable recovery and security within areas affected by the Lord's Resistance Army, with existing resources, and in partnership with other donors and multilateral bodies, including the World Bank, the European Union, and others.

SENATE RESOLUTION 238—EXPRESSING THE DETERMINATION OF THE SENATE THAT THE 60-CALNDAR DAY PERIOD FOR CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW OF THE NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN DID NOT BEGIN WITH THE TRANSMITTAL OF THE AGREEMENT ON JULY 19, 2015, BECAUSE THAT TRANSMITTAL DID NOT INCLUDE ALL MATERIALS REQUIRED TO BE TRANSMITTED PURSUANT TO THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015

Mr. CRUZ submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 238

Whereas section 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-17), states that “Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership . . . the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes;”;

Whereas, under section 135(h)(1) of such Act (as so added), the term “agreement” is defined as “an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.”;

Whereas section 135(b)(1) of such Act (as so added) states that “During the 30-calendar day period following transmittal by the President of an agreement pursuant to subsection (a), the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives shall, as appropriate, hold hearings and briefings and otherwise obtain information in order to fully review such agreement.”;

Whereas section 135(b)(2) of such Act (as so added) states that “The period for congressional review under paragraph (1) shall be 60 calendar days if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1), is transmitted pursuant to subsection (a) between July 10, 2015, and September 7, 2015.”;

Whereas section 135(b)(3) of such Act (as so added) states that “prior to and during the period for transmission of an agreement in subsection (a)(1) and during the period for congressional review provided in paragraph (1), including any additional period as applicable under the exception provided in paragraph (2), the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such

sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a).”;

Whereas the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action was agreed to on July 14, 2015, by the nations of China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, the United States, and Iran;

Whereas the Department of State asserted that it had transmitted to Congress the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, its annexes, and related materials on July 19, 2015;

Whereas Senator Tom Cotton of Arkansas and Congressman Mike Pompeo of Kansas were informed by officials from the International Atomic Energy Agency of additional side agreements with Iran that were not included in the Department of State’s transmission to Congress;

Whereas guidance materials related to sanctions relief, sanctions interpretations, and licensing policy described in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action were not included in the Department of State’s transmission to Congress; and

Whereas the integrity of the proceedings of the Senate is compromised by the inability of the Senate and its committees to carry out the review provided under section 135(b)(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 because of the absence of all documents required to be transmitted under that section: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the determination of the Senate that—

(1) for purposes of section 135(b)(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-17), the 60-calendar day period for congressional review of the agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran did not begin with the transmittal of the agreement on July 19, 2015, because that transmittal did not include all materials required to be transmitted under the definition of the term “agreement” under section 135(h)(1) of such Act (as so added), including specifically side agreements with Iran and United States Government-issued guidance materials in relation to Iran; and

(2) the 60-calendar day period for review of such agreement in the Senate cannot be considered to have begun until the Majority Leader certifies that all of the materials required to be transmitted under the definition of the term “agreement” under such Act, including any side agreements with Iran and United States Government-issued guidance materials in relation to Iran, have been transmitted to the Majority Leader.

SENATE RESOLUTION 239—COMMEMORATING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIRGINIA INSTITUTE OF MARINE SCIENCE OF THE COLLEGE OF WILLIAM & MARY

Mr. KAINE (for himself and Mr. WARNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 239

Whereas the Virginia General Assembly, with Professor Donald W. Davis of the College of William & Mary, envisioned a center for marine research and education in the Commonwealth of Virginia;

Whereas the Virginia Institute of Marine Science (referred to in this preamble as “VIMS”), originally known as the Virginia Fisheries Laboratory, began operation in 1940;

Whereas the early work of VIMS assured the future of the fishery industry in Virginia by improving the general knowledge of the resources of fisheries so that they might be properly conserved and managed, and by meeting the need for training in practical marine biology;

Whereas VIMS is now the home of the School of Marine Sciences of the College of William & Mary, a university research and teaching center with a strong element of public service, and is the leading marine center that focuses on estuarine and coastal environments in the nation; and

Whereas VIMS continues to serve the Commonwealth of Virginia and the United States by advancing the frontiers of marine science and sharing the knowledge gained through research with the users and stewards of the environment and future scientists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the College of William & Mary and the Virginia Institute of Marine Science on the 75th anniversary of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science; and

(2) expresses appreciation for the 75 years of service to the environment by the faculty, staff, and students of the Virginia Institute of Marine Science and the School of Marine Sciences of the College of William & Mary.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, Virginia has a proud tradition of academic excellence dating back to Thomas Jefferson and a deep appreciation for our beautiful and bountiful coastal waters that predates that. For 75 years, one Virginia academic institution has built a sterling reputation as a national leader in environmental education and a trusted source of information and analysis for generations of policymakers. The Virginia Institute of Marine Science at the College of William & Mary is celebrating its 75th anniversary in 2015. I am proud to join my bipartisan colleagues Senator MARK WARNER and Congressman ROB WITTMAN in submitting a resolution to commemorate this milestone.

VIMS research has yielded critical insights into the water quality of the Chesapeake Bay and its rivers, informing the work of Virginia and other Chesapeake Bay States in striving to reduce pollution while growing outdoor recreation and the economic activity that goes with it. It has produced data and analysis that has contributed to the development of strategies to maintain robust oyster and crab populations, particularly through cooperative partnership with Virginia’s commercial watermen. It has also developed technology and expertise that allows more precise projections than ever before of rates of sea level rise and recurrent flooding in the Hampton Roads region.

Elected officials of both parties and at all levels of government in Virginia have benefitted from the expertise and objectivity that this institution brings to environmental policy. I was fortunate to have access to this valuable scientific asset as Governor of Virginia, and I continue to consider its thoughtful views on policy issues that come before Congress.

I congratulate VIMS for 75 years of dedication to academic excellence and scientific achievement.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2542. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 22, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes.

SA 2543. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1172, to improve the process of presidential transition.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2542. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 22, to authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "To authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes."

SA 2543. Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. CARPER (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1172, to improve the process of presidential transition; as follows:

On page 7, strike lines 11 through 16 and insert the following:

"(A) the Federal Transition Coordinator and the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as Co-Chairpersons of the agency transition directors council;

"(B) other senior employees serving in the Executive Office of the President, as determined by the President;

On page 8, lines 2 and 3, strike "Federal Transition Coordinator" and insert "Co-Chairpersons".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Opportunities to Improve Student Success."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jake Baker of the committee staff on (202) 224-8484.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet in executive session on Thursday, August 6, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to mark up S. 799 Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015, S. 1893 Mental Health Awareness and Improvement Act of 2015, S. 481 Improving Regulatory Transparency for New Medical Therapies Act, the Nomination of Dr. Karen DeSalvo to be Assistant Secretary for Health, Department of Health and Human Services, the Dr. Kathryn Matthew to be Director, Institute of Museum and Library Services, the nomination of W. Thomas Reeder, Jr. to be Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and the nomination of Walter Barrows to be Member, Railroad Retirement Board; as well as any additional nominations cleared for action.

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact the Committee at (202) 224-5375.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Com-

mittee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Sanctions and the JCPOA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Nominations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 12:10 p.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PERMANENT SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "Impact of the U.S. Tax Code on the Market for Corporate Control and Jobs."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on July 30, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. UDALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my State Department fellow, Andreea Paulopol, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FOREIGN TRAVEL FINANCIAL REPORTS

In accordance with the appropriate provisions of law, the Secretary of the Senate herewith submits the following reports for standing committees of the Senate, certain joint committees of the Congress, delegations and groups, and select and special committees of the Senate, relating to expenses incurred in the performance of authorized foreign travel:

July 30, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

13437

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Pat Roberts:									
Cuba	Peso		714.00						714.00
Joel Leftwich:									
Cuba	Peso		521.00						521.00
Totals			1,235.00						1,235.00

SENATOR PAT ROBERTS,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry,
July 15, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Alexander Carnes:									
Pakistan	Rupee		396.00						396.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		18.00						18.00
United States	Dollar				5,954.70				5,954.70
Paul Grove:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		660.00						660.00
Pakistan	Rupee		100.00						100.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		18.00						18.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		184.11						184.11
United States	Dollar				9,125.90				9,125.90
Adam Yezerski:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		660.00						660.00
Pakistan	Rupee		100.00						100.00
Afghanistan	Afghani		18.00						18.00
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		184.11						184.11
United States	Dollar				9,125.90				9,125.90
Tim Rieser:									
Sri Lanka	Rupee		330.00				600.00		930.00
Nepal	Rupee		273.00		230.00		445.00		948.00
Laos	Kip		276.00				228.00		504.00
Vietnam	Dong		196.00		190.00		339.00		725.00
Dubai	Dirham		277.00						277.00
United States	Dollar				5,869.00				5,869.00
Paul Grove:									
Egypt	Pound		534.00						534.00
Israel	Shekel		500.00						500.00
Jordan	Dinar		421.54						421.54
Turkey	Lira		853.14						853.14
United States	Dollar				4,467.16				4,467.16
Adam Yezerski:									
Egypt	Pound		534.00						534.00
Israel	Shekel		500.00						500.00
Jordan	Dinar		421.54						421.54
Turkey	Lira		853.14						853.14
United States	Dollar				4,424.70				4,424.70
Heideh Shahmoradi:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,078.14						1,078.14
United States	Dollar				10,852.20				10,852.20
Rajat Mathur:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,078.14						1,078.14
United States	Dollar				10,852.20				10,852.20
Dabney Hegg:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		1,078.17						1,078.17
United States	Dollar				10,852.20				10,852.20
Senator Bill Cassidy:									
Jordan	Dinar		355.41				1,189.61		1,545.02
Israel	Shekel						167.54		167.54
Senator Richard Durbin:									
Lithuania	Euro		312.11						312.11
Ukraine	Hryvnia		742.00						742.00
Chris Homan:									
Lithuania	Euro		312.11						312.11
Ukraine	Hryvnia		742.00						742.00
Senator Thad Cochran:									
France	Euro		4,062.00						4,062.00
Senator Richard Shelby:									
France	Euro		4,062.00						4,062.00
Jeremy Weirich:									
France	Euro		3,424.00						3,424.00
Brian Potts:									
France	Euro		3,424.00						3,424.00
Jacqui Russell:									
France	Euro		3,424.00						3,424.00
Ann Caldwell:									
France	Euro		3,424.00						3,424.00
Kay Webber:									
France	Euro		872.00						872.00
Senator Patrick Leahy:									
Cuba	Peso		1,098.00						1,098.00
Tim Rieser:									
Cuba	Peso		899.00				76.00		975.00
Kevin McDonald:									
Cuba	Peso		899.00						899.00
Senator Susan Collins:									
Cuba	Peso		732.00				181.33		913.33
Delegation Expenses: *									
Sri Lanka	Rupee						798.00		798.00
Sri Lanka	Rupee				3,200.00				3,200.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Delegation Expenses: *									
Lithuania	Euro						253.20		253.20
Ukraine	Hryvnia						2,590.00		2,590.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro				9,291.52				9,291.52
France	Euro						9,583.63		9,583.63
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Peso						1,806.42		1,806.42
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Peso						181.33		181.33
Delegation Expenses: *									
UAE	Dirham						130.03		130.03
Delegation Expense: *									
Egypt	Pound						79.00		79.00
Israel	Shekel						2,705.83		2,705.83
Jordan	Dinar						1,128.98		1,128.98
Total			40,325.66		84,435.48		22,482.90		147,244.04

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR THAD COCHRAN,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations, July 21, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
Germany	Euro		360.12						360.12
Bahrain	Dinar		363.92						363.92
Ethiopia	Birr		356.17						356.17
Tanzania	Shilling		498.25						498.25
Spain	Euro		214.78						214.78
John Bonsell:									
Germany	Euro		368.10						368.10
Bahrain	Dinar		285.48						285.48
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		348.82						348.82
Ethiopia	Birr		342.92						342.92
Tanzania	Shilling		510.50						510.50
Spain	Euro		276.93						276.93
Anthony Lazarski:									
Germany	Euro		339.73						339.73
Bahrain	Dinar		287.76						287.76
Ethiopia	Birr		335.94						335.94
Tanzania	Shilling		497.25						497.25
Spain	Euro		274.93						274.93
Mark Powers:									
Germany	Euro		339.37						339.37
Bahrain	Dinar		253.41						253.41
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		351.07						351.07
Ethiopia	Birr		321.07						321.07
Tanzania	Shilling		498.25						498.25
Spain	Euro		297.68						297.68
Luke Holland:									
Germany	Euro		342.26						342.26
Bahrain	Dinar		255.48						255.48
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		394.83						394.83
Ethiopia	Birr		321.77						321.77
Tanzania	Shilling		518.25						518.25
Spain	Euro		254.93						254.93
Joel Starr:									
Germany	Euro		333.72						333.72
Bahrain	Dinar		284.23						284.23
Saudi Arabia	Riyal		351.07						351.07
Ethiopia	Birr		321.17						321.17
Tanzania	Shilling		497.25						497.25
Spain	Euro		274.93						274.93
Senator Mike Rounds:									
Germany	Euro		328.72						328.72
Bahrain	Dinar		235.48						235.48
Ethiopia	Birr		321.17						321.17
Tanzania	Shilling		498.97						498.97
Spain	Euro		201.93						201.93
Daniel Adelstein									
Germany	Euro		248.92						248.92
Bahrain	Dinar		287.23						287.23
Ethiopia	Birr		321.17						321.17
Tanzania	Shilling		497.25						497.25
Spain	Euro		254.93						254.93
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro						1,305.40		1,305.40
Romania	Leu						584.10		584.10
Saudi Arabia	Riyal						4,081.85		4,081.85
Ethiopia	Birr						2,645.65		2,645.65
Tanzania	Shilling				2,152.40				2,152.40
Burundi	Franc				256.20				256.20
Bahrain	Dinar				308.94		1,392.00		1,700.94
Spain	Euro						503.69		503.69
Senator Dan Sullivan:									
Japan	Yen		172.00						172.00
David Eric Sayers:									
Japan	Yen		107.00						107.00

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Paul O. Feather:									
Japan	Yen		200.00						200.00
Jason Suslavich:									
Japan	Yen		248.96						248.96
Delegation Expenses: *									
Japan	Yen								
Kathryn Wheelbarger:									
United States	Dollar				1,087.41		4,497.09		5,584.50
France	Dollar				18,810.60				18,810.60
Niger	Franc		421.78						421.78
Adam Barker:									
United States	Dollar								660.01
France	Dollar		660.01						
Niger	Franc								
Michael Kuiken:									
United States	Dollar				18,810.60				18,810.60
France	Dollar		395.96						395.96
Niger	Franc		589.00						589.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
United States	Dollar				18,810.60				18,810.60
France	Dollar		457.65						457.65
Niger	Franc		562.31						562.31
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Dollar						1,616.66		1,616.66
Niger	Franc						350.00		350.00
Jonathan Epstein:									
United States	Dollar				15,492.00				15,492.00
Belgium	Euro		190.83						190.83
Germany	Euro		183.01						183.01
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro						648.11		648.11
Germany	Euro						237.05		237.05
Thomas Goffus:									
United States	Dollar				9,426.40				9,426.40
Belgium	Euro		643.00						643.00
Poland	Zloty		499.00						499.00
Dustin Walker:									
United States	Dollar				9,336.40				9,336.40
Belgium	Euro		699.84						699.84
Poland	Zloty		454.15						454.15
William Monahan:									
United States	Dollar				9,336.40				9,336.40
Belgium	Euro		673.84						673.84
Poland	Zloty		474.15						474.15
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro				2,737.70		194.63		2,932.33
Poland	Zloty						827.52		827.52
Senator Bill Nelson:									
Honduras	Lempira		624.20						624.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Honduras	Lempira						1,227.80		1,227.80
Senator Kristin Gillibrand:									
Tunisia	Dinar		250.30						250.30
Chad	Franc		337.67						337.67
Kenya	Shilling		668.00						668.00
Senegal	Franc		321.00						321.00
Moran Banai:									
Tunisia	Dinar		179.19						179.19
Chad	Franc		306.64						306.64
Kenya	Shilling		686.37						686.37
Senegal	Franc		240.09						240.09
Jess Fassler:									
Tunisia	Dinar		250.30						250.30
Chad	Franc		337.67						337.67
Kenya	Shilling		668.00						668.00
Senegal	Franc		321.00						321.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Tunisia	Dinar				414.00				414.00
Chad	Franc						321.23		321.23
Kenya	Shilling						954.30		954.30
Senegal	Franc						645.27		645.27
Senator Roger F. Wicker:									
France	Dollar		1,266.18						1,266.18
Denmark	Krone		444.53						444.53
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Dollar				852.80		1,180.62		2,033.42
Denmark	Krone				1,111.86		194.71		1,306.57
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				14,776.00				14,776.00
Vietnam	Dong		434.53						434.53
Singapore	Dollar		813.98						813.98
Christian Brose:									
United States	Dollar				14,776.00				14,776.00
Vietnam	Dong		583.78						583.78
Singapore	Dollar		813.98						813.98
David Eric Sayers:									
United States	Dollar				14,776.00				14,776.00
Vietnam	Dong		456.38						456.38
Singapore	Dollar		1,087.81						1,087.81
Senator Jack Reed:									
United States	Dollar				14,193.50				14,193.50
Vietnam	Dong		372.44						372.44
Singapore	Dollar		796.19						796.19
Ozge Guzelsu:									
United States	Dollar				18,063.40				18,063.40
Vietnam	Dong		513.78						513.78
Singapore	Dollar		763.98						763.98
Senator Mazie Hirono:									
United States	Dollar				7,036.50				7,036.50
Singapore	Dollar		748.13						748.13
Senator Joni Ernst:									
United States	Dollar				14,779.95				14,779.95
Vietnam	Dong		284.00						284.00
Singapore	Dollar		106.95						106.95
Senator Dan Sullivan:									
United States	Dollar				13,279.90				13,279.90

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Vietnam	Dong		372.44						372.44
Singapore	Dollar		840.10						840.10
Delegation Expenses: *									
Vietnam	Dong						3,542.97		3,542.97
Singapore	Dollar						2,627.24		2,627.24
Senator Lindsey Graham:									
United States	Dollar				25,445.66				25,445.66
Israel	Shekel		50.59						50.59
Matthew Rinkunas:									
United States	Dollar				12,307.56				12,307.56
Dubai	Dollar		109.05						109.05
Israel	Shekel		103.15						103.15
Craig Abele:									
United States	Dollar				12,333.60				12,333.60
Dubai	Dollar		109.09						109.09
Israel	Shekel		137.75						137.75
Delegation Expenses: *									
Dubai	Dollar						1,230.33		1,230.33
Israel	Shekel						6,596.05		6,596.05
Senator Deb Fischer:									
Germany	Euro		284.22						284.22
Estonia	Euro		218.32						218.32
Czech Republic	Koruna		331.66						331.66
Romania	Leu		227.09						227.09
Spain	Euro		141.10						141.10
Peter Schirtzinger:									
Germany	Euro		260.28						260.28
Estonia	Euro		207.49						207.49
Czech Republic	Koruna		334.64						334.64
Romania	Leu		220.27						220.27
Spain	Euro		147.24						147.24
Joseph Hack:									
Germany	Euro		285.08						285.08
Estonia	Euro		231.23						231.23
Czech Republic	Koruna		330.10						330.10
Romania	Leu		230.42						230.42
Spain	Euro		156.23						156.23
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
Germany	Euro		332.38						332.38
Estonia	Euro		289.86						289.86
Czech Republic	Koruna		432.00						432.00
Romania	Leu		293.75						293.75
Spain	Euro		223.25						223.25
Sandra Luff:									
Germany	Euro		331.97						331.97
Estonia	Euro		273.40						273.40
Czech Republic	Koruna		425.00						425.00
Romania	Leu		272.53						272.53
Spain	Euro		217.29						217.29
Delegation Expenses: *									
Germany	Euro				443.42				443.42
Estonia	Euro						1,084.14		1,084.14
Czech Republic	Koruna				442.35				442.35
Romania	Leu						855.63		855.63
Daniel Lerner:									
United States	Dollar				9,301.14				9,301.14
Estonia	Euro		660.43						660.43
Estonia	Euro						669.08		669.08
Senator James M. Inhofe:									
France	Dollar		3,617.83						3,617.83
Anthony Lazarski:									
France	Dollar		2,964.34						2,964.34
Senator Jeff Sessions:									
France	Dollar		3,678.36						3,678.36
Sandra Luff:									
France	Dollar		3,232.18						3,232.18
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Dollar				5,309.45		4,986.18		10,295.63
Senator John McCain:									
United States	Dollar				12,841.20				12,841.20
Ukraine	Hryvnia		240.59						240.59
Slovakia	Euro		301.91						301.91
Elizabeth O'Bagy:									
United States	Dollar				12,222.20				12,222.20
Ukraine	Hryvnia		316.43						316.43
Slovakia	Euro		284.82						284.82
Senator Tom Cotton:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		274.81						274.81
Slovakia	Euro		280.44						280.44
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						9,891.03		9,891.03
Slovakia	Euro						1,474.27		1,474.27
Senator Bill Nelson:									
United States	Dollar				4,617.70				4,617.70
Haiti	Gourde		322.00						322.00
Total			62,091.78		315,446.42		56,808.02		434,346.22

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services, July 24, 2015.

July 30, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

13441

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Sherrod Brown:									
Germany	Euro		150.00						150.00
United Kingdom	Pound		330.00						330.00
Mark Podden:									
Germany	Euro		89.70						89.70
United Kingdom	Pound		219.42						219.42
Senator Richard Shelby:									
Germany	Euro		2,549.65						2,549.65
United Kingdom	Pound		2,687.46						2,687.46
United States	Dollar				12,679.30				12,679.30
Christopher Ford:									
Germany	Euro		2,549.65						2,549.65
United Kingdom	Pound		2,591.94						2,591.94
United States	Dollar				12,679.30				12,679.30
Totals			11,167.82		25,358.60				36,526.42

SENATOR RICHARD SHELBY,
Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs,
June 18, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jeffrey Farrah:									
United States	Dollar				11,123.53				11,123.53
Argentina	Peso		462.22						462.22
Total			462.22		11,123.53				11,585.75

SENATOR JOHN THUNE,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation,
July 29, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FINANCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Maria Cantwell:									
Switzerland	Franc		320.00						320.00
United States	Dollar				8,679.60				8,679.60
Rosemary Gutierrez:									
Switzerland	Franc		510.26						510.26
United States	Dollar				11,872.10				11,872.10
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar						620.00		620.00
Senator Dean Heller:									
Cuba	Peso		895.69						895.69
Edgar Abrams:									
Cuba	Peso		581.69						581.69
Tyler Brace:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,448.24						1,448.24
United States	Dollar				9,423.80				9,423.80
Delegation Expenses:*									
United States	Dollar						492.56		492.56
Total			3,755.88		29,975.50		1,112.56		34,843.94

* Delegation expenses include transportation and other official expenses in accordance with the responsibilities of the host country.

SENATOR ORRIN G. HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, July 20, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22 U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 6 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Germany	Euro		290.37						290.37
Estonia	Euro		211.30						211.30
Czech Republic	Koruna		330.11						330.11
Romania	Leu		228.95						228.95
Spain	Euro		139.56						139.56
Delegation Expenses:*									
Estonia	Euro						173.81		173.81
Czech Republic	Koruna						88.47		88.47
Romania	Leu						80.37		80.37
Spain	Euro						16.76		16.76

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 6 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Barrasso:									
Ukraine	Hryvnia		240.59						240.59
Slovakia	Euro		265.66						265.66
United States	Dollar				12,257.20				12,257.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						2,675.14		2,675.14
Slovakia	Euro						495.46		495.46
Senator Ben Cardin:									
France	Euro		1,607.83						1,607.83
Denmark	Krone		372.63						372.63
Debbie Yamada:									
France	Euro		1,656.49						1,656.49
Denmark	Krone		337.13						337.13
Delegation Expenses: *									
France	Euro						2,463.20		2,463.20
Denmark	Krone						1,643.65		1,643.65
Senator Ben Cardin:									
Cuba	Dollar		905.00						905.00
Brandon Yoder:									
Cuba	Dollar		670.94						670.94
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Dollar						1,204.28		1,204.28
Senator Christopher Coons:									
Tunisia	Dinar		252.31						252.31
Chad	Central African Franc		335.34						335.34
Kenya	Shilling		764.08						764.08
Senegal	West African Franc		418.97						418.97
Thomas Mancinelli:									
Tunisia	Dinar		244.31						244.31
Chad	Central African Franc		317.43						317.43
Kenya	Shilling		708.66						708.66
Senegal	West African Franc		465.04						465.04
Delegation Expenses: *									
Tunisia	Dinar						140.00		140.00
Chad	Central African Franc						214.15		214.15
Kenya	Shilling						636.20		636.20
Senegal	West African Franc						430.18		430.18
Senator Jeff Flake:									
Cuba	Dollar		684.58						684.58
Chandler Morse:									
Cuba	Dollar		641.00						641.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Dollar						362.66		362.66
Senator Jeanne Shaheen:									
Poland	Zlotych		150.11						150.11
Latvia	Lati		122.89						122.89
United States	Dollar				9,339.30				9,339.30
Joshua Lucas:									
Poland	Zlotych		150.11						150.11
Latvia	Lati		124.46						124.46
United States	Dollar				9,339.30				9,339.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Poland	Zlotych						349.46		349.46
Latvia	Lati						901.42		901.42
Senator Tom Udall:									
Cuba	Dollar		2,265.00						2,265.00
Matthew Padilla:									
Cuba	Dollar		1,830.00						1,830.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Dollar						1,274.85		1,274.85
Brooke Eisele:									
Morocco	Dirham		592.00						592.00
Algeria	Dinar		668.00						668.00
United States	Dollar				4,045.20				4,045.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Morocco	Dirham						690.00		690.00
Heather Flynn:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,728.00						1,728.00
South Sudan	Pound		115.00						115.00
Ethiopia	Birr		1,870.00						1,870.00
United States	Dollar				5,328.82				5,328.82
Charlotte Oldham Moore:									
Kenya	Shilling		1,728.00						1,728.00
South Sudan	Pound		115.00						115.00
United States	Dollar				5,328.82				5,328.82
Delegation Expenses: *									
Kenya	Shilling						3,901.06		3,901.06
Ethiopia	Birr						24.18		24.18
Carolyn Leddy:									
Korea	Won		1,008.72						1,008.72
Hong Kong	Dollar		419.90						419.90
Japan	Yen		734.50						734.50
United States	Dollar				5,787.30				5,787.30
Igor Krestin:									
Korea	Won		858.36						858.36
Hong Kong	Dollar		527.41						527.41
Japan	Yen		840.07						840.07
United States	Dollar				5,063.30				5,063.30
Michael Schiffer:									
Korea	Won		834.34						834.34
Hong Kong	Dollar		518.94						518.94
Japan	Yen		555.31						555.31
United States	Dollar				3,878.20				3,878.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Korea	Won						462.31		462.31
Hong Kong	Dollar						1,239.29		1,239.29
Japan	Yen						803.46		803.46
Carolyn Leddy:									
China	Renminbi		811.76						811.76
Hong Kong	Dollar		548.30						548.30
Taiwan	Dollar		567.18						567.18

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 6 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
United States	Dollar				11,043.60				11,043.60
Jaime Fly:									
Hong Kong	Dollar		1,119.12						1,119.12
Taiwan	Dollar		592.00						592.00
United States	Dollar				14,569.90				14,569.90
Delegation Expenses: *									
China	Renminbi						467.00		467.00
Hong Kong	Dollar						309.00		309.00
Taiwan	Dollar						218.29		218.29
Caleb McCarty:									
Honduras	Lempira		322.32						322.32
El Salvador	Dollar		427.40						427.40
Guatemala	Quetzal		421.53						421.53
United States	Dollar				1,251.40				1,251.40
Sarah Ramig:									
Honduras	Lempira		237.49						237.49
El Salvador	Dollar		396.59						396.59
Guatemala	Quetzal		237.61						237.61
United States	Dollar				1,199.20				1,199.20
Brandon Yoder:									
Honduras	Lempira		487.00						487.00
El Salvador	Dollar		396.40						396.40
Guatemala	Quetzal		411.20						411.20
United States	Dollar				1,094.30				1,094.30
Delegation Expenses: *									
Honduras	Lempira						456.95		456.95
El Salvador	Dollar						482.43		482.43
Guatemala	Quetzal						513.85		513.85
Damian Murphy:									
Latvia	Lati		254.00						254.00
Estonia	Euro		500.44						500.44
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,188.00						1,188.00
United States	Dollar				4,016.14				4,016.14
John Rader:									
Latvia	Lati		254.00						254.00
Estonia	Euro		500.44						500.44
Ukraine	Hryvnia		1,188.00						1,188.00
United States	Dollar				4,016.14				4,016.14
Delegation Expenses: *									
Latvia	Lati						208.28		208.28
Ukraine	Hryvnia						1,419.72		1,419.72
Stacie Oliver:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		437.60						437.60
Bahrain	Dirham		270.99						270.99
Qatar	Riyal		553.13						553.13
United States	Dollar				4,935.80				4,935.80
David Kinzler:									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham		473.61						473.61
Bahrain	Dirham		357.60						357.60
Qatar	Riyal		589.30						589.30
United States	Dollar				4,935.80				4,935.80
Delegation Expenses: *									
United Arab Emirates	Dirham						232.90		232.90
Bahrain	Dirham						259.70		259.70
Qatar	Riyal						225.28		225.28
Andrew Olson:									
Belgium	Euro		653.74						653.74
Switzerland	Franc		1,392.73						1,392.73
United States	Dollar				3,255.50				3,255.50
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro						1,194.11		1,194.11
Michael Schiffer:									
China	Renminbi		1,152.60						1,152.60
Philippines	Peso		445.00						445.00
Thailand	Bhat		358.21						358.21
Singapore	Dollar		3,007.03						3,007.03
United States	Dollar				16,459.90				16,459.90
Delegation Expenses: *									
Thailand	Bhat						270.52		270.52
Lowell Schwartz:									
Belgium	Euro		839.82						839.82
Germany	Euro		328.00						328.00
United States	Dollar				3,224.90				3,224.90
Total			51,564.54		130,370.02		26,528.39		208,462.95

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR BOB CORKER,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, July 21, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Mary Sumpter Lapinski:									
United States	Dollar				11,094.00				11,094.00
Belgium	Euro		790.07						790.07
United Kingdom	Pound		1,506.42						1,506.42
Grace Stuntz:									
United States	Dollar				11,094.00				11,094.00
Belgium	Euro		772.07						772.07
United Kingdom	Pound		1,525.18						1,525.18

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Delegation Expenses: *									
Belgium	Euro						263.78		263.78
United Kingdom	Pound						1,731.43		1,731.43
Total			4,593.74		22,188.00		1,995.21		28,776.95

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under the authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Sec. 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR LAMAR ALEXANDER,
Chairman, Committee on Health, Education, Labor,
and Pensions, July 17, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), SENATE SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE FOR TRAVEL FROM APRIL 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Christopher Joyner	Dollar		301.59						301.59
	Dollar		374.00						374.00
	Dollar		271.00						271.00
	Dollar		300.00						300.00
	Dollar				13,284.60				13,284.60
Ryan Tully	Dollar		301.59						301.59
	Dollar		374.00						374.00
	Dollar		271.00						271.00
	Dollar		300.00						300.00
	Dollar				13,284.60				13,284.60
Ryan Kaldahl	Dollar		301.59						301.59
	Dollar		374.00						374.00
	Dollar		271.00						271.00
	Dollar		300.00						300.00
	Dollar				13,284.60				13,284.60
Michael Pevzner	Dollar		301.59						301.59
	Dollar		374.00						374.00
	Dollar		271.00						271.00
	Dollar				13,274.60				13,274.60
Tressa Guenov	Dollar		496.00						496.00
	Dollar		125.00						125.00
	Dollar		410.00						410.00
	Dollar		164.00						164.00
Brian Miller	Dollar		496.00						496.00
	Dollar		125.00						125.00
	Dollar		410.00						410.00
	Dollar		164.00						164.00
Emily Harding	Dollar		496.00						496.00
	Dollar		125.00						125.00
	Dollar		410.00						410.00
	Dollar		164.00						164.00
James Catella	Dollar		496.00						496.00
	Dollar		125.00						125.00
	Dollar		140.00						140.00
	Dollar		164.00						164.00
John Matchison	Dollar		194.00						194.00
	Dollar		169.00						169.00
	Dollar				14,820.70				14,820.70
Christian Cook	Dollar		446.00						446.00
	Dollar		194.00						194.00
	Dollar		169.00						169.00
	Dollar				19,311.60				19,311.60
Jennifer Barrett	Dollar		446.00						446.00
	Dollar		194.00						194.00
	Dollar		169.00						169.00
	Dollar				19,311.60				19,311.60
Brian Walsh	Dollar		289.00						289.00
	Dollar		336.00						336.00
	Dollar				7,850.62				7,850.62
Nick Basciano	Dollar		289.00						289.00
	Dollar		336.00						336.00
	Dollar				7,850.62				7,850.62
Walter Weiss	Dollar		130.00						130.00
Ryan Kaldahl	Dollar		326.00						326.00
Hayden Milberg	Dollar		278.00						278.00
	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar				8,394.00				8,394.00
Tom Hawkins	Dollar		278.00						278.00
	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar				8,394.00				8,394.00
Paul Matulic	Dollar		278.00						278.00
	Dollar		282.00						282.00
	Dollar				8,394.00				8,394.00
Total			14,563.36		147,455.54				162,018.90

SENATOR RICHARD BURR,
Chairman, Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, July 28, 2015.

July 30, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

13445

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Rob Portman:									
United States	Dollar				16,623.80				16,623.80
Ukraine	Hryvnia		251.85						251.85
Latvia	Euro		213.41						213.41
Brent Bombach:									
United States	Dollar				14,668.70				14,668.70
Ukraine	Hryvnia		251.85						251.85
Latvia	Euro		209.41						209.41
Senator Rob Portman:									
United States	Dollar				9,811.36				9,811.36
Israel	Shekel		1,270.00						1,270.00
Brent Bombach:									
United States	Dollar				9,811.36				9,811.36
Israel	Shekel		1,490.00						1,490.00
Mark Isakowitz:									
United States	Dollar				9,811.36				9,811.36
Israel	Shekel		1,409.00						1,409.00
Senator Tammy Baldwin:									
Tunisia	Dinar		169.49						169.49
Chad	Franc		256.86						256.86
Kenya	Shilling		759.19						759.19
Senegal	Franc		240.19						240.19
Senator Gary Peters:									
Tunisia	Dinar		179.19						179.19
Chad	Franc		280.24						280.24
Kenya	Shilling		801.78						801.78
Senegal	Franc		296.95						296.95
Jeremy Steslicki:									
Tunisia	Dinar		175.55						175.55
Chad	Franc		262.92						262.92
Kenya	Shilling		765.25						765.25
Senegal	Franc		246.25						246.25
Edward Jordan Wells:									
Tunisia	Dinar		179.19						179.19
Chad	Franc		306.64						306.64
Kenya	Shilling		813.58						813.58
Senegal	Franc		226.09						226.09
Jose Bautista:									
United States	Dollar				1,059.30				1,059.30
Honduras	Dollar		388.00						388.00
El Salvador	Dollar		396.50						396.50
Guatemala	Dollar		370.00						370.00
Brooke Ericson:									
United States	Dollar				1,482.83				1,482.83
Guatemala	Dollar		376.00						376.00
El Salvador	Dollar		348.00						348.00
Stephen Vina:									
United States	Dollar				1,097.70				1,097.70
Honduras	Dollar		395.63						395.63
El Salvador	Dollar		370.07						370.07
Holly Idelson:									
United States	Dollar				1,199.20				1,199.20
Honduras	Dollar		359.00						359.00
El Salvador	Dollar		345.88						345.88
Guatemala	Dollar		336.00						336.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Ukraine	Hryvnia						134.02		134.02
Latvia	Euro						1,387.07		1,387.07
Israel	Shekel						17,360.89		17,360.89
Total			14,739.96		65,565.61		18,881.98		99,187.55

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR RON JOHNSON,
Chairman, Committee on Homeland Security & Governmental Affairs
July 23, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Al Franken:									
Cuba	Peso		1,278.15						1,278.15
Casey Aden-Wansbury:									
Cuba	Peso		1,202.00						1,202.00
Delegation Expenses: *									
Cuba	Peso						2,231.00		2,231.00
Senator John Cornyn:									
Germany	Euro		270.37						270.37
Estonia	Euro		224.70						224.70
Czech Republic	Koruna		305.49						305.49
Romania	Leu		231.01						231.01
Spain	Euro		33.56						33.56
Russell Thomasson:									
Germany	Euro		281.32						281.32
Estonia	Euro		190.17						190.17
Czech Republic	Koruna		326.47						326.47
Romania	Leu		272.50						272.50
Spain	Euro		83.20						83.20
Delegation Expenses: *									
Estonia	Euro						347.64		347.64
Czech Republic	Koruna						175.94		175.94

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Romania	Leu						160.75		160.75
Total			4,698.94				2,915.33		7,614.27

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95–384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR CHUCK GRASSLEY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, July 28, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE FOR TRAVEL FROM APR. 1 TO JUNE 30, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
David Killion:									
France	Euro		359.37						359.37
Denmark	Krone		439.24						439.24
Lithuania	Euro		975.00						975.00
United States	Dollar				11,350.60				11,350.60
South Korea	Won		776.00						776.00
China	Renembi		507.00						507.00
United States	Dollar				12,982.80				12,982.80
Total			3,056.61		24,333.40				27,390.01

SENATOR ROGER F. WICKER,
Chairman, Commission on Security and Cooperation
in Europe, July 14, 2015.

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95–384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM MAR. 27 TO APR. 4, 2015

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Mitch McConnell:									
Ireland	Dollar		181.05						181.05
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		75.00						75.00
Senator Shelley Moore Capito:									
Ireland	Dollar		190.47						190.47
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Senator Cory Gardner:									
Ireland	Dollar		180.61						180.61
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		417.79						417.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Senator Steve Daines:									
Ireland	Dollar		187.31						187.31
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Senator David Perdue:									
Ireland	Dollar		237.00						237.00
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Senator Thom Tillis:									
Ireland	Dollar		179.96						179.96
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		417.79						417.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Senator Ben Sasse:									
Ireland	Dollar		185.61						185.61
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79

CONSOLIDATED REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FUNDS FOR FOREIGN TRAVEL BY MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE U.S. SENATE, UNDER AUTHORITY OF SEC. 22, P.L. 95-384—22
U.S.C. 1754(b), MAJORITY LEADER FOR TRAVEL FROM MAR. 27 TO APR. 4, 2015—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Per diem		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Brian Monahan:									
Ireland	Dollar		197.82						197.82
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		169.00						169.00
Thomas Hawkins:									
Ireland	Dollar		203.46						203.46
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		1,650.00				1,711.00
Kuwait	Dollar		417.79						417.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		169.00						169.00
Stefanie Muchow:									
Ireland	Dollar		193.94						193.94
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		500.00				561.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Philip Maxson:									
Ireland	Dollar		150.11						150.11
Israel	Dollar		460.00						460.00
Jordan	Dollar		528.82						528.82
Iraq	Dollar		61.00		500.00				561.00
Kuwait	Dollar		317.79						317.79
Afghanistan	Dollar		56.00						56.00
United Kingdom	Dollar		69.00						69.00
Delegation Expenses:*									
Ireland	Dollar						276.64		276.64
Israel	Dollar						10,642.10		10,642.10
Jordan	Dollar						3,483.37		3,483.37
Iraq	Dollar						122.80		122.80
Kuwait	Dollar						1,002.78		1,002.78
Afghanistan	Dollar						122.80		122.80
Totals			19,012.05		15,850.00		15,650.49		50,512.54

* Delegation expenses include payments and reimbursements to the Department of State under authority of Sec. 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Section 22 of P.L. 95-384, and S. Res. 179 agreed to May 25, 1977.

SENATOR MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, May 22, 2015.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the title amendment, which is at the desk, to H.R. 22 be considered and agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2542) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: "To authorize funds for Federal-aid highways, highway safety programs, and transit programs, and for other purposes."

EDWARD "TED" KAUFMAN AND MICHAEL LEAVITT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITIONS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 166, S. 1172.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1172) to improve the process of presidential transition.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee

on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts intended to be inserted in the bill are shown in italic.)

S. 1172

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "*Edward 'Ted' Kaufman and Michael Leavitt Presidential Transitions Improvements Act of 2015*".

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 4, 5, and 6 as sections 5, 6, and 7, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 3 the following:

"SEC. 4. TRANSITION SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES BEFORE ELECTION.

"(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

"(1) the term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of General Services;

"(2) the term 'agency' means an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

"(3) the term 'eligible candidate' has the meaning given that term in section 3(h)(4); and

"(4) the term 'Presidential election' means a general election held to determine the

electors of President and Vice President under section 1 or 2 of title 3, United States Code.

"(b) GENERAL DUTIES.—The President shall take such actions as the President determines necessary and appropriate to plan and coordinate activities by the Executive branch of the Federal Government to facilitate an efficient transfer of power to a successor President, including by—

"(1) establishing and operating a White House transition coordinating council in accordance with subsection (d); and

"(2) establishing and operating an agency transition directors council in accordance with subsection (e).

"(c) FEDERAL TRANSITION COORDINATOR.—The Administrator shall designate an employee of the General Services Administration who is a senior career appointee to—

"(1) carry out the duties and authorities of the General Services Administration relating to Presidential transitions under this Act or any other provision of law;

"(2) serve as the Federal Transition Coordinator with responsibility for coordinating transition planning across agencies, including through the agency transition directors council established under subsection (e);

"(3) ensure agencies comply with all statutory requirements relating to transition planning and reporting; and

"(4) act as a liaison to eligible candidates.

"(d) WHITE HOUSE TRANSITION COORDINATING COUNCIL.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 6 months before the date of a Presidential

election, the President shall establish a White House transition coordinating council for purposes of facilitating the Presidential transition.

“(2) DUTIES.—The White House transition coordinating council shall—

“(A) provide guidance to agencies and the Federal Transition Coordinator regarding preparations for the Presidential transition, including succession planning and preparation of briefing materials;

“(B) facilitate communication and information sharing between the transition representatives of eligible candidates and senior employees in agencies and the Executive Office of the President; and

“(C) prepare and host interagency emergency preparedness and response exercises.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the White House transition coordinating council shall include—

“(A) senior employees of the Executive branch selected by the President, which may include the Chief of Staff to the President, any Cabinet officer, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, and the Archivist of the United States;

“(B) the Federal Transition Coordinator;

“(C) the transition representative for each eligible candidate, who shall serve in an advisory capacity; and

“(D) any other individual the President determines appropriate.

“(4) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the White House transition coordinating council shall be a senior employee in the Executive Office of the President, designated by the President.

“(e) AGENCY TRANSITION DIRECTORS COUNCIL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish and operate an agency transition directors council, which shall—

“(A) ensure the Federal Government has an integrated strategy for addressing interagency challenges and responsibilities around Presidential transitions and turnover of noncareer appointees;

“(B) coordinate transition activities between the Executive Office of the President, agencies, and the transition team of eligible candidates and the President-elect and Vice President-elect; and

“(C) draw on guidance provided by the White House transition coordinating council and lessons learned from previous Presidential transitions in carrying out its duties.

“(2) DUTIES.—As part of carrying out the responsibilities under paragraph (1), the agency transition directors council shall—

“(A) assist the Federal Transition Coordinator in identifying and carrying out the responsibilities of the Federal Transition Coordinator relating to a Presidential transition;

“(B) provide guidance to agencies in gathering briefing materials and information relating to the Presidential transition that may be requested by eligible candidates;

“(C) ensure materials and information described in subparagraph (B) are prepared not later than November 1 of a year during which a Presidential election is held;

“(D) ensure agencies adequately prepare career employees who are designated to fill non-career positions under subsection (f) during a Presidential transition; and

“(E) consult with the President's Management Council, or any successor thereto, in carrying out the duties of the agency transition directors council.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the agency transition directors council shall include—

“(A) the Federal Transition Coordinator, who shall serve as Chairperson of the agency transition directors council;

“(B) a senior employee serving in the Executive Office of the President, who shall be appointed by the President;

“(C) a senior representative from each agency described in section 901(b)(1) of title 31, United States Code, the Office of Personnel Management, the Office of Government Ethics, and the National Archives and Records Administration whose responsibilities include leading Presidential transition efforts within the agency;

“(D) a senior representative from any other agency determined by the Federal Transition Coordinator to be an agency that has significant responsibilities relating to the Presidential transition process; and

“(E) during a year during which a Presidential election will be held, a transition representative for each eligible candidate, who shall serve in an advisory capacity.

“(4) MEETINGS.—The agency transition directors council shall meet—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), not less than once per year; and

“(B) during the period beginning on the date that is 6 months before a Presidential election and ending on the date on which the President-elect is inaugurated, on a regular basis as necessary to carry out the duties and authorities of the agency transition directors council.

“(f) INTERIM AGENCY LEADERSHIP FOR TRANSITIONS.—

“(1) OVERSIGHT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSITION.—Not later than 6 months before the date of a Presidential election, the head of each agency shall designate a senior career employee of the agency and a senior career employee of each major component and subcomponent of the agency to oversee and implement the activities of the agency, component, or subcomponent relating to the Presidential transition.

“(2) ACTING OFFICERS.—Not later than September 15 of a year during which a Presidential election occurs, and in accordance with subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, for each noncareer position in an agency that the head of the agency determines is critical, the head of the agency shall designate a qualified career employee to serve in the position in an acting capacity if the position becomes vacant.

“(g) MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of a year during which a Presidential election occurs, the President (acting through the Federal Transition Coordinator) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, negotiate a memorandum of understanding with the transition representative of each eligible candidate, which shall include, at a minimum, the conditions of access to employees, facilities, and documents of agencies by transition staff.

“(2) EXISTING RESOURCES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the memorandums of understanding negotiated under paragraph (1) shall be based on memorandums of understanding from previous Presidential transitions.

“(h) EQUITY IN ASSISTANCE.—Any information or other assistance provided to eligible candidates under this section shall be offered on an equal basis and without regard to political affiliation.

“(i) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Federal Transition Coordinator,

shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate reports describing the activities undertaken by the President and agencies to prepare for the transfer of power to a new President.

“(2) TIMING.—The reports under paragraph (1) shall be provided 6 months and 3 months before the date of a Presidential election.”.

(b) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 3 of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (8)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i)—

(I) by inserting “and during the term of a President” after “during the transition”; and

(II) by striking “after inauguration”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or Executive agencies (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code)” before the period; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by inserting “including, to the greatest extent practicable, human resource management system software compatible with the software used by the incumbent President and likely to be used by the President-elect and Vice President-elect” before the period;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “30 days” and inserting “180 days”;

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting “except for activities under subsection (a)(8)(A),” before “there shall be no”; and

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) An eligible candidate shall have a right to the services and facilities described in this paragraph until the date on which the Administrator is able to determine the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3 of the Pre-Election Presidential Transition Act of 2010 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is repealed.

(2) The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(A) in section 3—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)(B), by striking “section 6” and inserting “section 7”;

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 3 of this Act” and inserting “this section”; and

(iii) in subsection (h)(3)(B)(iii), by striking “section 5” each place it appears and inserting “section 6”;

(B) in section 6, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, by striking “section 6(a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7(a)(1)”; and

(C) in section (7)(a)(2), as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(3) Section 8331(1)(K) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(4) Section 8701(a)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(5) Section 8901(1)(I) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.

Section 2203(g) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) When the President considers it practicable and in the public interest, the President shall include in the President’s budget transmitted to Congress, for each fiscal year in which the term of office of the President will expire, such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the authorities of this subsection.”.

SEC. 4. REPORTS ON POLITICAL APPOINTEES APPOINTED TO NONPOLITICAL PERMANENT POSITIONS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “covered civil service position” means a position in the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5, United States Code) that is not—

(A) a temporary position; or

(B) a political position;

(3) the term “former political appointee” means an individual who—

(A) is not serving in an appointment to a political position; and

(B) served as a political appointee during the 5-year period ending on the date of the request for an appointment to a covered civil service position in any agency;

(4) the term “political appointee” means an individual serving in an appointment to a political position; and

(5) the term “political position” means—

(A) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

(B) a noncareer appointment in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraph (7) of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

(C) a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) **REPORTING ON CURRENT OR RECENT POLITICAL APPOINTEES APPOINTED TO COVERED CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.**—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a quarterly report regarding requests by agencies to appoint political appointees or former political appointees to covered civil service positions, which shall—

(1) for each request by an agency that a political appointee be appointed to a covered civil service position during the period covered by the quarterly report, provide—

(A) the date on which the request was received by the Office of Personnel Management;

(B) subject to subsection (c), the name of the individual and the political position held by the individual, including title, office, and agency;

(C) the date on which the individual was first appointed to a political position in the agency in which the individual is serving as a political appointee;

(D) the grade and rate of basic pay for the individual as a political appointee;

(E) the proposed covered civil service position, including title, office, and agency, and the proposed grade and rate of basic pay for the individual;

(F) whether the Office of Personnel Management approved or denied the request; and

(G) the date on which the individual was appointed to a covered civil service position, if applicable; and

(2) for each request by an agency that a former political appointee be appointed to a cov-

ered civil service position during the period covered by the quarterly report, provide—

(A) the date on which the request was received by the Office of Personnel Management;

(B) subject to subsection (c), the name of the individual and the political position held by the individual, including title, office, and agency;

(C) the date on which the individual was first appointed to any political position;

(D) the grade and rate of basic pay for the individual as a political appointee;

(E) the date on which the individual ceased to serve in a political position;

(F) the proposed covered civil service position, including title, office, and agency, and the proposed grade and rate of basic pay for the individual;

(G) whether the Office of Personnel Management approved or denied the request; and

(H) the date on which the individual was first appointed to a covered civil service position, if applicable.

(c) **NAMES AND TITLES OF CERTAIN APPOINTEES.**—If determined appropriate by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, a report submitted under subsection (b) may exclude the name or title of a political appointee or former political appointee—

(1) who—

(A) was requested to be appointed to a covered civil service position; and

(B) was not appointed to a covered civil service position; or

(2) relating to whom a request to be appointed to a covered civil service position is pending at the end of the period covered by that report.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON REGULATIONS PROMULGATED NEAR THE END OF PRESIDENTIAL TERMS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “covered presidential transition period” means—

(A) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 1993.

(B) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2001;

(C) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2009; and

(D) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2017;

(2) the term “covered regulation” means a final regulation promulgated by an Executive department; and

(3) the term “Executive department” has the meaning given that term under section 101 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report regarding covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition periods described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (a)(1).

(2) **NEXT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.**—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report regarding covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period described in subsection (a)(1)(D).

(3) **CONTENTS OF REPORTS.**—The reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, for each covered presidential transition period covered by the report—

(A) compare the number, scope, and cost (if possible) of, and type of rulemaking procedure used for, covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period to the number, scope, and cost of, and type of rule-

making procedure used for, covered regulations promulgated during the 120-day periods ending on January 20 of each year after 1988, other than 1993, 2001, and 2009;

(B) determine the statistical significance of any differences identified under subparagraph (A) and whether and to what extent such differences indicate any patterns;

(C) evaluate the size, scope, and effect of the covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period; and

(D) assess the extent to which the regularly required processes for the promulgation of covered regulations were followed during the covered presidential transition period, including compliance with the requirements under—

(i) chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Congressional Review Act”);

(ii) the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note);

(iii) chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Regulatory Flexibility Act”); and

(iv) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”).

SEC. 6. ANALYSIS OF THREATS AND VULNERABILITIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report analyzing the threats and vulnerabilities facing the United States during a presidential transition, which—

(1) shall identify and discuss vulnerabilities related to border security and threats related to terrorism, including from weapons of mass destruction;

(2) shall identify steps being taken to address the threats and vulnerabilities during a presidential transition; and

(3) may include recommendations for actions by components and agencies within the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) **FORM.**—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall be prepared in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

Mr. McCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to; the Carper amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The amendment (No. 2543) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To improve the bill)

On page 7, strike lines 11 through 16 and insert the following:

“(A) the Federal Transition Coordinator and the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as Co-Chairpersons of the agency transition directors council;

“(B) other senior employees serving in the Executive Office of the President, as determined by the President;

On page 8, lines 2 and 3, strike “Federal Transition Coordinator” and insert “Co-Chairpersons”.

The bill (S. 1172), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1172

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Edward ‘Ted’ Kaufman and Michael Leavitt Presidential Transitions Improvements Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION IMPROVEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 4, 5, and 6 as sections 5, 6, and 7, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 3 the following:

“SEC. 4. TRANSITION SERVICES AND ACTIVITIES BEFORE ELECTION.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of General Services;

“(2) the term ‘agency’ means an Executive agency, as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

“(3) the term ‘eligible candidate’ has the meaning given that term in section 3(h)(4); and

“(4) the term ‘Presidential election’ means a general election held to determine the electors of President and Vice President under section 1 or 2 of title 3, United States Code.

“(b) GENERAL DUTIES.—The President shall take such actions as the President determines necessary and appropriate to plan and coordinate activities by the Executive branch of the Federal Government to facilitate an efficient transfer of power to a successor President, including by—

“(1) establishing and operating a White House transition coordinating council in accordance with subsection (d); and

“(2) establishing and operating an agency transition directors council in accordance with subsection (e).

“(c) FEDERAL TRANSITION COORDINATOR.—The Administrator shall designate an employee of the General Services Administration who is a senior career appointee to—

“(1) carry out the duties and authorities of the General Services Administration relating to Presidential transitions under this Act or any other provision of law;

“(2) serve as the Federal Transition Coordinator with responsibility for coordinating transition planning across agencies, including through the agency transition directors council established under subsection (e);

“(3) ensure agencies comply with all statutory requirements relating to transition planning and reporting; and

“(4) act as a liaison to eligible candidates.

“(d) WHITE HOUSE TRANSITION COORDINATING COUNCIL.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 6 months before the date of a Presidential election, the President shall establish a White House transition coordinating council for purposes of facilitating the Presidential transition.

“(2) DUTIES.—The White House transition coordinating council shall—

“(A) provide guidance to agencies and the Federal Transition Coordinator regarding preparations for the Presidential transition, including succession planning and preparation of briefing materials;

“(B) facilitate communication and information sharing between the transition representatives of eligible candidates and senior employees in agencies and the Executive Office of the President; and

“(C) prepare and host interagency emergency preparedness and response exercises.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the White House transition coordinating council shall include—

“(A) senior employees of the Executive branch selected by the President, which may include the Chief of Staff to the President, any Cabinet officer, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, the Administrator, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, the Director of the Office of Government Ethics, and the Archivist of the United States;

“(B) the Federal Transition Coordinator;

“(C) the transition representative for each eligible candidate, who shall serve in an advisory capacity; and

“(D) any other individual the President determines appropriate.

“(4) CHAIRPERSON.—The Chairperson of the White House transition coordinating council shall be a senior employee in the Executive Office of the President, designated by the President.

“(e) AGENCY TRANSITION DIRECTORS COUNCIL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish and operate an agency transition directors council, which shall—

“(A) ensure the Federal Government has an integrated strategy for addressing interagency challenges and responsibilities around Presidential transitions and turnover of noncareer appointees;

“(B) coordinate transition activities between the Executive Office of the President, agencies, and the transition team of eligible candidates and the President-elect and Vice President-elect; and

“(C) draw on guidance provided by the White House transition coordinating council and lessons learned from previous Presidential transitions in carrying out its duties.

“(2) DUTIES.—As part of carrying out the responsibilities under paragraph (1), the agency transition directors council shall—

“(A) assist the Federal Transition Coordinator in identifying and carrying out the responsibilities of the Federal Transition Coordinator relating to a Presidential transition;

“(B) provide guidance to agencies in gathering briefing materials and information relating to the Presidential transition that may be requested by eligible candidates;

“(C) ensure materials and information described in subparagraph (B) are prepared not later than November 1 of a year during which a Presidential election is held;

“(D) ensure agencies adequately prepare career employees who are designated to fill non-career positions under subsection (f) during a Presidential transition; and

“(E) consult with the President’s Management Council, or any successor thereto, in carrying out the duties of the agency transition directors council.

“(3) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the agency transition directors council shall include—

“(A) the Federal Transition Coordinator and the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget, who shall serve as Co-Chairpersons of the agency transition directors council;

“(B) other senior employees serving in the Executive Office of the President, as determined by the President;

“(C) a senior representative from each agency described in section 901(b)(1) of title 31, United States Code, the Office of Personnel Management, the Office of Government Ethics, and the National Archives and Records Administration whose responsibil-

ities include leading Presidential transition efforts within the agency;

“(D) a senior representative from any other agency determined by the Co-Chairpersons to be an agency that has significant responsibilities relating to the Presidential transition process; and

“(E) during a year during which a Presidential election will be held, a transition representative for each eligible candidate, who shall serve in an advisory capacity.

“(4) MEETINGS.—The agency transition directors council shall meet—

“(A) subject to subparagraph (B), not less than once per year; and

“(B) during the period beginning on the date that is 6 months before a Presidential election and ending on the date on which the President-elect is inaugurated, on a regular basis as necessary to carry out the duties and authorities of the agency transition directors council.

“(f) INTERIM AGENCY LEADERSHIP FOR TRANSITIONS.—

“(1) OVERSIGHT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF TRANSITION.—Not later than 6 months before the date of a Presidential election, the head of each agency shall designate a senior career employee of the agency and a senior career employee of each major component and subcomponent of the agency to oversee and implement the activities of the agency, component, or subcomponent relating to the Presidential transition.

“(2) ACTING OFFICERS.—Not later than September 15 of a year during which a Presidential election occurs, and in accordance with subchapter III of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, for each noncareer position in an agency that the head of the agency determines is critical, the head of the agency shall designate a qualified career employee to serve in the position in an acting capacity if the position becomes vacant.

“(g) MEMORANDUMS OF UNDERSTANDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than November 1 of a year during which a Presidential election occurs, the President (acting through the Federal Transition Coordinator) shall, to the maximum extent practicable, negotiate a memorandum of understanding with the transition representative of each eligible candidate, which shall include, at a minimum, the conditions of access to employees, facilities, and documents of agencies by transition staff.

“(2) EXISTING RESOURCES.—To the maximum extent practicable, the memorandums of understanding negotiated under paragraph (1) shall be based on memorandums of understanding from previous Presidential transitions.

“(h) EQUITY IN ASSISTANCE.—Any information or other assistance provided to eligible candidates under this section shall be offered on an equal basis and without regard to political affiliation.

“(i) REPORTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The President, acting through the Federal Transition Coordinator, shall submit to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate reports describing the activities undertaken by the President and agencies to prepare for the transfer of power to a new President.

“(2) TIMING.—The reports under paragraph (1) shall be provided 6 months and 3 months before the date of a Presidential election.”.

(b) OTHER IMPROVEMENTS.—Section 3 of the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—
 (A) in paragraph (8)—
 (i) in subparagraph (A)(i)—
 (I) by inserting “and during the term of a President” after “during the transition”; and

(II) by striking “after inauguration”; and
 (ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “or Executive agencies (as defined in section 105 of title 5, United States Code)” before the period; and

(B) in paragraph (10), by inserting “including, to the greatest extent practicable, human resource management system software compatible with the software used by the incumbent President and likely to be used by the President-elect and Vice President-elect” before the period;

(2) in subsection (b)(2), by striking “30 days” and inserting “180 days”;

(3) in subsection (g), by inserting “except for activities under subsection (a)(8)(A),” before “there shall be no”; and

(4) in subsection (h)(2), by adding at the end the following:

“(D) An eligible candidate shall have a right to the services and facilities described in this paragraph until the date on which the Administrator is able to determine the apparent successful candidates for the office of President and Vice President.”.

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3 of the Pre-Election Presidential Transition Act of 2010 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is repealed.

(2) The Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note) is amended—

(A) in section 3—

(i) in subsection (a)(4)(B), by striking “section 6” and inserting “section 7”;

(ii) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “section 3 of this Act” and inserting “this section”; and

(iii) in subsection (h)(3)(B)(iii), by striking “section 5” each place it appears and inserting “section 6”;

(B) in section 6, as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, by striking “section 6(a)(1)” each place it appears and inserting “section 7(a)(1)”; and

(C) in section 7(a)(2), as redesignated by subsection (a) of this section, by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(3) Section 8331(1)(K) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(4) Section 8701(a)(10) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

(5) Section 8901(1)(I) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 4” and inserting “section 5”.

SEC. 3. NATIONAL ARCHIVES PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.

Section 2203(g) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4); and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) When the President considers it practicable and in the public interest, the President shall include in the President’s budget transmitted to Congress, for each fiscal year in which the term of office of the President will expire, such funds as may be necessary for carrying out the authorities of this subsection.”.

SEC. 4. REPORTS ON POLITICAL APPOINTEES APPOINTED TO NONPOLITICAL PERMANENT POSITIONS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term “Executive agency” in section 105 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) the term “covered civil service position” means a position in the civil service (as defined in section 2101 of title 5, United States Code) that is not—

(A) a temporary position; or

(B) a political position;

(3) the term “former political appointee” means an individual who—

(A) is not serving in an appointment to a political position; and

(B) served as a political appointee during the 5-year period ending on the date of the request for an appointment to a covered civil service position in any agency;

(4) the term “political appointee” means an individual serving in an appointment to a political position; and

(5) the term “political position” means—

(A) a position described under sections 5312 through 5316 of title 5, United States Code (relating to the Executive Schedule);

(B) a noncareer appointment in the Senior Executive Service, as defined under paragraph (7) of section 3132(a) of title 5, United States Code; or

(C) a position in the executive branch of the Government of a confidential or policy-determining character under schedule C of subpart C of part 213 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations.

(b) REPORTING ON CURRENT OR RECENT POLITICAL APPOINTEES APPOINTED TO COVERED CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.—The Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a quarterly report regarding requests by agencies to appoint political appointees or former political appointees to covered civil service positions, which shall—

(1) for each request by an agency that a political appointee be appointed to a covered civil service position during the period covered by the quarterly report, provide—

(A) the date on which the request was received by the Office of Personnel Management;

(B) subject to subsection (c), the name of the individual and the political position held by the individual, including title, office, and agency;

(C) the date on which the individual was first appointed to a political position in the agency in which the individual is serving as a political appointee;

(D) the grade and rate of basic pay for the individual as a political appointee;

(E) the proposed covered civil service position, including title, office, and agency, and the proposed grade and rate of basic pay for the individual;

(F) whether the Office of Personnel Management approved or denied the request; and

(G) the date on which the individual was appointed to a covered civil service position, if applicable; and

(2) for each request by an agency that a former political appointee be appointed to a covered civil service position during the period covered by the quarterly report, provide—

(A) the date on which the request was received by the Office of Personnel Management;

(B) subject to subsection (c), the name of the individual and the political position held by the individual, including title, office, and agency;

(C) the date on which the individual was first appointed to any political position;

(D) the grade and rate of basic pay for the individual as a political appointee;

(E) the date on which the individual ceased to serve in a political position;

(F) the proposed covered civil service position, including title, office, and agency, and the proposed grade and rate of basic pay for the individual;

(G) whether the Office of Personnel Management approved or denied the request; and

(H) the date on which the individual was first appointed to a covered civil service position, if applicable.

(c) NAMES AND TITLES OF CERTAIN APPOINTEES.—If determined appropriate by the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, a report submitted under subsection (b) may exclude the name or title of a political appointee or former political appointee—

(1) who—

(A) was requested to be appointed to a covered civil service position; and

(B) was not appointed to a covered civil service position; or

(2) relating to whom a request to be appointed to a covered civil service position is pending at the end of the period covered by that report.

SEC. 5. REPORT ON REGULATIONS PROMULGATED NEAR THE END OF PRESIDENTIAL TERMS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered presidential transition period” means—

(A) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 1993.

(B) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2001;

(C) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2009; and

(D) the 120-day period ending on January 20, 2017;

(2) the term “covered regulation” means a final regulation promulgated by an Executive department; and

(3) the term “Executive department” has the meaning given that term under section 101 of title 5, United States Code.

(b) REPORTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report regarding covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition periods described in subparagraph (A), (B), or (C) of subsection (a)(1).

(2) NEXT PRESIDENTIAL TRANSITION.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives a report regarding covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period described in subsection (a)(1)(D).

(3) CONTENTS OF REPORTS.—The reports required under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, for each covered presidential transition period covered by the report—

(A) compare the number, scope, and cost (if possible) of, and type of rulemaking procedure used for, covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period to the number, scope, and cost of, and type of rulemaking procedure used for, covered regulations promulgated during the 120-day periods ending on January 20 of each year after 1988, other than 1993, 2001, and 2009;

(B) determine the statistical significance of any differences identified under subparagraph (A) and whether and to what extent such differences indicate any patterns;

(C) evaluate the size, scope, and effect of the covered regulations promulgated during the covered presidential transition period; and

(D) assess the extent to which the regularly required processes for the promulgation of covered regulations were followed during the covered presidential transition period, including compliance with the requirements under—

(i) chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Congressional Review Act”);

(ii) the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 601 note);

(iii) chapter 6 of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the “Regulatory Flexibility Act”); and

(iv) chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code (commonly known as the “Paperwork Reduction Act”).

SEC. 6. ANALYSIS OF THREATS AND VULNERABILITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than February 15, 2016, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report analyzing the threats and vulnerabilities facing the United States during a presidential transition, which—

(1) shall identify and discuss vulnerabilities related to border security and threats related to terrorism, including from weapons of mass destruction;

(2) shall identify steps being taken to address the threats and vulnerabilities during a presidential transition; and

(3) may include recommendations for actions by components and agencies within the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) FORM.—The report submitted under subsection (a) shall be prepared in unclassified form, but may contain a classified annex.

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, JULY 31, 2015, AND MONDAY, AUGUST 3, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Friday, July 31, for a pro forma session only with no business being conducted; further, that following the pro forma session, the Senate adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, August 3; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be

approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1881; finally, notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 1881 occur at 5:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:51 p.m., adjourned until Friday, July 31, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION

ERIC DRAKE EBERHARD, OF WASHINGTON, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE MORRIS K. UDALL AND STEWART L. UDALL FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 6, 2018, VICE BRADLEY UDALL, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

MICHAEL F. SUAREZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES FOR A TERM EXPIRING JANUARY 26, 2020, VICE DAWN HO DELBANCO, TERM EXPIRED.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

ELISSA SLOTKIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, VICE DEREK H. CHOLLET, RESIGNED.

THE JUDICIARY

JOHN E. SPARKS, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, VICE JAMES EDGAR BAKER, TERM EXPIRING.

AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS

DEREK TAI-CHING KAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE NANCY A. NAPLES, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

BEVERLY ANGELA SCOTT, OF OHIO, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 31, 2019, VICE MARK R. ROSEKIND, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JOHN D. FEELEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE,

CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF PANAMA.

ROBERT PORTER JACKSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

VICTORIA A. LIPNIC, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2020. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

MICHAEL HERMAN MICHAUD, OF MAINE, TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF LABOR FOR VETERANS' EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING, VICE KEITH KELLY.

THE JUDICIARY

SUSAN PARADISE BAXTER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE SEAN J. MCLAUGHLIN, RESIGNED.

INGA S. BERNSTEIN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, VICE DOUGLAS P. WOODLOCK, RETIRED.

GARY RICHARD BROWN, OF NEW YORK, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK, VICE SANDRA J. FEUERSTEIN, RETIRED.

ROBERT JOHN COLVILLE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE GARY L. LANCASTER, DECEASED.

ELIZABETH J. DRAKE, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE RICHARD K. EATON, RETIRED.

JENNIFER CHOE GROVES, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE GREGORY WRIGHT CARMAN, RETIRED.

MARILYN JEAN HORAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE TERENCE F. MCVEERY, RETIRED.

GARY STEPHEN KATZMANN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, VICE JANE A. RESTANI, RETIRED.

DAX ERIC LOPEZ, OF GEORGIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, VICE JULIE E. CARNES, ELEVATED.

JOHN MILTON YOUNGE, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE MARY A. MCLAUGHLIN, RETIRED.

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

DARRYL L. DEPRIEST, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE CHIEF COUNSEL FOR ADVOCACY, SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, VICE WINSLOW LORENZO SARGEANT, RESIGNED.

WITHDRAWALS

Executive Message transmitted by the President to the Senate on July 30, 2015 withdrawing from further Senate consideration the following nominations:

EARL L. GAY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT, VICE CHRISTINE M. GRIFFIN, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JANUARY 8, 2015.

DEREK TAI-CHING KAN, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A DIRECTOR OF THE AMTRAK BOARD OF DIRECTORS FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS, VICE JEFFREY R. MORELAND, TERM EXPIRED, WHICH WAS SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 13, 2015.

SENATE—*Friday, July 31, 2015*

The Senate met at 10 and 6 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
AUGUST 3, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands

adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, August 3, 2015.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 10 and 19 seconds a.m., adjourned until Monday, August 3, 2015, at 2 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, July 31, 2015

The House met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
July 31, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable GEORGE HOLDING to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend John Peck, S.J., Holy Trinity Catholic Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise and thank You for the opportunity to serve You and do Your work.

We know You will require much of those entrusted with much. You have entrusted to the Members of this House great responsibility, a share in the governing of our country.

Bless the Members in their work today, Lord. May they do all You require and please You by their service to the common good. Give them minds open to the truth, and courageous hearts to carry it out in the laws they enact.

As they return to their districts for the month of August, give them ears open to their constituents' views and concerns. Encourage and re-energize them for the important work that lies ahead.

We ask all these gifts through Christ, our Lord.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 380, the Journal of the last day's proceeding is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 30, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 30, 2015 at 2:30 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3236.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, July 31, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 31, 2015 at 10:01 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with amendments H.R. 22.

That the Senate passed S. 1172.
With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following enrolled bill was signed by the Speaker on Thursday, July 30, 2015:

H.R. 3236, to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1172. An act to improve the process of presidential transition; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform; in addition, to the Committee on Homeland Security for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 3236. An act to provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 29, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 876. To amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to require hospitals to provide certain notifications to individuals classified by such hospitals under observation status rather than admitted as inpatients of such hospitals.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(b) of House Resolution 380, consistent with the fourth clause in section 5 of article I of the Constitution, and notwithstanding section 132 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the House stands adjourned until noon on Tuesday, August 4, 2015.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 2015, at noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2330. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Martin E. Dempsey, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2331. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of General Raymond T. Odierno, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2332. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Organization and Functions, and Seal Amendments (RIN: 2590-AA75) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2333. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Zeta-cypermethrin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0889; FRL-9929-74] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2334. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Phosphoric Acid Manufacturing and Phosphate Fertilizer Production RTR and Standards of Performance for Phosphate Processing [EPA-HQ-OAR-2012-0522; FRL-9931-01-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ20) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2335. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Isotetamid; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0138; FRL-9923-86] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2336. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluxapyroxad; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0638; FRL-9930-73] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2337. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ethanesulfonic acid, 2-hydroxy and the corresponding ammonium, sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium, and zinc salts; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0325; FRL-9930-22] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2338. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Benalaxyl-M; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0714; FRL-9927-63] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2339. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Wyoming; Revisions to SO₂ Ambient Standards [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0187; FRL-9931-38-Region 8] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2340. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Interstate Transport of Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0330; FRL-9931-46-Region 10] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2341. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina: Non-interference Demonstration for Federal Low-Reid Vapor Pressure Requirement for Gaston and Mecklenburg Counties [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0260; FRL-9931-27-Region 4] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2342. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: Revisions to Definitions and Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0413; FRL-9931-65-Region 4] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2343. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans and Designation of Areas; North Carolina; Redesignation of the Charlotte-Rock Hill, 2008 8-Hour Ozone Non-attainment Area to Attainment [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0275; FRL-9931-28-Region 4] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2344. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; West Virginia; 2011 Base Year Emissions Inventory for the Marshall, West Virginia Nonattainment Area for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0411; FRL-9931-56-Region 3] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2345. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Consumer and Commercial Products and Mobile Equipment Repair and Refinishing Operations [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0816; FRL-9931-29-Region 3] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2346. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Iowa; Revisions to Linn County Air Quality Ordinance [EPA-R07-

OAR-2015-0357; FRL-9931-33-Region 7] received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2347. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Technical Amendments to Inadvertent Errors in Air Quality Designations for the 2006 24-hour Fine Particle National Ambient Air Quality Standards (2006 24-hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS), 1997 Annual PM_{2.5} NAAQS, and 1987 Annual Coarse Particle (PM₁₀) NAAQS [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0359; FRL-9929-97-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR95) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2348. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the "2013 Progress Report on Understanding the Long-Term Health Effects of Living Organ Donation", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. Sec. 273b, as added by the Charlie W. Norwood Living Organ Donation Act, Pub. L. 110-144; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2349. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a notice of proposed lease to the governments of Australia and the United Kingdom, Transmittal No. 08-15, pursuant to Sec. 62(a) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2350. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 14-132; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2351. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-066; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-046; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2354. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-048; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2355. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Federal Voting Assistance Program's 2014 Post-Election Report to Congress, in accordance with 52 U.S.C. 20308(b); to the Committee on House Administration.

2356. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the final report on the "Assist CAO in Equipment Inventory Process" management advisory project (Report No. 15-CAO-05); to the Committee on House Administration.

2357. A letter from the Inspector General, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the final audit report entitled "Review of the

Effectiveness of the Secure Configuration Management Program (Report No. 15-CAO-06); to the Committee on House Administration.

2358. A letter from the Architect of the Capitol, transmitting the semiannual report of disbursements for the operations of the Architect of the Capitol for the period of January 1, 2015 through June 30, 2015, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 1868a(a); Public Law 113-76, div. I, title I, Sec. 1301(a); (H. Doc. No. 114—54); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2359. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Affairs and Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Acknowledgement of American Indian Tribes [156A2100DD/AAK001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1076-AF18) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2360. A letter from the Chief, Division of Environmental Review, Ecological Services, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Interagency Cooperation—Endangered Species Act of 1973, as Amended; Incidental Take Statements [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2011-0080; NOAA-120106024-5048-02; FF09E-31000-156-FXES-1122-0900000] (RIN: 1018-AX85; 0648-BB81) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2361. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Foreign Species, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Listing All Chimpanzees as Endangered Species [Docket No.: FWS-R9-ES-2010-0086; 4500030115] (RIN: 1018-AZ52) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2362. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Atlantic Dolphin [Docket No.: 130403322-4454-02] (RIN: 0648-XE002) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2363. A letter from the Wildlife Biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Migratory Bird Permits; Update of Falconry Permitting Reporting Address [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-MB-2015-0032; FF09M21200-156-FXMB123 099BPP0] (RIN: 1018-BA90) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2364. A letter from the Acting Chief, Branch of Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Rufa Red Knot [Docket No.: FWS-R5-ES-2013-0097] [4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AY17) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2365. A letter from the Chief, Branch of Recovery and State Grants, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Corrections for 54 Wildlife and Plant Species on the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2015-0031] [FXES11130900000C6-156-FF09E42000] (RIN: 1018-BA89) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2366. A letter from the Regulations Specialist; FWS — Office of Subsistence Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Subsistence Management Regulations for Public Lands in Alaska—2015-16 and 2016-17 Subsistence Taking of Fish Regulations [Docket No.: FWS-R7-SM-2013-0065; FXFR13350700640-156-FF07J00000 FBMS#4500076030] (RIN: 1018-AZ67) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2367. A letter from the Branch Chief, Endangered Species Listing, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Mount Charleston Blue Butterfly [Icaricia (Plebejus) shasta charlestonensis] [Docket No.: FWS-R8-ES-2013-0105] [4500030114] (RIN: 1018-AZ91) received July 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2368. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Safety Zone; Big Foot TLP, Walker Ridge 29, Outer Continental Shelf on the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0863] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2369. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Fall River Grand Prix, Mt. Hope Bay and Taunton River, Fall River, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0286] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2370. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland Triathlon, Lake Erie, North Coast Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0659] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2371. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones and Regulated Navigation Area; Shell Arctic Drilling/Exploration Vessels and Associated Voluntary First Amendment Area, Puget Sound, WA, Extension [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0295] (RIN: 1625-AA00; 1625-AA11) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2372. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Red Bull GRC Air Show, Detroit River, Detroit, MI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0618] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2373. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Maritime Museum Party, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0647] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2374. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Town of Olcott Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario, Olcott, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0595] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2375. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Mavericks Surf Competition, Half Moon Bay, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0427] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2376. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0192] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2377. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Southeast Drag Boat Championships, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Bucksport, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0045] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2378. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Block Island Wind Farm; Rhode Island Sound, RI [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0227] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2379. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones; Misery Challenge, Manchester Bay, Manchester, MA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0188] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2380. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; POLAR PIONEER, Outer Continental Shelf Drill Unit, Chukchi Sea, Alaska [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0247] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2381. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Victoria Barge Canal, Bloomington, TX [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0952] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2382. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Lake Metroparks Stand-Up Paddleboard Race; Lake Erie, Fairport Harbor, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0612] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2383. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; The Cleveland Yachting Club Annual Regatta Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Rocky River, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0613] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2384. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Oswego Harborfest Jet Ski Show; Oswego Harbor, Oswego, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0507] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received July 29, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2385. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report on the drug-free workplace plan of the Defense Acquisition University, pursuant to Sec. 503 of the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1987, Pub. L. 100-71; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations and Oversight and Government Reform.

2386. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the report to Congress entitled, "Assessing the Continued Suspension of the Long Term Care Hospital 25 Percent Policy", pursuant to Sec. 1206(b)(1)(C) of the Pathway for SGR Reform Act of 2013 (Pub. L. 113-67); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENT: Committee on Ethics. In the Matter of Officially-Connected Travel by House Members to Azerbaijan in 2013 (Rept. 114-239). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mrs. RADEWAGEN):

H.R. 3433. A bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. HANNA):

H.R. 3434. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act with respect to the guidelines for specification of certain disposal sites for dredged or fill material; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 3435. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit against income tax for employees who participate in qualified apprenticeship programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 3436. A bill to provide discretionary authority to an immigration judge to determine that an alien parent of a United States citizen child should not be ordered removed, deported, or excluded from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3437. A bill to ensure State and local compliance with all Federal immigration detainers on aliens in custody and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYCE (for himself and Mr. ENGEL) (both by request):

H.J. Res. 63. A joint resolution providing for the approval of the Congress of the proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy transmitted on June 16, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. RIGELL:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution providing for a plan to alleviate the effects of sequestration; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BROOKS of Alabama (for himself and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 406. A resolution recognizing the progress made and challenges still faced by people living with albinism in East Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. MENG:

H. Res. 407. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the liberation of the Republic of Korea and expressing the shared

vision of the people of the United States and the people of the Republic of Korea for a continued prosperous relationship; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

107. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 9, to establish a sustainable energy-abundance plan for Ohio to meet future Ohio energy needs with affordable, abundant, and environmentally friendly energy; which was referred jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. REICHERT:

H.R. 3433.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. HURT of Virginia:

H.R. 3434.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3435.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. SERRANO:

H.R. 3436.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4, which states that: "The Congress shall have Power To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization."

By Mr. SESSIONS:

H.R. 3437.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.J. Res. 63.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 217: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 449: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 525: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 540: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Ms. McCOLLUM.
H.R. 546: Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 592: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 702: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 721: Mr. ZINKE and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 745: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 751: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 757: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 775: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
H.R. 815: Mr. PEARCE and Mr. BUCHANAN.
H.R. 825: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 835: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 915: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 918: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 923: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 961: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 973: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1000: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1054: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1062: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1100: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. DENT, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1112: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1130: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. BARLETTA, and Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 1142: Mrs. BUSTOS.
H.R. 1148: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 1174: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. BASS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BARTON.
H.R. 1202: Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 1218: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 1222: Mr. DOLD.
H.R. 1258: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 1299: Mr. GOODLATTE.
H.R. 1321: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 1333: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 1340: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 1342: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 1356: Mr. RIGELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. HILL and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1384: Mr. RIGELL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. HILL, Mr. KIND, Mr. McHENRY, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1393: Mr. LOEBSACK and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 1401: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. YOHO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1427: Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 1453: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California.
H.R. 1462: Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 1475: Mr. SANFORD.
H.R. 1479: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1559: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 1565: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 1567: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 1594: Mr. KATKO, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. ABRAHAM.
H.R. 1608: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1624: Mr. CALVERT, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 1686: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1752: Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 1779: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 1781: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 1859: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 2030: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VEASEY, and Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 2061: Mr. CAPUANO and Mr. WESTMORELAND.
H.R. 2124: Ms. MENG and Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 2156: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 2193: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2254: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 2260: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 2293: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 2303: Ms. McCOLLUM.
H.R. 2306: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2320: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 2404: Mr. HECK of Washington and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2406: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2410: Ms. MENG.
H.R. 2494: Mr. COSTA, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2508: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. LONG, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 2515: Mr. DOLD and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 2521: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. CLEAVER.
H.R. 2568: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 2602: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2646: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 2648: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 2653: Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. LONG, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 2687: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 2704: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2715: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2804: Mr. VEASEY and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2811: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 2847: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 2852: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 2866: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 2876: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BRADY of Texas.
H.R. 2894: Mr. DOLD, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 2903: Ms. BONAMICI and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2911: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. COOPER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. BLUM.
H.R. 2914: Mr. YOHO.
H.R. 2915: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2956: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 2999: Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 3037: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. NUNES.
H.R. 3081: Mr. McCLINTOCK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. MARINO.
H.R. 3115: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. STUTZMAN.
H.R. 3122: Mr. HILL.
H.R. 3134: Mr. FINCHER.
H.R. 3136: Mr. TAKAI and Mr. POE of Texas.
H.R. 3139: Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. BOST.
H.R. 3140: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 3150: Mr. COHEN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. VELA, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3167: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 3180: Mr. JOLLY and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 3187: Mr. AMASH, Mr. GARRETT, and Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 3190: Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3197: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3221: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 3243: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
H.R. 3258: Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 3261: Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 3268: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. POLIS, Ms. ESTY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3296: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. STEWART, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. CULBERSON.
H.R. 3304: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 3326: Mr. YOHO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
H.R. 3338: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois and Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 3345: Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3364: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 3381: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 3420: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3421: Mr. PITTENER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Mrs. BLACKBURN, and Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 3423: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 3429: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
H.J. Res. 47: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.J. Res. 54: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina and Mr. MASSIE.
H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. NUNES and Ms. KAPTUR.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DOLD.
H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. TONKO.
H. Res. 28: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H. Res. 49: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 220: Ms. MENG and Mr. MESSER.
H. Res. 293: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H. Res. 343: Mr. GARRETT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. BARR, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. KIND, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. CLAY, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MESSER, Mr. KEATING, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HILL, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H. Res. 354: Mr. TROTT, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. McCOLLUM, and Mr. RIGELL.
H. Res. 367: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
H. Res. 393: Ms. LEE.
H. Res. 394: Mr. HONDA, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 400: Mr. HOYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. TORRES, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN RECOGNITION OF TEACHER AND
MUSICIAN WILLIAM DEWITT

**HON. GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**

OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. SABLAN. Mr. Speaker, allow me to add to the record of the U.S. House of Representatives the story Mr. William DeWitt, a teacher, who has brought the art of music in the Northern Mariana Islands to an unprecedented level of excellence and who has given to thousands of our young people the joy of finding within themselves their own musical talents.

Mr. William DeWitt first came to the Northern Mariana Islands in 1993, beginning his career in middle and junior high school, teaching a variety of subjects, including band, piano, and choir. He then accepted an offer to teach at Marianas High School and was successful there at reviving its band program. Enthusiasm for instrumental music education began to crescendo, and in 2002 Mr. DeWitt was invited to join the faculty of the newly inaugurated Saipan Southern High School, which was designed to be a magnet school for students with an interest in the arts and technology. He has now spent thirteen years at Saipan Southern, helping countless students fulfill their dream to make music and share it with the world. In doing so, Mr. DeWitt and the students he has guided have created a legacy, the Saipan Southern High School Manta Ray Band, that is certainly one of the greatest sources of pride for the Northern Marianas Public School System and, indeed, for our entire community.

When Mr. DeWitt came to Saipan 22 years ago, he could not have known what he would accomplish. Our island community has always teemed with multi-generational musical talent and held a deep love for singing. But band music and its array of instruments—the trumpet, flute, trombone, and clarinet—were less well known. Mr. DeWitt changed that.

Mr. DeWitt also oversaw the incorporation of a growing diversity of students into our schools using music as a unifying influence and adding the international flavor of this new student body to its musical sensibility. Up to 250 students now participate in some aspect of the Manta Ray Band program at Saipan Southern. They come from many ethnicities and cultures—Chamorro, Carolinian, Palauan, Marshallese, Filipino, Korean, Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, Indian—and William DeWitt has helped them learn to join together as one, making music.

Perhaps, this very diversity is key to the success and world-wide recognition the Manta Ray Band has achieved under the baton of Mr. DeWitt. Five times in the last seven years the Manta Ray Band has earned the Tumon

Bay Music Festival Sweepstakes Award, the most wins by any organization in the festival's history. The Manta Rays have been invited to and performed at two Olympic Games: Beijing in 2008 and London in 2012. The Band has showcased its talents at the Sydney Opera House, Carnegie Hall, Westminster Abbey, and Disneyland. And just last month, at the Los Angeles Musical Festival the Manta Ray Band earned the Gold Award as the highest scoring ensemble in festival competition.

This Gold Award is something of a fairy-tale ending to Mr. DeWitt's career. His band executed its performance with a new precision and intensity. His students displayed an infectious enthusiasm and rhythmic jaunt that gave their concert an element of variety and versatility no other ensemble could match. But backstage after the event amidst the triumph, while cameras clicked, tears flowed and hugs abounded, as the Manta Rays dealt with the recognition that this pinnacle also marked the end of an era—for Mr. William DeWitt had taken his final bow with the band.

William DeWitt and his family will now be able to spend time with his parents in California, where he will also pursue a post-graduate degree. We wish him well. And we will always be grateful to him for the way that he drew from a very small population of students their maximum talent, so inculcating them in the fundamental elements of musicianship that they were able to soar on international stages.

As significant as what he gave to each individual student, we will remember what Mr. William DeWitt gave to the larger communities of which we are part: the pride and honor his musicians brought to Saipan Southern High School, to the Public School System, and to the Northern Mariana Islands as a whole. This musical venture he has led became a partnership for all of us. Individuals and businesses gladly supported the Manta Ray Band with contributions totaling more than a million dollars over the course of the past decade. And, as a community, we should honor William DeWitt's legacy by continuing to give our young musicians the opportunity to develop, master, and showcase their talents.

Lastly, we acknowledge, as does Mr. DeWitt, his wife Lois and his children Emily, Abigail, and James, who throughout have been his source of inspiration and support. We thank them for allowing their husband and father to commit so much of his time and energy to the students of Saipan Southern and the Northern Mariana Islands.

And we thank you, Mr. William DeWitt. May the richness of island life always flow in your blood, just as your accomplishments will always be engraved into our island history.

THE MAN WHO WAS LARGER
THAN LIFE

HON. J. FRENCH HILL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of his life, Richard "Dick" Bass was a force to be reckoned with. He always strove to be the first and best at whatever he did—whether as a student, oilman, rancher, ski resort developer, or mountaineer.

As a young man of sixteen, he enrolled in Yale University, graduating with a B.S. in Geology at the age of twenty. The gregarious spirit and boundless curiosity that prompted him to climb one of Europe's highest peaks, the Matterhorn, at nineteen, would continue to be both servant and driver throughout his life.

Shortly after moving back to Texas to join the family oil business, Dick began taking regular trips to Colorado to ski. His love for skiing and his fellow outdoor enthusiasts motivated him to seek out involvement in the industry. Shortly after starting these trips, he and his brother purchased stock in a small underdeveloped area in Eagle County, Colorado, that became the globally famous Town of Vail. The success and increased public interest in Vail led to his co-ownership and development of the Snowbird ski resort in Utah. He and his Snowbird partner, Ted Johnson, traveled across Europe searching for inspiration and innovation to bring their vision to life.

His pioneering spirit was not limited to investments and skiing and harken back to his younger self's interest in mountain climbing. He was determined to become the first man to conquer the Seven Summits, the highest mountains in each of the continents, and achieved this monumental undertaking on April 30, 1985. Throughout his life, his mindset was always that of ceaseless perseverance, as exemplified by his three attempts and final summit of Mt. Everest.

Dick Bass may have passed on to his newest adventure at the age of eighty-five, but his entire life serves as a testament to the power of determination and enterprise. Dick was larger than life, actively living every second to the fullest and taking on any challenge thrown at him. He left a truly indelible mark on the world, his wife, Alice, his children Dan Bass, Bonnie Smith, Barbara Moroney, Jim Bass, and his thirteen grandchildren.

I was proud to count Dick Bass as a family friend and a source of inspiration to me in my love of the mountains and my business career. As John Muir said, "Climb the mountains and get their good tidings"; Dick, your legacy lives on.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE
REVEREND WILLIE L. HILL

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding man of God who has been a longstanding source of inspiration, spiritual guidance, and moral leadership to the people of Southwest Georgia, the Reverend Willie L. Hill. Reverend Hill is retiring after 28 years of pastoring the Greater Beallwood Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia. The congregation will be honoring Rev. Hill for his leadership at a retirement dinner on Saturday, August 15, 2015 at 6:00 p.m. at the Columbus Country Club and at a retirement program on Sunday, August 16, 2015 during the 11:00 a.m. service at the church.

A native of Columbus, Georgia, Willie L. Hill was born to the late Hollis and Dora Hill. He was educated in the public school system of Muscogee County. Reverend Hill then served our nation honorably in the United States Army during the Vietnam War. After completing his service, he attended Chattahoochee Valley Community College in Phenix City, Alabama, where he earned an associate's degree, and later attended Troy University to complete a bachelor's degree in Criminology. It was then that Rev. Hill heard God's call to preach and enrolled in the American Baptist College to study theology.

Rev. Hill pastored the Greater Beallwood Baptist Church for 28 years, faithfully carrying out his vision for the church and leading its members in the fulfillment of a God-first life. In the years after Rev. Hill became pastor, Greater Beallwood expanded greatly, growing from a century-old church that was facing financial hardship to a spiritual praising center serving almost 350 people weekly. Not only did Rev. Hill's leadership grow the congregation in number and in spirit, but it also was instrumental in the building of a new sanctuary that would accommodate the numerous church services and meetings.

A strong advocate of access to Christian education, Rev. Hill founded Children's Church, a separate training and worship service for children ages 5 through 12 to grow in their faith. Children's Church serves as a valuable resource for members of the Greater Beallwood Baptist Church and has helped children learn about the word of God in a way that they can relate to and understand.

Throughout his pastoral career, always seeking to improve the craft of Christian ministry and discipleship, Rev. Hill has served as President of the Inter-Denominational Ministerial Alliance for eight years and Vice President for four years. He served as President of the Fourth District Congress of Christian Education for two years, and he also co-founded the Columbus Ministerial Association. An avid golfer and fierce competitor, Rev. Hill served on the Golf Authority of the Columbus Consolidated Government for ten years.

Jeremiah 3:15 says, "Then I will give you shepherds after my own heart, who will lead you with knowledge and understanding." Reverend Willie Hill is one such shepherd and a

man of integrity who exudes the genuine principles and values of Christian discipleship. A charismatic evangelical leader and pioneer, his spiritual zeal is both infectious and highly contagious.

Rev. Hill is surrounded by the love and support of his congregation, but also his family—his wife of 52 years, Helen; their two sons, Daren and Brandon; and three beloved grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my wife Vivian, and the more than 730,000 residents of Georgia's Second Congressional District in thanking the Reverend Willie L. Hill for his service to our nation, the Columbus community, the Greater Beallwood Baptist Church, and the Kingdom of God.

HONORING DR. R. SCOTT RALLS,
RETIRING PRESIDENT OF THE
NORTH CAROLINA COMMUNITY
COLLEGE SYSTEM

HON. DAVID E. PRICE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Scott Ralls, the seventh president of the North Carolina Community College System, who stepped down as president of the system this summer after seven years of service.

North Carolina's community college system is one of the state's greatest educational assets. It is one of the nation's largest community college systems, and its reach is extensive, with most North Carolinians residing within 30 miles of one of its 58 colleges. The system serves more than 850,000 individuals annually, with 321,000 students in degree, certificate and curriculum programs and almost 500,000 students taking continuing education classes. Some 40 percent of the state's wage earners today have received some education or training at a North Carolina community college in the past 10 years.

Dr. Ralls was an exemplary president, carrying on the fine tradition of leadership of his predecessor, and our former House colleague, Martin Lancaster. Taking the helm in 2008, President Ralls' tenure began just as the recession hit and the state's unemployment rate began to soar. During the first three years of his presidency, displaced workers flocked to the state's community colleges; the system's enrollment grew 28 percent from 2007 to 2010. At the same time, the system weathered a budget crunch, all the while embarking on a strategy to revamp curriculum, improve completion rates, and forge new transfer agreements with the state's university system.

Even with these challenges, Dr. Ralls helped the System obtain international recognition for its efforts to foster economic and workforce development. Ralls's efforts included expanding health care programs, reenergizing technical education, strengthening the connection between economic and workforce development, and furthering strong partnerships between public schools, community colleges and the University of North Carolina System to promote seamless education pathways.

President Ralls also focused efforts on improving student success. He was an early champion for early college high schools, and today, North Carolina hosts one-third of all early colleges in the U.S.—the vast majority located on the campuses of community colleges. In addition, in 2009, under Dr. Ralls's leadership, the North Carolina Community College System initiated a comprehensive set of strategic initiatives focused on student success and program completion entitled SuccessNC, consolidating curriculums into 32 critical growth areas for North Carolina's economy and providing students with opportunities to earn industry-recognized, stackable credentials, resulting in a more competitive workforce. The Brookings Institution and the Rockefeller Foundation recognized this model in describing one of the most "forward-thinking economy-shifting efforts underway in America's state and metropolitan areas."

During his tenure, President Ralls was elected by national peers to be the President of the National Association of Industry-Specific Training Directors. He also led a state task force responsible for creating policies and procedures for the New and Expanding Industry Training Program, which resulted in a 16% reduction in expenditures and 11% increase in total training projects. Further, he chaired a task force on workplace safety training and generated new policies for administering the NC Worker Training Tax Credit Program.

Dr. Ralls serves on several national and state boards and commissions and is the Chair of the National Council of State Directors of Community Colleges. He has earned a number of awards and honors, including a Certificate of Appreciation from the U.S. Department of Commerce (1995), and a Certificate of Appreciation from the NC Rural Prosperity Task Force (2000). He was also awarded the 2006 Freedom Fund Award from the Craven County NAACP, and was dubbed a 2007–2008 Impact Business Leader by the Charlotte Business Leader Magazine.

Prior to serving as the North Carolina Community College System President, Dr. Ralls was president of Craven Community College in New Bern and Havelock. This makes him only the second former North Carolina community college president to hold the System presidency, and he is leaving to once again assume the presidency of a fine institution, the Northern Virginia Community College (NVCC). While at Craven, he led efforts to support college enrollment growth, while facing significant impacts of military deployment. At Craven, Ralls led in establishing workforce development programs in targeted industry sectors; helped create Craven Early College; initiated University Connections to foster on-site and on-line degree completion opportunities, and fostered an Undergraduate Engineering Education partnership with N.C. State College of Engineering.

Dr. Ralls, a leader of national distinction, is also an approachable, collaborative person who has been a delight for me and others to work with personally. He guided North Carolina's community colleges through the economic downturn and state budget cuts and oversaw a period of remarkable growth. Thanks to his tireless efforts, thousands of North Carolinians have had the opportunity to

obtain the education and training they need to realize their full potential. I thank Dr. Ralls for his years of service to the state of North Carolina and wish him the very best as he assumes the helm at NVCC.

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE 2015 BEST OF BRADDOCK AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the recipients of the 2015 Best of Braddock Awards, presented by the Braddock District Council of Community Associations. These awards are given annually to deserving individuals, organizations, and companies in the Braddock Magisterial District of Fairfax County, Virginia, who have demonstrated an outstanding commitment to our community.

The goal of the Braddock District Council is to promote the civic, community, and general welfare of the citizens of the Braddock District. The Council represents the interests of community associations, facilitates cooperation and coordination between associations, and provides a path of communications between associations and officials or elected representatives of the Braddock District.

I am pleased to join the Braddock District Council of Community Associations in recognizing the following Recipients of the 2015 Best of Braddock Awards:

Citizens of the Year:

Amy Zydell for her selfless devotion of time and talent to foster care children and foster care parents in the Braddock District and all of Fairfax County. She also is a key supporter of "Let's Help Kids," a local charity aimed at giving a helping hand to elementary school children whose parents are suffering financial hardship.

Duwan Ketch for his many years of working with the Kings Park and Burke Centre Libraries. He currently serves on the Executive Board of the Fairfax Library Foundation and heads the Foundation's Scholarship Committee. Mr. Ketch previously has served as a member of the Burke Centre Conservancy Board of Trustees, and he is a member of the Rotary Club of Burke.

Young Person of the Year: Jonathan McCarty—a member of Boy Scout Troop 1115—for his Eagle Scout project. Jonathan led a group of volunteers in completing trail improvements in Accotink Park by digging a ditch next to the trail which will help reduce the amount of standing water on the trail after rainstorms. All of the work was done by hand because it is located in an area of archeological importance.

Most "Can-Do" Public Employee: Dennis Barton of the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) for volunteering to work overtime with Jonathan McCarty to haul away thirteen cubic feet of dirt that was removed when digging a trail ditch. Without his help, the project couldn't have been completed.

Club or Organization Making a Difference in the Braddock District: Friends of Long Branch Stream Valley. Less than a year old, this

group organized itself for the express purpose of improving both environmental and recreational opportunities in the Long Branch Stream Valley, a part of the Accotink Watershed.

Neighborhood Enhancement or Beautification in the Braddock District (2 honorees):

The Commonwealth Swim Club. When declining membership and tight budgets caused the pool board to cut back on grounds maintenance funds, the grounds began to show signs of neglect. James Watkins, a member of the club and a handyman, offered his time and resources to remedy the problems. He repaired the entrance to the pool, restored the primary storm water runoff channel, installed new lighting, and landscaped and beautified the area leading to the clubhouse.

Kings Park West Townhouses HOA. When Marilyn Stoney's property began experiencing flooding, she came to the board with a simple request which led to a community-wide storm water management project. Ms. Stoney volunteered her experience as a program manager to research the problems, develop solutions, solicit bids, oversee the work, and obtain a grant to assist with replanting once construction was completed. A dozen members of the community assisted with the planting.

Special Recognition also is being given to the employees of the Fairfax County Park Authority who worked with the residents of Olde Forge/Surrey Square to build the new community playground.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating these outstanding residents and organizations and also in thanking them for their service to our community. Their efforts and leadership have been a great benefit to the Braddock District and are deserving of our highest praise.

HONORING ALBERT SORANO

HON. ELIOT L. ENGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a community is only as strong as the commitments of its citizens to its success. Albert Sorano has been one of those committed citizens, a true visionary in the city of Yonkers.

Albert was born in the Bronx and became a communicant of St. Bartholomew's Church. A graduate of New York City Schools, Albert served honorably in the United States Military during the War in Vietnam. Following his service, Albert moved to Yonkers where he became one of the most sought after mentors in the city.

Albert dove into serving the Yonkers community by assisting and leading in Career training and Job Placement. He excelled as a major Fundraiser and Event Coordinator for non-profit organizations, including organizing a major fundraising effort to benefit the Ursuline Sisters in New Rochelle. The \$125,000 raised was used to establish an infirmary for ill and disabled retired Sisters has been a Yonkers resident for close to 40 years. In 2004, Albert became a strong member of the Exchange Club of Yonkers, rising to the position of Presi-

dent for three terms from July 2006 to June 2009, and has been on the Board of Directors for many years.

Albert continued using his gifts to rally the community to fundraise for the Child Abuse Prevention Center in White Plains, College Scholarships for Yonkers High School graduates, the Yonkers 5th Grade City Wide Spelling Bee, and the Freedom Shrine installations in schools, libraries and city facilities with recognition of outstanding private citizens.

Albert's greatest commitment however has always been serving the young people in the neighborhood, including those individuals that had been at risk or just released from jail.

This year, the Exchange Club of Yonkers is honoring Albert at the club's annual "Book of Golden Deeds Gala." He is incredibly deserving of this recognition, and I count myself fortunate to represent such a fine individual in the Halls of Congress. Congratulations to Albert for receiving this wonderful award.

COMMEMORATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEDICARE AND MEDICAID

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the 50th Anniversary of the passage of Medicare and Medicaid, two of the most beneficial and consequential government programs ever launched.

On July 30, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Medicare and Medicaid into law as part of the Social Security Act and in the process made good on the commitments made by Presidents Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, Harry Truman, and John Kennedy to provide health security to Americans in their old age.

Medicare is a promise kept to those who have contributed a lifetime to our nation to enjoy their golden years with peace of mind and the security of reliable, affordable, and high quality healthcare.

Likewise, Medicaid created a crucial partnership between the government and the people to provide a basic health care safety net for the most vulnerable Americans: children of adults with low incomes, persons with disabilities, and the poor.

Mr. Speaker, half a century later, the legacy of these programs have proven how effective and critical government action can be to the life and well-being of our nation's most vulnerable.

In 1965, almost half of all Americans aged 65 and older had no health coverage, living in fear that the colossal healthcare costs would drive them and their families into poverty.

Today, because of Medicare, over 98% of seniors have health insurance, which has led to a five-year increase in life expectancy for those over 65.

Today, 55 million Americans rely on Medicare for health care, ranging from preventive services, hospital visits, lab tests, to critical medical supplies, and prescription drugs.

It is difficult for some to imagine what 1965 was really like, when today affordable, accessible and available health insurance is a reality for so many people living with disabilities.

Before Medicaid was enacted children from poor families, pregnant women, and low-income working Americans were not able to afford even the most basic medical care they needed to remain healthy and productive.

When the legislation was first passed, many claimed that Medicaid would not live up to its promise; but today, because of expansion of Medicaid through passage of the Affordable Care Act the program provides comprehensive coverage for over 70 million children, pregnant women, low-income adults, and people living with disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, it cannot be seriously disputed that Medicare and Medicaid have changed our country and made it better.

In my home state of Texas and in communities across the country, both programs have significantly changed the lives and improved health outcomes of many Americans over the past century and represent the best of American values.

Unfortunately, Texas has the highest percentage of uninsured (27.6%) in the nation, 4% more than Louisiana the next state on the list and Texas' refusal to participate in the Medicaid expansion created by the Affordable Care Act puts the poor residents in my state in jeopardy.

So the 50th anniversary of Medicaid is bittersweet for Texans because while we celebrate a program that has saved lives, helped people live longer, expanded care to marginalized communities, and reduced disparities in access to healthcare, thousands of low income Texans still do not have the peace of mind that comes with access to affordable, quality health care enjoyed by low-income residents of states that have expanded their Medicaid program with funds made possible by the Affordable Care Act.

In the 18th Congressional District of Texas there are 195,400 persons with Medicaid and 74,704 with medical care provided by Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents favor the Affordable Care Act because they understand the insecurity and feeling of helplessness of being uninsured or underinsured.

Like Medicare and Medicaid, the Affordable Care Act, or "Obamacare," was vehemently opposed and derided by its adversaries, who said it was too costly, would not work, was unnecessary, or would change the character of America for the worse.

Like the critics of Social Security, Medicare, and the G.I. Bill, all of whom are silent now, they are wrong.

The Affordable Care Act has been an unqualified success.

This historic legislation has extended affordable health coverage to tens of millions of Americans, and has helped to bring peace of mind to many of those for whom relief seemed far out of reach.

The Affordable Care Act was driven by a simple premise: that citizens of the most prosperous nation on earth should not be forced to choose between their health and their financial security.

Since the passage of the ACA in 2010, the number of uninsured Americans has fallen by nearly one-third, or roughly 16 million people.

These Americans come from all walks of life.

They are women, who can no longer be denied coverage or be forced to pay exorbitant amounts for coverage simply because of their sex.

There are nine million seniors and persons with disabilities, who have saved an average of \$1,600 on expensive and lifesaving prescription medication.

And they are this country's most at risk citizens; people who are working hard and struggling to make ends meet while living in near-poverty, and who have been covered by Medicaid expansion in 27 states and the District of Columbia.

These benefits have been felt across the country, especially in my home state of Texas:

1. 10.7 million individuals with pre-existing conditions such as asthma, cancer, or diabetes—including up to 1,632,000 children—no longer have to worry about being denied coverage or charged higher prices because of their health status or history;

2. 4.9 million uninsured Texans have new health insurance options through Medicaid or private health plans in the ACA Marketplace; and

3. 5.2 million persons on private insurance have gained coverage for at least one free preventive health care service such as a mammogram, birth control, or an immunization in 2011 and 2012.

In addition to the tangible healthcare benefits for millions of families, the ACA has had powerful effects on the financial state of our nation.

Since the passage of the Affordable Care Act, we have extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust fund by more than a decade, and helped save taxpayers \$116 billion through new Medicare efficiencies.

The Department of Health and Human Services has estimated that hospitals saved more than \$5.7 billion in costs that would have normally gone unpaid by patients without insurance.

Contrary to the claims of the law's critics, private insurance companies have leaped at the opportunity to compete for business among the newly insured, and the healthcare industry has boomed.

Through all of these successes, however, House Republicans remain obsessed with destroying this law, and with unraveling the security it provides to millions of Americans.

Medicare and Medicaid also continue to drive innovation and set the standard for coverage, quality, and innovation in American healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare and Medicaid continue to play crucial roles in providing equitable and affordable healthcare, leading innovation in payment and delivery reform, carrying out outreach to the most vulnerable communities, and reshaping the delivery of care for the future.

Because of these programs, more Americans have access to affordable, equitable health care today than at any point in our history.

And I am committed to making sure that number will continue to grow.

On this 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid, we should remember that a healthy America is a prosperous America.

And as we look ahead to the next half century, we can celebrate that what was put in place in 1965 has given us the foundation for a healthy and prosperous future for all Americans.

HONORING BRIGADIER GENERAL DAVID T. BUCKALEW

HON. EVAN H. JENKINS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Brigadier General David T. Buckalew of the West Virginia National Guard. General Buckalew has served in the West Virginia Air National Guard for more than 40 years, having enlisted in the Guard's 130th Airlift Wing in Charleston, West Virginia in December 1971. After completing his education at West Virginia State University and the Academy of Military Science, General Buckalew returned to West Virginia in December 1983 to serve as a logistics plans officer for the 130th Airlift Wing.

General Buckalew continued to serve honorably and was promoted regularly, advancing to the position of Director of Joint Staff in 2011. He has received numerous awards and decorations for his service to our country, including the distinguished Meritorious Service Medal with two Bronze Oak Leaf Clusters.

I know the servicemen and women of the West Virginia Air National Guard have been inspired by General Buckalew's character and his commitment to service, and they will miss General Buckalew's presence and tremendous leadership. However, I am certain that the lessons and inspiration that he has bestowed on Guardsmen will continue to have a positive impact on their service to our nation and West Virginia.

General Buckalew is one of West Virginia's finest Mountaineers, and I along with many others wish him well in his retirement. Godspeed, General.

RECOGNIZING THE RETIREMENT OF TAWNY HAMMOND

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of my constituent Tawny Hammond and to congratulate her on her retirement following 26 years of service to Fairfax County and our community.

Ms. Hammond began her career with the county at the Fairfax County Park Authority (FCPA) in 1989 and served in a variety of roles including management of recreation centers, a large lakefront park and a historic farm park. Additionally, she was involved in strategic planning and accreditation, and was instrumental in FCPA being awarded multiple gold medals by the National Recreation and

Park Association. During her tenure, she represented Fairfax County Park Authority at regional, state and national conferences, providing presentations on community building, revenue generation and innovative programming. In recognition of her extraordinary service to preserving and enhancing the county park system, she received numerous performance and achievement awards, most notably the A. Heath Onthank Award in 2002, which is Fairfax County's highest honor for its employees.

Ms. Hammond was named Director of the Fairfax County Animal Shelter in 2012. In just three years, she has turned the shelter into a national model for the humane treatment of animals and has made Fairfax one of the top life-saving communities in the nation. The CEO of the Humane Society of the United States proclaimed the shelter to be one of the top 1% of municipal shelters in the nation. Under Director Hammond's leadership, Fairfax County became the largest jurisdiction in the US with a live release rate of animals above 90%. On her watch, adoptions of shelter pets have nearly doubled, with 2014 seeing the highest number of dogs ever adopted in a single year (more than 1000).

Each year, approximately 5,000 animals come through the shelter's doors. Director Hammond implemented policies and programs so that no animals are euthanized for lack of space or other resources and so that all adoptable animals find loving permanent homes. She implemented new programs including shelter dog play groups and low income spay and neuter services, eliminated breed adoption restrictions, established community cat rooms, and expanded the trap-neuter-return program, which is now the largest of its type in the Commonwealth of Virginia. She grew the volunteer program to 300 active volunteers and 150 foster families, launched the animal shelter Facebook page, which has become the County's most popular Facebook page, and started a partnership with the Fairfax County Park Authority to offer Scout programs, camps, programs and obedience classes in the shelter training room. She did all this while overseeing the total reconstruction of the shelter.

For these accomplishments, she received the 2014 Leadership Award from the Metropolitan D.C. Council of Governments, the 2014 Compassion Award by the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies, and was recently named to the Board of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies. Upon her retirement, she was again awarded the A. Heath Onthank Award—the first person to earn this distinction twice.

Ms. Hammond is also well known for her service to the community outside of her job. She lead "Springfield Days" for more than 20 years, helping it grow to one of the County's largest special events, and served for ten years as president of the Springfield Civic Association where she was credited with making the community group accessible to the disabled and successfully tackling tough neighborhood issues such as boarding houses and hoarding.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Tawny Hammond for a lifetime of service to our community and in congratulating her on her retirement. When I was Chairman

of the County Board, we often joked when retirement announcements like this were made that we should pass an ordinance not allowing such talented and dedicated people to leave public or community service, and I certainly wish that was the case here. I wish Tawny and her family all the best in this next chapter of her life.

IN RECOGNITION OF FIRST AFRICAN BAPTIST CHURCH'S 175TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and pleasure to extend my sincere congratulations to the congregation of First African Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia as the church's membership and leadership celebrate a remarkable 175 years. The congregation of First African Baptist Church will celebrate this very significant anniversary with a Jubilee Celebration on Sunday, August 9, 2015 at the church in Columbus, Georgia.

Tracing its roots back to the antebellum South, African Baptist Church was founded by slaves in 1840 in a building on the corner of Third Avenue and Twelfth Street in Columbus, only blocks away from the Chattahoochee River. This building was the sanctuary formerly used by First Baptist Church, which was established in 1829 as the first church in Columbus.

Though founded by slaves, First African Baptist Church was pastored by white ministers during its first twenty-two years. Possessing a spirit of love and acceptance for all of humankind regardless of skin color that was unique in this time period and in this society, the members of the church opened its doors to all in Columbus who felt the call to worship. By 1858, 731 professed believers had been baptized by the church—390 white and 341 black.

From its inception through 1915, the church relocated three times to accommodate its congregation that swelled with the development of the City of Columbus. The second location was a frame building located at the corner of St. Clair and Front Street, now known as Eleventh and Front. In 1881, the Georgia General Assembly gave the land site located at Eleventh Street and Sixth Avenue to the church, and it was renamed the Six Avenue Baptist Church. This site is now occupied by Golden Foundry and Machine Company.

The current location is on the corner of Fifth Avenue and Ninth Street, where the church was renamed the First African Baptist Church in 1915. Along with the 175th anniversary of the church's existence, today I celebrate with the congregation of First African Baptist the centennial of the church's current location.

Throughout the years, the church would be remodeled and renovated several times. With these aesthetic changes came changes to the church mission. Today, under the leadership of Reverend Roderick B. Green, the church continues to grow and change with the vision of holistic transformation and continual improvement in Christ.

The story of First African Baptist Church, which began as a small group of people worshipping 175 years ago and has grown into an expansive and successful church, is truly an inspiring one of the dedication and perseverance of a faithful congregation of people who put all their love and trust in the Lord.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to First African Baptist Church in Columbus, Georgia for their long history of coming together through the good and difficult times to praise and worship our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

COMMEMORATING 125 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE EAST DUNDEE FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the East Dundee Fire Protection District on their 125th anniversary celebration.

Throughout the year, the community will gather to recognize the heroic firefighters and paramedics who have proudly and faithfully served their community.

In 1890, the department's first year of service, firefighters responded to 25 calls while protecting the residents living in the area. Today, the fire protection district boasts a 2 million dollar budget, responds to over 1,350 calls, and covers over 10,000 residents from the Fox River to the Arboretum in South Barrington.

Throughout their history, the East Dundee Fire Department has seen its ranks swell with family members. Max Freeman, the district's first fire chief, served with his brother Earl in the 1950's and another fire chief, Eugene Rakow, served as chief until 1986, when his son Mark took his place until late 2009.

The thirty men and women of the East Dundee Fire Protection District risk their lives daily to protect the surrounding community. Their bravery and courage are deserving of our recognition and admiration.

Please join me in celebrating this special occasion and the long years of service and commitment that it represents.

DECLARATION FOR ONE UNITED KOREA

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to submit a declaration for one united Korea as established by the organization One Dream One Korea.

On this 70th anniversary of the liberation and the division of Korea, we, the people and friends of Korea, declare that:

Korean unification is inevitable. We are one people in one land who have shared a common history and culture for millennia. Reunification of the Korean Peninsula is a

profound aspiration in the hearts of the Korean people, and a national destiny that supersedes 70 years of separation and all differences of ideology and government systems.

Korean unification is desirable. The suffering of people in North Korea and the continuing anguish of separated families cry out for a concerted response from the civilized world. Nuclear threats destabilize the security of Northeast Asia in particular and the world in general. Meanwhile the people of South Korea seek a pathway to transcend materialism and dysfunctional political divides. Building One Korea offers a fundamental solution to all these problems and will advance peace and prosperity in Northeast Asia to the benefit of the world at large.

Korean unification is now achievable. In the past century Korea endured colonization and then division, at the hands of more powerful nations. Today, for the first time in modern history, Korean people possess the political and economic power to determine their own future, together with growing global support for the establishment of One Korea. We are at a historic crossroads. Set against the enormous challenges of ending the division and creating a new nation, we have an opportunity to achieve a true greatness that history rarely accords to any people. Now is the time to build a national consensus for a shared vision of One Korea on the foundation of Korean identity and a common destiny and to garner international support for it.

The Korean people share one dream: To live in One Korea we can all be proud of. Since time immemorial, the Korean people have longed for a model country; one guided by universal principles, shared moral values, and the rule of law, guaranteeing the basic human rights and freedoms endowed to all people by the Creator, as the foundation for a just and prosperous society. In realizing such a model, One Korea will become a strong, sovereign nation that acts as a peacemaker, committed to resolving conflict in Northeast Asia and the wider world. It will be a 21st century leader as a compassionate, humane nation acting with concern for posterity, and as a responsible steward of the earth.

One Korea will benefit all and threaten none. Korea has never invaded another country in its entire history. The love of peace lies deep in our heritage. Therefore, One Korea will foster new guiding principles for peace in the 21st century through integrating the values of East and West, and soften the sharp edges of global power confrontations. One Korea will offer a powerful example, especially for developing nations, of a traditional society that has advanced by embracing the positive aspects of modernity while seeking to retain the enduring values of the past.

For Korea, those values are expressed in the principle of Hong-Ik Ingan: Living for the benefit of all humanity. Since the very origin of Korea, it has been embedded in the hearts, minds, customs, and traditions of the Korean people. It offers a broad, guiding philosophy for One Korea where "Hong-Ik Democracy" will offer a 21st Century model of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Inspired by this vision of One Korea we, the undersigned, submit the following proposals for adoption and support by ALL:

We encourage initiatives to awaken understanding of the principles that have shaped Korea's distinctive heritage in order to strengthen national and international resolve to bring about One Korea.

We support efforts to start and sustain co-prosperity projects to build infrastructure that allows ordinary people in North Korea to improve their living standards through their own efforts. We advocate people-to-people contact through cultural exchanges, joint service projects and other initiatives that can rebuild connections between Koreans of north and south.

We call on our brethren in North Korea to embrace the program for co-prosperity so that both South and North can cooperate to improve the lives of ordinary people. Let us prosper together, thus building a bridge towards peaceful unification when the people themselves can decide how they wish to govern themselves.

We urge the eight million Korean people living outside of the Korean Peninsula to dedicate themselves to the global movement toward One Korea and call on Korean compatriots abroad to mobilize the substantive support of their adopted lands.

We appeal to the governments and people of all nations, and in particular the United States, the People's Republic of China, Japan, Russia, and Mongolia, to actively cooperate in advancing Korean unification as the key to the joint security and mutual prosperity of all the nations of the Northeast Asia region and the Pacific rim.

We call for multi-national entities, such as the United Nations, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank, the World Health Organization, and international non-governmental organizations, to provide advice and assistance especially during the challenging transitional period to assure the success of One Korea.

Therefore, at this historic juncture, we do solemnly declare that the Korean people shall be, justly and by right, one family, one people, and one nation. We will work together to realize the dream of One Korea, fulfilling, our historical destiny, and establishing a shining example for generations to come.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FAIRFAX COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 75th Anniversary of the Fairfax County Police Department (FCPD) and to thank its officers and staff for their service to our community.

The Department's roots actually date back to the 1920s when a small group of officers was assembled to handle the then perceived growing traffic problems in Fairfax County, which then had a population of about 22,000 people. By 1940, the county population had nearly doubled to 44,000. The need for an independent police force had become clear and a small department comprised of just 6 officers was established.

Today, Fairfax County, with a population of about 1.2 million people, is the safest jurisdiction of its size in the United States. In fact, the total number of serious crimes against people and property committed in the county is actually lower today than it was in 1970 when

FCPD began tracking statistics even though the population has more than doubled since then. Remarkably, FCPD has achieved this level of safety with the lowest officer-to-community-member ratio for a jurisdiction of its size and has lost only six officers in the line of duty in 75 years.

FCPD accomplishes this success through strong relationships with the community, other county agencies, and its counterparts in other jurisdictions. I enjoyed a strong relationship with the department during my 14 years on the Board of Supervisors, particularly during my five years as chairman, and that partnership continues with my service in the U.S. Congress.

Community engagement is a particularly high priority for FCPD. Officers are visible in our schools and mentor our youth. They meet with local business owners and coordinate with neighborhood watch programs. They meet with local minority communities and faith groups to foster better understanding and cooperation. Moreover, the Chief's Council on Diversity Recruitment strives to ensure that the diversity of the force reflects that of the community.

Almost every year since 1995, I have ridden alongside the Chief or another police officer to National Night Out events throughout Fairfax County and it is inspiring to see the depth of community support for our law enforcement officers. This is a tribute to the level of passion and commitment displayed by the Department to their mission and our residents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Fairfax County Police Department on its 75th anniversary and in thanking the men and women of the Fairfax County Police Department who have made Fairfax County the safest jurisdiction of its size in the United States. This accomplishment certainly contributes to the County being rated as one of the best communities in the nation in which to live, work, and raise a family.

HONORING JACKIE BORCHEW

HON. ROBERT J. DOLD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am honored today to recognize Jackie Borchew for her tireless efforts and dedication to Orphans of the Storm, an animal shelter in Riverwoods, Illinois. In her many years of service, she has helped find countless permanent homes for abandoned dogs and cats.

Jackie's years of enthusiastic service to Orphans of the Storm has most assuredly contributed to raising awareness of the shelter and the good work they do to benefit the animal community. Jackie has helped Orphans pursue their mission of saving, caring for and adopting out dogs and cats into loving permanent homes. Through off-site adoption events and other countless volunteer efforts, Jackie has been essential to establishing Orphans as a staple for the animal community throughout the region.

There will most certainly be a hole left behind as Jackie leaves Orphans to embark on

her next endeavor. Although she will be missed, all of her efforts have created a strong foundation for the shelter to continue to place abandoned pets into loving homes. I feel personally privileged to have Jackie as a member of our community, and I look forward to seeing what the next stage of her life brings.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF ANNANDALE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Rotary Club of Annandale and to thank its members for their service to our community.

The world's first service club, the Rotary Club of Chicago was formed February 23, 1905, by Paul P. Harris. The name "Rotary" is derived from the early practice of rotating meetings among members' offices. The Rotary Club concept thrived in its early years, and by 1921 there were chapters on six continents. In 1922, the name "Rotary International" was adopted. The objective of Rotary International is to encourage and foster community service. International understanding, goodwill, and peace are promoted through the shared commitment to service of Rotarians from around the world. Rotary International now boasts more than 1.2 million members in 166 countries, and I am pleased to be counted among their honorary ranks.

Chartered in 1965, the Rotary Club of Annandale is an integral part of the community and engages in numerous public service activities. The Club supports various local community service organizations that provide day care facilities, housing for the homeless, literacy classes, and summer camps for low income families, through financial donations and volunteer work programs. In addition, the Club is very committed to supporting educational programs, including the support of student service organizations at Annandale High School and Northern Virginia Community College's Annandale Campus, scholarships to graduating seniors at Annandale and Woodson high schools and vocational scholarships to students at NVCC. The Club also presents Rotary Medals to the outstanding graduate at each of the elementary, middle, and high schools in the greater Annandale area.

Rotary International is renowned for its worldwide humanitarian projects. The Annandale Rotary Club embraces this philosophy and has sponsored projects in other countries, including efforts to and equip a school in Haiti.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Rotary Club of Annandale on its 50th Anniversary and thanking its members, volunteers, and supporters for putting service above self.

COMMEMORATING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE CARPENTERSVILLE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Carpentersville Fire Department on their centennial anniversary celebration.

On September 19th, the community will gather to recognize the heroic firefighters and paramedics who have proudly and faithfully served the families and businesses of Carpentersville and the surrounding area.

In October of 1914, an ordinance was created by the village of Carpentersville to establish a volunteer fire department and on February 23rd, 1915 the Carpentersville Fire Department assembled for its first meeting in the village hall. A long cry from the one call it received in 1915, the Carpentersville Fire Department responded to 3,518 calls in 2014. However, their mission to protect the quality of life of those they serve has been the same since its founding.

The men and women who comprise the Carpentersville Fire Department risk their lives daily to protect their communities. Their bravery and courage deserve of our recognition.

Please join me in celebrating this special occasion and the long years of service and commitment that it represents.

RECOGNIZING MR. ANTONIO CAMPOS

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I, along with Congressman NUNES and Congressman COSTA, rise today to congratulate Antonio "Tony" Campos for receiving the 2015 Ag One Community Salute.

Mr. Campos was born and raised in Orondritz, Spain. At the age of seventeen, Mr. Campos immigrated to the United States. Although he was originally a shepherd, he began farming vineyards near Caruthers, California in collaboration with his brothers, Esteban and Fermin, four years after arriving in America. In 1971, they began growing almonds and launched Campos Brothers Farms.

Throughout his life, Mr. Campos has been an active leader in the agricultural community and the Central Valley as a whole. He has served on the Almond Board of California, the Raisin Bargaining Association, the Raisin Administrative Committee, the National Farmers Organization, the California Bean Advisory Board, and the Fresno County Farm Bureau. Additionally, Mr. Campos has made a point of supporting charitable organizations throughout our community, such as Ag One, Valley Children's Hospital, Catholic Charities Diocese of Fresno, Basque Cultural Center, Caruthers High School, and Jordan College.

Today, Mr. Campos lives on the farm he established when he first came to America with

his wife, Juliet, and their three children, Jeanne, Joseph, and Steven. Through their dedication, hard work, and commitment to family values, Campos Brothers Farms has grown to be an industry leader in almond production and processing.

On Friday, July 31, 2015, Ag One will honor Mr. Campos as the 2015 Community Salute for his success as a local almond farmer and his commitment to serving his community.

Mr. Speaker, we ask our colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join us in commending Antonio Campos for successfully pursuing the American Dream and congratulating him for being recognized as the 2015 Community Salute.

RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF VIENNA

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50th Anniversary of the Rotary Club of Vienna and to thank its members for their service to our community.

The world's first service club, the Rotary Club of Chicago was formed February 23, 1905, by Paul P. Harris. The name "Rotary" is derived from the early practice of rotating meetings among members' offices. The Rotary Club concept thrived in its early years and by 1921 there were chapters on six continents. In 1922, the name "Rotary International" was adopted. The objective of Rotary International is to encourage and foster community service. International understanding, goodwill, and peace are promoted through the shared commitment to service of Rotarians from around the world. Rotary International now boasts more than 1.2 million members and Clubs exist in 166 countries located on six different continents. And I am pleased to be counted among their honorary ranks.

The Vienna Club was chartered June 30, 1965. Shortly thereafter, the Club sponsored a circus as its very first fundraiser. The event raised \$1,000 towards the construction of the Vienna Community Center. Since then, the Club has engaged in a wide variety of activities that have benefitted the community.

In the early years, the Club offered several different scholarships to local students, provided career counseling, organized CPR training, and engaged in several service projects. Today, the Rotary Club of Vienna is perhaps best known for hosting the annual ViVa Vienna Festival every Memorial Day Weekend. This event attracts thousands of people from throughout the region and is a great source of pride for the Vienna community. Perhaps more importantly, the most recent festival raised approximately \$160,000 that the Club will donate to dozens of organizations locally and throughout the world.

The efforts and effectiveness of the Vienna Rotary Club have been recognized with Rotary International awards for best club, vocational service, literacy programs, international service, membership, best all-round club, best

small club bulletin, community service, and outstanding club.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Rotary Club of Vienna on its 50th Anniversary and thanking its members, volunteers and supporters for putting service above self.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, on July 16 of this year, I was away from the Capitol tending to a matter that required me to be in my home district that day. As a result, I was unable to vote on any legislative measures on the floor that day.

On the amendment of Mr. GARAMENDI of California, Amendment No. 3 to H.R. 2898, Roll Call Vote #443, had I been present I would have voted no.

On the amendment of Mr. LAMALFA of California, Amendment No. 7 to H.R. 2898, Roll Call Vote #444, had I been present I would have voted yes.

On the amendment of Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona, Amendment No. 8 to H.R. 2898, Roll Call Vote #445, had I been present I would have voted no.

On Motion to Recommit with Instructions H.R. 2898, Roll Call Vote #446, had I been present I would have voted no.

On Passage of H.R. 2898, Western Water and American Food Security Act, Roll Call Vote #447, had I been present I would have voted yes.

TRIBUTE TO YOUNG STAFF MEMBERS FOR THEIR CONTRIBUTIONS ON BEHALF OF THE PEOPLE OF THE 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF TEXAS AND THE UNITED STATES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress we know well, perhaps better than most, how blessed our nation is to have in reserve such exceptional young men and women who will go on to become leaders in their local communities, states, and the nation in the areas of business, education, government, philanthropy, the arts and culture, and the military.

We know this because we see them and benefit from their contributions every day. Many of them work for us in our offices as junior staff members, congressional fellows, or interns and they do amazing work for and on behalf of the constituents we are privileged to represent.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is no higher calling than the call to serve a cause larger than ourselves. That is why I ran for public office. I was inspired to serve by President Ken-

nedy who said, "Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country," and by the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. who said:

Everybody can be great because anybody can serve. . . . You only need a heart full of grace. A soul generated by love.

By this measure, there are several other great young men and women who served as volunteers this year in my offices. They may toil in obscurity but their contributions to the constituents we serve are deeply appreciated. That is why today I rise to pay tribute to eight extraordinary young persons for their service to my constituents in the 18th Congressional District of Texas and to the American people. They are:

Christopher Lange from the University of California at Berkeley and the United States Air Force;

Earl King from North Carolina Central School of Law;

BerThaddaeus Bailey from the University of Oklahoma;

Jesse Guadiana from the University of Texas;

Ashley Melero from Texas Tech University; Cassie Gianni from the University of Houston and the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas;

Aisha Yaqoob of the University of Georgia; Aaron Richards of St. John's University; and Asad Moten from Harvard University and the F. Edward Hébert School of Medicine at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.

Mr. Speaker, the energy, intelligence, and idealism these wonderful young people brought to my office and those interning in the offices of my colleagues help keep our democracy vibrant. The insights, skills, and knowledge of the governmental process they gain from their experiences will last a lifetime and prove invaluable to them as they go about making their mark in this world.

Because of persons like them the future of our country is bright and its best days lie ahead. I wish them all well.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful that such thoughtful committed young men and women can be found working in my office, those of my colleagues, and in every community in America. Their good works will keep America great, good, and forever young.

IN RECOGNITION OF ALLYSEN LOVSTUEN, A 2015 PRESIDENTIAL AWARD FOR EXCELLENCE IN MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE TEACHING RECIPIENT

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Allysen Lovstuen, a constituent from Waukon, Iowa and a 2015 recipient of the Presidential Award for Excellence in Mathematics and Science Teaching.

On July 1, 2015, President Obama honored Ms. Lovstuen, a mathematics teacher at Decorah High School in Decorah, Iowa, with

the award for Excellence. Awarded annually on behalf of the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and the National Science Foundation (NSF), this Presidential honor recognizes outstanding teaching contributions in the fields of math and science in K-12 education.

For her contributions to curriculum development and mathematics instruction, Allysen will receive a signed certificate from President Obama, along with a \$10,000 award from the NSF. Additionally, she will travel to Washington, D.C. for an official awards ceremony hosted by the Administration where she will have the opportunity to meet and collaborate with the 107 other award recipients from across the country.

I want to thank Allysen for her commitment to her students at Decorah High School and congratulate her on this honor.

CONGRATULATING THE ROBERT E. SIMON JR. CHILDREN'S CENTER ON THE OCCASION OF ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Robert E. Simon Jr. Children's Center on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary and its relocation to a new facility.

The education and well-being of our children are among the highest priorities that we as a community share. The Robert E. Simon Jr. Children's Center provides a safe, nurturing, instructional atmosphere that promotes creativity, curiosity, independence, and cooperation.

The Simon Center is a nonprofit organization located in the 11th Congressional District in Reston, Virginia, and named after Mr. Robert E. Simon, the founder of Reston. The Center was founded in 1990 as part of the Reston Area Child Care Consortium. The consortium was made up of employers, community residents, parents, educators, and professionals concerned about child care needs in our community. The Simon Center fulfilled Mr. Simon's original vision for providing quality childcare in his master plan for Reston.

Mr. Simon's original plan placed the Center adjacent to an elder care facility to add an "inter-generational" component. That feature was part of the Center's original space as it was connected to a rehabilitation center and a close walk to an assisted-living facility. For 24 years, this arrangement flourished and both the children and the senior citizens in the neighborhood benefitted greatly.

The Simon Center is dedicated to meeting the emotional, social, physical, and intellectual needs of children aged three months to five years in a safe, child-oriented environment. Since 2000, the Center has held an advanced accreditation by the National Academy of Early Childhood Programs, a division of The National Association for the Education of Young Children.

The Simon Center prides itself on helping children grow through the exploration of their

environment and the community. Its caring and highly qualified staff, low teacher turnover, parent-run board of directors, and low children-to-staff nursery ratios create a stable, nurturing environment for our children. The Center provides families greater flexibility with a year-round program and convenient hours with minimal closings.

The benefits of quality early education programs are indisputable. The Center for Public Education has conducted extensive research into both the short term and long term effects of Pre-K educational programs. In every measurable area including kindergarten readiness, high school graduation rates, test scores at various points throughout elementary and high school, average income at age 40, even in home ownership rates, children who had participated in Pre-K programs fared much better than their counterparts who did not.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating the Robert E. Simon, Jr. Children's Center on the occasion of its 25th Anniversary and commending its staff and supporters for their unwavering devotion to our children.

RECOGNIZING MR. ALEX SANCHEZ'S LIFETIME OF SERVICE

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Alex Sanchez, a public servant and long standing friend who most recently retired as Executive Director of the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara. It is my great pleasure to commend Mr. Sanchez for his lifelong commitment and dedication to providing affordable housing opportunities for Californians. The reach of his legacy has gone even further, as he has also tirelessly and very effectively advocated for the development and promotion of national housing policies to serve all Americans in need.

I have had the honor of working with Mr. Sanchez for over a quarter of a century to promote housing policies at the State and federal level to assist lower income households in Silicon Valley. The task has been incredibly daunting, given that we serve the most expensive region in the country.

I first met Mr. Sanchez in 1988, when I was asked to join the American Leadership Forum (ALF) as a representative of the educational sector. ALF/Silicon Valley was just forming and a group of local leaders were asked to serve as Class I, which included nearly 30 individuals representing business and local governments, educational institutions and non-profits.

At the time, I worked for a local school district and also served on a Board of Education for a different school district. Mr. Sanchez had just been named Director of Housing for the City of San Jose. He and I spent many months together and discussed our visions and plans for bettering our community.

One of the most significant moments was to take a two week trip with the ALF group to Colorado Springs, Colorado to discuss the

value of community and the need to work together. During this two-week period, we became very close and ultimately helped each other to climb the 8,000 feet to the top of Pike's Peak.

Mr. Sanchez met his biggest challenge . . . to meet the San Jose Mayor's and City Council's goals to produce thousands of units of affordable housing. Through our time with ALF and the opportunity to work with each other, I was able to witness Alex's selfless and courageous drive to promote policies and design programs to increase the supply of affordable housing.

It has been a great privilege to have shared a friendship and working partnership with Alex Sanchez over the years. I commend him for his 27 years of distinguished service with the City of San Jose Housing Department and the Housing Authority of the County of Santa Clara. Alex has greatly improved the lives of thousands of people and I thank him for his years of dedicated service to Silicon Valley.

His work has been recognized through his leadership positions in a number of national and state housing policy organizations. He is a founder of the California Housing Consortium, and served as a member of the Housing Leadership Council of the Silicon Valley Leadership Group. Most recently, he was appointed by Governor Jerry Brown to Chair the California Housing Partnership Corporation.

Mr. Sanchez's exemplary leadership will be greatly missed. I rise today to wish him my very deepest congratulations for his exceptional level of commitment to public service across various California communities, including the City of Bell Gardens and the City of Santa Ana. I extend him my greatest personal wishes for health and happiness throughout his very well-earned retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, due to illness, I was unable to attend votes from July 20–31, 2015. I would have supported final passage of the following bills:

Roll Call #489 (H.R. 1994: VA Accountability Act of 2015—On Passage)

Roll Call #486 (H.R. 3236: Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015—On Passage)

Roll Call #482 (H.R. 427: Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act of 2015—On Passage)

Roll Call #472 (H.R. 675: Veterans Compensation Cost-of-Living Adjustment Act of 2015—On Passage)

Roll Call #466 (H.R. 3009: Enforce the Law for Sanctuary Cities Act—On Passage)

Roll Call #458 (H.R. 1734: Improving Coal Combustion Residuals Regulation Act of 2015—On Passage)

Roll Call #449 (H.R. 2256: Veterans Information Modernization Act—On Motion to Suspend the Rule and Pass, as Amended)

RECOGNIZING RECIPIENTS OF THE 2015 GREATER RESTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AWARDS FOR CHAMBER EXCELLENCE

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize recipients of the 2015 Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce Awards for Chamber Excellence. The Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce was founded in 1982 as a business roundtable in the growing community of Reston, Virginia. For more than 30 years, the Reston Chamber has facilitated business growth and entrepreneurship through its programming, advocacy, and engagement throughout the region. The Reston Chamber currently has more than 600 member businesses that together employ more than 10,000 people. It is the 6th largest chamber of commerce in the Washington, D.C.-metropolitan region and is deeply embedded in the community.

The Reston Chamber hosts annual events such as Taste of Reston, Oktoberfest Reston, and Best of Reston, and it has received national recognition for its Ethics Day, a workshop for high school students on ethical decision making. Members use the INC.spire Education Foundation and business coaching programs to help create and grow their enterprises. INC.spire has assisted more than four dozen entrepreneurs create 500 jobs and \$45 million of business investment.

Each year, the Chamber recognizes member companies, individuals, and volunteers who have demonstrated excellence, innovation, and exceptional dedication to the Reston community. I am pleased to join the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce in recognizing the following Awards for Chamber Excellence (ACE) recipients:

Committee of the Year: Communications Committee

Small Business of the Year: Visual Impact Productions

Medium Business of the Year: Able Moving and Storage

Large Business of the Year: Odin, Feldman & Pittleman, PC

Member of the Year: Maggie Parker and Comstock Partners LC

New Member of the Year: Jason Butler, JB Printing & Specialty Services

Volunteer of the Year: Janel Giambrone, M&T Bank

President's Award: Cornerstones
Joe Ritchey Pinnacle Award: Matthew Brennan, Brennan & Waite, PLC

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating this year's award recipients and in thanking them for their contributions to the local economy and outstanding service to our community. I also commend the Greater Reston Chamber of Commerce for its role as an invaluable partner to local businesses, nonprofits and schools. The efforts of the Chamber, the member businesses, and volunteers have helped make Reston a truly special place live, work, and raise a family.

ACKNOWLEDGING NATIONAL CLINICAL NURSE SPECIALIST RECOGNITION WEEK

HON. MIKE QUIGLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge National Clinical Nurse Specialist Recognition Week, which is taking place from September 1st through September 7th.

There are over 72,000 clinical nurse specialists in the United States, and they are an integral part of our health care system. Clinical nurse specialists deliver high quality health care by diagnosing, treating, and managing patients. These critical health care providers identify and implement best practices, which reduce health care costs. The expertise of clinical nurse specialists will be crucial as our nation's population continues to age and demand for health care grows.

The National Association of Clinical Nurse Specialists represents this important profession nationally. I would like to congratulate the association on celebrating their 20th anniversary this year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing National Clinical Nurse Specialist Recognition Week, as well as all the clinical nurse specialists in this country who help ensure that we all stay healthy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN C. CARNEY, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, on July 29th 2015, I missed seven recorded votes. I would like to indicate how I would have voted had I been present. On Roll Call No. 483, I would have voted "no." On Roll Call No. 484, I would have voted "no." On Roll Call 485, I would have voted "yes." On Roll Call 486, I would have voted "no."

Although I support full VA funding, I cannot support another short term transportation bill that fails to address the long term transportation funding needs in our country. I was disappointed that the VA funding was tied to this vote. On Roll Call 487, I would have voted "yes." On Roll Call 488, I would have voted "yes." On Roll Call 489, I would have voted "no."

RECOGNIZING THE THIRD ANNUAL GREATER SPRINGFIELD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE "ABOVE AND BEYOND" AWARDS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an outstanding group of first responders and public safety officers who have been

honored with the Third Annual Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce "Above and Beyond" Award.

These awards honor Fairfax County Firefighters, EMTs, Police Officers and Sheriff's Deputies who give back to the Greater Springfield area by providing service to the community outside their normal duties.

In addition to the immeasurable contributions made every day in the line of duty, these men and women have distinguished themselves through their extraordinary efforts in the community, which largely go unseen. They willingly volunteer their personal time, energies, and support to activities for the betterment of our children, our neighborhoods, and our quality of life.

It is my honor to submit the names of the following individuals:

Fairfax County Sheriff 2nd Lt. Kevin Timothy for his efforts on behalf of Leadership Fairfax Inc.'s Emerging Leaders Institute.

Northern Virginia Community College Police Chief Daniel Dusseau for creating the Northern Virginia Community Outreach Officer Working Group, with members from 20 agencies, among other activities.

Fairfax County Police Officer PFC Matthew Dannemann, West Springfield District Police Station, for his volunteer efforts with the Virginia Chapter of the American Rescue Dog Association and the Police Department Supplemental Search and Rescue Team.

Fairfax County Master Police Officer Jason Thompson, Franconia District Police Station, also for his volunteer efforts with the Virginia Chapter of the American Rescue Dog Association and the Police Department Supplemental Search and Rescue Team.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating and thanking each of the brave men and women who go above and beyond the call of duty to serve our community. They are part of the bravest and the finest who collectively ensure that Fairfax County remains one of the nation's safest communities in which to live, work, and raise a family. Moreover, the volunteer service exhibited by these honorees is one of the hallmarks of what has made Fairfax the thriving community it is today, and because of their efforts, that tradition will carry on for future generations.

RECOGNIZING THE PASSING OF ALFRED W. BLUMROSEN

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Alfred W. Blumrosen, Thomas A. Cowan Professor of Law Emeritus, Rutgers School of Law Law School, who died this month, for his pioneering work in the development of the nation's equal opportunity laws and for his frontier role in the shaping of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), which celebrated its 50th year of operation on July 2, 2015.

The nation is fortunate that Professor Blumrosen's dedication to equal rights led him

to choose a brand new field of law, equal employment law, to which to devote his brilliant mind. When Professor Blumrosen was born, in 1928, there were no laws requiring equal treatment in the United States. His legacy is work that was instrumental in laying the groundwork for modern anti-discrimination law.

Professor Blumrosen inspired generations of law students at Rutgers School of Law for almost 50 years. As a public intellectual, his steady stream of publications in discrimination and labor law, were matched by his work on the ground helping to put new anti-discrimination laws in action. Blumrosen's work in both these worlds was cited just last month in a dissent in a housing discrimination case, Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs v. Inclusive Communities Project, by Justice Clarence Thomas, who gave Professor Blumrosen credit for the development of disparate-impact theory, the most powerful tool used in equal opportunity legal work.

"Alfred Blumrosen, one of the principal creators of disparate-impact liability at EEOC, rejected what he described as a 'defeatist view of Title VII' that saw the statute as a 'compromise' with a limited scope. A. Blumrosen, Black Employment and the Law 57-58 (1971). Blumrosen 'felt that most of the problems confronting the EEOC could be solved by creative interpretation of Title VII which would be upheld by the courts, partly out of deference to the administrators. . . . EEOC's guidelines from those years are a case study in Blumrosen's 'creative interpretation.' Although EEOC lacked substantive rulemaking authority it repeatedly issued guidelines on the subject of disparate impact.' . . . EEOC's strategy paid off. The Court embraced EEOC's theory of disparate impact, concluding that the agency's position was 'entitled to great deference.' See Griggs 401 U.S., at 433-434.

Professor Blumrosen began his leadership in developing anti-discrimination law and the EEOC itself as soon as Title VII, the employment equal rights section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, was enacted. He was the EEOC's first chief of conciliations, where early Title VII law was often made by securing negotiated agreements with employers. He was director of federal-state relations, guiding state and local anti-discrimination agencies in applying this burgeoning new area of law. Although Blumrosen's work in anti-discrimination law was particularly prominent at the EEOC, his work with other agencies was also important, particularly with the Office of Federal Contract Compliance, including his research with that agency to show that so-called reverse discrimination was uncommon in affirmative action cases. He served as special attorney in the Civil Rights Division of U.S. Department of Justice. Blumrosen was always generous in lending his brilliant mind to develop equal employment law—as counsel to Kaye, Scholer, Fierman, Hays and Handler, a New York law firm, and as counsel to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, among others.

Mr. Speaker, when I chaired the EEOC, Professor Blumrosen was a principal advisor on much of my most important work. He was particularly instrumental in helping us develop

our guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures as well as our affirmative action guidelines to motivate employers to correct discriminatory patterns before they led to liability. Al was on the front lines with me in the total reorganization of EEOC operations nationwide to eliminate its huge backlog while significantly increasing remedies for complainants using negotiated agreements.

Notwithstanding his groundbreaking law development work in the public sector, Professor Blumrosen remained a prolific scholar, whose efforts in the field often informed his scholarship. For his essay "Six Conditions for Meaningful Self-Regulation", he received the Ross Prize from the American Bar Association.

I was fortunate to write the introduction to one of his books, coauthored by his late wife, the late Ruth Gerber Blumrosen, *Slave Nation: How Slavery United the Colonies and Sparked the American Revolution*. Ruth Blumrosen, a professor of business and an adjunct professor of law at Rutgers, often collaborated with her husband. Together, they were a formidable team of scholars. Not surprisingly, their work in the law also infected their two sons, Steven and Alexander, who are both attorneys and legal scholars.

Mr. Speaker, Alfred Blumrosen spent his professional life as a leader on the development of equal opportunity law and in bringing equality to the workplace. It is rare that a lawyer or a professor has been able to be so influential simultaneously in law development and in implementation of one of the nation's most important laws.

Alfred Blumrosen was fortunate to live to see the 50th anniversary of Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and the 50th anniversary of the opening of the EEOC itself just this past July 2. A fair share of both of these commemorations belongs to Professor Blumrosen.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in honoring Alfred K. Blumrosen for a lifetime of productive trailblazing work that was instrumental in the creation of equal opportunity law, in the invention of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and in sparking scholarship in a new field of American law.

CELEBRATING THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF SING TAO DAILY

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Sing Tao Daily. On August 1, 2015, Sing Tao Daily will celebrate its 40th anniversary in San Francisco, California. Since 1975, Sing Tao Daily's Western Edition has covered local, state, and international news for Chinese American communities in the Silicon Valley, Seattle, Portland, and Hawaii. The organization is a leading content and service provider for global Chinese communities.

Headquartered in Hong Kong, Sing Tao Daily was the first Chinese language newspaper to publish overseas. The San Francisco Edition was the company's first global expansion and ranks as the highest paid circulation

publication among Chinese language newspapers outside of China. Sing Tao Daily has been instrumental in helping Chinese immigrants adapt to their new country. Dedicated to journalistic integrity and recognized for its quality pieces, Sing Tao Daily has presented balanced reports and earned national awards from New American Media and local media organizations. As one of the world's most widely read Chinese newspapers, Sing Tao Daily has earned distinction as a global name in the print media market.

During its lifetime, the multimedia news group has served 625,000 Chinese Americans in the San Francisco Bay Area. Mr. Speaker, I commend Sing Tao Daily for its service and dedication to providing quality media, which have deeply enriched our Chinese communities.

RECOGNIZING 34 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT BY JOHN STREUFERT

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of my constituent, Mr. John Streufert. Mr. Streufert retired from his position as Director of the Federal Network Resilience Branch (FNR) of the Department of Homeland Security, Office of Cybersecurity and Communications May 31, 2015, following 34 years of exemplary federal service.

Since Mr. Streufert began his service to our country, he has held an assortment of positions with various agencies including the Navy Sea Systems Command, the Department of Agriculture, and the U.S. Agency for International Development. While serving as the special assistant for Signals Intelligence and Information Operations, Naval Network Warfare Command, he led the Navy's expansion of its operational role in cyberspace. Mr. Streufert also served with the State Department where he served as Chief Information Security Officer before transferring to DHS and assuming the position of Director of the FNR, which he held for more than three years.

Mr. Streufert is well known in government and industry as the "brains and energy" behind the government's move to secure and continuously monitor the federal information technology network, which was a revolutionary approach he developed while with USAID and State. Upon joining DHS, he cultivated this approach into a strategy for government-wide cybersecurity acquisitions that leveraged the advantages of volume purchasing and thereby reducing taxpayer cost. This program, now known as Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM), enhances the cybersecurity of networks and systems across the government by enabling vulnerabilities to be identified and mitigated more quickly.

In addition to being an innovative technologist and industry trailblazer, Mr. Streufert is known for being a true leader and mentor. His empowerment and mentorship of his fed-

eral colleagues and staff will serve as his legacy as those employees become the next generation of our nation's leaders, due largely to his example and guidance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Mr. John Streufert on his retirement and in thanking him for his 34 years of distinguished service to the people of the United States of America. His accomplishments, innovation, and leadership have contributed greatly to our nation and are worthy of our highest praise.

COMMEMORATING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE LAKEWOOD FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize the Lakewood Fire Department for 100 years of loyal service to the community.

Throughout the year, the City of Lakewood will recognize the heroic firefighters and paramedics who have proudly and faithfully served the families and businesses in their community.

Fire Chief Ralph Webster and the men and women of Lakewood Fire Department reflect the pride and tradition of excellence that exists throughout the fire protection community. They risk their lives in service to the community and their bravery and courage deserve our recognition.

Please join me in celebrating this special occasion and the long years of service and commitment that it represents.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably missed votes on July 27–28, 2015. Had I been present I would have voted "yes" on roll call vote 467, "yes" on roll call vote 468, "yes" on roll call vote 469, "no" on roll call vote 470, "no" on roll call vote 471, "yes" on roll call vote 472, "no" on roll call vote 473, "no" on roll call vote 474, "yes" on roll call vote 475, "yes" on roll call vote 476, "yes" on roll call vote 477, "yes" on roll call vote 478, "yes" on roll call vote 479, "yes" on roll call vote 480, "yes" on roll call vote 481, and "no" on roll call vote 482.

TRIBUTE TO ANNA TERESA NARVÁEZ BOU

HON. NYDIA M. VELÁZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of Anna Teresa Narváez Bou in

celebration of her 100th birthday. She was born in Corozal, Puerto Rico on July 26, 1915. She married Ramon Narváez Ferrer and had two children, Ramond Luis Narváez Bou and Carmen Lourdes Narváez Bou.

Doña Teresa, as she is affectionately known, came to New York in 1952 during the great migration from Puerto Rico to the States. The Great Depression of the 1930s and the impact of World War II in the 1940s on the island doubly effected poverty and the prospect of employment for many Puerto Ricans. This combined with the launch of commercial air travel influenced her and her family to come to New York. She settled at 25 McKibbin Street in Williamsburg, Brooklyn. A few years later they were displaced due to the city's urban renewal development project in the area. Housing discrimination patterns and the language barrier resulted in further displacement for the family in the years that followed.

In spite of the challenges faced by living in a new city and learning a new language and culture, Doña Teresa persevered. She earned her living working at a factory and lived her life, then and now, selflessly with honor and pride. She raised her children and instilled the values of integrity, fairness, service, faith and community. Her determination motivated her to triumph during difficult times. Her experiences compelled her to advocate for safe, decent and affordable housing for the growing Puerto Rican community in Williamsburg, Brooklyn.

Today, Doña Teresa continues to exemplify a love for her family and friends. She is proud of her children and grandchildren who embody a life of service whether in the community or serving the nation. Her sense of humor, generosity, and perseverance has served her well for 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, it is women like Doña Teresa that embody the heart of our great nation as

well as the spirit of the proud Puerto Rican woman and mother who dreamed of a better life for her family and community.

Therefore, I join with the residents of the entire 7th Congressional District of New York in wishing Anna Teresa Narváez-Bou a very happy 100th birthday.

HONORING THE 2015 LITERACY
COUNCIL OF NORTHERN VIR-
GINIA AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 31, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the recipients of the 2015 Literacy Council of Northern Virginia Community Partner Awards and Volunteer of the Year Awards. Founded in 1962, the Literacy Council of Northern Virginia (LCNV) is a non-profit educational organization that recruits and trains volunteers to teach adults who need help reading, writing, speaking, and understanding the English language.

The mission of LCNV is to empower adults by providing a wide range of programs that teach the basic literacy skills needed in order to become self-sufficient and full participants in society. These programs include Basic Adult Literacy Tutoring, which works with adults who speak and understand English but are beginning readers and writers, and ESOL tutoring programs that teach reading, writing, listening comprehension, and speaking to those in our community for whom English is not their native language. In addition, LCNV offers two classroom programs: The ESOL Learning Center program, which serves low-income immigrant adults and teaches life skills

important in the work place and community, and Family Learning Programs, which teach English proficiency to parents while their children participate in separate literacy-related activities.

Over more than 50 years, thousands of people and families have gained new knowledge through LCNV programs. This would not have been possible without the dedication and commitment of the many volunteers and community partners. It is my great honor to recognize the following recipients of the 2015 Literacy Council of Northern Virginia Awards:

Community Partner Awards: Capital One; The Phillip L. Graham Fund; Region 8 Adult Education Programs

Student Essay Readers: Lorena Lemus De Hernandez; Nansy Peta; Blanca Soliz

Volunteers of the Year: Lynn Gallagher; Sandra Thomas; Chris Wollenberg

Mid Allen Ries Award: Xavier Muñoz

This year, LCNV learners were invited to submit writings around the theme for this year's Annual Recognition Event: "My Hopes and Dreams." Learners worked with tutors, teachers, and classmates to formulate ideas, construct drafts, edit, and polish their writing in order to create final products that were published in LCNV's annual report. I commend each of the learners who submitted a piece and congratulate them on the incredible progress that they have made.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in recognizing the contributions of the Literacy Council of Northern Virginia and in congratulating each of the 2015 Award Recipients. Their dedication, hard work, and commitment improves the quality of life for the students, as well as the community, by providing program participants with the life skills that are necessary to become active and productive members of society.

SENATE—Monday, August 3, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Lord God omnipotent, Your power and love sustain us. Rule the wills of our lawmakers by Your might as You use them to do Your work on Earth. Lord, give our Senators faith to look beyond today's challenges and trials, finding in You the source of their optimism and confidence. May their confidence in the unfolding of Your loving providence lighten every task, providing them with reasons to rejoice. Give them the gift of perseverance, enabling them to refuse to become weary in doing Your will. When they fall, help them always to rise again.

Lord, thank You for providing us with faith to look beyond today's vicissitudes, always knowing that nothing can separate us from Your love.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATIONS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, in just a few minutes, President Obama will deliver another blow to the economy and to the middle class. He will unveil regressive regulations that are set to harm struggling workers and families. They are projected to cost literally billions. They threaten to ship good middle-class jobs overseas and will likely make it harder to maintain reliable sources of energy to meet demand. They will also likely result in higher energy bills for those who can

least afford them, potentially raising electricity rates by double digits for people I represent.

All of this, and for what? Not only will these massive regulations fail to meaningfully affect the global climate, but they could actually end up harming the environment by outsourcing the energy production to countries with poorer environmental records like India and China.

They may also be illegal. That is why I wrote the Governors earlier this year, suggesting they take a responsible wait-and-see approach and allow the courts to weigh in before subjecting their citizens to such unnecessary pain.

The Supreme Court's rebuke to the White House in June on another environmental regulation underlines the wisdom of this approach. Even though that mercury regulation was ultimately tossed out, most of its damage had already been done. It reminded Governors that it would be reckless not to take a wait-and-see approach this time.

Now, several Governors have already decided they will not allow the administration to rush them into adopting these regulations, and I expect more to follow. I was recently able to place language in the Senate Interior appropriations bill that would prohibit the administration from arbitrarily imposing its will on States that take this responsible approach.

Senator CAPITO also has a bill that would prohibit the regulations from moving forward until the courts have ruled on their legality. These aren't the only legislative options Congress can consider. We can pursue other avenues like CRA resolutions and further appropriations riders as these regulations are published and as they wind their way through the courts.

Here is the bottom line about today's announcement. If the Obama administration were actually serious about advancing renewable energy, then it would follow the example of what leaders like Senator MURKOWSKI have been achieving in the Energy Committee. She is showing how we can make big strides on energy diversification and that we can do it in a bipartisan way and that we don't have to punish the middle class to do it.

This White House seems to want good politics, not good policy. Officials in this administration have said they want to make electricity rates skyrocket, and they want to make examples out of people who get in the way. They are tired of having to work with the Congress the people elected. That is why the administration is now try-

ing to impose these deeply regressive regulations—regulations that may be illegal, won't meaningfully impact the global environment, and will likely harm middle and lower class Americans the most—by executive fiat. It represents a triumph of blind ideology over sound policy and honest compassion.

In Kentucky, these regulations would likely mean fewer jobs, shuttered powerplants, and higher electricity costs for families and businesses. I am not going to sit by while the White House takes aim at the lifeblood of our State's economy. I am going to keep doing everything I can to fight them.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the revelations we have seen from Planned Parenthood are deeply disturbing. They raise fundamental questions about what kind of society we want to be, so I want to thank Senators ERNST, PAUL, LANKFORD, and a number of others, for accepting my invitation to lead the effort on the Senate's response.

The legislation they worked to develop is all about restoring America's commitment to care and to compassion. It would fund women's health, not Planned Parenthood, and we will take a vote to advance it tonight. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would protect Federal funding for health services for women. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would ensure funds continue to flow to community health centers and hospitals that provide more comprehensive health services and may have many more facilities nationwide. Instead of subsidizing a political group, this bill would help women receive health services, such as screenings, prenatal and post-natal care, well-child care, diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, immunizations, and other care they need. That is a true commitment to women's health. That is real compassion.

I know Democrats have relied on Planned Parenthood as an ally recently, but they must be moved by the horrifying images we have all seen. They must be shocked by the utter lack of compassion that has been on display. They must care about women's health as much as they care about some scandal-plagued political organization. That is why tonight I am asking them to truly reflect on what is important. I am asking them not to block this funding for women's health just to protect some political group mired in scandal. Women deserve better, and our country deserves better.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. REID. Mr. President, here is an excerpt from an article in the Republican leader's hometown newspaper, the Louisville Courier-Journal:

Sara Hall started going to Planned Parenthood when she was in her late teens and needed birth control, and she's gotten care there ever since.

Without them, "I wouldn't have a doctor to see. I don't know where I would have gone. It would have meant I wouldn't get the care I needed."

Like Sara, millions of American women depend on Planned Parenthood for much needed health services. Every year, Planned Parenthood helps women, just like Sara, get the important services they need, such as birth control measures, but it is more than just birth control.

Here are a few of the health services Planned Parenthood provides to American women, and they did it, for example, in 2013. Half a million women went to Planned Parenthood for breast cancer screening, 400,000 women received a cervical exam from Planned Parenthood's medical staff, and 4.5 million treatments and tests for sexually transmitted diseases and infections were performed. Yet, here we are once again, faced with another Republican attempt to limit women's access to health care.

A few hours from now, the Senate will vote on a Republican bill to defund Planned Parenthood. Let's understand what that vote means. Defunding Planned Parenthood would limit American women's access to critical health services, such as contraception, breast and cancer screenings, and well-women visits. This legislation is just another Republican attack on the health care of millions of women, like Sara from Kentucky.

Over the past few months, Republicans have worked to trick American women into believing Republicans don't want to limit women's access to contraceptives or other critical health services provided by Planned Parenthood, but votes like the one we are going to take in a couple of hours lay bare the truth. The cold, hard fact is that a vote to defund Planned Parenthood is a vote to limit women's access to cancer screenings, contraceptives, and other important services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Our Nation is already facing a shortage of primary care providers. For many women, Planned Parenthood is their preferred medical provider. One in five American women will go to Planned Parenthood for services at some time during their lives. Defunding Planned Parenthood and reduc-

ing the number of providers available for women to receive contraceptives and other critical health services would reduce women's access to good health, and more importantly, their access to care, which is very direct and to the point.

To put it another way, the demand for care would still exist, but there would be fewer providers to render this care. And for many women, Planned Parenthood may be the only provider where they can seek medical help. Republicans are trying to eliminate their access to health centers.

Last Thursday, I listened to the senior Senator from Texas, where he claimed this bill we are going to vote on soon would actually increase access to care for women. I am surprised this distinguished Member of the Senate, a longtime member of the Texas Supreme Court, would say something like that.

He and other Republicans believe, I guess, that clinics like community health centers will pick up the slack should Planned Parenthood be defunded. That is simply not true. I am a strong supporter of community health centers. It is part of ObamaCare, the Affordable Care Act, because I believe in community health centers. We put billions of dollars in that bill, and during the years it has been in existence, it has done so much to provide help for community health centers, but we still have far, far much to do. There are not enough community health centers, even with what we have done, to increase their ability to meet the current demand. To throw in a few more women who have been knocked out of Planned Parenthood—and "a few" is a pejorative term; it would be millions of women—is wrong.

The director of women's health policy at the Kaiser Family Foundation says: "Across the nation, Community health centers are already at capacity."

Take a look, for example, at the assistant Republican leader's home State of Texas. A recent report from George Washington University detailed what it would take for other providers to replace Planned Parenthood—exactly what the senior Senator from Texas has suggested.

For example, in Midland County, TX, there would have to be an increase of 537 percent by non-Planned Parenthood clinics, if Planned Parenthood is defunded. Lubbock County would see an increase of 250 percent. Community health centers cannot handle that, nor can they handle that increase in heavily populated Dallas County, where it would be an almost 200-percent increase.

What the Republican legislation does is makes it nearly impossible for women who need medical attention to get the care they need. If women cannot go get health care from Planned Parenthood, where do they go?

Take a look at what happened in the State of Indiana in 2011, when that State's legislature voted to deny State funding for Planned Parenthood health centers. Republicans then argued that other health care providers would bridge the gap and absorb Planned Parenthood patients. They asserted that other providers would take care of those women just fine.

So what are those other health care providers for women that the Indiana Republicans said could take the place of the State's Planned Parenthood health centers? Prisons—listen to this—prisons, they suggested, juvenile detention centers, and homeless shelters. These are certainly not the kinds of places my Republican colleagues would want to send their daughters, sisters or wives for care.

It is common sense—if you take away Planned Parenthood health centers, women will have no ability to access care, and most will go without the care they need.

The Republican senior Senator from Maine agrees. Here is what she said:

The problem is, in my state and many others, Planned Parenthood is the primary provider of women's health services in certain parts of my state. So I don't know how you would ensure that all of the patients of Planned Parenthood could be absorbed by alternative care providers.

In Nevada, Planned Parenthood centers there serve about 22,000 patients a year. Where will these patients go if the Republicans' legislation passes? I do not know. They will not get the care they need, that is for sure.

Senate Republicans are not being fair to American women. They are trying to shift the responsibility to someone who does not exist.

It is our responsibility in the Senate to ensure that American women have access to care. It is our obligation to protect our wives, our sisters, our daughters, and our granddaughters from the absurd policies of a Republican Party that has lost its moral compass. Today, Senate Democrats will do just that. This Planned Parenthood bill is not going anywhere in the Senate. Senate Democrats will fight this vigorously and any other attempt from Republicans to deprive American women health care.

Mr. President, I do not see anyone here to speak. I would ask the Chair to announce the business of the day.

PROHIBITING FEDERAL FUNDING OF PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 1881, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 169, S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to discuss Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

Every now and then we see something that is so horrific that we must answer it. And by now, we are all familiar with the deeply disturbing videos of Planned Parenthood doctors cavalierly discussing their practice and methods of harvesting baby body parts.

Like so many Nebraskans, I am shocked by the lack of compassion for these women and their unborn babies.

My colleague and friend from Iowa, Senator JONI ERNST, has introduced legislation that takes immediate action and cuts off funding for this scandal-plagued organization. I am proud to join her in sponsoring this very important legislation.

This bill has nothing to do with whether one is pro-life or pro-choice. It is not going to settle the issue of abortion, which has divided our country for over 40 years. This bill simply says that taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations mired in scandal and likely illegal activity. This has nothing to do with ideology. It has nothing to do with religious conviction. This is about the responsible and conscientious use of Federal tax dollars.

Elected officials have a responsibility to be wise stewards of public funding. I believe it is irresponsible to continue to support funding for a group that has lost the public's trust and engages in violations of Federal law.

I believe it is important to note that Federal law clearly prohibits abortion providers from the intentional manipulation of the bodies of unborn children for the purposes of obtaining body parts. Section 498A of title 42 of the U.S. Code clearly states:

In research carried out under subsection (a) of this section, human fetal tissue may be used only if the attending physician with respect to obtaining the tissue from the woman involved makes a statement, made in writing and signed by the physician, declaring that—No alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.

A video released on July 21, 2015, details a Planned Parenthood doctor discussing using a “less crunchy” abortion technique to get more whole specimens. Let me repeat the law: A doctor must certify that “no alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to

terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue.”

Senators can reach their own conclusions.

I think the truth is pretty self-evident, and I believe the law and these videos speak for themselves.

I wish to address another important point. This legislation is not an attack on women's health. To the contrary, as a mother and a grandmother, I am steadfastly committed to ensuring that all women have access to high-quality medical care. The legislation I intend to support today redirects funds to local health departments, hospitals, and community health centers.

Our focus should be on supporting organizations that prioritize women's health, not organizations hiring pricey PR firms for damage control.

Across the country there are 1,200 Federally qualified health centers and 9,000 clinic sites. These community health centers vastly outnumber the roughly 700 Planned Parenthood facilities nationwide. In Nebraska, we have 6 health centers and 36 clinic sites that have served over 64,000 people. These centers serve all of Nebraska—from the panhandle to our metropolitan areas in Omaha and Lincoln. Fifty-two percent of those patients are uninsured and 30 percent are on Medicaid. Meanwhile, there are only two Planned Parenthood centers in Nebraska.

So it begs the question: Wouldn't patients be better served if that money was redirected to community health centers? I believe the answer is yes. These health centers deliver many—and sometimes more—of the health services provided by Planned Parenthood. In 2012 alone, federally qualified health centers performed 400,000 mammograms and over 2 million cervical cancer screenings.

These health centers are better able to respond to the needs of these women because they are closer to the communities they serve. They are indispensable in providing preventive health services and preventive screenings to the uninsured and our medically underserved populations.

In conclusion, I believe elected officials have a basic duty to stop sending tax dollars to an organization mired in scandal and likely illicit activity.

It is time for us to come together and support truly compassionate care for women and their unborn children. It is time to cut funding for Planned Parenthood and to use that money for its original intent, which is providing resources and care for women's health.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I rise today to speak on an issue that has shaken the moral compass of our society. The phrase “it's a boy” is one we often use when celebrating new life. Instead, this was spoken by a Planned Parenthood employee as the body of an unborn baby boy was picked apart and harvested for organs, such as a liver, kidneys, and heart. We have watched as other Planned Parenthood employees talked about “less crunchy” techniques to preserve baby organs for buyers and grumbled about a “war torn” unborn baby before being sold for parts.

While it would be easier to ignore these videos, today we are standing up and shining a light on what is really happening. This is human life, and Planned Parenthood—the Nation's single largest provider of abortion services—is harvesting baby body parts. The American people are shocked and horrified by the utter lack of compassion and disregard shown by Planned Parenthood for these women and their babies. This gruesome footage resonates with our collective conscience and goes against the very principles we stand for.

As a mother and grandmother, I believe the gravity of Planned Parenthood's callous and morally reprehensible behavior cannot be ignored. I am committed to defending life because protecting the most vulnerable is an important measure of any society.

I am proud to stand before you today with 45 cosponsors and offer legislation that will defund Planned Parenthood while safeguarding funding for women's health services. This legislation prohibits Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, protects Federal funding for women's health services, such as prenatal and post-partum care, cervical and breast cancer screenings, diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, and guarantees there will be no reduction in overall Federal funding available to support women's health.

This legislation redirects Federal funding taken from Planned Parenthood to other eligible entities that provide health services for women, such as community health centers and hospitals. There would be absolutely no reduction in overall Federal funding available to support women's health. Community health centers provide more comprehensive primary and preventive health care services—except abortion—regardless of a person's ability to pay. Meanwhile, Planned Parenthood facilities do not perform in-house mammograms.

The American taxpayers should not be asked to fund an organization such as Planned Parenthood that has shown a sheer disdain for human dignity and complete disregard for women and their babies. These videos are hard for

anyone to defend and pull back the curtain on Planned Parenthood's careless practice of rummaging for unborn baby organs to be harvested and sold at a price.

I leave you with this one question: Who do we want to be as a nation? Before us today is an opportunity to vote for legislation that will protect the most vulnerable and women's health.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, even in the greatest deliberative body in this Nation and likely the world, there are moments of profound sadness and regret, and this moment is one for me. I am deeply dismayed that the Republican leadership is engaging in an effort—an effort doomed to fail in just a couple of hours—to defund probably the most trusted provider of health care for women in the United States of America.

It is misguided because there are so many significant issues that should be front and center for this body: making sure that we invest in our roads and bridges, making sure that we improve our education system, making sure that we keep faith with our veterans. So many of them are going nowhere because of this partisan paralysis and gridlock. Dismayingly to the American people, that has prevented real action. I regret that we are, in effect, distracted from those goals and those missions that the American people expect us to fulfill.

Once again, many of my colleagues across the aisle have aligned themselves with the most extreme of the anti-choice movement to undermine access to critical health care services for women—for millions of women in this country and thousands in Connecticut who depend on Planned Parenthood for basic health care screenings, cancer diagnosis, family planning, and contraception services, which distinguish it as one of the most trusted health care providers in the United States.

It is the Republican leadership—not just a few Senators but the Republican leadership—that has set up this vote to defund Planned Parenthood. So instead of the Senate moving forward to provide additional health care services to women, it has engaged in this onslaught and assault on women's health care, taking a step back with legislation that is really—let me say bluntly—a political charade, a stunt, a bill

or legislative measure that will go nowhere and is as much a sham for the supporters as it is for opponents. The fact is Planned Parenthood provides health care services to women across this country. Only 3 percent of its activity relates to abortion. So 97 percent of what it does is to provide screenings, diagnosis, and family planning. If this measure goes through, millions of women will be undiagnosed with cervical and breast cancer, millions of women will be denied access to contraception and family planning, and millions of young women will be denied the kind of education they need to prevent pregnancy.

It is in preventing pregnancy that so often Planned Parenthood is engaged, and to make it safe, legal, and rare. Eliminating \$528 million from the largest women's health care provider in the country would create a public health crisis. Pure and simple, a public health crisis would be the inevitable consequence of this measure to defund Planned Parenthood. Of the 2.7 million women Planned Parenthood serves every year, 78 percent are low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood for breast cancer screening, testing for sexually transmitted infections, hepatitis B vaccines, family planning counseling, education on how to recognize and leave abusive relationships, domestic violence, referrals to other medical specialists, and many other essential services that would be unaffordable and inaccessible without Planned Parenthood.

Over half of Planned Parenthood's clinics serve women in medically underserved areas or in health provider shortage areas. So 13 of Connecticut's 17 women's health centers serve women in rural or medically underserved parts of my State. Defunding Planned Parenthood would mean 64,000 of my constituents could lose access to quality health services.

Because there is no network of health care providers with the capacity to serve this population if Planned Parenthood is denied funding, millions of women—particularly Medicaid recipients—would lose access to quality health services, and the result would be a public health crisis. That is the stark reality of these numbers and statistics. Dry and abstract as they are, they stand for real-life consequences—real women whose lives will be inevitably transformed for the worse if this measure were to pass.

Beyond the din of this place that so often consumes us—the confusion and the noise—there are real people whose lives will be affected by these kinds of measures and whose lives are affected even by the effort to defund Planned Parenthood because of the uncertainty and doubt that it creates.

These real people are women such as Elizabeth A., who said:

When I didn't have health insurance 3 years ago, I went to Planned Parenthood

where I had access to safe, affordable, reproductive health care. I still go there for my health needs! I was able to get STD testing and birth control when I couldn't afford it anywhere else.

Rachel S. of Naugatuck, CT:

Birth control helped my husband and me put off having a family until we were financially ready to care for a child. The effects of pregnancy, both physically and financially, mean that free or low-cost birth control is an important factor in a successful future for both the woman and her family.

And Nicole B. of West Haven, CT:

I come to Planned Parenthood because it is a safe place to get birth control and exams. Everyone is helpful and non-judgmental. The city needs a place like this and many women benefit from Planned Parenthood services.

These stories are from real people whose lives we in the Senate are supposed to care about. I care about them because I know so many women whose lives have been affected by Planned Parenthood. I know so many of the staff and dedicated professionals who work at Planned Parenthood clinics.

One spoke to me on Saturday afternoon—one of the low points last week during the controversy that has enveloped Planned Parenthood—about how she was inspired and revived by simply passing by a room where one of the counselors was talking to a group of young people, both men and women, about the education that was important to them as far as preventing unwanted pregnancy and how seeing Planned Parenthood at work in that setting—the real work of providing health care and education—inspired her to keep going despite those difficulties.

The fact is that over and over my constituents, the people of Connecticut, have told me they choose Planned Parenthood because of the professionalism, dedication, and non-judgmental approach to their patients. Many view Planned Parenthood as a safe space to come when they need advice, when they need medical examinations.

If Republicans succeed in defunding it, women will be without their most trusted health care provider. So many of them are relying on it because it is trustworthy, professional, and dedicated to them—first and foremost to them.

Today I stand with Planned Parenthood and the thousands and thousands of women in Connecticut and around the country who benefited from their services. I will vehemently oppose these efforts to allow a secretive and dishonest group to discredit and to dismay so many. They have manipulated the facts, put employees and volunteers in danger, and have eliminated the organization's ability to provide essential services. But the important point is that we resist this effort today to defund an organization that has provided so many services to so many people in need and has enabled this Nation

to avert a public health crisis that will ensue if we follow this misguided effort, and that we follow our better instincts and make sure that we keep the faith with women who need health care in this Nation.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, William Wilberforce is a man whom I have, over the years, looked to as a role model and an example of what public service should be and what public servants should be.

Wilberforce served as a Member of the British Parliament from 1784 to 1812. After an early career marked by what he described as doing nothing of purpose, Wilberforce then went through a transformational period of self-reflection. He emerged with a deepened faith, greater moral courage, and an unshakeable passion for ending the slave trade. He said:

So enormous, so dreadful, so irremediable did the [slave] trade's wickedness appear that my own mind was completely made up for abolition. Let the consequences be what they would: I from this time determined that I would never rest until I had effected its abolition.

It took Wilberforce 20 years of blood, sweat, tears, and even death threats, but he succeeded in pushing the House of Commons and the House of Lords to put abolition into law when the Slave Trade Act of 1807 passed.

I believe today, just 2 hours from now, we will have a William Wilberforce moment facing the Senate. Through a series of video releases over the past few weeks, the American people have learned about the shocking and barbaric practices Planned Parenthood uses to terminate innocent human lives. In several different videos, senior Planned Parenthood officials openly and candidly discussed the organ harvesting of fetuses.

In one video, the senior director of medical research for Planned Parenthood explained the process by which aborted body parts are harvested. I am not going to describe that process on the floor. I talked about it last week. But for those who have seen the video and those who have read about the practices, it is abhorrent to hear the cold, calculating consideration of how best to disassemble, to tear apart, to rip apart a growing life so that they could harvest certain body parts and then sell them for research. And they were negotiating prices.

It was like describing to somebody how they could go to Home Depot and

pick things off the shelf: Let's see what this costs; no, maybe we can get a better price for this. But in this case we are talking about living human tissue being taken, harvested, and sold from aborted babies.

So let's consider for a second what is the bottom line. The bottom line is we are talking about an organization that is embracing the dismembering of human life with taxpayer support. Millions of Americans who have seen these videos are outraged by the cavalier attitude that Planned Parenthood has about human life. Americans from all walks of life, Americans of different faiths and, maybe, even of different political parties abhor this.

Then we learned that our tax dollars, our hard-earned tax dollars, are sent to an organization that practices these methods. Surely, we can come to a conclusion that this is something that violates the faith and beliefs of many millions Americans and is subsidized by the Federal taxpayer?

Now, over the past few days, we have heard many who say they object to what Planned Parenthood is doing here. But, you know, we can't afford to stop funding many of the very important women's health services that Planned Parenthood provides. And this is an important consideration because I am sure every Senator here believes in ensuring that all women, regardless of their status and regardless of their financial situation, deserve to have access to vital services that health care providers provide.

The bill before us that we will be voting on today, offered by the Presiding Officer, Senator ERNST of Iowa, addresses these concerns. Her legislation would transfer money provided to Planned Parenthood to a whole range of women's health care providers. I have the bill here in front of me. It is very simple, a very basic bill.

I want to read from this bill:

State and county health departments, community health centers, hospitals, physicians offices, and other entities currently provide, and will continue to provide, health services to women. Such health services include relevant diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postpartum care, immunization, family planning services including contraception, sexually transmitted disease testing, cervical and breast cancer screenings, and referrals.

The bill goes on to say that such entities provide services to all persons, regardless of their ability to pay and provide services in medically underserved areas and to medically underserved populations.

So what is being offered here and what we will be voting on this evening doesn't take anything away from women's ability—regardless of their financial situation or where they live—to have the services that are needed and need to ensure their health and the future health of their children.

In the United States there are five times as many community health centers as there are Planned Parenthood operations. In my own State, we have 108 community health centers in urban and rural areas all throughout the State of Indiana—5 times the amount of Planned Parenthood facilities. So the issue of denying women needed health care simply is not the case under this legislation.

The barbaric practice of conducting abortions in a way that promotes harvesting fetal organs or profiting from such practice has no place in a modern society. Planned Parenthood's practices, I would suggest, should not receive a dime of taxpayer money. The question is, Do we want taxpayer dollars to continue to support an organization that treats human body parts like a product on the shelves of a store?

Today the Senate will decide if we fight for what we believe is morally right or whether we stand by and allow the trivialization of life to continue.

I am here to urge my colleagues to vote yes on this vitally important piece of legislation that we will be taking up in less than 2 hours.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to speak in opposition to S. 1881, the bill that will be coming before us this afternoon, and I have several quick points that I think need to be made.

The first is that this bill has nothing to do with abortion. Ninety-seven percent of the activities of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America and its associated facilities have nothing to do with abortion. They have to do with women's health, they have to do with cancer screening, and they have to do with contraception and early detection. The 3 percent that do involve abortion have no involvement whatsoever with Federal funds. This is not a case where Federal funds are going to support abortion or any of the related activities.

The net effect of this bill is simply to deny basic health care, including contraception, to millions of women, particularly low-income women. And the irony is that it will undoubtedly increase abortions in this country.

I have never understood why people who are opposed to abortion also seem to be opposed to the provision of family planning and contraceptive information which can prevent unwanted pregnancies and, indeed, prevent abortions.

The Guttmacher Institute, a respected, nonpartisan institution, estimates that without family planning information supplied by organizations such as Planned Parenthood, abortions would increase in this country by 345,000 a year. That is not a result anybody wants. It is certainly not one I want. That would mean an increase in abortions—345,000 a year.

I understand the bill does make funds generally available to a whole host of different organizations, some of which may or may not provide the kinds of family planning services that have been provided for over 70 years by Planned Parenthood. It is a narrower network. It eliminates clinics that have been available to women and doctors who have been available to women for many years.

Ironically, amidst all the discussion about the Affordable Care Act, a criticism which was “Maybe you can’t keep your own doctor,” this is a bill designed to keep you away from your doctor, the doctor you have been seeing and have confidence in at a clinic run by Planned Parenthood.

The issue, which my colleague from Indiana noted, is not about abortion. It is not about Planned Parenthood. It is not about contraception. It is about fetal tissue and the uses of fetal tissue and how fetal tissue should be controlled and whether it should be allowed to be used for medical research. But that is a debate we should have on that issue. There is no reason we should be defunding Planned Parenthood because of a debate we may or may not want to have in the future about the use of fetal tissue. We are denying medical services to women—particularly low-income women—because of an issue that has nothing to do with the 97 percent of services this organization provides. To me, this bill is like attacking Brazil after Pearl Harbor—it is a vigorous response, but it is the wrong target.

If the concern is Planned Parenthood or any other organization having access to fetal tissue and then using that tissue in medical research—by the way, designed to save lives and ameliorate the effects of diseases such as Parkinson’s or Alzheimer’s—then let’s focus on that. Let’s talk about whether it should be legal, how it should be controlled, what the limitations should be. But we should not eliminate an organization which for many years—almost 100 years—has been providing health care for women, particularly low-income women, basic female health care such as cancer screenings and contraception and family planning.

This is a straightforward attack on women’s health, in my view, particularly the health of low-income women.

“No American woman should be denied access to family planning assistance because of her economic condition.” That radical statement wasn’t

made by me. It wasn’t made by Jimmy Carter. It wasn’t made by John F. Kennedy. It was made by that known radical Richard M. Nixon in 1970. So access to family planning information goes back almost 50 years. If people in this body don’t think that is appropriate, then let’s debate that, but let’s not use this collateral issue of fetal tissue, which we can debate, to defund an organization that serves the needs of many women in my State and in States across the country, particularly low-income women. Two-thirds of Planned Parenthood’s patients are low-income women. They serve the needs of those women in a responsible, legal, and thoughtful way.

This is targeting an organization for the wrong reason. If we want to discuss fetal tissue and how to deal with it and what the pros and cons are, then let’s do so, but I don’t believe it is appropriate to do it in the context of legislation that will basically crush an organization that has been enormously helpful in maintaining women’s health throughout this country and will not, in fact, end whatever concerns people have about the use of fetal tissue.

Again, Madam President, this bill has nothing to do with abortion. It has everything to do with women’s health. I hope my colleagues will move on, debate the real issues, and oppose this ill-founded and I believe unsupported piece of legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 1917 are printed in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Madam President, I am informed that it is in order for me to file the substitute amendment that I just described, and I send that to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, this weekend I watched the Planned Parenthood videos that are in the news, including one in which the organization’s leadership says very clearly that the statements made by some of their staff are totally unacceptable. I believe that is important for everyone to hear.

With that said, here is the great danger with the legislation before the Senate today: This bill paints a big red target on some of the most basic, essential health care services for women in America: birth control, gone; pregnancy tests, gone; prenatal services, gone; HIV tests, gone; breast cancer screenings, gone; cervical cancer screenings, gone; ovarian cancer screenings, gone; vaccinations that prevent cancers, gone; treatment for urinary tract infections, gone; testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections, gone; basic physical exams, gone; treatment for digestive or breathing problems, gone; treatment for chronic conditions, gone; pediatric care, gone; adoption referrals, gone; nutrition programs, gone; referrals to hospitals and specialists, gone.

When you wipe out Planned Parenthood’s funding, you dramatically and painfully reduce women’s access to services that have absolutely nothing to do with abortion—nothing to do with abortion. This bill will take away the guarantee that Medicaid patients have their free choice of doctors in the program. The people who this bill will hurt the most are poor women who have nowhere else to turn.

I urge my colleagues today to drop this misguided campaign. Instead of restricting women’s access to health care services—such as the ones I have just outlined—let’s work on a bipartisan basis to improve access to health care services for women in America.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, as the Presiding Officer knows, we will have a very important vote about an hour and a half from now on a bill that would eliminate taxpayer funding for abortions, consistent with four decades of U.S. law. Contrary to the comments made by our friend from Oregon who just spoke, rather than withhold those funds, it would take that same amount of money and redirect it for women’s health services and actually give them better access to health services at the same time. In other words, this legislation will fund women’s health care but not abortions on the taxpayers’ dime.

I particularly want to thank Senator ERNST, Senator LANKFORD, Senator FISCHER, and Senator PAUL for their leadership on this important issue. This is the beginning of the fight to regain America’s conscience and the fight to restore the law that has been on the books for 40 years when it comes to taxpayer funding of abortions.

We all understand that the Supreme Court in *Roe v. Wade* has held that abortion is a right. But we also know that there is a rare area where there is a consensus between pro-choice and pro-life people, such as myself, and that is that we draw the line—and have since 1976—when it comes to taxpayer

funding of abortions. Of course, what brought us to this point most immediately was that our collective conscience was shocked by videos depicting Planned Parenthood executives discussing the harvesting and sale of the organs of unborn babies—an abhorrent, disgusting practice that we cannot ignore. Perhaps the only thing more shocking than the actual dismembering of unborn children for sale is the cavalier attitudes by the Planned Parenthood staff who seem to have sacrificed their humanity and show so little regard for the sanctity of human life.

What was shown in these videos is an outrage, and it demands our action. Many of our colleagues from across the aisle have cited their own disapproval of what has been presented in these videos. They will be given an opportunity at 5:30 when we vote on the motion to proceed to get on this bill to demonstrate that their actions actually match their words.

According to one report, the junior Senator from Indiana said he found the comments by Planned Parenthood personnel in the video disgraceful. Similarly, the junior Senator from Virginia said that he found the videos “extremely troubling.” When asked about the videos last week, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton also called them “disturbing.” And they are.

Like our recent successful bipartisan efforts to fight the scourge of human trafficking, we have a rare opportunity to make a difference and address the moral imperative to defend those who cannot defend themselves.

It is important—because I have already heard some of our colleagues misrepresent what is in the bill—to remind everybody what this bill actually does. First and foremost, it eliminates Federal funding for one of the country’s largest abortion providers—Planned Parenthood. In fiscal year 2014, Planned Parenthood performed 327,653 abortions. At the same time, Planned Parenthood received \$528 million from Federal taxpayers.

Planned Parenthood reported revenue in fiscal 2014 of \$1.1 billion. In other words, almost half of its income came from tax dollars from the Federal Government at the same time they performed 327,653 abortions.

You will hear some of our friends who are defending Planned Parenthood say: Oh, well, this is different because the money is kept separate. But we know that money that comes from the Federal Government can keep the lights on and keep the doors open so the abortions can continue to be performed. It is simply a fiction to claim that Federal tax dollars are not supporting conduct proscribed by the Hyde amendment for the last 40 years.

We don’t stop there, though, when it comes to this legislation. As I mentioned at the outset, we would actually

redirect the money to ensure that taxpayer dollars that once went to Planned Parenthood now go to provide for women’s health, such as in thousands of community health centers across the country.

I am a big fan of community health centers because they really represent one-stop shopping when it comes to primary health care needs. The ironic thing is we can actually provide better access and more access for women by transferring the money from Planned Parenthood to community health centers and other nonabortion providers. For example, in my State, we have as many as eight times more community health centers as there are Planned Parenthood providers. We can provide women with eight times more opportunity to see that their health care needs are taken care of and at the same time respect the law that prohibits taxpayer dollars to be used for abortions and to support abortions.

In fact, according to data from 2013—the most recently available nationwide—every State in the country has more community health centers than Planned Parenthood clinics.

Since I didn’t want to mention all 50 of them here—that would be a little overwhelming and be hard to read at the same time—I just picked out two States, along with the nationwide statistic—13 community health centers to every 1 Planned Parenthood provider that would still be able to provide primary health care services to women under this legislation. But if we look at Indiana, for example, we would have four times more providers under this legislation. In the State of Virginia, we would have 20 times more providers by simply defunding Planned Parenthood, the abortion provider, and using tax dollars and transferring that money to community health centers. We can actually provide greater access for women’s health care.

Let’s be clear, because I suspect, as I have already heard when I came to the floor, that there will be a lot of misrepresentation about what is in the bill. We need to be clear. This legislation defends women’s health and ensures women access across the country to essential health services.

As I said a few moments ago, in many respects the debate that we are having was already decided in 1976, the year of the Hyde amendment, named after Henry Hyde, which, as my colleagues all know, prevents taxpayer dollars from funding abortions, except in rare circumstances. We talked about that a lot during the course of the anti-human trafficking bill. But this has been the law of the land for 40 years.

I strongly encourage all of our colleagues to vote to get on this bill. An organization that so callously reduces our most vulnerable to spare parts for sale has no business receiving any money from the Federal taxpayers. If

people want to raise money from other private sources to support this effort, then let them do that. But tax dollars are not available and should not be available to fund Planned Parenthood’s abortion practice—again, the largest single abortion provider in America.

While many of our colleagues on the other side have agreed that the vile practices that we witnessed in these videos are disturbing, still some have tried to put off having this discussion at all. I think what would be the biggest failure on our part—no matter what the outcome of our vote on the underlying legislation—would be to fail to have this discussion and this debate for the American people to hear so we can get their input. The real travesty would be if we shut off debate because 60 Senators didn’t see fit to vote to get on the bill. That vote will be in roughly 1 hour and 15 minutes.

There are others who say we simply have more important things to do. I disagree. For example, the senior Senator from New York said consideration of this bill was “wasting valuable time” and that we should instead “[start] urgent budget negotiations.”

Really? Really? I hardly know what to say. To those who share my disgust for the conduct depicted in these videos and who agree they are disgraceful, disturbing, and extremely troubling, how can you now turn around and refuse to vote with us to get on this legislation so we can have that discussion, so we can have that debate, and so we can vote our conscience? If your conscience is shocked by the footage in these videos, I really can’t see how anybody could possibly vote no on this legislation at 5:30 when we vote to get on the bill.

Somehow, we as a nation have been lulled into a sense of complacency and have become somehow so desensitized to these barbaric practices depicted in these videos that they no longer stimulate us to act. But today we have a chance on behalf of the American people, the people we collectively represent, to act and to act in a way that protects the most vulnerable.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, thanks to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, the Senate is unfortunately taking a vote on whether critical health care services should be taken away from millions of women across the country. We will be voting on whether a young woman should be able to go to a provider she trusts to

get birth control, whether cancer screenings should be more or less available to women across the country, and whether the U.S. Senate is going to turn back the clock on women's health.

To me—and to many Democrats and even some Republicans who want to help women get the care they need—it is deeply disappointing that we are even having this debate because extreme Republicans have attacked Planned Parenthood and women's health so many times before—on the budget, the highway bill, the Affordable Care Act, and even on the legislation I introduced last week to help wounded veterans start families. That is right. Some of my Republican colleagues were more interested in scoring political points with their extreme base by picking fights over women's health than they were in helping our wounded veterans.

Unfortunately, it is clear they will jump at any opportunity to put politics before women's health. The bill we are talking about this evening that would defund Planned Parenthood is just more of the same.

My Republican colleagues who support this bill claim it would simply redirect funding for Planned Parenthood to other providers. Let's keep in mind that 2.7 million people visited Planned Parenthood for their health care last year, and 1 out of every 5 women in the United States will visit a Planned Parenthood center at some point in her life. So Planned Parenthood is a critical source of health care in communities across this country, and claiming that other providers can simply absorb those patients is like saying you can pour a bucket of water into a cup. It will not work. Instead, what this bill would actually do is take access to birth control, cancer screenings, STD tests, and other important preventive care away from women. It would leave families and communities without trusted, quality health care providers they rely on, and it would mean that in the United States of America in the 21st century the tea party gets to tell women what doctors they can or cannot go to.

I am not going to let that happen, and I know many of my colleagues here today agree. So this legislation is going nowhere, and, just as we have every other time they have tried these partisan tactics, we are sending a very clear message to those who choose political pandering over women's health.

Political attacks and threats to shut down the government are not going to get in the way of women's access to the care they need—not on our watch. Why? Because we know millions of women and their families are counting on us, and we are going to keep standing up for them.

I will close today by sharing the story of a woman from my home State of Washington. Shannon is from

Tumwater, WA. When she was a teenager, she experienced “unbearable pain” and went to see a doctor to find out whether she had endometriosis. That is a serious disease that can keep women from having children if it goes untreated. Her doctor told her she was far too young to have endometriosis and sent her home. A few years later when she turned 18, Shannon tried again, and this time she went to a Planned Parenthood center. There, her provider confirmed that she did indeed have endometriosis. Her lesions were removed, and Shannon got the medication to manage her condition, thanks to Planned Parenthood. She no longer has to live with chronic pain, and now she is the proud mother of a little girl.

Shannon said, “My daughter is truly a gift, and I really have Planned Parenthood to thank for her.”

So today, as many Members on the other side of the aisle vote to take health care away from women and their families, as they try as hard as they can to appeal to the extreme fringe of their party no matter the cost, I hope they think of women like Shannon whose lives are happier and healthier because of the services Planned Parenthood provides to so many communities in our country. That is whom I will be thinking about. I am very proud to vote no tonight and will continue to keep fighting for women, their health care, and their rights.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Ms. WARREN. Madam President, I come to the Senate floor to ask my Republican colleagues a question: Do you have any idea what year it is? Did you fall down and hit your head and think you woke up in the 1950s or the 1890s? Should we call for a doctor? Because I simply cannot believe that in the year 2015, the U.S. Senate would be spending its time trying to defund women's health care centers.

On second thought, maybe I shouldn't be that surprised. The Republicans have had a plan for years to strip away women's rights to make choices about their own bodies. Just look at the recent facts. In 2013, Republicans threatened to shut down the government unless they could change the law to let employers deny women access to birth control. In March of this year, Republicans held up a non-controversial, bipartisan bill to stop human trafficking. Why? Because they demanded new anti-abortion restrictions to cover private funding meant to help the victims of human trafficking. In June, House Republicans passed a budget eliminating funding for the Title X Family Planning Program, the only Federal grant program that provides birth control, HIV tests, STD screening, and other preventive services for poor and uninsured people.

Over the past few years, Republicans have voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act more than 50 times, including the portions that require insurers to cover contraception. Let's be clear. It is not just Congress. Over the past 5 years Republican State legislators have passed nearly 300 new restrictions on abortion access. This year alone Republican State legislators have passed more than 50 new restrictions on women's access to legal health care.

Let's be really clear about something. The Republican scheme to defund Planned Parenthood is not some sort of surprised response to a highly edited video. Nope. The Republican vote to defund Planned Parenthood is just one more piece of a deliberate, methodical, orchestrated, rightwing attack on women's rights, and I am sick and tired of it. Women everywhere are sick and tired of it. The American people are sick and tired of it.

Scheduling this vote during the week of a big FOX News Presidential primary debate, days before candidates take trips to Iowa or New Hampshire, isn't just some clever gimmick. This is an all-out effort to build support to take away a woman's right to control her own body and access to medical care she may need.

This affects all of us, whatever your age, wherever you live. I guarantee that you know someone who has used Planned Parenthood health care centers. No one may mention it at Thanksgiving dinner or post it on Facebook for the whole world to know, but just look at the facts. One in five women in America is a Planned Parenthood patient at least once in her life. Every single year nearly 2.7 million women and men show up for help at Planned Parenthood.

Why do so many people use Planned Parenthood? Because they are non-profit and they are open. More than half of Planned Parenthood centers are located in areas without ready access to health care. Women who can't get appointments anywhere else go to Planned Parenthood for pap tests and cancer screenings. Couples go to Planned Parenthood for STD treatments or pregnancy tests. Young people go to Planned Parenthood for birth control. And, yes, 3 percent of patients visit Planned Parenthood for a safe and legal abortion with a doctor who will show compassion and care for a woman who is making one of the most difficult decisions of her entire life.

To be clear, even though the abortions performed at Planned Parenthood are safe and legal, the Federal Government is not paying for any of them—not one dime. For almost 40 years the Federal Government has prohibited Federal funding for abortions except in the cases of rape, incest or life endangerment.

Most of the money Planned Parenthood receives from the government

comes in the form of Medicaid payments for medical care provided to low-income patients, the same payments any other doctor or clinic receives for providing cancer screenings or other medical exams. The rest of Planned Parenthood's Federal funding comes from title X that provides birth control to low-income and uninsured people, the same program the House Republicans voted to cut in June.

The government doesn't fund abortions, period. A vote today to defund Planned Parenthood is not a vote to defund abortions. It is a vote to defund cancer screenings, birth control, and basic health care for millions of women.

I say to my Republican colleagues: The year is 2015, not 1955 and not 1895. Women have lived through a world where backward-looking ideologues tried to interfere with the basic health decisions made by a woman and her doctor, and we are not going back—not now, not ever.

The Republican plan to defund Planned Parenthood is a Republican plan to defund women's health care. For my daughter, for my granddaughters, for people all across Massachusetts, and all across this country, I stand with Planned Parenthood, and I hope my colleagues will do the same.

I thank the Presiding Officer, and I yield the floor.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, Congress provides billions of dollars in taxpayer money for many different programs in various areas, including women's health. Sometimes, however, we have to draw the line, rearrange our priorities, and put some things off-limits. This is one of those times. The taxpayers should not be funding an organization engaged not only in the abortion business but, as we now know, in the baby body parts business.

In the last fiscal year, Planned Parenthood received more than one-half billion dollars of taxpayer money in the form of government grants, contracts, and Medicaid reimbursements. That is nearly \$1.5 million per day, every day, and more than 40 percent of Planned Parenthood's revenue. The group's annual reports reveal what it does. In the last 3 years, it performed nearly 1 million abortions. In fact, this taxpayer-supported organization is the nation's largest abortion provider.

Some of Planned Parenthood's propaganda suggests the group focuses more on promoting pregnancies than ending them. But the numbers reveal the truth. Abortion accounts for 94 percent of Planned Parenthood's pregnancy services. The number of Planned Parenthood abortions dwarfs its recipients of prenatal care by more than 15 to 1. Planned Parenthood performs 174 abortions for every 1 adoption referral. In fact, Planned Parenthood's abortion business is growing while its adoption referrals and prenatal care services are shrinking.

We are also told that Planned Parenthood provides other women's health services. Those same annual reports, however, show that cancer prevention services are down 17 percent over the year before. Planned Parenthood does not provide what the American Cancer Society calls a "very effective and valuable tool" for breast cancer screening: mammograms. That procedure requires an FDA certification and no Planned Parenthood clinic in America has such a certification.

It is no wonder that Planned Parenthood has fought anything that could conceivably reduce the number of abortions. That is the business they are in. They oppose measures to inform women about abortion dangers or alternatives, they oppose any kind of involvement by parents when children seek an abortion. They even oppose restricting the horrible practice of partial-birth abortion.

We have learned recently what such a commitment to abortion produces.

Not one, not two, not three, but four videos released so far show Planned Parenthood's own leaders discussing the harvesting and selling of baby parts as casually as a mechanic sells car parts. They discuss how Planned Parenthood abortionists arrange their procedures and techniques to obtain the intact baby body parts that they need. These videos are revolting. They reveal an attitude toward human life that I thought we left behind long ago, when we decided human beings were not commodities to be traded.

Planned Parenthood has responded to these videos with propaganda and distraction. After the first video was released, for example, they said that it had been heavily edited, and their comments were taken out of context. That is often the first response by someone exposed by their own words. I urge my colleagues and fellow citizens not to be distracted. The Center for Medical Progress, which released the video, has made the full video and complete transcript available.

Planned Parenthood also claims that it receives cost reimbursement for the "services" it provides. I remind my colleagues of two things. First, even if that were true, these are costs associated with the harvesting of baby body parts. We must never forget what is at the heart of this whole thing—the harvesting and selling of pre-born body parts. Second, Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services says in one of the videos that if they can "do better than break even," they are "happy to do it." It appears that Planned Parenthood's only guideline is that "this is not something that you should be making an exorbitant amount of money on."

In the fourth video, a Planned Parenthood medical director talks about how "a little bit of training" will make sure that fetal organs can be removed

intact. She says that charging a fee for each body part "works a little better, just because we can see how much we can get out of it." And to top it all off, this medical director talks about how calling this gruesome business "research" helps to avoid getting caught.

The truth about Planned Parenthood is finally coming out, and Congress should respond in two ways. First, we should exercise our oversight authority to investigate how Planned Parenthood is using the hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars it annually receives. Federal law, for example, makes it illegal "for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any fetal tissue for valuable consideration." If our investigation turns up any evidence of possible criminal wrongdoing, such evidence should be turned over to the proper authorities.

Second, we should stop giving Planned Parenthood taxpayer money. Even if the investigations show that Planned Parenthood has broken no laws, regulations, or other rules, we should get American taxpayers out of the business of harvesting and selling baby body parts. Senator ERNST's bill would do just that.

The abortion lobby's misdirection, distraction, and spin are already in high gear. Last week here on the Senate floor, one of my Democratic colleagues said that this bill is an "attack on women's health." It is no such thing. Planned Parenthood is not the only provider of prenatal services or cancer screenings. It is, however, the only organization financed by American taxpayers that traffics in baby body parts.

Just as everyone should judge Planned Parenthood's words for themselves, everyone should also read this bill for themselves. It says that while Planned Parenthood will no longer receive taxpayer money, overall funding for women's health will not decrease. This bill supports women's health but defunds Planned Parenthood.

This bill does not prohibit Planned Parenthood from performing abortions, it does not even prohibit Planned Parenthood from continuing its practice of harvesting and selling baby body parts. But if Planned Parenthood wants to be in this gruesome business, it should do so without being subsidized by American taxpayers.

I reiterate that this bill does not reduce services for women's health by a single dime. Healthcare providers all over this country, including community health centers, offer all sorts of services for women. These include the very services that my Democratic colleague mentioned here last week, such as cancer screenings, vaccinations, breast exams, and HIV testing. Under this bill, Federal funding for such services will not be reduced, but rather redirected to providers who are not involved in the sordid and contemptible baby body parts business.

The recent revelations about Planned Parenthood have pulled back the curtain on something very ugly in our culture. Millions of abortions over multiple decades have devalued human life to the point where—at least to some—preborn babies are little more than commodities, collections of parts that can be harvested and sold. Is that the kind of country we want? No, it is not. We should use this opportunity to examine our values to chart a better course.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, we are now 7 months into the 114th Congress, and our Nation is faced with many challenges. Less than 1 year ago, the American people were promised that if Republicans took control of the Senate, our focus would be on committee-reported bills and promoting bipartisanship. Leader McCONNELL pledged not to fill the amendment tree and instead to allow for an open amendment process when bills were brought to the floor. These promises have already been broken and this week we will likely see them broken again.

We are just a few days before the first debate for the many Republicans seeking their party's nomination for President. Given the crowded stage, they have already resorted to attention-getting attacks designed to excite the most extreme right wing of their base. It should surprise no one then that at the top of the Senate's agenda this week is a bill that would jeopardize the health and well-being of women across the country.

I spoke in opposition to this misguided, partisan effort last week. It is disappointing that instead of using the few remaining weeks before the end of the fiscal year working to reach an agreement on how to fund the government, we are considering ideologically-driven legislation to bar funding for Planned Parenthood health centers. This issue is unfortunately all too familiar. A few years ago, a small but vocal minority nearly shut down the Federal Government over a provision prohibiting funding for Planned Parenthood. Thankfully, we prevailed in the end, removing the rider and assuring women's access to vital health care. I hope the Senate makes the right choice again today.

This latest attack on women's health is fueled by an extreme organization that is in the process of releasing surreptitiously recorded videos, which the group heavily edited in a misleading way to suggest wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood. The Attorney General is currently reviewing the matter, and I have every confidence that if there is credible evidence to warrant an investigation of any of the parties involved in the videos, the Justice Department will act.

The bill before the Senate today would affect the lives of millions of

American women, men, and young people who trust and depend on Planned Parenthood for their basic health care needs, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screenings, and HIV screenings. Last year in Vermont, Planned Parenthood centers provided critical primary and preventive services to over 16,000 patients. In a small State like Vermont, this impact cannot be overstated.

Proponents of this bill argue that if we defund Planned Parenthood, women will find care at other health centers. This is simply not the case. Planned Parenthood centers overwhelmingly serve populations in rural and medically underserved parts of the country where access to health care, especially for low-income individuals, is difficult. In fact, over 90 percent of Vermont's Planned Parenthood centers are located in rural or medically-underserved areas. Many women in my State describe Planned Parenthood as their primary source of health care. What this partisan bill would do is force the women in Vermont who have trusted Planned Parenthood for their health care to try to find another doctor where few are available, or, more likely, go without care at all. That undermines all of our efforts to strengthen our Nation's health care system, and ensure access to care for everyone.

Planned Parenthood health centers are eligible for Federal funds in two ways, and under the Hyde amendment, funds cannot be used for abortion services except in very limited circumstances. First, Planned Parenthood centers can receive Federal grant funding through title X of the Public Health Service Act. Title X is the only Federal grant program dedicated to offering people comprehensive family planning and related preventive health services. President Nixon was instrumental in enacting this legislation, and it has long been supported by lawmakers and Presidents of both parties. It cannot be emphasized enough that title X was a remarkable breakthrough in women's health care. The second way Planned Parenthood receives Federal funding is through Medicaid reimbursements, when women using Medicaid choose a Planned Parenthood provider as their doctor.

The federally supported services offered by Planned Parenthood are the core of their work and mission. Despite the misleading and blatantly false statements of some ideologically-driven advocates, more than 90 percent of the care Planned Parenthood health centers offer is preventive care like cancer screenings, annual checkups, and contraception. As noted by several observers over the weekend, the irony is that defunding Planned Parenthood would result in more unintended pregnancies, and probably more abortions.

Should we walk back from the remarkable progress we have made as a

nation in women's health? Of course not. But I am concerned that we still see this same irresponsible attack surfacing again and again. It is 2015. It is time for the mean-spirited and ideological assaults on women's health care to end.

The arrogance and shortsighted attitude of a minority has put at risk the lives and health of millions of women. Does this Congress care more about what looks good on a bumper sticker or what matters in the daily lives of real people? My wife Marcelle is a cancer survivor. We were lucky. We had good health care and the ability to pay the bills when she got sick. Others are not so lucky. Without the services that Planned Parenthood provides, thousands of low-income women in Vermont would lose their ability to have regular cancer screenings that could save their lives too. That we are even considering the elimination of these health services to America's women is shameful.

What a travesty it would be to gut health services that have literally meant the difference between life or death, health or grave illness, to countless American women. This bill is merely an effort to score political points at the expense of women's health. I hope the Senate rejects this irresponsible, partisan legislation. I urge the Senate majority leadership to return to its promise that it would lead this Chamber responsibly and act through regular order.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I am strongly opposed to the bill before us today, S. 1881, introduced by Senator ERNST.

I stand in strong support of Planned Parenthood, which every year provides 2.7 million people—including over 30,000 Marylanders and one in five women—with important health care services, such as breast and cervical cancer screenings, sexually transmitted disease, STD, testing and counseling, and birth control.

The bill before us today does one thing. It defunds Planned Parenthood.

Every year Planned Parenthood health centers receive approximately \$520 million in Federal funds to provide preventive health services to 2.7 million people in the United States, including one in five women. These services include cancer screenings, STD testing and counseling, and birth control. If the Ernst bill passes, Planned Parenthood would lose that money and could no longer provide those services to women and men in need.

For decades, anti-choice activists have looked for any excuse to eliminate funding to Planned Parenthood health centers because they use non-Federal funds to provide legal abortions. This time around, the excuse is that we should defund Planned Parenthood because of some misleading videos. Videos that, while uncomfortable

in nature, have shown nothing illegal to date.

Let us talk about what Planned Parenthood means to Maryland. In my State, Planned Parenthood is a leading provider of high-quality and affordable health care for so many women, men, and young people. Every year in MD, more than 33,000 patients receive health care from Planned Parenthood health centers. And what types of health care are Marylanders getting from these health centers? Approximately 5,000 breast exams every year. Nearly 4,000 cervical cancer screenings and Pap tests. More than 34,000 STD tests and counseling sessions. And more than 26,000 Marylanders rely on Planned Parenthood health centers for birth control.

The bill before us today is just the latest in a series of unrelenting attacks on Planned Parenthood. Those supporting this bill are simply latching on to yet another misguided attempt to try and eliminate Planned Parenthood in an effort to undermine women's reproductive rights.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill on behalf of the 2.7 million people, and 1 in 5 American women, who rely on Planned Parenthood for their health care.

Mr. NELSON. Madam President, before us this evening is a decision whether or not to take money away from Planned Parenthood.

For close to 100 years, Planned Parenthood has provided critical health services to millions, providing care to 2.7 million people in 2013 alone.

In fact, many Planned Parenthood affiliates operate in rural and medically underserved areas. In some cases, closing these facilities could cause patients to travel great distances to receive health services.

Now, that said, I find the videos at issue to be extremely disturbing and I believe we have a responsibility to determine all the facts.

More investigation is needed before we even start talking about taking away vital health services like annual wellness exams and cancer screenings from the millions who rely on them for care.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I would like to take a moment to express my sincere disappointment in Planned Parenthood's apparent disregard for human life. As a father of four and a strong advocate for the sanctity of life, I am deeply disturbed by reports of the gruesome and inhuman actions being performed by Planned Parenthood and their affiliates.

I am proud to be a lead coauthor of Senator ERNST's bill that we are considering today to defund this organization and hope my fellow Senators will put the sanctity of life ahead of any political interests.

Last year, Planned Parenthood received \$528 million in taxpayer funding,

or more than \$1.4 million per day, accounting for 41 percent of Planned Parenthood's overall revenue. Although the organization claims to use this funding to provide necessary health services to women, the fact is that abortions made up 94 percent of Planned Parenthood's pregnancy services in 2013, while prenatal care and adoption referrals accounted for 5 percent and 0.5 percent, respectively.

Given our current fiscal climate and the level of division among Americans on this issue, there is no justification for continuing to subsidize Planned Parenthood's profitable venture with taxpayer dollars. It is time for big abortion businesses like this one to be investigated and defunded.

Senator ERNST's bill, of which I am very proud to be a lead co-author, would prohibit Planned Parenthood, or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics, from receiving any Federal funds. Instead, funds that are currently offered to Planned Parenthood would be available to other eligible entities to provide women's health care services, including diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postnatal care, immunizations, and cervical and breast cancer screenings.

The sanctity of human life is a principle that Congress should proclaim at every opportunity. The time has come to respect the wishes of the majority of Americans who adamantly oppose using taxpayer dollars for abortions by denying Federal funds to these abortion providers. I strongly encourage the support of my fellow Senators on efforts to defund Planned Parenthood and protect these innocent babies from being the target of Planned Parenthood's gruesome practices.

Ms. WARREN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise today to speak in strong opposition to legislation that would defund Planned Parenthood and jeopardize women's access to health care.

Each year Planned Parenthood opens its doors to millions of Americans, including more than 54,000 people in my State of Minnesota, people who need affordable, quality health care, such as breast and cervical cancer screenings, pregnancy tests, and family planning services. One in five women in this country has received that care at Planned Parenthood, and for many women Planned Parenthood is their primary source of health care. Yet today the Senate is considering open-

ing debate on a proposal to defund Planned Parenthood—a proposal to block this health care provider from continued participation in our Federal safety net health programs. It is a proposal that would close Planned Parenthood's doors and leave millions without a provider.

Make no mistake, this proposal has nothing to do with protecting women's health. Instead, it advances a political agenda that threatens women's ability to receive often lifesaving care. In my State of Minnesota alone, Planned Parenthood provided more than 9,000 cervical cancer screenings and nearly 14,000 screenings for breast cancer in just 1 year. These screenings save women's lives, women such as Liz Steele from Minneapolis.

Liz's first job after graduating from the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire didn't offer health insurance, so she relied on Planned Parenthood for basic health care services. When a blood sample taken during a routine physical exam more than 25 years ago indicated that Liz had a deadly form of leukemia, the nurse practitioner who cared for Liz at Planned Parenthood tracked her down and connected her with a physician who treated her cancer and saved her life. Liz said, "Without [the nurse's] persistence, I quite frankly wouldn't be here right now. Planned Parenthood is responsible for saving my life."

Unfortunately, the bill we are discussing today ignores women like Liz. Rather than recognizing Planned Parenthood's role in protecting women's health, the legislation continues a series of unrelenting attacks on Planned Parenthood and on women's access to basic health care. We have seen this strategy before. In 2007, the Senate voted on a measure that would have eliminated support for any health care provider—including Planned Parenthood—that provides safe, legal abortion services. In 2011, the Senate voted on a proposal that singled out Planned Parenthood by name and would have disqualified it from receiving Federal support. Each time, these attempts to place political hurdles between a woman and the health care provider of her choice failed—by a vote of 41 to 52 in 2007 and 42 to 58 in 2011. Today's attempt will fail as well.

Recently, antiabortion activists secretly recorded videos of Planned Parenthood doctors and staff. In these videos, some of the physicians captured on tape did not treat the issue of reproductive health services with the appropriate level of sensitivity. I was glad to see that the president of Planned Parenthood apologized for the tone of those remarks. But these videos—deceptively edited to paint a misleading picture of the organization—were designed to distort the truth and create controversy, a controversy that opponents of reproductive rights are now

exploiting by pushing the same failed strategy, only this time they have focused their opposition to reproductive rights in disingenuous rhetoric that purports to value women's health.

The bill's lead sponsor claimed that "[t]here will be no reduction in overall federal funding available to support women's health." Another cosponsor of this legislation claimed the bill would "provide additional money for women's primary health care services," but the bill's operative language makes no such commitment. It merely provides that "no federal funds may be made available to Planned Parenthood." What the bill's proponents choose not to acknowledge is that Planned Parenthood health centers serve 36 percent of all patients who receive health care from a federally supported women's health center—more than any other provider—but those sponsors have no plan for where the millions of patients currently receiving health care from Planned Parenthood would go if this legislation were successful—no plan.

Moreover, claims that opponents of Planned Parenthood support continuing or even increasing funding for women's health services are especially hard to believe in light of the fact that some of the same people also support cutting the very programs that fund women's health services now. Just a little over 1 month ago, House appropriators approved a spending bill that would completely eliminate the title X family planning program—the Nation's only Federal program exclusively dedicated to reproductive health care. Senate appropriators proposed slashing title X—a program that is already running on fumes—by \$30 million. So claims that a bill to ban one of America's most trusted health care providers from Federal programs would support women's health—claims made while the bill's proponents are working to gut Federal programs that provide services like breast and pelvic exams, contraceptives, testing and treatment for sexually transmitted infections and HIV—are nothing short of preposterous.

It is no secret that attacks on Planned Parenthood are part and parcel of a longstanding campaign to make safe and legal abortion in this country virtually impossible to access. Ironically, the defunding of Planned Parenthood would interfere with the delivery of health care that actually prevents unintended pregnancy and reduces the need for abortion. If the proponents of this bill were truly sincere in their desire to support women's health, they would embrace efforts to improve contraceptive coverage and increase access to birth control rather than continue to attack the Nation's No. 1 provider of basic women's health services.

The ability to access reproductive health care by the services that

Planned Parenthood provides has a powerful effect on the choices women and families make every day—choices about finishing college or graduate school, whether to buy a home or start a business. The ability to decide whether or when to start a family shapes lives, and for nearly 100 years Planned Parenthood has played an important role in ensuring that women are able to make that decision for themselves and shape their own destinies. I urge my colleagues to resist the impulse to let politics stand between a woman and her health care and to oppose legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield to my colleague from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Thank you, Madam President.

Once again, this 114th Congress is proving its priorities are completely misguided. Last week the House of Representatives adjourned for a 6-week recess instead of taking up the Senate 6-year highway bill. That bill would strengthen our transportation infrastructure and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, which helps businesses compete globally and returns hundreds of millions of dollars to the Treasury. By skipping town, the House forced another short extension, delaying long-term investments and denying States and businesses long-term certainty.

Today we are debating whether to defund Planned Parenthood and deny thousands of women access to primary health care. Outside of these walls, this debate was settled decades ago. Most voters—including over 70 percent of Independents—oppose this effort because they see it for what it is: an aggressive assault on women's health care.

If you don't believe me, let me tell you the story of one of my constituents named Liz from Billings. Planned Parenthood has been Liz's primary health care provider for 30 years. The doctors and nurses at her local facility found precancerous cells and got her the treatment she needed to prevent a life-threatening disease. Despite a complicated medical history, she was able to start a family thanks to the prenatal care she accessed at Planned Parenthood. Now she has a daughter of her own and trusts the providers of Planned Parenthood to provide critical health care to her and her family. But Liz isn't alone.

In 2013, in my home State of Montana, over 15,000 men and women were patients at Planned Parenthood for everything from affordable primary care to cancer screenings, to family planning services. Four out of ten women who receive care at a title X-funded health care center consider it their only source of health care. Taking away this funding is political, short-

sighted, and outright dangerous. Unfortunately, it is not their only attempt to rob women of their health care choices. As it sits now, next year's U.S. House appropriations bill for Health and Human Services eliminates all of the title X family planning health clinics. While that is the kind of shortsightedness we have come to expect from the House in recent years, the Senate Labor-HHS appropriations bill isn't much better because it significantly cuts title X funding. It cuts teen pregnancy prevention funding by 81 percent. In a large rural State like Montana, access to quality health care is always a serious challenge. Without a serious effort to recruit more doctors and nurses, we could soon be facing a crisis-level shortage of qualified medical providers.

This bill is designed to score political points, no doubt about it. It is certainly not designed with women's health or public health in mind. This is crazy. We need to be giving the American people more options when it comes to their health care, not fewer.

I would urge my colleagues to stop the political gaming and simply vote no on this bill.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. President, there comes a time in the history of nations when a civilized people must stand up and decide whether life is important, whether life is something special, and whether there is maybe something greater than just us that has to do with life.

It sickens me to see what has been going on with Planned Parenthood. Some of my first memories of my children were the ultrasounds I saw before they were born. We still keep those. We now find out, though, that this technology that can do wonders, that can save babies—now you can perform surgery in the uterus and the baby can survive. These same techniques are being used by Planned Parenthood to manipulate the baby into a position to harvest the baby's organs. I think all America should be sickened by this. It should also trouble us if we are a society that is not sickened by this.

I think the time has come to have a full-throated debate. The time has come to end all taxpayer funding for Planned Parenthood. Some will say: Well, where will people get their health care? We have 9,000 community health centers and 700 Planned Parenthood clinics. The only difference is abortion.

In fact, you can get many things at a community health center you cannot get at Planned Parenthood, but the only thing you get at Planned Parenthood that you cannot get anywhere else is an abortion.

But this debate is not just about abortion; this debate is about little babies who have not given their consent.

It is about time we had a debate in our country about this, and it is about time we said enough is enough. The question is, Can a civilization long endure that does not respect life? Do we lose everything else that makes us human if we are unwilling to protect life? Can we stand up and defend our other rights if we are not willing to stand up and defend the most basic of rights?

I come here today to ask my fellow Senators to vote to defund Planned Parenthood. I hope they will.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to have a colloquy with several Members on the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would first like to enter into a colloquy with Senator DAINES. This is an issue which many of us here in this body feel extremely passionate about. We will talk about Planned Parenthood and what is going on and the basic issue of children.

This has been spun multiple different ways, but really this is not about a lot of other issues other than one thing. This is about children—children who are recognizable outside of the womb, and once they have been carved up and set out on a table to be sold as parts, they can be plainly seen to be children.

So my conversation today will circle around a little bit about what we are doing, where we are headed, what this vote this evening is all about, and what this debate is that should begin here in America about what happens with Planned Parenthood.

So I would like to entertain a conversation with Senator DAINES.

Mr. DAINES. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for having this colloquy today because I do believe we are at a crossroads. With this vote we will have in about 20 minutes, we have a choice set before us, one that each one of us must make as a Senator and one that each American must make with us.

With a “yes” vote—a “yes” vote is to defund Planned Parenthood—we reaffirm our dedication to women’s health. In fact, we recommit every dollar made available to support things such as well-baby care, cervical and breast cancer screening, prenatal and postpartum care, immunizations, family planning services, including contraception, sexually transmitted disease testing, and

relevant diagnostic, laboratory, and radiology services.

This bill does not take a single dollar away from women’s health. I think it is very important, as we debate this decision in front of us, that we do not get caught up in rhetoric. Let’s get focused on the facts, on what this does and what it does not do. This is a vote about our culture. This is a vote about our ethics. Most importantly—and I say this as a daddy of four children, two boys and two girls—this is about the value of our children.

Over the last few weeks, we have seen these videos. Americans have been horrified at high-level Planned Parenthood executives who are callously discussing the price of baby organs harvested from the tiny bodies of aborted babies. In fact, just last week we witnessed an abortion doctor poking through the pieces of a tiny and broken body. He was pointing out the heart and lungs and discussing what each of them should cost when sold, meanwhile exclaiming it is a baby.

We have heard so many arguments today: Well, this is about the woman’s body. We respect the body of the woman, and we want to make sure that the proper services are allowed to protect a woman’s health. But this is not about the woman’s body. This is about a different body with a different DNA. This is about a little baby—a baby who now has a price not just on its head but on literally every part, as these videos exposed.

When we place a price on the outcome of the destruction of our children, we incentivize it. In another setting, we would call this price-per-specimen arrangement a bounty scheme, because with potential for such financial gain, there is little wonder why there are 149 abortions to every 1 adoption referral at these clinics—149 abortions to every 1 adoption referral at these clinics.

The discussions we heard are not exceptions or even the actions of a single clinic. This is a systemic issue within Planned Parenthood. We heard direct testimony that clinics act in concert, with the consent of their corporate headquarters at Planned Parenthood, and that no single clinic acts alone.

We learned that an overarching legal department works to build layers upon layers of defenses so that no one clinic is left holding the bag. Such a culture shows little regard for women’s health. This is a culture that has been embroiled in a number of lawsuits about making false reimbursement claims to the Federal Government and helping to facilitate the covering up of sexual abuse and statutory rape. In fact, just last week a complaint was filed with the Colorado Department of Regulatory Agencies against one of these clinics regarding a little 13-year-old girl who was sexually abused, had an abortion, and was returned to her

abuser. No report was made by the clinic or the abortionist. Her parents were not contacted—all in violation of the laws of Colorado.

So a “no” vote on this bill supports this culture. It devalues both the woman and that tiny little baby, that child.

We do have a choice today. We can work to change that culture if we choose to vote for women, if we would choose to vote yes, because a “yes” vote redirects—again, let’s get the facts straight here and separate them from the rhetoric—funds from Planned Parenthood and provides that money for women’s health services to the numerous community health centers.

You heard Senator PAUL talk about 9,000 community clinics around the country versus 700 Planned Parenthood centers. It would provide these dollars to those clinics, to local clinics, to hospitals, to other providers that already serve the majority of women.

I must tell you I was deeply disturbed—as a daddy of four—with this most recent video where a doctor pokes around the aborted baby’s parts until she finds the legs, and she shouts and exclaims: It is another boy.

There can be no denying what she was saying. We hear those words for the first time. I heard those words for the first time from a doctor during an ultrasound when Cindy and I were seeing the doctor as we were pregnant or in that ecstatic phone call that comes from an expecting mom or as the new father takes that newborn son into his arms. That doctor was the same one to say: It is a baby.

There is no doubt that this is what the little boy is; it is a baby.

I cannot support an organization that would place a dollar amount on body parts. I cannot support an organization that would incentivize his death. That is why I will vote for this bill, and my vote will be a vote for women’s health.

To be very clear, this bill won’t touch 1 cent of funding for women’s health—not 1 cent. That means that this vote is for one thing and one thing only. A “yes” vote is a vote for women. It is a vote for our children. I urge my colleagues: Let us vote for women. Let us vote for our children. Let us vote yes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, this ongoing conversation has happened. I would like to be able to demonstrate what we are really up against and what this really looks like in practical terms.

I brought a chart with me here for when we talk about women’s health because there is an accusation that is sitting out there that this is about cutting off access to women’s health. The chart I have on the right shows all Planned Parenthood licensed mammogram facilities. They would be a dot on this map. If you were looking close at the map, you would see no dots on it. It

is clear there is not a single one. The accusation is, over and over, that if women are going to get access to mammograms, they have to be able to get to Planned Parenthood. The dirty secret is they are referred to other locations. They recommend that you go get a mammogram, but Planned Parenthood doesn't do any of them. On the left, these are the 8,000-plus facilities—the dots on the map here—where you can actually get a mammogram. We are talking about taking funding from a location that refers patients to the location that actually does the mammogram.

This is about women's health, but it is also about the health of children. I have a very difficult time talking about things such as early childhood education on this floor with individuals who are passionate about early childhood education, but if that child was just a couple of years younger, they would have no issue with them being aborted and their body parts being sold.

That is the same child. That is the same child whose early childhood education we are passionate about. That is the same child whom we are passionate about in the Women, Infants, and Children funding to make sure that they get proper nutrition at birth. That is the same child. The only difference between the child in the womb and the child who is a preschooler is time. We just think it is important in this incredibly divisive issue of abortion that we treat this seriously as a nation.

What has happened in the last couple of weeks with the Planned Parenthood video coming out is that for the first time in a long time, this is not an invisible thing that is happening somewhere in secret. Now it is something that is actually happening where people can see it. I think our culture, for the first time in a while, is having to slow down and deal with the reality of this: Is it possible that this culture has been wrong, that this really is a child?

I spoke last week to a friend of mine. His child was born a year ago at 14 ounces. So 14 ounces was the birth weight. The child was born very, very premature. Their child is now 14 pounds, a year later, and doing extremely well. That 14-ounce child is a child that everyone sees now, but that 14-ounce child is exactly what Planned Parenthood was harvesting, was turning in the womb so they could crush the head to be able to gather the organs to be able to sell them.

As a culture, we have to deal with this one simple reality. That child is important. This is not about Cecil the lion. This is not about whales at SeaWorld. This is about children.

Maybe we as a culture should slow down and be able to answer that one simple question and at least for this moment with Planned Parenthood to say this to an organization where there

are a couple of things that are hanging over them right now that are very serious. One is that it is not legal under Federal law to sell parts of a human for profit. Now, it is still yet to be determined what was done. But it is also not legal to be able to change the timing, procedure or method of an abortion to be able to gather organs to be sold. That is very clear in Federal law as well.

So if the method is changed, if the timing is changed, if the procedure has changed, specifically to harvest organs, that is not legal. In the videos, over and over you hear doctors talking about how they changed the method, how they used the ultrasound to turn the child around, how they used a different technique than they would have normally done because they wanted to be able to gather these organs for sale.

Those are serious accusations. These are children—children. We think it is entirely reasonable to say let's take the funding that has been committed to Planned Parenthood, which is the single largest abortion provider in the country—40 percent of their revenue comes from the Federal taxpayer, 40 percent. Let's take that funding and let's commit it to organizations that do full women's health—mammograms, testing, contraceptives, and the works—not just recommending it to others and also do abortions, but we would commit it to those individuals.

With that, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana in this colloquy. I see my colleague from California as well. I think she would also like to have a moment in our colloquy.

Would the Senator like to be able to speak for a moment in our colloquy?

Mrs. BOXER. Yes, I was going to ask unanimous consent that following my friend from Louisiana I be given 2 minutes.

Mr. LANKFORD. Could we just swap and go straight to the Senator now? Would that be appropriate?

Mrs. BOXER. Whatever the Senator wants.

Mr. LANKFORD. Let's do that then.

I have a unanimous consent for an ongoing colloquy, and I would be pleased to have the Senator join this conversation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank my friend from Oklahoma for his generosity here. I tell him that I would really rather work with him on transportation.

I gave birth to two premature kids, and I just don't like lectures from men about what it is like—and thank God they made it.

I am pro-choice. I just have to say that using pregnancy as a political football doesn't sit well with the people I represent and the people of this country.

We have to respect one another. I respect your view entirely. I am asking

you to respect mine. Keep Uncle Sam out of my private life, and that of my children, my grandkids, and yours.

Families will make these decisions with their God and their doctor. Ninety-seven percent of the work Planned Parenthood does has nothing to do with abortion. It is primary health care.

I have to say that in 2011 Republicans threatened to shut down the government if Planned Parenthood wasn't defunded. I heard my friend from Washington, PATTY MURRAY, say they were serious. They were going to shut down the government to deny health care to 2.7 million women and men every year—for some of them, basic health care.

I will show you a particular person, Doreen from California, who said:

I went to Planned Parenthood and I talked to the clinician. . . . She gave me a referral to a breast care center where I had a mammogram and a biopsy [and] was ultimately diagnosed with breast cancer. . . . I was scheduled for a lumpectomy in about two weeks.

That woman could have died, and you say: Go to community health care centers. First, I find it ironic because they were set up in ObamaCare and all of you voted no on ObamaCare. We expanded community health centers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the community health care center association in California.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA PRIMARY CARE
ASSOCIATION,
July 30, 2015.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: The California Primary Care Association has recently become aware of new legislation by Senator Joni Ernst that would redirect federal funding from Planned Parenthood to other health care providers. The purported goal of such legislation is to prevent a decrease in federal funding for women's health services, while eliminating Planned Parenthood as a health care provider.

As the state-wide representatives of community clinics and health centers in California, who serve 5.6 million patients annually, we believe this action would negatively impact the health of our community.

Planned Parenthood currently operates 115 health centers in California and serves nearly 800,000 patients through 1.5 million encounters annually. Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our state's comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining providers. We do not have the capacity for such an increase in care and building such capacity would require significant capital investment on par with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act expansion.

Even then, the legislation would still eliminate patient's ability to choose the provider with which they feel most comfortable. Planned Parenthood is seen by many as women's health centric, which provides their

patients with a level of comfort that cannot be easily duplicated. The women's health focus allows them to be a provider of choice to hundreds of thousands of women who seek out a variety of services that include well woman exams, breast exams, birth control and sexually transmitted disease testing.

In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood conducted 733,641 tests for Chlamydia—the leading cause of preventable infertility—that resulted in 37,014 positive results and follow-up treatment.

Planned Parenthood is a vital component of the health care system in California and for that reason, we are opposed to legislation that will diminish their capacity to provide care in our state. We respectfully request that you oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

ANDIE MARTINEZ PATTERSON, MPP,

Director of Government Affairs.

They say they cannot take any more patients. They cannot take those 800,000 patients.

So they say to the women: Go to the community health care centers. They voted against ObamaCare, which expanded the community health care centers, and the health care centers are saying no, they are sorry, they cannot do it. Planned Parenthood does a great job.

So this is a continuation of the Republican war on women. I hope we will defeat this ill-considered bill that is about to come our way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I wish to be able to continue this conversation because it is extremely important that we continue this as a nation.

I wish to make a couple of comments to you as well.

I am a dad with two daughters. I had something to do with the birth as well and was also there. I was there during the sonograms. My wife and I are extremely close. As a dad of two daughters, I am very passionate—not only about my own wife but about my mom, who is a cancer survivor. She is a multiple-time cancer survivor. I am passionate about my daughters having every single opportunity. So this is important to us as well. This is not just a women's issue. This is a men's issue as well because this is a family issue, and families are extremely important to all of us.

But I would say that community health centers don't serve 3.2 million people, like Planned Parenthood. Community health centers serve 23 million people around the country. There are around 650 Planned Parenthood locations around the country. There are 9,000 community health centers around the country. The Planned Parenthood facilities refer people to go get breast cancer screenings. The community health centers actually do that testing there. They actually do the mammograms there and not just say that you should get one.

So this is about women's health. It is also about the efficiency of what we are going to be about.

I would also say one other thing on this issue about ObamaCare and the community health centers. The community health centers were funded under ObamaCare, but they long preexisted before ObamaCare. Community health centers are not an invention of ObamaCare. There was a section of ObamaCare that funded some of them an additional amount, but they have been around for decades and decades. They are an extremely efficient form of health care, especially to those on Medicaid.

I yield to my friend and fellow Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Mr. President, I am a physician, a doctor. For the last 25 years, I have worked in hospitals for the uninsured. So when my friend from California mentions the need to ensure access for those who might not otherwise afford it, that is what I have been attempting to do in my medical practice for the last 25 years.

As a practicing physician, one of the first things you are taught in medical school is "first, do no harm." Tragically, these videos demonstrate that some do not share that perspective.

When patients see their doctors, they want an honest, objective opinion. But what the video suggests is that Planned Parenthood puts profits and special interests before the women who call on them for their advice.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator should be advised that the time for the vote, scheduled for 5:30, has arrived. He can ask unanimous consent for additional time if he so wishes.

Mr. CASSIDY. Oh, is it 5:30 now? I am sorry. I ask unanimous consent for another 2 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASSIDY. Now, again, for 30 years, I have been working to get health care for folks, and I think it is important we ensure access for women to health care.

Currently, Planned Parenthood gets \$500 million in Federal funding per year. If we redirect this funding to the community health centers, which I have worked with for 30 years, their health can be better served.

There are two Planned Parenthood facilities in Louisiana, and there are 160 community health centers. The two Planned Parenthood offices, one in New Orleans and one in Baton Rouge, are in the southeastern portion of the State. The community health centers are scattered all over the State, and, again, there are 160 of those.

For every American who is troubled by these videos, we should be equally troubled by the fact that the Planned Parenthood provision of health care is geographically centered in some areas but not as broadly as the community health centers.

I will also point out, as a physician, that the Planned Parenthood model of care is outdated. We now talk about clinics which are medical homes, not which are siloed into only the provision of birth control pills and, in the case of Planned Parenthood, abortion. The community health centers can provide the whole range of services including those for diabetes, hypertension, et cetera.

It is time for Congress to act. I ask my colleagues to support this redistribution of money, sending it closer to where those patients live, to better ensure a woman's access to health care, and to address the troubling issues raised by these videos.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

Mrs. BOXER. Reserving the right to object, I will not object if Senator BLUMENTHAL can respond with 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, the question before us today is clear: Who do we want to be as a nation?

It is hard for anyone to defend these morally reprehensible videos as Planned Parenthood callously harvested the organs of unborn babies to be sold at a price. The American people, Republicans and Democrats alike, are horrified by the blatant disregard and utter lack of compassion shown by Planned Parenthood for these women and their babies.

It is wrong. The American people know it, and they should not be asked to foot part of the bill. We can no longer turn a blind eye. This is human life, and Planned Parenthood, the Nation's single largest provider of abortion services, is harvesting baby body parts.

Before you now is a critical opportunity to vote for legislation that will protect the most vulnerable in our society and fund women's health.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am tempted to say there they go again, because we have seen this attack on women's health care again and again and again. It is a very weak excuse to defund Planned Parenthood.

We know 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's activities have nothing to do with abortion. Let's stand strong for women's health care to protect women against cancer, against hepatitis, against sexually transmitted diseases. Eighty percent of Planned Parenthood's clients have nowhere else to go for those vital services. We will not tolerate this attack on women's health

care under the guise of stopping abortion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I am grateful for this conversation about children.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is regular order at this point?

Parliamentary inquiry. What is the regular order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order is that all time has expired.

Mr. LANKFORD. I would advise my colleague from California I have a unanimous consent request under rule XXII.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

Mitch McConnell, James M. Inhofe, Rand Paul, Pat Roberts, Ben Sasse, James Lankford, Joni Ernst, Daniel Coats, Cory Gardner, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, Johnny Isakson, Lindsey Graham, Michael B. Enzi, Jerry Moran, Tim Scott, John Cornyn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) would have voted "yea."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 46, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 262 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Capito	Cornyn
Ayotte	Cassidy	Cotton
Barrasso	Coats	Crapo
Blunt	Cochran	Cruz
Boozman	Collins	Daines
Burr	Corker	Donnelly

Enzi	Lankford	Rubio
Ernst	Lee	Sasse
Fischer	Manchin	Scott
Flake	McCain	Sessions
Gardner	Moran	Shelby
Grassley	Murkowski	Sullivan
Hatch	Paul	Thune
Heller	Perdue	Tillis
Hoeven	Portman	Toomey
Inhofe	Risch	Vitter
Isakson	Roberts	Wicker
Johnson	Rounds	

NAYS—46

Baldwin	Heitkamp	Peters
Bennet	Hirono	Reed
Blumenthal	Kaine	Reid
Booker	King	Sanders
Boxer	Kirk	Schatz
Brown	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cantwell	Leahy	Shaheen
Cardin	Markey	Stabenow
Carper	McCaskill	Tester
Casey	McConnell	Udall
Coons	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Feinstein	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden
Gillibrand	Murray	
Heinrich	Nelson	

NOT VOTING—1

Graham

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 46.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to S. 754.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 754, a bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 28, S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John McCain, Richard C. Shelby, Tom Cotton, Marco Rubio, Susan M. Collins, John Thune, Daniel Coats; Richard

Burr, Pat Roberts, John Barrasso, James E. Risch, Orrin G. Hatch, Roy Blunt.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be brief.

I understand why our colleagues want to respond in some way to the horrendous hack at the Office of Personnel Management. I wish to say to my colleagues that it needs to be a response that is going to work. My concern is that this bill, in its present form, will create more problems than it solves, and it would be a mistake to bring it up without agreeing to an inclusive process for considering relevant amendments.

I appreciate that the sponsors of the bill have been working on a managers' amendment to address some of the very serious concerns that have been raised. My own view is that the bill needs a lot more work. For example, the managers' amendment does not fix the provision of this bill that will allow private companies to hand over large volumes of their customers' personal information to the Government with only a cursory review, even if that information is not necessary for cyber security.

Cyber security experts and privacy advocates have been raising concerns about these issues for many months. They state that they have sent something like 6 million communications to the Hill in the last few days.

For me, the bottom line is that the legislation, as it stands today, doesn't do a whole lot to protect U.S. networks against sophisticated hacks, and it will do a lot to undermine the privacy rights of the American people.

I see the distinguished senior Senator from California here, and I know she has a different view. My colleague from North Carolina is here. I look forward to working with both of them and the Senate and hope that we will have an inclusive debate that will ensure that all sides get a chance to raise their concerns.

Cyber security is a very real problem in America. My constituents have been hacked. In fact, the Chinese were indicted for hacking my constituents. Information sharing can play a valuable role. Yet information sharing without vigorous and robust privacy safeguards will be seen by the American people as a surveillance bill. That is a fact.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Ohio.

DRINKING WATER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I have come back to the floor again this afternoon to plead with my colleagues to pass legislation that deals with the toxic algal blooms that affect many of our States, including my State of Ohio.

It turns out this is the 1-year anniversary of the water crisis that occurred in Toledo, OH. I see my colleague from Ohio is now on the floor also. He will remember this well. But it was a year ago when we found that there were toxic algal blooms around the intake valve in Toledo, OH, making the water unsuitable. There was an advisory sent out to 500,000 people that said: Do not drink the water.

You can imagine the chaos that occurred. You can imagine how difficult this was for the people who live in the Toledo area, who rely on this water. By the way, there are about 3 million Ohioans who rely on Lake Erie water and more than twice that many around the country and in other States, such as Michigan.

This is a critical issue. Last week it turned out that there were algal blooms that were moving within a few miles of this same intake valve—the same kind of blue-green toxic algal blooms. I was on the lake the weekend before last to see some of this. Within a couple of days, the city of Toledo changed the city's water quality status from "clear" to "watch." We are on a "watch" status right now because of the amounts of toxins that have drifted closer to the intake valve.

We have a problem right now. We know that the toxic algal blooms prediction for this year in Lake Erie is projected to be worse than it was last year, almost as bad as it was during another crisis period in 2011, when a lot of the beaches were closed down and people weren't able to take their pets to the water and when fishing was pretty much shut down because of the algal blooms. This is a huge issue. It is an economic development issue. It is a health and safety issue. It is an issue that goes to the heart of the economy in this part of Ohio where we have relatively high unemployment and where Lake Erie is the single biggest driver of economic activity. In fact, it is the biggest destination in the State of Ohio. It is our biggest resource for tourism.

It is not just Lake Erie. We now have this in Grand Lake St. Marys. There is an advisory out on water in Grand Lake St. Marys, which is a reservoir that is inland that is a freshwater reservoir south of Lake Erie. It is the same thing—toxic algal blooms. We had a lot of rain earlier this spring and summer, as those of us in the Midwest will remember, and that washed a lot of effluent into the lakes, a lot of nitrogen, a lot of phosphorous—the things that cause algal blooms to grow. Then we had some hot weather. That is a bad combination.

Again, I see my colleague Senator BROWN is on the floor too. We drafted legislation to get the EPA more engaged in this issue, to help Ohio more, and to help all of the States represented here.

We have had this legislation on the floor of the Senate for over 40 days—45

days, I think. We have had it cleared on both sides of the aisle. In other words, there is no substantive concern about it. It took a while to do that.

We had to work with some people on my side of the aisle who thought maybe EPA didn't have a role here. But EPA does have a role. It is a really important role. It can bring best practices, and it certainly can bring the best research done in the country. It happens to be done in Cincinnati, among other places, at EPA. We have required EPA under this legislation to come up with a plan to deal with this issue immediately for Lake Erie, working with the other agencies, such as USGS, NOAA, or the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and USDA, and to come up with a plan that helps us to deal with this issue right now.

If you live in the Toledo area this evening, you are worried. There is a watch on. Once again, you are worried that you are not going to have water supply that is safe for you and your kids. If you live somewhere else along the lake—say, in Cleveland or Sandusky—you are worried too because these same toxic algal blooms know no barriers, know no boundaries, and they move around the lake.

All we are asking tonight is that we be able to pass legislation that is straightforward, that is nonpartisan. It is not just bipartisan. I would say it is nonpartisan. It is very sensible, and it highlights the need for us to take immediate action because it talks about some of the issues that are involved.

There are 42 water systems in Ohio that are now susceptible to harmful algal blooms, for instance. It talks about the fact that we have to be sure that we are not just protecting Lake Erie but other bodies of freshwater, and it forces the EPA to come up with a plan that helps us deal with this issue right now.

This legislation passed the House already. It didn't just pass the House; it passed the House with a vote of 375 to 37. Not many pieces of legislation pass the House with those kinds of numbers. Again, Senator BROWN and I have been trying for more than 4 months to get that House-passed bill passed here in the Senate. We have worked through the substantive problems. I tried to do this on Thursday evening, and I was told I had to stop and I was going to get blocked from doing it because the other side had other legislation they wanted to consider that had not been passed in the House—much less passed in the House 375 to 37.

If we pass this legislation tonight and if we are able to get it through with a voice vote and get it done, it will go to the President and he will sign it. In other words, it will become law. That is what the people I represent are looking for.

Again, I notice my colleague Senator BROWN is on the floor. If he is inter-

ested, I would certainly yield to him. Any comments he has, I would appreciate hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I will be brief and turn it back to Senator PORTMAN.

We worked on this issue for a long time. We remember what happened with algal blooms 4 years ago. We remember just last year—1 year ago—in August, 500,000 people in northwest Ohio didn't have drinking water. Imagine what that does to a community for 2½, 3 days.

We know that the Western Basin of Lake Erie is the shallowest part of any of the Great Lakes—only 30 feet deep in the Western Basin. Contrast that with Lake Superior, where 600 feet deep is the average. You can see the vulnerability of Lake Erie and what it means. Whether it is from runoff, whether it is from agriculture and homeowners and commercial and industrial establishments, the Maumee River Basin is the largest river feeding any of the Great Lakes. Whether it is coming together on climate change and heating of the water and all the issues that affect the short term and long term, our legislation will help us this year and help us the next couple of years. We obviously need long-term solutions. This is critical.

I called the mayor of Toledo today, and I know Senator PORTMAN is working with the city, the county, the State EPA, and the U.S. EPA on this. This is very crucial for people in our State and ultimately throughout the Great Lakes as these problems proliferate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his good work on this bill. He helped to improve this legislation and make it more effective. It is about having the EPA play a bigger role on not only how we monitor but also how we treat the water and how we establish when there is a problem. This is needed, it is needed now, and it is immediate.

This is a photograph that was taken about 8 days ago—not this past week but the weekend before—on the lake. The jar in the photograph was collected by the charter boat captain. He is actually one of the charter boat captains who go out every day and collect samples that are then used by the experts to determine not just where the algal blooms are but the level of toxicity. This is what we found. As you can see, that doesn't look very appetizing. It is thick and green. It is filled with the kinds of toxins that can affect people in very negative ways if they get in the drinking water. We know that people are getting rashes right now from some other freshwater reservoirs in our area, from being in contact with the water.

If we don't deal with this issue, we know we are going to have more of this. We know it has already cost our communities a lot to mitigate it. In Grand Lake St. Marys, as I mentioned earlier, they have already shut down some of the beaches because of this. The city of Celina spends \$450,000 annually to deal with this. So this is also a taxpayer issue. Columbus was recently forced to spend \$700,000 to mitigate an outbreak in their reservoir. This is happening right now as we speak.

We just want this legislation to be out there as one of the tools in the toolbox to deal with it, and it is a very sensible one. It gets the EPA engaged in a way so that Republicans and Democrats in both the House and Senate can agree on it. Let's get this done tonight.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212

Mr. President, I ask that we get this legislation done now by asking unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 212, which is at the desk, and that the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, we have been through this before, so I think the Senator from Ohio knows what I am going to say. The bill he proposes to go forward on these terms has been paired by our side with the National Estuary Program, which, like his bill, is bipartisan and, like his bill, is not controversial. It has been passed over and over again by the Senate. Indeed, I think it was originally the work of Republican Senator John Chafee of Rhode Island. It has been passed by the House over and over again. This is a reauthorization. If we clear it through the House, it will go to the President for signing.

Our bill came through the Environment and Public Works Committee in regular order, whereas this came over from the House, was held at the desk, was never reviewed by the committee of jurisdiction, and is now being hotlined, which is fine except that I understand it to be a tradition around here that we compare noncontroversial bills.

I don't understand. Our bill, the estuary bill, is noncontroversial also. Our bill is also bipartisan. It is the work of Senator VITTER, who is the chairman of the committee. Why is there this effort week after week to separate the two rather than just pass them both?

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212
AND S. 1523

So I ask that the Senator amend his unanimous consent request to read as follows: I ask unanimous consent that

the EPW Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 212, which is the Drinking Water Protection Act, a bill to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and S. 1523, a bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program; further, that the Senate proceed to their immediate consideration en bloc, the Senate proceed to vote on passage of the bills, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

If the Senator will agree to that so that the pairing is maintained, then I will have no objection. If he will not agree to it, then I must object because I don't know why these bills are being repeatedly taken apart.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio modify his request?

Mr. PORTMAN. No, I can't modify my request because his bill has not cleared, and he knows that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the original request?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. There is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Look, this is ridiculous. We have a health and safety issue on the floor of the Senate that is ready to go. You just heard from me and Senator BROWN. It is bipartisan, bicameral, and is ready to go to the President.

I must say to my friend the Senator from Rhode Island, who talked about his legislation, that I have no problem with his legislation, but he hasn't had it cleared. The Senator said this has been going on for weeks and weeks, and that is not true. This came onto our radar screen on Thursday night of last week when, after over 40 days on the floor with our bill, we got it all cleared, and then we found out just prior to my going and asking to have a voice vote on it that now they want to pair it with another piece of legislation that has nothing to do with health and safety. It is a reauthorization of a program that has not been passed by the House. The Senator from Rhode Island said it has been passed by the House. It has not been passed by the House. It may have been passed by the House in a previous Congress, but that doesn't count. What counts is that our bill passed the House with a vote of 375 to 37, and it is now on the floor.

The people I represent deserve to have our government work for them right now to help deal with this algal bloom problem, and they are blocking my bill with legislation they say is nonpartisan and noncontroversial?

I am happy to support their bill. In fact, what I did last week when I found out about it on Thursday was I started clearing it for them because they hadn't done it. I put it in the clearance process. As of today, there are some concerns on my side of the aisle. No-

body has seen it yet. They are seeing it for the first time. We went out of session right after I started clearing it, and we are back in session now and people are looking at it. I am happy to support the Senator's bill, but the Senator from Rhode Island shouldn't block our bill because they are looking for me to support their bill. I am happy to support their bill but not if it is going to keep us from moving forward tonight. I can't agree to pair it because there will be an objection because people haven't had a chance to look at it. I know the committee sometimes likes to pair legislation. They don't always pair legislation, by the way.

I think it is ridiculous that we can't move forward on a very simple piece of legislation that we worked on for over 40 days. And everybody is fine with it. There are no substantive problems. It is a health-and-safety issue. Let's go ahead with this. In this instance, let's put partisanship aside.

I support the Senator's bill. I will support his bill. I will vote for his bill. I will continue to try to clear it even though they didn't clear it. I am the one trying to clear it. I don't know if they have even cleared it on their side. I don't know if they even put it in the process yet. But obviously you have to do that in order for this to happen.

I am amazed that we are going to actually stop legislation that is needed right now for legislation that has not passed the House, is not going to the President for his signature, and is not due to an imminent health-and-safety issue.

The Federal Government is not going to be there for the people in northern Ohio and throughout our State who are worried about the algal blooms right now, because of some disagreement on the floor of this Chamber where at the very last minute Democrats stepped forward and said: No, we are not going to let this bipartisan bill go forward because we want to insist that it be paired with one that has not gone through the clearance process.

I commit to my friend that I will support his bill. I have had a chance to look at it over the weekend. I am OK with it. But it has not been cleared, and it is not going to go to the President for signature.

The House of Representatives is not in session this week, so even if by some miracle they could get their bill cleared here, they can't get it cleared by the House because the House is out of session. They are coming back in September. We are in session. We can get this done. We can send it to the President. We can let people know they can sleep a little more comfortably at night, with a little more peace of mind, knowing that we have actually taken action here to get this expert agency that deals with water quality engaged and involved to help the local folks, the State folks, and experts back home

to be able to do the right thing so they can avoid another water crisis and all of the issues Senator BROWN and I saw when we were up there.

I went up with bottles of water, threw them in the back of my pickup, and they were gone like that. Why? Families were desperate to be sure they had water for their kids. Mothers were desperate to make sure they had water to be able to ensure that their families weren't going to be left without access to what is perhaps the most important thing any of us can imagine, which is clean water one can drink and use for cooking.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.R. 212

I again ask unanimous consent that my colleague yield and that we allow this bill to go forward. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to H.R. 212, which is at the desk, that the bill be read a third time, and that the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. PORTMAN. I am sorry to hear that. I will be back again tomorrow and the next day. I will be back again and again because we want to get this done. This is simple. There is no real mystery here. This is an opportunity to get something done that helps people not just in my State but around the country deal with a very real problem they are facing this summer, now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I suggest to my friend the Senator from Ohio that if he is going to keep coming back every day, it might be productive if during the course of the day he were to get his side to clear the paired piece of legislation, which, as I have said, is bipartisan. His colleague Senator VITTER, for instance, is the co-author of it. It has cleared the EPW Committee, which is chaired and run by the Republicans now. If their side isn't aware of this bill, it came through regular order through the committee that they run. If their side isn't aware of this bill—it has been sitting over here ever since it cleared the committee. All they have to do is clear it, and we will be done.

So perhaps if the Senator will put his effort into clearing a noncontroversial, bipartisan bill that for decades has been passed and reauthorized by this body, then we can move forward. It should be a fairly easy task. I would be very happy to support him in any way I can.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. So this is all about leverage—to leverage me to be able to help you on your bill, which I told you

I support, in order for us to get something done that has been on the floor for over 40 days.

Look, I am happy to talk to my colleagues. I am the one who started clearing this on our side of the aisle. You guys didn't. I am happy to talk to colleagues who have concerns. But they get a chance to look at it, just as you had a chance to look at our bill over the last 45 days.

So if this is all about leverage, you got me. You have leveraged me. You have already done it. You have succeeded. I already started clearing it. I support it. I am happy to help, and I am sure Senator BROWN is happy to help also, but let's not block this in the meantime.

We will be able to get your bill done; I am sure of it. I am sure, if it is as popular as you say it is, we can get it done in the House too. It has not cleared the House at this point. In the meantime, let's not block this legislation. This is ridiculous. This is not the way this Senate ought to operate.

We have a smart bill on the floor that has been looked at over 40 days. It is ready to go. It has been cleared by both sides. There are no substantive concerns. And it is time that we deliver for the people we represent.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I respect the Senator from Ohio greatly. I know this lake is important to him. We are a State that is wrapped around the estuary, Narragansett Bay, and that, too, is important to us. If my friend is sure, as he just said, that this bill will clear on his side, then I urge him to please go ahead and clear it, and let's clear this unnecessary blockage and move both good bills forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, just a short time ago, the Senate rejected legislation that would promote and protect women's health and protect the lives of unborn children. The legislation introduced by Senator JONI ERNST would deny the Nation's largest abortion provider taxpayer funding and shift that funding to local health organizations to provide necessary health care and medical treatment for women.

This issue arises once more after the release of several undercover videos that successively have become more gruesome than the last. The videos of Planned Parenthood that have been released so far reveal the breadth of institutionalized disregard for human life at its earliest stages.

At the basic level of decency, we are repulsed by these videos because science and reason inform our consciences and lead us to the inescapable conclusion that lives are being ended

through this exploitation. If individual organs and tissues can be harvested from aborted babies, it is impossible to make the case that this is not a human life that is being destroyed. Why do we place more value on the parts and the pieces of a human life than the life as a whole?

In one of those videos, Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services noted: "We've been very good at getting heart, lung, and liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part, I'm going to basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact."

Another Planned Parenthood official in another video—this one from California—said this:

It's been years since I talked about compensation, so let me just figure out what others are getting. If this is in the ballpark, it's fine. If it's still low, then we can bump it up. I still want my Lamborghini.

These words by two different officials in two different settings reflect a view that unborn children are nothing more than a commodity to be exploited and abused and they seemingly would do that for material gain. Is this where we would want our scarce tax dollars to go? In fact, if we had an abundance, is this a place we would want those dollars to go?

Critics contend that the videos are heavily edited. Yet the videos have been released in their entirety and the transcripts of the full conversations have been provided. It is telling that despite full access to what was discussed, these critics have not been able to justify their grotesque practices being described, nor the inappropriate tone adopted with regard to selling tissues and organs of an unborn child.

This isn't news. We have long known of the hundreds of thousands of abortions Planned Parenthood performs each year. If we can only avert our eyes and look the other way, as critics would have us do, we can avoid what is obscene and hugely uncomfortable. That can no longer happen. Light needs to be shed on an organization that destroys human lives while hiding behind the veil of women's health services.

It is alarming that Politico reports that Planned Parenthood's public relations firm is requesting that members of the media refrain from airing the videos that expose the truth of Planned Parenthood practices. We cannot allow atrocities such as this to be swept under the rug because of the power this organization wields.

Kansans have long made it clear they don't want their tax dollars contributing to abortion providers, and I have worked to make their voices heard in Washington. Taxpayers should not fear that their money is going to fund actions they find sincerely and seriously morally wrong. This legislation would prevent taxpayer dollars from funding

Planned Parenthood, allowing our taxpayers peace of mind and a sense of morality that their hard-earned money is not facilitating something they abhor.

Instead, S. 1881 would reallocate the funds Planned Parenthood receives through grants back into their communities. The money would go to local health care providers that offer important women's health services, allowing them to care for more women in their communities. By distributing the funds Planned Parenthood currently receives through a grant process to community health centers, we can increase the number of women's health care providers instead of funding a contentious organization that ends life. In fact, in our State, there are two offices of Planned Parenthood, but there are 50 community health centers. It would actually be more available. Women would have more access to health care services if the money was provided through community health centers. We are a rural State and only through that process would many women be able to access this service. Hard-working Americans—our constituents—deserve to have their taxpayer dollars going toward local community centers and county health departments, places that value life instead of destroying it.

Women deserve affordable health care, and it is being provided by a number of organizations that have nothing to do with abortion. We can and should support these health providers and we can and should protect the unborn. We can do both. S. 1881 would be a significant step, an important step, in accomplishing both of those goals, and I believe it should have passed with broad support.

Though I am deeply disappointed by the result of tonight's vote, I remain hopeful for a solution that will advance the life and health of both mother and child. In fact, as science improves our understanding of the unborn and the practices of abortion providers are further exposed, I think a solution will be inevitable.

Unfortunately, that time apparently has not yet come, but I and others will remain focused on this goal. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to act appropriately to do the same.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

HONORING VIETNAM VETERANS AND NORTH DAKOTA'S SOLDIERS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I rise to speak again about the 198 North Dakotans who died during the Vietnam war. In a moment I will speak about some of the things I have learned about who they are.

I also wish to thank Vietnam veterans who have served our State and our country, and one of those Vietnam veterans is Robert "Bob" Wefald of Bismarck.

The year Bob graduated from the University of North Dakota, he enlisted in the Navy. He served 3 years on Active Duty during the conflict in Vietnam. In Bob's 2010 autobiography titled "Moments," he wrote: "Going to WESTPAC and Vietnam was the biggest and most intense experience of my 27 years in the Navy." After his Active-Duty service, Bob continued to serve his country in the Naval Reserve.

In 1970, Bob began law school at the University of Michigan and saw his classmates being drafted to serve in Vietnam. As a part of the university's student board of governors, Bob led the movement for the dean to promise to allow drafted students to return to law school after completing their service.

While in Michigan, Bob met and married the love of his life, Susan. They moved to Bismarck, ND, and spent their careers and even now their retirement in public service.

Bob's first job after law school was clerking for the North Dakota Supreme Court. He later worked in private practice as an attorney. In 1981, he was elected North Dakota's Attorney General. I have him to thank for appointing me as assistant attorney general in the tax department and for fighting for me to earn a decent wage while I was in that position. Bob made me say that.

In 1998, Bob was elected as a district court judge and served there until his retirement in 2010. While working, Bob and Susan, who was North Dakota's public service commissioner for 16 years, raised three children. Throughout their careers, and now, Bob and Susan have both volunteered to serve on many boards and organizations throughout our State, including the Boys and Girls Scouts, the American Legion, and Boys State.

Bob was the spark that lit the fire in making two significant military projects a reality for North Dakota. One was establishing a State veterans cemetery and the other was having a Navy ship named after North Dakota—the USS *North Dakota*. Both ideas became a reality. For over 20 years, the vets cemetery outside my community of Mandan has been a beautiful resting place for those who gave so much to our country. In 2013, I had the honor of attending the 2013 christening of the USS *North Dakota*, and I could see Bob's involvement in every thoughtful detail.

Bob is an example of a true public servant. Thank you, Bob, for your continued drive and your dedication to service. North Dakota loves and appreciates you.

Bob also wanted to make a point to publicly recognize other people's service and sacrifice. One of Bob's University of North Dakota Sigma Chi Fraternity brothers, Bill Potter served in the Air Force and died serving in the Vietnam war. Bob regularly writes

about Bill to encourage others to remember and honor Bill.

Now I am going to conclude my series of speeches on the floor of the U.S. Senate by remembering Bill Potter, as well as other North Dakotans who died during the Vietnam war. Today is the last of my weekly trips to the Senate floor to talk about the men from our State who died during the war. I have taken to the floor 15 times to honor these fallen soldiers, these fallen heroes, and every time has been an enormous and special privilege. I have made it a point to reach out to the families of each of the 198 North Dakotans who lost their lives in Vietnam. I wanted to speak about each man so his family, friends, and people who served with him would know how much we appreciate who he was and what he did for us. Learning from family members about each man has truly been a great honor. To everyone who shared with us, I imagine it was difficult to speak about your loved one, and I can honestly say that doing so made a difference to my staff, made a difference to so many people, made a difference to many of the Senators who have listened to these speeches, and I hope it has made a great difference to the young pages who have been so patient as I have talked about these fallen heroes.

WILLIAM "BILL" POTTER

Today I begin with William "Bill" Potter. Bill was from Grand Forks. He was born December 28, 1942. He served as a pilot in the Air Force's 432nd Tactical Recon Wing. Bill was 25 years old on February 5, 1968, when his plane was shot down and burned.

The Air Force awarded Bill the Air Medal and the Distinguished Flying Cross in recognition for his heroism in aerial flight. For 7 years after Bill's plane crashed, the Air Force listed Bill as missing in action.

Bill was survived by his wife Betsy. Betsy wrote the following poem regarding the need in her life to file for divorce from Bill while he was listed as missing. Eyewitnesses had described watching his plane crash and burn. This is her poem:

In my adult life as a serviceman's wife
I stayed home so "the man" could deploy.
Had dependent I.D. card—and first passport
got stamped
'66 was a year of some joy
'67 not bad—'68 very sad
Potter's body got lost in Nam's shuffle
MIA was the status, completely non-gratis
And the Air Force told me that I should muffle.

Crashed in Laos (the site)
and try as I might
D.O.D would not call it a death.
Civil court was my choice if I wanted a voice
for my life to move forward with breadth.
As I saw no dishonor to distance myself
from a pilot flown into the earth.
The life I have led since Bill Potter was dead
Second husband, kids/grandkids and mirth.
Peter Rice career Navy,
now our son in the Army

continued our serviceman's code
As a widow, wife, mother, North Dakotan or
OTHER

I have carried my share of the load.

HERBERT "HERB" LAPP

Herbert "Herb" Lapp was from Hebron. He was born February 1, 1923. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. Herb was 43 years old when he died on July 3, 1966.

He had seven brothers and eight sisters. Herb's sister Betty remembers him as someone with a great sense of humor and that he was easy to get along with.

Herb enlisted in the Army as a young man and served in World War II prior to serving in Vietnam. Five of his brothers served their country by serving in the military, and Herb's younger brother Edwin was killed in action in the Korean war.

Herb was then killed early in the Vietnam war, when he was shot in the stomach.

In addition to his mother and siblings, Herb was survived by his wife Juanita; daughter Diana; and son Marcus.

ROGER ALBERTS

Roger Alberts was from Fort Totten. He was born on July 11, 1947. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Roger died on February 5, 1968. He was 20 years old.

Roger was the ninth of 10 children, and his older sister Winona helped her parents raise Roger. Winona remembers Roger as a quiet person who did many great things, including helping his family around their home. Winona said, "Everything was good about that young boy."

Roger had a desire so strong to serve his country that he enlisted in the Army before he graduated from high school. At the same time that Roger was serving in Vietnam, his brother Allen was serving in the Navy on a ship close to Vietnam. Allen remembers looking toward Vietnam and seeing flares and wondering where Roger was and if he was OK.

When he had less than a month to serve in Vietnam, Roger was shot. On February 2, his family received notice that Roger was missing. Finally, at the end of February, the Army confirmed that they found his body and that Roger had been killed. They later learned from another North Dakota soldier, Wesley Howling Wolf, that when Roger died, Wesley hid his body so the opposing forces would not be able to find his body, but after hiding Roger's body, Wesley was hurt and went into a coma. When he awoke, he told the Army officials that he had hidden Roger's body to protect him and Roger was found.

Roger's family appreciates the Army for sending an escort to remain with Roger's body until he could reach them in North Dakota, and to Roger's girlfriend for giving them the letters

he wrote while Roger was serving in Vietnam.

MITCHEL "MITCH" HANSEY

Mitchel "Mitch" Hansey was a native of Scranton and was born March 25, 1947. Mitchel died December 14, 1968. He was 21 years old.

He grew up on his family's farm and was the oldest of eight children, born to Dennis and Bertha Hansey. In his early years, he attended country school, and later graduated from Scranton High School.

His youngest sister Gwyn laughs and remembers the time she felt Mitchel saved her life by kicking a grasshopper off her leg despite his arms being full of the groceries he was carrying.

Mitchel's family is dedicated to serving their country. His father Dennis served in the Army during World War II. His brother Terry served in the Marines, and his brother Gail served in the Army.

Mitchel's siblings remember him sending them letters from Vietnam with pictures of himself on a boat. They understand that when he was on his way to mail them Christmas cards, Mitchel fell off a plank as he was walking between two ships and drowned.

MICHAEL "MIKE" WOLF, JR.

Michael "Mike" Wolf, Jr., was from Beulah, and he was born June 27, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps H Company, 2nd Battalion, 5th Marines, 1st Marine Division. He was 21 years old when he died on September 10, 1967.

He was the fifth of 12 children. Mike's sister Laurel said Mike was a quiet man who was involved in just about every sport offered in high school. His dream was to work as a high school coach someday. Mike enlisted at the same time as his cousin Rick Wolf and two of their friends from Beulah enlisted. The day he died, Rick was sent ahead as a scout and was killed in an ambush. He had been expected to return home about 3 weeks later.

Mike's 1955 Pontiac Chieftain sat in the yard for 30 years. Laurel's husband spent 10 years restoring Mike's car and gave it to Laurel's son Donovan, who is currently having it painted. As a tribute to Mike, they made a scrapbook which shows the process of restoring his car.

RANDOLPH "RANDY" MARTHE

Randolph "Randy" Marthe was from Esmond. He was born November 17, 1950. He served in the Army's 52nd Artillery Group. Randy died March 31, 1971. He was 20 years old.

He was the youngest of his family of 10 children. His older siblings enjoyed spoiling him and treating him like the baby of the family. Randy's sister Rita said he was a good, quiet boy who liked to have fun and never caused his parents any problems. Rita remembers that after she was married and living on a farm, Randy and two of his brothers, Pat and Dale, would go to Rita's

farm to help. Rita's basement bathroom shower had a window in it, and Randy had a great time surprising his showering brothers with a blast of cold water from the garden hose.

Randy's family appreciates the calls he made and letters he sent them from Vietnam. Rita remembers Randy calling her from Vietnam. He said he would be going on duty for a while, so she would not hear from him again for a while. She never heard from him again.

The Army awarded Randy the Silver Star for gallantry due to his heroic actions the day he was killed in Vietnam. That day, Randy's firebase was under heavy attack and he defended his position, despite being injured and ultimately sacrificing himself, which saved the lives of many of his fellow soldiers.

In 2010, Randy's family was touched to read a Benson County Farmer's Press column written by a young woman, Shell Eyl, who was born after Randy died but thought about Randy because she spent time as a child at the Randy Marthe Memorial Park in Esmond. Shell wrote about what giving up your life for country truly means. She described a lifetime of moments Randy didn't get to have, such as hot summer days by the lake and walking his daughters down the aisle. Shell concluded her column describing that Randy didn't die so his name would be etched on a granite wall or for a park named after him. He died and gave up everything so you and I could have it all.

THOMAS "TOM" SENNE

Thomas "Tom" Senne was from Valley City, and he was born November 14, 1948. He served in the Army's 1st Infantry Division. Tom died on October 26, 1968. He was 19 years old.

Tom worked at the Red Owl store in Valley City and was looking forward to a future in that business. He was a great athlete and top wrestler at his high school. Everyone knew and loved Tom. He made friends easily. He was so well liked that sometimes folks would look the other way when he did things like take part in an impromptu drag race down Central Avenue in Valley City on a Sunday morning. Now, I would just tell you that is hearsay.

Tom came from a family with a deep history of serving their country. His dad served in World War II, his uncles from both sides of his family served in either World War II or Korea, and two of his brothers served with the National Guard.

CLEO LEVANG

Cleo Levang was from Forman. He was born February 6, 1946. He served in the Marine Corps, Company I, 3rd Battalion, 7th Marines, 1st Marine Division. Cleo died on January 5, 1967. He was just 20 years old.

He was the third of four children born to Cliff and Leckny Levang and grew up on his family's farm northwest

of Forman. His sister Bev said Cleo loved to tease in good fun. She recalls Cleo visiting her, sneaking around behind her in the kitchen and opening the cupboard doors behind her. After closing them several times, she finally realized her jokester brother was behind the recurring problem. Bev's son Rick also went into the Marine Corps. Bev said that seeing Rick wearing a marine uniform is a striking similarity to Cleo in his uniform.

My friend from Rutland, Bill Anderson, remembers Cleo well. He said that Cleo was a tall, good-looking guy with a ready smile. He particularly remembers Cleo's exceptional musical talent, playing "Bugler's Holiday" in a trumpet trio with the Sergeant Central Cadets Marching Band. Bill said that band, "The Governor's Band," was, in fact, the best in the State.

After high school, Cleo moved to Wisconsin to work, but his love of the trumpet and music drew him back to North Dakota and he enrolled in college to study music. With the Vietnam War beginning, Cleo joined the Marines. After learning of his death, his family said the 2 weeks it took for his body to arrive felt like an eternity.

Bev appreciates the meaningful yet difficult phone call she received about 10 years ago from the marine who was with Cleo the day he died.

DAVID "DAVE" NESSET

David "Dave" Nessel was from Fargo. He was born April 16, 1942. He served in the Army's 1st Cavalry Division. Dave died on April 19, 1968, 3 days after his 26th birthday.

Dave and his sister Arlene grew up in Fargo. Their father Oscar worked for the North Dakota State University Extension Service and lived in different parts of the world, including Iran and Korea, with his wife and children. After graduating from Fargo Central High School, Dave earned a degree from NDSU. He enlisted in the Army and became a helicopter pilot.

Dave's sister Arlene named her son David after her brother. The younger Dave remembers his uncle's infectious smile and said it was always a pleasure to see him. He was their "cool" uncle. He still clearly remembers when he was in the third grade and his mother received a call in the middle of the night from her parents in Korea explaining that Dave was missing and, a few hours later, an officer coming to his door to deliver his mother a telegram explaining her brother had died.

Dave and Arlene's mother Ruth lives in Colorado and is 104 years old. She is a woman who has buried both of her children during her lifetime.

DAVID JOHNSON

David Johnson was born August 20, 1950. He spent his high school years in West Fargo. He served in the Army's 25th Infantry Division. David was only 19 years old when he died on May 17, 1970.

Right after high school, David chose to enlist in the Army. His sister Eva believes David's trip to basic training in California was his first airplane ride. While David was serving in Vietnam, Eva's first daughter, Stephanie, was born. David became Stephanie's godfather by proxy. About 2 months later, Dave was wounded and died. When she had children of her own, Stephanie named her son Nelson David in honor of the uncle she never met.

In the 1980s, the Fargo area Armed Forces rededicated a building the David F. Johnson United States Armed Forces Reserve Center. Fargo residents chose David for his contributions, recognizing his Army medals, including the Silver Star, Bronze Star, Purple Heart, Army Commendation Medal, and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Members of David's 3rd Platoon, called the Bobcats, maintain contact with David's family. In June, the Bobcats held their annual reunion in Fargo. They held a memorial service and visited David's grave. His sisters and their families were thankful to the Bobcats for inviting them and helping David's memory to live on.

JON ROBBINS

Jon Robbins was from Dickinson, and he was born November 22, 1947. He served in the Army's 56th Postal Unit as a clerk. Jon died February 23, 1969. He was 21 years old.

Lester Davies is a man who calls himself Jon's Army buddy.

I want to read a poem that Lester shared that he wrote about Jon the day Jon died. I think Lester's poem is a tribute to all of the people who served in the Vietnam War who had little to no combat training. These people were nurses, clerks, and other staff. Lester's poem is titled, "The February Awakening."

From peaceful sleep and dreams of home
I'm thrown into the night.

At two A.M. the twenty-third

I know that I must fight,
For sirens blow, as rockets fall
And flares illumine the night.

I still recall with saddened heart

The night I went to war
And how I lost, so thoroughly,
My innocence before.

I know that I will ne'er forget
The UGLINESS of war.

When Charlie hit from out 'the night
He came intent to kill.

Just office clerks who'd never fought,
We met him on our will.

And so the price we paid was dear—Jon Robbins did they kill!

A shocking hell to see him fall, But one of many more.

And now I wonder why I made it
Through that night of war.

Yes I'm alive and free to do
What Jon will do no more—

And so I'll ne'er forget my friend
Who wanted so to live.

Who gave for us his precious life
The most a man can give.

In freedom's name my buddy died
In his name must I live.

This is the 50th commemoration of the Vietnam War, and we all have an

important part to play in recognizing those soldiers and families who gave so much and who were rewarded so little at the time.

This has been a project of great emotion for me and great love, and I encourage other people to pick up the mantle and remember those soldiers who gave their all.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I rise in support of S. 1881, which would transfer Federal funds now granted to Planned Parenthood to other women's health care and counseling centers. It is a modest, commonsense response to the blood-chilling scandal besetting America's leading abortion provider.

To date, only 4 of the promised 12 undercover videos of Planned Parenthood officers and facilities have been released. To be sure, in coming months there will be more revelations about Planned Parenthood's profiteering, violence, and fraud. There will be congressional investigations to cut through the obstructions and obfuscations of Planned Parenthood's army of lawyers, spokespeople, and friends in the media. There will be criminal investigations into whether physicians altered procedures in violation of the law and in violation of medical ethics to maximize the prices they could charge for the remains of their victims. There will be inquiries into Planned Parenthood's army of clerks, lawyers, and bookkeepers who turned barbarism into commerce. There might well be civil litigation brought against Planned Parenthood by former patients who did not realize their harrowing personal ordeals were being exploited for profit by people they thought they could trust.

It may be some time before all the facts come out about the full scope of Planned Parenthood's moral and economic corruption, but the revelations exposed in just the first four videos all by themselves are more than enough to disqualify Planned Parenthood from continued taxpayer support. After all, nobody is entitled to taxpayer money. Nobody is entitled to it. Nobody can just assume that it is theirs. Recipients have to continually demonstrate their worthiness for public support.

I think we can all agree it is not too much to ask that our women's health care grants not finance a criminal conspiracy against American women and children. So, of course, we should pass Senator ERNST's bill. Now, it does not cut any funding. We have to remember that. It does not cut anything; it just transfers Planned Parenthood's grants to other women's and community health centers.

This is a no-brainer. This is something every Member of this body should be able to vote for and do so enthusiastically. Yet this bill did not

pass today. It did not get past the cloture vote. Planned Parenthood's defenders don't even want to debate it. They are not willing even to bring it to the floor to allow it to be debated, discussed, and voted on on the merits at the end of the day.

Now, in a sense, I cannot say I blame them, but the fear of open dialogue on the other side of the aisle is itself part and parcel of the unfolding scandal. Now, let's be honest. Let's be honest about the fact that the multibillion-dollar abortion industry includes grisly revenue streams, legal corner-cutting, and the bullying dehumanization of the human family's most vulnerable members. This should not surprise anyone who gives the matter 5 minutes of concentrated thought. For all of the political spin, at the end of the day, Planned Parenthood makes its money doing things any child could tell you are simply indefensible. That is why those things are almost never actually defended, including on this floor today. Defenders of Planned Parenthood offer, instead, gauzy rhetoric about "care" and "access" and "choice," which are totally irrelevant to Senator ERNST's thoughtful, focused compromise proposal.

On the other hand are the shocking words at the heart of this scandal. Shocking words like "abortion," "organ," "price," "crunch" are carefully, almost religiously avoided. That is what you do when you are forced to defend the indefensible. You distract, you confuse, you talk about anything else besides the facts at hand. In this debate, Planned Parenthood's defenders' true adversary is not the Center for Medical Progress or the pro-life movement or the millions of even pro-choice Americans outraged by the scandal. Like all defenders of institutional violence, their real adversary is the truth.

The pro-life movement today may love different sinners and hate different sins than previous social reform movements, but they fight for the same truth: that not only are all men created equal but that all human beings are, in fact, human beings. Abortion on demand survives today as other peculiar institutions once did, violating a universal moral principle by disguising a biological fact.

Such is the nature of violence. As the Russian writer Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn put it in his Nobel lecture in 1974:

[L]et us not forget that violence does not live alone and is not capable of living alone: it is necessarily interwoven with falsehood. Between them lies the most intimate, the deepest of national bonds. Violence finds its only refuge in falsehood, falsehood its only support in violence. Any man who has once acclaimed violence as his method must inexorably choose falsehood as his principle. At its birth violence acts openly and even with pride. But no sooner does it become strong, firmly established, than it senses the rarefaction of the air around it and it cannot

continue to exist without descending into a fog of lies, clothing them in sweet talk. It does not always, not necessarily, openly throttle the throat, more often it demands from its subjects only an oath of allegiance to falsehood, only complicity in falsehood.

Complicity in falsehood, Mr. President, that some of us created in the image and likeness of a loving God are not; that some of us endowed with inalienable human rights weren't; that because of the color of our skin, the arrangement of our genes, the content of our prayers or the tiny size of a little girl's hand, some of us become them—all to absolve ourselves from doing to them, to the weak, the vulnerable, the voiceless, terrible, unspeakable things that we know are terrible. That is what violence demands.

Because the inhumane but all too common logic goes: If we all do it, and we all agree only to speak of it in comforting words, then, maybe, just maybe, we can tell ourselves it isn't wrong. "Clump of cells," "tissue specimens," "products of conception"—but even as we grope through this fog of lies, we all know the truth. We know that one day, that truth is going to burn through the euphemisms like the sun through the clouds. When that day comes, we are going to have to choose whether to stay complicit in the falsehood, to crouch down a while longer in our comforting fog or stand up and face the searing truth of what is being done to these little hands and hearts, our fellow passengers to the grave, still so fresh from God.

The day will come when, in an act not of reckoning but of love, America finally sets these things right in full. That day is not yet here. For now, even though Planned Parenthood apparently breaks some laws, its lucrative business remains protected by others.

So even when we do pass the Ernst bill, and we will one day soon, Planned Parenthood will nonetheless continue at least for a while in its grisly work, but not in our name, and not with our money. Planned Parenthood has betrayed our trust and the trust of the women who came to them for help. Within the community of women's health and services, even among those who support its mission, Planned Parenthood now stands apart.

Planned Parenthood has chosen a path we cannot follow, crossed a line we cannot ignore, and profited from an unspeakable business we cannot support. We can, and under the Ernst bill we will, support health care, especially for vulnerable women and children who are always targets for exploitation. That is why we must pass the Ernst bill, and why I urge my colleagues to support it, to protect America's women and children from Planned Parenthood's ongoing abuse and to protect American taxpayers from financing it.

We no longer have to be complicit in the lie of Planned Parenthood or the violence that it protects. The Ernst

legislation, S. 1881, finally accepts the facts, embraces the truth, and would help move our Nation a small step forward toward the culture of life America's every mother and child deserve.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN INDIANA 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the University of Southern Indiana, USI, on its 50th Anniversary. I also want to recognize the outstanding faculty and staff for the extraordinary impact they have had on the education and lives of hundreds of thousands of students.

USI was founded September 15, 1965, in Evansville to respond to the need for a public higher education institution in southwestern Indiana. It began first as a regional campus of Indiana State University and then on April 16, 1985, legislation was signed into law making USI a separate State university. The university started out small, but quickly expanded, sitting on 330 acres by September 1969 and today covering 1,400 acres.

USI is home to four academic colleges: the Romain College of Business, the College of Liberal Arts, the College of Nursing and Health Professions, and the Pott College of Science, Engineering, and Education. USI is a Carnegie Foundation Community Engaged University and offers continuing education and special programs to more than 15,000 participants annually through outreach and engagement. USI also houses the Indiana University School of Medicine-Evansville.

More than 9,300 students are currently enrolled at USI, and the university serves full-time, part-time, commuting and continuing education students. USI takes great care to keep class sizes small to maintain a high quality of individualized instruction; 40 percent of classes have fewer than 20 students and only 7 percent have more than 50. These numbers reinforce an institution committed to its vision of "Shaping the future through learning and innovation." The USI curriculum offers a wide variety of classes in 70 undergraduate majors in the areas of liberal arts, preprofessional, professional, technical, and occupational programs at both the associate and baccalaureate levels, in addition to its 10

master's programs and a nursing doctorate. With more than 140 student groups on campus, USI's student body is living up to the university's mission to be an "engaged learning community," one that always strives to achieve its goal of "advancing education and knowledge, enhancing civic and cultural awareness, and fostering partnerships through comprehensive outreach programs."

USI has excelled outside of the classroom as well. The Screaming Eagles compete as a member of the NCAA Division II athletics in the Great Lakes Valley Conference. USI boasts 17 varsity teams and has claimed three national championships—men's basketball in 1995 and men's baseball in 2010 and 2014. The Screaming Eagles have finished as national finalists three times—men's basketball in 1994 and 2004 and women's basketball in 1997. In addition, the USI men's and women's cross country/track teams have combined to capture seven individual national championships since 1997. These teams have accomplished much over the past 50 years, all the while meeting high academic standards in the classroom.

USI has, for the last five decades, provided its students from southwestern Indiana, across our State, and around the country with the opportunity to achieve their dreams through higher education. USI remains representative of the hard work, dedication, and innovation that are such integral parts of the Hoosier spirit. I congratulate president Linda L.M. Bennett, the entire faculty and staff, and students both past and present, on this important anniversary. I am confident USI will continue to be a fixture in southwestern Indiana and know the faculty and staff will continue to provide an outstanding education to our students in the years to come. On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I congratulate each and every member of the USI community on this 50th anniversary. I wish the University of Southern Indiana continued success and growth for many more years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO BOB FRAUMANN

• Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I am proud to pay tribute to Bob Fraumann on the occasion of his retirement after 60 years of ministry through music. Bob will be honored on Sunday, August 9, at Mt. Zion United Methodist Church in Marietta, GA, where he has been music director for the last 33 years.

Bob Fraumann graduated from Asbury University with a degree in music education and a minor in organ and conducting. Bob was married to the love of his life, Jan, and they raised

two sons, Rick and Greg, who are both Christian musicians.

Many have enjoyed Bob's music but none more than those at the National Prayer Breakfast on February 4, 2010, where Bob played selections from his great CD "To God Be the Glory." Over 3,000 dignitaries including the President and many Members of Congress joined Christians and leaders of all faiths to enjoy Bob's testimony through music.

Bob's friendship and music have been a blessing to me, and I am proud to honor him in the Senate Chamber. Join me in wishing Bob Fraumann all the best in his retirement. •

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the National Association of Community Health Centers, NACHC, for their hard work and dedication to providing Americans with the care they need and deserve. The association is celebrating 50 years of providing support through health centers across the Nation. A series of events will be held during National Health Center Week, scheduled for August 9 through August 15, to recognize the importance of health care and to celebrate 50 years of support.

The NACHC was organized in 1965 and held demonstration programs under the Federal Office of Economic Opportunity to help Americans receive medical support regardless of their income. Also during this time, the first four health care centers opened in Massachusetts, Mississippi, Colorado, and New York. Since 1965, the NACHC has worked to address our Nation's widespread lack of access to basic health care services.

Devoted to the mission of, "promoting the provision of high quality, comprehensive and affordable health care that is coordinated, culturally and linguistically competent, and community directed for all medically underserved populations," the NACHC helps educate Americans on the importance of health care. The NACHC also provides health centers with a unified voice and a common source for research, information, training, and advocacy.

Maine currently has 19 organizations that run 135 health center sites. The 19 federally-funded health center organizations in Maine serve 184,546 patients, 17.8 percent of whom are uninsured, and create over 200 jobs. Mr. President, 89 percent of people relying on these centers live in extremely rural areas of the State. These Mainers would not be able to access adequate health care services if these sites did not exist. The work that has been done in Maine continues to help the State become healthier and smarter.

The theme for this year's National Health Center Week is "America's Health Centers: Celebrating Our Legacy, Shaping Our Future." This theme showcases the numerous ways in which America's health centers are driving and empowering healthier communities and Americans. With more than 9,000 delivery sites throughout the Nation, health centers employ hundreds of thousands of individuals nationally which, in turn, powers local economies.

During the National Health Center Week, health centers in all 50 States will be hosting a variety of public events to highlight their work in local communities and to honor the elected officials who have supported the work of the health centers. I would like to join the National Association of Community Health Centers in highlighting the success that has been demonstrated over the last 50 years by local health centers throughout the Nation. •

TRIBUTE TO DAVID ALLEN WALKER

• Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize David Walker of Fenton, MI, as he nears the end of his term as the 110th chairman of the Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, also known as the Big "I." Mr. Walker was installed as chairman of the Big "I" in September 2014, and has been a strong and thoughtful leader for independent insurance agents across the country throughout his term.

Mr. Walker is president of the Hartland Insurance Agency which is headquartered in Hartland, MI. Throughout his career, he has been an active leader at both the State and national level. He previously served as president of the Michigan Association of Independent Agents, president of the Genesee County of Independent Agents, and as the Michigan director on the Big "I" national board.

Mr. Walker has also held numerous leadership positions within the Michigan Association of Insurance Agents, including chairman of the education committee and as a member of the Michigan Legislative Affairs Committee. In all his roles, David has sought to promote an environment where independent insurance agents in Michigan and across the country can thrive by providing excellent customer service.

As I recognize Mr. Walker, I would also like to acknowledge his active involvement in his community. He has served on the board of directors for the Hartland Area Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Walker has also worked as a trustee and president of the Fenton Area Public Schools. He currently serves as a Tyrone Township trustee and sits on the board of the Michigan Basic Property Association. He is also a founding member of the Hartland Rotary.

I am pleased to join Mr. Walker's colleagues from across Michigan and the United States in congratulating him as he finishes his term as chairman of the Big "I." I, along with his family and friends, appreciate all that he has accomplished.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY HATFIELD MARINE SCIENCE CENTER

● Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I am a firm believer in the power of higher education. It is our Nation's responsibility to honor the institutions that consistently provide America's youth with the skills necessary to make our country a better place. I am thrilled to recognize the achievements of Oregon State University's Hatfield Marine Science Center, on its 50th anniversary as a center for marine studies.

Over the last half-century, thanks in large part to early collaboration with the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, the Hatfield Center has served students from community college to post-doctoral candidates. In addition to providing educational opportunities, the Hatfield Center works closely with the Environmental Protection Agency to research the most pressing environmental issues of our generation. As climate change and sustainability increasingly impact our Nation's agriculture and energy policies, Oregonians can take comfort in knowing that OSU's Marine Science Center has the technology and partnerships necessary to spearhead State, national and global initiatives.

It always amazes me how quickly novel ideas transform into success stories. Since its establishment in 1965, the Hatfield Marine Science Center has worked extensively with the colleges of Oregon State University and various State and Federal agencies to produce seawater systems, experimental wet labs, and other programs that have attracted some of the Nation's top scientific minds. It gives me great pleasure to say that the Hatfield Marine Science Center is home to the Coastal Oregon Marine Experiment Station—a program recognized internationally for its innovative approach to the study of marine mammals.

I am particularly excited to witness the results of OSU's world-class Marine Studies Initiative. In addition to the construction of a top-notch research and teaching facility, the Marine Studies Initiative will offer students the opportunity to see how marine studies intersects with the other elements of a liberal arts education. Thousands of young adults, as well as experienced professionals, will gain a greater appreciation for the role of business, government, and big data in the world of marine studies. The addition of an undergraduate degree program in marine studies, projected to attract 500 stu-

dents in-residence to Newport by 2025, will yield tremendous partnerships in the years ahead. The Federal Area Re-development Administration must be incredibly proud of the intellectual profit that its \$960,000 investment has produced.

The future of our planet depends upon unique and innovative approaches to the environmental challenges of our era. Higher education is an integral part of the solution. But more specifically, interdisciplinary programs that promote awareness of agricultural, energy, and oceanic issues, and that simultaneously connect the environment to the liberal arts, are a key to building the training necessary to solve imminent problems. I could not be prouder of what OSU's Hatfield Marine Science Center means for our State, our Nation, and for the world.●

TRIBUTE TO REBECCA ACKERMAN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Rebecca Ackerman, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Rebecca is a student at the University South Carolina, where she is majoring in international studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Rebecca for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIEL ALMEIDA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Daniel Almeida, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Daniel is a student at the University of Edinburgh, where he is majoring in philosophy and politics. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Daniel for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO LAUREN BALTIMORE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Lauren Baltimore, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Lauren is currently a student at Pine Crest High School. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Lauren for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MAX BERGER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Max Berger, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Max is currently a student at Western High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Max for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO KASSANDRA CABRERA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Kassandra Cabrera, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Kassandra is a student at the University of Central Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Kassandra for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO EMILY CLARK

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Emily Clark, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Emily is a student at the University of West Florida, where she is majoring in agriculture communications. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Emily for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSHUA COCKREAM

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Joshua Cockream, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Joshua is a student at the University of Virginia, where he is majoring in political philosophy, policy, and law. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who

has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Joshua for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ANTONELLA DAVALOS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Antonella Davalos, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Antonella is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Antonella for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ALLISON DIENER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Allison Diener, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Allison is a student at the University of Michigan, where she is majoring in business. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Allison for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SAMUEL FALIC

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Samuel Falic, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Samuel is a student at the University of Miami, where he is majoring in accounting. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Samuel for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO HAILEY FROMKIN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Hailey Fromkin, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Hailey is a student at the University of Miami, where she is majoring in po-

litical science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Hailey for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DESTINY GOEDE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Destiny Goede, a 2015 summer intern in my Naples office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Destiny is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in economics. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Destiny for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT GUTIERREZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Robert Gutierrez, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Robert is currently a student at Columbus High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Robert for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TREVOR HANSEN

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Trevor Hansen, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Trevor is a student at Broward College, where he is majoring in international relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Trevor for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO TODD HIGGINBOTHAM

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Todd Higginbotham, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Todd is a student at the University of North Florida, where he is majoring in

political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Todd for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NICHOLAS JOHNSON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Nicholas Johnson, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Nicholas is a student at Heidelberg University, where he is majoring in political science and communications. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nicholas for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CARLOS SAN JOSE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Carlos San Jose, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Carlos is a student at Miami-Dade College, where he is majoring in political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Carlos for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO ISABELLA LLANO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Isabella Llano, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Isabella is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Isabella for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DAVID MALLIS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize David Mallis, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

David is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to David for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NATALIE MARTINEZ

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Natalie Martinez, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Natalie is a student at the University of Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Natalie for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO AMANDA MEADOR

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Amanda Meador, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Amanda is a student at Washington and Lee University, where she is majoring in business, accounting, and environmental studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Amanda for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO BRIANNA MORENO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Brianna Moreno, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Brianna is a student at Vanderbilt University, where she is majoring in public policy. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Brianna for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO THOMAS MORRISON

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Thomas Morrison, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Thomas is currently a student at Lincoln High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Thomas for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCO RIVERA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Franco Rivera, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Franco is currently a student at Belen Jesuit Preparatory School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Franco for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHELLE RIVERA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Michelle Rivera, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Michelle is a student at the University of North Florida, where she is majoring in political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Michelle for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MICHAEL RUSSELL

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Michael Russell, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Michael is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science and criminology. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Michael for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CHRISTIAN SADLER

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Christian Sadler, a 2015 summer intern in my Naples office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Christian is currently a student at the University of Florida. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Christian for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DANIELA SHIED

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Daniela Shied, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Daniela is a student at Florida State University, where she is majoring in international affairs and political science. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Daniela for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO DRIENA SIXTO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Driena Sixto, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Driena is a student at Florida International University, where she is majoring in political science and international relations. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Driena for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JACKSON STORY

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jackson Story, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jackson is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science and public relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jackson for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO FRANCO DEL TORRO

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Franco del Torro, a 2015 summer intern in my Tallahassee office,

for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Franco is a student at the University of Florida, where he is majoring in political science. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Franco for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO JORGE TREVILLA

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Jorge Trevilla, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Jorge is currently a student at Columbus High School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Jorge for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO NATHAN WATTERS

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Nathan Watters, a 2015 summer intern in my Jacksonville office, for all of the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Nathan is a law student at Florida Coastal Law School. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Nathan for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO SHANNON WEST

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Shannon West, a 2015 summer intern in my Tampa office, for all of the hard work she has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Shannon is a student at Boston College, where she is majoring in political science and international studies. She is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of her internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Shannon for all the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO CONRAD WITTE

● Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, today I recognize Conrad Witte, a 2015 summer intern in my Miami office, for all of

the hard work he has done for me, my staff, and the people of the State of Florida.

Conrad is a student at the University of Arkansas, where he is majoring in political science and international relations. He is a dedicated and diligent worker who has been devoted to getting the most out of his internship experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Conrad for all the fine work he has done and wish him continued success in the years to come.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1629. A bill to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-110).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. COONS):

S. 1915. A bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to make anthrax vaccines and antimicrobials available to emergency response providers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. THUNE:

S. 1916. A bill to include skilled nursing facilities as a type of health care provider under section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1917. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to an entity that receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue derived from an abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to extend the import- and export-related provision of that Act to species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under that Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BENNET):

S. Res. 240. A resolution recognizing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and its partners for the success of the historic flyby of Pluto by the New Horizons spacecraft; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. REID, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CASEY):

S. Res. 241. A resolution designating August 16, 2015, as "National Airborne Day"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 377

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 377, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase access to ambulance services under the Medicare program and to reform payments for such services under such program, and for other purposes.

S. 404

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 404, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit taking minors across State lines in circumvention of laws requiring the involvement of parents in abortion decisions.

S. 429

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 429, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide a standard definition of therapeutic foster care services in Medicaid.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 586

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 586, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to foster more effective implementation and coordination of clinical care for people with pre-diabetes, diabetes, and the chronic diseases and conditions that result from diabetes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 898

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 898, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the participation of optometrists in the National Health Service Corps scholarship and loan repayment programs, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1090

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1090, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1143

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1143, a bill to make the authority of States of Washington, Oregon, and California to manage Dungeess crab fishery permanent and for other purposes.

S. 1148

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1148, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the distribution of additional residency positions, and for other purposes.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1314, a bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes and their safe integration into the national airspace system.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1566

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1566, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 1719

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

S. 1722

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1722, a bill to amend the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act to repeal certain additional disclosure requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1742

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1742, a bill to improve the provision of postal services to rural areas of the United States.

S. 1767

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1767, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to combination products, and for other purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Illinois

(Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to treat Puerto Rico as a State for purposes of chapter 9 of such title relating to the adjustment of debts of municipalities.

S. 1785

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1785, a bill to repeal the wage rate requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1798, a bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1863

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1863, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Timothy Nugent, in recognition of his pioneering work on behalf of people with disabilities, including disabled veterans.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to support enhanced accountability for United States assistance to Afghanistan, and for other purposes.

S. 1876

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, a bill to rename the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking of the Department of State the Bureau to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in Persons and to provide for an Assistant Secretary to head such Bureau, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, *supra*.

S. 1881

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1881, a bill to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America.

S. 1882

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1882, a bill to support the sustainable recovery and rebuilding of Nepal following the recent, devastating earthquakes near Kathmandu.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of

promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. RES. 176

At the request of Mr. MARKEY, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 176, a resolution designating September 2015 as "National Brain Aneurysm Awareness Month".

S. RES. 228

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 228, a resolution designating September 2015 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month".

S. RES. 232

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 232, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that August 30, 2015, be observed as "1890 Land-Grant Institutions Quasiquicentennial Recognition Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI):

S. 1917. A bill to prohibit the provision of Federal funds to an entity that receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue derived from an abortion; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate will be voting on a motion to proceed to a bill that would completely eliminate all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood. While I do not support this legislation, I have received assurances from the majority leader that should the motion to proceed succeed, there will be ample opportunity to offer amendments. Therefore, I would like to take this opportunity to propose an alternative approach which Senator KIRK and I will offer as a substitute for the bill.

Throughout my service in the Senate, I have been a strong proponent of family planning and measures to promote and protect women's health. The fact is that the best way to reduce the number of abortions in this country is to ensure that women have access to family planning services they need to protect against unintended pregnancies. That is why I have long supported title X family planning programs.

My support for family planning aside, however, I was sickened when I viewed

the recently released videos featuring Planned Parenthood physicians in both their edited and unedited versions. The callousness with which Planned Parenthood employees discuss the sale of fetal tissue is appalling. It deserves our attention. The videos also raise valid questions about the ethics and legality of Planned Parenthood's practices in some of its clinics, albeit a minority of its clinics. As a result, I believe a full investigation is warranted to determine whether Planned Parenthood broke the law prohibiting the sale of fetal tissue.

Reviews by State medical boards are also warranted because it appears that some Planned Parenthood doctors may have been putting the procurement of fetal organs ahead of the well-being of their patients.

We do, however, need to keep in mind the fact that Planned Parenthood provides important family planning, cancer screening, and basic preventive health care to millions of women across this country. For many women, Planned Parenthood clinics provide the only health care services they receive. The title X Federal family planning funding that goes to Planned Parenthood already cannot be used for abortions, and the Federal Medicaid funding it receives can only be used for abortions in the case of rape, incest, and where the life of the mother is at risk. In other words, the Hyde amendment—which has been on the books for so many years—applies fully to this Federal funding.

Some contend that other health care providers such as community health centers could somehow fill the gap in family planning and other women's health services if Federal funding were to be cut off to Planned Parenthood. In my State, the four Planned Parenthood clinics see almost 40 percent of the patients seeking title X family planning services, and they treat virtually all of the patients seeking those services in southern Maine. By way of contrast, the 20 community health sites in Maine that receive title X funding see just 17 percent of the patients seeking those services. If we were to defund Planned Parenthood, other family planning clinics in Maine, including community health centers, would see a 63-percent increase in their patient load. They would be forced to absorb 8,583 more patients if Federal funds to Planned Parenthood were eliminated. Moreover, these other family planning clinics are predominantly in central, western, and the northern parts of my State. None is in the area that is served by Planned Parenthood in southern Maine. I don't see how we can ensure that all of the patients currently served by Planned Parenthood can be absorbed by alternative health care providers.

The bill that has been proposed by several of my colleagues would require women to give up the health care pro-

vider of their choice, when we don't yet know all of the facts about Planned Parenthood's actions.

Therefore, I am joining my colleague from Illinois Senator KIRK in introducing legislation, which we intend to turn into an amendment if we proceed to this bill, that would require the Department of Justice to investigate whether Planned Parenthood or its affiliates have engaged in any illegal activity pertaining to fetal tissue and support a report to Congress on its findings within 90 days.

Activities involving fetal tissue have no relationship to Planned Parenthood's primary mission of promoting and protecting women's health. While Planned Parenthood claims that only a very small number of its affiliates engage in the sale of fetal organs and tissue, let's determine the facts. Those organizations that do engage in this reprehensible practice are the ones that have sparked this outrage and rightly so. I believe these are the organizations that should be the focus of our efforts. I know none of the Planned Parenthood clinics in my State engage in the practice of the procurement and sale of fetal tissue. I think we should keep in mind that we can come up with a more tailored and targeted approach that is aimed at those clinics that do engage in this practice.

Therefore, our legislation would defund any affiliate or subsidiary of Planned Parenthood Federation of America that received any compensation for engaging in these activities.

So the more targeted approach proposed by Senator KIRK and me accomplishes three important goals: First, it would not cause women served by Planned Parenthood clinics that do not engage in these reprehensible fetal tissue sales to lose their health care provider for basic services like family planning and cancer screening. After all, many of us have been critical of ObamaCare because it has forced families in this country to give up the doctor of their choice. Well, that is what this amendment would do. It would require women and other patients to find alternative health care providers, even if their Planned Parenthood clinic has done nothing wrong and is not engaged in the reprehensible sale of fetal tissue. How is that fair? How is that a targeted approach?

Second, our legislation would allow Congress to get the facts to determine if those few Planned Parenthood affiliates that do engage in fetal tissue procurement have broken Federal law and violated medical ethics. We need to know the answer to those questions, and we need to know how widespread this practice actually is.

Third, our legislation would defund those affiliates, subsidiaries, and clinics that do receive compensation for procuring fetal organs and tissues, thus putting an end to this reprehensible trafficking in fetal tissue.

I believe the proposal that Senator KIRK and I offer to our colleagues is a more targeted approach, a fairer approach, an approach that will be based on the facts, and is the best way forward as we deal with this important issue. I encourage my colleagues to join us in support of our more targeted legislation.

This is the bill that should we proceed to the underlying legislation, would be offered as a substitute to the bill by Senator KIRK and me.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 240—RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND ITS PARTNERS FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE HISTORIC FLYBY OF PLUTO BY THE NEW HORIZONS SPACECRAFT

Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. BENNET) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

S. RES. 240

Whereas, in 1930, from the Lowell Observatory in Flagstaff, Arizona, Clyde Tombaugh discovered Pluto, the ninth largest known body orbiting the sun;

Whereas, on January 19, 2006, the New Horizons spacecraft launched on an Atlas V launch vehicle from the Space Launch Complex 41 at Cape Canaveral Air Force Station in Florida;

Whereas, on July 14, 2015, after a 9½-year journey, the New Horizons probe successfully flew within approximately 7,800 miles (12,500 kilometers) of the surface of the dwarf planet Pluto;

Whereas the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this preamble as “NASA”) has now completed missions to each of the 9 largest planetary bodies orbiting the sun;

Whereas the successful New Horizons mission to Pluto was achieved through years of planning, research, design, testing, and mission operations conducted by the dedicated scientists, engineers, and staff at NASA and affiliated academic and private sector partners;

Whereas the New Horizons mission was the first mission to study Pluto, the moons of Pluto, and other planetary building blocks within the Kuiper Belt, which is the ring of icy objects that surrounds the solar system beyond the orbit of Neptune;

Whereas the findings of the New Horizons interplanetary space probe have demonstrated the great scientific value of the continued exploration of Pluto and the outer-region of our solar system;

Whereas New Horizons is the first mission to collect high-resolution images and a variety of other data about the geological and atmospheric composition of Pluto as well as the space environment near Pluto and the moons of Pluto;

Whereas the initial images and data returned from the New Horizons spacecraft have already led to new discoveries about Pluto, the moons of Pluto, and the space environment near Pluto;

Whereas images of Pluto show ice mountains that have never been seen before and that are comparable in height to the Rocky Mountains;

Whereas images of Charon, the largest moon of Pluto, show deep canyons and a row of cliffs and troughs stretching 600 miles wide;

Whereas images of Pluto and Charon show a lack of impact craters, suggesting that their relatively young surfaces have been reshaped by internal geological activity;

Whereas the data collected by instruments on the New Horizons spacecraft confirms that the Pluto system contains a large amount of frozen water, which is considered an essential building block of life;

Whereas the data collected by the New Horizons spacecraft will continue to provide scientific insight, data to train the next generation of planetary scientists, and inspiration to humanity for years to come; and

Whereas the New Horizons spacecraft could continue traveling to the far edges of our solar system and could be capable of exploring the Kuiper Belt and collecting data on our solar system that is not detectable from any other spacecraft or telescope due to its unique position, instrumentation, and long-lasting power supply: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (referred to in this resolving clause as “NASA”), the Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory in Maryland, the Southwest Research Institute in Colorado, and the academic and private sector partners of the New Horizons mission for their roles in the historic flyby of Pluto by the New Horizons spacecraft;

(2) recognizes the importance of the New Horizons mission to the long-term exploration of the solar system by NASA and the training of the next generation of planetary scientists;

(3) recognizes the importance of the continued pursuit of robotic space exploration missions by NASA, which enable extraordinary scientific discoveries about the nature and origin of our solar system and beyond; and

(4) recognizes the significance of the scientific and engineering research by NASA with respect to stimulating economic growth, strengthening national competitiveness, and inspiring humankind.

SENATE RESOLUTION 241—DESIGNATING AUGUST 16, 2015, AS “NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY”

Mr. REED (for himself, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. CORKER, Mr. REID, Mr. WICKER, Mr. TESTER, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BURR, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. CASEY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 241

Whereas the members of the airborne forces of the Armed Forces of the United States have a long and honorable history as bold and fierce warriors who, for the national security of the United States and the defense of freedom and peace, project the ground combat power of the United States by air transport to the far reaches of the battle area and to the far corners of the world;

Whereas the experiment of the United States with airborne operations began on

June 25, 1940, when the Army Parachute Test Platoon was first authorized by the Department of War, and 48 volunteers began training in July 1940;

Whereas August 16 marks the anniversary of the first official Army parachute jump, which took place on August 16, 1940, to test the innovative concept of inserting United States ground combat forces behind a battle line by means of a parachute;

Whereas the success of the Army Parachute Test Platoon in the days immediately before the entry of the United States into World War II validated the airborne operational concept and led to the creation of a formidable force of airborne formations that included the 11th, 13th, 17th, 82nd, and 101st Airborne Divisions;

Whereas, included in those divisions, and among other separate formations, were many airborne combat, combat support, and combat service support units that served with distinction and achieved repeated success in armed hostilities during World War II;

Whereas the achievements of the airborne units during World War II prompted the evolution of those units into a diversified force of parachute and air-assault units that, over the years, have fought in Korea, Vietnam, Grenada, Panama, the Persian Gulf region, and Somalia, and have engaged in peace-keeping operations in Lebanon, the Sinai Peninsula, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo;

Whereas, since the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, the members of the United States airborne forces, including members of the XVIII Airborne Corps, the 82nd Airborne Division, the 101st Airborne Division, the 173rd Airborne Brigade Combat Team, the 4th Brigade Combat Team (Airborne) of the 25th Infantry Division, the 75th Ranger Regiment, special operations forces of the Army, Marine Corps, Navy, and Air Force, and other units of the Armed Forces, have demonstrated bravery and honor in combat, stability, and training operations in Afghanistan and Iraq;

Whereas the modern-day airborne forces also include other elite forces composed of airborne trained and qualified special operations warriors, including Army Special Forces, Marine Corps Reconnaissance units, Navy SEALs, and Air Force combat control and pararescue teams;

Whereas, of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces, thousands have achieved the distinction of making combat jumps, dozens have earned the Medal of Honor, and hundreds have earned the Distinguished Service Cross, the Silver Star, or other decorations and awards for displays of heroism, gallantry, intrepidity, and valor;

Whereas the members and former members of the United States airborne forces are all members of a proud and honorable tradition that, together with the special skills and achievements of those members, distinguishes the members as intrepid combat parachutists, air assault forces, special operation forces, and, in the past, glider troops;

Whereas individuals from every State of the United States have served gallantly in the airborne forces, and each State is proud of the contributions of its paratrooper veterans during the many conflicts faced by the United States;

Whereas the history and achievements of the members and former members of the United States airborne forces warrant special expressions of the gratitude of the people of the United States; and

Whereas, since the airborne forces, past and present, celebrate August 16 as the anniversary of the first official jump by the Army Parachute Test Platoon, August 16 is an appropriate day to recognize as National Airborne Day; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates August 16, 2015, as “National Airborne Day”; and

(2) calls on the people of the United States to observe National Airborne Day with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2544. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2545. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1881, to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2546. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COATS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2547. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2548. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2544. Mr. BOOKER (for himself and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 32, between lines 20 and 21, insert the following:

(6) **LIMITATION ON RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.**—A Federal entity may not receive a cyber threat indicator that another Federal entity shared through the process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) unless the Inspector General of the receiving Federal entity certifies that the receiving Federal entity meets the data security standard for receiving such a cyber threat indicator, as established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

On page 52, strike line 14 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. REPORT ON REDUCTION OF CYBERSECURITY RISK IN AGENCY DATA CENTERS.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Home-

land Security, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives a report on the feasibility of Federal civilian agencies creating an environment for the reduction in cybersecurity risks in agency data centers, including by—

(1) increasing compartmentalization between systems; and

(2) providing a mix of security controls between such compartments.

SEC. 11. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

SA 2545. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. KIRK, and Ms. MURKOWSKI) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 1881, to prohibit Federal funding of Planned Parenthood Federation of America; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. LIMITATION ON FUNDING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no Federal funds shall be made available to any affiliate, subsidiary, successor, or clinic of the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. if that affiliate, subsidiary, successor, or clinic receives compensation for facilitating the donation of fetal tissue products derived from an abortion.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to—

(1) affect any limitation contained in an appropriations Act relating to abortion; or

(2) reduce overall Federal funding available in support of women's health.

(c) **INVESTIGATION AND REPORT.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall conduct an investigation, and submit to Congress a report on the findings of such investigation, concerning whether or not the Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. or any of its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics has engaged in any illegal activity pertaining to fetal tissue products.

SA 2546. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. WARNER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. COATS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MCCASKILL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—FEDERAL INFORMATION SECURITY MANAGEMENT REFORM ACT OF 2015

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Information Security Management Reform Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY RELATED TO INFORMATION SECURITY.

Section 3553(b)(6) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by striking subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D) and inserting the following: “(B) operating consolidated intrusion detection, prevention, or other protective capabilities and use of associated countermeasures for the purpose of protecting agen-

cy information and information systems from information security threats;

“(C) providing incident detection, analysis, mitigation, and response information and remote or onsite technical assistance to the head of an agency;

“(D) compiling and analyzing data on agency information security;

“(E) developing and conducting targeted risk assessments and operational evaluations for agency information and information systems in consultation with the heads of other agencies or governmental and private entities that own and operate such systems, that may include threat, vulnerability, and impact assessments;

“(F) in conjunction with other agencies and the private sector, assessing and fostering the development of information security technologies and capabilities for use across multiple agencies; and

“(G) coordinating with appropriate agencies and officials to ensure, to the maximum extent feasible, that policies and directives issued under paragraph (2) are complementary with—

“(i) standards and guidelines developed for national security systems; and

“(ii) policies and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense and the Director of National Intelligence under subsection (e)(1); and”.

SEC. 203. COMMUNICATIONS AND SYSTEM TRAFFIC AND DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.

Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **COMMUNICATIONS AND SYSTEMS TRAFFIC.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

“(A) **ACQUISITION BY THE SECRETARY.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law and subject to subparagraph (B), in carrying out the responsibilities under subparagraphs (B), (C), and (E) of subsection (b)(6), if the Secretary makes a certification described in paragraph (2), the Secretary may acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic that are transiting to or from or stored on agency information systems and deploy countermeasures with regard to the communications and system traffic.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not apply to a communication or other system traffic that is transiting to or from or stored on a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

“(C) **DISCLOSURE BY FEDERAL AGENCY HEADS.**—The head of a Federal agency or department is authorized to disclose to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (A), information traveling to or from or stored on an agency information system, notwithstanding any other law that would otherwise restrict or prevent agency heads from disclosing such information to the Secretary.

“(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—A certification described in this paragraph is a certification by the Secretary that—

“(A) the acquisitions, interceptions, and other countermeasures are reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information systems from information security threats;

“(B) the content of communications will be retained only if the communication is associated with a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, and communications and system traffic will not be subject to the operation of a countermeasure unless associated with the threats;

“(C) information obtained under activities authorized under this subsection will only be retained, used, or disclosed to protect agency information systems from information security threats, mitigate against such threats, or, with the approval of the Attorney General, for law enforcement purposes when the information is evidence of a crime which has been, is being, or is about to be committed;

“(D) notice has been provided to users of agency information systems concerning the potential for acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications and other system traffic; and

“(E) the activities are implemented pursuant to policies and procedures governing the acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications and other system traffic that have been reviewed and approved by the Attorney General.

“(3) PRIVATE ENTITIES.—The Secretary may enter into contracts or other agreements, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities that provide electronic communication or information security services to acquire, intercept, retain, use, and disclose communications and other system traffic in accordance with this subsection.

“(4) NO CAUSE OF ACTION.—No cause of action shall exist against a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(i) DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3554, and subject to subparagraph (B), in response to a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or incident that represents a substantial threat to the information security of an agency, the Secretary may issue a directive to the head of an agency to take any lawful action with respect to the operation of the information system, including such systems owned or operated by another entity on behalf of an agency, that collects, processes, stores, transmits, disseminates, or otherwise maintains agency information, for the purpose of protecting the information system from, or mitigating, an information security threat.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not apply to a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

“(2) PROCEDURES FOR USE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in coordination with the Director and in consultation with Federal contractors, as appropriate, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which a directive may be issued under this subsection, which shall include—

“(i) thresholds and other criteria;

“(ii) privacy and civil liberties protections; and

“(iii) providing notice to potentially affected third parties;

“(B) specify the reasons for the required action and the duration of the directive;

“(C) minimize the impact of a directive under this subsection by—

“(i) adopting the least intrusive means possible under the circumstances to secure the agency information systems; and

“(ii) limiting directives to the shortest period practicable; and

“(D) notify the Director and the head of any affected agency immediately upon the issuance of a directive under this subsection.

“(3) IMMINENT THREATS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary determines that there is an imminent threat to

agency information systems and a directive under this subsection is not reasonably likely to result in a timely response to the threat, the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary for communications or other system traffic transiting to or from or stored on an agency information system without prior consultation with the affected agency for the purpose of ensuring the security of the information or information system or other agency information systems.

“(B) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The authority under this paragraph may not be delegated to an official in a position lower than an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security.

“(C) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall immediately notify the Director and the head and chief information officer (or equivalent official) of each affected agency of—

“(i) any action taken under this subsection; and

“(ii) the reasons for and duration and nature of the action.

“(D) OTHER LAW.—Any action of the Secretary under this paragraph shall be consistent with applicable law.

“(4) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may direct or authorize lawful action or protective capability under this subsection only to—

“(A) protect agency information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction; or

“(B) require the remediation of or protect against identified information security risks with respect to—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(ii) that portion of an information system used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency.”

SEC. 204. REPORT TO CONGRESS REGARDING OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ENFORCEMENT ACTION.

Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, as amended by section 203, is further amended by inserting at the end the following new subsection:

“(j) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—Not later than February 1 of every year, the Director shall report to the appropriate congressional committee regarding the specific actions the Director has taken pursuant to subsection (a)(5), including any actions taken pursuant to paragraph (5) of title 40 of section 11303(b).

“(2) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE.—In this subsection, the term ‘appropriate congressional committee’ means—

“(A) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

“(B) the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives.”

SA 2547. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, beginning on line 11, strike “knows” and all that follows through “knows” on line 19, and insert “reasonably believes at the time of sharing to be personal information or information that identifies a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity reasonably believes

SA 2548. Mr. HELLER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, line 22, strike “knows” and insert “reasonably believes”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 3, 2015, at 5 p.m., to conduct a classified briefing entitled “JCPOA: The Verification and Assessment Report.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL AIRBORNE DAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 241.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 241) designating August 16, 2015, as “National Airborne Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 241) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, AUGUST 4, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, August 4; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in

the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each; further, that the majority control the first half and the Democrats control the final half; further, that following morning business, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 754; and fi-

nally, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:10 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, August 4, 2015, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, August 4, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

AUGUST 5

Time to be announced

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

TBA

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the implications of sanctions relief under the Iran agreement.

SD-538

Committee on Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider S. 1324, to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to fulfill certain requirements before regulating standards of performance for new, modified, and reconstructed fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating units, S. 1523, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, S. 1500, to clarify Congressional intent regarding the regulation of the use of pesticides in or near navigable waters, S. 722, to extend the date after which interest earned on obligations held in the wildlife restoration fund may be available for apportionment, S. 1707, to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House", S. 1147, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83

Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center", S. 124, to amend the Water Resources Development Act of 1996 to deauthorize the Ten Mile Creek Water Preserve Area Critical Restoration Project, H.R. 2559, to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas, and other pending calendar business.

SD-406

Committee on Finance

Closed business meeting to consider pending calendar business, S-211, to be immediately followed by a business meeting to consider the nominations of Marisa Lago, of New York, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador, and W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

SD-215

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine reauthorizing the Higher Education Act, focusing on opportunities to improve student success.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Justice's legal obligation to ensure Inspector General access to all records needed for independent oversight.

SD-106

2 p.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the implications of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action for United States policy in the Middle East.

SD-419

AUGUST 6

9 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine agency progress in retrospective review of existing regulations.

SD-342

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the procurement, acquisition, testing, and oversight of the Navy's *Gerald R. Ford*-class aircraft carrier program.

SD-G50

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the 2015 Trafficking in Persons Report.

SD-419

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 799, to combat the rise of prenatal opioid

abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome, S. 1893, to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders, S. 481, to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing, and the nominations of Karen Bollinger DeSalvo, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Kathryn K. Matthew, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years, W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, and Walter A. Barrows, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2019.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1814, to withhold certain Federal funding from sanctuary cities, and S. 32, to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and the nominations of John Michael Vazquez, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wilhelmina Marie Wright, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, and Paula Xinis, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

SD-226

1 p.m.

Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship

To hold hearings to examine rising after disaster, focusing on improvements and continuing challenges.

SR-428A

SEPTEMBER 10

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Adam J. Szubin, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury.

SD-538

CANCELLATIONS

AUGUST 6

2:30 p.m.

Select Committee on Intelligence

To receive a closed briefing on certain intelligence matters.

SH-219

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, August 4, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
August 4, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JEFF DENHAM to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Reverend Dr. Dan C. Cummings, Skyline Wesleyan Church, San Diego, California, offered the following prayer:

To the Lord, the Chief Shepherd and Saviour of our Souls:

While Members of Congress are at home in their districts, we pray, give each Member rest. Cause them to lie down in green pastures. Lead them beside the still waters. Restore and refresh their souls. Lead them in the paths of righteousness for Your name's sake and our Nation's benefit.

While other Members are abroad, who may walk through the valley of the shadow of death, let them fear no evil. Assure them that You are near. Let Your rod and Your staff bring comfort.

Prepare a table for all in the presence of their families.

Anoint them with the oil of gladness.

Finally, let them return to this Chamber to follow justice and justice alone so as to live and possess the land the Lord our God has given us.

In Jesus Christ's name, I now pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 2(a) of House Resolution 380, the Journal of the last day's proceedings is approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

PROVIDING FOR AN ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE TWO HOUSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged concurrent resolution:

H. CON. RES. 72

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Tuesday, August 4, 2015, through Friday, September 4, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Tuesday, August 4, 2015, through Saturday, September 5, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after concurrence with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, when the House adjourns today, it shall adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Friday, August 7, 2015, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of

House Concurrent Resolution 72, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a grand jury subpoena for documents issued by the United States District Court for the Central District of Illinois.

After consultation with counsel, I will make the determinations required by Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, pursuant to the order of the House of today, the House stands adjourned until 11 a.m., on Friday, August 7, 2015, unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 72, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 06 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Friday, August 7, 2015, at 11 a.m., unless it sooner has received a message from the Senate transmitting its adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 72, in which case the House shall stand adjourned pursuant to that concurrent resolution.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2387. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a letter reporting violations of the Antideficiency Act, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1351; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2388. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules:

Regulatory Capital, Final Revisions Applicable to Banking Organizations Subject to the Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule (RIN: 3064-AE12) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2389. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 3133-AE40) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2390. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Refrigerated Bottled or Canned Beverage Vending Machines [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0045] (RIN: 1904-AD07) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2391. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Dehumidifiers [Docket No.: EERE-2014-BT-TP-0010] (RIN: 1904-AC80) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2392. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Approval of NOx Emission Offset Credits as Single Source SIP Revisions [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0498; FRL-9927-49-Region 1] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2393. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to the Control of Gasoline and Volatile Organic Compound Storage and Handling [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0854; FRL-9931-54-Region 3] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2394. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0105; FRL-9927-41-Region 7] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2395. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0910; FRL-9931-80-Region 3] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2396. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluazifop-P-butyl; Pesticide Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0441; FRL-9930-99] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2397. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Public Utility Filing Requirements [Docket No.: RM15-3-000] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2398. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cuba: Implementing Rescission of State Sponsor of Terrorism Designation [Docket No.: 150416374-5374-01] (RIN: 0694-AG60) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2399. A letter from the Special Inspector General for Afghanistan Reconstitution, transmitting the twenty-eighth quarterly report to Congress on Afghanistan Reconstruction, in accordance with Sec. 1229 of Pub. L. 110-181; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2400. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace, Revocation of Class E Airspace; Salem, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1069; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-11] received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2401. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0524; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-042-AD; Amendment 39-18189; AD 2015-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2402. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiębiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa "PZL-Bielsko" Sailplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0951; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-007-AD; Amendment 39-18190; AD 2015-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2403. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1988; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-18195; AD 2015-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2404. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; M7 Aerospace LLC Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2435; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-020-AD; Amendment 39-18197; AD 2015-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2405. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0499; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-061-AD; Amendment 39-18198; AD 2015-13-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2406. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0569; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-047-AD; Amendment 39-18199; AD 2015-14-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2407. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Piper Aircraft, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2434; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-023-AD; Amendment 39-18196; AD 2015-13-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2408. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Kaman Aerospace Corporation (Kaman) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0758; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-062-AD; Amendment 39-18202; AD 2015-14-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2409. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0339; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-025-AD; Amendment 39-18192; AD 2015-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2410. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0780; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18207; AD 2015-14-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2411. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1986; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-100-AD; Amendment 39-18188; AD 2015-13-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2412. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0482; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-18200; AD 2015-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2413. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, FHWA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Tunnel Inspection Standards [Docket No.: FHWA-2008-0038] (RIN: 2125-AF24) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2414. A letter from the FMCSA Regulatory Ombudsman, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — State Compliance With Commercial Driver's License Program: Correction [Docket No.: FMCSA 2015-0174] (RIN: 2126-AB80) received August 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2415. A letter from the U.S. Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a notification in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015, of the ongoing negotiations with Australia, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Singapore, and Vietnam of a regional, Asia-Pacific trade agreement, known as the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2416. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014, Interim Guidance [Notice 2015-43] received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2417. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Safe Harbor for Ratable Service Contracts (Rev. Proc. 2015-39) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2418. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2016 [CMS-1624-F] (RIN: 0938-AS45) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2419. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; FY 2016 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update and Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements [CMS-1629-F] (RIN: 0938-AS39) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2420. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs) for FY 2016, SNF Value-Based Purchasing Program, SNF Quality Reporting Program, and Staffing Data Collection [CMS-1622-F] (RIN: 0938-AS44) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2421. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems for Acute Care Hospitals and the Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System Policy Changes and Fiscal Year 2016 Rates; Revisions of Quality Reporting Requirements for Specific Providers, including Changes Related to the Electronic Health Record Incentive Program; Extensions of the Medicare-Dependent, Small Rural Hospital Program and the Low-Volume Payment Adjustment for Hospitals [CMS-1632-F and IFC] (RIN: 0938-AS41) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

2422. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System — Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2015 (FY 2016) [CMS-1627-F] (RIN: 0938-AS47) received July 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MCCAUL: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 1073. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to secure critical infrastructure against electromagnetic threats, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MARINO (for himself and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3438. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER (for himself and Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California):

H.R. 3439. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to provide for the inclusion of the names of certain members of the Armed Forces on the Vietnam Veterans Memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3440. A bill to direct the Department of Energy to support fusion energy innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER (for herself and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 3441. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish education programs for patients and health care providers regarding cell-free DNA prenatal screening, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.J. Res. 64. A joint resolution disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENHAM:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate; considered and agreed to.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 3438.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 1, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution, in that the legislation concerns the exercise of legislative powers generally granted to Congress, including the exercise of those powers when delegated by Congress to the Executive.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the U.S. Constitution in that the legislation exercises legislative power granted to Congress by that clause "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof;" and

Article III, Section 1, Clause 1, Sentence 1, and Section 2, Clause 1, of the Constitution in that the legislation defines or affects judicial powers and cases that are subject to legislation by Congress.

By Mr. ROHRABACHER:

H.R. 3439.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 14 the United States Constitution

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3440.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER:

H.R. 3441.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. ROYCE:

H.J. Res. 64.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 167: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 169: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 187: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 209: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. MCSALLY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 244: Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 303: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 419: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 499: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 610: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 625: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 771: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 932: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1057: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1062: Mr. YOHO.

H.R. 1100: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. PITTINGER.

H.R. 1101: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1112: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1130: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1147: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. FORTEN-

BERRY.

H.R. 1149: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 1174: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 1178: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1197: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1209: Ms. DELAURO, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. BENISHEK.

H.R. 1282: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1516: Ms. GRAHAM and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1608: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1655: Mr. DOLD and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1670: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 1733: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1882: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1901: Mr. LOUDERMILK.

H.R. 1920: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1945: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.R. 2045: Mr. FLEMING.

H.R. 2061: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 2123: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.

H.R. 2141: Mr. POE of Texas.

H.R. 2293: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 2400: Mr. BUCHSHON, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. RIGELL, and Mr. WEST-MORELAND.

H.R. 2404: Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 2412: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 2434: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2477: Mr. PITTINGER.

H.R. 2494: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 2640: Mr. REED.

H.R. 2646: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2658: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2689: Mr. RUIZ and Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 2697: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2698: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.

H.R. 2713: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2737: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 2753: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2849: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2903: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2920: Mr. FARR, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3041: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BEYER, and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3071: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3073: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 3095: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 3115: Mr. POLIQUIN and Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 3134: Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 3151: Mr. GOHMERT.

H.R. 3181: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 3193: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3296: Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 3308: Mr. GALLEGRO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SARBANES.

H.R. 3327: Mr. LAMALFA.

H.R. 3410: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3429: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.

H. Res. 15: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H. Res. 220: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H. Res. 343: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr.

BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HANNA, and Ms. ESTY.

H. Res. 367: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky.

H. Res. 397: Mr. REICHERT.

SENATE—Tuesday, August 4, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our King, let the Earth rejoice and righteousness and justice strengthen the land we love. Lord, we live in a fugitive earthly scene, but it is permeated by Your eternal presence. Remind us that transiency will not have the last word in our universe. We are grateful that life's changefulness is underlain and penetrated by Your unchanging purposes.

Guide our Senators. In these days of upheaval, show them how to find the permanent amid the impermanent, the durable amid the fragile, and the truth amid the falsehood.

Thank You for continuing to be the rock of our salvation, sustaining us in the best and worst of times.

We pray in Your strong Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I recently shared an AP news story with my colleagues, and I think it is worth sharing again.

Here is the headline: "Federal Agencies Are Wide Open to Hackers, Cyberspies."

I will read just a little bit of what it says.

The federal government, which holds secrets and sensitive information ranging from nuclear blueprints to the tax returns of hundreds of millions of Americans, has for years failed to take basic steps to protect data from hackers and thieves, records show. In the latest example, the Office of Personnel Management is under fire for allowing its databases to be plundered by suspected Chinese cyberspies in what is being called one of the worst breaches in U.S. history. OPM repeatedly neglected to implement basic cy-

bersecurity protections, its internal watchdog told Congress.

That story should worry every one of us, Democrats and Republicans alike. The AP referred to the massive cyber attack that recently struck the Obama administration as "one of the worst breaches in U.S. history." But while this massive breach may have been "one of the worst," it certainly—unless the administration can be rescued from the cyber security Dark Ages—will not be the last.

So the Senate will be considering bipartisan cyber security legislation this week that would help the public and private sectors defeat cyber attacks. The modern tools it contains, through the sharing of threat information, would provide for the construction of stronger defenses. The top Democrat on the Intelligence Committee says this bipartisan bill would also protect "individual privacy and civil liberties." She is right. It contains strong measures to limit the use, retention, and diffusion of consumers' personal information. Information sharing with the government would also be voluntary under this bipartisan legislation.

No wonder my colleague from California joined virtually every other Democrat and every other Republican to endorse this bipartisan bill overwhelmingly in committee 14 to 1. No wonder this bipartisan bill is backed by a diverse coalition of supporters, too—everyone from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce to farm supply stores, to your local community bank.

This is a strong bipartisan, transparent bill that has been meticulously vetted by both parties in committee and that has been available online for literally months for anyone to read. My friend the Democratic leader has also publicly declared that the Senate could finish this bill in "a couple of days."

"In a couple of days," he said, "at the most."

So with cooperation, we can pass the bipartisan bill this week. There will also be an opportunity for Members of both parties to offer amendments. I urge colleagues who wish to do so to begin working with the bill managers right now.

This legislation is the work of many Members. I mentioned Ranking Member FEINSTEIN earlier, who has been a key player on this issue. I also wish to thank Chairman BURR for his strong leadership and his hard work across the aisle in developing this bipartisan bill. I urge the Senate to allow us to act and pass it this week.

The House of Representatives has already passed two similar White House-backed cyber security bills. The sooner we pass ours, the sooner we conference with the House to finally get a good cyber security law on the books, and the sooner our country can be better protected from more of these types of attacks.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, this September, the Senate will formally weigh in on the nuclear deal struck between the White House and Iran. We will take a vote and answer a simple but powerful question: Will the agreement actually make America and its allies safer? When we do, the Senate, as an institution, will be put to the test.

The first test will come in which answer we arrive at. Some might take the view that releasing billions of dollars to a state sponsor of terrorism while leaving the regime with thousands of nuclear centrifuges, an advanced research and development program, and the means to improve its full-spectrum warfighting capability would represent an acceptable outcome. Those Senators will vote one way.

Others will say that ending Iran's nuclear program is worth the necessary exertion of political leadership—leadership to keep the coalition unified, to reveal Iran's development of ballistic missiles and its support of terrorism, and to resolve the IAEA concerns over Tehran's refusal to allow access to nuclear scientists and facilities—because doing so would be in the best interests of our country and in the best interests of our allies. Those Senators will vote a different way.

In answering this fundamental question, every Senator will reveal his or her view of America's standing, its leadership, and its capabilities in the modern world. They will demonstrate whether they think these things can and should be brought to bear to defend our interests and to defend against Iran's aggressive expansion and its threatening nuclear program.

We know that the next Senate and the next President will continue to be faced with a threat posed by Iran. So we should conduct this debate with our eyes on the future. This is a critical test, but it is not the only one. The other test comes not in which answer we choose but in how we answer the question.

Can we join together to conduct a debate worthy of the importance of this agreement?

Can we call up the resolution and respectfully debate it without employing

delay tactics designed specifically to impede the Senate's review of such a weighty matter?

Are Senators willing to focus on a matter of interest to the institution, defer committee activities, and sit in their chairs to truly listen and debate their colleagues on a matter of such significance?

Nearly every Member of both parties voted to have this debate when they passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. Surely, Senators wouldn't then turn around and block a proper debate from even proceeding.

My hope is that the Senate could reach agreement to call up the appropriate resolution, reach agreement to allow ample time for Senators to express their views, and then proceed to a thorough, thoughtful, and respectful debate, because it is hard to overstate the importance of what we are about to consider: our role in the world, our commitment to our allies, the kind of future we will leave our children. It is all wrapped up in this issue.

The debate we will conduct deserves the appropriate and respectful deliberation that this body was designed to facilitate. Every Senator owes as much to this institution, and every Senator owes as much to this country and to the people we serve.

We may disagree on the first test, but we should all agree on the second one.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I agree with the Republican leader that we should work to come up with a way of proceeding in a dignified manner to this most important piece of legislation. Certainly, I would lend my efforts to try to get that done. It is easier said than done, with the feelings on both sides of the aisle on this issue and other issues.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama took a very important step in addressing climate change and promoting clean energy. His Clean Power Plan is the strongest action ever taken by our government to fight climate change. The Clean Power Plan would reduce the dangerous amounts of carbon pollution being pumped into the atmosphere. By reducing pollution, the Clean Power Plan would yield significant public health benefits for our entire Nation.

Carbon pollution has many devastating effects on our environment, as

well as the health and well-being of all of us. Sadly, pollution from burning fossil fuels disproportionately affects low-income people and families of color. Exposure to air pollution can aggravate preexisting health problems, especially respiratory maladies such as asthma.

For millions of Americans, carbon pollution affects their ability to breathe and exacerbates the problems they have with asthma. Consider these facts. Minority and lower income Americans are far more likely to live near coal-fired powerplants. Statistically, that is terribly accurate. African Americans are three times more likely to be hospitalized from asthma. African-American children have an 80-percent higher rate of asthma and are roughly three times more likely to die from asthma than their White peers. Roughly half of Latinos live in areas that frequently violate clean air rules, and Hispanic children are 40 percent more likely to die from asthma than non-Hispanic Whites.

In Nevada, just a short distance out of Las Vegas, about 35 miles, there is an Indian reservation. Approximately 30 years ago, NV Energy—Nevada Power—built this huge coal-fired generator there. Over the more than three decades it has been in existence, tens of millions of tons of coal have been burnt in that powerplant. It is a football field away from the reservation. Those Native Americans have been really sick as a result of that. Now there has been a court settlement that gives them a little bit of economic strength as a result of this, and, to its credit, NV Energy's new ownership has decided it is going to phase out that plant very quickly. That is good for the health of those Native Americans.

Today the plant is being decommissioned and solar is being built on the tribe's reservation. It is wonderful to see that. They have a lot of jobs, and it is giving some economic viability, in addition to the court settlement I just talked about.

President Obama put it best yesterday: "If you care about low-income, minority communities, try protecting the air they breathe." That is exactly what the President's plan will do. It will clean the air we breathe, help curb health care costs, and improve the quality of life for all Americans. But that is not all.

As the plan is implemented, we will see even more investment in clean and renewable energy, which is not only good for the planet and our health, but it is good for the economy. The Clean Power Plan will boost renewable energy by 30 percent over the next 15 years, cutting pollution but, of course, creating tens of thousands of jobs for all Americans. President Obama's plan encourages programs and incentives to make American homes more efficient and lower consumers' utility bills.

Under the Clean Energy Incentive Program, a jump start in new jobs is expected from construction and installation of renewable energy and efficiency upgrades. This will incentivize new clean energy development and job creation before the new carbon standards even go into effect.

It has been disappointing, but not surprising, to see Republicans' knee-jerk opposition to addressing climate change. It is all the more frustrating because they have no plan of their own, except to let the smoke keep billowing. Instead, Republicans are clamoring to show special interests such as the oil baron Koch brothers how far they are willing to go to kill commonsense protections for our air and public health because it might hurt the bottom line of their coal and energy barons.

Last month, House Republicans passed legislation that would rescind President Obama's action addressing air pollution and climate change. Senate Republicans, for their part, are trying the same thing with policy riders in the Senate Interior and Environment appropriations bill.

Republicans would leave our children and grandchildren to pay the devastating costs of climate change. The Republicans have no solutions. They are afraid to acknowledge that climate change is a problem. It is.

President Obama's Clean Power Plan is good for this country. It is the strongest action we can take today to ensure a cleaner, healthier tomorrow for our children and grandchildren, and it has to be done administratively. We can't get anything done legislatively. It is all opposed by the Republicans.

It would be good for my State of Nevada, where investment in clean energy is \$6 billion. President Obama's plan gives States further flexibility to tailor programs for reducing carbon emissions while protecting public health and keeping electricity affordable and reliable.

Already the plan has wide support in Nevada. An article from the Associated Press yesterday reads:

Several Nevada government business leaders plan to voice support for a federal campaign to limit carbon pollution from power plants around the nation in an effort to address global climate change. . . . Nevada Governor Brian Sandoval's energy chief, Paul Thomsen, says Nevada is well-positioned to comply with the first national limits on carbon dioxide from existing power plants.

Nevada understands the benefits clean energy brings to communities and the lives that will be improved by cleaning the air we breathe. Nevada is at the forefront of clean energy in the United States. Over the past decade, our clean energy infrastructure has expanded substantially, bringing good-paying jobs and new industries to Nevada. There can be no better place for President Obama to begin a dialogue with the Nation about the Clean Power Plan than Nevada.

I am looking forward to President Obama's visit to Nevada later this month to speak at the National Clean Energy Summit in Las Vegas on August 24. This is the 8th annual National Clean Energy Summit.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we all want to address cyber security. Repeatedly, in the last two Congresses, I worked to convene the chairmen and ranking members of the relevant committees to move cyber security legislation, and we worked hard and came up with a number of bills, one of which we brought to the floor and was killed by the Republicans. What was good for our Nation's security was bad for the tea party and the Republicans. They blocked the cyber security legislation.

In this Congress, we have not been as uncooperative as the Republicans were when they were in the minority. Democrats are willing to proceed to the cyber security bill, if we can get assurance that Democrats can offer relevant amendments. It has to be done.

For the majority leader to say, as he did here today, that well, on this massive bill we had, I stuck the cyber security bill with a lot of other things—he knew it wouldn't work there. It was only to check it off his list that he tried to do it. Realistically, we have already been on this legislation. We should have been on this legislation. The Republican leader could have proceeded to cyber security instead of a politically motivated bill to defund access to health care for women. Unlike Republicans, we don't need all the poison pill amendments that deal with different subjects.

Democrats have amendments relevant to cyber security, and we must offer those. I have received a letter from Senators WYDEN, LEAHY, FRANKEN, WHITEHOUSE, and COONS yesterday that states:

We understand that the Senate may soon consider the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act. We share the view that increasing the security of U.S. networks while protecting Americans' privacy is an important goal, and while we have different views on this legislation, we are all interested in offering relevant amendments that we believe would improve this bill in various ways.

We look forward to working with you to ensure that there is an adequate process for considering a reasonable number of amendments.

The way Republican Senators used to talk about an open amendment process, our request to have a few relevant amendments should be readily accepted by the Republicans. But then, looking at how the Republican leader has led the Senate this year, there is plenty of reason for Democrats to be concerned.

Just look at the bill the Senate just considered last week—a major highway bill with more than 1,000 pages. The

Republican leader filled the amendment tree twice, not allowing any amendments to be offered. Accordingly, if you look at what the Congressional Research Service says, the Republican leader could potentially fill the amendment tree more times than any other majority leader has done in the first year of a Congress. So far he has done that more than I ever did.

Nevertheless, Democrats will work with Republicans to get on this bill and consider a reasonable number of important amendments. I hope the Republicans will cooperate with us.

Would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The Senator from South Dakota.

REPUBLICAN-LED SENATE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, while Republicans were campaigning last fall, we promised the American people that if they put us in charge, we would get the Senate working again. That wasn't a campaign slogan. That was a commitment.

I am proud to report that we are delivering on that promise. The first 7 months of the 114th Congress have been some of the most productive the Senate has had in a long time. We have passed more than 70 bills to help strengthen our economy, reform our government, protect some of the most vulnerable, and strengthen our national security.

We passed bipartisan legislation to authorize the Keystone Pipeline, a valuable infrastructure project that would support more than 42,000 jobs during construction and invest \$5.3 billion in the U.S. economy, all without spending a dime of taxpayer money.

We passed a bipartisan bill to strengthen our efforts to eradicate human trafficking in this country and to help its victims. This legislation, which passed the Senate with unanimous support from Democrats and Republicans and was signed into law in May, gives law enforcement new tools to target traffickers, including increased access to wiretaps, and it significantly expands the resources available to trafficking victims as they seek to rebuild their lives.

As negotiations with Iran over a nuclear agreement were repeatedly extended and as reports of significant compromises emerged, Democrats and Republicans alike grew concerned that the administration would fail to negotiate a deal that would be strong enough to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. To address these concerns, the Senate passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. This legislation, which passed the Senate with overwhelming support from Democrats and Republicans and was signed into law by President Obama, was designed to ensure that the American people, through their elected representatives, would have a voice in any deal with Iran.

Without the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act there would be no opportunity for an up-or-down vote on this deal in Congress and no way to prevent the President from immediately waiving the sanctions that Congress put in place. Congress is currently reviewing the final agreement announced by the President, an agreement that has been greeted, I might add, with bipartisan skepticism. We will be holding a vote on this deal in September.

Increasing access to jobs and expanding opportunities for American workers is a priority of the Republican-led Congress. In May, with the support of 14 Democrats, the Republican-led Senate passed legislation to reauthorize trade promotion authority, which is key to securing trade deals that are favorable to American workers and businesses. Since 2009, increasing exports have accounted for more than 1.6 million new jobs in the United States. Manufacturing jobs that depend on exports pay an average of 13 to 18 percent more than other jobs in the economy. Thanks to the bipartisan trade promotion authority legislation, the administration now has a key tool to negotiate trade agreements that will create more good-paying jobs for American workers and open new markets for products labeled "Made in the U.S.A."

After taking up bipartisan legislation to protect our economy, the Senate turned to another key Republican priority; that is, supporting our military men and women. The National Defense Authorization Act, which we considered in June, passed the Senate with strong bipartisan support. In addition to authorizing the funding our military needs to defend our Nation, this bill contains a number of reforms that will expand the resources available to our military men and women and strengthen our national security.

Among other things, this legislation targets \$10 billion in unnecessary spending and redirects those funds to military priorities such as funding for aircraft and weapons systems and modernization of Navy vessels. It implements sweeping reforms to the military's outdated acquisitions process by

removing bureaucracy and expediting decisionmaking. That will significantly improve the military's ability to access the technology and equipment it needs. It replaces the outdated military retirement system with a modern system that will extend retirement benefits to 75 percent of our servicemembers.

During the month of July, the Senate built on its bipartisan achievements with two important pieces of legislation: the Every Child Achieves Act and the DRIVE Act. The Every Child Achieves Act, which passed the Senate by an overwhelming margin, reauthorizes Federal K-12 education programs and revokes problematic Federal mandates such as those that resulted in the phenomenon of overtesting. This legislation restores control of education to those who know students the best, such as parents, teachers, and local school boards.

The DRIVE Act, which passed the Senate by a strong bipartisan margin, is notable because it is the first Transportation bill in almost a decade to provide more than 2 years of funding for our Nation's infrastructure needs. Around the country, hundreds of thousands of people and hundreds of thousands of jobs depend on the funding contained in Transportation bills. When Congress fails to provide the necessary certainty about the way transportation funding will be allocated, States and local governments are left without the certainty that they need to authorize projects or make long-term plans for transportation infrastructure. That means that essential construction projects get deferred, necessary repairs may not get made, and jobs that depend on transportation are put in jeopardy. The DRIVE Act will give States and local governments the certainty they need to plan for and commit to key infrastructure projects.

Every bill I have discussed today passed the Senate with strong bipartisan support. One major reason for that is Senate Republicans' commitment to opening up the legislative process here in the Senate. Under Democratic control, the legislative process of the Senate had almost ground to a halt. Instead of being developed in committee, bills were frequently drafted behind closed doors, and not only the minority party but many rank-and-file Democrats were shut out of the process.

When Republicans took control of the Senate in January, we changed all that. We opened up the committee process and debate on the floor. We made it a priority to ensure that every Senator—every Senator—both Democratic and Republican, has an opportunity to make his or her voice heard. During 2014, the Democratic leadership allowed just 15 amendment rollcall votes in the entire year—2014. Republicans allowed more than 15 amend-

ment rollcall votes in our first month. So far this year, we have allowed more than 165 amendment rollcall votes, and we still have 5 months to go in the year. The Republican-led Senate has accomplished a lot over the past 7 months. But we know that we have a lot more to do.

As the 114th Congress continues, we will continue to fight for the American people's priorities. We hope the Democrats here in the Senate will continue to join us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as I like to say, there are only two types of companies: those that have been hacked and those that know they have been hacked. This was recently seen at JPMorgan Chase. Last summer the company suffered a cyber attack that involved the theft of contact information for about 76 million households. In the aftermath, JPMorgan Chase is expected to double its budget for cyber security efforts this year. But the case of JPMorgan is not unique nor a simply cautionary tale for other major companies.

In the last few months, we have seen one of the largest cyber attacks on our Nation's technology infrastructure and other major cyber breaches affecting our financial and transportation sector. I share these comments in the context of having worked as an executive for a cloud computing company for 12 years prior to serving in the Senate. In the midst of these attacks, we see radical Islamic terrorists infiltrating American social media networks to recruit Americans to join them as jihadists overseas.

We must work to address these challenges, and our response must be measured as well as thoughtful, not only about the immediate threats to our cyber infrastructure but also to the long-term effects on our national security and our constitutional freedoms. As we are seeing with the European Union, after years of debate, the EU is currently working on a policy to ensure their citizens are notified of cyber breaches within 72 hours and that victims of these attacks are notified without undue delay.

This is the type of response we need in the United States, much like the notification reforms that I have worked for in Congress. On a near daily basis, we see headlines in our major news-

papers that underscore the absolute importance of creating a concrete timeline for implementing timely notification standards.

Having spent more than 12 years working on technology, I know firsthand the power that Big Data holds. I also understand the importance of setting standards and clear guidelines. As we always said in 28 years of business, if you aim at nothing, you will hit it. It is important that we not only expect more but that we also inspect. We want to be assured that guidelines are being followed.

It is unacceptable that any American is left in the dark when their personally identifiable information or PII may have been breached. That is why I have been fighting to strengthen notification requirements and ensure that the American people know when their personal information is compromised. When I was running customer service operations at RightNow Technologies and looking out for our customers, when we had a problem, our policy was that we notified our customers as soon as we were aware of the problem. Maybe we did not always understand the magnitude at the time of the problem, but we believed we owed it to our customers to get back to them as soon as possible.

The customers, the consumers of this country, should be served in a similar way. But as the Senate prepares to consider cyber security reforms, we also need to strike the right balance between protecting our cyber security infrastructure and the personal information of Americans, while also protecting the constitutional rights and the liberty of the American people. We must protect our Nation's security while also preserving our civil liberties.

We must remain vigilant. We must ensure that we have robust and transparent debate about cyber protection and what reforms must be implemented to protect American civil liberties. We see some of these protections in the legislation I cosponsored, spearheaded by Senators MIKE LEE and PAT LEAHY. The Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2015 modernizes our Nation's electronic privacy laws and brings protections against warrantless searches into harmony with the technological realities of the 21st century.

The protections currently on the books may have been robust in 1986 when the ECPA was written, but they do not adequately defend our citizens against the mass data storage that currently exists. Nobody in 1986 would have ever envisioned where we are today as to the massive amount of data that is collected and stored today on the American people. This bill ensures that the Federal Government gives our law enforcement officials the tools they need, while ensuring that Monitans and the American people are

not subjected to invasive and unwarranted searches.

Privacy and security both matter. I believe we can find a balance that protects both. I urge my colleagues to join me in finding reforms that stop cyber criminals from infiltrating our security networks and also preserve the privacy and the civil liberties that Montanans and Americans hold dear.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S CLEAN POWER PLAN AND COAL

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I would like to shift gears for a moment and share some comments about President Obama's news that he made yesterday with the EPA. Yesterday, President Obama and the "Employment Prevention" Agency, the EPA, continued to wage their war on American energy, American families, and American jobs. As President Obama was announcing his plan to devastate Montana's coal industry and the good-paying jobs it provides, yet another coal company filed for bankruptcy.

At the same time, the J.E. Corette powerplant, in my home State of Montana in Billings, is being dismantled as we speak in the aftermath of President Obama's previous anti-coal regulation. In addition to supporting 30 jobs, the Corette powerplant has powered tens of thousands of Montana homes and contributed several million dollars in tax revenue to Montana and Yellowstone County every year.

Over the past year, Montanans have braced themselves for the release of the Obama administration's final regulations, which were already set to wreak havoc on our coal industry and make construction of any new coal-fired plant virtually impossible. The proposed rule was bad. The final rule is even more devastating to Montana jobs and to Montana families.

The final rule announced by the Obama administration makes the retirement of existing coal-fired powerplants inevitable within the next few decades.

The rules moved the goalposts and, I might add, to the wrong end of the field. These rules will most likely lead to the shuttering of Montana's Colstrip Power Plant and countless others across the Nation. It would be devastating for our economy and hard-working families across the State.

Energy rates will increase. Thousands of Montana family-wage jobs would be lost. Critical tax revenue for schools, for our teachers, roads, and our infrastructure would evaporate. In the Obama administration's final rule, they took an already bad rule and they made it worse.

The so-called Clean Power Plan forces Montana to achieve even more aggressive standards than originally proposed. According to POLITICO, in 2012 Montana produced 2,481 carbon pounds per megawatt hour.

Under the President's plan, by 2030, he wants Montana to produce only 1,305 carbon pounds per megawatt hour. That is a 47.4-percent reduction in Montana's carbon emissions because in Montana more than half of our electricity comes from coal. In fact, my mobile device is powered by coal. Coal also powers good-paying jobs for thousands of Montanans, including Montana tribal members and union workers, and generates nearly \$120 million in tax revenue every year.

America is poised to lead the world's energy needs, but this will be done through American innovation, through American ingenuity, not more regulations. The Obama administration's regulations are completely out of touch with global realities, and this is why: Global demand for coal-fired energy will not disappear, even if the United States shuts down every last coal mine and coal-fired powerplant.

Nations such as China, Korea, and Japan will continue using coal as it is reliable and it is affordable. These nations should be powered by cleaner Montana coal because the coal we produce in Montana is cleaner than Asian coal.

In terms of the environmental picture for the world, we are better off using American coal, Montana coal—not coal from Asia. Rather than dismissing this reality, the United States should be on the cutting edge of technological advances in energy development and leading the way in promoting the use of clean, affordable American energy.

In fact, according to the International Energy Agency's 2013 data, the world consumes about 6 billion metric tons of steam coal for power generation. Of that, the United States consumes 750 million metric tons.

Let's put that into apples-to-apples comparison. That means the United States consumes about 12 percent of the coal. The rest of the world consumes 88 percent. As the world sees an increased demand for power, it is clear we need to be leading the way in clean coal and energy innovation.

The United States should be leading. Let's be working toward clean coal, clean energy, and leading the world as our 12 percent could have an influence on the other 88 percent.

America, we can and we should power the world, but we could only do it if the Obama administration steps back from its out-of-touch regulations and allows American innovation to thrive once again to not only lead America but to lead the world.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, last week I delivered my 19th "Waste of the

Week" and we actually reached our goal of \$100 billion in savings for the taxpayer by identifying waste, fraud, and abuse. This was money spent by the Federal Government, money collected from hard-working earners who paid their taxes, sent them to Washington, and expected they would be used for essential purposes, such as providing for our national security, supporting research at NIH for medical advances that would provide lifesaving techniques and medicines to Americans, funding the rebuilding of crumbling bridges and highways, and any number of things the Federal Government is involved in that the American public agrees are essential functions that could be performed only by the Federal Government.

What we want you to do though, they are saying, is be as efficient as you can. If there is excess money wasted on programs that have no place in the Federal budget, let's identify those, let's eliminate those, and either return our tax money and lower our tax rates or use it for something more essential.

We have reached our goal of \$100 billion of waste, fraud, and abuse identified by nonpartisan agencies—not Republican agencies, not Democratic agencies or firms but nonpartisan agencies—that simply look at numbers, identify the projects, identify the spending, and ask the question: Do we truly need to do that?

Particularly at a time when the deficit clock keeps ticking, when we continue year after year after year to spend more than we take in, despite raising taxes, despite looking for ever more sources of income, it is clear we need to take the necessary steps not to spend more than is absolutely necessary to function on behalf of the American people.

So today I am on the floor for speech No. 20. We reached the goal. It is just the beginning of August. The Senate has many more weeks in front of it, but we are going to keep going because it is amazing the amount of waste, fraud, and abuse that has been identified by some of these nonpartisan groups looking at Federal expenditures. If we can add to our chart, I think we will have to add an extension to that chart or devise another one—perhaps put another gauge over here—because we are going to keep doing this every week the Senate is in session.

Today, as I said, we are looking at No. 20. I looked at two agencies that exist in the Federal Government: the National Endowment for the Humanities, NEH, and the National Endowment for the Arts, NEA. These two agencies are engaged in cultural projects. Some of these are—people would deem—somewhat essential, but we have looked at two agencies that we think ought to be identified today.

The public probably will remember the 87th Academy Awards—better

known as the Oscars—that took place in Hollywood a few months ago. Many Americans tune in and watch this high-profile event featuring America's rich and famous. As always, a parade of actors pull up in their stretch limousines and step into the bright lights of the entertainment industry's media—the flashing lights, the march down the red carpet, and stop to have their pictures taken. There, in tailored tuxes and designer gowns—some of which cost, amazingly, over \$100,000—everybody is trying to outdo everybody else.

The bottom line is Hollywood is not short of money. As Americans watch this, they see the Oscars that are being offered. Then we look at that and say: What in the world is a \$25,000 check from the Federal Government to Hollywood doing in this process?

It is hard to understand the concept that Hollywood needs support, needs a handout from the Federal Government, but they are developing an Academy Museum of Motion Pictures in Hollywood. Somehow they have applied for a \$25,000 grant from the National Endowment for the Arts. Now, that is not a major amount compared to our budget problems here and the money we deal with, but the American public ought to be saying: Why in the world are we giving a penny to Hollywood to support the building of a museum?

It is simply because the process is open for anybody to submit for a grant. But who is reviewing these things? Who is looking at this? Does Hollywood truly need taxpayer money to construct a museum of motion pictures through the National Endowment for the Arts?

We also discovered that the National Endowment for the Humanities got engaged in one of these efforts, spending considerably more—\$914,000—to support a conference entitled “What is Love? Romance Fiction in the Digital Age.” The conference was full of speakers networking with each other and even giving the opportunity for adults to design and color their own title page.

Again, I am asking why. Why, given our \$18.5 trillion debt growing every day, do we have to give away a nearly \$1 million grant to support a conference on how in the digital age to develop romantic books?

While it might be fun to go deeper into this and examine just exactly what goes on at this conference, that is not really why I am speaking on the floor today. I am simply here to ask why. Is this necessary? Is this the kind of thing we need to be supporting and doing with hard-earned taxpayer dollars that are sent to Washington, not for these purposes?

So today, the cumulative runs close to \$1 million—\$939,000—of taxpayer savings that would go onto our gauge, and we add yet another increment to the gauge in determining how tax dollars are spent.

We are going to continue doing this. This is a small one today. You can see we had some major chunks and major dysfunctions in the Federal Government, but I think it is important for every Senator to be able to go home, talk to their people, and say: We are making every possible effort we can to be efficient and effective with the money you sent to Washington, and we are looking into every dollar to make sure it is spent on essential functions of the Federal Government.

It is astounding how much is being sent, used, and wasted, how much fraud and waste takes place. We will continue to identify that each week.

That is our waste of the week. We will be back each week after our August recess when the Senate is in session to continue to identify ways in which we can save the taxpayers' money.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business.

FOR-PROFIT SCHOOLS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have come to the floor many times to talk about for-profit colleges and universities. This is a problem and a challenge we face. What you need to know are three numbers to understand the for-profit college and university industry in America.

By way of preface, this is the most heavily subsidized private business in the United States of America. What are we talking about? The largest, the University of Phoenix; Kaplan University; DeVry University; Rasmussen; Corinthian—you have heard all the names because they advertise constantly, and the money they use to advertise comes from Federal taxpayers.

There are three numbers—and if I were a college professor or law school professor, I would say this is going to be on the final—on for-profit colleges and universities. Ten percent of high school graduates attend for-profit colleges and universities—10 percent. Twenty percent of all the Federal aid to education goes to for-profit colleges and universities. Why so much? They charge so much. Their tuition is so high. Ten percent of the students; 20 percent of the Federal aid to education; 44 percent of all the student loan de-

faults in America are at for-profit colleges and universities. Ten percent of the students, 44 percent of the defaults. Why? They charge so much that the students can't finish their education or they end up with a worthless diploma. That is the reality.

There is a second reality. This industry is in serious economic trouble. Last week we had news of another Federal investigation of a for-profit college. In a filing with the Securities and Exchange Commission, the University of Phoenix—the largest for-profit college and university—revealed it is under investigation by the Federal Trade Commission for unfair and deceptive practices.

This news comes just weeks after the Center for Investigative Reporting published a story about the University of Phoenix's thinly veiled, dubious marketing and recruiting efforts on military bases—exploitation of our men and women in uniform. Over the past several years, the University of Phoenix has spent millions of dollars to sponsor events, including dances, parties, and concerts, on military bases. Is it because they love our men and women in uniform? No. It is because they want to sign them up. To the University of Phoenix, these sponsorships were simply advertising and marketing events to enroll more men and women in uniform.

When you serve our country, we show our appreciation by saying there is a GI bill waiting for you at the end of your service—in fact, in some cases, while you are still serving—and for your family, too, so that you will be prepared after you have served our country to have a good life with good education and training and job opportunities.

These for-profit colleges and universities can smell an opportunity to make even more money. The University of Phoenix is after these men and women in uniform. They are after tuition assistance dollars. TA is a program that provides up to \$4,500 a year, so servicemembers can use it toward a postsecondary education. And guess what. The money isn't counted in the Federal 90/10 calculation that caps the amount of money these for-profit schools can receive from the Federal Government. Did you hear that? Ninety percent of their revenue comes from the Federal Government. That is why for-profit colleges and universities are the most heavily subsidized private for-profit businesses in America. To for-profit colleges, the money from servicemembers and veterans is unlimited money. All they have to do is sign them up. And that is what they are doing with these sponsorships.

After the article was published, I wrote to Secretary Ash Carter—Department of Defense—to ask him to take action. The University of Phoenix reportedly is in clear violation of Executive orders limiting the access of

these schools to our men and women in uniform. The Department of Defense has confirmed to me they have opened an inquiry into the matter.

During the Senate's reconsideration of the National Defense Authorization Act, I filed an amendment to require the Department to post information on Federal and State investigations and lawsuits against schools on its online education resources for servicemembers.

As part of the Tuition Assistance Program, the Department of Defense has created what it calls TA DECIDE. This allows servicemembers to find information about specific schools when deciding where to use their tuition assistance benefits. It includes information such as the graduation and default rates. Do you know why? Because once that servicemember has used up that GI bill, it is gone. If they waste it on one of these for-profit colleges and universities that give them little or nothing for their GI bill, they do not get a second chance.

Of course, servicemembers need accesses to this information. Publicly traded companies such as the University of Phoenix have to disclose the information to the SEC when they are under investigation. Members of the military should know that, as well as the general public. It only makes sense.

My amendment wasn't taken up during the Senate's debate, but last week 12 Senators joined me in writing Secretary Carter. This commonsense step to ensure better information for servicemembers about their education options is one the Department of Defense needs to make.

I also want to say a word about another for-profit college that is notorious for its exploitation of students—Ashford University. Ashford University first came to my attention when former Senator Tom Harkin of Iowa had an investigation. He took a look at this so-called university in his home State of Iowa. Do you know what he found? He found they had purchased a small Catholic girls college, purchased their accreditation, and then reopened it under the name "Ashford University." Do you know how many faculty members there were at Ashford? One faculty member for every 500 students. It wasn't a real university; it was an online scam. They announced last week they are closing down their campus in Iowa. What a heartbreak that must be for the people of Iowa—to lose such a stalwart higher education citizen. That is the reality.

I have run into students in Illinois who said they had just graduated from college.

I said: Where did you go?

They said: Ashford.

And I thought, oh my goodness. What a disappointment. You have wasted your time and your money, you are

deep in debt, and that diploma, sadly, is worth very little.

The tide is turning against the for-profit colleges and universities. The question is whether this Senate, this Congress, this government will step up once and for all and defend those young men and women who are wasting their time and money and taxpayer dollars—and in many cases GI bill benefits—on these worthless for-profit schools.

It is time for us to wake up to this reality. I am glad to see this industry is finally facing its day of reckoning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

SCHEDULES THAT WORK ACT

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I come to the Senate floor today to talk about something that has been bothering me. Who is this Senate supposed to be working for? For years now, this economy has been great for those at the top, but for everyone else, it is getting harder and harder to make it from paycheck to paycheck, harder and harder to build any real security. The world is changing, and Congress can make decisions that help working people stay in the game and help level the playing field or we can just turn our backs.

What have the Republicans done over the past 6 months to try to make families a little more secure, to give people a fighting chance? What have they done? They have turned their backs. In the past 6 months, they have burned huge amounts of time as they tried to shut down Homeland Security, tried to build a pipeline to help a Canadian oil company, tried to turn a human trafficking bill into a referendum on abortion, and now tried to defund Planned Parenthood—all this instead of working on the kinds of issues that would help level the playing field for hard-working people.

You know, there is a lot we could do. For example, Democrats have been fighting to raise the minimum wage. And I strongly agree that no one—one—should work full time and still live in poverty. I think a \$7.25-an-hour minimum wage is disgraceful. I support the Federal bill to raise the minimum wage to \$12 by 2020, and I applaud the fight for \$15 that is springing up across this country.

When I am asked about whether we should raise the minimum wage, I have three answers: Yes. Yes. Yes. But raising the minimum wage is only the beginning. Half of low-wage workers have little or no say over when they work, and an estimated 20 to 30 percent are in jobs where they can be called in to work at the last minute.

I want us to think about what this means for someone who is busting her fanny trying to build some economic security. Imagine trying to plan for anything—for childcare, for going back

to school, for getting a second job—without knowing when you will be working next week. Imagine trying to plan a monthly budget when your work hours and paycheck can fluctuate 70 percent in a single month. Imagine trying to schedule a doctor's visit or parent-teacher conference if you could get fired just for asking for a few hours off. This is the real world of millions of workers who struggle to make ends meet.

This is something we can fix. A few weeks ago, I introduced the Schedules That Work Act, with 17 Democrats in the Senate and more than 60 Democrats in the House of Representatives. The bill is just common sense and basic fairness: A single mom should know if her hours are being canceled before she arranges for daycare and drives halfway across town to show up at work, a young man trying to put himself through school should be able to request a more predictable schedule without getting fired just for asking, and a worker who is told to wait around on call for hours with no guarantee of work should get something for her time.

The Schedules That Work Act does two simple things: First, it gives all workers the right to request a change in their schedule without getting fired just for asking, and, second, it gives workers who face the worst scheduling practices—workers in retail, food service, and cleaning workers—2 weeks' notice of their work schedules and some additional pay if they are required to wait on call but don't get any work.

Now, look, this bill recognizes that there are emergencies, and when employers have unexpected needs they can reschedule their workers, but we are asking for a little basic fairness so that in ordinary times—day-by-day, week-by-week—workers will have a stable schedule and a chance to build some real economic security.

Democrats want to get to work on changes in the law that would give working people a fighting chance. We want Republicans to let us take up these proposals and let us vote on them. Instead, Republicans are pushing a different agenda, focusing on defunding women's health care and protecting those at the top.

People say Washington doesn't work, but that is wrong. Washington works great—for the right people. When the corporate lobbyists want a carve-out or giveaway, when a giant oil company wants the Keystone Pipeline or when Citibank wants to blast a hole in Dodd-Frank, Republicans fall all over themselves to make it happen. When the rightwing wants to cut off access to health care, Republicans are ready to go, but when it comes to the things that will help families, they turn their backs. This has to stop. We are not here to work for the lobbyists. We are not here to make life easier for big oil

companies or for big banks. We are here to make this country work for hard-working Americans. That is our job, and it is time for this Republican Senate to start doing that job.

Let's take up and pass the Schedules That Work Act. Let's give working families a fighting chance to build a future.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

MARINE CORPS AUDIT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, yesterday a very important Government Accountability Office report came out. I am going to present my view of that report in a little bit backward way by giving a summary before I speak about the fine points of this report.

Broken bookkeeping has plagued the Pentagon for years. Under deadline pressure, the Marine Corps claimed to be ready for a clean audit. An outside auditing firm produced work papers in support of an opinion on a clean audit that employees in the Defense Department inspector general's office found lacking. However, a manager in the inspector general's office overruled his lower level colleagues. That resulted in the inspector general's release of a clean opinion on the audit of the Marine Corps.

Meanwhile, work papers began to creep out of the bureaucracy showing the unsupported basis for such a clean opinion. The inspector general was then forced to withdraw that opinion.

Now the Government Accountability Office is releasing a report that exposes the whole house of cards. One senior employee with an apparent bias toward the outside auditing firm led his agency down the wrong path. We need to get things back on track and prevent an embarrassing setback like this from ever happening again.

I will go into those details. As I often do, I come to the floor to speak about the latest twist in the 25-year struggle to fix the Defense Department's broken accounting system. Billions have been spent to fix it and achieve audit readiness, but those goals remain elusive. Defense dishes out over \$500 billion a year. Yet the Department still can't tell the people where all the money is going, and now the drive to be audit-ready by 2017—that is what the law requires—has taken a bad turn and become a fight over the truth.

As overseers of the taxpayers' money, we in Congress need to get the Audit Readiness Initiative back on track, moving forward in the right direction.

I last spoke on this subject a long time ago—December 8, 2011. On that occasion, I commended the Secretary of Defense, Leon Panetta, for trying to get the ball rolling. He wanted to halt endless slippage in audit deadlines. He

wanted to provide an accurate and regular accounting of money spent to comply with the constitutional requirements. He turned up the pressure and in effect drew a line in the sand.

He directed the Department to, in his words, "achieve partial audit readiness," with limited statements by 2014, and, in his words, "full audit readiness" with all-up statements by the statutory deadline of 2017.

Not one of the major DOD components—including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force—reached Leon Panetta's 2014 milestone. None was or is audit ready today.

That said, one component—the Marine Corps—stepped up to the plate and claimed to be ready for what Leon Panetta's goal was. To test that claim, the accounting firm Grant Thornton was awarded a contract to audit five Marine Corps financial statements, 2010 to 2014.

The first two, 2010 and 2011, were unsuccessful. The Marine Corps was not ready. The third one was the 2012 audit, which is finally finished.

The 2012 audit was put under a microscope and subjected to intense review by the Office of Inspector General along with two other independent watchdogs.

The Marine Corps audit was a disaster. First, it took an ugly turn. It got twisted out of shape and turned upside down. Now it is getting turned right side up, thanks to the Government Accountability Office.

Grant Thornton was required to produce a conclusion memorandum. This happens to be what we might call a quasi-opinion. Work was to be finished by December 2012, but it took an extra year. So right off the bat it was running into trouble. The scaled-down financial statement did not meet contract specifications. So this was a showstopper that got glossed over. The contract was modified to accept a makeshift compilation that was cobbled together. It is called a Schedule of Budgetary Activity. It covers only current year appropriations and not vast sums of prior year appropriations that are still lost in the statutory and money pipeline. Of course, that is a far cry from a standard financial statement.

Even reducing the scope of the audit wasn't enough to overcome all of the other problems. The Office of Inspector General audit team was responsible for issuing the final opinion. After completing a review of Grant Thornton's workpapers in early 2013, the team determined that the evidence presented did not meet audit standards. It concluded that an adverse opinion—or what they call a disclaimer—was warranted. The team's rejection of Grant Thornton's conclusions embroiled the opinion in controversy and foul play. The trouble began when the Deputy IG for Auditing, Mr. Dan Blair, intervened

and reportedly overruled his team's conclusions. He issued an unqualified or clean opinion that was not supported by the evidence in the workpapers—quite a showboat approach.

Despite mounting controversy about the validity of the opinion, Secretary of Defense Hagel rolled out that opinion December 20, 2013—with trumpets "ablast." At a ceremony in the Pentagon's Hall of Heroes, he gave the Marine Corps an award for being the first military service to earn a clean opinion. The Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. John Paxton, accepted the award. According to press reports, he did so with "reluctance. . . . He mumbled something, then bolted from the stage at flank speed." Why would General Paxton take off like a scalded dog? Was it because he sniffed a bad odor with this so-called clean report and all the colorful presentations that were made by Secretary Hagel?

At that point, the word was already seeping out: The opinion was allegedly rigged. I heard rumblings about it and began asking Inspector General Rymer questions. Because of all the controversy, we asked his independent audit quality watchdog, Deputy Assistant IG Ashton Coleman, to review the audit. Mr. Coleman sent Inspector General Rymer reports in October 2014 and May of this year. These reports ripped the figleaf clean off of Mr. Blair's charade. They reinforced the audit team's disclaimer. After recommending "the OIG rescind and reissue the audit report with a disclaimer of opinion," Mr. Coleman zeroed right in on the root cause of the problem. That root cause was impaired independence. In other words, the people involved in this charade had an agenda that wasn't about good handling of the taxpayers' money, it was protecting somebody.

Mr. Coleman concluded that Mr. Blair "had a potential impairment to independence." He and a Grant Thornton partner, Ms. Tracy Porter Greene, had a longstanding but undisclosed professional relationship going back to their service together at the Government Accountability Office in the early 1990s. According to Coleman, that relationship by itself did not pose a problem. However, once it began to interfere with the team's ability to make critical decisions, he said it created an appearance of undue influence. Coleman identified several actions that led him in this direction.

The appearance problem was framed by a four-page email on August 2, 2013, from Ms. Greene to Mr. Blair but seen by the team and others, including me. It was a stern warning. If a disclaimer was coming—and Ms. Greene knew it was—she wanted, in her words, "some advanced notice."

She needed time then, as she thought, to prepare the firm's leadership for the bad news. A disclaimer, she

said, would pose “a risk to our reputation.” At the email’s end, she opened the door to private discussions to resolve the matter.

The record clearly indicates that both Blair and Greene began holding private meetings—without inviting Contracting Officer’s Representative Ball and the Office of Inspector General team to participate in those discussions. Both believed the contracting officer’s representative and the team were—in the words of Greene and Blair—“biased toward a disclaimer rather than considering all the facts.” I attributed those words to Greene and Blair, but those were Mr. Blair’s words.

This shows how the independence of the audit and the review of the audit were questionable. To put these actions in perspective, I remind my colleagues that the inspector general was exercising oversight of the company’s work. The inspector general needed to keep top company officials like Ms. Greene at arm’s length, and holding private meetings with Greene wasn’t the way to do it. These meetings may have violated the contract.

Why would the top IG audit official prefer to hold private meetings with Ms. Greene? Why would he seem so willing and eager to favor the firm over his team—even when the evidence appeared to support the team’s position? Why would he favor the firm over the evidence and over the truth? Why would he admit on the record that “OIG auditors were not independent of Grant Thornton”? Why would he order the team to give the work papers to the firm so they could be “updated to reflect the truth”? The firm was not even supposed to have those documents, so we get back to impaired independence again.

Coleman cited other indications of this impaired independence. Contracting Officer’s Representative Ball had rejected the firm’s 2012 deliverables because they were “deficient.” They did not meet quality and timeliness standards. The deliverables in question were the company’s final work product, including the all-important quasi-opinion called a conclusion memorandum.

This posed a real dilemma. Until she accepted the 2012 deliverables, the follow-on 2013 contract with Grant Thornton could not be awarded, and Blair wanted it done yesterday.

The impasse was broken with a crooked bureaucratic maneuver. A senior official, Assistant Inspector General Loren Venable, provided a certification that there were no major performance problems and Grant Thornton had met all contract requirements. Just then, with the stroke of a pen, that deceptive document cleared the way for accepting the disputed materials, paying the firm all their money, and awarding them at the same time a follow-on contract. Yet the record

shows that even Mr. Blair admitted that “we accepted deficient deliverables.”

Why would a senior Office of Inspector General official attempt to cover up a major audit failure by Grant Thornton in order to reward the poorly performing company with more money and a new contract? For a series of audit failures, the firm got paid \$32 million.

These actions appear to show how undue influence and bias trumped objectivity and independence. Alleged tampering with the opinion may be the most flagrant example of impaired independence.

While the team identified major shortcomings with Grant Thornton’s work and disagreed with its conclusions, the team was blocked from exercising its authority to issue a disclaimer. So where is the independence? Instead, that team was forced to do additional work in a futile attempt to find evidence to match the firm’s conclusion, but there was no such evidence.

Two weeks after Ms. Greene’s email warning that a disclaimer could destroy the company’s reputation, the front office resorted to direct action. With the team’s disclaimer staring him in the face and with complete disregard for evidence and standards, Mr. Blair gave the Office of Inspector General team a truly stunning set of instructions. These were as follows: No. 1, the Marine Corps earned a clean opinion; No. 2, Grant Thornton has supported a clean opinion; and No. 3, do what it takes to reach the same conclusion as Grant Thornton.

In the simplest of terms, this August 14 edict says: There will be a clean opinion. Disregard the evidence. Figure out how to do it and make it happen.

These instructions provoked an internal brawl. The team manager, Ms. Cecilia Ball, balked. She stated flatout:

I cannot do that. Our audit evidence does not support an unqualified [clean] opinion. We are at a disclaimer.

She wanted justification for Mr. Blair’s decision to overturn the team’s opinion. She asked:

Show me where my work is substandard and where my conclusions are incorrect. And I want to know what standards Mr. Blair used to reach his conclusions.

She never got a straight answer. From that point on, it was all downhill. When the team ignored coaxing, they got steamrolled.

Mr. Blair attacked their competence, professionalism, and independence. He repeatedly accused them of being “biased.” The team’s top manager, Ms. Cecilia Ball, reacted to the abusive treatment. She said:

I don’t appreciate the accusations to my professionalism and my team’s. I don’t think we are the right fit as our integrity is being questioned.

She later quit the team in disgust.

In early December, just as the clean opinion was about to be wheeled out, Ms. Ball made one final request for explanation: Why was “the team’s disclaimer of opinion not the correct opinion”? We repeatedly documented and explained why Grant Thornton’s conclusion was unsupportable. “The vast knowledge of the Front Office could have provided us insight as to where the team’s logic was flawed.”

In this case, the front office was unwilling to consider anything other than a clean opinion. These words are from the horse’s mouth. The clean opinion was handed down from on high. The front office was Mr. Blair’s domain.

All of these actions, when taken together, appear to show a lack of independence and a flagrant disregard for audit ethics, audit standards, audit evidence, and accepted practices.

In his oversight role, Blair had a responsibility to be independent, objective, and professionally skeptical. If the firm’s work failed to meet standards, as it did, then he had a responsibility to face the truth and tell it like it is. He needed to be a junkyard dog and issue the disclaimer. Maybe he lost sight of his core mission and turned into a Grant Thornton lapdog. It sure looks that way.

Mr. Blair’s words, deeds, and prior association with the Grant Thornton partner, Ms. Greene—when coupled with their many emails that were widely distributed—gave the appearance of undue influence by the Grant Thornton partner. The tone and the substance of the Blair-Greene emails suggest a professional relationship that was just too cozy—a relationship that might have been wise to disclose according to audit standards and professional ethics.

Inspector General Rymer disagrees with Mr. Coleman’s findings of impaired independence. However, Mr. Rymer’s evidence does not square with evidence presented by Coleman. For these reasons, Senator JOHNSON of Wisconsin and I will be asking the Comptroller General—the guardian of government auditing standards—to review all relevant evidence. Since independence is a cornerstone of audit integrity, we must be certain it has not been compromised.

Now, just yesterday another blockbuster report has been rolled out. The Government Accountability Office has issued a highly critical report. It was prepared at the request of Senator JOHNSON, Senator MCCASKILL, and Senator CARPER. The Government Accountability Office report is thorough and competent and tells the story as it happened.

Over the last 2 years, the GAO team held endless meetings with the Office of Inspector General, including Jon Rymer and Dan Blair. So the IG has known for some time what was coming down the pike. They knew early on the

GAO report concluded that the evidence in the workpapers did not support the clean opinion of the Marine Corps audit.

Echoing Ms. Ball's unanswered pleas, the Government Accountability Office states: The OIG's management's decision to overturn the disclaimer is—in their words—“undocumented, unexplained, and unjustified by evidence in the work papers as required by professional standards.”

This is the evidentiary gap identified by the Government Accountability Office. There is no legitimate explanation for how the auditors got from point A—the disclaimer—to point B—the clean opinion. There is no crosswalk between the two poles. It is a bridge too far.

Despite mounting questions about the opinion, the IG turned a blind eye to Blair's charade. The IG allowed it to go on and on. Countless man-hours and millions of dollars were wasted on cooking the books and on vicious infighting instead of productive problem-solving to right the ship. Mr. Coleman and the GAO got that done.

On March 23, the day before the IG's final exit briefing with the GAO, came a bolt from the blue. The IG stepped forward with a brave, bold announcement. The clean opinion was formally withdrawn. It was like a rush of fresh air in a very stuffy room. The inescapable truth finally dawned on Inspector General Rymer. So I want to thank Mr. Rymer for having the courage to do the right thing.

An audit failure of this magnitude should have consequences. This one is especially egregious. It leaves at least one former Secretary of Defense with egg on his face. Mr. Blair was removed as head of the Audit Office on June 10 but is still serving as the Office of Inspector General's Deputy Chief of Staff. He is the chief architect of the now discredited clean opinion. He is the one who planted the seeds of destruction when he allegedly quashed the audit team's disclaimer. Of course, those responsible for what happened ought to be held accountable.

Mr. Blair wants us to believe that the muffed opinion was the result of a routine dispute between opposing auditors' judgments over evidence, a mere difference of opinion among auditors. True, it reflects an unresolved dispute between the audit team and the management, and yes, that happened; however, there is a right way and a wrong way to resolve the conflicts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to complete this. I was told I would be given the time to do it, and I have about 4 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I won't object, I want to make certain that after

Senator GRASSLEY has completed his remarks, I will have time to make my remarks for up to 15 minutes. It will probably be less than that.

Is that all right, Senator?

Mr. GRASSLEY. That is OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Those responsible for what happened ought to be held accountable.

Mr. Blair wants us to believe the muffed opinion was the result of a routine dispute between opposing auditors' judgments over evidence and a mere difference of opinion among auditors. True, it reflects an unresolved dispute between the audit team and management, and yes, that happened; however, there is a right way and a wrong way to resolve such conflicts. According to audit standards cited in the GAO report, the dispute should have been addressed, resolved, and documented in workpapers before the report was issued. It was not because the two opinions were irreconcilable.

The team's disclaimer was based on evidence measured against standards documented in workpapers. Blair's so-called “professional preference,” by comparison, is none of these things. As the GAO's evidence gap suggests, Mr. Blair's opinion was hooked up to nothing. It was unsupported, and it was improper. So plain old common sense should have caused senior managers to realize that issuing the report with the opinion hanging fire was a senseless blunder. Doing it had one inevitable result: The opinion had no credibility, and that opinion had to go.

True, the integrity of the Office of Inspector General audit process may be damaged, but the final outcome of this tangled mess may help clear the way for recovery. That recovery ought to lead us to being able to have clean audits not only of the Marine Corps but all of the four services. The Marine Corps audit was the first big one out the box. If Inspector General Rymer had not embraced the truth, we might be staring at a bunch of worthless opinions awarded to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. The Department of Defense could have declared victory and buried the broken bookkeeping system for another 100 years.

Hopefully, the Defense Department will begin anew with fresh respect for the truth, audit standards, and the need for reliable transaction data. Reliable transaction data is the lifeblood of credible financial statements. Unreliable transaction data doomed the Marine Corps audit to failure from the get-go. Without reliable transaction data, the probability of conducting a successful audit of a major component is near zero.

With the right leadership and guidance, a plan with achievable deadlines can and should be developed. In the meantime, we watchdogs—and that is

all of us in the Congress of the United States, or at least it ought to be all of us—must remain vigilant. My gut tells me we are still not out of the woods.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 754, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 754, a bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate for up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, on November 19, 1863, standing on the blood-stained battlefield of Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln delivered one of the most significant and best remembered speeches in American history. At the conclusion of the Gettysburg Address, Lincoln stated “that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain . . . that this nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom . . . and that government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth.”

In the year 2015, with a political campaign finance system that is corrupt and increasingly controlled by billionaires and special interests, I fear very much that, in fact, government of the people, by the people, and for the people is perishing in the United States of America.

Five years ago, in the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision, by a 5-to-4 vote, the U.S. Supreme Court said to the wealthiest people in this country: Billionaires, you already own much of the American economy. Now we are going to give you the opportunity to purchase the U.S. Government, the White House, the U.S. Senate, the U.S. House, Governors' seats, legislatures, and State judicial branches as well. In essence, that is exactly what they said, and, in fact, that is exactly what is happening as we speak.

As a result of Citizens United, during this campaign cycle, billions of dollars from the wealthiest people in this country will flood the political process. Super PACs—a direct outgrowth of the

Citizens United decision—enabled the wealthiest people and the largest corporations to contribute unlimited amounts of money to campaigns. According to recent FEC filings, super PACs have raised more than \$300 million for the 2016 Presidential election already, and this election cycle has barely begun. This \$300 million is more than 11 times what was raised at this point in the 2000 election cycle. What will the situation be 4 years from now? What will the situation be 8 years from now? How many billions and billions of dollars from the wealthy and powerful will be used to elect candidates who represent the rich and the superrich?

According to the Sunlight Foundation, more than \$2 out of every \$3 raised for Presidential candidates so far is going to super PACs and not to the candidate's own campaign. This is quite extraordinary. What this means is that super PACs, which theoretically operate independently of the actual candidate, have more money and more influence over the candidate's campaign than the candidate himself or herself. Let me repeat that. The millionaires and billionaires who control the super PACs have more money and more influence over a candidate's campaign than the candidate himself or herself. In other words, the candidate becomes a surrogate, a representative for powerful special interests and is not even in control of his or her own campaign.

Mr. President, 35 individuals or companies have already donated more than \$1 million to super PACs so far. According to the Associated Press, almost 60 donors have accounted for nearly one-third of all of the money donated so far in the Presidential race, including donations to the campaigns themselves. Donors giving at least \$100,000 account for close to half of all funds raised. Let's be clear. This is all taking place at the early stages of the campaign. We have a long way to go.

We know, for example, that the Koch brothers, worth some \$85 billion—the second wealthiest family in America—have made public that they intend to spend some \$900 million on this election. This is more money than either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party will spend. One family will be spending more money than either the Democratic Party or the Republican Party. How do we describe a process in which one multibillion-dollar family spends more money on a campaign than either of the two major political parties? Well, I define that process not as democracy but as oligarchy.

Let's be honest and acknowledge what we are talking about. We are talking about a rapid movement in this country toward a political system in which a handful of very wealthy people and special interests will determine who gets elected or who does not get elected. That is not, to say the least,

what this country is supposed to be about. That was not, to say the least, the vision of Abraham Lincoln when he talked about a nation in which we had a government of the people, by the people, for the people. That is not what Lincoln's vision was about.

This is not just BERNIE SANDERS expressing a concern. Last week, this is what former President Jimmy Carter had to say about the current campaign finance system on the Thom Hartmann radio show. President Carter stated that unlimited money in politics “violates the essence of what made America a great country in its political system. Now, it's just an oligarchy, with unlimited political bribery being the essence of getting the nominations for president or to elect the president. And the same thing applies to governors and U.S. Senators and congress members. So now we've just seen a complete subversion of our political system as a payoff to major contributors, who want and expect and sometimes get favors for themselves after the election's over.”

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have President Carter's statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Intercept, July 30, 2015]

JIMMY CARTER: THE U.S. IS AN “OLIGARCHY WITH UNLIMITED POLITICAL BRIBERY”

(By Jon Schwarz)

Former president Jimmy Carter said Tuesday on the nationally syndicated radio show the Thom Hartmann Program that the United States is now an “oligarchy” in which “unlimited political bribery” has created “a complete subversion of our political system as a payoff to major contributors.” Both Democrats and Republicans, Carter said, “look upon this unlimited money as a great benefit to themselves.”

Carter was responding to a question from Hartmann about recent Supreme Court decisions on campaign financing like Citizens United.

TRANSCRIPT

HARTMANN: Our Supreme Court has now said, “unlimited money in politics.” It seems like a violation of principles of democracy. . . . Your thoughts on that?

CARTER: It violates the essence of what made America a great country in its political system. Now it's just an oligarchy, with unlimited political bribery being the essence of getting the nominations for president or to elect the president. And the same thing applies to governors and U.S. Senators and congress members. So now we've just seen a complete subversion of our political system as a payoff to major contributors, who want and expect and sometimes get favors for themselves after the election's over. . . . The incumbents, Democrats and Republicans, look upon this unlimited money as a great benefit to themselves. Somebody who's already in Congress has a lot more to sell to an avid contributor than somebody who's just a challenger.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, the need for real campaign finance reform is not a progressive issue. It is not a

conservative issue. It is an American issue. It is an issue that should concern all Americans, regardless of their political point of view, who wish to preserve the essence of the longest standing democracy in the world, a government which represents all of the people and not a handful of powerful and wealthy special interests.

The need for real campaign finance reform must happen and it must happen as soon as possible. That is why clearly we must overturn, through a constitutional amendment, the disastrous Citizens United Supreme Court decision as well as the Buckley v. Vallejo decision. That is why we need to pass disclosure legislation which will identify all those wealthy individuals who make large campaign contributions. More importantly, it is why we need to move toward public funding of elections.

Our vision for American democracy, our vision for the United States of America, should be a nation in which all people, regardless of their income, can participate in the political process, can run for office without begging for contributions from the wealthy and the powerful. Every Member of the Senate and every Member of the House knows how much time candidates spend on the telephone dialing for dollars—Republicans, Democrats, everybody. This is not what democracy should be about.

Our vision for the future of this country should be one in which candidates are not telling billionaires at special forums what they can do for them. Our vision for democracy should be one in which candidates are speaking to the vast majority of our people—working people, the middle class, low-income people, the elderly, the children, the sick, and the poor—and discussing with them their ideas as to how we can improve lives for all people in this country.

Let us be frank. Let us be honest. The current political campaign finance system is corrupt and amounts to legalized bribery. How can we in the United States tell developing countries how they can go forward in developing their democracies when our system is corrupt? Our vision for the future of this country should be a vision which is inclusive, which tells young people that if you are conservative, if you are progressive, if you are interested in public service, you can run for office without begging the rich and the powerful for campaign contributions.

When Congress returns after the August break, I will be introducing strong legislation which calls for public funding of elections, which will enable any candidate, regardless of his or her political views, to run for office without being beholden to the rich and the powerful. I hope very much the Republican leadership in the Senate will allow this legislation to get to the floor, I hope we can have a serious debate about it,

and I hope very much we can go forward to restoring American democracy to a situation in which every citizen of this country has the right to vote and has equal power in determining the future of our great Nation.

Mr. President, with that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I would like to speak in support of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act. I had hoped Senator BURR, the chairman of the committee, would be able to deliver the remarks initially. However, he has been unfortunately delayed, and so I will go ahead with my remarks as vice chairman of the committee.

There is no legislative or administrative step we can take that will end all cyber crime and cyber warfare, but as members of the Senate Intelligence Committee, we have heard over the course of several years now that improving the exchange of information and the sharing of that information, company to company and company to the government, can be very helpful and yield a real and significant improvement to cyber security.

Regrettably, this is the third attempt to pass a cyber security information sharing bill. In the almost 5 years that I have been working on this issue, two things have become abundantly clear about passing the bill. First, it must be bipartisan. In 2012, I cosponsored the Lieberman-Collins Cybersecurity Act, which included a title on information sharing based on a bill I had introduced. It was an important piece of legislation, but it received almost no Republican support and could not gain the 60 votes needed to invoke cloture. It became clear to me then that no cyber security legislation could pass without broad bipartisan support.

The second lesson that has been learned is, it must be narrowly focused. The Lieberman-Collins bill sought to address many critical challenges to our Nation's cyber security. Then-Majority Leader HARRY REID, brought the chairmen of all committees of jurisdiction on our side together and asked them to draft legislation on cyber security in their areas. It soon became clear that addressing so many complex issues makes a bill very difficult to pass. That bill died on the Senate floor in late 2012.

Based on these lessons, we have tried to take a bipartisan and focused approach so Congress can pass a cyber security information sharing bill. In the last Congress, in 2013 and 2014, then-vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee Saxby Chambliss and I sought to draft legislation on information sharing that would attract bipartisan support. We worked through a number of difficult issues together, and we were able to produce a bill that I be-

lieved would pass the Senate. The Intelligence Committee approved the bill in 2014 by a strong bipartisan vote of 12 to 3, but it never reached the Senate floor due to privacy concerns about the legislation.

This year, Chairman BURR and I have drafted legislation that both sides can and should support. This bill is bipartisan, it is narrowly focused, and it puts in place a number of privacy protections, many of which I will outline shortly. The bill's bipartisan vote of 14 to 1 in the Senate Intelligence Committee in March underscores this fact.

I would like to thank Senator BURR for his leadership and his willingness to negotiate a bipartisan bill that can and should receive a strong vote. As he often says, neither one of us would have written this bill this way if we were doing it ourselves. This Senator believes it is also true that by negotiating this draft, we will get substantially more votes than either of us can get on our own. I very much hope that is true.

I note that this bill has strong support from the private sector because it creates incentives for improving cyber security and protects companies that take responsible steps to do so. Companies are shielded from lawsuits if they properly use the authorities provided for in this bill. They can be confident that sharing information with other companies or with the government will not subject them to inappropriate regulatory action.

For these reasons, this bill has the support of over 40 business groups, and it is the first bill that has the support of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. It also has the support of the most important cyber security and critical infrastructure companies in the Nation.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have those letters printed into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 3, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: On behalf of our diverse members, we write today in strong support of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (S. 754), a bipartisan bill approved earlier this year on a near-unanimous basis by the Select Committee on Intelligence. We strongly urge you to bring up S. 754 as expeditiously as possible, defeat any amendments that would undermine this important legislation, and support the underlying bill.

The threat of cyber-attacks is a real and omnipresent danger to our sector, our members' customers and clients, and to critical infrastructure providers upon which we—and the nation as a whole—rely. S. 754 would enhance our ability to defend the financial services sector and the sensitive data of hundreds of millions of Americans. It is critical

that Congress get cybersecurity information sharing legislation to the President's desk before the next crisis, not after.

Our members and the broader financial services industry are dedicated to improving our capacity to protect customers and their sensitive information but as it stands today, our laws do not do enough to foster information sharing and establish clear lines of communication with the various government agencies responsible for cybersecurity. If adopted and signed into law, this legislation will strengthen the nation's ability to defend against cyber-attacks and better protect all Americans by encouraging the business community and the government to quickly and effectively share critical information about these threats while ensuring privacy. More effective information sharing provides some of the strongest protections of privacy, as it is sensitive information from our member firms' customers that we are asking Congress to protect from those who attempt to steal or destroy that information.

Each of our organizations and our respective member firms has made cybersecurity a top priority and we are committed to continuing to work with you and your colleagues in the Senate so that effective cyber threat information sharing legislation can be enacted into law.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association; American Insurance Association; The Clearing House; Financial Services Institute; Financial Services Roundtable; Investment Company Institute; NACHA—The Electronic Payments Association; The National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association.

AUGUST 3, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: The undersigned organizations reiterate their support for cybersecurity information sharing and liability protection legislation and urge the Senate to promptly take up and pass S. 754, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA) of 2015. Enactment of such legislation is urgently needed to further enhance and encourage communication among the federal government, the North American electric power sector, and other critical infrastructure sectors, thus improving our ability to defend against cyber attacks.

While the electric sector already engages in significant information sharing activities and has in place mandatory and enforceable reliability and cybersecurity standards, there remains an urgent need for the government and industry to better share actionable security information in a timely and confidential manner, including protections against public disclosure of sensitive security information. CISA provides a framework to help foster even more meaningful information sharing while maintaining a critical balance between liability and privacy protections.

The electric power sector takes very seriously its responsibility to maintain the reliability, safety, and security of the electric grid. Beyond mandatory standards, the industry maintains an all-hazards "defense in

depth" mitigation strategy that combines preparation, prevention, resiliency, and response and recovery efforts. We also work closely with the federal government and other critical infrastructure sectors on which the electric sector depends through the Electricity Subsector Coordinating Council, and share electric sector threat information through the Electricity Sector Information Sharing and Analysis Center. Passage of CISA will enhance these activities.

American Public Power Association (APPA); Canadian Electric Association (CEA); Edison Electric Institute (EEI); Electric Power Supply Association (EPSA); GridWise Alliance; Large Public Power Council (LPPC); National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA); National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners (NARUC); Transmission Access Policy Study Group (TAPS).

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, August 3, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. RICHARD BURR,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATORS: I am writing on behalf of the members of the American Bankers Association (ABA) to urge you to support the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA, S. 754) when it is brought to the Senate floor, and to defeat any amendments that would undermine this critically needed legislation.

CISA is bipartisan legislation introduced by Chairman Richard Burr and Vice Chairman Dianne Feinstein, and reported by a strong bipartisan 14-1 vote in the Senate Intelligence Committee. It will enhance ongoing efforts by the private sector and the Federal government to better protect our critical infrastructure and protect Americans from all walks of life from cyber criminals. Importantly, CISA facilitates increased cyber intelligence information sharing between the private and public sectors, and strikes the appropriate balance between protecting consumer privacy and allowing information sharing on serious threats to our nation's critical infrastructure.

Cybersecurity is a top priority for the financial services industry. Banks invest hundreds of millions of dollars every year to put in place multiple layers of security to protect sensitive data. Protecting customers has always been and will remain our top priority and CISA will help us work more effectively with the Federal government and other sectors of the economy to better protect them from cyber attacks.

We urge you to support this important legislation and pass it as soon as possible to better protect America's cybersecurity infrastructure against current and future threats.

Sincerely,

JAMES C. BALLENTINE.

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INDUSTRY COUNCIL,
Washington, DC, July 23, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Democratic Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND DEMOCRATIC LEADER REID: On behalf of the members of the Information Technology Industry Council (ITI), I write to express our support for S. 754, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (CISA), and urge you to bring it to the Senate floor for debate and vote. Given the importance of cybersecurity threat information sharing to the high-tech industry, we will consider scoring votes in support of CISA in our 114th Congressional Voting Guide.

ITI members contribute to making the U.S. information and communication technology (ICT) industry the strongest in the world in innovative cybersecurity practices and solutions. We firmly believe that passing legislation to help increase voluntary cybersecurity threat information sharing between the private sector and the federal government, and within the private sector, is an important step Congress can take to enable all stakeholders to address threats, stem losses, and shield their systems, partners and customers. It is important that the Senate act now to pass CISA and continue to move the legislative process forward, so that Congress can reconcile CISA with the House cybersecurity legislation, H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act, and H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act of 2015, and send a bill to the president.

ITI believes that legislation to promote greater cybersecurity threat information sharing should:

Affirm that cybersecurity threat information sharing be voluntary;

Promote multidirectional cybersecurity threat information sharing, allowing private-to-private, private-to-government and government-to-private sharing relationships;

Include targeted liability protections;

Utilize a civilian agency interface for private-to-government information sharing to which new liability protections attach;

Promote technology-neutral mechanisms that enable cybersecurity threat information to be shared in as close to real-time as possible;

Require all entities to take reasonable steps to remove personally identifiable information from information shared through data minimization; and

Ensure private sector use of information received through private-to-private sharing is only for cybersecurity purposes, and government use of information received from the private sector is limited to cybersecurity purposes and used by law enforcement only;

For the investigation and prosecution of cyber crimes;

For the protection of individuals from the danger of death or serious bodily harm and the investigation and prosecution of crimes involving such danger; and

For the protection of minors from child pornography.

We appreciate the progress made by the Senate Intelligence Committee to include provisions that would protect personally identifiable information while also allowing for a cybersecurity threat information sharing framework that will enhance our ability to protect and defend our networks.

We look forward to working closely with you, your committee leadership, and the House of Representatives to further address outstanding issues in conference to ensure it adheres to our above cybersecurity threat information sharing principles. ITI remains committed to refining the legislation and supporting a final product that can best achieve our goal of promoting greater cybersecurity.

Sincerely,

DEAN C. GARFIELD,
President & CEO.

BSA/THE SOFTWARE ALLIANCE,
Washington, DC, July 21, 2015.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Senate Majority Leader,
Washington, DC.
Hon. HARRY REID,
Senate Minority Leader,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL AND MINORITY LEADER REID: On behalf of BSA/The Software Alliance, I write in support of bringing the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 (S. 754) to the Senate floor for a robust debate. Enactment of bipartisan legislation that enhances voluntary cyber threat information sharing while ensuring privacy protection will be an important step in bolstering our nation's cybersecurity capabilities.

Our members are on the front lines defending against cyber attacks. Every day, bad actors are attacking networks to extract valuable private and commercial information. We believe it is now more important than ever to enact legislation to break down the legal barriers that currently discourage cyber threat information sharing between and among the public and private sectors. Increased awareness will enhance the ability of businesses, consumers, and critical infrastructure to better defend themselves against attacks and intrusions. We are confident that all of these goals can be accomplished without compromising the privacy of an individual's information.

I appreciate your leadership on moving this important legislation forward to a successful outcome in the Senate. We support this bipartisan effort and look forward to working with you in the process to ultimately move a cyber threat information sharing bill to the President's desk for signature.

Sincerely,

VICTORIA A. ESPINEL,
President and CEO.

PROTECTING AMERICA'S
CYBER NETWORKS COALITION,
July 21, 2015.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: The Protecting America's Cyber Networks Coalition (the coalition) urges the Senate to take up and pass S. 754, the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act (CISA) of 2015. Passing cybersecurity information-sharing legislation is a top policy priority of the coalition, which is a partnership of leading business associations representing nearly every sector of the U.S. economy.

In March, the Select Committee on Intelligence passed CISA by a strong bipartisan vote (14-1). The Senate can build on the momentum generated in the House to move CISA forward. In April, the House passed two cybersecurity information-sharing bills—H.R. 1560, the Protecting Cyber Networks Act (PCNA), and H.R. 1731, the National Cybersecurity Protection Advancement Act (NCPAA) of 2015—with robust majorities

from both parties and broad industry support.

Our organizations believe that Congress needs to send a bill to the president that gives businesses legal certainty that they have safe harbor against frivolous lawsuits when voluntarily sharing and receiving threat indicators and defensive measures in real time and taking actions to mitigate cyberattacks.

The legislation also needs to offer protections related to public disclosure, regulatory, and antitrust matters in order to increase the timely exchange of information among public and private entities. Coalition members also believe that legislation needs to safeguard privacy and civil liberties and establish appropriate roles for government agencies and departments. CISA reflects sound compromises among many stakeholders on these issues.

Recent cyber incidents underscore the need for legislation to help businesses improve their awareness of cyber threats and to enhance their protection and response capabilities in collaboration with government entities. Cyberattacks aimed at U.S. businesses and government bodies are increasingly being launched from sophisticated hackers, organized crime, and state-sponsored groups. These attacks are advancing in scope and complexity.

The coalition is committed to working with lawmakers and their staff members to get cybersecurity information-sharing legislation quickly enacted to strengthen our national security and the protection and resilience of U.S. industry. Congressional action cannot come soon enough.

Sincerely,

Agricultural Retailers Association (ARA); Airlines for America (A4A); Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers; American Bankers Association (ABA); American Cable Association (ACA); American Council of Life Insurers (ACLI); American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers (AFPM); American Gaming Association; American Gas Association (AGA); American Insurance Association (AIA); American Petroleum Institute (API); American Public Power Association (APPA); American Water Works Association (AWWA); ASIS International; Association of American Railroads (AAR); BITS—Financial Services Roundtable; College of Healthcare Information Management Executives (CHIME); CompTIA—The Computing Technology Industry Association; CTIA—The Wireless Association; Edison Electric Institute (EEI); Federation of American Hospitals (FAH); Food Marketing Institute (FMI).

GridWise Alliance; HIMSS—Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society; HITRUST—Health Information Trust Alliance; Large Public Power Council (LPPC); National Association of Chemical Distributors (NACD); National Association of Manufacturers (NAM); National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC); National Association of Water Companies (NAWC); National Business Coalition on e-Commerce & Privacy; National Cable & Telecommunications Association (NCTA); National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA).

NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association; Property Casualty Insurers Association of America (PCI); The Real Es-

tate Roundtable; Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association (SIFMA); Society of Chemical Manufacturers & Affiliates (SOCMA); Telecommunications Industry Association (TIA); Transmission Access Policy Study Group (TAPS); United States Telecom Association (USTelecom); U.S. Chamber of Commerce; Utilities Telecom Council (UTC).

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

February 14, 2015.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE: As the Senate prepares to consider S. 754, the "Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015," the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the world's largest business federation representing the interests of more than three million businesses of all sizes, sectors, and regions, as well as state and local chambers and industry associations, and dedicated to promoting, protecting, and defending America's free enterprise system, writes to express our strong opposition to the adoption of amendments that would weaken or overly complicate this important bipartisan bill, including issues related to data security, breach notification, or commercial privacy, which are best addressed in other contexts.

The Chamber believes that all provisions of S. 754 must support the important goal of protecting critical infrastructure. Unrelated issues, such as data security, breach notification, and commercial privacy legislation, have not yet received any consideration in the committees of jurisdiction and are not ready for consideration by the full Senate. These sensitive topics should proceed through the legislative process following regular order to ensure complete and deliberate consideration separate from the pending floor debate on cybersecurity information sharing legislation.

Cybersecurity information sharing legislation meets a dire national security need, and though the Chamber would like to see meaningful data security, breach notification, and commercial privacy legislation become law, for the benefit of businesses and consumers alike, we are equally steadfast in our belief that cybersecurity information sharing legislation is important for national security and should be Congress's immediate priority.

There are 47 separate state laws which deal directly with data security and breach notification. The business community has been working with members of Congress in both chambers and on both sides of the aisle to find the right path toward passage of a national data security and breach notification law. However, much work remains to be done, as disagreement continues regarding certain provisions which would be contained in federal legislation. This disagreement is evident in virtually every one of the significantly different data security bills which have been introduced in the Senate during the last several Congresses.

The Chamber has appreciated the opportunity to comment on and offer edits to the various bills and looks forward to working with their authors and cosponsors as legislation works its way through the committee process. However, data security legislation deserves its own due consideration and deliberate debate, separate from the complicated and pressing national security issue of cybersecurity information sharing. For example, the House Energy and Commerce committee has held multiple hearings on proposed legislation in addition to a subcommittee mark-

up and planned mark up at the full committee level. Though there are issues which need to be resolved in that legislation, the Chamber appreciates the process and consideration given and that the bill has worked its way through the proper channels.

Given the work that still needs to be done on data security proposals, the Chamber urges you to keep them separate and apart from cybersecurity information sharing legislation and not rush to make changes to the current landscape of state data security, data breach, and commercial privacy laws. Doing so would have a fundamentally negative impact on a broad segment of the American business community.

Sincerely,

R. BRUCE JOSTEN.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. At the same time, the bill includes numerous privacy protections beyond those contained in last year's bill. Senator BURR and I worked together to address the specific concerns raised by the administration, some of our Senate colleagues, and other key stakeholders. Because of these changes, the administration said yesterday that "cyber security is an important national security issue and the Senate should take up this bill as soon as possible and pass it."

I believe this is a good bill and will allow companies and the government to improve the security of their computer networks, but this is just a first-step bill. It will not bring an end to successful cyber attacks or thefts, but it will help to address the problem.

What does this bill do? It provides clear direction for the government to share cyber threat information and defensive measures with the private sector.

Two, it authorizes private companies to monitor their computer networks and to share cyber threat information and defensive measures with other companies and with the Federal, State, local, and tribal government.

And three, it creates a process and rules to limit how the Federal Government will and will not use the information it receives.

Companies are granted liability protection for the appropriate monitoring for cyber threats and for sharing and receiving cyber threat information. This liability protection exists for both company-to-company sharing as well as company-to-government sharing consistent with the bill's terms. Companies are also authorized to use defensive measures on their own networks for cyber security purposes.

Since the bill is complicated, let me describe what the bill does in more detail.

First, it recognizes that the Federal Government has information about cyber threats that it can and should share with the private sector and with State, local, and tribal governments. The bill requires the Director of National Intelligence to put in place a process that will increase the sharing of information on cyber threats already in the government's hands with

the private sector and help protect an individual or a business.

Importantly, as the first order of business, there will be a managers' amendment which makes changes to specifically limit the ways the government can use the cyber security information it receives. This amendment was distributed on Friday. I would urge everyone to look at it because under the amendment, this bill can only be used for cyber security purposes—no others. It is not a surveillance bill; it is strictly related to cyber security. The bill previously allowed the government to use the information to investigate and prosecute serious violent felonies. That has drawn substantial opposition, and we have removed it in the managers' package.

I would now like to take a minute to go over some of the privacy protections in the bill.

No. 1, the bill is strictly voluntary. It does not require companies to do anything they choose not to do. There is no requirement to share information with another company or with the government. The government cannot compel any sharing by the private sector. It is completely voluntary.

No. 2, it narrowly defines the term "cyber threat indicator" to limit the amount of information that may be shared under the bill. Companies do not share information under this bill unless it is specifically about a cyber threat or a cyber defense—nothing else.

No. 3, the authorizations are clear but limited. Companies are fully authorized to do three things: monitor their networks or provide monitoring services to their customers to identify cyber threats; use limited defensive measures to protect against cyber threats on their networks; and to share and receive information with each other and with Federal, State, and local governments.

No. 4, there are mandatory steps companies must take, before sharing any cyber threat information with other companies or the government, to review the information for irrelevant privacy information. In other words, the companies must do a privacy scrub. They are required to remove any personal information that is found. Companies cannot, as it has been alleged, simply hand over customer information.

No. 5, the bill requires that the Attorney General establish mandatory guidelines to protect privacy for any information the government receives. These guidelines will be public, and they will include consultation with the private sector prior to them being put together.

The bill requires them to limit how long the government can retain any information and provide notification and a process to destroy mistakenly shared information. It also requires the Attorney General to create sanctions for any

government official who does not follow these mandatory privacy guidelines.

No. 6, the Department of Homeland Security, not the Department of Defense or the intelligence community, is the primary recipient of cyber information. In the managers' amendment, we strengthen the role the Secretary of Homeland Security has in deciding how information sharing will take place.

No. 7, once the managers' amendment is adopted, the bill will restrict the government's use of voluntarily shared information, so the government cannot use this information for law enforcement purposes unrelated to cyber security and cyber crime.

No. 8, the bill limits liability protections to monitoring for cyber threats and sharing information about them and only—and only—if a company complies with the bill's privacy requirements. The bill explicitly excludes protection for gross negligence or willful misconduct.

No. 9, above and beyond these mandatory protections, there are a number of oversight mechanisms in the bill, including reports by heads of agencies, inspectors general, and the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.

In sum, this bill allows for strictly voluntary sharing of cyber security information and many layers of privacy protection.

It is my understanding that the chairman of our committee is here, so I would like to skip to the conclusion of my remarks and then be able to turn this over to him.

The House of Representatives has already passed two bills this year to improve cyber security information sharing. The Intelligence Committee has crafted a carefully balanced bill that passed by a 14-to-1 vote in March and it has improved significantly since then through the managers' amendment.

We very much need to take this first step on cyber security to address the almost daily reports of hacking and cyber threats. I very much hope the Senate will take action now.

Now I will yield the floor. I want to thank the chairman. It has been a pleasure, Mr. Chairman, to work with you. I think I speak for every member of the committee. I am very pleased we have this bill on the floor. God willing and the Members willing, we will be able to pass it one day.

I yield the floor to the chair of the Intelligence Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I want to thank my good friend and vice chair of the Intelligence Committee, Senator FEINSTEIN. She has been in the trenches working on cyber security legislation longer than I have. Her passion is displayed in the product that has come out. There has been no person more outspoken on privacy than DIANNE

FEINSTEIN. There is no person who has been more outspoken on the need for us to get this right than Senator FEINSTEIN.

Daily, she and I look at some of the most sensitive intelligence information that exists in this country. We are charged as a committee—15 individuals out of a body of 100—to provide the oversight to an intelligence community to make sure they live within the letters of the law or the boundaries set by Executive order. Every day we try to fulfill that job.

We are sometimes tasked with producing legislation, and that is why we are here today with the cyber security bill. It has been referred to that we are here because OPM got hacked. No. We are here because the American people's data will be in jeopardy if government does not help to find a way to help minimize the loss.

So where is the threat? The threat is to business, it is to government, and it is to individuals. There is no part of America that is left out of this. The legislation we are proposing affects everybody in this country—big and small business, State and Federal governments, and individuals, no matter where they live or how much they are worth. I think it is safe to say today that business and government have both been attacked, they have been penetrated, and data has been lost. In some cases that intent was criminal; in some cases the intent was nation-states. It was towards credit cards on one side or Social Security numbers, and on the other side it was plans for the next military platform or intellectual property that was owned by a company. But we are where we are, and now we have a proposal as to how we minimize.

Let me emphasize this. You heard it from the vice chairman. This bill does not prevent cyber attacks. I am not sure that we could craft anything that would do that. What this bill does is for the first time it allows us a pathway to minimizing the amount of data that is lost and for the first time empowering government, once they get the pertinent information, to push out to the rest of business and to individuals and to governments: Here is the type of attack that is happening. Here is the tool they are using. Here is the defensive mechanism you can put on your system that will provide you comfort that they cannot penetrate you and provide the company that has been attacked comfort that it might be able to minimize in real time the amount of data that is lost.

So, as the vice chairman said, these are key points on this piece of legislation: It is voluntary. There is no entity in America that is forced to report. It is a purely voluntary system. To have participation in a voluntary system, you have to listen to the folks who are the subjects of these attacks as to

what they need to act in real time and to provide pertinent data.

It is an information-sharing bill. It is not a surveillance bill. I say to those who have characterized it that way that we have done everything we can to clarify with the managers' amendment that there is no surveillance. The only thing we are after is minimizing the loss of data that exists.

Here is how it works. I want to break it into three categories.

This bill covers private to private. It says that if I am a private company and my IT system gets hacked and I get penetrated, I can automatically pick up the phone and call the IT people at my competitor's business, and I am protected under antitrust, that we can carry out a conversation so that I can figure out whether they got hacked, and if they did but they did not get penetrated, what software did they have on their system that secured their data. I can immediately go and put that on my system, and I can minimize the loss of any additional data. So we protect for that private-to-private conversation only for the purposes of sharing cyber information.

We also have private to government. We allow any company, in real time—at the same time they are talking to a competitor, they can transmit electronically the pertinent data that it takes to do the forensics of what happened. What tool did they use? They can transfer that to government, and they are protected from a liability standpoint for the transfer of that—the vice chairman got into all of this, so I do not want to rehash it—with the correct protections of personal data. The company is required not to send personal data. Any government agency that is the recipient of this data, as they go through it, if they see personal data that is not relevant to the determination of what type of attack, what type of tool, what type of response, then they have to minimize that data so it is not released.

In addition, we have government to private, which is the third leg. It amazed me that the government did not have the authority to push out a lot of information. What we do is we empower the government to analyze the attack, to determine the tool that was used, to find the most appropriate defensive software mechanism, and then to say to business broadly: There is an attack that has happened in America. This is the tool they used. This is the defensive mechanism that will protect the data at your company.

If you ask me, I think this is what we are here for. This is what the Congress of the United States is supposed to do—facilitate, through minor tweaks, a voluntary participation to close the door and minimize potential loss. That is all we are attempting to do.

I want to loop back to where the vice chairman was. We are now at the point

where we are asking our colleagues for unanimous consent to come to the floor and actually take up this bill. Moving to the bill allows our colleagues to come to the floor with relevant amendments to the bill, where they can be debated and voted on.

I actually believe, Vice Chairman, if we could do that now, we could process this entire bill and all of the amendments that are relevant by this time tomorrow. That would mean we would have to work and we would have to talk and we would have to vote, but we could do it because I think when we look at the array of relevant amendments, they are pretty well defined. Some of them are duplications of others that people have planned to talk about.

But to suggest that this is a problem, which it is—we have seen it with over 22 million government workers whose personal data and in some cases, because of the forms they had to fill out for security clearance, their most sensitive data has gotten out of the OPM system.

Just because OPM was the last one, don't think that somebody wasn't serious. Don't think that Anthem Blue Cross wasn't serious. Don't think that some of the attacks that only acquired credit card information aren't serious.

What we are attempting to do is to minimize the degree of that loss. All we need is the cooperation of every Member of the Senate to say: I am willing to move to the bill. I am willing to bring up amendments—relevant amendments—willing to debate them and willing to vote on them.

Process is where we are. At the end of the day, we can determine whether this is a bill that is worthy to move on. It is not the end of the road because once we get through in the Senate we have to conference the bill with the House of Representatives. As the vice chairman pointed out, they have produced multiple pieces of legislation. It is the Senate that is now holding us back.

I urge my colleagues: Let's agree to move to the bill. Let's agree to relevant amendments, and let's process this cyber security bill so that when we come back from August, we can actually sit down with our colleagues in the House, conference a bill, and provide the American people with a little bit of security, knowing that we are going to minimize the amount of data that is lost, because of a voluntary program between the private sector and the government.

I think the vice chairman shares my belief that we are not scared to have a debate on relevant amendments on this bill. We understand there are more views than just ours. But we have to get on the bill to be able to offer amendments, to be able to share what we know that might not necessarily support the amendment.

Right now, we are sort of frozen because we cannot offer amendments, including the managers' amendment, which I would say to my colleagues—and the vice chairman said this in a very specific way—if you will read the managers' amendment, a lot of the concerns that people have will vanish. Nobody will call it a surveillance bill because we have addressed the issues that people were concerned with. Although we didn't think they were problems before, we clarified it in a way that it is limited only to cyber security. I could make a tremendous case that through the cyber security forensic process, if we found another criminal act, the American people probably would want that reported—without a doubt.

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURR. I am pleased to yield for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. In light of recent events that have dominated the news, including the breach of millions of Americans' privileged information, which could be used in ways to harm them, do you think it is a good idea for the Senate to go out into a month-long recess without at least having debates, votes, and amendments on this issue?

Does the Senator know of an issue right now that impacts the lives of everyday Americans such as this threat of cyber security attacks on the citizens of the United States?

Mr. BURR. I thank the Senator for the question, and I think he knows the answer.

We should dispose of this. The easiest way, as I shared earlier, is that if we get on this bill and we process amendments, if we really wanted to, we could finish tomorrow. The reality is that it doesn't take a long time to debate amendments, to vote on amendments, and to be done.

At the end of the day, every Member would have to make a decision as to whether they are supportive or against the bill. But not getting on the bill, not offering amendments cheats the American people.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will just ask one more question.

It is obvious that the Senator from California and the Senator from North Carolina have worked very closely together on this issue. They are the two leaders on intelligence now for a number of years.

Wouldn't it seem logical that with a bipartisan piece of legislation that addresses an issue—I guess my question is this: How many Americans have been affected most recently by cyber attacks, and what would this legislation do to try to prohibit that from happening again? Don't we have some obligation to try to address the vulnerabilities of average American everyday citizens?

Mr. BURR. I think the answer is there have been millions of Americans

whose private data has been breached for numerous reasons. The Senator from Arizona is correct. We have an obligation to do what we can to minimize that loss.

Mr. MCCAIN. And isn't this a bipartisan product?

Mr. BURR. Well, this is very much a bipartisan bill, and I think it is a bicameral effort. It is not as if this is a limb we are walking out on and the House isn't already out there. Emphatically, I implore my colleagues: Let's get on the bill. Let's come and offer relevant amendments, and let's process those amendments as quickly as we can. I think we can accommodate both, the need to leave for August and to go see the people we are married to and get away from the people we see every day who influence us in numerous ways—I am speaking of the Senator from Arizona right now, and I know he is anxious to go somewhere other than here—and to process this bill, which is to do our work. To not get on the bill, to not offer amendments is to ignore the responsibilities that we have.

Mr. MCCAIN. I wish to just finally say to the Senator from North Carolina that I appreciate the hard work he and the Senator from California have put in on this issue. It has been said by our military leaders that right now one of the greatest vulnerabilities to national security is the possibility or likelihood of cyber attacks. The implications of that far exceed that of the invasion of someone's privacy.

I thank him and the Senator from California for their hard work on this. I think it at least deserves debate and amendments, and hopefully we can pass it before we go out for the recess.

Mr. BURR. I thank the Senator from Arizona, who has worked closely with us since the beginning to try to move this bill together. Hopefully, at our lunches today, we will have an opportunity to talk to our Members in the hopes that we can come back from lunch and maybe get started on this bill.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes, recognizing that it is after 12:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, in November 2013, the United States and five global powers, the P5+1, announced an interim deal to freeze Iran's nuclear program and negotiate a diplomatic resolution to one of the most challenging issues affecting global security.

Since then, as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the

Foreign Relations Committee, I participated in scores of hearings, classified briefings, meetings, and calls about this topic in Virginia, Washington, and during five trips to the Middle East, including two trips to Israel.

I have listened to the administration, to allies in the Middle East and elsewhere, to current and former Senate colleagues—especially former Armed Services Chairmen John Warner and Carl Levin—to national security and foreign policy experts, to critics and proponents of the deal, to American military leaders and troops, and also to my constituents. I helped write the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, under which Congress is currently engaging in a 60-day review period to approve or disapprove of the suspension of congressional sanctions as part of the final deal announced July 15.

Based on my review of this complex matter, I acknowledge that every option before us involves risk with upside and downside consequences.

I understand how people of good will can reach different conclusions, but I also conclude that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a dramatic improvement over the status quo at improving global security for the next 15 years and, likely, longer.

In this deal, America has honored its best traditions and shown that patient diplomacy can achieve what isolation and hostility cannot.

For this reason, I will support the deal.

Prior to the interim negotiation in November of 2013, and even in the face of a punishing international sanctions regime, Iran's nuclear program was marching ahead. Iran had amassed more than 19,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium, and that number was growing. Iran had produced more than 11,000 kilograms of enriched uranium, and that stockpile was growing. Iran had perfected the ability to enrich uranium to the 20-percent level, and that enrichment level was growing. Iran was constructing a heavy-water facility at Arak capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium, and Iran only allowed limited IAEA access to its declared nuclear facilities, shielding its operation and inspection of covert nuclear sites.

The program, when diplomacy began, was months away from being able to produce enough enriched uranium to make a nuclear weapon.

Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu told the United Nations in 2012:

For over seven years, the international community has tried sanctions with Iran. Under the leadership of President Obama, the international community has passed some of the strongest sanctions to date. . . . It's had an effect on the economy, but we must face the truth. Sanctions have not stopped Iran's nuclear program.

We must face the truth. A punishing sanctions regime did not stop Iran's

nuclear program. The nuclear program will only stop by a diplomatic agreement or by military action. While military action has to be an option, it is in America's interest—and in the interest of the entire world—to use every effort to find a diplomatic resolution. In fact, that was the purpose of the Iranian sanctions to begin with—to open a path to a diplomatic solution.

We now have a diplomatic solution on the table. The JCPOA is not perfect because all parties made concessions, as is the case in any serious diplomatic negotiation. But it has gained broad international support because it prevents Iran from getting sufficient uranium for a bomb for at least 15 years. It also stops any pathway to a plutonium weapon for that period, and it exposes Iranian covert activity to enhanced scrutiny by the international community forever.

Under the deal, Iran does the following: It affirms that “under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons,” it reduces its quantity of centrifuges by more than two-thirds, and it slashes its uranium stockpile by 97 percent to 300 kilograms for 15 years. This is dramatically less than what Iran would need to produce even a single weapon. It caps the enrichment level of the remaining uranium stockpile at 3.67 percent. It reconfigures the Iraq reactor so that it can no longer produce weapons-grade plutonium. It commits to a series of limitations on R&D activities to guarantee that any nuclear program will be “for exclusively peaceful purposes” in full compliance with international nonproliferation rules. Finally, Iran agrees to a robust set of international inspections of its declared nuclear facilities, its entire uranium supply chain, and its suspected covert facilities by a team of more than 130 international inspectors.

After year 15, the unique caps and requirements imposed on Iran are progressively lifted through year 2025. After year 25, Iran is permanently obligated to abide by all international nonproliferation treaty requirements, including the extensive inspections required by the NPT Additional Protocol, and its agreement that it will never “seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons” continues forever.

If Iran breaks this agreement, nuclear sanctions may be reimposed. The United States reserves the right to sanction Iran for activities unrelated to its nuclear program, including support for terrorism, arms shipments, and human rights violations.

Finally, and importantly, the United States and our partners maintain the ability to use military action if Iran seeks to obtain a nuclear weapon in violation of this deal. The knowledge of the Iranian program gained through extensive inspections will improve the effectiveness of any military action,

and the clarity of Iran's commitment to the world—in the first paragraph of the agreement—that it will never pursue nuclear weapons will make it easier to gain international support for military action should Iran violate their unequivocal pledge.

This deal does not solve all outstanding issues with an adversarial regime. In that sense, it is similar to the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty President Kennedy negotiated with the Soviet Union in the midst of the Cold War. Iran's support for terrorism remains a major concern, and we must increase efforts with our regional allies to counter those malign activities. But at the end of the day, this agreement is not about making an ally out of an adversary, it is about denying an adversary a path to obtaining nuclear weapons.

This deal takes a nuclear weapons program that was on the verge of success and disables it for many years through peaceful diplomatic means with sufficient tools for the international community to verify whether Iran is meeting its commitments. I hope this resolution might open the door to diplomatic discussion of other tough issues with Iran.

In conclusion, monitoring this agreement and countering Iran's nonnuclear activity will require great diligence by the United States, our allies, and the IAEA, and there will be an important role for Congress in this ongoing work. I look forward to working with my colleagues on measures to guarantee close supervision and enforcement of this deal. That work will be arduous, but it is far preferable to allowing Iran to return to a march toward nuclear weapons. It is also far preferable to any other alternative, including war.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:46 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my friend from Florida, Senator NELSON, for allowing me to speak for 5 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that he be recognized immediately following me—not the Senator from New Mexico, the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of S. 754, the Cybersecu-

rity Information Sharing Act. I want to thank my colleagues Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN for their leadership on this critically important legislation. This bill, of which I am an original cosponsor, was overwhelmingly approved by a 14-to-1 vote in the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in March.

Enacting legislation to confront the accumulating dangers of cyber threats must be among the highest national security priorities of the Congress. Cyber attacks on our Nation have become disturbingly common. More recently, it was the Office of Personnel Management. A few weeks before that, it was the Pentagon network, the White House, and the State Department. Before that it was Anthem and Sony—just to name a few. The status quo is unacceptable, and Congress needs to do its part in passing this legislation. But the President, as our Nation's Commander in Chief, must also do his part to deter the belligerence of our adversaries in cyber space.

The threats from China, Russia, North Korea, and Iran—not to mention the aspirations of terrorist organizations like ISIL and Al Qaeda—are steadily growing in number and severity. And our national security leadership has warned us repeatedly that we could face a cyber attack against our Nation's critical infrastructure in the not too distant future. I believe our response to such an attack, or lack thereof, could define the future of warfare.

To date, the U.S. response to cyber attacks has been tepid at best, and nonexistent at worst. Unless and until the President uses the authorities he has to deter, defend, and respond to the growing number and severity of cyber attacks, we will risk not just more of the same but emboldened adversaries and terrorist organizations that will continuously pursue more severe and destructive cyber attacks.

As ADM Mike Rogers, the commander of U.S. Cyber Command, told listeners at the Aspen Security Forum a couple weeks ago, "to date there is little price to pay for engaging in some pretty aggressive behaviors." According to James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, "we will see a progression or expansion of that envelope until such time as we create both a substance and psychology of deterrence. And today we don't have that."

According to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, our military enjoys "a significant military advantage" in every domain except for one—cyber space. As General Dempsey said, cyber "is a level playing field. And that makes this chairman very uncomfortable." Efforts are currently underway to begin addressing some of our strategic shortfalls in cyber space, including the training of a 6,200-person cyber force. However,

these efforts will be meaningless unless we make the tough policy decisions to establish meaningful cyber deterrence. The President must take steps now to demonstrate to our adversaries that the United States takes cyber attacks seriously and is prepared to respond.

This legislation before us is one piece of that overall deterrent strategy, and it is long past time that Congress move forward on information sharing legislation. The voluntary information sharing framework in this legislation is critical to addressing these threats and ensuring that the mechanisms are in place to identify those responsible for costly and crippling cyber attacks and, ultimately, deter future attacks.

Many of us have spent countless hours crafting and debating cyber legislation back to 2012. Mr. President, 2012 was the last time we attempted to pass major cyber legislation. This body has come a long way since that time. We understand that we cannot improve our cyber posture by shackling the private sector, which operates the majority of our country's critical infrastructure, with government mandates. As I argued at that time, heavyhanded regulations and government bureaucracy will do more harm than good in cyber space. The voluntary framework in this legislation represents the progress we have made in defining the role of the private sector and the role of the government in sharing threat information, defending networks, and deterring cyber attacks.

This legislation also complements actions we have taken in the National Defense Authorization Act, or NDAA, currently in conference with the House. As chairman of the Armed Services Committee, cyber security is one of my top priorities. That is why the NDAA includes a number of critical cyber provisions designed to ensure the Department of Defense has the capabilities it needs to deter aggression, defend our national security interests, and, when called upon, defeat our adversaries in cyber space.

The NDAA authorizes the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, and, when authorized by the President, conduct a military cyber operation in response to malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign power. The NDAA also authorizes \$200 million for the Secretary of Defense to assess the cyber vulnerabilities of every major DOD weapons system. Finally, Congress required the President to submit an integrated policy to deter adversaries in cyber space in the fiscal year 2014 NDAA. We are still waiting on that policy, and this year's NDAA includes funding restrictions that will remain in place until it is delivered.

Every day that goes by, I fear our Nation grows more vulnerable, our privacy and security are at greater risk,

and our adversaries are further emboldened. These are the stakes, and that is why it is essential that we come together and pass the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act.

Mr. President, I thank again my friend from Florida, who is a valued member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, for his indulgence to allow me to speak. I thank my colleague.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I rise to announce my decision on the Iranian nuclear agreement, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

This decision of mine comes after considerable study of the issue—as have our colleagues in the Senate taken this quite seriously. I have talked with folks on all sides of the issue. These include colleagues as well as constituents. It includes experts on the Middle East and Central Asia, arms control experts, foreign allies, and, as we say in my constituency, it includes just plain folks. I want to say that Secretary Moniz, a nuclear physicist, has been especially helpful.

Needless to say, I wish that the three Americans jailed in Iran and Bob Levinson, a former FBI agent missing in Iran for 8 years, had been a part of an agreement—of this agreement—to return them. The Levinson family in Florida is anxious for information and help to return Bob. This is personal for me.

I am a strong supporter of Israel, and I recognize that country as one of America's most important allies. I am committed to the protection of Israel as the best and right foreign policy for the United States and our allies.

I am blessed to represent Florida, which also has among our citizens a strong and vibrant Jewish community, including many Holocaust survivors and Holocaust victims' families, some of whom I have worked with to help them get just compensation from European insurance companies that turned their backs on them after World War II and would not honor their insurance claims.

In our State we are also proud to have a Floridian, a former U.S. and Miami Beach resident, as the Israeli Ambassador to the United States. Ambassador Ron Dermer grew up in Miami Beach. His father and brother are former mayors. He is someone I have enjoyed getting to know and have had several conversations with over the years and recently spent time talking to him about his opposition to this joint agreement.

I acknowledge that this has been one of the most important preparations and will be one of the most important votes that I will cast in the Senate because the foreign and defense policy consequences are both huge for the United States and our allies.

Unless there is an unexpected change in the conditions and facts before the vote is called in September—and it will be called on the very first day that we return in September—unless there is an unexpected change, I will support the nuclear agreement between Iran and the P5+1—which are the United States, the UK, France, Russia, China, and Germany—because I am convinced it will stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon for at least the next 10 to 15 years. No other available alternative accomplishes this vital objective.

The goal of this almost 2-year negotiation—culminated in this deal—was to deny Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. This objective has been fulfilled in the short term. For the next 10 years, Iran will reduce its centrifuges—the machines that enrich the uranium—by two-thirds. They will go from more than 19,000 centrifuges to 6,000. Only 5,000 of those will be operating, all at Natanz, all the most basic models. The deeply buried Fordow facility will be converted to a research lab. No enrichment can occur there, and no fissile material can be stored there. For the next 15 years, Iran's stockpile of low-enriched uranium—which currently amounts to 12,000 kilograms; enough for 10 bombs—will be reduced by 98 percent, to only 300 kilograms. Research and development into advanced centrifuges will also be limited. Taken together, these constraints will lengthen the time it would take for Iran to produce the highly enriched uranium for one bomb—the so-called breakout time. It will lengthen it from 2 to 3 months that they could break out now to more than 1 year. That is more than enough time to detect and, if necessary, stop Iran from racing to a bomb.

Iran's ability to produce a bomb using plutonium will also be blocked under this deal. The Arak reactor—which as currently constructed could produce enough plutonium for one to two bombs every year—will be redesigned to produce no weapons-grade plutonium. And Iran will have to ship out the spent fuel from the reactor forever.

Iran signed the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in 1968, in which they agreed they would not pursue nuclear weapons. Iran has reaffirmed this principle in this joint agreement. Iran also says they want to eventually make low-grade nuclear fuel, as other NPT-compliant nations do, in order to produce electricity. If they comply, they will eventually be allowed to do so under this joint agreement. Our expectation is that in 15 years, when Iran can lift the limit of 300 kilograms of low-enriched uranium, if they have not cheated, they will continue to abide by their NPT obligations and use their fuel only for electricity and medical isotopes. If they deviate from those civilian purposes, then harsh economic

sanctions will result, and, very possibly, U.S. military action.

The world will be a very different place in 10 to 15 years. If we can buy this much time, instead of Iran developing a nuclear bomb in the near future, then that is reason enough for me to vote to uphold this agreement. If the United States walks away from this multinational agreement, then I believe we would find ourselves alone in the world with little credibility, but there are many more reasons to support this agreement.

The opponents of the agreement say that war is not the only alternative to the agreement. Indeed, they, as articulated by the Israeli Ambassador, say we should oppose the agreement by refusing to lift congressional economic sanctions, and the result will be that the international sanctions will stay in place, that Iran will continue to feel the economic pinch, and therefore Iran will come back to the table and negotiate terms more favorable to the United States and our allies.

If the United States kills the deal that most of the rest of the world is for, there is no question in this Senator's mind that the sanctions will start to erode, and they may collapse altogether. We just had a meeting with all the P5+1 Ambassadors to the United States, and they reaffirmed that exact fact. Sanctions rely on more than just the power of the U.S. economy, they depend on an underlying political consensus in support of a common objective. China, Russia, and many other nations eager to do business with Iran went along with our economic sanctions because they believed they were a temporary cost to pay until Iran agreed to a deal to limit their nuclear program. That fragile consensus in support of U.S. policy is likely to fall apart if we jettison this deal.

I think it is unrealistic to think we can stop oil-hungry countries in Asia from buying Iranian oil, especially when offered bargain basement prices. It is equally unrealistic to think we can continue to force foreign banks that hold the Iranian oil dollars—banks in China, India, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan that have sequestered Iranians' oil dollars—it is unrealistic to expect that they will hold on to that cash simply because we threaten them with U.S. banking sanctions. How will such threats be taken seriously when these countries, taken together, hold nearly half of America's debt, making any decision to sanction them extraordinarily difficult. Killing this deal by rejecting it means the sanctions are going to be weaker than they are today, not stronger, and the United States cannot simply get a better deal with Iran, with less economic leverage and less international support. That is a fact we are having to face. Of course, if we rejected it and if the sanctions crumbled, all of this would probably

happen while Iran would be racing to build a bomb. Without this deal, Iran's breakout time could quickly shrink from months to a handful of weeks or days.

It is reasonable to ask why Iran would agree to negotiate a delay in their nuclear program that they have advanced over the years at the cost of billions of dollars. The simple answer is they need the money. The Iranian economy is hurting because of the sanctions, and Iran's Supreme Leader needs to satisfy rising expectations of average Iranians, who are restless to have a bigger slice of the economic pie with more and better goods and supplies.

So they have an interest in striking a deal, but does that mean we trust Iran's Government? No, not at all. The Iranian religious leadership encourages hardliners there to chant "Death to America" and "Death to Israel." Therefore, this agreement can't be built on trust. We must have a good enough mechanism in place to catch them when and if they cheat; in other words, don't trust but verify.

I believe the agreement sets out a reasonable assurance that Iran will not be able to hide the development of a bomb at declared or undeclared sites. The International Atomic Energy Agency inspectors will have immediate access to declared sites—the Arak reactor and the enrichment facilities at Natanz and Fordow.

For the next 20 to 25 years, inspectors will also have regular access to the entire supply chain, including uranium mines and mills, centrifuge production, assembly, and storage sites. That means inspectors will catch Iran if they try to use the facilities we know about to build a weapon or if they try to divert materials to a secret program. To confirm that Iran is not building a covert bomb, this agreement ensures that inspectors will have access to suspicious sites with no more than a 24-day delay. I know there has been a lot of conversation about that. It is broken off into days. At the end of the day, it must be physical access. Now, would this Senator prefer they get in instantaneously? Of course. Could Iran hide some activities relevant to nuclear weapons research? Possibly. But to actually make a bomb, Iran's secret activity would have to enrich the fuel for a device—and they couldn't cover that up if they had years, let alone do so in a few weeks. Traces of enriched uranium or a secret plutonium program do not suddenly vanish, and they can't be covered up with a little paint and asphalt. So I am convinced that under the agreement, Iran cannot cheat and expect to get away with it.

On top of the unprecedented IAEA inspections established by this deal is the vast and little understood world of American and allied intelligence. This

Senator served on the Intelligence Committee for 6 years and now has clearances on the Armed Services Committee. I can state unequivocally that U.S. intelligence is very good and extensive and will overlay IAEA inspections. Remember, we discovered their secret activities in the past, even without the kinds of inspections put in place by this joint agreement. So if Iran tries to violate its commitment—its commitment not to build nuclear weapons—and if the IAEA doesn't find out, I am confident our intelligence apparatus will.

What about the part of the joint agreement that allows the conventional arms embargo to be lifted in 5 years and missile technology to be lifted in 8 years? I understand it was always going to be tough to keep these restrictions in place, and I don't like that those restrictions are not there. Fortunately, even when the arms embargo expires, five other U.N. resolutions passed since 2004 will continue to be in force to prohibit Iran from exporting arms to terrorists and to militants. These have had some success, albeit limited, as in the case of the U.S. Navy stopping arms shipments to the Houthis in Yemen. These same U.N. resolutions will stay in place to block future Iranian arms shipments to others. We also have nonnuclear sanctions tools we can—and we must—continue to use to go after those who traffic in Iranian arms and missiles.

Will this agreement allow Iran to continue to be a state sponsor of terrorism? Yes, but they now have the capability to develop a nuclear weapon within months and still be a state sponsor of terrorism. I believe it is in the U.S. interest that Iran is not a nuclear power sponsoring terrorism. As dangerous a threat that Iran is to Israel and our allies, it would pale in comparison to the threat posed to them and to us by a nuclear-armed Iran.

Would I prefer a deal that dismantles their entire program forever and ends all of Iran's bad behavior? Of course I would. But how do we get a better deal that the opposition wants? We don't have that opportunity if the sanctions fall apart, and that is exactly what would happen if we reject this deal. Iran will emerge less isolated and less constrained to build a nuclear weapon.

Under the deal, we keep most of the world with us. That means, if the Iranians cheat, they know we can snap back the economic sanctions and cut off their oil money. This joint agreement declares that Iran will never ever be allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. If they break their agreement, even in 10 or 15 years, every financial and military option will still be available to us, and those options will be backed by ever-improving military capabilities and more and better intelligence.

So when I look at all the things for the agreement and against the agree-

ment, it becomes pretty obvious to me to vote in favor of the agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, our government was recently struck by a devastating cyber attack that has been described as one of the worst breaches in U.S. history. It was a major blow to the privacy of millions of Americans. We know the private sector is vulnerable to attack as well. The House has already passed two White House-backed cyber security bills to help address the issue. Similar legislation is now before the Senate. It is strong, bipartisan, and transparent. It has been vetted and overwhelmingly endorsed 14 to 1 by both parties in committee.

It would help both the public and private sectors to defeat cyber attacks. The top Senate Democrat on this issue reminds us it would protect individual privacy and civil liberties too. Now is the time to allow the Senate to debate and then pass this bipartisan bill.

In just a moment, I will offer a fair consent request to allow the Senate to do just that. The Democratic leader previously said that both he and the senior Senator from Oregon believe the Senate should be able to finish the bill "in a couple of days . . . at the most." And just today he said the Democrats remain willing to proceed to this bipartisan bill if allowed to offer some relevant amendments. The senior Senator from New York has also said that Democrats want to get to the bill and that they want to get a few amendments too.

Our friends across the aisle will be glad to know that the UC I am about to offer would allow 10 relevant amendments per side to be offered and made pending. That is a good and fair start that exceeds the request from our friends across the aisle.

Now that we have a path forward that gives both sides what they said they need, I would invite our colleagues to join us now in moving forward on this bill. I invite our colleagues to allow the Senate to cooperate in a spirit of good faith to pass a bill this week so we can help protect the American people from more devastating cyber attacks.

I notified the Democratic leader that I would propound the following consent request: I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion on the motion to proceed to calendar No. 28, S. 754, be withdrawn and that the Senate immediately proceed to its consideration. I further ask that Senator BURR then be recognized to offer the Burr-Feinstein substitute amendment and that it be in order during today's session of the Senate for the bill managers, or their designees, to offer up to 10 first-degree amendments relevant to the substitute per side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. The Republican leader is my friend, and I don't mean in any way to disparage him, other than to bring out a little bit of history. I can't imagine how he can make this offer with a straight face. Have amendments pending? That is like nothing. We tried that before, as recently as the highway bill. Having amendments pending doesn't mean anything.

We want to pass a good cyber security bill. We have a bill that has been crafted in the intelligence committee. Other committees have been interested in participating in what we have here on the floor, but they are willing to say: OK. We have a bill from the intelligence committee.

There have been no public committee hearings, no public markups. There has been nothing done other than a rule XIV which, of course, my friend said he would not do if he got to be the leader and there would be a robust amendment process. Having a robust amendment process has nothing to do with having amendments pending.

We want to pass a good bill. But we want to have a reasonable number of amendments, and there will be votes on those amendments. We are not asking for longtime agreements. The Republican leader's proposal would not lead to votes on the amendments. He would allow the amendments to be pending, but if the Republican leader were to file cloture, as he has done repeatedly the last few months—and an example is what he did with the recent highway bill—all amendments that were not strictly germane would fall.

Remember, we are not asking for germane amendments. We are asking for relevant amendments. We are willing to enter into an agreement that provides votes on a reasonable number of amendments that would be germane in nature, and we should be working on that agreement.

In contrast, if we fail to get that agreement, we are going to have a cloture vote an hour after we come in in the morning, and 30 hours after that—sometime late Thursday afternoon or early Thursday evening—he would have to file cloture on that. That puts us right into the work period when we get back on September 8.

When we get back, we have the 8th to the 17th, including weekends and a holiday that is celebrated every year that we always take off, which includes 2 days. It is a Jewish holiday. I can't imagine why we would want this to interfere with what we are trying to do in the month of September.

We are willing to do this bill. We can start working on these amendments right now if we can have votes on them, but we are not going to agree to some arrangement like this. If the Re-

publicans are going to push this, we can come in here tomorrow, and we will vote. The 30 hours of time will go by—and we know how to use 30 hours; we were taught how to do that—30 hours of postcloture time. And Thursday afternoon, the leader can make whatever decision is necessary.

We want a cyber bill. This bill is not the phoenix of all cyber bills, but it certainly is better than nothing. We should—following the recommendation and the suggestion and what the Republican leader has said he would do—be allowed some amendments to vote on. We can start that today. Today is Tuesday. We can finish these amendments—I would hope on the Democratic side—in a fairly short order of time.

As for the Republicans, I don't know. All I heard following the caucus is one Republican Senator wanted to offer an amendment on the cyber bill dealing with auditing the Fed. I can't imagine why that has anything to do with this bill.

We are serious about legislating. We want to do something that is good, we believe, for the country, good for the order of the Senate. Otherwise, we will look at each other around here until Thursday afternoon, and the Republican leader can look forward to this being the first thing we take up when we get back in September. We are willing to be fair and reasonable to finish this, with our amendments, in a very short period of time. So I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, let me say, I think there may well be a way forward here. What I thought I heard the Democratic leader say is that they are interested in passing a bill. That is important. He said when it was offered on the defense authorization bill that it was a 2-day bill, and we could agree to a limited number of amendments.

I think we both agree this is an important subject. I can't imagine that either the Democrats or the Republicans want to leave here for a month and not pass the cyber security bill. I think there is enough interest on both sides to try to continue to discuss the matter and see if there is a way forward. That would be in the best interest of the country if we could come together and do this. This bill came out of the intelligence committee 14 to 1.

Chairman BURR and Vice Chair FEINSTEIN have been asking for floor time. They are anxious to move this bill across the floor. I am hoping the Democratic leader and I can continue to discuss the matter and that we can find a way forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I look forward to that discussion. Keep in mind, being reported out of committee—this

is a committee that holds everything in secret. They do nothing public. So having a 14 to 1 vote in a meeting that takes place in secret doesn't give the other Senators who are not on that committee a lot of solace.

I look forward to the Republican leader and me and our staffs working together to try to come up with some way to move forward on this legislation. We want to do that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, as my good friend the Democratic leader used to remind me, the majority leader always gets the last word.

This is not a new issue. It was around during the previous Congress. Other committees acted—other committee chairmen like what Chairman BURR and Vice Chair FEINSTEIN have done. Hopefully, we can minimize sort of manufacturing problems here that keep us from going forward when it appears to me that both sides really would like to get an outcome and believe it would be best for the country to get an outcome before we go into the recess. We will continue to discuss the matter and hope that we can find a way forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I understand there has already been an objection.

I will speak later in the afternoon or early evening in some detail about why I have significant reservations with respect to this legislation.

To say—as we heard again and again throughout the day—that this is about voluntary information sharing is essentially only half true. The fact is, companies could volunteer to share their customers' information with the government, but they wouldn't have to ask for permission from their customers before handing it over. That is one reason every major organization with expertise and interest on privacy issues has had reservations about the bill. It may be voluntary for companies, but it is mandatory for their customers and their consumers. They are not given the opportunity to opt out.

The legislation has been public for months, and dozens of cyber security experts have said it wouldn't do much to stop sophisticated, large-scale attacks such as the horrendous attack at the Office of Personnel Management.

On Friday, the Department of Homeland Security—an absolutely essential agency as it relates to this bill—wrote a letter to our colleague, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, Mr. FRANKEN, and said if this bill's approach is adopted, “the complexity and inefficiency of any information sharing program will markedly increase.” The Department of Homeland Security added that the bill “could sweep away important privacy protections.” That

is a pretty strong indictment from the agency that would be in charge of implementing the legislation.

As I have indicated a couple of times in the last day or so, I think the managers, Senator FEINSTEIN and Senator BURR, have made several positive changes, but the bottom line is it doesn't address the very substantial privacy concerns that relate to this bill. The fact is, cyber security is a very serious problem in America.

Oregonians know a lot about it because one of our large employers was hacked by the Chinese. SolarWorld was hacked by the Chinese because they insisted on enforcing their rights under trade law. In fact, our government indicted the Chinese for the hack of my constituents and others.

So cyber security is a serious problem. Information sharing can play a constructive role, but information sharing without robust privacy safeguards is really not a cyber security bill. It is going to be seen by millions of Americans as a surveillance bill, and that is why it is so important that there be strong privacy guidelines.

The fact is, in the managers' legislation, the section allowing companies to hand over large volumes of information with only a cursory review would be essentially unmodified. The Department of Homeland Security asked for some specific changes to the language, which the managers' amendment does not include. So my hope is, we are going to have a chance to have a real debate on this issue. Personally, I would rather go down a different route with respect to cyber security legislation. In particular, I recommend the very fine data breach bill of our colleague from Vermont Senator LEAHY, but if Senators have their hearts set on doing the bill before us, it is going to need some very substantial amendments, both to ensure that we show the American people that security and privacy are not mutually exclusive, that we can do both, and to address the very serious operational reservations the Department of Homeland Security has raised. Neither set of concerns is thoroughly addressed by the managers' amendment.

So my hope is that we are going to have a chance to make some very significant reforms in this legislation. After seeing what has happened over the last few weeks, where the government isn't exactly doing an ideal job of securing the data it has, and now we are going to propose legislation that has private companies, without the permission of their customers, for example, to dump large quantities of their customers' data over to the government with only a cursory review—this legislation is not going to be real attractive to the millions of Americans who sent us to represent them.

In fact, in just the last few days, I read in the media that some of the op-

ponents of this legislation have sent something like 6 million faxes to the Senate—and people wonder if there are still fax machines. I guess the point is to demonstrate it is important that we understand, as we look at digital communications, what the challenge is.

I will have more to say about this later in the afternoon and in the evening, but I wanted to take this opportunity, since we have just gotten out of the party caucuses, to make some corrections with respect to what we were told this morning and particularly on this question about how this is a voluntary bill. Ask millions of Americans whether it is voluntary when companies can hand over their private information to the government without their permission.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, cyber security is an important issue, but I come to the floor to talk for a bit about one of the most consequential decisions that I, as a Member of the U.S. Senate, and my colleagues will make, and that concerns the negotiated agreement between the P5+1 and Iran—the proposed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. In my view, it provides too much relief in return for too few concessions. The deal implicitly concedes that Iran will become a nuclear power and will gain the ability and legitimacy to produce a weapon in a matter of years while gaining wealth and power in the meantime.

I serve on the Senate Banking Committee. The sanctions that were created by Congress originate from that committee. Those sanctions were put in place to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear power—a country capable of delivering a nuclear weapon across their border. Those sanctions were not put in place to give Iran a path or a guideline to become a nuclear-weapon-capable country. The key is to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of Iran's Government. The key to that is to permanently disable Iran from nuclear capability and remove the technology used to produce nuclear materials. This deal fails to achieve this goal by allowing Iran to retain nuclear facilities. Though some of it will be limited in use in the near term, the centrifuges used to enrich nuclear matter will not be destroyed or removed from the country. This deal allows Iran's nuclear infrastructure to remain on standby for nuclear development when the restrictions expire.

Also troubling is the agreement's lack of restrictions on nuclear research and development. Iran seeks to replace

its current enrichment technology with a more advanced centrifuge that more efficiently enriches nuclear material. By failing to restrict research and development now, we are priming Iran's nuclear program to hit the ground running toward a bomb once the restrictions are lifted in a matter of years.

Also, the inspection regime agreed to in this negotiation is dangerously accommodating. The agreement provides Iran a great deal of flexibility regarding the inspection of military sites just like those where Iran's past covert nuclear development work took place. The deal allows Iran to hold concerned international inspectors at bay for weeks, if not months, before granting access to a location suspected of being a site for nuclear development.

The value of any access to suspected Iranian nuclear sites that international inspectors ultimately do receive will depend upon their understanding of Iran's past nuclear weapons research. A comprehensive disclosure of possible military dimensions to Iran's nuclear research is necessary for inspectors to fully understand Iran's current infrastructure and is critical to their ability to rule out any future efforts to produce nuclear weapons.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, IAEA, has not made public its site agreement with Iran about their previous nuclear developments. This is an aside, but I would say none of us should agree to this negotiated agreement without seeing, reading, and knowing the content of that agreement. Under the proposed deal, that vital full disclosure of Iran's nuclear past may not occur, diminishing the value of inspections and increasing the risk that another covert weaponization of Iran will take place.

Painfully absent from the agreement's requirements is Iran's release of American hostages: Saeed Abedini, Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, and Amir Hekmati. The freedom of Americans unjustly held in Iran should have been a strict precondition for sanctions relief instead of an afterthought.

In return for very limited concessions, this deal gives Iran way too much. If implemented, the agreement would give Iran near complete sanctions relief up front. This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. Common sense tells us that you don't give away a leverage until you get the result that you are looking for, and this agreement provides sanctions relief upfront, delivering billions in frozen assets to the Iranian Government and boosting the Iranian economy. Included in this relief are sanctions related to Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps, which were to be lifted only when Iran ceased providing support for international terrorism.

The sanctions relief in this proposal not only fails to require preconditions

and cooperation regarding nuclear disarmament but will remove sanctions from the Iranian Guard, despite their status as a top supporter of terrorist groups around the Middle East and globe.

This type of gratuitous flexibility for Iran is found elsewhere in the agreement. The P5+1 acceptance of Iranian demands for a relaxed U.N. arms embargo is both perplexing and scary. This deal would relax trade restrictions on missiles after 8 years, while immediately erasing limits on missile research and development. It would also lift restrictions on Iranian centrifuge use and development after just 8 to 10 years. The deal grants Iran the ability to more efficiently produce nuclear material just as it gains the ability to access the delivery weapons system.

Earlier this month, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey, said: "Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Lifting the U.N. arms embargo was "out of the question." Yet, just 1 week later, negotiators announced the lifting of the embargo in 5 to 8 years or less. I wonder what has changed. Unless the menace of an increased flow of weapons in and out of Iran somehow substantially decreased during the intervening week, the consequence of this sudden capitulation should have us all greatly concerned.

This fear of increased money flow to terror organizations linked to the Iranian Government is not based upon merely an outside possibility; it is a likelihood. Last week Iran's Deputy Foreign Minister stated: "Whenever it's needed to send arms to our allies in the region, we will do so." More money and more weapons in the hands of terrorist organizations are the fuel for increased violence and further destabilization in the conflict-torn Middle East.

We have little reason to believe Iran's behavior will change as a result of this agreement. In fact, their chants of "Death to America" become more real.

Since the announcement of the agreement, the leader of Iran has been openly antagonistic to the United States. Ayatollah Ali Khamenei has promised to continue to incite unrest and said Iran's "policy towards the arrogant U.S. will not change." These anti-American statements come from an Iranian leader whose commitment the Obama administration is relying on for the nuclear accord to work. It should trouble every American that the Obama administration is asking us to support a deal that relies on the total cooperation of those who, as I say, strongly state their commitment to bringing about "death to America."

Given the Obama administration's troubling efforts to push through this

deal to the United Nations and restrict the influence of the American people through this Congress in the decision, it is all the more important that we follow through with a serious assessment of this nuclear agreement. We are faced with a circumstance that, by the administration's own previous standards, concedes too much and secures too little.

I strongly oppose this nuclear deal. It is intolerably risky, and the result will be a new Iran—a legitimized nuclear power with a growing economy and enhanced means to finance terror, to antagonize, and to ultimately pursue a nuclear weapons program. I will support the congressional resolution to express Congress's explicit disapproval.

President Obama has used fear in his agenda in seeking our support for this agreement. The warning has been that a vote against his policy is a vote for war with Iran. The President's political scare tactics are not only untrue but also illogical.

Incidentally, we were not at war with Iran when the agreements were in place before the negotiation. The absence of agreeing to the negotiated agreement would not mean we will be at war thereafter.

The President's claims undermine numerous statements his own administration has made about the negotiation process, the nature of the Iranian nuclear program, and the proposed agreement's prospects for success. If true, the President's words concede that his foreign policy has led America into a dangerous position.

We would expect a President to provide the American people as many alternatives to war as possible, not just a single narrow and risky one such as this. According to the President, the only alternative to war is this agreement—a deal that results in better financed terrorists, a weakened arms embargo, and the need for boosting U.S. weapons sales to Iran's regional rivals. If this prospect of war is his concern, the President would benefit by reevaluating the geopolitical consequences of the deal and seeking out much better options.

I had hoped these negotiations would result in a strong but fair deal to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Again, the purpose of placing sanctions on Iran was to get rid of their nuclear capability as far as delivery of nuclear material across their borders. Yet this agreement leaves that infrastructure in place and puts them on a promising path toward that nuclear capability.

Regrettably, that kind of deal was not reached. Now my hope is a simple one: that we are able to reverse some of the damage that is already done and that this agreement is rejected.

I would say that there are those who argue that we would be isolated by rejection of this agreement, that other countries would approve and the

United Nations may approve. This is an issue of such importance that we need to do everything possible to see that Iran does not become a nuclear power, and we need to have the moral character and fiber to say no to this agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR OUR COUNTRY'S WORKERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, across our country today, so many of our workers clock in 40 hours a week. They work very hard, and yet they are unable to provide for their families.

Just last fall, NBC News interviewed a woman named Latoya who worked in a fast food restaurant. She was protesting as part of a fast food workers strike. Latoya is raising four children alone on \$7.25 an hour. That is less than \$300 a week and is well below the poverty line for her and her family. For part of last year, she was living in a homeless shelter. She told the reporter: "Nobody should work 40 hours a week and find themselves homeless." On top of rock-bottom wages, Latoya said she and her colleagues experienced unpaid wages, unpredictable scheduling, and having to make do with broken equipment on the job.

In today's economy, too many of our workers across the country face the same challenges as Latoya. They are underpaid, they are overworked, and they are treated unfairly on the job. In short, they lack fundamental economic security.

Several places around the country and in my home State of Washington are working to address this at the local level. This Senator believes we need to bring the Washington State way here to Washington, DC. In Congress, I believe we need to act to give workers some much needed relief. We need to grow our economy from the middle out, not the top down, and we should make sure our country works for all Americans, not just the wealthiest few.

There is no reason we can't get to work today on legislation to do just that. That is why I have joined with my colleagues over the past few months in introducing several bills that will help restore some much needed economic security and stability to millions of workers. That is why I am hoping we can move some of these bills forward before we all go back home to our States.

For too long we have heard from some Republicans the theory—a deeply flawed theory—that if we would only grant more tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and if we would just keep rolling back regulations on the biggest

corporations, those benefits would eventually trickle down and reach working families in our country. Not only does that theory not work, as we have seen over the past few decades, that trickle-down system has done real damage to our Nation's middle class and our working families. While worker productivity has actually reached new heights, workers have lost basic protections they once had.

While trickle-down economics allows corporations to post big profits, too many of our workers are paying the price. Let me give some examples. Today the Federal minimum wage can leave a family in poverty even after working full time and even without taking a single day off. Not only that, today some businesses are using unfair scheduling practices to keep workers guessing about when they are going to be called in to work, with no guarantee of how much money they will earn in a given week. Those types of scheduling abuses take a real toll on workers' lives and prevent them from getting ahead. Attending college classes is not an option when someone's work schedule is always in flux. Taking on a second job to earn more money is nearly impossible when you can't plan around your first job. And that is not all. Today, 43 million workers in this country don't have paid sick leave. When they get sick, they have to choose between toughing it out at work and passing that illness on to others or staying at home and potentially losing their job. When their child is sick, they have to choose between losing money on their paycheck or missing out on caring for their son or daughter. If that is not enough, in our country women are paid just 78 cents for every dollar a man makes. That is not just unfair to women, by the way; it is bad for families and it hurts our economy.

Many businesses are doing the right thing and are supporting their workers, but other corporations that don't, put those businesses that are doing the right thing at a competitive disadvantage by running a race to the bottom and pulling their workers down with them.

This worker insecurity isn't just devastating for the millions of workers and their families who are impacted by it, it is also hurting our economy. Truly robust and strong economic growth comes from the middle out, not the top down. When our workers lack security, when they are not treated fairly, they can't invest in themselves and their children or spend money in their communities or move their families into a middle-class life.

I believe we have to address this challenge on multiple fronts. We can start by making sure our workers are treated fairly so they can earn their way toward rising wages and increased economic security.

There are important things we can do here in Congress to expand economic

security and stability for millions of our working families today. For starters, we should pass the Paycheck Fairness Act that the senior Senator from Maryland has championed for so many years to finally close the pay gap between men and women. The Paycheck Fairness Act would tackle pay discrimination head-on. This Senator hopes we can all agree that in the 21st century, workers should be paid fairly for the work they do, regardless of their gender.

We should also raise the minimum wage to make sure hard work does pay off. My Raise the Wage Act increases the minimum wage to \$12 by 2020 and is enough to lift a family of three out of poverty. It will put more money in workers' pockets so they can spend it in their local communities. It will help to build a strong floor—a Federal minimum—that workers and cities can build off of and go even higher where it makes sense, like in Seattle in my home State in Washington. It is a level that Republicans should be able to agree with and start moving toward right now.

I have also worked on a bill, along with Senators WARREN and MURPHY, to crack down on the scheduling abuses I just talked about, so businesses would no longer keep their workers guessing on when they would be called in or how many hours they might get in a given week.

In February I introduced the Healthy Families Act to allow workers to earn up to 7 paid sick days. I want to move forward on that legislation to give our workers some much needed economic security because no one should have to sacrifice a day of pay or their job altogether just to take care of themselves or their sick child.

We as a nation should not turn our backs on empowering our workers through collective bargaining, especially since strong unions ensure workers have a strong voice at the table. It is the very thing that helped so many workers climb into the middle class in this country.

Enacting these critical policies won't solve every problem facing our workers and their families today. It is not the only way that I and Senate Democrats will be fighting to protect workers and making sure the economy is growing from the middle out, not the top down. But these policies would be very strong steps in the right direction to bring back that American dream of economic security and a stable middle-class life for millions of workers who have seen it slip away.

When workers succeed, businesses succeed and thus the economy succeeds. We know this works. I have seen it in my home State of Washington where State and local governments have taken the lead on proposals such as raising the minimum wage and paid sick days. I think it is time to bring

some of that Washington State way right here to Washington, DC.

I recently heard from a small business owner by the name of Laura. She owns a small auto repair shop in Renton, WA. She shared something that I hear all the time from business owners: Doing the right thing by workers starts a virtuous cycle. Laura said, "When workers have more money, businesses have more customers. With more customers, businesses can hire more workers, which in turn generates more customers."

Working families in our country have been waiting long enough for some relief from the trickle-down system that hurts the middle class. That is why I am going to be asking for unanimous consent to work on the policies that would restore economic security and stability to more workers.

Let's finally restore some stability and security for workers across our country. Let's make sure hard work pays off. Let's help more families make ends meet, expand economic opportunity, and grow our economy from the middle out.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for 3 minutes and that I be followed immediately by the Senator from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, is the parliamentary procedure that there was an objection to the Senate moving forward with the consideration of the cyber bill? Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was an objection that was heard to the request of the majority leader.

Mrs. MURRAY addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. I have the floor, I tell the Senator from Washington.

This is unbelievable. It is unbelievable that this body would not move forward with a cyber bill with the situation of dire consequences and dire threats to the United States of America. Admiral Rogers, the commander of U.S. Cyber Command, told listeners at the Aspen Security Forum that "to date there is little price to pay for engaging in some pretty aggressive behaviors."

According to James Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, "we will see a progression or expansion of that envelope until such time as we create both the substance and psychology of deterrence. And today we don't have that."

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, our military

enjoys "significant military advantage" in every domain except for one—cyber space. General Dempsey said cyber "is a level playing field. And that makes this chairman very uncomfortable." The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is uncomfortable about the cyber threats to this Nation.

What just took place is millions of Americans had their privacy hacked into. God only knows what the consequences of that are. The other side has decided to object to proceeding with a bill that passed through the Intelligence Committee by a vote of 14 to 1. This is disgraceful—this is disgraceful. I tell my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, by blocking this legislation, you are putting this Nation in danger. By blocking this legislation, you are putting this Nation in danger by not allowing the Senate of the United States to act against a very real threat to our very existence.

I say this is a shameful day in the Senate. I urge the Democratic leader to come to the floor and allow us to consider amendments, move forward with this legislation because the security of the United States of America is in danger.

I thank my colleagues.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

SAWTOOTH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AND JERRY PEAK WILDERNESS ADDITIONS ACT

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, is H.R. 1138 at the desk?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of H.R. 1138, which has been received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1138) to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1138) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RISCH. Mr. President and fellow Senators, today is a historic day for the State of Idaho. This is the creation of a wilderness area in the Sawtooth

area of Idaho, the Boulder-White Clouds area, and the Jerry Peak area. These two mountain ranges and one mountain peak area have been under consideration for about 10 years.

I want to talk very briefly about what we are dealing with. These are some of the most magnificent pieces of land, not only in Idaho but in the United States. Before anyone goes abroad to see the Champs-Elysees or to see the magnificent works of art in Italy, you need to put on your list seeing the Boulder-White Clouds area. It is truly a magnificent area.

What we just did was we created a wilderness of about 275,000 acres that creates these three wilderness areas, plus a buffer zone around them. It is a great day for Idaho. This is an Idaho solution to an issue that has been pending for some time.

I conclude by simply stating that all credit for this goes to Congressman MIKE SIMPSON. Congressman SIMPSON started working on this about 10 years ago and wanted to put together, in a collaborative fashion, a wilderness bill for this particular area. He did that. He brought it back to Washington, DC. Because of the situation in DC at the time, the bill was changed greatly and was no longer an Idaho solution to the Idaho problem.

Congressman SIMPSON did not give up. He worked and he worked and he worked at it. It is truly his long-term commitment to this and his long work on this that got us to this point. What he did was take this land that there was virtually unanimous agreement should be in wilderness; that is, the heart of this area, the Boulder Range, the White Cloud Range, and the Jerry Peaks area.

There was unanimous agreement that this is the kind of land that needs to be in wilderness. Indeed, when I was Governor, I wrote this rule for several million acres. This was included in it. It was protected as wilderness. This is not changing the character of it in that regard. What it does is put it in statute instead of in rule.

The difficulty was, as always with these kinds of areas, the buffer area around what everybody agrees is truly unique ground that should be handled as wilderness. Obviously, it is an area that ingrains passion in people. It causes people to have strong feelings about the area. As a result of that, people fight to protect what they think should be protected, and just as much, people who use the buffer zones for different reasons feel just as passionately the other way.

What Congressman SIMPSON was able to do was get everybody to the table in a very collaborative fashion, to where he got the wilderness preservationists, the hikers, the backpackers, the horse people, the motorized users, including snowmobile, ATV, and motorcycle people, to all agree to a management plan

for everything that is included in this bill.

Congressman SIMPSON was tenacious on this. He gets the full credit for this. I think Idahoans will truly appreciate this for many years. There is no doubt in my mind that the efforts Congressman SIMPSON put into this will be greatly appreciated for years and years to come.

With that, I yield the remainder of my time to my colleague, my good friend, Senator MIKE CRAPO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. I thank Senator RISCH.

Mr. President, it is an honor for me to rise with my colleague JIM RISCH to celebrate the passage of this legislation. It has been years and years in the making. This legislation culminates from the hard work by people all over Idaho. As Senator RISCH has indicated, the credit for making this all finally come together goes to Representative MIKE SIMPSON. I wholeheartedly agree with that.

Passage of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Jerry Peak Wilderness Additions Act, also called the SNRA+ Act, is the result of tremendous efforts by Representative SIMPSON and Senator RISCH. He deserves tremendous credit as well. I do want to say that I honor Representative SIMPSON's dogged determination and his persistence to fight through many obstacles associated with this treasured region of our State for a very long period of time.

Representative SIMPSON's efforts have given Idaho a homegrown solution to what was rapidly becoming a national problem. As I said, similarly, my colleague Senator RISCH has fought through many challenges in his pursuit of developing a consensus on this issue that has been hard to achieve. Both of my colleagues, in their respective ways, have expressed again the power of collaboration in the attempt to find consensus to deliver local solutions to longstanding public land management challenges in Idaho.

Local governments and local stakeholders must be empowered to shape and manage decisions relating to our public lands. In the process, such efforts must respect private property rights as well as other impacted stakeholders. Such initiatives are never easy to achieve, and consensus takes dedication, patience, and persistence. For too long, westerners have been saddled with top-down land management decisions that are both harmful to the landscape and the people living in and subsisting off of our natural treasures. The SNRA+ is a win for Idaho and an example of how local governments and interests can achieve solutions to some of the most persistent public land management issues we face.

I have to conclude by saying that while we have succeeded today in passing a milestone in Congress, the focus must now shift to the hard work of successful implementation that will require commitment from the various Federal agencies and all of the affected interests.

Again, I commend Senator RISCH and Representative SIMPSON for their incredibly important work that has been accomplished today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I congratulate my colleagues from Idaho on this particular piece of legislation, proving it can be done right. It was just a few weeks ago that the President unilaterally declared a monument in the State of Nevada the size of Rhode Island, with two counties that had no input in the process. Our delegation had no input. The collaborative effort that we saw from Idaho and how it works and how the system should work needs to be recognized. What happened in Nevada, I feel, was a disgrace.

It is a shame we are standing here today with a monument in the State of Nevada the size of Rhode Island with no input from Nevada's delegation or counties, just a single action made by one person.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, I would like to talk about personal privacy rights for American citizens. It was just 2 months ago that the Senate took action to restore privacy rights of American citizens through the USA FREEDOM Act—part of action that was taken, as I mentioned, just 2 months ago. Both Chambers of Congress and the President agreed it was time to end the bulk collection of American's call records pouring into the Federal Government.

I was a proud supporter of the USA FREEDOM Act and believed it was the right thing to do on behalf of U.S. citizens. My constituents all across Nevada—from Elko, to Reno, Ely, and Las Vegas—all understand how important these rights are and will not accept any attempts to diminish them. Today, I am here to continue protecting these privacy rights and uphold our civil liberties.

Protecting privacy will always be important to Nevadans. It is nonnegotiable to me, very important. Similar to many of my colleagues in the Senate, I believe addressing cyber security is also important.

When I was ranking member of the commerce committee's consumer protection subcommittee, I worked on these issues in detail. I understand very well the impact of data breaches,

cyber threats. In fact, back in my State of Nevada, one of the top concerns is identity theft. Not only can these identity thieves wreak financial havoc on a consumer's life, but these threats also pose a serious national security concern.

We saw with OPM's breach that personal information for 21.5 million Federal employees, even those who received security clearances, was compromised. In my office, in fact, a member of my staff was breached three times in just the last 4 years. These thieves cross international borders. They break and enter into private homes. They hack their way to intrusion with a keyboard and a simple click of the mouse.

So I share the desire to find a path forward on information sharing between the Federal Government and the private sector as another tool in the cyber security toolbox, but I have always stood firm with these types of efforts that they must also maintain American's privacy rights.

The bill I see today, including the substitute amendment, does not do enough to ensure personally identifiable information is stripped out before sharing. That is why I filed a fix. Let's strengthen the standard for stripping out this information. Right now, this bill says the private sector and the Federal Government only have to strip out personal information if they know—if they know—it is not directly related to a cyber threat.

I would like to offer some context to that. Let's say you are pulled over for speeding, not knowing the speed limit does not absolve you of guilt. If your company fails to follow a Federal law or regulation, not knowing about the law does not exempt you from the consequences of violating it. Ignorance is no excuse under the law, so why should this particular piece of legislation be any different?

My amendments ensure that when personal information is being stripped out, it is because the entity reasonably believes—not knows but reasonably believes—it is not related to a cyber threat. One of my amendments addresses the Federal Government's responsibility to do this, and the other addresses the private sector's responsibility to do this.

This term "reasonably believes"—let me repeat that—"reasonably believes" is an important distinction that this bill needs. It creates a wider protection for personal information by ensuring these entities are making an effort to take out personal information that is not necessary for cyber security. Our friends over in the House of Representatives already agree the private sector should be held to this standard, which is why they included this language in the cyber security bill which they passed. I hope to see this important protection retained in any conference

agreement should this bill move forward.

Furthermore, in a letter to a Senator last week, DHS directly acknowledged the importance of removing personally identifiable information and even went so far as to say this removal will allow the information-sharing regime to function much better. Even DHS agrees that with this amendment it would function much better. So what it comes down to is our Nation's commitment to balancing the needs for sharing cyber security information with the need to protect America's personal information.

I believe my amendment, No. 2548, to hold the Federal Government accountable strikes that balance, and I will continue strongly pushing forward to get this vote. I encourage my colleagues to support this commonsense effort to strengthen this bill and keep our commitment to upholding the rights of all U.S. citizens.

As we discuss this issue, I hope we will continue having the opportunity to truly debate and make improvements to this bill. I believe that if given the opportunity, we can strengthen this legislation even more to protect against cyber security threats while also protecting American citizens' private information.

No bill is perfect, as the Presiding Officer knows, but that is why we are here and that is why there is an amendment process. That is why I wish to see the Senate openly debate and amend this bill, including my amendment. The privacy rights of Americans are too important an issue and a very important issue to all of us.

I acknowledge that some of my colleagues want the opportunity to debate issues related to the bill and those issues that are unrelated to the bill. I recognize there are many important issues Members would like to see addressed before August—or at least the August recess—such as my friend from Kentucky, who filed an amendment regarding firearms on bases. Like my colleague, I recognize the importance of this issue, which is why I introduced this legislation days ago. My legislation would simply require the Secretary of Defense to establish a process for base commanders in the United States to authorize a servicemember to carry a concealed personal firearm while on base. Men and women who serve our country deserve to feel safe and should be able to defend themselves while stationed in the United States. That is why I feel strongly that Congress should give our Nation's base commanders the authority they need to create a safer environment for our heroes serving across America.

At this time I recognize it is unclear if there will be an opportunity to debate this issue on this particular piece of legislation, but it is an important issue. Once again, I hope that as we

continue to debate this bill that we will find a path forward on all amendments.

I appreciate the willingness of both Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN to work with me on my amendments, and I look forward to continuing this debate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the next 30 minutes be equally divided between Senators SCHUMER, BOXER, WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, and SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, may I ask for a modification that I be able to speak for 1 minute on the cyber issue before we go into that 30 minutes?

With that modification, I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Thank you.

Mr. President, in my 1 minute, I just wish to respond to what my friend, the Senator from Arizona, said. We are very keen to get a good, strong cyber security bill passed.

My concern about the amendment process is that amendments that will strengthen the bill and make it a better cyber bill ought to have a chance to get a vote. I have one that I worked out with Senator GRAHAM, who I think has good national security credentials and whom Senator MCCAIN respects, and another one with Senator BLUNT, who also has good national security credentials and whom I think Senator MCCAIN also respects. I believe both of the bills have now been cleared by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, so they don't have a business community objection. But I also fear that if we followed the majority leader's proposal, he would file cloture and they wouldn't survive a germaneness test.

So I think our leader's offer, basically, of a specific list of amendments—none of which are “gotcha” amendments, all of which relate to this bill—would be a very good way to proceed, get on the bill, and get something passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. First, I thank my friend from Rhode Island. I think there is a broad agreement—I certainly do—that we want to move to this bill and, if given an agreement on a limited number of amendments, all relevant to cyber security, with no intention to be dilatory, and with time limits, we can get this done. But it is only fair on a major bill to offer some amendments and not just to fill the tree and have no amendments at all.

CLIMATE CHANGE

On the issue at hand, I thank Senators WHITEHOUSE, MARKEY, SCHATZ,

and BOXER for speaking today and participating in this colloquy. I join my colleagues in appealing for meaningful action on climate change in this body, which thus far has been stymied by my friends on the other side of the aisle on behalf of special interests, and that is an absolute shame.

Climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time. Left unchecked, the changing climate and rising seas will threaten our shoreline cities and communities, as I personally witnessed after Superstorm Sandy buffeted New York. Left unchecked, a changing climate will have dramatic consequences for our children and grandchildren. Pope Francis's papal encyclical represents as much. He said climate change “represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.”

We know we have to act. We know the American people want us to act. According to a New York Times-Stanford University poll, 74 percent of Americans said the Federal Government should be doing a substantial amount to combat climate change. That is 74 percent.

Democrats agree the Federal Government must do something. We tried to pass several bills through Congress, but my friends on the other side of the aisle blocked action time and time again on behalf of the special interests in the fossil fuel industry.

Now the President has a bold plan to reduce carbon emissions, which he announced yesterday and today, but already the groups on the other side are marshaling their forces. The New York Times reported today that fossil fuel lobbyists and corporate lawyers have been working since 2014, over 1½ years ago, to bring down these new rules.

Some of these Republicans admit that climate change is real and a threat. Yet they still block and block and block. My friend, the distinguished majority leader, has urged governors across the country to simply ignore the new climate rules while they cook up lawsuits to delay and frustrate their implementation.

OK. So you don't like the actions we propose or what the President proposes. Fine. What do you propose? I say to those on the other side of the aisle: What is your plan to meet this existential challenge? I have heard none. That is why this chart says:

—WANTED—

A GOP plan to combat climate change and reduce dangerous air pollution

#WhatstheGOPClimatePlan

There is none. We all know it is happening. Just look at the news, read the weather reports, and ask what scientists who are totally impartial and nonpolitical say. Unfortunately, I have a funny feeling that our colleagues on the other side are using the same playbook they are using on health care, im-

migration, and a host of other issues. Block, repeal, oppose, but propose nothing.

So I conclude my brief remarks by repeating the question. What is the Republican plan to act on climate change? Let me ask again in case they didn't hear me. What is the Republican plan to act on climate change?

Let me suggest that my friends on the other side join us in seeking solutions on climate change rather than obstructing our efforts and the wishes of the American people on behalf of special interests. Again, I thank my friends for organizing this colloquy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, what is the order in terms of time allocated?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty minutes have been allocated. Each Senator has about 6 minutes to speak.

Mrs. BOXER. Will the Chair remind me when I have spoken for 5 minutes so I can wrap up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be so notified.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

In 2007, in its landmark decision called *Massachusetts v. EPA*, the U.S. Supreme Court found very clearly that carbon pollution is covered under the Clean Air Act. I think it is important to note that the Bush administration took the position that carbon pollution could not be covered under the Clean Air Act. They wasted about 8 long years litigating the matter, and we lost a lot of time. But when the Supreme Court finally spoke out, this is what they said, and I quote from the decision:

Because greenhouse gases fit within the Clean Air Act's capacious definition of “air pollutant,” we hold that EPA has the statutory authority to regulate the emission of such gases. . . .

Following the Supreme Court decision, the Obama administration issued an endangerment finding which showed that current and future concentrations of carbon pollution are harmful to our health. This finding built on the work of the Bush administration, and we found some of the raw data from the Bush administration, and we went public with it. This is what the endangerment finding said, among other things:

No. 1, severe heat waves are expected to intensify, which can increase heat-related death and sickness.

No. 2, climate change is expected to worsen regional smog pollution, which can cause decreased lung function, aggravated asthma, increased emergency-room visits, and premature deaths.

So once that endangerment finding was made, the Clean Air Act clearly requires the Environmental Protection Agency to act to control greenhouse gas pollution because it is determined that that pollution causes harm.

I wish to say, when I still had the gavel of the Environment and Public Works Committee, we called four former EPA administrators who served under Republican Presidents from Richard Nixon to George W. Bush. Every single one of those Republicans called on us to act now to reduce carbon pollution.

In that hearing, former EPA administrator Christine Todd Whitman, who served under George W. Bush, summed it up best—and I know my friends remember this. She said:

I have to begin by expressing my frustration with the discussion about whether or not the Environmental Protection Agency has the legal authority to regulate carbon emissions that is still taking place in some quarters. The issue has been settled.

This is a former Republican EPA administrator under George W. Bush. Continuing:

EPA does have the authority. The law says so, the Supreme Court has said so twice. That matter, I believe, should now be put to rest. Given that fact, the agency has decided, properly in my view, that it should act now to reduce carbon emissions to improve the quality of our air, to protect the health of our people and, as part of an international effort, to address global climate change.

Now, I was so proud in that particular hearing because I haven't found a Republican on the Environment and Public Works Committee who really even believes that climate change is real, to be honest. So to have a Republican—the former head of the EPA under George W. Bush—tell us it is time to move was very heartening to me because I believe action can't come too soon. The impacts that scientists predicted years ago are all around us and they are happening now.

I wish to share a couple of charts. The prediction quite a while ago was that we were going to see extreme heat more frequently all around the world. Well, 2014 was the hottest year on record, according to NASA and NOAA, and 2015, the first half of this year, is the hottest on record, according to NOAA.

Then, heat waves are more frequent. In Australia, in 2014, towns 320 miles northwest of Sydney hit 118 degrees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has consumed 5 minutes.

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the Chair.

Areas affected by drought will increase. Look at what is happening in my great State, the worst drought, according to scientists, in 1,200 years. Fires are increasing—same thing—and I am just so disheartened by the fact that we lost a firefighter, a visiting firefighter. Firefighters are fighting those fires right now and putting their lives on the line every single day. Tropical storms, hurricanes—this is all happening—heavy precipitation, flooding events. Houston got 11 inches of rain in 24 hours in 2015. And there is decreasing polar ice, and, in addition, rising sea levels.

So I will close with this. The evidence of climate change is here. To say you are not a scientist is no answer. You know you are not a scientist. Politicians as a group are not. But we should listen to the 98, 99 percent of scientists who are telling us our planet is in trouble. Our people are going to be in trouble.

As long as I can stand up on my feet in this body, I am going to stand shoulder to shoulder—well, not quite; in my high heels shoulder to shoulder—with my friends because this is a moment in our Nation's history when our kids and grandkids will look back and ask: Why didn't they protect us? Why didn't they save us? As far as I am concerned, it is our duty and our moral responsibility.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I want to start my remarks with this photograph I have in the Chamber, which is a photograph of—I guess the miniplanet is what they call it now—Pluto. Why do I start remarks on climate change and carbon pollution with a picture of Pluto? I do so because of the amazing achievement it was for our NASA scientists to fly a craft close enough to Pluto to take that picture. That is a heck of an accomplishment by our American NASA scientists.

But that is not their only one. While this craft was shooting by Pluto taking these pictures, they had a rover rolling around on the surface of Mars. They sent a vehicle the size of an SUV to the surface of Mars and are driving it around. Do you think these scientists know what they are talking about when they say something as simple as climate change is real? Of course, they do.

But our Republican friends can't acknowledge that. They have even said these NASA scientists are in on a hoax. Can you imagine anything more demeaning to the people who put a rover on Mars and shot this picture of Pluto than to say: Oh, they do not know what they are talking about. They are in on a hoax. Forget about it. That is just not true.

The real issue is this. Here is Kentucky's electric generation fuel mix. That is its fuel mix. Guess what the gray is? Coal. That is basically all they have. There is a tiny little strip of blue at the bottom for the hydro. There is a little tiny strip here of red for oil. And there is a tiny little bit of natural gas here at the top, for which you need a magnifying glass. You can look and, with a magnifying glass, you can see this tiny little green line at the top that is their entire renewables portfolio. Really?

The last I heard the sun shines bright on my old Kentucky home. Right? So why no solar? None. How about wind? Do you think the wind blows through

the Kentucky hills? None. You have to use a magnifying glass to see it. They are not even trying. They are not even trying. The coal industry has that State so locked down they are doing nothing.

Go to Iowa. There are two Republican Senators from Iowa—hardly some liberal bastion—and they get about 30 percent of their electricity from wind. It is not a Communist plot. It is not a Socialist fabrication. It is Iowa, and the farmers love it.

But no, we have to protect coal at all costs. So this is the GOP signal for what they are doing on climate change. I think it would probably be wise to take out the smile and actually put a little band of tape over the mouth so that it is clear that nobody is allowed to say a word.

This is really astonishing. Here we are, in which every State—just ask your home State university if climate change is real. You don't have to go far. Ask the University of Kentucky, ask the University of Louisville, ask your home State university. They know. Everybody knows. The problem is the coal industry and the Koch brothers have this place locked down, and it is ridiculous.

The Koch brothers have pledged to spend \$889 million in this election through this group called Americans for Prosperity. And they have also said that “anybody who crosses us on climate change will be at a severe disadvantage.” When you are swinging a \$900 million club and you are telling folks, disagree with us and you will be at a severe disadvantage, this is what you get—no plan on climate change.

You are going to hear endless complaining from our friends on the other side about the President's plan. What are you not going to hear? What their plan is. What is the alternative? What have they got? If you have nothing, if you have nada, zip, you really have to get into this conversation because even your own Republican young voters are demanding it. Republican voters under the age of 35 think climate denial is ignorant, out of touch or crazy—their words in the poll, not mine.

So it is time we broke through. It is time the majority leader got away from this 100-percent coal situation that he is defending, allowed the future to take place, and allowed a conversation to take place here in the Senate. We are ready for it. We are ready for it.

I yield the floor to my wonderful colleague, Senator MARKEY, who has been working on this a good deal longer than I have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I thank my good friend from Rhode Island, my friend from California, Senator BOXER, Senator SCHATZ from Hawaii, and all the Members who work on these issues.

This is the big one. This is the issue. This is the threat to the entire planet.

Young people want us to do something about it. They are wondering when the older generation is finally going to get around to doing something about it, from moving to sending pollution up into the air to moving to clean energy, moving to new energy technologies.

So as they look at this, they look at coal, they look at a 19th century technology—coal—and they say: When are we moving to the new era? Well, that is a good question because in 2005 in the United States of America we deployed a grand total of 79 megawatts of solar. In 2014, we deployed 7,000 megawatts of solar—100 times more—because we started to have a plan.

Democrats put a plan in place by creating tax breaks for solar, by incentivizing more investment in solar across the country. Individual States started to put new regulations on the books—7,000 megawatts. Now we have 20,000 megawatts of solar in the United States. But we only deployed 79 in 2005.

Now, if you really want some great news as to what is possible, in 2015 and 2016, we are going to deploy 20,000 more—in just 2 years. So we are going to double the total amount of all solar ever deployed in the United States in just 2 years.

Over on the wind front, we are going to have about 80,000 megawatts total deployed by the end of next year, bringing it up to 120,000 megawatts. How much is that? When you look at a big nuclear powerplant and you see the picture of it, that is 1,000 megawatts. So we are talking about 120 of them being deployed by the end of next year.

So the young generation looks at us and they say: Can we do this? Can we meet the goals President Obama is setting? Can we meet the objective of having 28 percent of all of our electricity coming from renewables by the year 2030?

Well, if you hear from the coal industry or you hear from the nuclear industry, if you hear from the other fossil fuel industries, they say: Well, that is impossible. You can't do it. It is absolutely just going to be a very small part of the total amount of electricity that we generate in our country.

Well, they are just dead wrong. We are proving that in 2015 and 2016 because of the fight that is taking place at the State level—the tax breaks for wind and solar that were put on the books largely by Democrats here nationally. We are doing it. It is there. We now have over 200,000 people working in the solar industry in the United States. There are only 85,000 people who are in the coal industry. Got that? It is 2015. There are 80,000 people working in the wind industry in our country.

These are the growth industries. These are the Internet corollaries in clean energy. This is where young people are going. This is where innovation is going. This is where venture capital

in America is going. This is where the innovation around our planet is going. We can do this. We can reduce greenhouse gases dramatically, increase employment simultaneously, and create wealth and health for our planet.

The President's plan will reduce by 90,000 per year the number of asthma attacks in our country. It will reduce by 90 percent the total amount of sulfur that is sent up into the atmosphere. It will be something that is supported by doctors and nurses and by Presidents and Popes. That is what we have. That is what this plan is. It is a beautiful plan. It is a plan that spans not just the technological and the political but also the moral imperative that is presented by this problem.

So yes, the big question that is being asked is this: Where is the Republican plan? Well, of course, there is none because they are still in denial that there is a problem, notwithstanding the fact that every single national academy of sciences of every single country in the world says there is a problem.

This is basically a small cabal of fossil fuel executives still trying to peddle 19th century technologies in the 21st century. It would be as though there were a cabal to stop us from moving from black rotary dial phones to wireless devices so that people could walk around with the new technologies. Oh, wait. There was a cabal. They fought it for years and years and years and years because they had the monopoly. The black rotary dial phone in the living room was all anyone would ever need. We had to break down those monopolies, and we have to break down these as well.

But here it is more than just having a phone in your pocket. Now it is actually saving the planet. It is ensuring we put in place the preventive measures that will reduce greenhouse gases while creating new jobs.

Senator WHITEHOUSE and I are part of a plan called the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative across New England, New York, Delaware, and Maryland. We already have a plan in place that has, in fact, reduced greenhouse gases, which has simultaneously seen dramatic increases in wealth, creating \$1.5 billion in savings for consumers. We can do this. We can do this.

The auto industry said we could not increase the fuel economy standards of the vehicles that we drive. We just went right past them. The telecommunications industry did not want us to be moving to this wireless revolution. We just went right past them. The coal industry does not want us to act right now. For the sake of the planet, for the sake of generations to come, we must go right past them and ensure President Obama's plan is enacted.

I thank the Chair, and I now yield to the Senator from Hawaii, Mr. SCHATZ.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Massachusetts and Senators WHITEHOUSE and BOXER for their great leadership. I am really appreciative of the senior Senator from New York for taking the time to come to the floor to demonstrate his commitment to this issue.

There is an incredible opportunity here for American leadership. In Hawaii, in various places across the State, in 1 month we had 33 record highs—in the month of July. So we all know this is the challenge of our generation, and we all know the next most important step is the full implementation of the President's Clean Power Plan.

I wish to make a couple of points about the particulars of the plan. The first is that this is really done well. Normally, regulatory functions can be a blunt instrument. They can be a little less than careful in terms of how they are going to impact the economy. But this is done with great precision, with great care, and with great interaction with the incumbent utility companies and distribution and generation companies. So this is done with enough flexibility to say: Whatever your mix in terms of energies, we are not going to dictate exactly how you do it at a powerplant level, at a county level, at a city level. All we are saying is you have to meet these targets. And if you meet these targets through distributed generation or wind or solar or geothermal or hydro, that is not the Federal Government's concern.

Our concern is that carbon is a pollutant—and that has been determined by the courts, and it has been determined by scientists—and the Clean Air Act requires that airborne pollutants are regulated. So we are simply going to tell every State: This, like all other pollutants, has to be reduced over time.

I think the EPA took great pains to make sure this was done in a way that wouldn't cause too much upheaval in the economy. This is legally sound. There is no question that the EPA doesn't just have the authority and the discretion to move forward with carbon pollution regulations, they are actually required to under the last Supreme Court decision. And it is doable. Hawaii has a 100-percent clean energy goal. The Northeast has its RGGI program. California has a cap-and-trade program. And all of our economies continue to grow. It is not that individuals and companies don't continue to have their challenges, but it is not because of our leaning forward into clean energy.

I will make one point about the kind of layering of obstruction. The first layer, which I think we have been successful in the last 6 months at breaking through, is the whole "I am not sure whether climate change is real." Then they sort of pivoted to "Well, I am not

a scientist." So I don't think that is going to last for very long.

I think the next layer of obstruction is going to be "I think climate change is real. I am not sure what percentage of climate change is caused by humans and how much of it is naturally occurring." I think we will be able to punch through that opposition.

The next layer of opposition will be this: "America should wait." They will tell us that America should not lead in this, that we should wait for China, that we should wait for India, that we should wait for Germany, that we should wait for Japan. So let me ask this question: Since when does the United States wait for other countries to lead? This is the challenge of our generation, and it strikes me as preposterous that anybody who believes in American leadership would be willing to say "Let's see what other countries do about this problem first. Why don't we give this a few years?" We don't have a few years. This is an incredible opportunity for America to display the leadership it has always displayed in the international community. We finally have the high ground going into the Paris discussions. We are on legally sound ground, we are on morally sound ground, and I think politically we are increasingly on sound ground.

I am a full supporter of the President's Clean Power Plan. The one thing that causes me great dismay and I think causes some of the other participants in this colloquy dismay is that we are not even having a debate.

This is the Democrats asking you to come down to the floor and disagree with us. Disagree with the President. Disagree with Gina McCarthy. Tell SHELTON and me that our bill is a piece of garbage and this is what should be done instead. But let's have the great debate in the world's greatest deliberative body. Right now, it is entirely one-sided. If we are going to display American leadership, we need some Republican leadership as well.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I don't know if the Senator is aware of this, but I do know Senators WHITEHOUSE and MARKEY know this since they serve with me on the Environment and Public Works Committee. Tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock, the Republicans on the Environment and Public Works Committee are going to put forward two bills, and they expect to pass them. One would stop the President's Clean Power Plan in its tracks without putting in anything to replace it—as a matter of fact, putting up obstacles, as I understand it, to any other plan. So it would stop it in its tracks and set up huge obstacles for another rule. The other one would say that if you spray pesticides on bodies of water and the pesticides get into the water, that spraying should be exempted from the Clean Water Act.

I mean, it pains me. It pains me to say that this is coming from the environment committee. Why don't they just rename it the "anti-environment committee" when they are in charge because every week, every day on the environment they go in the wrong direction for our children and our grandchildren. I know my friend has young children. I have young grandchildren.

Isn't it a shame that at the moment in time when the Environment and Public Works Committee—they did a great job—we did a great job, all of us, on transportation. We had a 20-to-0 vote. We are so proud of it. But on the environment, we are split down the middle, with Republicans trying to stop the Clean Power Plan, stop the advances in fighting climate change, stop the ability of regulators to protect the waters from pesticide spraying. Isn't it just shameful that this will be happening tomorrow?

Mr. SCHATZ. Through the Chair, I understand the time for the colloquy is about to expire. Just to respond to the Senator from California, if there is no objection, I would just say that we really do need Republican leadership here. Prior to about 10 years ago, the Republican Party had a long history and an august history of working with Democrats to protect our air and our water, and we are all sincerely hoping we can get back to that place.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

PRESCRIPTION OPIOID AND HEROIN ABUSE

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a public health issue that is devastating communities and families in New Hampshire and throughout this country; that is, prescription opioid and heroin abuse.

I actually see my colleagues from Rhode Island and Massachusetts here. This is an issue where, on a bipartisan basis, we are focused on important legislation to address this terrible public health crisis.

Right now in New Hampshire, heroin—sometimes combined with a very powerful synthetic drug called fentanyl—is taking lives, ruining families, and harming communities. Public safety officials are confronting overdoses every single day.

My good friend, Manchester police chief Nick Willard, said recently: "I'm up to my eyes in heroin addiction." Unfortunately, the statistics underscore Chief Willard's statement. In all of 2014, Manchester police seized over 1,300 grams of heroin. As of just last month, Manchester police had seized over 27,000 grams of heroin in 2015. That is nearly 26,000 more grams in just 7 months. In 2014, there were over 320 fatal drug-related overdoses in New Hampshire—up from 193 in 2013—and heroin and fentanyl were the primary drivers of nearly 250 of those deaths. In Manchester alone—our largest city—

overdose deaths so far have increased 90 percent over 2014 and over 269 percent if we go back to 2013. That is the crisis we are facing. That is how many lives are being taken by opioids, by overdosing on prescription drugs and heroin, and it is devastating.

I worked with law enforcement when I was attorney general of New Hampshire. I know how hard they are working on this. They are working tirelessly to get these drugs off the streets. But they will tell you that we simply cannot arrest our way out of this problem. I have actually heard from law enforcement in New Hampshire that what they believe we need most to confront this public health crisis and to confront the public safety issues that go with it are more prevention, more treatment options, and more support for individuals in recovery.

We know that addiction to prescription pain medication can often become a gateway to heroin abuse. Unfortunately, right now the price of heroin on the streets has gotten so cheap that people are often going from prescription drug addiction to heroin addiction because of the price and the high and the way they feel. It is so tragic. According to a study from the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, approximately 4 out of every 5 new heroin users previously used nonmedical prescription opioids before using heroin.

I wish to briefly mention two pieces of legislation that I believe represent critical steps in the right direction.

In February I helped reintroduce the bipartisan Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island, who is in this Chamber, as well for his important work on this legislation. This legislation would expand opioid prevention and education efforts and expand the availability of naloxone to first responders and law enforcement. It would also support additional resources to identify and treat incarcerated individuals suffering from substance abuse disorder and encourage prevention by expanding drug take-back sites to promote the safe disposal of unwanted or unused prescription drugs, strengthening prescription drug monitoring programs, and launching a prescription opioid and heroin treatment and intervention program.

This summer I had the privilege of doing a ride-along with the Manchester fire department. Within half an hour of being at the fire department, we were called to a heroin overdose. I watched the first responders give Narcan to a young man who was on the ground who I thought was going to die, and he came right back. But what I noticed was that in that room in a corner was an infant—an infant child whom the firefighter gave to another young woman in the room. Think about the impact of that. What chance does that

child have when her father is on the floor, is not getting treatment, and is getting back in this cycle?

Often what I hear from our first responders is that when they save someone's life using a drug such as Narcan, they see the same people again because they are not getting the treatment they need to get the recovery they need from this horrible addiction they have.

Earlier this year I also reintroduced the Heroin and Prescription Opioid Abuse Prevention, Education, and Enforcement Act with Senator JOE DONNELLY of Indiana. This bipartisan bill would reauthorize programs related to prescription drug monitoring programs that are helpful to our physicians so they can get good information when they are prescribing pain medication; grants for local law enforcement; and establishing an interagency task force to develop best practices in prescribing pain medication.

The headlines we are seeing in New Hampshire every day in our local newspapers underscore the sad reality of this problem. Here are some we have seen in recent weeks:

The Union Leader: "Mom, dad overdose on heroin while bathing child."

The Nashua Telegraph in May: "Nine die from drug overdoses in Nashua so far this year, including three in one weekend." Nashua is where I was born and where I lived.

The Telegraph on May 14: "Toddler left in care of men, one of whom died of an overdose."

There was more on that same day: "Hampton man on heroin causes 5-car crash."

May 29: "Ossipee mom accused of selling heroin with 2 kids in the car."

These news stories mirror the heart-breaking personal stories of loss I have been hearing about from families in our State. I want to share a couple of these stories.

Recently, I met with the family of Courtney Griffin, a 20-year-old young woman from Newton, NH. Tragically, Courtney lost her life to a heroin overdose last September. I was very moved by her family's story.

Courtney aspired to join the Marine Corps and had already attended boot camp. She was a charter member of the Kingston Lions Club. She played the French horn in high school and was a member of the tennis club.

During high school, Courtney started hanging out with a different crowd, and at some point the Griffins' prescription medication in their cabinet started disappearing. After Courtney graduated from high school, her addiction grew worse. She was stealing from her father's business and from her family in a desperate attempt to feed her addiction.

Courtney entered drug treatment, but she relapsed. When she finally admitted she had a problem, she tried to

seek treatment but was denied coverage because the Griffins' insurance company said it wasn't a life-or-death situation. With some help from local law enforcement, Courtney was finally able to find a place to receive treatment. Tragically, she died of a heroin overdose about a week before she was set to begin treatment.

Her father Doug is doing everything he can to turn Courtney's story of tragedy into a cautionary tale so that he can save other families from what his family has been through.

Doug and others like him have a perspective on this crisis that is impossible for anyone who has not personally experienced a loss like this to understand. I admire his courage in sharing the story of his family so that he can save other families' lives.

Unfortunately, this story is all too common. In April, Molly Parks, a waitress at Portland Pie Company in Manchester, lost her life to a heroin overdose while she was at work. Her father is also speaking out to warn other families of the dangers of drug addiction.

I want to share as a final point one story that really moved me on Memorial Day. That story came from Keith Howard. He served our country with distinction. I know him personally. When he returned home from his enlistment, he struggled with alcohol and heroin abuse and he became homeless. Unfortunately, we hear too many of these stories about our veterans, what they are carrying with them, the wounds from war, and they become addicted to drugs and alcohol. Keith was one of those individuals who served our country and who became addicted. Today Keith is sober, and he helps run Liberty House in Manchester, NH, which provides sober housing for American veterans transitioning out of homelessness and helps our homeless veterans. Keith has dedicated his life to this.

On Memorial Day—on that important day on which we honor those who have sacrificed so much and made the ultimate sacrifice for our freedom—he shared stories with us of veterans who have come to Liberty House and turned their lives around, but he also shared stories of others who came but could not overcome their addiction, eventually costing them their homes, their families, and in some cases their lives.

Keith and Liberty House are doing incredibly important work for veterans in Manchester, but he believes there is more to be done. On Memorial Day of this year when we were honoring those servicemembers who gave their lives in service to our country, Keith reminded us of something else when he told a crowd at Veteran's Park in Manchester—and you could have heard a pin drop when he said this: "Let us honor our dead by creating hope for our living." He is absolutely right.

It is clear to me that we need to work together. This is a bipartisan

issue. This is a public health crisis. This is about the quality of life in our country. This is a problem on which we need to work together at the local, State, and Federal level in partnership to identify effective strategies to help save lives and take back our communities.

For my part, I will remain committed to fighting against this public health epidemic and taking it up at its roots to make sure for our children that this addiction and heroin—that we get it off our streets but that we get help for those who are addicted and that they understand they shouldn't feel the stigma I know many of them do, that we want them to come forward, we want to help them, and we understand this is incredibly difficult. We want them to know we stand with them so they can get the help and the treatment they need to lead productive lives.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, before the Senator from New Hampshire leaves the floor, I wish to thank her for her work on the comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act. She has been a very good partner in that effort. I know her home State, like Rhode Island, is suffering an extraordinary wave of opioid addiction and opioid fatalities. I know she is also working hard to make sure we get a hearing in the Judiciary Committee under present leadership. I am getting good signals on that. I hope we can pin that down before too long. I think this is a very important issue for us to get a hearing on, and I think it is one that all of the Presidential candidates are seeing. It is one so many of us see in our home States.

One of the smallest towns in Rhode Island is a little town called Burrillville. It is a beautiful place. It is in the northern rural area of our State. People laugh when I say "the rural area of Rhode Island," but we really do have them. Burrillville is a very bucolic area, and there are very wonderful people there.

In the first quarter of this year, in little Burrillville, six people lost their lives to overdose. When I went to the Burrillville High School to do an event there about this bill and to listen and get ideas for our legislation, there were three recovering folks who came to talk about their situation. Like so many folks in recovery, they were unbelievably inspiring and noble in the way they discussed it. All three of them had gone to Burrillville High School.

It is a real problem, and I appreciate very much the leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. President, this is actually the time of the week for me to deliver my

109th “Time to Wake Up” speech. I find it a little bit frustrating these days because climate change used to be a bipartisan issue. Over and over again, we had bipartisan, serious climate change bills. In fact, the first big climate change bill in the EPW Committee was Warner-Lieberman—John Warner, Republican of Virginia, and Joe Lieberman, Democrat of Connecticut. But then came Citizens United and all that dark money began to flow, all that fossil fuel money began to flow, all that Koch brothers money began to flow. Now, even as the evidence of climate change deepens to irrefutability, it is hard to find a Republican in Congress who will do anything. Here is the formula: Duck the question, deny the evidence, and disparage the scientists. Duck, deny, and disparage. That is some strategy for an issue which so many people take seriously.

As Congress sleepwalks through history, the warnings are painfully clear. Carbon pollution piles up in the atmosphere. Temperatures are rising. Weather worsens at the extremes. The oceans rise, warm, and acidify. These are all measurements. This isn’t theory. The measurements confirm what the science has always told us about dumping so much excess carbon into oceans and atmosphere.

So hurry for the President’s Clean Power Plan. For the first time, we have a national effort to reduce carbon pollution from powerplants, which are the largest source of U.S. carbon emissions. This plan is big. This plan is good. And this plan is urgently needed. I congratulate the President, I congratulate Administrator McCarthy, and I congratulate the good and public-spirited people of the EPA and other Federal agencies who worked hard to listen and make this plan final.

Of course, we will still have the usual complaining from all of the usual suspects. The Senate majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky, opposes any serious conversation about climate change. In fact, he is ready to lead his modern version of massive resistance against the Federal Clean Power Plan. The Republican leader has written to Governors urging defiance of the EPA regulations, calling them “extremely burdensome and costly,” which would be a more credible conclusion had he not reached it months before the regulations were even finalized.

Actually, if we want to get into the actual world here, a report just out from that famous liberal, Socialist bastion Georgia Tech found that the clean power rule could be enacted in a very cost-effective manner and could lower folks’ energy bills in the long term. But let’s not let the facts get in the way when there are fossil fuel interests to be placated.

As the Washington Post reported, folks expect to comply with the Clean Power Plan with relatively little ef-

fort, even in Kentucky. “We can meet it” is what Dr. Leonard Peters, Kentucky’s energy and environment secretary, has to say about the Clean Power Plan. “We can meet it.” In fact, Dr. Peters praised the EPA for working with States like his to build this rule. “The outreach they’ve done, I think, is incredible,” he said. EPA had an “open door policy. You could call them, talk to them, meet with them.” The Kentucky experience was echoed around the country, as EPA listened closely to the concerns of utilities, regulators, experts, and citizens. They have made big adjustments to accommodate the concerns of stakeholders in the States.

When the usual complaining comes from the usual suspects, please ask them: What is your plan? How would you do a better job of addressing the carbon emissions that are polluting our atmosphere and oceans? What is your alternative?

Spoiler alert: You will look far and wide before finding a Republican plan. Don’t look here. Don’t look in the Senate. Republicans in the Senate have exactly zero legislation for addressing carbon pollution in any serious way. None. Zip. Nada. Duck, deny, and disparage is all they have. Don’t look at their Presidential candidates. In recent weeks I have used these weekly climate speeches to look at Republican Presidential candidates’ views on climate change. It is pathetic. There is nothing. What are we up to—87 Republican Presidential candidates? And not one has a climate change plan. OK, I was exaggerating about the 87.

Florida, ground zero for sea level rise, two Republican Presidential candidates, and what do the two of them have? Nothing. Republican mayors from Florida, State universities in Florida, the Army Corps office in Florida—nothing gets through to the candidates. Duck, deny, disparage is all they have.

The Wisconsin Presidential candidate ignores his own home State university, his own State newspapers, and his own State scientists. But Governor Walker can actually top duck, deny, and disparage. His response to climate change? Use your budget to fire the scientists at the State environmental protection agency.

How about our Presidential candidate, the junior Senator from Kentucky? What do we hear from him? He has said that the EPA rules are illegal, and he has predicted that they will result in power shortages—no lights and no heat. But does he have an alternative he would prefer? No. He has nothing, and, like all the other got-nothing Republican Presidential candidates, he is out of step with his own home State.

Kentucky isn’t just easily able to comply with the Clean Power Plan; agencies and officials all across Kentucky are working seriously on climate change.

By the way, here is a look at why compliance is easy in Kentucky: Kentucky’s fuel mix, which this charts, is a wall of coal. As the song says, the Sun shines bright on my old Kentucky home, but good luck finding any solar in there. You will need a magnifying glass to find this tiny little green line at the top that is barely visible that is solar and wind combined. I mean, really? Iowa can get to 30 percent wind. Iowa has two Republican Senators. It is not impossible. In Kentucky, they haven’t even tried.

Kentucky’s cities—Lexington, Louisville, Frankfurt, Bowling Green, and Villa Hills—get it. They have signed the U.S. Mayors Climate Protection Agreement in order to—quoting officials from Lexington—“act locally to reduce the impacts of climate change by lowering (manmade) greenhouse gas emissions.”

The hills of Kentucky are some distance from the shores of Rhode Island and the shores of New Hampshire as well. Living by the sea, I have to worry about climate change and what it is doing to our oceans and coasts. Kentucky is landlocked. So imagine my surprise to read the Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources warning about sea level rise. I will quote them.

With the predicted increases in severity of hurricanes and tropical storms, coupled with potential shoreline losses in Florida and throughout the eastern seaboard, people may begin migrations inland. If and when these events occur, Kentucky may experience human population growth unprecedented to the Commonwealth.

So I say to our candidate from Kentucky, the junior Senator, and our majority leader, the senior Senator, with Kentucky, their home State, projecting that people on the coasts will be hit so hard by climate change that we may have to flee inland to landlocked Kentucky, I hope the Senators from Kentucky will understand my persistence on this issue when their own State thinks that my citizens might have to flee to Kentucky to get away from this threat.

Kentucky is renowned for its horses. So I turned to Horse & Rider magazine and found a great article on “how climate change might affect our horses’ health.” Horse & Rider’s expert was none other than Dr. Craig Carter of the University of Kentucky. He had specific concerns in the article for equine health, but he also offered us this general reminder:

It’s not just horses (and people) at risk: crops are being affected, as are trees, due to beetle infestations. Climate change affects all forms of life.

That is from Dr. Carter of the University of Kentucky.

Kentucky Woodlands Magazine reports that “the world is changing right before our eyes. . . . [O]ur natural systems are changing as a result of a warming climate.” The magazine even

warns that “climate change is happening as you read this article.”

Meanwhile the Senators from Kentucky are not sure why that may be. The junior Senator has said that he is not sure anybody knows exactly why all of this climate change is happening. The majority leader invokes that climate denial classic: I am not a scientist. Well—and I say this thankfully—the scientists are here to help, including Kentucky scientists.

At Kentucky’s universities, the science seems pretty clear about exactly why all of this climate change is happening. Dr. Paul Vincelli is a professor at the University of Kentucky Cooperative Extension Service. He says:

In the scientific community, it is widely accepted that the global climate is changing and that human activities which produce greenhouse gases are a principal cause. Greenhouse gases have a strong capacity to trap heat in the lower atmosphere, even though they are present at trace concentrations.

Elsewhere, Professor Vincelli and his University of Kentucky colleagues write:

Scientific evidence that our global climate is warming is abundant. . . . Practicing scientists consider the evidence of human-induced global warming to be extremely strong.

The University of Kentucky is not the only place. Eastern Kentucky University offers concentrations in environmental sustainability and stewardship, including courses on global climate change. Northern Kentucky University signed the American College and University Presidents’ Climate Commitment, pledging Northern Kentucky University to “an initiative in pursuit of climate neutrality.”

At the University of Louisville, Professor Keith Mountain is the chair of the department of geography and geosciences. He has lectured about “how climate change is a measurable reality and how people have contributed to the trends.”

Despite all of the experts in Kentucky saying that human-caused climate change is real, despite the harms that State and local officials foresee for Kentucky and the rest of the country, and despite the easy steps being taken in Kentucky to comply with the President’s Clean Power Plan, the Senators from Kentucky have no plan—nothing. They are part of the “duck, deny, and disparage” caucus.

And the Presidential candidates? There is almost nothing they won’t make up to try to jam a stick in the wheels of progress—imaginary wars on coal when it is really coal’s war on us, imaginary cost increases that have been completely debunked by actual experience, imaginary reliability failures when the real reliability problem is already happening around us thanks to climate-driven extreme weather. On and on they go. Yet they offer no alter-

native. Republicans simply have no plan other than a shrug.

Why do they have no climate plan? Why do they present nothing by way of limits to carbon pollution? Here is a clue: Look where the money comes from. It comes from fossil fuel billionaires and fossil fuel interests. Look at the beauty pageant hosted this weekend by the Koch brothers in Dana Point, CA, where Republican Presidential candidates went to display their wares to the big donors.

Do you think the Koch brothers want to hear about climate change? Here is another clue: Americans for Prosperity, part of the Koch brothers’ big-money political organization, has openly warned that any client who crosses them on climate change will be “at a severe disadvantage”—subtle as a brick from an outfit threatening to spend part of the \$889 million total that the Koch brothers have budgeted for this election. And yes, \$889 million in one election is big money. “For that kind of money, you could buy yourself a president,” said Mark McKinnon, a Republican and former George W. Bush strategist and a good Texan. “Oh, right,” he continued, “that’s the point.”

Even the Donald called the Republicans out on this one, calling the Koch brothers’ California event a “beg-a-thon,” and saying: “I wish good luck to all of the Republican candidates that traveled to California to beg for money, etc., from the Koch Brothers.”

What a shame, to be a Presidential candidate willing to ignore your home State universities, ignore your home State newspapers, ignore your home State scientists—unless, of course, you are trying to fire them—ignore your own home State farmers, foresters, and fishermen, all so you can prance successfully at pageants for the big-money fossil fuel interests that today control the Republican party. Duck, deny, and disparage is what gets you through the beauty pageant. So duck, deny, and disparage it is.

Eventually, the Republican Party is going to have to come up with a plan on climate change. The American people are demanding it, Independent voters, whom they will need in 2016, are demanding it. Even Republican voters demand it, at least if they are young ones. And it really matters that we get this right. It is the responsibility of the United States of America, as a great nation, to set an example for others to follow and not just sit back and wait for others to act.

Failing to act on climate change would both dim the torch we hold up to the world and give other nations an excuse for delay. Failure, I contend, when the stakes are so high becomes an argument for our enemies against our very model of government. How do we explain the influence of this special interest interfering with what must be

done? There will be no excuse when a reckoning comes to say: I really needed the political support of those fossil fuel billionaires; so, sorry, world.

President Abraham Lincoln, a native Kentuckian, warned us that “the dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present.” Before the present gets too stormy, I urge my colleagues from Kentucky to heed the experts in their home State, heed the local leaders in their home State, and wake up to what needs to be done.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I came to the floor expecting to hear my friend and colleague talk about the bill that we are trying to get on, which is the cyber security bill, but again, I hear him returning to his favorite topic, which is climate change. I know he thinks that is the most important subject that we could possibly discuss on the floor of the Senate.

I will just say—and I certainly don’t purport to be the expert he is—that when you look at the President’s proposed new rules with regard to electricity generation, it looks to me like it is all pain and no gain. The experts, perhaps that he has referred to, said that CO₂ reductions would actually be less than one-half of 1 percent, and, of course, energy prices on low-income individuals, seniors, and people on fixed income would go up—people who have already been suffering through flat wages and slow wage growth for a long time. Of course, in this economy, which grew last year at the rate of 2.2 percent, it would be a further wet blanket on economic growth and job creation.

The Senator and I have worked together closely on a number of issues, and I enjoy his company, his intellect, and his energy, but I would say he is all wrong on this one. It sounds to me like so many of our colleagues sound like Chicken Little: The sky is falling, the sky is falling. Well, I don’t think the facts justify it.

There are more important things we can do today and this week—for example, to pass a cyber security bill.

WORK IN THE SENATE

But first, I want to take a minute to consider what we have done this year under the new leadership. I know some like to focus on things that we haven’t done, but I assure my colleague that we are just getting started, and there is a lot of important work that remains to be done. Last November the American people elected a new majority in the Senate, and I believe they elected us to represent their interests, to flesh out legislation, and to get this Senate back to work. We were elected to run the government and get things done; that is, of course, in a way that is consistent with our principles.

I even heard some people suggest that working with folks on the other

side of the aisle in a bipartisan way is wrong, that we shouldn't do anything with Democrats on the Republican side or that Democrats shouldn't do anything with Republicans. That is a completely warped perspective.

I think the better perspective is that expressed by one of our conservative colleagues whom I asked when I got to the Senate: How is it that you work so productively in an important Senate committee with Senator Teddy Kennedy, the liberal lion of the Senate? This question was asked to one of the most conservative Members of the U.S. Senate. How can a conservative Senator and a liberal Senator work together productively to the best interests of their constituents and the American people? And he said: It is easy. It is the 80-20 rule. Let's find the 80 percent we can agree on, and the 20 percent we can't we will leave for another fight on another day. I believe we have been applying for the benefit of the American people the 80-20 rule, trying to find those things we can agree on, and we have been making substantial progress.

Since January we have delivered real results, proving that our back-to-work model was not just another empty campaign promise. Early this summer we passed the important trade bill, legislation that will help American goods get to global markets. Then we passed the Defense authorization bill, a bill that provides our men and women in uniform the resources and authority they need to keep us safe in an ever more dangerous world. We passed an important education bill, the Every Child Achieves Act, legislation that would actually do what my constituents in Texas want us to do, which is send more of the authority from Washington back into the hands of our parents, teachers, and local communities and out of the Department of Education here in Washington, DC. Just last week we passed the 3-year highway bill. Actually, it is a 6-year highway bill. We were able to come up with funding for the first 3 years and left open for us work to be done to come up with additional funding working with our colleagues in the House. Transportation infrastructure is something that supports our States and local communities and allows them to prepare for the growing infrastructure needs in the future while keeping commerce rolling, public safety protected, and protecting our environment.

Of course, we all know that we are just getting started. We have been here in the new Congress for 7 months. We are now on another important bill requiring every Senator's full and immediate attention. The Cyber Security Information Sharing Act is legislation that is long overdue. If it sounds familiar, it is for a good reason because we actually tried to pass this earlier this summer before it was blocked by our

friends on the other side of the aisle. This legislation would provide for greater information sharing by people who have been subjected to hacks and would address the rampant and growing cyber threats facing our country.

One of the things that is so dangerous now is when a private company or an individual is hacked, they can't actually share that information through a central portal with other people to protect them if they haven't yet been hacked themselves. Of course, there are all sorts of concerns about liability and the like, but we need to address this to help the Nation deter future cyber attacks and to help the public and private sector act more nimbly and effectively when attacks are detected.

As I said, we had a chance to vote on this in June as an amendment to the Defense authorization bill. Unfortunately, this was about the time that some on the other side—I think most notably the next Democratic leader—announced something they called the filibuster summer. These are not exactly encouraging words when it comes to trying to work together to get things done. In spite of the real and frightening threats all around us, our Democratic friends filibustered that cyber security bill in June. We know what happened soon thereafter. The need for real cyber security legislation became even more apparent.

Many of us recall that in June there was an initial disclosure that hackers had accessed sensitive background information used for security clearance purposes at the Office of Personnel Management. The estimate in June was that about 4 million people were affected—their personal information. Then on July 9, after our Democratic friends filibustered the cyber security bill on the Defense authorization bill, there was a second report. This time that report informed us that more than 21 million people's private, secure information had been accessed. This information, illegally accessed, includes passport information, which would show anywhere and everywhere you have traveled; Social Security numbers, which are portals to all sorts of secure financial information; private information, background details, extensive information from previous places of residence. You can imagine. On a form you fill out in order to get a security clearance, you literally have to give your whole life history. That is the kind of sensitive information that was acquired on 21 million people as announced on July 9. Of course, it also provides the names of contact information, close friends, and family members.

While many of these reports indicate that China, one of the worst offenders along with Russia when it comes to malicious cyber attacks—many reports indicate China was responsible. The

Obama administration for some reason has been unwilling to acknowledge that or tell us who attacked and accessed 21 million sensitive pieces of information. Of course, they have done nothing to respond to this growing threat of cyber attacks.

The Office of Personnel Management was not the only government agency affected. In early June, it was also reported that the Internal Revenue Service had similar problems and that data from more than 100,000 taxpayers had been stolen—again, the kind of information that if you were to disclose it about private taxpayers, it would be a felony. It would be a criminal offense. This is sensitive information that has now been stolen for 100,000 taxpayers. This breach included access to past tax returns, sensitive information such as Social Security numbers, addresses, birthdays—all stolen and potentially in the hands of criminals. It is exactly the kind of information that identity thieves want in order to pretend they are somebody they are not in order to steal your money.

Clearly, we don't have time to waste when it comes to cyber security legislation. I would point out that the Democratic leader himself, someone who is quick to dismiss the earlier vote when we tried to do this in the context of the Defense authorization bill in June, has said that he is committed to getting cyber legislation done. Well, I would ask: If not now, when?

This bipartisan legislation that passed the Intelligence Committee in the Senate by a margin of 14 to 1 provides us another opportunity this week. With cyber threats so clearly in evidence all around us, we should act quickly to implement a solution. I would encourage all of our colleagues to try to find that 80-20 solution on this bill.

No one is claiming it is perfect. I already talked to the committee chairmen in the House who say they have some different views, but that is customary around here. Once the Senate passes the bill, it can be reconciled with the differences in the House bill in a conference committee.

Surely we all agree that this type of legislation and the protection it provides is desperately needed. As the vote in July suggests, this is a bill in and of itself that will be the product of a functioning bipartisan Senate. Let's continue our progress for the American people.

I would add, by way of closing, that more than 70 pieces of legislation have passed the Senate since January 1, and 30 of those have been signed into law. More than 160 bills have been reported out of committee. That is what a functioning Senate looks like.

As I said before and I will say again, even our colleagues who are in the minority must enjoy getting to do what they were elected to do, which is to

come here and cast a vote on behalf of their constituents on important issues that the Senate is addressing. I hope we can get this legislation passed this week.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, yesterday Republicans in the Senate put forward legislation to defund Planned Parenthood. Unfortunately, this bill was a clear partisan attack on access to health care for women, and especially women in rural and underserved areas.

One in five American women have relied on Planned Parenthood health centers at some point in their lifetime. Often, Planned Parenthood is the woman's only option for basic, preventive health care, including prenatal care, physicals, and cancer screenings.

For example, take Mary, a 20-year-old student in my home State of Michigan, who went through her campus health center when she found a lump on her breast. They told her it was nothing and not to worry. When she visited Planned Parenthood a year later for an unrelated matter, the clinician expressed concern that the lump was still there. Through Planned Parenthood she got referred to a program for low-income women with breast cancer, and she received the treatment that she needed. Today, Mary is thankfully cancer free. Planned Parenthood provides upward of a half million breast cancer exams every year and can save the lives of women just like Mary across the Nation.

Planned Parenthood also provides about 400,000 potentially lifesaving cervical cancer screenings annually. Katie, another young woman from Michigan, went in for her annual exam at a Michigan Planned Parenthood center. Her exam revealed that she had cervical cancer, and Planned Parenthood helped her weigh options to cover the biopsy and subsequent surgery. Today she, too, is thankfully cancer free.

The doctors and nurses at these facilities provide affordable, potentially lifesaving health care to 2.7 million people per year. Michigan has 21 Planned Parenthood health centers, 11 of which are located in rural or medically underserved areas. These numbers mirror national numbers, with over half of their 700 health care centers located in areas with limited access to medical care. Federal funding for Planned Parenthood supports access to treatment at these health centers for women like Mary and Katie in States all across this country.

Let's be clear. Federal funding for Planned Parenthood or any other organization is not used for abortion. Let me say this again because it is a very important fact. Federal funding for

Planned Parenthood or any other organization is not used for abortion. This has been settled Federal law for decades.

Despite this fact, we have seen the adoption of extreme measures that restrict a woman's fundamental right to make her own decisions about her reproductive health, including in Michigan. A woman should have access to reproductive health services and the freedom to make her own decisions about her health care, and I will fight to protect this right each and every day that I serve here in the U.S. Senate.

Yesterday evening I voted to stop the Senate from moving forward with legislation to defund Planned Parenthood. This bill would have jeopardized access to health care for 2.7 million men and women who rely on Planned Parenthood for their health care needs. While I am pleased that the Senate did not move forward with the bill, it is clear that we have not seen the end of these types of partisan attacks on Planned Parenthood.

I urge my colleagues to move away from efforts to restrict access to health care and, instead, focus on crafting bipartisan agreements to fund our government, provide certainty to American employers and workers, support small businesses, and grow our middle class.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. HATCH pertaining to the introduction of S. 1922, S. 1923, and S. 1929 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HATCH. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLEAN POWER PLAN

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I rise today to join my colleagues in commending President Obama for putting forth his Clean Power Plan.

Theodore Roosevelt said:

Of all the questions which can come before this nation, short of the actual preservation of its existence in a great war, there is none which compares in importance with the great central task of leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.

I think it captured very well the challenge we face with carbon pollution and global warming because we are facing that great central task of leaving this land better for our descendants than it is for us.

We are facing a situation in which there is an accelerating quantity of carbon dioxide pollution in the atmosphere, and it is having a profound impact on, basically, the temperature of our planet. If we simply look at the carbon pollution itself, scientists have said that we are in trouble if it rises over 350 parts per million. Well, here we are with pollution that last year hit 400 parts per million. So we are above the danger zone. We are going deeper into the danger zone—let me put it that way—and that is not where we need to be.

Furthermore, we are accelerating the rate at which we are polluting the planet with carbon dioxide. It was just a few decades ago that the rate of carbon pollution was increasing by about 1 part per million per year, and now it is increasing by something closer to 2 parts per million per year. So where we need to be decreasing the overall pollution, bringing it down, we are increasing it and increasing the rate at which we are polluting, and that is a very bad place for humankind to be on this planet.

There is incontrovertible evidence of how quickly the planet is warming. We have, by scientific record—14 of the warmest 15 years in recorded history have occurred in the last 15 years. So 14 of the 15 warmest years over the centuries of measurement have all occurred in the last 15 years. That is not just one little warm spell on some little piece of land; that is a global temperature.

As carbon pollution is increasing, we see the global temperature increasing, and it is reverberating all across the planet. We see dramatic changes in the Arctic. The rate of warming in the Arctic is roughly four times the rate of warming in more moderate latitudes. So we are seeing an incredible decrease in the ice, huge changes that are coming so quickly, it is very hard for animals to adapt. Of course, people are well aware of the crisis the polar bears are facing, but that is just one particular visible species as an indicator of the challenges that are going on.

We are seeing the feedback mechanisms in the polar zone. We are seeing the open waters where ice is not reflecting the sunlight back up. More water is absorbing more sunlight, and that is creating an accelerated heating impact. We are seeing that as thawing occurs in the permafrost, we have these situations with what are called drunken forests, where the trees that all stood straight are now staggering in one direction or the other as they lean slightly, as the ground underneath them that was frozen is melting. As it

starts to melt, it will start to release methane gas, which is a very potent global warming gas. So that is another feedback mechanism we should all be concerned about.

Let's take my home State of Oregon, and I think one could do this type of checkup, if you will, on any State in the Union. In my home State, we had a very severe series of droughts in the Klamath Basin, which is a major agricultural basin. We have had the three worst ever droughts in a period of 15 years. It corresponds with the period of the warmest years on planet Earth in recorded history. And that has a huge impact on our farming industry. So if you care about farmers, you should care about global warming.

Then we had a big challenge with our forests because as these summers are becoming dryer and as the types of storms we have are producing more lightning strikes, we are having a lot more forest fires. The fire season is getting longer and more devastating. Far more acres are being burned. Over several decades, the fire season has increased by several weeks in length, and the amount of acres burning each summer, on average, is increasing. So if you care about timber, if you care about forests, then you should care about global warming.

Another impact of this changing pattern is that we are getting very little snowfall in the Cascades. Just as Glacier Park is now becoming the park of disappearing glaciers—you have to look very hard to find any glaciers left in Glacier Park—the Cascades also—a different mountain range—are losing their snowpack. In fact, we have virtually no snowpack now feeding the mountain streams that come down. So if you are a fisherman, you are looking at smaller and warmer streams, which is very unhealthy for fish.

That is not all. Right now we have sockeye coming up the Columbia River and getting to the Snake River, and they are dying because the temperature of the river is too warm for them to continue upriver to spawn. Some estimates that I have seen in the last week are that as many as 80 percent of the sockeye now returning are dying in the Columbia River before they make it to the Snake River. So if you care about fishing, you should care about global warming.

Then we look at our coastal shellfish and we discover that we have a significant problem with our oysters. Oregon produces a lot of oyster seed. Those are the baby oysters that get distributed to oyster fishermen. There is a similar process going on in Washington State at another hatchery. The challenge for the hatcheries is that the water that is pumped out of the ocean to produce the baby oysters, get them going, is becoming too acidic. This also is about global warming because the higher rates of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are

being absorbed by the ocean, and that creates carbonic acid. It has been enough that there is a 30-percent increase in the acidity of the ocean, and that is causing a big problem with baby oysters as far as forming shells. So if you care about the seafood industry, you should care about global warming.

When we talk about the issue of global warming, we are not talking about computer models and things that are 50 years into the future; we are talking about real-life effects seen on the ground right now, things that are having a big impact on our seafood, a big impact on our fishing, a big impact on our farming, and a big impact on our forestry. If you care about rural America's resource-driven economies across this country, you should care about global warming.

As a nation, it is incumbent on us to take on this challenge. We are the first generation—as has been said by others—to feel the impact of global warming and the last generation that can do something about it. It is incumbent on us, the Senators in this Chamber, the U.S. Senate, to take on this issue. It is incumbent on the Presidents and the executive teams they put together to take this on in partnership with the rest of the world because this is absolutely a tragedy of the commons.

Very clearly, if the United States takes some action to reduce our carbon dioxide or to reduce our methane production, it will have a modest impact but not enough. Nations across the planet have to act, and they will act more or less as a community because very few nations are going to say they will act alone knowing they won't have a big enough impact unless nations join together. So it is up to our leadership role in the world that we act actively, aggressively, and reach out with other nations to partner.

Earlier this year there was an agreement struck with China. China is going to produce as much renewable energy from electricity by 2030 as all the electricity we currently produce in the United States. I am not just talking about our renewable energy. If you take the U.S. renewable energy, our nuclear energy, our energy produced from gas-fired plants, our electricity produced from coal-fired plants, and you add it all together, that is the amount of electricity China is going to produce with just renewable energy between now and 2030. They are taking on a massive commitment to renewable energy. They wouldn't be doing it if the United States wasn't also responding aggressively. India is starting to become interested in doing their share, seeing that other nations are stepping up.

The United States should never be sitting on its hands and saying: We will wait for everybody else to act—not when there is an issue that threatens the success of the next generation of

humans on this planet and the generation after and the generation after.

I said earlier that not only are we the first generation to feel the impact of global warming, but we are the last generation that can do something about it. What do I mean by that? What I mean is that the further you get into global warming, the further you get into carbon pollution, methane pollution, and more feedback mechanisms, the harder it is to stop. There is momentum that builds behind the warming of the planet. It becomes much harder to take it on. That is why we need to act decisively now.

So the Clean Power Plan the President launched, put forward yesterday, is responding to the moral demand of this generation to take on carbon pollution. It is doing so in a most cost-effective fashion, a fashion that will create jobs in the United States, a fashion that will reduce deaths in the United States.

Let me give an example of the health benefits. It will avoid up to 3,600 premature deaths, lead to 90,000 fewer asthma attacks in children, and prevent 300,000 missed workdays and schooldays. That is incredible. It will save the average family nearly \$85 in their annual energy bill by the year 2030. So that is powerful.

In addition, we are going to create jobs in this fashion. It has the tremendous impact of putting people to work—tens of thousands to work, driving new investments in cleaner, more modern, and efficient renewable energy technologies.

I close by turning back to President Theodore Roosevelt, who said there is no more important mission than “leaving this land even a better land for our descendants than it is for us.”

There are individuals who will come to this floor and they will say: Let's act someday but not now. Let's do it when it will not have an impact on jobs. Well, this will actually create jobs right now. Let's do it when it will cost less. Well, it never costs less if the problem gets bigger. It costs less to invest now. Let's pass it on to the next generation. They will solve it. That is morally irresponsible.

Every State is feeling the direct impact. Every rural community, timber community, fishing community, shellfish community, and farming community is feeling the impact today of our failure to address this yesterday. Our children, our children's children, and our children's children's children are counting on us in the Senate to act aggressively, to support a strong plan to take on carbon pollution—a strong Clean Power Plan. So let's do so.

I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

MR. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY POLICY

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I come from an energy State—Oklahoma. We truly do all of the above. We have coal, oil, gas, wind, solar, hydro, geothermal, and we are just missing nuclear. Quite frankly, we probably would have nuclear if the regulations weren't so incredibly high and so incredibly expensive to do. In my State and in my region, we want diverse, inexpensive, healthy, plentiful, and reliable energy. We don't think that should be such a high goal that it is only limited to Oklahoma. Quite frankly, I think just about every area of the country wants that.

In fact, that used to be a bipartisan goal. It used to be that Democrats also supported "all of the above" energy. At some point, they shifted to the ways of Solyndra and determined if you want to be in that party, you have to commit to a certain environmental orthodoxy. It makes it a tougher conversation to have about real energy policy based around facts.

It is another day. It seems to be another day for the EPA to release massive new regulations. People wonder why their paycheck doesn't go as far nowadays, why food costs more, why products cost more, and why energy costs more. I can tell you why. It is this ever-growing regulation on the basic cost of energy. It changes the cost of everything.

The EPA stated they are not responsible for determining the benefits of climate change, just that it would happen. As they put out their new Clean Power Plan, they said they didn't have to actually list or abide by the cost. They did determine the cost anyway—\$8.4 billion a year to the American consumer; \$8.4 billion on top of the energy regulations that already exist.

They also said they weren't responsible for having to be able to run through the actual effects on climate change, they just said it is happening and so we need to do something. In fact, it has been interesting for me to hear so many of my colleagues in the past 24 hours say: Republicans, put out your plan. We are doing something. You need to put out a plan to show you are doing something as well.

We ran the numbers on it and tried to evaluate it through the EPA models and looked for somewhere where someone who ran the EPA model would note how much change there would be in the environment if this plan is fully implemented. The model came back that it would slow the rise of the sea 0.3 millimeters once this is fully implemented—0.3 millimeters of sea change difference. To give an example, the head of this pen is 0.7 millimeters. So half the head of this pen is what we are going to save in sea level change if we fully implement this plan.

This seems to be about fear—severe weather, imminent danger. If you don't change everything in your life to the way we think you should live your life, the whole Earth is going to fall into chaos and ruin.

We need to have an energy debate on this floor. I completely agree. We even need to have a climate debate on this floor, but it doesn't need to be out of fear. It needs to be about the facts—what really needs to happen.

Let's start with some basic questions about energy policy and about energy future: What will it take to have reliable energy for the United States during a summer heat wave so we don't have rolling blackouts and senior adults suffering from heatstroke during an August afternoon?

What will it take to protect our grid so that doesn't occur? What will it take to have reliable energy for the hardest nights of winter to make sure Americans are protected in those coldest nights so their power doesn't go out because of rolling blackouts? What energy sources are plentiful in the United States and what energy sources leave us vulnerable to international pressures? What energy sources do we have that we should export to gain economic benefits and geopolitical power for the United States? What energy sources are economical so we can attract manufacturing to the United States to create more jobs for America? How can we ensure that the energy we use has the least amount of health risks so we can have a healthy nation and a healthy world? How about this question. What is the best way to keep energy diversity and distribution to protect our economy from rapid price swings or localized acts of terrorism?

That is how you begin to set an energy policy, which is to ask some general questions and then start answering some of those and asking, What is the best way to accomplish that? Instead, our energy policy is being run by environmental policy and fear of what could possibly happen in the future or protecting ourselves from 0.3 millimeters of sea rise.

Over the past 10 years, CO₂ emissions have drastically been reduced. Since 2005, CO₂ emissions from electric generation has been reduced by 364 million metric tons to 2,051 metric tons. The future goal, by the way, in this new Clean Power Plan is to have 788 metric tons of reduction from 2005, but we are already 364 metric tons there because there has already been a pretty dramatic reduction, much of that from a very slow economy—so 424 more metric tons by 2030. That would mean, even with an ever-increasing population, increasing energy needs, and hopefully a recovering economy, we need to cut much more.

Let me try to set this in context. I am going to throw around some numbers for a while, but I think we as a

body can handle it. Let me give some perspective on where things are going on this.

The last time the United States emitted this target amount for CO₂ that has now been laid out as the targeted amount was in 1985, with 237 million people. If you want a little bit of throwback time, that is when Duran Duran, Huey Lewis, and the Commodores had all the big hits. That is when there were no personal computers or cell phones or iPads, cloud computing had never even been discussed, and there weren't all the electric devices we have now. We had 237 million people at the time.

The target is to get to that same amount of CO₂ usage, but we will have 363 million people at the time. That is the estimate from the Census Bureau. So the plan is to have 126 million more people emit less carbon and use less electricity. That sounds like an interesting plan. If you want the real number by percentage, let me break that down for you. In 1985, every 1 million people used 6.86 metric tons of CO₂—6.86 metric for every 1 million people. Now, in 2015, every 1 million people use 6.38 metric tons of CO₂.

That means, in the past 30 years, we have reduced for each 1 million people about half a ton of CO₂ because of energy efficiencies, because of the changes in the way we do energy. We do it much cleaner now than we did it in the 1970s and 1980s. Good for us. We achieved a lot in 1985—a lot of changes—but we have half a ton less CO₂ per 1 million people.

What the administration is proposing in their plan is that for every 1 million people in the United States in 2030, we would use 4.48 million tons of CO₂. That means, in the last 30 years, with the energy efficiency movement, with everything that has been done, with the remarkable shift in renewables, we have gained half a ton. The administration wants us now to get 2 tons of additional amount in the next 15 years.

Do you understand why a lot of people say this is just not rational? You can't get to an acceleration that fast with that big a goal. Here is what happens, though. I look at the facts and the requirements and immediately I am called a Neanderthal who just wants dirty air and dirty water. Actually, I have children, too, and I like clean air and clean water, but facts are very stubborn things.

A government mandate doesn't create reality. Remember Jimmy Carter in 1979? He declared his policies would create an energy path so that by the year 2000, 20 percent of America's energy would be produced by solar power—20 percent by the year 2000. How are we doing with that? Less than 2 percent of our energy in 2015 is produced by solar power.

Mandates don't create realities. If we drastically change all our electric generation to wind, solar, nuclear, and

some natural gas, we will hit our annual number, but the amount of decrease per year will amount to approximately what China puts out in 1 month. You see, they are talking about reducing per year about 450-or-some metric tons of CO₂ that America would put out. China emits 800 metric tons per month. This is why so many people say this is a very expensive goal for America that will have no effect on the global reality.

Just to add a dose of cold water to the reality, it usually takes more than 10 years for a powerplant to even get a permit and start the construction because the Department of Energy, FERC, and EPA restrictions are so high. So this plan that in the next 15 years we are going to have all this rollout, we can't even get through the permitting time in that time period.

I haven't even touched on the legal issues of the new mandates of the administration. They haven't been in front of the American people or in front of the Congress. The existing law—the Clean Air Act—does not allow EPA to add another layer of regulations on top of the existing regulations. That is clear in the law. You cannot do that. Even the former Sierra Club general counsel, David Bookbinder, found this new proposal is based on what he called a “legally dubious ground.”

As a nation, we don't need more pie-in-the-sky energy ideas. We need real solutions and a right direction that will benefit the United States and the world. We lead the world in power and ideas. We should set high goals. But our goals should help us as a nation, not hurt us. Every American pays more at the pump right now because of the increasing regulations in the ethanol mandates. Every American is paying more for gasoline than we should. Every American is paying more for electricity than we should because of the cost of all these mandates. People ask me all the time why their dollars don't go as far; the regulations are the reason.

Many people want to talk about our energy future—great, so do I. But I also want to talk about our energy present. The goal of a quarter of America's electricity produced by renewables is a good goal. It is a huge jump. We are just at around 5 percent right now in renewables. But that will still leave us—even if that goal is accomplished—with 75 percent of our energy coming from coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear. That is base power. It is not effective at night or on hot still days in the summer when the wind doesn't blow. It is base power.

Solar is more efficient than ever. Let's keep going. It is a good thing. I am glad we are able to harness some of that. It takes a massive amount of acreage. There is a new solar facility that just came into Oklahoma. Great,

we are glad to have it. It has 15 acres of solar—15 acres of panels. It powers two neighborhoods—two neighborhoods—and it takes 15 acres to get that accomplished.

Windmills are much more efficient right now than they have ever been. In fact, they are efficient enough that we should probably stop subsidizing them. They are not a startup anymore. We started subsidizing utility-grade windmills more than 20 years ago, saying someday this thing is going to be efficient enough that it is going to work. I think we are already there. In fact, there are more than 48,000 utility-scale wind turbines in the country right now—48,000 windmills in the country right now. To give some perspective, there are 36,000 McDonald's in the world. We have 48,000 windmills. There are 36,000 McDonald's in the world. I don't exactly think the windmill thing is a startup anymore. I think maybe that is fairly well established. So maybe the need for the subsidy is not there.

Geothermal is a great energy source. We have yet to tap the full potential for heating and cooling our homes and businesses. But we still need natural gas, oil, coal, and nuclear to provide power for the foreseeable future. Even the Obama administration lays out over the next 30 years what they anticipate energy use will be, and they still anticipate we are going to need gas, coal, oil, basic base power.

So let's do it the cleanest way we can, the most efficient way we can so the consumer is not punished for using energy. We should keep innovating for the future, but we should make rational choices on energy.

Let me give an example of an irrational choice. Can I do that? Here is an example of an irrational energy choice: the Keystone XL Pipeline. Now, I know everyone is going to say we are going to talk about Keystone again. This is day 2,510 of a permit request to build a pipeline. Today is day 2,510 of a permit request sitting on the President's desk for a pipeline. Let me give an example.

All of these black lines that we see here are crude oil pipelines in the United States currently there. This is how many thousands of miles? More than 60,000 miles in the United States of crude oil pipeline—60,000. It is another pipeline. Why does it take 2,510 days to be able to make a decision on this? Oh, it is an international pipeline. That is right. Well, let me add something to it. We have 19 international pipelines currently running—19 of them. This would be No. 20. This is not something new and radical. We are already buying a significant amount of Canadian oil. That oil is coming from right up here. Look at all of these pipelines already coming from the same spot. Look at that, they cross the border, and it has been safe and reliable. This has not been a big challenge for us.

That oil is not just being blocked from Canada. Many people think that if we don't put in a pipeline, it won't come. Actually, it is coming by rail already. It is already moving into the country. This is just cleaner and more efficient to be able to move it that way. Canada is discussing taking a pipeline and bringing it all the way over here, dropping it off and bringing it to the coast, and bringing it by ship over to the U.S. gulf coast.

Does someone think that is more efficient than bringing a pipeline in? Now, it is not more efficient by rail. It is not more efficient by this way. If we are going to bring it in and Canada is going to sell it, why don't we have an international pipeline—that No. 20, right there—and be able to bring it in?

Now, I have heard multiple people say it is because of the aquifer in Nebraska. Let me try to discuss this because I have heard this over and over: We can't run pipelines because of the aquifer in Nebraska.

Here is the aquifer that is being discussed all in the purple here. Every line that we see is an existing pipeline running through that aquifer. This tiny blue line is the proposed Keystone that is to go right through there as well.

They make these comments: We can't run it through the aquifer because, oh, my gosh, we can't run a pipeline there. That is how many we already have in that spot. This is not radical. This is not different.

In fact, let me give one more image. This is the number of pipelines that we have in America right now of all types. This is both natural gas and crude and all kinds of petroleum products that move through the United States all the time—every single one of those lines. This is irrational energy policy that is knee-jerk that is happening. To say that we can't add one more pipeline because somehow that would go over the top ignores the reality of what we already have in the United States.

Moving energy by pipeline is clean and efficient. It is also a rational way to do it. We have to move from fear-based energy policy to fact-based energy policy—to look not only at our energy future but what may happen in the decades to come. I hope my car one day runs on a pinwheel on the hood ornament. That would be great. But that doesn't happen right now. My car still runs on gas. So does everyone else's here. And for every single person here that gets on an airplane every week, it doesn't run on water. It still runs on energy that we pull out of the ground.

So for the foreseeable future we need to deal with the facts. Stop hurting consumers for some proposed future hope of what may happen. Let's do it clean. Let's do it innovative. But let's not hurt consumers in the process.

People want to know where their money has gone. It is being spent away on regulations. Let's get to work on an energy plan.

I am glad to have this conversation, but this should not be a conversation in the hallways of the EPA. This should be a conversation in this room to determine where energy policies go. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 10 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about seizing the opportunity to drive real economic growth right now. But first, I wish to give a little context by referencing our great Nation's desperate fiscal condition.

Decades of overspending by both parties and mismanagement by both parties have led to a crushing \$18 trillion of Federal debt. Even more sobering to me is the upcoming over \$100 trillion of future unfunded liabilities coming at us like a freight train. We have a fiscal crisis in this country. Everybody can see it. People back home can feel it. As an outsider, my role is to bring a new sense of urgency to Washington to help solve this fiscal crisis.

While I am encouraged by the work my colleagues on the Budget Committee completed this year—we completed a balanced budget for the first time since 2001—it was merely a good first step in the right direction. But we have a lot of heavy lifting to do. We must act right now to get our fiscal house in order before it is too late.

Yes, we must cut unnecessary spending. Yes, there are redundant agencies and programs that should be eliminated. And yes, we do need to have a national dialogue on how we keep the commitments that were made to our seniors, while saving those important programs for future generations. However, discretionary spending cuts and long-term reforms to mandatory programs alone will not solve this problem. The numbers just simply don't add up to solve this crisis. Economic growth is really the only answer.

Economic growth supports good-paying jobs across the entire country, and economic growth eventually means more revenue for the Federal Government without raising taxes. If we are ever going to get out of the hole that Washington has dug for our country, we are going to have to grow our way out of it economically. One of the biggest opportunities to infuse energy and investment into our economy right now is before us as I speak, just waiting for us to act on it.

There are approximately \$2.1 trillion in corporate profits of American multinational companies sitting abroad trapped by our archaic tax laws. Imagine if we could lure just a portion of that back in terms of capital investment in our economy. The multiplier

effect alone would be incredible as it rippled its way throughout our domestic economy.

In recent weeks we have heard a lot of talk about how we in Washington can get those overseas earnings repatriated back into the United States economy. For me, the solution is quite simple. We simply eliminate the barrier to repatriation by completely eliminating the tax on repatriation.

My approach isn't just based on my business career. It is not just based on my desire to give our economy a much-needed shot in the arm. Completely eliminating this tax on repatriation is an absolute necessity for global competitiveness and to create a level playing field with the rest of the world.

I rarely compare other countries to the United States for simple reasons. No. 1, we have an 18 trillion economy. No. 2, we are the innovator in the world. No. 3, we have the rule of law. No. 4, we have really a very dynamic and diverse economy. Very few countries compare. But this is one time where a comparison is warranted because it is about how we compete for economic development and jobs with the rest of the world.

A company headquartered in the United States not only has to pay taxes in every single country in which it does business, but when it elects to bring back the remaining profits from abroad, that corporation is forced to pay an additional tax—a repatriation tax. This doesn't happen if the corporation is based in Canada, France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Australia, Japan or, indeed, the remainder of the 39 OECD countries. In fact, there is only one country on the list of 39 OECD countries that has a repatriation tax—the United States. The United Kingdom actually eliminated their repatriation tax in 2009, and over the last decade they have reduced their corporate tax rate from 28 percent to 18 percent.

We continue to see companies leave the United States because they can go pretty much anywhere else and benefit from much lower tax rates than here in America. We have seen a rash of those inversions over the last few years, and it is not going to stop until we deal with the underlying problem; that is, our corporate tax rate is not competitive with the rest of the world. The repatriation tax is a derivative of that primary causal problem.

What I am talking about today is simply the elimination of the repatriation tax. But sooner or later, we have to deal with the fact that our corporate tax rate is simply not competitive. The question simply before us is, Do we want multinational companies—in many cases iconic American brands—to continue to call the United States home or not?

As a former CEO of a large branded company that manufactured in dozens of countries and sold in dozens more, I

have firsthand experience, and I can tell you that, based on that experience, we are losing our competitive advantage with the rest of the world. In fact, I see us now at a growing disadvantage for our American companies to compete with companies in other countries.

The hostile regulatory environment the current administration has created is killing American jobs, and our outdated tax system is forcing them to expand abroad. Executive orders and regulatory mandates have created a punitive atmosphere in which to try to grow businesses or start businesses here in the United States. Unfortunately, in typical Washington fashion, the dialogue on repatriation is focused on how to get a short-term solution—a short-term Federal tax increase—instead of using repatriation as a tool to grow the economy and make us more competitive. In my estimation, this kind of thinking is dead wrong and another example of how we got in this mess in the first place.

We should not be looking at repatriation as a way to pay for the highway trust fund or any other short-term solution to Washington's spending problems, for that matter. That kind of shortsighted thinking will only make our fiscal situation worse. It will only cause more American companies to look for a new home.

Repatriation is a big idea with a big potential impact for our economy. If we encourage repatriation the right way, it means sustained growth for our economy. It means more American jobs and innovation. Ultimately, it means an organic increase in Federal tax revenue based on pure economic growth. This growth can allow us to deal with our economic and fiscal priorities and finally develop a long-term plan to begin to pay down our overburdened debt.

Before I conclude, I have one final thought. I hope this thought will compel my colleagues to act with a sense of urgency on this issue and others that impact our economy. We actually have fewer people working than at any time in the last 30 years. When I go back home, the number one question that is put before me is: How can I get my hours up? How can I get more work?

People back home know we have a crisis. It is not just bureaucrats in Washington looking for a few more tax dollars so we can make government bigger. This is about putting people back to work—helping us compete against the growing economies of China, India, Russia, and other rivals in today's world.

The approval rating of Congress today is somewhere in the mid-single digits, and that is only because our mothers voted. I believe it is because this town's priorities are not aligned with those of the people who sent us here for their bidding. Folks back

home know that shortsighted, short-term solutions to the big problems are how Washington got in this mess in the first place.

Today we can continue to argue about temporary ways to pay for trust funds that are going bankrupt every few weeks, or we can simply finally get serious about solving this systemic problem before we have to hand it to our children and our children's children. I know the American people expect the latter. In fact, they are demanding it. That can happen, but we must make real tax reforms right now that will set us on a new course for economic growth and opportunity for generations to come. The time for serious debate about repatriation has come.

We have an opportunity. I implore my colleagues in the Senate to debate this earnestly, and let's move on this right now and put people back to work and make America more competitive for our children and our children's children.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

ARENA ACT

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, yesterday President Obama and his Environmental Protection Agency announced their final clean power grab, continuing the economic assault on energy-producing States like West Virginia.

Yesterday, Alpha Natural Resources, one of the Nation's largest coal producers, filed for bankruptcy. As of the end of 2014, Alpha had 4,870 employees at 33 active mines and 13 prep plants in West Virginia. Alpha follows Patriot Coal, Jim Walter Resources, and James River mining—all of which have filed bankruptcy since 2014.

According to the Mine Safety and Health Administration, coal mining employment has dropped from 143,437 in 2011 to 98,310 in the first quarter of this year. That represents a 31-percent drop over the last 4 years.

Earlier this year when Murray Energy announced hundreds of layoffs in northern West Virginia, the Wheeling Intelligencer newspaper reported that the impact would mean almost \$62 million in annual income lost wages for Ohio Valley residents. Other communities have also been hard hit. Nicholas County—a small county in my State—was forced to lay off sheriff's deputies because they could no longer pay their county commitments because of a decline in coal severance revenues.

Now, 17 coal units in West Virginia have retired due, at least in part, to EPA policies. The electricity produced by these units is enough to power 2.7 million homes. Put another way, the units that have already closed in West Virginia would generate enough electricity to power the entire State of Hawaii.

These are not the same old talking points, as the administrator of the EPA and the President said. These are not stale. This is not motivated by special interests. These are real Americans, real jobs, real families, and real communities that have been negatively impacted by this administration's overreaching regulations. These are people like Tammy Rowan of Coalton, WV, who wrote me a letter:

My whole family has concerns with the regulations that seem to be out of control. EPA, government officials, and the president are putting families out of work.

Or Patrick Sparks in Warriormine, WV, who said:

I know the EPA has been trying to force strict regulations on coal. It's hurting a lot of people, not just here in West Virginia, but a lot of businesses are suffering from it.

And Theresa Simmons of Tridelfia, WV, whose family has worked in coal mines for generations, wrote:

My husband was able to provide for our family with just his income. We were able to donate money to local charities and help needy families around the holidays. Now that is going to be my family, looking for donations.

Put simply, yesterday's announcement will make an already bleak situation in our State much worse. Working families across the Nation woke up to the sad news that their jobs just don't count. Much has been said about the open process that led to this final rule. In fact, West Virginia, which is one of the States most deeply affected by this regulation, was not even visited by the EPA after I and others extended many invitations. Instead, they went to cities like Chicago, Boston, and San Francisco. Talk about special interests. Talk about being bold.

The administration's final clean power grab will force States away from affordable, reliable energy toward expensive, intermittent power sources, many of which are heavily subsidized by the taxpayer. It proposes benchmarks that are more stringent and less attainable.

In West Virginia, our emissions rate under the proposed rule was to drop 20 percent. On Monday, the final rule requires our rate to drop by 37 percent—a drop that is almost twice as severe. There is no way for West Virginia to comply with this rule without significant cuts to our coal production, coal jobs, and coal use.

According to the EPA's own calculations, the final rule is worse for coal than the proposed rule. Coal's share of electric generation will go to 27 percent by 2030 under this rule—as compared to 39 percent, which we currently have or did have in 2014.

If this misguided final rule is ever implemented, pain will be felt by all Americans with fewer job opportunities, higher power bills, and less reliable electricity. Studies of the proposed rule projected that the Clean

Power Plan will increase electricity prices in a State like mine 12 to 16 percent.

What does this mean for American jobs? A recent study by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association found that a 10 percent increase in electricity prices can mean as much as 1.2 million jobs lost. Roughly one-half million of these job losses will be in rural communities like those in West Virginia. Put simply, affordable energy matters. It especially matters to those who the administration incorrectly says will benefit the most from this rule, which is the low and moderate income.

More than half of West Virginia's households take home an average of less than \$1,900 per month and already spend 17 percent of their income on energy. These families are especially vulnerable to the administration's clean power grab. While States are given additional time to comply under the final rule, it does not change the fact that the EPA is picking winners and losers in the energy economy. The losers will be the American families who rely on affordable and reliable energy. We can and we should innovate for the future but not with a sledgehammer bearing down on us. Thankfully there are several legislative options that Congress can pursue to challenge this rule.

Tomorrow the EPW Committee will be taking up my legislation—the ARENA Act. Let me explain that briefly. This bipartisan legislation would empower States to protect families and businesses from electric rate increases, reduced electric reliability, and other harmful effects. It will force the EPA to reconsider this misguided rule-making.

The ARENA Act holds the EPA accountable by requiring the agency to issue State-specific model plans demonstrating how each State will meet the required reductions. It gives States the ability to opt out if the plan hinders economic growth.

For existing powerplants, the ARENA Act delays implementation of the Clean Power Plan until the courts determine the legality of the rule. Recently, the Supreme Court ruled that EPA had unlawfully failed to consider costs when formulating its MATS regulation. Because the rule went forward while it was still being litigated, millions of dollars were spent to comply with a rule that was ultimately deemed illegal. States should not be forced to proceed until the legality of the rule has been determined. I hope that many States will follow Leader McConnell's suggestion and delay implementation of this rule until the legal process is completed.

Mr. President of the United States, your clean power grab will devastate already hurting communities in my State. It will cause economic pain for working families across the country. It

will forever harm our energy landscape.

The proposed rule was bad. The final rule announced yesterday is even worse, doubling down on the destruction of our economy. There is no question that we must take steps to protect our environment, but it simply cannot be at the expense of our families.

We can do better. Let Congress, the elected representatives, make these decisions. That is the way it should be. I ask my colleagues to join me by supporting the ARENA Act and sending these overreaching EPA regulations back to the drawing board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, as the Senate prepares for the month of August in our home States, I want to discuss tonight what I believe to be an urgent issue: The West is on fire. There is a really serious prospect that my part of the country is going to get hit by what I call the terrible trifecta—drought, high temperatures, and enormous fuel load on the forest floor. When you couple that with a lightning strike—which is not exactly a rarity in my part of the world—all of a sudden you can have on your hands an inferno. The fires are getting bigger, they are lasting longer, and they are doing more damage.

Senators here on both sides of the aisle—Democrats and Republicans—have come to realize that our system for fighting fire is a broken, dysfunctional mess. What happens is, historically, prevention gets short shrift. The agencies can't do enough thinning; they can't do enough of the preventive work to reduce the fuel load on the forest floor. Then you have one of those lightning strikes, and all of a sudden there is a huge fire because the fuel buildup is so great on the forest floor.

The agencies then run out of money putting these fires out because they are getting bigger, and they are lasting longer. The problem just keeps getting worse because the agencies then have to rob the prevention fund in order to fight these big fires. In other words, the agencies borrow from the prevention fund, and the problem gets worse because by shorting the prevention fund it creates the prospect of still more big fires in the future.

With the West burning, the Western Governor's Association—a bipartisan group—put out a new update of how big the recent fires are. So far in 2015, nearly 6 million acres have burned. That is an area bigger than the State of New Jersey, scorched in massive fires.

In my home State, a wildfire in Douglas County in southern Oregon has spread to over 16,000 acres, with 1,400 crew members battling a blaze that is threatening more than 300 homes. According to recent reports, 20,000 acres

were scorched by one single fire in northern California in a matter of only 5 hours. That is 20,000 acres—nearly the size of the entire city of Bend, OR—that burned in the time span of an extra-inning baseball game.

With the Forest Service budget effectively flatlined and the higher cost of fighting fires producing this robbing of other programs that I have described—the fire borrowing—what you have is a vicious, self-defeating circle of fire-fighting and shoddy budgeting, which, in effect, will cause an even bigger crisis in the future because you shorted the prevention fund. In 10 years, if this isn't fixed—what is known as fire borrowing—the Forest Service says it will be spending two-thirds of its entire budget on suppressing wildfires, and my constituents say they will be calling the Forest Service the Fire Service because that is essentially what they will be.

This is particularly serious right now, which is why I came to the floor tonight to try to drive home the urgency of this issue, because it is so dry in the West. This year Governor Brown of my home State has declared drought emergencies in 23 of our 36 counties. All 36 counties are experiencing severe drought, according to the National Drought Center. It is a very dangerous mix of factors, what I have come to call the terrible trifecta of drought and temperatures and fuel load. They all came together and turned the West into a virtual tinderbox.

To try to fix this, my colleague Senator CRAPO and I have worked together for quite some time to in effect say that what we ought to do is break this dysfunctional system of fighting fires and go with a different approach. What we would say is that the biggest fires—the 1 or 2 percent of the megafires—we ought to fight them from the disaster fund because they really are disasters. Use the prevention fund for what it is intended, which is prevention, so we can keep from having those megafires.

The good news is that the Congressional Budget Office—my colleague is new here, but he already knows that the Congressional Budget Office is our official scorekeeper—says that there really aren't added costs for this approach because while you would spend a bit more money trying to put out those megafires, you would save some money by not cheating the prevention fund and not having so many fires in the first place.

In effect, it is a lot smarter for the agencies to focus on keeping our forests healthy and clear of the fuels that go up in flames when lightning strikes. So we do the preventive work and we no longer are shorting it by all the fire borrowing which I have just described.

Senator CRAPO and I have been able to get well over 250 organizations to go on record in support of our idea. These are groups associated with forestry pol-

icy, environmental folks, industry personnel, people across the political spectrum. More than 250 groups have said they are in support of this. The Under Secretary of Agriculture, Robert Bonnie, noted in a recent letter that the proposal Senator CRAPO and I have offered is one that both fixes fire borrowing and provides the resources needed to prevent these catastrophic wildfires down the line. Fifteen of our colleagues here in the Senate have supported the bill, and 123 Members in the other body have also supported the bill. The administration is on board. The agencies that battle these fires are waiting for the Congress to act.

Each day, the reality in the West is that immensely brave men and women are on the ground fighting fires, and they risk their lives to keep our homes and communities protected. It is long, long, long past time for the Congress to step up, fix this budgetary mess, and guarantee that the funding is there to fight fires and to prevent them in the first place.

I filed our bipartisan bill as an amendment to the Transportation bill. I filed a wildfire amendment to the budget resolution. I filed the Senate Interior appropriations wildfire language as an amendment to the Transportation bill. And I believe this is the fourth time in recent months I have been on the floor talking about this issue, and that is in addition to talking about it in the budget markup and in several hearings in the natural resources committee that I had the honor to chair in the last Congress.

I see my new colleague in the chair, and he has been doing good work on this fire borrowing issue. And even with everything else we are dealing with here in the Senate, I think it is very important that we focus on an actual way to leave with an agreement on how this is actually going to get fixed and get done. In that regard, I have been talking in the last day or so with colleagues in both political parties, and I think there is now this sense of urgency because we see it not only on TV, but every time we are home, we go to fire briefings. As the Presiding Officer knows, even fire briefings have changed very dramatically. We used to have a fire briefing in July, and now we have fire briefings—as I did—in the winter because the Forest Service and the folks at BLM often say they are not even sure when one fire season has ended and the next one has begun because these challenges have gotten so great.

Senator CRAPO and I, with this bill that has gotten more than 250 organizations sponsoring it, have talked in just the last few hours. We want to work with all of our colleagues to make sure that we get some sense because our constituents are going to ask about this. They are going to ask about this issue this summer. They are going

to ask: How is the Senate actually going to get this done? How is the Senate going to fix this broken, dysfunctional system of fighting fires? In effect, year after year—and I gather there will be some new analyses coming out—the entire budget for the Forest Service is getting eaten up in fighting these counterproductive fires.

Senator CRAPO and I have a proposal that received a favorable score from the Budget Committee. I know my colleague in the chair has also done very good work on these issues, as have a number of Senators on both sides of the aisle. Given the good will I have seen among Senators here in the last couple of days as we talked about what this really means, given the urgency and because we are going home and seeing constituents in August, I am convinced we can have an agreement on how this is going to get fixed. That is why I wanted to come to the floor tonight, because there are a lot of topics that are still going to be tackled in the next few days before the Senate wraps up. I want it understood that our part of the country is on fire. It is on fire. We have communities burning up, and business as usual is unacceptable.

Senator CRAPO and I have offered a proposal that we think will turn this around, and other colleagues have very good ideas as well. What is nonnegotiable is just saying: Oh, you know, maybe we will take care of it at the end of the year or on standard congressional time. That is not good enough for the West, which is burning up.

I invite my colleagues here, as we move forward in the last few days before the August recess, to join me, Senator CRAPO, and colleagues in both political parties to make sure that people see—as we go home to talk to the people we have the honor to represent—that this is now going to actually get fixed and that the Senate is coming together to make sure it actually gets done. We are going to turn this around so that we can do more to prevent fires in the rural west, No. 1, and No. 2, fight them in a more cost-effective way.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO SCOTT WATTS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the distinguished career of Scott “Scotty” Watts, who served as the president of the Nevada Alliance for Retired Americans, NARA, from 2001 until his retirement in 2014.

Building on the work of its predecessor, the Nevada National Council of Senior Citizens, NARA has been at the forefront of advocating for the interests of retired Nevadans for more than a decade. Scotty Watts, who was the founding president of NARA, led the organization and played a critical role in its progress and success. Under his steadfast leadership, Scotty helped NARA build a powerful grassroots network to support the economic and health programs that are important to retirees throughout Nevada. Today, NARA has grown to include more than 19,330 members and 28 chapters, making it the largest progressive senior citizen organization in the Silver State.

Prior to becoming the president of NARA, Scotty was a leading advocate for retirees and seniors in the Silver State. He served two terms as the president of the Nevada National Council of Senior Citizens. Through his leadership positions in these organizations, he led the effort in our State to protect and strengthen the benefits seniors have earned under Social Security and Medicare and has been a fierce advocate for the Affordable Care Act. I am pleased that this month NARA will honor Scotty during the organization’s State convention for his career in dedicated service and advocacy.

I have had the pleasure of meeting with Scotty, and I can say without reservation that Nevada’s retirees were fortunate to have him in their corner, fighting on their behalf. I commend Scotty for his service to the Silver State, and I wish him the best in his retirement and future endeavors.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DOMINICANS OF HAITIAN DESCENT

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I have traveled to the Dominican Republic and Haiti and am familiar with the history of racial tensions between the population of Haitian migrants and Dominicans of Haitian descent and other citizens of the Dominican Republic. These problems are by no means unique to these two neighboring countries, nor are there easy solutions. In addition to race there is competition for land, social services, and jobs. But while this situation should not be oversimplified, the way the Dominican Government is dealing with it is unfortunate.

In a September 2013 Dominican Constitutional Court ruling the citizenship of more than 200,000 people—mostly Dominicans of Haitian descent—was summarily revoked, and they lost ac-

cess to education, health care, and other essential social services, as well as their basic rights. Since that ruling the Dominican Government has threatened to enforce strict and prejudicial immigration laws. Many affected residents live under constant fear of deportation, and according to the United Nations nearly 20,000 have already fled the country in the past month, putting the island on the brink of a mass refugee crisis.

By threatening to deport Haitian migrants and Dominicans of Haitian descent, the Dominican Government is on a path that not only disregards fundamental principles of international humanitarian law, but may provoke a reaction that makes the situation worse. Even as we are already seeing the consequences of the threat of mass deportations, following through with such a policy would likely greatly exacerbate tensions in the Dominican Republic and create a regional diplomatic and humanitarian crisis. Haiti, impoverished and still recovering from the devastating 2010 earthquake, does not have the capacity to handle the sudden arrival of thousands of homeless, jobless, Dominicans.

The United States, with 319 million people spread across 50 States is among the most ethnically and racially diverse countries in the world. The challenges this has posed for our own democracy over the past two centuries are well known. We have not always handled these challenges as we should have. I hope the Dominican Government will learn from our experience and recognize the need to reverse course and reaffirm the legal status and rights of these people.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the nomination of David Malcolm Robinson to be Assistant Secretary for Conflict and Stabilization Operations and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization.

I will object because the State Department has engaged in unreasonable delay in responding to Judiciary Committee investigations and inquiries. Since June of 2013, the Judiciary Committee has requested a number of documents related to an investigation into Ms. Huma Abedin regarding her possible conflicts of interest created by her simultaneous employment with the State Department and private sector entities. In addition, the Judiciary Committee has inquired about former Secretary Clinton and Ms. Abedin’s questionable email practices that may be in violation of Department policy and Federal law. Furthermore, the committee’s inquiry also centers on the possible interference of Freedom of

Information Act requests by State Department personnel, including Secretary Clinton's former Chief of Staff, Ms. Cheryl Mills. To this day, the committee has not received a complete response. Moreover, the committee recently acquired information that shows the State Department has been in possession of material that would answer some of the Committee's inquiries. Yet, the requested material is still not forthcoming.

This willful lack of cooperation is made more evident by the example of repeated failures by State Department personnel to respond to emails or respond days or weeks later. And in yet another recent committee investigation beginning in June 2015, the State Department has still failed to provide any communication, via email or a phone call, to acknowledge or confirm that they have received a committee letter, despite three emails sent by committee staff.

Not only has the Judiciary Committee experienced unacceptable delays in receiving information, other entities inside and outside of the government have experienced delays as well. The Associated Press sued the State Department over the failure to satisfy repeated document requests under the Freedom of Information Act related to these same issues. One of these requests dates back 5 years ago. Judge Richard Leon of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, the judge responsible for this case, chided the State Department for its failure to produce documents on time, "Now, any person should be able to review that in one day—one day. Even the least ambitious bureaucrat could do this."

In total, these actions illustrate a pattern of conduct that clearly demonstrates a lack of cooperation and bad faith in its interaction with Congress. This is unacceptable and cannot continue.

In order to maintain the proper balance of separation of powers and in order for Congress to exercise its proper oversight function, government agencies must respond to inquiries. The State Department apparently believes that it can simply ignore Congress. It is important to note that my objection is not intended to question Mr. Robinson's credentials in any way. However, withholding consent to suspend Senate rules on nominations is one tool a Senator has to incentivize executive agencies to respond to congressional inquiries. Frankly, this should not be necessary, and the nominee is an innocent victim of the State Department's contemptuous failures to respond to congressional inquiries. I urge the State Department to change its ways and if they choose not to, I will be forced to escalate the scope of my intent to object to include unanimous consent requests relating to Foreign Service officer candidates as well.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL RAYMOND T. ODIERNO, 38TH CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my cochair of the Army Caucus, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, I rise today to honor GEN Raymond T. Odierno, the 38th Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, and one of our Nation's finest military officers. General Odierno will retire from Active military duty in August 2015, bringing to a close 39 years of distinguished service to our great Nation.

In 1976, General Odierno was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Field Artillery upon graduation from the United States Military Academy at West Point. He commanded units at every echelon, from platoon to theater, with duty in Germany, Albania, Kuwait, Iraq, and the United States. General Odierno deployed in support of Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm; commanded the 4th Infantry Division during Operation Iraqi Freedom from April 2003 to March 2004; served as the commanding general, Multi-National Corps—Iraq, III Corps, from 2006 to 2008; and later served as the commanding general, Multi-National Force—Iraq and subsequently United States Forces—Iraq, from 2008 until 2010. General Odierno went on to serve as the commander of U.S. Joint Forces Command from 2010 to 2011, where he led the development and integration of joint capabilities in support of combatant command requirements around the world.

On September 7, 2011, General Odierno became the 38th Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army. Since assuming this position, General Odierno's leadership and commitment to his soldiers, to the Army, and to the Nation have significantly contributed to the U.S. Army being the most highly trained and professional land force in the world.

General Odierno developed and implemented the U.S. Army's vision establishing a path for the Army of 2025 and beyond. He envisioned how future Army forces would prevent conflict, shape security environments, and win wars. He ensured that we possessed the capability and capacity to provide globally responsive and regionally aligned forces, as well as expeditionary and decisive land-power across the range of military operations in defense of our Nation at home and abroad, both today and against emerging threats.

But the one thing that remained constant was General Odierno's tireless commitment to soldiers and their families. He built leaders capable of navigating the complex challenges of the world we face today and cared for our families by focusing on keeping the total Army—soldiers, families, and civilians alike—healthy, ready, resilient, and total Army strong. General Odierno is an exceptional leader, an American patriot committed to our

Army and Nation, but most importantly, General Odierno is a great man of character. It is for GEN Ray Odierno, a soldier, leader, and selfless servant, whom we with profound admiration and deep respect pay tribute to for all he has done for the U.S. Army and our Nation. We thank General Odierno, his wife Linda, and his three children, Tony, Katie, and Mike, for their dedication and sacrifice, and we wish them well in the years to come.

RECOGNIZING LARRY AND MARGO BEAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, on September 1, 2015, the Boys & Girls Club of Central Wyoming will be holding their Annual Awards and Recognition Breakfast where they will honor Casper philanthropists, Larry and Margo Bean.

The Boys & Girls Club of Central Wyoming has been making positive differences in the lives of our children since 1978. The club provides a supportive environment and an extensive array of programs and services to enhance the development of our youth. Through entertaining activities and with the guidance of volunteer mentors, participants learn the important values of independence, community, and belonging. Every year, the Boys & Girls Club plans a breakfast to honor a member or members of the community who make outstanding contributions to both the Boys & Girls Club and the city of Casper. This year's honorees, Larry and Margo Bean, are incredible champions in the Casper community and worthy of this special recognition.

Growing up on farms in Iowa, Larry and Margo moved to Casper as young adults with a desire to help, encourage, and bring joy to those who crossed their paths, particularly children. Anyone who knows the couple knows that the care and support they show for each other equals their passion for philanthropy and civic engagement. Next year, the couple will celebrate their 50th anniversary. They will celebrate this milestone occasion with their children Joshua, Amber, Nathan, and Nicole, and grandchildren Ella, Xavier, Mia, Mars, Sullivan, Cassius, and Vincent—who will be born next month.

As a couple, they are a powerhouse, yet they have significant individual accomplishments. As an author of four children's books, Margo's inspiration to write stories for children came from her father, Max Cronbaugh. Her father was an amazing storyteller who never failed to capture the imagination of children and the excitement of everyday life on the farm. With her experience as an elementary school teacher and growing up on her family's Iowa farm, Margo's books reflect her unique experience and the special place children have always held in her heart. Her

continued dedication to educating children in Wyoming is shown by leadership efforts at the St. Anthony Tri-Parish Catholic School, where some of their grandchildren attend school. Additionally, Margo was chairman of the Wyoming Medical Center board of directors and ran a successful business.

Larry is a certified public accountant and he provides valuable guidance and financial advice. In addition, Larry serves on the board of directors for several important organizations including the Martin Family Foundation, the Converse County Bank, and the Central Wyoming Counseling Center. As so many folks in Wyoming know, Larry is the ultimate letterwriter. His letters are individual masterpieces. In every letter from Larry, you see his smile and feel his friendship. Larry freely gives encouragement and inspiration—one letter at a time. Over the years, Bobbi and I have looked forward to the Bean's annual Christmas letter.

Together, Larry and Margo have touched the lives of thousands of children and families in Wyoming through their philanthropic and volunteer work. At Christmastime, their "Love in Action" project collects presents for families in need. They sponsor and coordinate youth events in the community including The American Dream Essay contest, The Uprising, and the Global Leadership Summit. The Beans also support youth faith-based organizations such as Child Evangelism Fellowship and Youth for Christ. They also have been strong supporters of the Nicolaysen Discovery Center and the Central Wyoming Rescue Mission.

Their kindness and generosity expands across the globe. Larry and Margo are diligently working to develop faith-based schools in Zambia and Haiti. These neighborhood schools will bring hope and opportunities to these children as well as to these communities.

My wife, Bobbi, joins me in extending our congratulations to Larry and Margo Bean and thanking them for their dedication to Wyoming and its youth. All of us privileged to know them are blessed.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY WOMEN'S TENNIS TEAM NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

• Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, as a fellow Commodore, I would like to congratulate the Vanderbilt University women's tennis team on winning the NCAA championship, the first national championship for the women's tennis program, and the third in Commodore history.

Geoff Macdonald, the head coach of this program for 21 years, has done a phenomenal job of training and guiding

these exceptional student-athletes. He has worked hard to transform the Vanderbilt's women's tennis program into the best in the country.

Vanderbilt is a very special university, one that produces student-athletes of exceptional character and integrity, who have pride in themselves and their school. This may be the first national championship for Vanderbilt's women's tennis team, but their commitment to these ideals ensures that this success will not be the last.

This achievement would not have been possible without the hard work, talent, and teamwork of the following outstanding student-athletes: Payton Robinette, Margaret Leavell, Ellie Yates, Georgina Sellyn, Ashleigh Antal, Marie Casares, Courtney Colton, Frances Altick, Astra Sharma, and Sydney Campbell.

Of course, these student-athletes were trained and mentored by a dedicated team of coaches and staff led by Coach Macdonald. They are: Emil Iankov, Christy Hogan, Kerry Wilbar, Lori Alexander, Aleke Tsubanos, and Catherine Hilley.

Go 'Dores!•

CONCORD, NEW HAMPSHIRE 250TH ANNIVERSARY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise today in honor of Concord, NH—a city in Merrimack County that is celebrating the 250th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join the citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this special occasion.

Concord, settled in 1725 by colonists from Massachusetts, was incorporated in 1733 as the town of Rumford, and later the parish of Concord where it experienced several border disputes with the neighboring town of Bow. The parish of Bow officially became part of Concord in 1765.

Concord includes the villages of Penacook, East Concord, and West Concord. The city's population has grown to over 40,000 residents with over 6,000 acres of protected land. Concord residents have access to numerous hiking and biking trails, and the town's location on the Merrimack River significantly adds to its natural beauty.

In 1808, Concord was established as the State capital of New Hampshire. The statehouse is the oldest legislative building in the Nation still in use by the State's house and senate. The house chamber is also home to the largest State legislative body in the country.

Concord has produced many innovative businesses, including the Abbot-Downing Company that designed and built the world-famous Concord Coach in 1827, revolutionizing travel throughout the world.

Today, Concord is a civic, cultural, business, and medical hub for the Granite State. It is where New Hampshire's

lone U.S. President, Franklin Pierce had an office, and it is the location of his final resting place. Concord is also home to the McAuliffe-Shepard Discovery Center, named after Christa McAuliffe, a Concord educator who bravely volunteered to become the first teacher in space aboard the fatal Challenger space shuttle mission in 1986, and New Hampshire astronaut Alan Shepard. Today, new generations can visit the planetarium to learn about our universe. On Concord's thriving Main Street, residents and visitors can find an outstanding collection of New Hampshire small businesses that represent the heart of the city. Downtown Concord is full of history and culture—including the Museum of New Hampshire History, the Capital Center for the Arts, and the Red River Theater.

The spirit of community and volunteerism is strong in Concord as evidenced by the hard work and dedication of all involved with the planning and celebration of this special sescentennial anniversary.

Concord, as our State's capital, has greatly contributed to the life and spirit of New Hampshire. I am pleased to extend my warm regards to the people of Concord as they celebrate the city's 250th anniversary. •

PITTSBURG, NEW HAMPSHIRE 175TH ANNIVERSARY

• Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, today I wish to pay tribute to Pittsburg, NH—a town in Coos County that is celebrating the 175th anniversary of its founding. I am proud to join citizens across the Granite State in recognizing this historic occasion.

Pittsburg is nestled deep within New Hampshire's Great North Woods and sits in the shadows of Stub Hill and Magalloway Mountain. It is the largest town by area in the State, and contains all four Connecticut Lakes. Pittsburg is the only town that shares a border with both Maine and Vermont, and contains the only portion of New Hampshire west of the Connecticut River. Pittsburg holds the only New Hampshire crossing into Canada, sharing an international border with the Province of Québec.

The area known as Pittsburg was settled in the early part of the 19th century, but an unclear boundary line between the United States and Canada allowed for the formation of a region known as the Republic of Indian Stream. Shortly thereafter, the town was incorporated in 1840 and named for English Prime Minister William Pitt.

Pittsburg is home to scenic lakes, rivers, streams, and forestland, and has become the perfect venue for all recreational outdoor activities. Thousands of off-highway recreational vehicle enthusiasts visit each season to enjoy the hundreds of miles of snowmobile and ATV trails that have earned Pittsburg

the title, "snowmobile capital of New England."

On behalf of all Granite Staters, I am pleased to offer my congratulations to the residents of Pittsburg on reaching this special milestone, and I thank them for their many contributions to the life and spirit of the State of New Hampshire.●

REMEMBERING LOIS HORVITZ

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Lois Horvitz, a beloved mother, grandmother, public health advocate, and extraordinary philanthropist who passed away on July 23, 2015. She was 88 years old.

Lois Horvitz was born April 22, 1927 in Cleveland, OH. She attended the University of Wisconsin before marrying Harry R. Horvitz, a World War II naval officer and newspaper publisher.

In 1962, Lois met Dr. Claude S. Beck, a renowned cardiac surgeon and pioneer of cardiopulmonary resuscitation, the lifesaving technique more commonly known as CPR. Inspired by his work, Lois became an early advocate of CPR training, championing a wide spread public awareness campaign and establishing the Resuscitators of America to teach CPR classes.

Lois' efforts to promote CPR awareness sparked her lifelong passion for philanthropy, inspiring her to dedicate her time and resources to improving lives in her community and country. In addition to serving on the boards of the Eisenhower Medical Center and the Betty Ford Center, Lois established the Harry R. Horvitz Center for Palliative Medicine at the Cleveland Clinic in honor of her late husband of 44 years. An active member of her Indian Wells community, Lois created the Desert Town Hall in 1993, which became an annual speaker series featuring world leaders.

I send my deepest condolences to Lois' children, Michael, Pam, and Peter, and their families. Lois' legacy of commitment and compassion will continue to inspire others for years to come.●

REMEMBERING SERGEANT SCOTT LUNGER

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Sergeant Scott Lunger, an exceptional law enforcement officer, loyal friend, and beloved father who was tragically killed in the line of duty on July 22, 2015.

Scott Lunger was born on March 13, 1967 and grew up in Dublin, CA, where he played baseball and football at Dublin High School. After graduation, Scott followed his father and older brother's footsteps and entered the electrical trade, becoming a member of

IBEW Local 595. However, a lifelong interest in law enforcement prompted Scott to switch career paths, and he began working as a Contra Costa County sheriff's deputy before transferring to the Hayward Police Department in 2001.

During his 15-year career with the department, Sergeant Lunger was assigned to some of the most critical units, including the gang task force, SWAT team, and the special duty unit. Sergeant Lunger also worked as a field training officer and became the head of the field training unit, allowing him to mentor dozens of young officers on the force. Sergeant Lunger's colleagues recalled admiringly his ability to encourage his fellow officers to give their best effort, always leading by example.

Sergeant Lunger dedicated his life to his family, his community, and his country. On behalf of the people of California, whom he served so bravely, I extend my gratitude and deepest sympathies to his daughters, Ashton and Saralyn; father, Paul; brothers, Mike and Todd; sisters, Michelle and Ciara; nieces and nephews; and entire extended family. His dedicated and courageous service will never be forgotten.●

REMEMBERING JOSEPH MENDOZA, JR.

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of my good friend, Joey Mendoza, a longtime pillar of the West Marin ranching community.

Born in 1943, Joey grew up on his family's historic B Ranch in Point Reyes National Seashore, which had been purchased by his grandfather in 1919. After attending college at Cal Poly, San Luis Obispo, Joey returned to Marin County to work in the family business, becoming a third-generation dairyman.

I first met Joey during my time as a Marin County supervisor, and although we did not see eye to eye on every issue, Joey was always willing to work together to try to forge consensus. He never let political differences get in the way of personal relationships, and over the years we formed an unwavering friendship.

A well-respected and beloved member of the Marin community, Joey gave generously of his time and energy to numerous organizations throughout his career, including the Western United Dairymen and the Marin County Farm Bureau. A lifelong farming advocate, Joey worked tirelessly to preserve California's North Bay agricultural heritage. It is a testament to his lifelong passion that his children decided to follow in their father's footsteps by operating their own ranches, with Joey's son maintaining the family's operation at B Ranch nearly 100 years after his great-grandfather worked the

land. Joey and his family's legacy will help ensure that ranching and dairy operations will be part of the fabric of the Marin community for generations to come.

With his warm and welcoming nature, Joey remained a leading voice for the ranching community until his final days. I send my deepest condolences to Joey's wife Linda, his son Jarrod, his daughter Jolynn, his brother Jim, and his grandchildren, Collin, Luke, and Layla, along with his entire extended family.●

REMEMBERING OFFICER DAVID JOSEPH NELSON

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Bakersfield Police Officer David Joseph Nelson, a beloved son, brother, and grandson who was tragically killed in the line of duty on June 26, 2015.

David Nelson was born on November 16, 1988 in Burbank, CA. He graduated with top honors from Burbank High School in 2007, where he was a member of the Associated Student Body and the varsity swim and water polo teams. Officer Nelson attended Occidental College, earning a bachelor's degree in economics with a minor in public policy. He was also a member of Occidental's water polo and basketball teams.

As a college student, Officer Nelson interned with the U.S. Department of the Treasury and was offered a position upon graduation. However, he chose to remain in California to follow his lifelong dream of pursuing a career in law enforcement. In 2008, he joined the Burbank Police Department as a police cadet and became an officer with the Bakersfield Police Department in 2013.

At a memorial service on July 1, 2015, Bakersfield Police Sergeant Uriel Pacheco recalled that Officer Nelson was a "dedicated, trustworthy, courageous and respectful" member of the department. Others remembered David Nelson as a talented athlete with a great sense of humor and a strong desire to help those less fortunate.

On behalf of the people of California, whom Officer Nelson served so bravely, I extend my deepest sympathy to his parents Larry and Mary, brothers Erik and Michael, grandmothers Elsie Nelson and Josephine Gutierrez, and many uncles, aunts, cousins and friends.

We are forever indebted to Officer David Joseph Nelson for his courage and sacrifice, and he will be deeply missed.●

CONGRATULATING LIEUTENANT GENERAL BRUCE A. LITCHFIELD

● Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, today on behalf of Senator LANKFORD and myself, we are pleased to congratulate Lt. Gen. Bruce A. Litchfield upon the completion of his career of service in the U.S. Air Force. Throughout his 34-year

military career, Lieutenant General Litchfield served with distinction and dedication, ultimately becoming the commander of the Air Force Sustainment Center at Tinker Air Force Base, OK, responsible for providing operational planning and execution of Air Force Supply Chain Management and Depot Maintenance for a wide range of aircraft, engines, missiles, and component items in support of Air Force Materiel Command missions. From his command in Oklahoma, he was responsible for operations which spanned 3 air logistics complexes, 3 air base wings, 2 supply chain management wings, and multiple remote operating locations, incorporating more than 32,000 military and civilian personnel. Finally, he oversaw installation support to more than 75,000 personnel working in 140 associate units at the 3 sustainment center bases.

In July 2012, General Litchfield became the first commander of the newly established Air Force Sustainment Center in Oklahoma. During his command, he returned over \$1.5 billion back to the Air Force, and ultimately the taxpayer, through comprehensive initiatives like the AFSC Way and Cost Effective Readiness.

General Litchfield entered the Air Force in 1981 as a distinguished graduate from the Reserve Officer Training Corps program at Norwich University in Vermont. During his distinguished career, Lieutenant General Litchfield commanded at the squadron and group levels in addition to commanding two wings, and was the director of logistics, Headquarters Pacific Air Forces, Hickam Air Force Base, Hawaii. He spent the last 6 years in the great State of Oklahoma at Tinker Air Force Base as commander of the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center, as well as commander of the Air Force Sustainment Center.

General Litchfield earned military awards to include the Defense Service Medal, Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters, the Air Force Commendation Medal, and the Air Force Achievement Medal as well as other service awards.

Under General Litchfield's command, the Air Force Sustainment Center earned two of the prestigious Department of Defense Maintenance Effectiveness Awards, as well as the Outstanding Unit Award.

General Litchfield led the successful reorganization and standup of the Air Force Sustainment Center, placing command and control of depot maintenance, supply chain and associate air base wing support under one command chain of command at Tinker Air Force Base, OK. His proactive leadership incorporated a revolutionary leadership model and governance process that

drove rapid culture change and is currently under review by multiple universities as the example of success for government and industry.

General Litchfield, his wife Linda, and children Matthew and Jennifer have made many sacrifices during his Air Force career, and we appreciate their contributions of conscientious service to our country. His family and his fellow airmen can be proud of his service.

As he departs the Air Force to start the next part of his journey, I call upon my colleagues to wish Bruce and his family every success. It is our pleasure to recognize him at the conclusion of a distinguished career of service to the Air Force and to the United States of America.●

RECOGNIZING COCO EROS

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, in the wake of the recent tragedy in Lafayette, I wish to recognize Coco Eros Clothing Boutique and Design Studio as Small Business of the Week for their efforts in supporting the Lafayette community. Small businesses are created by entrepreneurs who not only have a passion for their companies, but also have love for their community members.

In the days after the July 23, 2015, shooting at the Grand 16 Movie Theater in Lafayette, LA, Coco Eros sought to support the victims' recovery and families by selling a necklace designed by Mayci Breau, who lost her life in the tragic attack. Mayci was an employee at Coco Eros and was preparing for a career as an ultrasound and radiology technician. The proceeds of her design—the Mayci necklace—will go to the families of the victims. It is my honor to recognize the thoughtfulness of the folks at Coco Eros through this week's Small Business of the Week.

Coco Eros was founded in 2009 by fashion enthusiasts Monica Broussard and Emily Adams, whose goal is to share their love for clothing and accessories with local customers. The locally owned and operated boutique prides itself on its friendly and personable shopping experience. With a sofa to lounge on and helpful staff on hand, the store is a community staple contributing unique and trending fashion and accessories. Monica and Emily focus on fashion-forward clientele, carefully selecting trend-conscious labels and styles. Coco Eros features popular, contemporary clothing lines like Trina Turk, Paige, La Bella Vita, and Joie. The store provides in-store alteration services, and co-owner Emily designs and creates original, customized dresses. Monica and Emily take advantage of social media opportunities as well, with popular Facebook and Instagram accounts that feature Emily's original designs and happy,

well-dressed customers. At Coco Eros, the goal is to promote good style and self-confidence for each customer.

Congratulations again to Coco Eros for being selected as Small Business of the Week. We appreciate your thoughtful contributions to the Lafayette community.●

RECOGNIZING RED ARROW WORKSHOP

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, in the wake of the recent tragedy in Lafayette, I wish to recognize Red Arrow Workshop as Small Business of the Week in memory of co-owner Jillian Johnson, who lost her life in the July 23, 2015, shooting at The Grand 16 Movie Theater in Lafayette, LA.

Jillian Johnson and her husband Jason Brown spent years “planning, plotting, and scheming” before opening Red Arrow Workshop in August 2012. Jillian was well-known for her creativity, kindness, and generosity, which translated directly into the success of her family-owned small business. Red Arrow Workshop is a locally owned-and-operated gift, apparel, accessories, and toy shop showcasing a variety of products unavailable anywhere else in Acadiana. The shop also showcases the local, specialty t-shirt line Parish Ink—of which Jillian was a creative partner. After 2 successful years in Lafayette, she and Jason expanded their thriving business, opening a second shop on Magazine Street in New Orleans, LA.

Beloved by locals and cited by many as an artistic staple in the community, Red Arrow Workshop hosts a thoughtfully curated, ever-changing collection of American-made, fair-trade, handmade, and eco-friendly items—including products of several talented south Louisiana artists. The shop's Louisiana-themed items are some of their most popular, with artistic representations of the Mississippi River and State silhouettes covering a collection of prints, paintings, stickers, and home goods. Red Arrow also sells a collection of quirky books, fabrics, and paper goods.

It is my honor to designate Red Arrow Workshop as Small Business of the Week. Small businesses are created by entrepreneurs who not only have love for their companies, but also have love for their community members. Jillian and Jason have contributed to the Lafayette community with their earnest and enthusiastic entrepreneurial spirit. Together we are all “Lafayette Strong.”●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:43 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution,

in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2464. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fluazifop-P-butyl; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930-99) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2465. A communication from the Associate General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2466. A communication from the Secretary of Education, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act within the Program Administration, Departmental Management, Education account; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2467. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of the Army, Department of the Army, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2468. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2469. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Department of Defense General Counsel, Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2470. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John D. Johnson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2471. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "U.S. Industrial Base Surveys Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950" (RIN0694-AG17)

received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 22, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2472. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2473. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cuba: Implementing Rescission of State Sponsor of Terrorism Designation" (RIN0694-AG60) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2474. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rules: Regulatory Capital, Final Revisions Applicable to Banking Organizations Subject to the Advanced Approaches Risk-Based Capital Rule" (RIN3064-AE12) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2475. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Organization and Functions, and Seal Amendments" (RIN2590-AA75) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2476. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" (RIN3133-AE40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2477. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Certain Persons from the Entity List Based on Removal Requests" (RIN0694-AG61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2478. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, General Law, Ethics, and Regulation, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Director of the Mint, Department of the Treasury, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2479. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Refrigerated Bottled or Canned Beverage Vending Machines" ((RIN1904-AD07) (Docket

No. EERE-2013-BT-TP-0045)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2480. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Dehumidifiers" ((RIN1904-AC80) (Docket No. EERE-2014-BT-TP-0010)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2481. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Public Utility Filing Requirements" (Docket No. RM15-3-000) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2482. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Pennsylvania; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone and 2010 Sulfur Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards" (FRL No. 9931-80-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2483. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference" (FRL No. 9927-41-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2484. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Amendments to the Control of Gasoline and Volatile Organic Compound Storage and Handling" (FRL No. 9931-54-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2485. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Approval of NOx Emission Offset Credits as Single Source SIP Revisions" (FRL No. 9927-49-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2486. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Assessing the Continued Suspension of the Long Term Care Hospital (LTCH) 25 Percent Policy"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2487. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expatriate Health Coverage Clarification Act of 2014, Interim Guidance" (Notice 2015-43) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2488. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safe Harbor for Ratable Service Contracts" (Rev. Proc. 2015-39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 31, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2489. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Psychiatric Facilities Prospective Payment System—Update for Fiscal Year Beginning October 1, 2015 (FY 2016)" ((RIN0938-AS47) (CMS-1627-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2490. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System and Consolidated Billing for Skilled Nursing Facilities (SNFs) for FY 2016, SNF Value-Based Purchasing Program, SNF Quality Reporting Program, and Staffing Data Collection" ((RIN0938-AS44) (CMS-1622-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2491. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; FY 2016 Hospice Wage Index and Payment Rate Update and Hospice Quality Reporting Requirements" ((RIN0938-AS39) (CMS-1629-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2492. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment Systems . . . Payment Adjustment for Hospitals" ((RIN0938-AS41) (CMS-1632-F and IFC)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2493. A communication from the Deputy Director, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Medicare Program; Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Prospective Payment System for Federal Fiscal Year 2016" ((RIN0938-AS45) (CMS-1624-F)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2494. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a

Middle East country (OSS-2015-1237); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2495. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 14-132); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2496. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1241); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2497. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1240); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2498. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1239); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2499. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1238); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2500. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-035); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2501. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-043); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2502. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-065); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2503. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Federal Agency Drug-Free Workplace Programs"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2504. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2012 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse Second Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2505. A communication from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Office's fiscal year 2014 annual report relative to the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2506. A communication from the Director of the Office of Regulatory Affairs and

Collaborative Action, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acknowledgment of American Indian Tribes" (RIN1076-AF18) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 30, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2507. A communication from the Chair, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Impact of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2508. A communication from the Acting Deputy Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting, pursuant to law, the Federal Voting Assistance Program's 2014 Post-Election Survey Report; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2509. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; The Cleveland Yachting Club Annual Regatta Fireworks Display; Lake Erie, Rocky River, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0613)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2510. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Lake Metroparks Stand-Up Paddleboard Race; Lake Erie; Fairport Harbor, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0612)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2511. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Victoria Barge Canal, Bloomington, TX" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0952)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2512. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; POLAR PIONEER, Outer Continental Shelf Drill Unit, Chukchi Sea, Alaska" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0247)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2513. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Misery Challenge, Manchester Bay, Manchester, MA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0188)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2514. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Block Island Wind Farm; Rhode Island Sound, RI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0227)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2515. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department

of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Southeast Drag Boat Championships, Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway; Buckport, SC" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0045)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2516. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Beaufort Water Festival, Beaufort, SC" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0192)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2517. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Mavericks Surf Competition, Half Moon Bay, CA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0427)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2518. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Town of Olcott Fireworks Display; Lake Ontario, Olcott, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0613)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2519. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones and Regulated Navigation Area; Shell Arctic Drilling/Exploration Vessels and Associated Voluntary First Amendment Area, Puget Sound, WA, Extension" ((RIN1625-AA00 and RIN1625-AA11) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0295)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2520. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Big Foot TLP, Walker Ridge 29, Outer Continental Shelf on the Gulf of Mexico" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0863)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2521. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Red Bull GRC Air Show, Detroit River, Detroit, MI" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0618)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2522. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cleveland Triathlon, Lake Erie, North Coast Harbor, Cleveland, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0659)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2523. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Fall River Grand Prix, Mt. Hope Bay and Taunton River, Fall River, MA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0613)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2524. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Oswego Harborfest Jet Ski Show; Oswego Harbor, Oswego, NY" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0507)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2525. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Maritime Museum Party, San Diego Bay; San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0647)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2526. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; GE Aviation Czech s.r.o. Turboprop Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0482)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2527. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Atlantic Dolphin" ((RIN0648-XE002) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2528. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Snowy Grouper" ((RIN0648-XE003) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on July 29, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2529. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Tunnel Inspection Standards" ((RIN2125-AF24) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2530. A communication from the Regulatory Ombudsman, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "State Compliance With Commercial Driver's License Program: Correction" ((RIN2126-AB80) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2531. A communication from the Chair of the Incentive Auctions Task Force, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions" (FCC 15-69) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2532. A communication from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions; Channel Sharing by Full Power and Class A Stations Outside the Broadcast Television Spectrum Incentive Auction Context" ((GN Docket No. 12-268) (MB Docket No. 15-137) (FCC 15-67)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-74. A concurrent resolution adopted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio urging the United States Congress to provide an adequate budget for the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to establish rules relative to environmentally friendly energy; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

AMENDED HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NUMBER 9

Whereas, Ohio has many finite natural energy resources; and

Whereas, World energy demand and usage are expected to increase; and

Whereas, It is vital to the country's energy future to provide abundant base-load power and peaking energy-on-demand power affordably; and

Whereas, Extending Ohio's current energy boom will rest in creating a long-term energy plan and developing clean and affordable energy technologies such as liquid core molten salt reactors and small modular reactors; and

Whereas, America possesses a nearly inexhaustible supply of thorium and uranium (more than a billion years) that dramatically exceeds all known potential energy reserves; and

Whereas, The elements thorium and uranium have the practical potential to provide unlimited energy resources for Ohioans and Americans on demand in the near future and to provide many other tangible benefits; and

Whereas, Better utilization of thorium and uranium in specially designed reactors such as molten salt reactors, including liquid fluoride thorium reactors, can provide energy security from other nations by utilizing Ohio coal and a reactor's nuclear heat energy to produce an abundance of synthetic liquid transportation fuels. These synthetic fuels can be produced for many future generations of Ohioans in a safe, affordable, and in a most environmentally friendly manner; and

Whereas, The efficient use of thorium or uranium in a specially designed molten salt reactor allows for greatly increased environmentally friendly energy production that improves the economics of many recycling technologies and raises the standard of living; and

Whereas, It is incumbent upon Ohio legislators to be forward-thinking in addressing the future energy challenges for the next generation of Ohioans; and

Whereas, Ohio is uniquely capable to commercialize small modular reactors, liquid core molten salt reactors, and integral fast reactors with its research and development assets of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Plum Brook (Sandusky, Ohio), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration John H. Glenn Research Center (Cleveland, Ohio area), the Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (Dayton, Ohio), USEC's uranium-enrichment facility (Piketon, Ohio), The Ohio State University's nuclear-research-and-development facilities (Columbus, Ohio), and other private companies and nonprofit organizations that specialize in nuclear-technology development in Ohio; and

Whereas, The academic, scientific, manufacturing, and business communities in Ohio have some of the best talent and research and development records in the world. Development of this groundbreaking and economic game-changing technology would serve Ohio's and America's economy better than current federal efforts to develop this technology in partnership with China; and

Whereas, Advanced technology using thorium and uranium can affordably provide medical isotopes of materials for medical uses such as treating cancer and HIV/AIDS, diagnostic procedures, and improved health care; and

Whereas, S. 99, the "American Medical Isotopes Production Act of 2011," was signed into law by President Barack Obama on January 2, 2013, and mandates a reliable domestic supply of molybdenum-99 for medical imaging and diagnostics; and

Whereas, Molybdenum-99 is used in more than sixteen million medical procedures annually in the United States; and

Whereas, No domestic supply of molybdenum-99 currently exists, and present suppliers use old reactors that result in frequent supply disruptions; and

Whereas, The Nuclear Regulatory Commission, charged with licensing nuclear reactors, is not well-funded for establishing procedures for new, advanced reactor designs based on different architectures from today's fleet of light water reactors; and

Whereas, Small modular reactors and liquid core molten salt reactors represent a business opportunity that Ohio's manufacturing base is well-suited to exploit. This could potentially result in creating forty thousand manufacturing jobs in total within Ohio, because these jobs have the ability to complement Ohio's coal industry, oil industry, and natural gas hydraulic fracturing industry by increasing jobs in those industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the 131st General Assembly of the State of Ohio, make the following recommendation for solutions to energy and medical-isotopes production; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Ohio shall create a long-term energy plan that addresses the long-term energy needs of the country; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Ohio shall encourage the research and development of liquid-core-molten-salt-reactors and small-modular-reactors technologies as a long-term solution to Ohio's energy needs; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Ohio shall advocate that the Congress of the United States mandate, and provide an adequate

budget for, the Department of Energy and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to establish rules for manufacturing, siting, and licensing of small modular reactors and liquid core molten salt reactors to be built and operated in the United States by private industry for the production of energy and medical isotopes; and be it further

Resolved, That the State of Ohio shall invest in, seek to acquire grants for, implement programs for, encourage its institutions of higher learning to conduct research into, and attract companies for the development of future technologies that will provide greater energy resources more affordably, abundantly, and in a more environmentally friendly manner than is being done at present; and be it further

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House of Representatives transmit duly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the United States Department of Energy, the Commissioners of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Speaker and Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore and Secretary of the United States Senate, each member of the Ohio Congressional delegation, and the news media of Ohio.

POM-75. A petition by a citizen from the State of Texas urging the United States Congress to propose an amendment to the United States Constitution relative to establishing a procedure by which the President of the United States could be removed from office by means of a nationwide recall election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 719. A bill to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-111).

By Mr. BLUNT, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Report to accompany S. Res. 73. An original resolution authorizing expenditures by committees of the Senate for the periods March 1, 2015 through September 30, 2015, October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016, and October 1, 2016 through February 28, 2017 (Rept. No. 114-112).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 280. A bill to improve the efficiency, management, and interagency coordination of the Federal permitting process through reforms overseen by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-113).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 986. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico (Rept. No. 114-114).

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment:

H.R. 1020. A bill to define STEM education to include computer science, and to support

existing STEM education programs at the National Science Foundation (Rept. No. 114-115).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

H.R. 1531. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCCAIN for the Committee on Armed Services.

*Joyce Louise Connery, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2019.

*Joseph Bruce Hamilton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring October 18, 2016.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. David S. Baldwin, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Aaron M. Prupas, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Gen. Mark A. Milley, to be General.

Navy nomination of Adm. John M. Richardson, to be Admiral.

Air Force nomination of Col. Christopher P. Azzano, to be Brigadier General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert B. Neller, to be General.

Air Force nomination of Brig. Gen. Theron G. Davis, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Maj. Gen. John M. Murray, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Lt. Gen. Anthony R. Ierardi, to be Lieutenant General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Garrett S. Yee, to be Major General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Patrick J. Reinert, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr., to be Admiral.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Joseph P. Aucoin, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Capt. Cedric E. Pringle, to be Rear Admiral (lower half).

Army nominations beginning with Colonel Brett W. Andersen and ending with Colonel David E. Wood, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nomination of Col. Laura L. Yeager, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. William J. Edwards, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Robert W. Enzenauer, to be Major General.

Army nominations beginning with Brigadier General Randy A. Alewel and ending with Brigadier General Joanne F. Sheridan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. Rex C. McMillian, to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Robert R. Ruark, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Cox, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Gina M. Grosso, to be Lieutenant General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Paul A. Grosklags, to be Vice Admiral.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Jesse L. Johnson, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of Jose M. Goyos, to be Major.

Air Force nomination of John C. Boston, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of John A. Christ, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Richard H. Fillman, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Thomas M. Cherepko, to be Major.

Army nomination of Eric R. Davis, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Stephen T. Wolpert, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Jennifer E. Hey, to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nomination of Michael R. Starkey, to be Major.

Army nomination of Deepa Hariprasad, to be Major.

Army nomination of Dale T. Waltman, to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Vincent E. Buggs and ending with James M. Zepp III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Shontelle C. Adams and ending with Joseph S. Zuffanti, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Andrea C. Alicea and ending with Giovanni F. Zalamar, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Eric B. Abdul and ending with Sara I. Zoesch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Gary S. Anselmo and ending with John G. Zierdt, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Dean R. Klensz and ending with James J. Riche, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Richard L. Bailey and ending with Kenneth S. Shedarowich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with William Andino and ending with Christopher P. Willard, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with David B. Anderson and ending with Carl W. Thurmond, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Jerry G. Baumgartner and ending with Mauri M.

Thomas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Elizabeth A. Anderson and ending with Margaret L. Young, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Tonia M. Crowley and ending with Cheryl M. K. Zeise, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Jennifer M. Ahrens and ending with Todd W. Traver, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Ramie K. Barfuss and ending with Dentonio Worrell, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with David J. Adam and ending with Victor Y. Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with April Critelli and ending with Gregg A. Vigeant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Thomas F. Caldwell and ending with Bronson B. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Carol L. Coppock and ending with Marie N. Wright, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Norman S. Chun and ending with Harry W. Hatch, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Lavetta L. Bennett and ending with Craig W. Strong, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 29, 2015.

Navy nomination of Audry T. Oxley, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Mark B. Lyles, to be Captain.

Navy nominations beginning with Russell P. Bates and ending with Horacio G. Tan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Sylvester C. Adamah and ending with Chadwick D. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Ruben A. Alcocer and ending with Melissa A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Accursia A. Baldassano and ending with Jacqueline R. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason S. Ayeroff and ending with Brent E. Troyan, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jerry J. Bailey and ending with Erin R. Wilfong,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with William M. Anderson and ending with Jeffrey R. Wessel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Maria A. Alavanja and ending with Vincent A. I. Zizak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on July 23, 2015.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. LANKFORD (for himself, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. CORKER, Mr. COATS, Mr. DAINES, Mr. SASSE, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 1919. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. HELLER):

S. 1920. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to develop and submit to Congress a biennial report on the current state of the skills gap in the United States, as of the date of the report, that includes an analysis of the effectiveness of efforts to close the skills gap and policy recommendations to improve such efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1921. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to encourage States to adopt administrative procedures with respect to nonmedical exemptions for State immunization requirements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1922. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for quality reviews of benefit decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1923. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide certain individuals with information on employment support services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Mr. ROUNDS):

S. 1924. A bill to transfer administrative jurisdiction over certain Bureau of Land Management land from the Secretary of the

Interior to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for inclusion in the Black Hills National Cemetery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BENNET, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TESTER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. KING, Mr. LEAHY, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1925. A bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program and to make permanent the payment in lieu of taxes program and the land and water conservation fund; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. AYOTTE):

S. 1926. A bill to ensure access to screening mammography services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. COATS (for himself and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 1927. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to postpone the effective date of high-impact rules pending judicial review; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TESTER (for himself, Mr. FRANKEN, and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1928. A bill to support the education of Indian children; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1929. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to prevent disability fraud, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON (for himself and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 1930. A bill to adjust the boundary of the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park to include the Wallis House and Harriston Hill, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. MORAN (for himself and Mr. TESTER):

S. 1931. A bill to reaffirm that certain land has been taken into trust for the benefit of certain Indian tribes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET:

S. 1932. A bill to provide States with flexibility to use Federal IV-E funding for State child welfare programs to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for all children who need child welfare services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. KIRK, Mr. COONS, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

S. 1933. A bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. COONS, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1934. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to establish the Scale-up Manufacturing Investment Com-

pany ("SUMIC") Program; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. KING, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. PETERS):

S. 1935. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to undertake certain activities to support waterfront community revitalization and resiliency; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 1936. A bill to provide for drought preparedness measures in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. UDALL:

S. 1937. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve nutrition in tribal areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 356

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) were added as cosponsors of S. 356, a bill to improve the provisions relating to the privacy of electronic communications.

S. 779

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 779, a bill to provide for Federal agencies to develop public access policies relating to research conducted by employees of that agency or from funds administered by that agency.

S. 849

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 849, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for systematic data collection and analysis and epidemiological research regarding Multiple Sclerosis (MS), Parkinson's disease, and other neurological diseases.

S. 1049

At the request of Ms. HETTKAMP, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1049, a bill to allow the financing by

United States persons of sales of agricultural commodities to Cuba.

S. 1065

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1065, a bill to amend title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to provide grants for the development of asthma management plans and the purchase of asthma inhalers and spacers for emergency use, as necessary.

S. 1085

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1085, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1314, a bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes and their safe integration into the national airspace system.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to amend the limitation on liability for passenger rail accidents or incidents under section 28103 of title 49, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1382

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1382, a bill to prohibit discrimination in adoption or foster care placements based on the sexual orientation, gender identity, or marital status of any prospective adoptive or foster parent, or the sexual orientation or gender identity of the child involved.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466,

a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes.

S. 1491

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1491, a bill to provide sensible relief to community financial institutions, to protect consumers, and for other purposes.

S. 1532

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1532, a bill to ensure timely access to affordable birth control for women.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1709

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1709, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1819

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1819, a bill to improve security at Armed Forces recruitment centers.

S. 1844

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1844, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for voluntary country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken.

S. 1897

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1897, a bill to help keep law enforcement officers and communities safer by making grants to purchase body worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers.

S. 1911

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1912

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1912, a bill to protect the rights of Indian and Native Alaskan voters.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to extend the import- and export-related provision of that Act to species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under that Act.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

S. RES. 228

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 228, a resolution designating September 2015 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month".

AMENDMENT NO. 2547

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2547 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 2548

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2548 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HATCH (for himself, Mr. COATS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1922. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for quality reviews of benefit decisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to speak once again on the Social Security Disability Insurance—or DI—Program. As everyone in this Chamber should know, the DI trust fund is projected to be exhausted next year. That means, absent any change in law, we will be seeing across-the-board benefit cuts of close to 20 percent for DI beneficiaries. Over the last several months, I have come to the floor on a handful of occasions to talk about this program and the imminent depreciation of its trust fund.

I have called on my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to work with me to address these issues. I will repeat that call today.

In addition, today I have introduced three separate bills that are designed to help update and improve the administration of the DI program. As we talk about solutions to address the depletion of the DI trust fund, we should also be talking about ways to update the DI program, ways to make it easier for beneficiaries who can and who desire to return to work to be able to explore those opportunities and ways to improve efforts to deter and prevent waste and fraud.

The first bill I introduced today would update and expand the Social Security Administration's tools to deter and punish fraudsters who cheat the system. The second bill would authorize the Commissioner of SSA to provide denied DI applicants with information about employment support services that are provided by both public agencies and private nonprofit organizations.

That information will help denied applicants find opportunities to reenter the workforce, instead of continually cycling through the DI application process. The third bill would require SSA to review hearing decisions by administrative law judges to ensure that they are following the law as well as Social Security regulations and policy. All three of these bills are designed to improve the administration of this disability program and make it work better for beneficiaries and taxpayers. They will not, by themselves, solve all of the program's fiscal problems, but they will improve the DI system.

More work will need to go into this effort, and as chairman of the committee with jurisdiction over the DI program, I am committed to solving these problems and preventing the massive benefit cuts we will see under current law. I would like to point out three things about my stated approach to dealing with the DI program.

First, you will note I have not used the word "crisis" to describe what is happening with the DI trust fund. Second, you would be hard-pressed to find

any proposal I have submitted that could credibly be characterized as “slashing” DI benefits. Third, nothing I have put forward either today or in the past could conceivably be thought of as “privatizing” disability insurance.

I have to point this out because a number of people, including some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, have described the Republican efforts to address the DI trust fund depletion using some of those very same words.

These individuals are currently more interested in turning this issue and the coming benefit cuts into a political football than in actually solving the problem. My question is, What good will that do for the DI program or its beneficiaries? It is not just the DI program that has problems. Social Security, in general, faces a number of significant fiscal and policy challenges.

In their most recent report, the Social Security board of trustees, which includes several members of President Obama’s Cabinet, recommended “that lawmakers address the projected trust fund shortfalls in a timely way in order to phase in necessary changes gradually and give workers and beneficiaries time to adjust to them.”

That says to me the sooner we act to put Social Security on a sustainable fiscal path the better it is for Americans and their security. It clearly does not mean we should ignore the financial problems facing Social Security or kick the can down the road, hoping some future Congress will get its act together and solve the problems.

Of course, providing financial sustainability to Social Security is easier said than done. There are reasonable disagreements over how best to address Social Security’s fiscal shortfalls, including different views on payroll tax revenues that fund the program and how quickly promised benefits will grow in the future. Yet we should not limit the discussion to taxes and outlays.

We also should look at how the program can be improved and brought up-to-date. For example, the vocational grids and medical guidelines that SSA uses in the disability program are woefully out of date, and much of the existing structure of Social Security’s retirement program was developed long ago, when labor markets and work patterns were much different than they are today.

We should be working to address all of these challenges, both the fiscal and policy challenges now, instead of putting them off for later days. With respect to the DI program in particular, I have been working for some time now to obtain input from experts and stakeholders across the spectrum to figure out how we can make the program work better. Joined by House Ways and Means Committee Chairman RYAN and

Social Security Subcommittee Chairman JOHNSON, I have solicited input from stakeholders in various venues and continue to welcome ideas or proposals from anyone who wants to submit them.

The bills I have dropped today are just the latest in a series of bills I have introduced to help jump-start the discussion of DI reforms. We should not sit idly by and wait for another financing cliff to appear around the end of next year. As the Social Security trustees made clear, the sooner Congress acts to address these shortcomings, the better. Neither DI beneficiaries nor taxpayers benefit from lingering uncertainty about how the impending trust fund depletion will be resolved.

As I have said many times, I am ready and willing to have this conversation. Sadly, up to now, I have heard nothing in response from the Obama administration and very little from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Anyone familiar with the current state of the DI trust fund would likely acknowledge that we are going to have to reallocate resources into the fund if we are going to prevent the impending benefit cuts from happening next year.

Most proposals I have seen, including those from the President’s budget, involve a shuffling of money from Social Security’s retirement fund to the DI trust fund, but even if we have to reallocate resources to shore up the DI program, we should not delay confronting the obvious need for reform. On this point, I will once again quote the most recent report from the Social Security trustees, which says, “Re-allocation of resources in the absence of substantive relief might serve to delay DI reforms and much-needed corrections for Social Security as a whole.”

It is true that as many of my colleagues have noted, there have been bipartisan agreements to reallocate resources within Social Security in the past. However, in virtually every case, the reallocations were accompanied by substantive policy changes. This time should be no different. The last time we reallocated resources from the retirement to the DI trust fund, DI awards were increasing unexpectedly and Congress needed to examine the reasons for this increase before acting to change the way the DI system worked.

At the time, most people agreed that reforms were necessary and that the reallocation would buy the time Congress needed to come up with those reforms, get them enacted, and put the trust fund on sound fiscal footing. That was more than 20 years ago. Sadly, though not surprisingly, Congress did not follow through with the reforms, and we now face another reserve depletion in the trust fund.

Needless to say, doubling down on the same strategy, a strategy that has already failed to produce the needed policy changes, is not a prudent course of action. In my view, any resource reallocation that gets enacted must be accompanied by changes in the DI program. However, the President does not seem to share this view. The administration has called for a stand-alone reallocation of payroll tax receipts away from the retirement and survivor’s trust fund and into the DI trust fund.

This proposal would, depending on the estimate, extend the life of the DI program to the early 2030s, at which point both Social Security trust funds, disability and retirement, will be exhausted at the same time, triggering massive benefit cuts for all beneficiaries. In fact, there are those who would argue that the Social Security retirement fund is already exhausted and deeply in debt.

That is their idea of a responsible approach to a widely acknowledged fiscal problem. Outside of the stand-alone reallocation scheme, the President’s budget offers precious little in the way of reforms to the DI program or Social Security in general. In other words, the Obama administration’s entire answer to all of Social Security’s many fiscal problems is literally to just let future Congress’s and administrations deal with those problems.

This, to me, would be the height of irresponsibility. While it may not be possible, absent some kind of resource allocation, to keep the DI program’s current promises between now and the end of the year, we can and should take meaningful steps now to improve the program. That is my goal. I hope enough of my colleagues share this goal to make it a reality.

If we are going to get there, it is going to require bipartisan cooperation on both ends of Pennsylvania Avenue. In other words, we are going to need to see more from the administration than we have seen thus far. It is already August. Despite my repeated requests to the administration and my friends on the other side of the aisle to engage with me to work on this issue, I have yet to hear a meaningful response. I hope that will change.

There is no harm in discussing options. I am willing to discuss any and all options to fix these problems. There is, on the other hand, a great deal of potential harm to DI beneficiaries if we continue to ignore the problem while waiting for a financial cliff to force people’s hands. Once again, I urge my friends on both sides of the aisle to engage on this issue now, and do not wait until it is too late to take meaningful action.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2549. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the

to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2611. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2612. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2613. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2614. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2615. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2549. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CERTIFICATION FOR CYBERSECURITY AND INFORMATION ASSURANCE EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

The Secretary of Homeland Security, in collaboration with the National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence at the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall develop a certification for existing cybersecurity and information assurance education programs, which shall be provided to those programs that provide training in proper procedure and protocol for sharing cyber threat indicators and protecting sensitive personally identifiable information.

SA 2550. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 230. CYBERSECURITY AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall develop and implement an ongoing and comprehensive cybersecurity awareness campaign regarding cybersecurity risks and voluntary best practices for mitigating and responding to such risks.

“(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The campaign developed under subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, publish and disseminate, on an ongoing basis, the following:

“(1) Public service announcements targeted at improving awareness among State, local, and tribal governments, the private

sector, academia, and stakeholders in specific audiences, including the elderly, students, small businesses, members of the Armed Forces, and veterans.

“(2) Vendor and technology-neutral voluntary best practices information.

“(c) CONSULTATION.—The Under Secretary for Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection shall consult with a wide range of stakeholders in government, industry, academia, and the non-profit community in carrying out this section.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 226 (relating to cybersecurity recruitment and retention) the following:

“Sec. 230. Cybersecurity Awareness Campaign.”

SA 2551. Mr. PETERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(F) ensure collaboration with State, local and tribal governments to enhance the effectiveness of sharing cyber threat indicators and ensure cooperation to prevent, protect, mitigate, respond to, and recover from cybersecurity incidents.

SA 2552. Mr. COONS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 21, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 31, line 5 and insert the following:

(3) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Consistent with the guidelines required by subsection (b), the policies and procedures developed and promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 4 that are received through the process described in subsection (c) of this section and that satisfy the requirements of the guidelines developed under subsection (b)—

(i) are shared in an automated manner with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(B) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 4 in a manner other than the process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared as quickly as operationally practicable with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(C) consistent with this Act, any other applicable provisions of law, and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled “National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace” and published by the President in April 2011, govern the retention, use, and dissemination by the Federal Government of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this Act, including the extent, if any, to which such cyber threat indicators may be used by the Federal Government; and

(D) ensure there is—

(i) an audit capability; and

(ii) appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully conduct activities under this Act in an unauthorized manner.

(4) GUIDELINES FOR ENTITIES SHARING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop and make publicly available guidance to assist entities and promote sharing of cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this Act.

(B) CONTENTS.—The guidelines developed and made publicly available under subparagraph (A) shall include guidance on the following:

(i) Identification of types of information that would qualify as a cyber threat indicator under this Act that would be unlikely to include personal information of or identifying a specific person not necessary to describe or identify a cyber security threat.

(ii) Identification of types of information protected under otherwise applicable privacy laws that are unlikely to be necessary to describe or identify a cybersecurity threat.

(iii) Such other matters as the Attorney General considers appropriate for entities sharing cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this Act.

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the

appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers and private entities described in subparagraph (A), periodically review the guidelines promulgated under subparagraph (A).

(3) **CONTENT.**—The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this Act;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the timely destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to uses authorized under this Act; and

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients to be informed that such indicators may only be used for purposes authorized under this Act; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified and other sensitive national security information.

(C) **CAPABILITY AND PROCESS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and implement a capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security that—

(A) shall accept from any entity in real time cyber threat indicators and defensive measures, pursuant to this section;

(B) shall, upon submittal of the certification under paragraph (2) that such capability and process fully and effectively operates as described in such paragraph, be the process by which the Federal Government receives cyber threat indicators and defensive measures under this Act that are shared by a private entity with the Federal Government through electronic mail or media, an interactive form on an Internet website, or a real time, automated process between information systems except—

(i) communications between a Federal entity and a private entity regarding a previously shared cyber threat indicator; and

(ii) communications by a regulated entity with such entity's Federal regulatory authority regarding a cybersecurity threat;

(C) shall require the Department of Homeland Security to review all cyber threat indicators and defensive measures received and

remove any personal information of or identifying a specific person not necessary to identify or describe the cybersecurity threat before sharing such indicator or defensive measure with appropriate Federal entities;

(D) ensures that all of the appropriate Federal entities receive in an automated manner such cyber threat indicators as quickly as operationally possible from the Department of Homeland Security;

(E) is in compliance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section; and

(F) does not limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including—

(i) reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or a Federal entity;

(ii) voluntary or legally compelled participation in a Federal investigation; and

(iii) providing cyber threat indicators or defensive measures as part of a statutory or authorized contractual requirement.

(2) **CERTIFICATION.**—Not later than 10 days prior to the implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, certify to Congress whether such capability and process fully and effectively operates—

(A) as the process by which the Federal Government receives from any entity a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under this Act; and

(B) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines developed under this section.

(3) **PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the capability and process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) so that—

(A) any entity may share cyber threat indicators and defensive measures through such process with the Federal Government; and

(B) all of the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures as quickly as operationally practicable with receipt through the process within the Department of Homeland Security.

SA 2553. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike paragraph (2) of section 3(b) and insert the following:

(2) **COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.**—In developing the procedures required under this section, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General shall, to ensure that effective protocols are implemented that will facilitate and promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government in a timely manner—

(A) consult with appropriate private entities; and

(B) coordinate with appropriate Federal entities, including the National Laboratories (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)).

SA 2554. Mr. SCHATZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 13, strike line 4, and all that follows through page 14, line 1.

SA 2555. Ms. HEITKAMP submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ ENHANCEMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES.

(a) **COLLECTION OF DATA.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, in coordination with appropriate entities and the Director for Emergency Communications, shall establish a process by which a Statewide Interoperability Coordinator may report data on any cybersecurity risk or incident involving any information system or network used by emergency response providers (as defined in section 2 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101)) within the State.

(b) **ANALYSIS OF DATA.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, acting through the Director of the National Cybersecurity and Communications Integration Center, in coordination with appropriate entities and the Director for Emergency Communications, and in consultation with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall conduct integration and analysis of the data reported under subsection (a) to develop information and recommendations on security and resilience measures for any information system or network used by State emergency response providers.

(c) **BEST PRACTICES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Using the results of the integration and analysis conducted under subsection (b), and any other relevant information, the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall, on an ongoing basis, facilitate and support the development of methods for reducing cybersecurity risks to emergency response providers using the process described in section 2(e) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272(e)).

(2) **REPORT.**—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall submit a report to Congress on the methods developed under paragraph (1) and shall make such report publicly available on the website of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

SA 2556. Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. HELLER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS PRIVACY ACT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Electronic Communications Privacy Act Amendments Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. CONFIDENTIALITY OF ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 2702(a)(3) of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(3) a provider of remote computing service or electronic communication service to the public shall not knowingly divulge to any governmental entity the contents of any communication described in section 2703(a), or any record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of such service.”.

SEC. 203. ELIMINATION OF 180-DAY RULE; SEARCH WARRANT REQUIREMENT; REQUIRED DISCLOSURE OF CUSTOMER RECORDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

“(a) CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATIONS.—A governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by the provider only if the governmental entity obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure.

“(b) NOTICE.—Except as provided in section 2705, not later than 10 business days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not later than 3 business days in the case of any other governmental entity, after a governmental entity receives the contents of a wire or electronic communication of a subscriber or customer from a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service under subsection (a), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective, as specified by the court issuing the warrant, the subscriber or customer—

“(1) a copy of the warrant; and

“(2) a notice that includes the information referred to in clauses (i) and (ii) of section 2705(a)(4)(B).

“(c) RECORDS CONCERNING ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION SERVICE OR REMOTE COMPUTING SERVICE.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), a governmental entity may require a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to disclose a record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of the provider or service (not including the contents of communications), only if the governmental entity—

“(A) obtains a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) that is issued by a court of competent jurisdiction directing the disclosure;

“(B) obtains a court order directing the disclosure under subsection (d);

“(C) has the consent of the subscriber or customer to the disclosure; or

“(D) submits a formal written request relevant to a law enforcement investigation concerning telemarketing fraud for the name, address, and place of business of a subscriber or customer of the provider or service that is engaged in telemarketing (as defined in section 2325).

“(2) INFORMATION TO BE DISCLOSED.—A provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall, in response to an administrative subpoena authorized by Federal or State statute, a grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena, or any means authorized under paragraph (1), disclose to a governmental entity the—

“(A) name;

“(B) address;

“(C) local and long distance telephone connection records, or records of session times and durations;

“(D) length of service (including start date) and types of service used;

“(E) telephone or instrument number or other subscriber number or identity, including any temporarily assigned network address; and

“(F) means and source of payment for such service (including any credit card or bank account number),

of a subscriber or customer of such service.

“(3) NOTICE NOT REQUIRED.—A governmental entity that receives records or information under this subsection is not required to provide notice to a subscriber or customer.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall be construed to limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized under a Federal or State statute or to use a Federal or State grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena to—

“(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of an electronic communication to disclose the contents of the electronic communication to the governmental entity; or

“(2) require an entity that provides electronic communication services to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose the contents of an electronic communication to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the electronic communication is held, stored, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned or operated by the entity.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 2703(d) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “A court order for disclosure under subsection (b) or (c)” and inserting “A court order for disclosure under subsection (c)”;

(2) by striking “the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or”.

SEC. 204. DELAYED NOTICE.

Section 2705 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 2705. Delayed notice

“(a) DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is seeking a warrant under section 2703(a) may include in the application for the warrant a request for an order delaying the notification required under section 2703(b) for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for delayed notification made under

paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant one or more extensions of the delay of notification granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(4) EXPIRATION OF THE DELAY OF NOTIFICATION.—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notification under paragraph (2) or (3), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective as specified by the court approving the search warrant, the customer or subscriber—

“(A) a copy of the warrant; and

“(B) notice that informs the customer or subscriber—

“(i) of the nature of the law enforcement inquiry with reasonable specificity;

“(ii) that information maintained for the customer or subscriber by the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service named in the process or request was supplied to, or requested by, the governmental entity;

“(iii) of the date on which the warrant was served on the provider and the date on which the information was provided by the provider to the governmental entity;

“(iv) that notification of the customer or subscriber was delayed;

“(v) the identity of the court authorizing the delay; and

“(vi) of the provision of this chapter under which the delay was authorized.

“(b) PRECLUSION OF NOTICE TO SUBJECT OF GOVERNMENTAL ACCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A governmental entity that is obtaining the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 may apply to a court for an order directing a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to which a warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive under section 2703 is directed not to notify any other person of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive for a period of not more than 180 days in the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(2) DETERMINATION.—A court shall grant a request for an order made under paragraph (1) if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant, order, subpoena, or other directive may result in—

“(A) endangering the life or physical safety of an individual;

“(B) flight from prosecution;

“(C) destruction of or tampering with evidence;

“(D) intimidation of potential witnesses; or

“(E) otherwise seriously jeopardizing an investigation or unduly delaying a trial.

“(3) EXTENSION.—Upon request by a governmental entity, a court may grant one or more extensions of an order granted under paragraph (2) of not more than 180 days in

the case of a law enforcement agency, or not more than 90 days in the case of any other governmental entity.

“(4) **PRIOR NOTICE TO LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—Upon expiration of the period of delay of notice under this section, and not later than 3 business days before providing notice to a customer or subscriber, a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service shall notify the governmental entity that obtained the contents of a communication or information or records under section 2703 of the intent of the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service to notify the customer or subscriber of the existence of the warrant, order, or subpoena seeking that information.

“(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section and section 2703, the term ‘law enforcement agency’ means an agency of the United States, a State, or a political subdivision of a State, authorized by law or by a government agency to engage in or supervise the prevention, detection, investigation, or prosecution of any violation of criminal law, or any other Federal or State agency conducting a criminal investigation.”.

SEC. 205. EVALUATION BY THE GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE.

Not later than September 30, 2017, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report regarding the disclosure of customer communications and records under section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, which shall include—

(1) an analysis and evaluation of such disclosure under section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, as in effect before the date of enactment of this Act, including—

(A) a comprehensive analysis and evaluation regarding the number of individual instances, in each of the 5 years before the year in which this Act is enacted, in which Federal, State, or local law enforcement officers used section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, to obtain information relevant to an ongoing criminal investigation;

(B) an analysis of the average length of time taken by a provider of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service to comply with requests by law enforcement officers for information under section 2703 of title 18, United States Code;

(C) the number of individual instances, in each of the 5 years before the year in which this Act is enacted, in which information was requested by law enforcement officers from a provider of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service under a warrant as authorized under section 2703(a) of title 18, United States Code;

(D) the number of individual instances and type of request, in each of the 5 years before the year in which this Act is enacted, in which information was requested by law enforcement officers from a provider of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service under the other information request provisions in section 2703 of title 18, United States Code; and

(E) the number of individual instances, in each of the 5 years before the year in which this Act is enacted, in which law enforcement officers requested delayed notification to the subscriber or customer under section 2705 of title 18, United States Code; and

(2) an analysis and evaluation of such disclosure under section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, as amended by this title, including—

(A) an evaluation of the effects of the amendments to the warrant requirements on

judges, court dockets, or any other court operations;

(B) a survey of Federal, State, and local judges and law enforcement officers to determine the average length of time required for providers of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service to provide the contents of communications requested under a search warrant, which shall include identifying the number of instances in which a judge was required to order a provider of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service to appear to show cause for failing to comply with a warrant or to issue an order of contempt against a provider of an electronic communication service or a remote computing service for such a failure; and

(C) determining whether the amendments to the warrant requirements resulted in an increase in the use of the emergency exception under section 2702(b)(8) of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 206. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title shall be construed to preclude the acquisition by the United States Government of—

(1) the contents of a wire or electronic communication pursuant to other lawful authorities, including the authorities under chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the “Wiretap Act”), the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this title; or

(2) records or other information relating to a subscriber or customer of any electronic communications service or remote computing service (not including the content of such communications) pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.), chapter 119 of title 18 (commonly known as the “Wiretap Act”), or any other provision of Federal law not specifically amended by this title.

SA 2557. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Mr. CARDIN, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . FUNDING.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, there is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, an additional amount for the appropriations account appropriated under the heading “SALARIES AND EXPENSES” under the heading “OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT”, \$37,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2017, for accelerated cybersecurity in response to data breaches.

(b) **EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—The amount appropriated under subsection (a) is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.

SA 2558. Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE ASSESSMENT

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Cybersecurity Workforce Assessment Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—The term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives;

(D) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(E) the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of House of Representatives.

(2) **DIRECTOR.**—The term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Personnel Management.

(3) **ROLES.**—The term “roles” has the meaning given the term in the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s Cybersecurity Workforce Framework.

SEC. 203. NATIONAL CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE MEASUREMENT INITIATIVE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The head of each Federal agency shall—

(1) identify all positions within the agency that require the performance of information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions; and

(2) assign the corresponding employment code, which shall be added to the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s National Cybersecurity Workforce Framework, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **EMPLOYMENT CODES.**—

(1) **PROCEDURES.**—

(A) **CODING STRUCTURE.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the National Institute of Standards and Technology, shall update the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s Cybersecurity Workforce Framework to include a corresponding coding structure.

(B) **IDENTIFICATION OF CIVILIAN CYBER PERSONNEL.**—Not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence, shall establish procedures to implement the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s coding structure to identify all Federal civilian positions that require the performance of information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions.

(C) **IDENTIFICATION OF NON-CIVILIAN CYBER PERSONNEL.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall establish procedures to implement the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education’s coding structure to identify all Federal non-civilian positions that require the performance of information technology, cybersecurity or other cyber-related functions.

(D) **BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF EXISTING CYBERSECURITY WORKFORCE.**—Not later than 3 months after the date on which the procedures are developed under subparagraphs (B)

and (C), respectively, the head of each Federal agency shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees of jurisdiction a report that identifies—

(i) the percentage of personnel with information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related job functions who currently hold the appropriate industry-recognized certifications as identified in the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education's Cybersecurity Workforce Framework;

(ii) the level of preparedness of other civilian and non-civilian cyber personnel without existing credentials to pass certification exams; and

(iii) a strategy for mitigating any gaps identified in clause (i) or (ii) with the appropriate training and certification for existing personnel.

(E) PROCEDURES FOR ASSIGNING CODES.—Not later than 3 months after the date on which the procedures are developed under subparagraphs (B) and (C), respectively, the head of each Federal agency shall establish procedures—

(i) to identify all encumbered and vacant positions with information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions (as defined in the National Initiative for Cybersecurity Education's coding structure); and

(ii) to assign the appropriate employment code to each such position, using agreed standards and definitions.

(2) CODE ASSIGNMENTS.—Not later than 1 year after the date after the procedures are established under paragraph (1)(E), the head of each Federal agency shall complete assignment of the appropriate employment code to each position within the agency with information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related functions.

(c) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a progress report on the implementation of this section to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 204. IDENTIFICATION OF CYBER-RELATED ROLES OF CRITICAL NEED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date on which the employment codes are assigned to employees pursuant to section 203(b)(2), and annually through 2022, the head of each Federal agency, in consultation with the Director and the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall—

(1) identify information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related roles of critical need in the agency's workforce; and

(2) submit a report to the Director that—

(A) describes the information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related roles identified under paragraph (1); and

(B) substantiates the critical need designations.

(b) GUIDANCE.—The Director shall provide Federal agencies with timely guidance for identifying information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related roles of critical need, including—

(1) current information technology, cybersecurity, and other cyber-related roles with acute skill shortages; and

(2) information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related roles with emerging skill shortages.

(c) CYBERSECURITY NEEDS REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall—

(1) identify critical needs for information technology, cybersecurity, or other cyber-related workforce across all Federal agencies; and

(2) submit a progress report on the implementation of this section to the appropriate congressional committees.

SEC. 205. GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE STATUS REPORTS.

The Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) analyze and monitor the implementation of sections 203 and 204; and

(2) not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that describes the status of such implementation.

SA 2559. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 8, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(16) REAL TIME; REAL-TIME.—The terms “real time” and “real-time” means as close to real time as practicable.

(17) DELAY.—The term “delay”, with respect to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator, excludes any time necessary to ensure that the cyber threat indicator shared does not contain any personally identifiable information not needed to describe or identify a cybersecurity threat.

(18) MODIFICATION.—The term “modification”, with respect to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator, excludes any process necessary to ensure that the cyber threat indicator modified does not contain any personally identifiable information not needed to describe or identify a cybersecurity threat.

SA 2560. Mr. MANCHIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, strike lines 4 through 10, and insert the following:

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B) and paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this Act and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(B) EXCEPTION FOR DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), no entity is permitted under this Act to share with the Department of Defense or any component of the Department, including the National Security Agency, a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

SA 2561. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —CARRYING OF FIREARMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Servicemembers Self-Defense Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FIREARMS PERMITTED ON DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PROPERTY.

Section 930(g)(1) of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “The term ‘Federal facility’ means” and inserting the following: “The term ‘Federal facility’—

“(A) means”;

(2) by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”;

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) with respect to a qualified member of the Armed Forces, as defined in section 926D(a), does not include any land, a building, or any part thereof owned or leased by the Department of Defense.”.

SEC. 3. LAWFUL POSSESSION OF FIREARMS ON MILITARY INSTALLATIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) MODIFICATION OF GENERAL ARTICLE.—Section 934 of title 10, United States Code (article 134 of the Uniform Code of Military Justice), is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “Though not specifically mentioned”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(b) POSSESSION OF A FIREARM.—The possession of a concealed or open carry firearm by a member of the armed forces subject to this chapter on a military installation, if lawful under the laws of the State in which the installation is located, is not an offense under this section.”.

(b) MODIFICATION OF REGULATIONS.—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense shall amend Department of Defense Directive number 5210.56 to provide that members of the Armed Forces may possess firearms for defensive purposes on facilities and installations of the Department of Defense in a manner consistent with the laws of the State in which the facility or installation concerned is located.

SEC. 4. CARRYING OF CONCEALED FIREARMS BY QUALIFIED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 926C the following

“§926D. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified members of the Armed Forces

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

“(1) the term ‘firearm’—

“(A) except as provided in this paragraph, has the same meaning as in section 921;

“(B) includes ammunition not expressly prohibited by Federal law or subject to the provisions of the National Firearms Act; and

“(C) does not include—

“(i) any machinegun (as defined in section 5845 of the National Firearms Act);

“(ii) any firearm silencer; or

“(iii) any destructive device; and

“(2) the term ‘qualified member of the Armed Forces’ means an individual who—

“(A) is a member of the Armed Forces on active duty status, as defined in section 101(d)(1) of title 10;

“(B) is not the subject of disciplinary action under the National Code of Military Justice;

“(C) is not under the influence of alcohol or another intoxicating or hallucinatory drug or substance; and

“(D) is not prohibited by Federal law from receiving a firearm.”.

“(b) AUTHORIZATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of the law of any State or any political subdivision thereof, an individual who is a qualified member of the Armed Forces and who is carry identification required by subsection (d) may carry a concealed firearm that has been shipped or transported in interstate or foreign commerce, subject to subsection (c).

“(c) LIMITATIONS.—This section shall not be construed to superseded or limit the laws of any State that—

“(1) permit private persons or entities to prohibit or restrict the possession of concealed firearms on their property; or

“(2) prohibit or restrict the possession of firearms on any State or local government property, installation, building, base, or park.

“(d) IDENTIFICATION.—The identification required by this subsection is the photographic identification issued by the Department of Defense for the qualified member of the Armed Forces.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 926C the following:

“926D. Carrying of concealed firearms by qualified members of the Armed Forces.”.

SA 2562. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 11. LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FUNDS TO SANCTUARY CITIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL FUNDS TO SANCTUARY CITIES.—

“(1) SANCTUARY CITY DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘sanctuary city’ means a State or subdivision of a State that the Attorney General determines—

“(A) has in effect a statute, policy, or practice that is not in compliance with subsection (a) or (b); or

“(B) does not have a statute, policy, or practice that requires law enforcement officers—

“(i) to notify the U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement if the State or unit has custody of an alien without lawful status in the United States and detain the alien for no more than six hours for no other purpose than to determine whether or not U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement will issue a detainer request; and

“(ii) to maintain custody of such an alien for a period of not less than 48 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays) if U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement issues a detainer for such alien.

“(2) LIMITATION ON GRANTS.—A sanctuary city shall not be eligible to receive, for a minimum period of at least 1 year, any funds pursuant to—

“(A) the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant Program established pursuant to subpart 1 of part E of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3750 et seq.);

“(B) the ‘Cops’ program under part Q of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and

Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd et seq.);

“(C) the Urban Area Security Initiative authorized under section 2003 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 604);

“(D) the State Homeland Security Grant Program authorized under section 2004 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 605);

“(E) the port security grant program authorized under section 70107 of title 46, United States Code;

“(F) the State Criminal Alien Assistance Program under section 241(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1231(i)); or

“(G) any other non-disaster preparedness grant program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency.

“(3) TERMINATION OF INELIGIBILITY.—A jurisdiction that is found to be a sanctuary city shall only become eligible to receive funds under a program set out under paragraph (1) after the Attorney General certifies that the jurisdiction is no longer a sanctuary city.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 642 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1373) is amended by striking “Immigration and Naturalization Service” each place that term appears and inserting “Department of Homeland Security”.

SEC. 12. TRANSFER OF ALIENS FROM BUREAU OF PRISONS CUSTODY.

(a) TRANSFER TO U.S. IMMIGRATION AND CUSTOMS ENFORCEMENT.—The Attorney General shall prioritize a request from the Secretary of Homeland Security to transfer a covered alien to the custody of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement before a request from the appropriate official of a State or a subdivision of a State to transfer the covered alien to the custody of such State or subdivision.

(b) COVERED ALIEN DEFINED.—In this section, the term “covered alien” means an alien who—

(1) is without lawful status in the United States; and

(2) is in the custody of the Bureau of Prisons.

SA 2563. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

TITLE —FEDERAL RESERVE TRANSPARENCY

SEC. 01. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Reserve Transparency Act of 2015”.

SEC. 02. AUDIT REFORM AND TRANSPARENCY FOR THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 714 of title 31, United States Code, or any other provision of law, an audit of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal reserve banks under subsection (b) of such section 714 shall be completed within 12 months of the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) REPORT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A report on the audit required under subsection (a) shall be submitted by the Comptroller General to the Congress before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date on which such audit is

completed and made available to the Speaker of the House, the majority and minority leaders of the House of Representatives, the majority and minority leaders of the Senate, the Chairman and Ranking Member of the committee and each subcommittee of jurisdiction in the House of Representatives and the Senate, and any other Member of Congress who requests it.

(2) CONTENTS.—The report under paragraph (1) shall include a detailed description of the findings and conclusion of the Comptroller General with respect to the audit that is the subject of the report, together with such recommendations for legislative or administrative action as the Comptroller General may determine to be appropriate.

(c) REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.—Subsection (b) of section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking all after “in writing.”.

(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 714 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (f).

SEC. 03. AUDIT OF LOAN FILE REVIEWS REQUIRED BY ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct an audit of the review of loan files of homeowners in foreclosure in 2009 or 2010, required as part of the enforcement actions taken by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System against supervised financial institutions.

(b) CONTENT OF AUDIT.—The audit carried out pursuant to subsection (a) shall consider, at a minimum—

(1) the guidance given by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to independent consultants retained by the supervised financial institutions regarding the procedures to be followed in conducting the file reviews;

(2) the factors considered by independent consultants when evaluating loan files;

(3) the results obtained by the independent consultants pursuant to those reviews;

(4) the determinations made by the independent consultants regarding the nature and extent of financial injury sustained by each homeowner as well as the level and type of remediation offered to each homeowner; and

(5) the specific measures taken by the independent consultants to verify, confirm, or rebut the assertions and representations made by supervised financial institutions regarding the contents of loan files and the extent of financial injury to homeowners.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than the end of the 6-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General shall issue a report to the Congress containing all findings and determinations made in carrying out the audit required under subsection (a).

SA 2564. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, line between lines 19 and 20, insert the following:

(d) EXCEPTION.—This section shall not apply to any private entity that, in the course of monitoring information under section 4(a) or sharing information under section 4(c), breaks a user agreement or privacy agreement with a customer of the private entity.

SA 2565. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 40, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following:

(iv) For inclusion in the unclassified form of this report under paragraph (4) of this subsection, to the greatest extent practicable, the number of United States persons who have been the subject of monitoring authorized under section 4.

(v) For inclusion in the unclassified form of this report under paragraph (4) of this subsection, to the greatest extent practicable, the number of United States persons with respect to whom personal information of or identifying the persons was shared with a Federal entity under this Act.

SA 2566. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, line 19, insert “with an entity or another Federal entity” after “indicator”.

SA 2567. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 8, add the following:

(n) **PRESERVATION OF PRIVACY LAW.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, nothing in this Act shall supersede any provision of law as it relates to the retention by a Federal entity of personal information of or identifying a specific United States person.

SA 2568. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 45, line 4, add “Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of such information to the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board.” after “law.”.

SA 2569. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act or amendments made by this Act shall be construed as permitting

the Federal Government to access communications content outside of networks of the Federal Government, including e-mail and messaging content, of a person located in the United States without prior court approval.

SA 2570. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. FOURTH AMENDMENT PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Fourth Amendment Preservation and Protection Act of 2015”.

(b) **FINDINGS.**—Congress finds that the right under the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures is violated when the Federal Government or a State or local government acquires information voluntarily relinquished by a person to another party for a limited business purpose without the express informed consent of the person to the specific request by the Federal Government or a State or local government or a warrant, upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “system of records” means any group of records from which information is retrieved by the name of the individual or by some identifying number, symbol, or other identifying particular associated with the individual.

(d) **PROHIBITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the Federal Government and a State or local government may not obtain or seek to obtain information relating to an individual or group of individuals held by a third party in a system of records, and no such information shall be admissible in a criminal prosecution in a court of law.

(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The Federal Government or a State or local government may obtain, and a court may admit, information relating to an individual held by a third party in a system of records if—

(A) the individual whose name or identification information the Federal Government or State or local government is using to access the information provides express and informed consent to the search; or

(B) the Federal Government or State or local government obtains a warrant, upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

SA 2571. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS TO CONDUCT WARRANTLESS SEARCHES FOR THE COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.

Section 702(b) of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1881a(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (5) as subparagraphs (A) through (E), respectively, and indenting such subparagraphs, as so redesignated, an additional two ems from the left margin;

(2) by striking “An acquisition” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—An acquisition”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) **CLARIFICATION ON PROHIBITION ON SEARCHING OF COLLECTIONS OF COMMUNICATIONS OF UNITED STATES PERSONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), no officer or employee of the United States may conduct a search of a collection of communications acquired under this section in an effort to find communications of a particular United States person (other than a corporation).

“(B) **CONCURRENT AUTHORIZATION AND EXCEPTION FOR EMERGENCY SITUATIONS.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a search for communications related to a particular United States person if—

“(i) such United States person is the subject of an order or emergency authorization authorizing electronic surveillance or physical search under section 105, 304, 703, 704, or 705 of this Act, or under title 18, United States Code, for the effective period of that order;

“(ii) the entity carrying out the search has a reasonable belief that the life or safety of such United States person is threatened and the information is sought for the purpose of assisting that person; or

“(iii) such United States person has consented to the search.”.

SA 2572. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. PROHIBITION ON DATA SECURITY VULNERABILITY MANDATES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (b), no agency may mandate that a manufacturer, developer, or seller of covered products design or alter the security functions in its product or service to allow the surveillance of any user of such product or service, or to allow the physical search of such product, by any agency.

(b) **EXCEPTION.**—Subsection (a) shall not apply to mandates authorized under the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(c) **COVERED PRODUCT DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “covered product” means any computer hardware, computer software, or electronic device that is made available to the general public.

SA 2573. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about

cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part II of the Federal Power Act is amended by inserting after section 215 (16 U.S.C. 824o) the following:

“SEC. 215A. CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE SECURITY.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) BULK-POWER SYSTEM; ELECTRIC RELIABILITY ORGANIZATION; REGIONAL ENTITY.—The terms ‘bulk-power system’, ‘Electric Reliability Organization’, and ‘regional entity’ have the meanings given those terms in section 215.

“(2) CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ‘critical electric infrastructure’ means a system or asset of the bulk-power system, whether physical or virtual, the incapacity or destruction of which would negatively affect national security, economic security, public health or safety, or any combination of those matters.

“(3) CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘critical electric infrastructure information’ means information related to critical electric infrastructure, or proposed critical electric infrastructure, generated by or provided to the Commission or other Federal agency, other than classified national security information, that is designated as critical electric infrastructure information by the Commission under subsection (c)(2).

“(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term ‘critical electric infrastructure information’ includes information that qualifies as critical energy infrastructure information under regulations promulgated by the Commission.

“(4) CYBERSECURITY THREAT.—The term ‘cybersecurity threat’ means the imminent danger of an act that severely disrupts, attempts to severely disrupt, or poses a significant risk of severely disrupting the operation of programmable electronic devices or communications networks (including hardware, software, and data) essential to the reliable operation of the bulk-power system.

“(5) ELECTROMAGNETIC PULSE.—The term ‘electromagnetic pulse’ means 1 or more pulses of electromagnetic energy emitted by a device capable of disabling or disrupting operation of, or destroying, electronic devices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, by means of such a pulse.

“(6) GEOMAGNETIC STORM.—The term ‘geomagnetic storm’ means a temporary disturbance of the magnetic field of the Earth resulting from solar activity.

“(7) GRID SECURITY EMERGENCY.—The term ‘grid security emergency’ means the imminent danger of—

“(A) a malicious act using electronic communication or an electromagnetic pulse, or a geomagnetic storm event, that could disrupt the operation of those electronic devices or communications networks, including hardware, software, and data, that are essential to the reliability of the bulk-power system; and

“(B) disruption of the operation of such devices or networks, with significant adverse effects on the reliability of the bulk-power system, as a result of such act or event.

“(8) SECRETARY.—The term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Energy.

“(b) AUTHORITY TO ADDRESS GRID SECURITY EMERGENCY.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—If the President issues and provides to the Secretary a written directive or determination identifying a cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency, the Secretary may, with or without notice, hearing, or report, issue such orders for emergency measures as are necessary in the judgment of the Secretary to protect the bulk-power system during the cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency.

“(B) RULES.—As soon as practicable but not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall, after notice and opportunity for comment, establish rules of procedure that ensure that the authority described in subparagraph (A) can be exercised expeditiously.

“(2) NOTIFICATION OF CONGRESS.—If the President issues and provides to the Secretary a written directive or determination under paragraph (1), the President shall promptly notify congressional committees of relevant jurisdiction, including the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, of the contents of, and justification for, the directive or determination.

“(3) CONSULTATION.—Before issuing an order for emergency measures under paragraph (1), the Secretary shall, to the extent practicable in light of the nature of the cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency and the urgency of the need for action, consult with appropriate governmental authorities in Canada and Mexico, entities described in paragraph (4), the Commission, and other appropriate Federal agencies regarding implementation of the emergency measures.

“(4) APPLICATION.—An order for emergency measures under this subsection may apply to—

“(A) the Electric Reliability Organization;

“(B) a regional entity; or

“(C) any owner, user, or operator of the bulk-power system.

“(5) EXPIRATION AND REISSUANCE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), an order for emergency measures issued under paragraph (1) shall expire not later than 30 days after the issuance of the order.

“(B) EXTENSIONS.—The Secretary may reissue an order for emergency measures issued under paragraph (1) for subsequent periods, not to exceed 30 days for each such period, if the President, for each such period, issues and provides to the Secretary a written directive or determination that the cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency identified under paragraph (1) continues to exist or that the emergency measure continues to be required.

“(6) COST RECOVERY FOR CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—If the Commission determines that owners, operators, or users of the critical electric infrastructure have incurred substantial costs to comply with an order for emergency measures issued under this subsection and that such costs were prudently incurred and cannot reasonably be recovered through regulated rates or market prices for the electric energy or services sold by such owners, operators, or users, the Commission may, after notice and an opportunity for comment, prescribe standards for a public utility to seek to recover such costs by filing a rate schedule or tariff pursuant to section 205 for sales of electric energy or the transmission of electric energy subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission.

“(7) TEMPORARY ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—The Secretary, and other appro-

priate Federal agencies, shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the obligations of the Secretary and Federal agencies to protect classified information, provide temporary access to classified information related to a cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency for which emergency measures are issued under paragraph (1) to key personnel of any entity subject to the emergency measures to enable optimum communication between the entity and the Secretary and other appropriate Federal agencies regarding the cybersecurity threat or grid security emergency.

“(c) PROTECTION AND SHARING OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION.—

“(1) PROTECTION OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—Critical electric infrastructure information—

“(A) shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552(b)(3) of title 5, United States Code; and

“(B) shall not be made available by any State, political subdivision, or tribal authority pursuant to any State, political subdivision, or tribal law requiring disclosure of information or records.

“(2) DESIGNATION AND SHARING OF CRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Commission, in consultation with the Secretary, shall promulgate such regulations and issue such orders as necessary—

“(A) to designate critical electric infrastructure information;

“(B) to prohibit the unauthorized disclosure of critical electric infrastructure information; and

“(C) to ensure there are appropriate sanctions in place for Commissioners, officers, employees, or agents of the Commission who knowingly and willfully disclose critical electric infrastructure information in a manner that is not authorized under this section.

“(3) CONSIDERATIONS.—In promulgating regulations and issuing orders under paragraph (2), the Commission shall take into consideration the role of State commissions in—

“(A) reviewing the prudence and cost of investments;

“(B) determining the rates and terms of conditions for electric services; and

“(C) ensuring the safety and reliability of the bulk-power system and distribution facilities within the respective jurisdictions of the State commissions.

“(4) NO REQUIRED SHARING OF INFORMATION.—Nothing in this section requires a person or entity in possession of critical electric infrastructure information to share the information with Federal, State, local, or tribal authorities, or any other person or entity.

“(5) DISCLOSURE OF NONCRITICAL ELECTRIC INFRASTRUCTURE INFORMATION.—In carrying out this section, the Commission shall segregate critical electric infrastructure information within documents and electronic communications, wherever feasible, to facilitate disclosure of information that is not designated as critical electric infrastructure information.

“(d) SECURITY CLEARANCES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall facilitate and, to the extent practicable, expedite the acquisition of adequate security clearances by key personnel of any entity subject to this section, to enable optimum communication with Federal agencies regarding threats to the security of the critical electric infrastructure.

“(2) SHARING.—The Secretary, the Commission, and other appropriate Federal agencies

shall, to the extent practicable and consistent with the obligations of the Secretary, Commission, and Federal agencies to protect classified and critical electric infrastructure information, share timely actionable information regarding grid security with appropriate key personnel of owners, operators, and users of the critical electric infrastructure.

“(e) CLARIFICATIONS OF LIABILITY.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), to the extent any action or omission taken by an entity that is necessary to comply with an order for emergency measures issued under subsection (b)(1), including any action or omission taken to voluntarily comply with the order, results in noncompliance with, or causes the entity not to comply with, any rule, order, regulation, or provision of this Act, including any reliability standard approved by the Commission pursuant to section 215, the action or omission shall not be considered a violation of the rule, order, regulation, or provision.

“(2) RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAW.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), an action or omission taken by an owner, operator, or user of the bulk-power system to comply with an order for emergency measures issued under subsection (b)(1) shall be treated as an action or omission taken to comply with an order issued under section 202(c) for purposes of section 215.

“(3) ADMINISTRATION.—Nothing in this subsection requires dismissal of a cause of action against an entity that, in the course of complying with an order for emergency measures issued under subsection (b)(1) by taking an action or omission for which the entity would be liable but for paragraph (1) or (2), takes the action or omission in a grossly negligent manner.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 201 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 824) is amended by inserting “215A,” after “215,” each place it appears in subsections (b)(2) and (e).

SA 2574. Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS TO DATA STORED ABROAD ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “The Law Enforcement Access to Data Stored Abroad Act”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Electronic Communications Privacy Act of 1986 (Public Law 99-508; 100 Stat. 1848) (referred to in this section as “ECPA”) was intended to protect the privacy of electronic communications stored with providers of electronic communications services and remote computing services, while balancing the legitimate needs of law enforcement to access records stored by such providers.

(2) To strike this balance, ECPA authorized governmental entities to obtain certain categories of communications data from providers using established, pre-existing forms of process—warrants and subpoenas. It also created a new form of court order, in section 2703(d) of title 18, United States Code, that

governmental entities could use to obtain additional types of communications data.

(3) It has been well established that courts in the United States lack the power to issue warrants authorizing extraterritorial searches and seizures, and neither ECPA nor subsequent amendments extended the warrant power of courts in the United States beyond the territorial reach of the United States.

(4) Nevertheless, Congress also recognizes the legitimate needs of law enforcement agencies in the United States to obtain, through lawful process, electronic communications relevant to criminal investigations related to United States persons wherever that content may be stored. Therefore, this title authorizes the use of search warrants extraterritorially only where the Government seeks to obtain the contents of electronic communications belonging to a United States person.

SEC. 203. SCOPE AND CLARIFICATION OF WARRANT REQUIREMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 121 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 2702(a), by amending paragraph (3) to read as follows:

“(3) a provider of remote computing service or electronic communication service to the public shall not knowingly divulge to any governmental entity the contents of any communication described in section 2703(a), or any record or other information pertaining to a subscriber or customer of such service.”;

(2) in section 2703—

(A) by striking subsections (a) and (b) and inserting the following:

“(a) **CONTENTS OF WIRE OR ELECTRONIC COMMUNICATION IN ELECTRONIC STORAGE.**—A governmental entity may require the disclosure by a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service of the contents of a wire or electronic communication that is in electronic storage with or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by the provider only pursuant to a warrant issued using the procedures described in the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure (or, in the case of a State court, issued using State warrant procedures) by a court of competent jurisdiction. Subject to subsection (b), a warrant issued pursuant to this subsection may be used to require the disclosure of contents of a wire or electronic communication that are in the provider’s electronic storage within the United States or otherwise stored, held, or maintained within the United States by the provider.

“(b) **WARRANT REQUIREMENTS.**—A warrant issued under subsection (a) may require the disclosure of the contents of a wire or electronic communication, regardless of where such contents may be in electronic storage or otherwise stored, held, or maintained by the provider, if the account-holder whose contents are sought by the warrant is a United States person. A court issuing a warrant pursuant to this subsection, on a motion made promptly by the service provider, shall modify or vacate such warrant if the court finds that the warrant would require the provider of an electronic communications or remote computing service to violate the laws of a foreign country.”;

(B) in subsection (d), in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “(b) or”;

(ii) by striking “the contents of a wire or electronic communication, or”;

(iii) by striking “sought, are” and inserting “sought are”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section or in section 2702 shall be con-

strued to limit the authority of a governmental entity to use an administrative subpoena authorized under a Federal or State statute or to use a Federal or State grand jury, trial, or civil discovery subpoena to—

“(1) require an originator, addressee, or intended recipient of an electronic communication to disclose the contents of the electronic communication to the governmental entity; or

“(2) require an entity that provides electronic communication services to the officers, directors, employees, or agents of the entity (for the purpose of carrying out their duties) to disclose the contents of an electronic communication to or from an officer, director, employee, or agent of the entity to a governmental entity, if the electronic communication is held, stored, or maintained on an electronic communications system owned or operated by the entity.

“(i) **NOTICE.**—Except as provided in section 2705, not later than 10 business days after a governmental entity receives the contents of a wire or electronic communication of a subscriber or customer from a provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service under subsection (a), the governmental entity shall serve upon, or deliver to by registered or first-class mail, electronic mail, or other means reasonably calculated to be effective, as specified by the court issuing the warrant, the subscriber or customer—

“(1) a copy of the warrant; and

“(2) notice that informs the customer or subscriber—

“(A) of the nature of the law enforcement inquiry with reasonable specificity; and

“(B) that information maintained for the customer or subscriber by the provider of electronic communication service or remote computing service named in the process or request was supplied to, or requested by, the governmental entity.”;

(3) in section 2704(a)(1), by striking “section 2703(b)(2)” and inserting “section 2703”;

(4) in section 2705—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (1) and inserting the following:

“(1) A governmental entity that is seeking a warrant under section 2703 may include in the application for the warrant a request, which the court shall grant, for an order delaying the notification required under section 2703(i) for a period of not more than 90 days, if the court determines that there is reason to believe that notification of the existence of the warrant may have an adverse result described in paragraph (2) of this subsection.”; and

(B) in subsection (b), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “under section 2703(b)(1)”;

(5) in section 2711—

(A) in paragraph (3)(B) by striking “warrants; and” and inserting “warrants”;

(B) in paragraph (4) by striking “thereof.” and inserting “thereof; and”;

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) the term ‘United States person’ means a citizen or permanent resident alien of the United States, or an entity or organization organized under the laws of the United States or a State or political subdivision thereof.”.

SEC. 204. MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE TREATY REFORMS.

(a) MUTUAL LEGAL ASSISTANCE TREATY TRANSPARENCY AND EFFICIENCY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish—

(A) a form for use by a foreign government filing a mutual legal assistance treaty request (referred to in this section as an “MLAT request”), which shall—

(i) be made available on the website of the Department of Justice; and

(ii) require sufficient information and be susceptible for use by a foreign government to provide all the information necessary for the MLAT request; and

(B) an online docketing system for all MLAT requests, which shall allow a foreign government to track the status of an MLAT request filed by the foreign government.

(2) ANNUAL PUBLICATION.—Beginning not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, the Attorney General shall publish on the website of the Department of Justice statistics on—

(A)(i) the number of MLAT requests made by the Department of Justice to foreign governments for the purpose of obtaining the contents of an electronic communication or other information or records from a provider of electronic communications or remote computing services; and

(ii) the average length of time taken by foreign governments to process the MLAT requests described in clause (i); and

(B)(i) the number of MLAT requests made to the Department of Justice by foreign governments for the purpose of obtaining the contents of an electronic communication or other information or records from a provider of electronic communications or remote computing services; and

(ii) the average length of time taken by the Department of Justice to process the MLAT requests described in clause (i).

(3) NOTICE TO DEPARTMENT OF STATE.—The Attorney General shall notify the Secretary of State not later than 7 days after the date on which disclosure of electronic communications content to a foreign government is made pursuant to an MLAT request.

(b) PRESERVATION OF RECORDS.—The Attorney General may issue a request pursuant to section 2703(f) of title 18, United States Code, upon receipt of an MLAT request that appears to be facially valid.

(c) NOTIFICATION TO PROVIDER OF MLAT REQUEST.—When the Attorney General makes use of the process provided in section 2703 of title 18, United States Code, to obtain information from an electronic communications provider or a remote computing provider based on an MLAT request, the Attorney General shall notify that provider in writing that the request has been made pursuant to a mutual legal assistance treaty.

SEC. 205. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) data localization requirements imposed by foreign governments on data providers are—

(A) incompatible with the borderless nature of the Internet;

(B) an impediment to online innovation; and

(C) unnecessary to meet the needs of law enforcement; and

(2) the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the United States Trade Representatives should pursue open data flow policies with foreign nations.

SA 2575. Ms. HIRONO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 38, strike lines 7, 8, and 9, and insert the following:

(A) the date on which the interim policies and procedures are submitted to Congress under section 5(a)(1) and guidelines are submitted to Congress under section 5(b)(1); or

SA 2576. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, strike line 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 30102(a)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (11) as paragraphs (10) through (17), respectively;

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as paragraphs (4) through (6), respectively;

(C) by inserting before paragraph (3), as redesignated, the following:

“(1) ‘Administrator’ means the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration;

“(2) ‘Commission’ means the Federal Trade Commission;

“(3) ‘critical software systems’ means software systems that can affect the driver’s control of the vehicle movement;”; and

(D) by inserting after paragraph (6), as redesignated, the following:

“(7) ‘driving data’ include, but are not limited to, any electronic information collected about—

“(A) a vehicle’s status, including, but not limited to, its location or speed; and

“(B) any owner, lessee, driver, or passenger of a vehicle;

“(8) ‘entry points’ include, but are not limited to, means by which—

“(A) driving data may be accessed, directly or indirectly; or

“(B) control signals may be sent or received either wirelessly or through wired connections;

“(9) ‘hacking’ means the unauthorized access to electronic controls or driving data, either wirelessly or through wired connections;”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“§ 30129. Cybersecurity standards

“(a) CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—All motor vehicles manufactured for sale in the United States on or after the date that is 2 years after the date on which final regulations are prescribed pursuant to section 10(b)(2) of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 shall comply with the cybersecurity standards set forth in paragraphs (2) through (4).

“(2) PROTECTION AGAINST HACKING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—All entry points to the electronic systems of each motor vehicle manufactured for sale in the United States shall be equipped with reasonable measures to protect against hacking attacks.

“(B) ISOLATION MEASURES.—The measures referred to in subparagraph (A) shall incorporate isolation measures to separate critical software systems from noncritical software systems.

“(C) EVALUATION.—The measures referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be evaluated for security vulnerabilities following

best security practices, including appropriate applications of techniques such as penetration testing.

“(D) ADJUSTMENT.—The measures referred to in subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be adjusted and updated based on the results of the evaluation described in subparagraph (C).

“(3) SECURITY OF COLLECTED INFORMATION.—All driving data collected by the electronic systems that are built into motor vehicles shall be reasonably secured to prevent unauthorized access—

“(A) while such data are stored onboard the vehicle;

“(B) while such data are in transit from the vehicle to another location; and

“(C) in any subsequent offboard storage or use.

“(4) DETECTION, REPORTING, AND RESPONDING TO HACKING.—Any motor vehicle that presents an entry point shall be equipped with capabilities to immediately detect, report, and stop attempts to intercept driving data or control the vehicle.

“(b) PENALTIES.—A person that violates this section is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not more than \$5,000 for each violation in accordance with section 30165.”.

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall issue a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to carry out section 30129 of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall issue final regulations to carry out section 30129 of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(3) UPDATES.—Not later than 3 years after final regulations are issued pursuant to paragraph (2) and not less frequently than once every 3 years thereafter, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall—

(A) review the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) update such regulations, as necessary.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 301 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 30128 and inserting the following:

“30128. Vehicle rollover prevention and crash mitigation.

“30129. Cybersecurity standards.”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 30165(a)(1) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting “30129,” after “30127.”.

SEC. 11. CYBER DASHBOARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 32302 of title 49, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

“(c) CYBER DASHBOARD.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—All motor vehicles manufactured for sale in the United States on or after the date that is 2 years after the date on which final regulations are prescribed pursuant to section 11(b)(2) of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 shall display a ‘cyber dashboard’, as a component of the label required to be affixed to each motor vehicle under section 32908(b).

“(2) FEATURES.—The cyber dashboard required under paragraph (1) shall inform consumers, through an easy-to-understand, standardized graphic, about the extent to which the motor vehicle protects the cybersecurity and privacy of motor vehicle owners, lessees, drivers, and passengers beyond

the minimum requirements set forth in section 30129 of this title and in section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.”.

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall prescribe regulations for the cybersecurity and privacy information required to be displayed under section 32302(c) of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall issue final regulations to carry out section 32302 of title 49, United States Code, as added by subsection (a).

(3) UPDATES.—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Administrator, after consultation with the Commission, shall—

(A) review the regulations issued pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) update such regulations, as necessary.

SEC. 12. PRIVACY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) is amended by inserting after section 26 (15 U.S.C. 57c-2) the following:

“SEC. 27. PRIVACY STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—All motor vehicles manufactured for sale in the United States on or after the date that is 2 years after the date on which final regulations are prescribed pursuant to subsection (e) shall comply with the features required under subsections (b) through (d).

“(b) TRANSPARENCY.—Each motor vehicle shall provide clear and conspicuous notice, in clear and plain language, to the owners or lessees of such vehicle of the collection, transmission, retention, and use of driving data collected from such motor vehicle.

“(c) CONSUMER CONTROL.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraphs (2) and (3), owners or lessees of motor vehicles shall be given the option of terminating the collection and retention of driving data.

“(2) ACCESS TO NAVIGATION TOOLS.—If a motor vehicle owner or lessee decides to terminate the collection and retention of driving data under paragraph (1), the owner or lessee shall not lose access to navigation tools or other features or capabilities, to the extent technically possible.

“(3) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to driving data stored as part of the electronic data recorder system or other safety systems on-board the motor vehicle that are required for post-incident investigations, emissions history checks, crash avoidance or mitigation, or other regulatory compliance programs.

“(d) LIMITATION ON USE OF PERSONAL DRIVING INFORMATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A manufacturer (including an original equipment manufacturer) may not use any information collected by a motor vehicle for advertising or marketing purposes without affirmative express consent by the owner or lessee.

“(2) REQUESTS.—Consent requests under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be clear and conspicuous;

“(B) shall be made in clear and plain language; and

“(C) may not be a condition for the use of any nonmarketing feature, capability, or functionality of the motor vehicle.

“(e) ENFORCEMENT.—A violation of this section shall be treated as an unfair and de-

ceptive act or practice in violation of a rule prescribed under section 18(a)(1)(B).”.

(b) RULEMAKING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission, after consultation with the Administrator of the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration (referred to in this subsection as the “Administrator”), shall prescribe regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a).

(2) FINAL REGULATIONS.—Not later than 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission, after consultation with the Administrator, shall issue final regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, to carry out section 27 of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as added by subsection (a).

(3) UPDATES.—Not less frequently than once every 3 years, the Commission, after consultation with the Administrator, shall—

(A) review the regulations prescribed pursuant to paragraph (2); and

(B) update such regulations, as necessary.

SEC. 13. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

SA 2577. Mr. MARKEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 17, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

(B) PROHIBITION ON USE FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN CYBERSECURITY PURPOSES.—A private entity may not use a cyber threat indicator or a defensive measure received under this section for any other purpose than as authorized in subparagraph (A), including for commercial, marketing, and sales purposes not authorized in subparagraph (A).

SA 2578. Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. TESTER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . REVIEW AND UPDATE OF GUIDANCE REGARDING SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR CERTAIN SENATE EMPLOYEES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “covered committee of the Senate” means—

(A) the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(C) the Subcommittee on Defense of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(D) the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(F) the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate;

(2) the term “covered Member of the Senate” means a Member of the Senate who serves on a covered committee of the Senate; and

(3) the term “Senate employee” means an employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate.

(b) REVIEW OF PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of Senate Security, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Chairperson of the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), shall—

(A) conduct a review of whether procedures in effect enable 1 Senate employee designated by each covered Member of the Senate to obtain security clearances necessary for access to classified national security information, including top secret and sensitive compartmentalized information, if the Senate employee meets the criteria for such clearances; and

(B) if the Director of Senate Security, in coordination with the Director of National Intelligence and the Chairperson of the Suitability and Security Clearance Performance Accountability Council established under Executive Order 13467 (73 Fed. Reg. 38103), determines the procedures described in subparagraph (A) are inadequate, issue guidelines on the establishment and implementation of such procedures.

(2) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of Senate Security shall submit to each covered committee of the Senate a report regarding the review conducted under paragraph (1)(A) and guidance, if any, issued under paragraph (1)(B).

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter—

(1) the rule of the Information Security Oversight Office implementing Standard Form 312, which Members of Congress sign in order to be permitted to access classified information;

(2) the requirement that Members of the Senate satisfy the “need-to-know” requirement to access classified information;

(3) the scope of the jurisdiction of any committee or subcommittee of the Senate; or

(4) the inherent authority of the executive branch of the Government, the Office of Senate Security, any Committee of the Senate, or the Department of Defense to determine recipients of all classified information.

SA 2579. Mr. VITTER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . SMALL BUSINESS CYBER SECURITY OPERATIONS CENTER.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) The Federal Government has been hit by a barrage of high-profile cyber assaults over the past year, including the attacks on the Office of Personnel Management and the Department of State.

(2) These attacks exposed the most sensitive personal information of millions of Federal employees and their families.

(3) The President has instituted emergency procedures to immediately deploy so-called indicators, or tell-tale signs of cybercrime operations, into agency anti-malware tools.

(4) According to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, small business concerns have

lost more than \$1,000,000,000 during the period beginning October 2013 and ending June 2015 as a result of cyber corporate account takeover and business email fraud.

(5) The Federal Government leverages the creative genius of small business concerns across the country to accomplish its missions.

(6) The Federal Acquisition Regulations dictates that a percentage of all Federal Government acquisition be set aside for small business concerns.

(7) Over 90 percent of small business concerns use the Internet through the course of their activities to conduct business.

(8) Small business concerns tend to have weaker online security and do not have necessary funding for high-end encryption technology or staff expertise.

(9) Industry reports indicate that 30 percent of cyber attacks target small business concerns and of those businesses that are attacked, 59 percent have no contingency plan, while according to a First Data report, the average cost for a data breach at a small business concern is \$36,000 and rising annually.

(10) A 2012 Verizon study shows that in 855 data breaches examined, 71 percent occurred in businesses with fewer than 100 employees.

(11) Small business concerns are increasingly attacked with data breaches and ransomware, where an attacker encrypts the businesses data until a ransom is paid to the attacker.

(12) It is imperative that small business concerns are provided improved secured guidance to limit negative impacts on the economy of the United States.

(13) There is a vast cyber threat facing the business sector of the United States, which poses a direct threat against the national security of the United States, the Department of Defense, private industry, and critical infrastructure components.

(14) The current layer of protection from cyber threats does not exist for small business concerns.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “Center” means the Small Business Cyber Security Operations Center established under subsection (c);

(2) the term “cyber lab” means—

(A) a Joint Cyber Training Lab; and

(B) a facility that works in conjunction with the National Guard Cyber Teams;

(3) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security; and

(4) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(c) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall begin carrying out a 3-year pilot program to establish a cybersecurity operations center for small business concerns, to be known as the Small Business Cyber Security Operations Center.

(d) PART OF EXISTING CENTER.—The Secretary shall establish the Center as part of and co-locate the Center with a center providing situational awareness information to businesses on the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) DUTIES.—The Center shall—

(1) work with cyber labs to provide realistic scenario based training to network managers and security personnel of small business concerns, including monitoring, detection, analysis (such as trend and pattern analysis), and response and restoration activities;

(2) provide periodic sharing, through publication and targeted outreach, of cybersecu-

rity best practices that are developed based on ongoing analysis of cyber threat indicators and information in possession of—

(A) the Federal Government;

(B) the Business Emergency Operations Center operated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency; and

(C) other technology and cyber research centers, as determined appropriate by the Secretary;

(3) collaborate with private industry, academia, and the Department of Defense to develop a secure business supply chain which is capable of adapting, evolving, and responding to emergent cybersecurity threats;

(4) review and develop the necessary tools to—

(A) facilitate security information flow and mitigation actions;

(B) provide cyber attack sensing, warning, and response services;

(5) place an emphasis on accessibility and relevance to small business concerns; and

(6) review the policy limitations and restrictions on information sharing relating to cybersecurity.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section \$2,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, to remain available until expended.

(2) OFFSET.—Section 21(a)(4)(C)(vii) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 648(a)(4)(C)(vii)) is amended—

(A) in subclause (I), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(III) \$133,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019.”.

SA 2580. Mr. FLAKE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 46, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 47, line 12, and insert the following:

(3) to require a new information sharing relationship between any entity and the Federal Government or another entity; or

(4) to require the use of the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security developed under section 5(c).

(g) PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any entity or Federal entity.

(h) ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require an entity to provide information to the Federal Government or another entity;

(2) to condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators with an entity on such entity's provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government or another entity; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity or another entity.

SA 2581. Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 29, strike line 9 and insert the following:

authority regarding a cybersecurity threat; and

(iii) communications between a private entity and the Federal Bureau of Investigation or the United States Secret Service regarding a cybersecurity threat;

SA 2582. Mr. FLAKE (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be in effect during the 6-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—With respect to any action authorized by this Act or information obtained pursuant to an action authorized by this Act, which occurred before the date on which the provisions referred to in subsection (a) cease to have effect, the provisions of this Act shall continue in effect.

SA 2583. Ms. BALDWIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 7(a)(2), by striking subparagraph (F) and inserting the following:

(F) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this Act, including—

(i) the number of actions taken by each agency, department, or component of the Federal Government with which the cyber threat indicators were shared;

(ii) the specific purpose under section 5(d)(5)(A) for which the cyber threat indicators were disclosed to, retained by, or used by each agency, department, or component of the Federal Government; and

(iii) the appropriateness of any subsequent retention, use, or dissemination of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under section 5.

In section 7(b)(2)(B), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators, including the number of actions taken by each Federal entity and the specific purpose under section 5(d)(5)(A) for which cyber threat indicators were disclosed to, retained by, or used by each Federal entity.

SA 2584. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be

proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(C) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS BY FEDERAL ENTITIES OF RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE, USE, AND PROTECTION OF VOLUNTARILY SHARED CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government knowingly or recklessly violates the requirements of this Act with respect to the disclosure, use, or protection of voluntarily shared cyber threat indicators, the United States shall be liable to a person adversely affected by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) the actual damages sustained by the person as a result of the violation or \$50,000, whichever is greater; and

(B) the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court.

(2) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability created under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

(A) the district in which the complainant resides;

(B) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

(C) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that disclosed the information is located; or

(D) the District of Columbia.

(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No action shall lie under this subsection unless such action is commenced not later than two years after the person adversely affected by a violation described in paragraph (1) first learns, or by which such person reasonably should have learned, of the facts and circumstances giving rise to the action.

SA 2585. Mr. BLUMENTHAL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 44, between lines 5 and 6, insert the following:

(C) PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION FOR VIOLATIONS BY FEDERAL ENTITIES OF RESTRICTIONS ON DISCLOSURE, USE, AND PROTECTION OF VOLUNTARILY SHARED CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a department or agency of the Federal Government knowingly or recklessly violates the requirements of this Act with respect to the disclosure, use, or protection of voluntarily shared cyber threat indicators, the United States shall be liable to a person adversely affected by such violation in an amount equal to the sum of—

(A) the actual damages sustained by the person as a result of the violation or \$1,000, whichever is greater; and

(B) the costs of the action together with reasonable attorney fees as determined by the court.

(2) VENUE.—An action to enforce liability created under this subsection may be brought in the district court of the United States in—

(A) the district in which the complainant resides;

(B) the district in which the principal place of business of the complainant is located;

(C) the district in which the department or agency of the Federal Government that disclosed the information is located; or

(D) the District of Columbia.

(3) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—No action shall lie under this subsection unless such action is commenced not later than two years after the person adversely affected by a violation described in paragraph (1) first learns, or by which such person reasonably should have learned, of the facts and circumstances giving rise to the action.

SA 2586. Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, strike lines 9 through 19.

SA 2587. Mr. LEAHY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 32, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 33, line 5.

SA 2588. Mrs. BOXER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 7, insert the following:

(C) ANNUAL DATA SECURITY CERTIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than annually thereafter, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall certify the adequacy of the security controls utilized by Federal entities to protect information shared or received under this Act.

(2) CONTENTS.—Each certificate issued by the Director under paragraph (1) shall include a description of the adequacy of the security controls of each Federal entity based on—

(A) a review of the annual reports and evaluations submitted under sections 3554(c) and 3555 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) any additional certification requirements determined necessary by the Director.

(3) ACTIONS IF INADEQUATE SECURITY CONTROLS ARE DETECTED.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Director determines the security controls of a Federal entity are not adequate to protect the information shared or received under this Act, the Director shall submit to such Federal entity, in writing, a notice of the actions the Federal entity shall take in order to ensure that the information is adequately protected.

(B) SCHEDULE AND EXPLANATION.—Not later than 30 days after the date the Director submits a notice under subparagraph (A), the Federal entity shall—

(i) take the actions required by the notice; or

(ii) submit to the Director and the appropriate committees of Congress, in writing, an explanation of why such actions have not been taken and an estimate of the number of days until such actions shall be taken.

(C) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—In this paragraph, the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means the following:

(i) The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate.

(ii) The Committee on Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

(4) FORM.—Each certification, notice, and explanation required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SA 2589. Mr. MURPHY (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. . JUDICIAL REDRESS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Judicial Redress Act of 2015”.

(b) EXTENSION OF PRIVACY ACT REMEDIES TO CITIZENS OF DESIGNATED COUNTRIES.—

(1) CIVIL ACTION; CIVIL REMEDIES.—With respect to covered records, a covered person may bring a civil action against an agency and obtain civil remedies, in the same manner, to the same extent, and subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual may bring and obtain with respect to records under—

(A) section 552a(g)(1)(D) of title 5, United States Code, but only with respect to disclosures intentionally or willfully made in violation of section 552a(b) of such title; and

(B) subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 552a(g)(1) of title 5, United States Code, but such an action may only be brought against a designated Federal agency or component.

(2) EXCLUSIVE REMEDIES.—The remedies set forth in paragraph (1) are the exclusive remedies available to a covered person under this subsection.

(3) APPLICATION OF THE PRIVACY ACT WITH RESPECT TO A COVERED PERSON.—For purposes of a civil action described in paragraph (1), a covered person shall have the same rights, and be subject to the same limitations, including exemptions and exceptions, as an individual has and is subject to under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, when pursuing the civil remedies described in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(4) DESIGNATION OF COVERED COUNTRY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, designate a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a “covered country” for purposes of this subsection if—

(i) the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of

such organization, has entered into an agreement with the United States that provides for appropriate privacy protections for information shared for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses; or

(ii) the Attorney General has determined that the country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, has effectively shared information with the United States for the purpose of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses and has appropriate privacy protections for such shared information.

(B) REMOVAL OF DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of Homeland Security, revoke the designation of a foreign country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, as a “covered country” if the Attorney General determines that such designated “covered country”—

(i) is not complying with the agreement described under subparagraph (A)(i);

(ii) no longer meets the requirements for designation under subparagraph (A)(ii); or

(iii) impedes the transfer of information (for purposes of reporting or preventing unlawful activity) to the United States by a private entity or person.

(5) DESIGNATION OF DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General shall determine whether an agency or component thereof is a “designated Federal agency or component” for purposes of this subsection. The Attorney General shall not designate any agency or component thereof other than the Department of Justice or a component of the Department of Justice without the concurrence of the head of the relevant agency, or of the agency to which the component belongs.

(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR DESIGNATION.—The Attorney General may determine that an agency or component of an agency is a “designated Federal agency or component” for purposes of this subsection, if—

(i) the Attorney General determines that information exchanged by such agency with a covered country is within the scope of an agreement referred to in paragraph (4)(A)(i); or

(ii) with respect to a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, that has been designated as a “covered country” under paragraph (4)(A)(ii), the Attorney General determines that designating such agency or component thereof is in the law enforcement interests of the United States.

(6) FEDERAL REGISTER REQUIREMENT; NON-REVIEWABLE DETERMINATION.—The Attorney General shall publish each determination made under paragraphs (4) and (5). Such determination shall not be subject to judicial or administrative review.

(7) JURISDICTION.—The United States District Court for the District of Columbia shall have exclusive jurisdiction over any claim arising under this subsection.

(8) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(A) AGENCY.—The term “agency” has the meaning given that term in section 552(f) of title 5, United States Code.

(B) COVERED COUNTRY.—The term “covered country” means a country or regional economic integration organization, or member country of such organization, designated in accordance with paragraph (4).

(C) COVERED PERSON.—The term “covered person” means a natural person (other than

an individual) who is a citizen of a covered country.

(D) COVERED RECORD.—The term “covered record” has the same meaning for a covered person as a record has for an individual under section 552a of title 5, United States Code, once the covered record is transferred—

(i) by a public authority of, or private entity within, a country or regional economic organization, or member country of such organization, which at the time the record is transferred is a covered country; and

(ii) to a designated Federal agency or component for purposes of preventing, investigating, detecting, or prosecuting criminal offenses.

(E) DESIGNATED FEDERAL AGENCY OR COMPONENT.—The term “designated Federal agency or component” means a Federal agency or component of an agency designated in accordance with paragraph (5).

(F) INDIVIDUAL.—The term “individual” has the meaning given that term in section 552a(a)(2) of title 5, United States Code.

(9) PRESERVATION OF PRIVILEGES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to waive any applicable privilege or require the disclosure of classified information. Upon an agency’s request, the district court shall review in camera and ex parte any submission by the agency in connection with this paragraph.

(10) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2590. Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. WARNER, Mr. KAINE, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RECOVER ACT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the “Reducing the Effects of the Cyberattack on OPM Victims Emergency Response Act of 2015” or the “RECOVER Act”.

(b) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “affected individual” means any individual whose personally identifiable information was compromised during—

(1) the data breach of personnel records of current and former Federal employees, at a network maintained by the Department of the Interior, that was announced by the Office of Personnel Management on June 4, 2015; or

(2) the data breach of systems of the Office of Personnel Management containing information related to the background investigations of current, former, and prospective Federal employees, and of other individuals.

(c) IDENTITY PROTECTION COVERAGE FOR INDIVIDUALS AFFECTED BY FEDERAL AGENCY DATA BREACHES.—The Office of Personnel Management shall provide to each affected individual complimentary identity protection coverage that—

(1) is not less comprehensive than the complimentary identity protection coverage that the Office provided to affected individuals before the date of enactment of this Act;

(2) is effective for the remainder of the life of the individual; and

(3) includes not less than \$5,000,000 in identity theft insurance.

SA 2591. Mr. SANDERS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—COMMISSION ON PRIVACY RIGHTS IN THE DIGITAL AGE

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Today, technology that did not exist 30 years ago pervades every aspect of life in the United States.

(2) Nearly ¾ of adults in the United States own a smartphone, and 43 percent of adults in the United States rely solely on their cell phone for telephone use.

(3) 84 percent of households in the United States own a computer and 73 percent of households in the United States have a computer with an Internet broadband connection.

(4) Federal policies on privacy protection have not kept pace with the rapid expansion of technology.

(5) Innovations in technology have led to the exponential expansion of data collection by both the public and private sectors.

(6) Consumers are often unaware of the collection of their data and how their information can be collected, bought, and sold by private companies.

SEC. 203. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to establish, for a 2-year period, a Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age to—

(1) examine—

(A) the ways in which public agencies and private companies gather data on the people of the United States; and

(B) the ways in which that data is utilized, either internally or externally; and

(2) make recommendations concerning potential policy changes needed to safeguard the privacy of the people of the United States.

SEC. 204. COMPOSITION OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—To carry out the purpose of this title, there is established in the legislative branch a Commission on Privacy Rights in the Digital Age (in this title referred to as the “Commission”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 13 members, as follows:

(1) Five members appointed by the President, of whom—

(A) 2 shall be appointed from the executive branch of the Government; and

(B) 3 shall be appointed from private life.

(2) Two members appointed by the majority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(3) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the Senate, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the Senate; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(4) Two members appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(5) Two members appointed by the minority leader of the House of Representatives, of whom—

(A) 1 shall be a Member of the House; and

(B) 1 shall be appointed from private life.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Commission shall elect a Chairperson and Vice-Chairperson from among its members.

(d) MEETINGS; QUORUM; VACANCIES.—

(1) MEETINGS.—After its initial meeting, the Commission shall meet upon the call of the Chairperson or a majority of its members.

(2) QUORUM.—Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

(3) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(e) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS; INITIAL MEETING.—

(1) APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS.—Each member of the Commission shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) INITIAL MEETING.—On or after the date on which all members of the Commission have been appointed, and not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall hold its initial meeting.

SEC. 205. DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION.

The Commission shall—

(1) conduct an investigation of relevant facts and circumstances relating to the expansion of data collection and surveillance practices in the public, private, and national security sectors, including implications for—

(A) constitutional and statutory rights of privacy;

(B) transparency, as it relates to—

(i) government practices;

(ii) consumers; and

(iii) shareholders;

(C) waste, fraud, and abuse; and

(D) the effectiveness of congressional oversight; and

(2) submit to the President and Congress reports containing findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures relating to the facts and circumstances investigated under paragraph (1), in accordance with section 212.

SEC. 206. POWERS OF THE COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) HEARINGS AND EVIDENCE.—The Commission or, at its direction, any subcommittee or member of the Commission, may, for the purpose of carrying out this title—

(A) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and administer such oaths as the Commission or such subcommittee or member determines advisable; and

(B) subject to paragraph (2)(A), require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, documents, tapes, and materials as the Commission or such subcommittee or member determines advisable.

(2) SUBPOENAS.—

(A) ISSUANCE.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—A subpoena may be issued under paragraph (1) only—

(I) by the agreement of the Chairperson and the Vice Chairperson; or

(II) by the affirmative vote of 8 members of the Commission.

(ii) SIGNATURE.—Subject to clause (i), a subpoena issued under paragraph (1) may—

(I) be issued under the signature of—

(aa) the Chairperson; or

(bb) a member designated by a majority of the Commission; and

(II) be served by—

(aa) any person designated by the Chairperson; or

(bb) a member designated by a majority of the Commission.

(B) ENFORCEMENT.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In the case of contumacy or failure to obey a subpoena issued under paragraph (1), the United States district court for the judicial district in which the subpoenaed person resides, is served, or may be found, or where the subpoena is returnable, may issue an order requiring such person to appear at any designated place to testify or to produce documentary or other evidence.

(ii) CONTEMPT OF COURT.—Any failure to obey the order of the court under clause (i) may be punished by the court as a contempt of that court.

(3) WITNESS ALLOWANCES AND FEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 1821 of title 28, United States Code, shall apply to witnesses requested or subpoenaed to appear at any hearing of the Commission.

(B) SOURCE OF FUNDS.—The per diem and mileage allowances for witnesses shall be paid from funds available to pay the expenses of the Commission.

(b) CONTRACTING.—The Commission may, to such extent and in such amounts as are provided in appropriations Acts, enter into contracts to enable the Commission to discharge its duties under this title.

(c) INFORMATION FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission may secure directly from any Federal department or agency such information as the Commission considers necessary to carry out this title.

(2) FURNISHING OF INFORMATION.—If the Chairperson, the chairperson of any subcommittee created by a majority of the Commission, or any member designated by a majority of the Commission submits to a Federal department or agency a request for information under paragraph (1), the head of the department or agency shall, to the extent authorized by law, furnish the information directly to the Commission.

(3) RECEIPT, HANDLING, STORAGE, AND DISSEMINATION.—Information furnished under paragraph (2) shall only be received, handled, stored, and disseminated by members of the Commission and its staff consistent with all applicable statutes, regulations, and executive orders.

(d) ASSISTANCE FROM FEDERAL AGENCIES.—

(1) GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Administrator of General Services shall provide to the Commission on a reimbursable basis administrative support and other services for the performance of the Commission's functions.

(2) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES.—In addition to the assistance provided under paragraph (1), departments and agencies of the United States may provide to the Commission such services, funds, facilities, staff, and other support services as the departments and agencies may determine advisable and as authorized by law.

(e) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Commission may use the United States mails in the same manner and under the same conditions as a department or agency of the United States.

SEC. 207. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION.

(a) DISCHARGE OR DISCRIMINATION PROHIBITED.—No employer may discharge, demote, suspend, threaten, harass, or otherwise discriminate against an employee with respect to the terms and conditions of employment because the employee, or any person acting pursuant to a request of the employee—

(1) commenced, caused to be commenced, or is about to commence or cause to be com-

menced a proceeding with the Commission under this title;

(2) testified or is preparing to testify in a proceeding described in paragraph (1);

(3) lawfully assisted or is preparing to lawfully assist in any manner in a proceeding described in paragraph (1) or in any other action to carry out the purposes of this title; or

(4) refuses to violate the provisions of this title.

(b) ENFORCEMENT ACTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee who alleges discharge or other discrimination by an employer in violation of subsection (a) may seek relief under subsection (c) by—

(A) filing a complaint with the Secretary of Labor; or

(B) if the Secretary of Labor has not issued a final decision within 180 days of the filing of the complaint and there is no showing that such delay is due to the bad faith of the claimant, bringing an action at law or equity for de novo review in the appropriate district court of the United States, which shall have jurisdiction over such an action without regard to the amount in controversy.

(2) PROCEDURE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A complaint filed under paragraph (1)(A) shall be governed under the rules and procedures set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

(B) EXCEPTION.—Notification made under section 42121(b)(1) of title 49, United States Code, shall be made to any individual named in the complaint and to the employer.

(C) BURDENS OF PROOF.—An action brought under paragraph (1)(B) shall be governed by the legal burdens of proof set forth in section 42121(b) of title 49, United States Code.

(D) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—A complaint under paragraph (1)(A) shall be filed not later than 180 days after the date on which the violation occurs, or after the date on which the employee became aware of the violation.

(E) JURY TRIAL.—A party to an action brought under paragraph (1)(B) shall be entitled to trial by jury.

(c) REMEDIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—An employee prevailing in any action under subsection (b)(1) shall be entitled to all relief necessary to make the employee whole.

(2) COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.—Relief for any action under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) reinstatement with the same seniority status that the employee would have had, but for the discrimination;

(B) the amount of back pay, with interest; and

(C) compensation for any special damages sustained as a result of the discrimination, including litigation costs, expert witness fees, and reasonable attorney fees.

(d) RIGHTS RETAINED BY EMPLOYEE.—Nothing in this section shall be deemed to diminish the rights, privileges, or remedies of any employee under any Federal or State law, or under any collective bargaining agreement.

(e) NONENFORCEABILITY OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS WAIVING RIGHTS AND REMEDIES OR REQUIRING ARBITRATION OF DISPUTES.—

(1) WAIVER OF RIGHTS AND REMEDIES.—The rights and remedies provided for in this section may not be waived by any agreement, policy form, or condition of employment, including by a predispute arbitration agreement.

(2) PREDISPUTE ARBITRATION AGREEMENTS.—No predispute arbitration agreement shall be valid or enforceable, if the agreement requires arbitration of a dispute arising under this section.

SEC. 208. NONAPPLICABILITY OF FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Commission.

(b) PUBLIC HEARINGS AND MEETINGS.—The Commission shall—

(1) hold public hearings and meetings to the extent appropriate; and

(2) conduct public hearings and meetings in a manner consistent with the protection of information provided to or developed for or by the Commission as required by any applicable statute, regulation, or executive order.

SEC. 209. STAFF OF COMMISSION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) APPOINTMENT AND COMPENSATION.—The Chairperson, in consultation with the Vice Chairperson and in accordance with rules agreed upon by the Commission, may appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director and such other personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to carry out the functions of the Commission, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of that title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, except that no rate of pay fixed under this paragraph may exceed the equivalent of that payable for a position at level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) PERSONNEL AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The executive director and any personnel of the Commission who are employees shall be employees under section 2105 of title 5, United States Code, for purposes of chapters 63, 81, 83, 84, 85, 87, 89, 89A, 89B, and 90 of that title.

(B) MEMBERS OF COMMISSION.—Subparagraph (A) shall not be construed to apply to members of the Commission.

(b) DETAILEES.—Any Federal Government employee may be detailed to the Commission without reimbursement from the Commission, and such detailee shall retain the rights, status, and privileges of his or her regular employment without interruption.

(c) CONSULTANT SERVICES.—The Commission may procure the services of experts and consultants in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed the daily rate paid a person occupying a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of that title.

SEC. 210. COMPENSATION AND TRAVEL EXPENSES.

(a) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission who is not an officer or employee of the Federal Government may be compensated at not to exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay in effect for a position at level IV of the Executive Schedule under section 5315 of title 5, United States Code, for each day during which that member is engaged in the actual performance of the duties of the Commission.

(b) TRAVEL EXPENSES.—While away from their homes or regular places of business in the performance of services for the Commission, members of the Commission shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in the same manner as persons employed intermittently in the Government service are allowed expenses under section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 211. SECURITY CLEARANCES FOR COMMISSION MEMBERS AND STAFF.

The appropriate departments or agencies of the Federal Government shall cooperate

with the Commission in expeditiously providing to the members and staff of the Commission appropriate security clearances, up to the level of sensitive compartmented information, to the extent possible under applicable procedures and requirements, and no person shall be provided with access to classified information under this title without the appropriate security clearances.

SEC. 212. REPORTS OF COMMISSION; TERMINATION.

(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—The Commission shall submit to the President and Congress, and make publicly available online, interim reports containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(b) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall submit to the President and Congress, and make publicly available online, a final report containing such findings, conclusions, and recommendations for corrective measures as have been agreed to by a majority of Commission members.

(c) CLASSIFIED INFORMATION.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) or (b) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) TERMINATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission, and all the authorities under this title, shall terminate 60 days after the date on which Commission submits the final report under subsection (b).

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIVITIES BEFORE TERMINATION.—The Commission may use the 60-day period referred to in paragraph (1) for the purpose of concluding its activities, including providing testimony to committees of Congress concerning its reports and disseminating the final report.

SEC. 213. FUNDING.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this title.

(b) DURATION OF AVAILABILITY.—Amounts made available to the Commission under subsection (a) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission.

SA 2592. Mr. PAUL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ WHISTLEBLOWER REPORTS AND PROTECTION AGAINST RETALIATION.

(a) AUTHORIZATION TO REPORT COMPLAINTS OR INFORMATION.—An employee of or contractor to a Federal entity that has knowledge of the programs and activities authorized under this Act may submit a covered complaint—

(1) to the Comptroller General of the United States;

(2) to the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board;

(3) to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(4) to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; or

(5) in accordance with the process established under section 103H(k)(5) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3033(k)(5)).

(b) INVESTIGATIONS AND REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall investigate a covered complaint submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(1) and shall submit to Congress a report containing the results of the investigation.

(2) AVAILABILITY TO CONGRESS.—A report submitted to Congress under paragraph (1) shall be accessible to all members of Congress.

(c) REQUIREMENT TO PERMIT SUBMISSION.—No Federal entity may promulgate a rule or prohibition on its employees, on contractors of that Federal entity, or on any entity sharing cyber threat indicators or defensive measures with the Federal Government under this Act that prohibits submission of complaints under this section.

(d) PROHIBITION ON RETALIATORY ACTIONS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no officer or employee of a Federal entity shall take any retaliatory action against an employee of or contractor to a Federal entity who seeks to disclose or discloses covered information to—

(1) the Comptroller General;

(2) the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board;

(3) the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate;

(4) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives; or

(5) the Office of the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE SANCTIONS.—An officer or employee of a Federal entity who violates subsection (d) shall be subject to administrative sanctions, up to and including termination.

(f) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COVERED COMPLAINT.—The term “covered complaint” means a complaint or information concerning programs and activities authorized by this Act that an employee or contractor reasonably believes is evidence of—

(A) a violation of any law, rule, or regulation; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

(2) COVERED INFORMATION.—The term “covered information” means any information (including classified or sensitive information) that an employee or contractor reasonably believes is evidence of—

(A) a violation of any provision of law; or

(B) gross mismanagement, a gross waste of funds, an abuse of authority, or a substantial and specific danger to public health or safety.

SA 2593. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 18, line 24, strike “records.” and insert “records, except disclosure required under any State, tribal, or local law in any criminal prosecution.”.

On page 32, line 17, strike “Cyber” and insert “Except for disclosure of evidence required by law or rule in any criminal prosecution, cyber”.

SA 2594. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 48, between lines 8 and 9, insert the following:

(3) CONSTRUCTION REGARDING OPERATION OF DEFENSIVE MEASURES AND TORT LIABILITY.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that establishes a right of action or remedy for damages to a party other than an entity described in section 4(b)(1) resulting from the operation of a defensive measure under this Act.

SA 2595. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 35, line 6, strike “Cyber” and insert

(i) IN GENERAL.—Cyber

On page 35, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(ii) LIMITATION ON USE IN PROCEEDINGS.—Cyber threat indicators, defensive measures, and any other information provided to the Federal Government under this Act and all evidence derived therefrom may not be received in evidence in any trial, hearing or other proceeding in or before any court, grand jury, department, officer, agency, regulatory body, legislative committee, or other authority of the United States, a State, or any political subdivision thereof if the sharing, disclosure or use of such cyber threat indicator, defensive measure, or other information was or would be in violation of this Act.

SA 2596. Mr. DURBIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 11, line 10, strike “contravention;” and insert “contravention, and instructions to remedy or mitigate such error or contravention, including the destruction of such cyber threat indicator and the cessation of any defensive measures based on such indicator;”

On page 15, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(3) NOTIFICATION AND MITIGATION OF ERROR OR CONTRAVENTION.—

(A) REQUIREMENT TO NOTIFY.—An entity that shares a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure and subsequently determines that such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure was in error or in contravention of the requirements of this Act or another provision of Federal law or policy shall notify each entity with which such indicator or measure was shared of such error or contravention.

(B) REQUIREMENTS FOR RECEIVING ENTITY.—An entity that receives a notice under subparagraph (A)—

(i) shall cease use of such cyber threat indicator or defensive measure;

(ii) shall not further share such indicator or measure; and

(iii) shall provide a similar notice to each other entity with which the receiving entity has shared such indicator or measure.

On page 17, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(II) a notification of error or contravention received from a Federal entity or sharing entity pursuant to section 3(b)(1)(C) or section 4(c)(3); or

SA 2597. Mrs. SHAHEEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 10, line 8, strike “and”.

On page 10, line 13, strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

On page 10, between lines 13 and 14, insert the following:

(5) the periodic sharing, through publication and targeted outreach, of cybersecurity best practices that are developed based on ongoing analysis of cyber threat indicators and information in possession of the Federal Government, with attention to accessibility and implementation challenges faced by small business concerns (as defined in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632)).

On page 12, line 13, insert “the Small Business Administration and” after “including”.

SA 2598. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 5, strike line 10 and all that follows through page 52, line 6, and insert the following:

(7) ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “entity” means any private entity, non-Federal government agency or department, or State, tribal, or local government (including a political subdivision, department, or component thereof).

(B) INCLUSIONS.—The term “entity” includes a government agency or department of the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands, and any other territory or possession of the United States.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term “entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(8) FEDERAL ENTITY.—The term “Federal entity” means a department or agency of the United States or any component of such department or agency.

(9) INFORMATION SYSTEM.—The term “information system”—

(A) has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code; and

(B) includes industrial control systems, such as supervisory control and data acquisition systems, distributed control systems, and programmable logic controllers.

(10) LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—The term “local government” means any borough, city, coun-

ty, parish, town, township, village, or other political subdivision of a State.

(11) MALICIOUS CYBER COMMAND AND CONTROL.—The term “malicious cyber command and control” means a method for unauthorized remote identification of, access to, or use of, an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(12) MALICIOUS RECONNAISSANCE.—The term “malicious reconnaissance” means a method for actively probing or passively monitoring an information system for the purpose of discerning security vulnerabilities of the information system, if such method is associated with a known or suspected cybersecurity threat.

(13) MONITOR.—The term “monitor” means to acquire, identify, or scan, or to possess, information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(14) PRIVATE ENTITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

(B) INCLUSION.—The term “private entity” includes a State, tribal, or local government performing electric utility services.

(C) EXCLUSION.—The term “private entity” does not include a foreign power as defined in section 101 of the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 (50 U.S.C. 1801).

(15) SECURITY CONTROL.—The term “security control” means the management, operational, and technical controls used to protect against an unauthorized effort to adversely affect the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of an information system or its information.

(16) SECURITY VULNERABILITY.—The term “security vulnerability” means any attribute of hardware, software, process, or procedure that could enable or facilitate the defeat of a security control.

(17) TRIBAL.—The term “tribal” has the meaning given the term “Indian tribe” in section 4 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 450b).

SEC. 3. SHARING OF INFORMATION BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with the protection of classified information, intelligence sources and methods, and privacy and civil liberties, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and promulgate procedures to facilitate and promote—

(1) the timely sharing of classified cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government with cleared representatives of relevant entities;

(2) the timely sharing with relevant entities of cyber threat indicators or information in the possession of the Federal Government that may be declassified and shared at an unclassified level;

(3) the sharing with relevant entities, or the public if appropriate, of unclassified, including controlled unclassified, cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government; and

(4) the sharing with entities, if appropriate, of information in the possession of the Federal Government about cybersecurity threats to such entities to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from such cybersecurity threats.

(b) DEVELOPMENT OF PROCEDURES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The procedures developed and promulgated under subsection (a) shall—

(A) ensure the Federal Government has and maintains the capability to share cyber threat indicators in real time consistent with the protection of classified information;

(B) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, existing processes and existing roles and responsibilities of Federal and non-Federal entities for information sharing by the Federal Government, including sector specific information sharing and analysis centers;

(C) include procedures for notifying entities that have received a cyber threat indicator from a Federal entity under this Act that is known or determined to be in error or in contravention of the requirements of this Act or another provision of Federal law or policy of such error or contravention;

(D) include requirements for Federal entities receiving cyber threat indicators to implement and utilize security controls to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicators; and

(E) include procedures that require a Federal entity, prior to the sharing of a cyber threat indicator—

(i) to review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that such Federal entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(ii) to implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(2) COORDINATION.—In developing the procedures required under this section, the Director of National Intelligence, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Defense, and the Attorney General shall coordinate with appropriate Federal entities, including the National Laboratories (as defined in section 2 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15801)), to ensure that effective protocols are implemented that will facilitate and promote the sharing of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government in a timely manner.

(c) SUBMITTAL TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall submit to Congress the procedures required by subsection (a).

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATIONS FOR PREVENTING, DETECTING, ANALYZING, AND MITIGATING CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION FOR MONITORING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a private entity may, for cybersecurity purposes, monitor—

(A) an information system of such private entity;

(B) an information system of another entity, upon the authorization and written consent of such other entity;

(C) an information system of a Federal entity, upon the authorization and written consent of an authorized representative of the Federal entity; and

(D) information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system monitored by the private entity under this paragraph.

(2) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the monitoring of an information system, or the use of any information obtained through such monitoring, other than as provided in this Act; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(b) AUTHORIZATION FOR SHARING OR RECEIVING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this Act and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator.

(2) LAWFUL RESTRICTION.—An entity receiving a cyber threat indicator from another entity or Federal entity shall comply with otherwise lawful restrictions placed on the sharing or use of such cyber threat indicator by the sharing entity or Federal entity.

(3) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed—

(A) to authorize the sharing or receiving of a cyber threat indicator other than as provided in this subsection; or

(B) to limit otherwise lawful activity.

(c) PROTECTION AND USE OF INFORMATION.—

(1) SECURITY OF INFORMATION.—An entity monitoring an information system or providing or receiving a cyber threat indicator under this section shall implement and utilize a security control to protect against unauthorized access to or acquisition of such cyber threat indicator.

(2) REMOVAL OF CERTAIN PERSONAL INFORMATION.—An entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this Act shall, prior to such sharing—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(3) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY ENTITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with this Act, a cyber threat indicator shared or received under this section may, for cybersecurity purposes—

(i) be used by an entity to monitor—

(I) an information system of the entity; or

(II) an information system of another entity or a Federal entity upon the written consent of that other entity or that Federal entity; and

(ii) be otherwise used, retained, and further shared by an entity subject to—

(I) an otherwise lawful restriction placed by the sharing entity or Federal entity on such cyber threat indicator; or

(II) an otherwise applicable provision of law.

(B) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to authorize the use of a cyber threat indicator other than as provided in this section.

(4) USE OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS BY STATE, TRIBAL, OR LOCAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.—

(i) PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section may, with the prior written consent of the entity sharing such

indicator, be used by a State, tribal, or local government for the purpose of preventing, investigating, or prosecuting any of the offenses described in section 5(d)(5)(A)(vi).

(ii) ORAL CONSENT.—If exigent circumstances prevent obtaining written consent under clause (i), such consent may be provided orally with subsequent documentation of the consent.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.—A cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this section shall be—

(i) deemed voluntarily shared information; and

(ii) exempt from disclosure under any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(C) STATE, TRIBAL, AND LOCAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (ii), a cyber threat indicator shared with a State, tribal, or local government under this Act shall not be directly used by any State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activity of any entity, including an activity relating to monitoring or sharing of a cyber threat indicator.

(ii) REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.—A cyber threat indicator shared as described in clause (i) may, consistent with a State, tribal, or local government regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of a regulation relating to such information systems.

(d) ANTITRUST EXEMPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 8(e), it shall not be considered a violation of any provision of antitrust laws for 2 or more private entities to exchange or provide a cyber threat indicator, or assistance relating to the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat, for cybersecurity purposes under this Act.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—Paragraph (1) shall apply only to information that is exchanged or assistance provided in order to assist with—

(A) facilitating the prevention, investigation, or mitigation of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system; or

(B) communicating or disclosing a cyber threat indicator to help prevent, investigate, or mitigate the effect of a cybersecurity threat to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(e) NO RIGHT OR BENEFIT.—The sharing of a cyber threat indicator with an entity under this Act shall not create a right or benefit to similar information by such entity or any other entity.

SEC. 5. SHARING OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—

(1) INTERIM POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and submit to Congress interim policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government.

(2) FINAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General

shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, promulgate final policies and procedures relating to the receipt of cyber threat indicators by the Federal Government.

(3) REQUIREMENTS CONCERNING POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.—Consistent with the guidelines required by subsection (b), the policies and procedures developed and promulgated under this subsection shall—

(A) ensure that cyber threat indicators are shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 4(b) through the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared in an automated manner with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any delay, modification, or any other action that could impede real-time receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(B) ensure that cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government by any entity pursuant to section 4 in a manner other than the real-time process described in subsection (c) of this section—

(i) are shared as quickly as operationally practicable with all of the appropriate Federal entities;

(ii) are not subject to any unnecessary delay, interference, or any other action that could impede receipt by all of the appropriate Federal entities; and

(iii) may be provided to other Federal entities;

(C) consistent with this Act, any other applicable provisions of law, and the fair information practice principles set forth in appendix A of the document entitled “National Strategy for Trusted Identities in Cyberspace” and published by the President in April 2011, govern the retention, use, and dissemination by the Federal Government of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this Act, including the extent, if any, to which such cyber threat indicators may be used by the Federal Government; and

(D) ensure there is—

(i) an audit capability; and

(ii) appropriate sanctions in place for officers, employees, or agents of a Federal entity who knowingly and willfully conduct activities under this Act in an unauthorized manner.

(4) GUIDELINES FOR ENTITIES SHARING CYBER THREAT INDICATORS WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall develop and make publicly available guidance to assist entities and promote sharing of cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this Act.

(B) CONTENTS.—The guidelines developed and made publicly available under subparagraph (A) shall include guidance on the following:

(i) Identification of types of information that would qualify as a cyber threat indicator under this Act that would be unlikely to include personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cyber security threat.

(ii) Identification of types of information protected under otherwise applicable privacy laws that are unlikely to be directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

(iii) Such other matters as the Attorney General considers appropriate for entities sharing cyber threat indicators with Federal entities under this Act.

(b) PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.—

(1) GUIDELINES OF ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee–1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

(B) PERIODIC REVIEW.—The Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers and private entities described in subparagraph (A), periodically review the guidelines promulgated under subparagraph (A).

(3) CONTENT.—The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this Act;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process for the timely destruction of such information that is known not to be directly related to uses authorized under this Act; and

(ii) specific limitations on the length of any period in which a cyber threat indicator may be retained;

(C) include requirements to safeguard cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons from unauthorized access or acquisition, including appropriate sanctions for activities by officers, employees, or agents of the Federal Government in contravention of such guidelines;

(D) include procedures for notifying entities and Federal entities if information received pursuant to this section is known or determined by a Federal entity receiving such information not to constitute a cyber threat indicator;

(E) protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons to the greatest extent practicable and require recipients to be informed that such indicators may only be used for purposes authorized under this Act; and

(F) include steps that may be needed so that dissemination of cyber threat indicators is consistent with the protection of classified

and other sensitive national security information.

(c) CAPABILITY AND PROCESS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, shall develop and implement a capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security that—

(A) shall accept from any entity in real time cyber threat indicators, pursuant to this section;

(B) shall, upon submittal of the certification under paragraph (2) that such capability and process fully and effectively operates as described in such paragraph, be the process by which the Federal Government receives cyber threat indicators under this Act that are shared by a private entity with the Federal Government through electronic mail or media, an interactive form on an Internet website, or a real time, automated process between information systems except—

(i) communications between a Federal entity and a private entity regarding a previously shared cyber threat indicator; and

(ii) communications by a regulated entity with such entity's Federal regulatory authority regarding a cybersecurity threat;

(C) ensures that all of the appropriate Federal entities receive in an automated manner such cyber threat indicators shared through the real-time process within the Department of Homeland Security;

(D) is in compliance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by this section; and

(E) does not limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including—

(i) reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or a Federal entity;

(ii) voluntary or legally compelled participation in a Federal investigation; and

(iii) providing cyber threat indicators as part of a statutory or authorized contractual requirement.

(2) CERTIFICATION.—Not later than 10 days prior to the implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), the Secretary of Homeland Security shall, in consultation with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities, certify to Congress whether such capability and process fully and effectively operates—

(A) as the process by which the Federal Government receives from any entity a cyber threat indicator under this Act; and

(B) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines developed under this section.

(3) PUBLIC NOTICE AND ACCESS.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall ensure there is public notice of, and access to, the capability and process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) so that—

(A) any entity may share cyber threat indicators through such process with the Federal Government; and

(B) all of the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators in real time with receipt through the process within the Department of Homeland Security.

(4) OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) shall ensure that other Federal entities receive in a timely manner any cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government through such process.

(5) REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION.—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report on the development and implementation of the capability and process required by paragraph (1), including a description of such capability and process and the public notice of, and access to, such process.

(B) **CLASSIFIED ANNEX.**—The report required by subparagraph (A) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(d) **INFORMATION SHARED WITH OR PROVIDED TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.**—

(1) **NO WAIVER OF PRIVILEGE OR PROTECTION.**—The provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government under this Act shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or protection provided by law, including trade secret protection.

(2) **PROPRIETARY INFORMATION.**—Consistent with section 4(b)(2), a cyber threat indicator provided by an entity to the Federal Government under this Act shall be considered the commercial, financial, and proprietary information of such entity when so designated by the originating entity or a third party acting in accordance with the written authorization of the originating entity.

(3) **EXEMPTION FROM DISCLOSURE.**—Cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall be—

(A) deemed voluntarily shared information and exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local law requiring disclosure of information or records; and

(B) withheld, without discretion, from the public under section 552(b)(3)(B) of title 5, United States Code, and any State, tribal, or local provision of law requiring disclosure of information or records.

(4) **EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS.**—The provision of a cyber threat indicator to the Federal Government under this Act shall not be subject to a rule of any Federal agency or department or any judicial doctrine regarding ex parte communications with a decision-making official.

(5) **DISCLOSURE, RETENTION, AND USE.**—

(A) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—Cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act may be disclosed to, retained by, and used by, consistent with otherwise applicable provisions of Federal law, any Federal agency or department, component, officer, employee, or agent of the Federal Government solely for—

(i) a cybersecurity purpose;

(ii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat, including the source of such cybersecurity threat, or a security vulnerability;

(iii) the purpose of identifying a cybersecurity threat involving the use of an information system by a foreign adversary or terrorist;

(iv) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, an imminent threat of death, serious bodily harm, or serious economic harm, including a terrorist act or a use of a weapon of mass destruction;

(v) the purpose of responding to, or otherwise preventing or mitigating, a serious threat to a minor, including sexual exploitation and threats to physical safety; or

(vi) the purpose of preventing, investigating, disrupting, or prosecuting an offense arising out of a threat described in clause (iv) or any of the offenses listed in—

(I) section 3559(c)(2)(F) of title 18, United States Code (relating to serious violent felonies);

(II) sections 1028 through 1030 of such title (relating to fraud and identity theft);

(III) chapter 37 of such title (relating to espionage and censorship); and

(IV) chapter 90 of such title (relating to protection of trade secrets).

(B) **PROHIBITED ACTIVITIES.**—Cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall not be disclosed to, retained by, or used by any Federal agency or department for any use not permitted under subparagraph (A).

(C) **PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.**—Cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall be retained, used, and disseminated by the Federal Government—

(i) in accordance with the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by subsections (a) and (b);

(ii) in a manner that protects from unauthorized use or disclosure any cyber threat indicators that may contain personal information of or identifying specific persons; and

(iii) in a manner that protects the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying a specific person.

(D) **FEDERAL REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act shall not be directly used by any Federal, State, tribal, or local government to regulate, including an enforcement action, the lawful activities of any entity, including activities relating to monitoring or sharing cyber threat indicators.

(ii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—

(I) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY SPECIFICALLY RELATING TO PREVENTION OR MITIGATION OF CYBERSECURITY THREATS.**—Cyber threat indicators provided to the Federal Government under this Act may, consistent with Federal or State regulatory authority specifically relating to the prevention or mitigation of cybersecurity threats to information systems, inform the development or implementation of regulations relating to such information systems.

(II) **PROCEDURES DEVELOPED AND IMPLEMENTED UNDER THIS ACT.**—Clause (i) shall not apply to procedures developed and implemented under this Act.

SEC. 6. PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.

(a) **MONITORING OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS.**—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any private entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the monitoring of information systems and information under section 4(a) that is conducted in accordance with this Act.

(b) **SHARING OR RECEIPT OF CYBER THREAT INDICATORS.**—No cause of action shall lie or be maintained in any court against any entity, and such action shall be promptly dismissed, for the sharing or receipt of cyber threat indicators under section 4(b) if—

(1) such sharing or receipt is conducted in accordance with this Act; and

(2) in a case in which a cyber threat indicator is shared with the Federal Government, the cyber threat indicator is shared in a manner that is consistent with section 5(c)(1)(B) and the sharing or receipt, as the case may be, occurs after the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the interim policies and procedures are submitted to Congress under section 5(a)(1); or

(B) the date that is 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to require dismissal of a cause of action against an entity that has engaged in gross

negligence or willful misconduct in the course of conducting activities authorized by this Act; or

(2) to undermine or limit the availability of otherwise applicable common law or statutory defenses.

SEC. 7. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES.

(a) **BIENNIAL REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the heads of the appropriate Federal entities shall jointly submit and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, shall jointly submit to Congress a detailed report concerning the implementation of this Act.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) An assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines required by section 5 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators are shared effectively and responsibly within the Federal Government.

(B) An evaluation of the effectiveness of real-time information sharing through the capability and process developed under section 5(c), including any impediments to such real-time sharing.

(C) An assessment of the sufficiency of the procedures developed under section 3 in ensuring that cyber threat indicators in the possession of the Federal Government are shared in a timely and adequate manner with appropriate entities, or, if appropriate, are made publicly available.

(D) An assessment of whether cyber threat indicators have been properly classified and an accounting of the number of security clearances authorized by the Federal Government for the purposes of this Act.

(E) A review of the type of cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this Act, including the following:

(i) The degree to which such information may impact the privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(ii) A quantitative and qualitative assessment of the impact of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators with the Federal Government on privacy and civil liberties of specific persons.

(iii) The adequacy of any steps taken by the Federal Government to reduce such impact.

(F) A review of actions taken by the Federal Government based on cyber threat indicators shared with the Federal Government under this Act, including the appropriateness of any subsequent use or dissemination of such cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity under section 5.

(G) A description of any significant violations of the requirements of this Act by the Federal Government.

(H) A summary of the number and type of entities that received classified cyber threat indicators from the Federal Government under this Act and an evaluation of the risks and benefits of sharing such cyber threat indicators.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each report submitted under paragraph (1) may include recommendations for improvements or modifications to the authorities and processes under this Act.

(4) **FORM OF REPORT.**—Each report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(b) **REPORTS ON PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES.**—

(1) **BIENNIAL REPORT FROM PRIVACY AND CIVIL LIBERTIES OVERSIGHT BOARD.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board shall submit to Congress and the President a report providing—

(A) an assessment of the effect on privacy and civil liberties by the type of activities carried out under this Act; and

(B) an assessment of the sufficiency of the policies, procedures, and guidelines established pursuant to section 5 in addressing concerns relating to privacy and civil liberties.

(2) **BIENNIAL REPORT OF INSPECTORS GENERAL.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act and not less frequently than once every 2 years thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security, the Inspector General of the Intelligence Community, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice, the Inspector General of the Department of Defense, and the Inspector General of the Department of Energy shall, in consultation with the Council of Inspectors General on Financial Oversight, jointly submit to Congress a report on the receipt, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators that have been shared with Federal entities under this Act.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—Each report submitted under subparagraph (A) shall include the following:

(i) A review of the types of cyber threat indicators shared with Federal entities.

(ii) A review of the actions taken by Federal entities as a result of the receipt of such cyber threat indicators.

(iii) A list of Federal entities receiving such cyber threat indicators.

(iv) A review of the sharing of such cyber threat indicators among Federal entities to identify inappropriate barriers to sharing information.

(3) **RECOMMENDATIONS.**—Each report submitted under this subsection may include such recommendations as the Privacy and Civil Liberties Oversight Board, with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (1), or the Inspectors General referred to in paragraph (2)(A), with respect to a report submitted under paragraph (2), may have for improvements or modifications to the authorities under this Act.

(4) **FORM.**—Each report required under this subsection shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

SEC. 8. CONSTRUCTION AND PREEMPTION.

(a) **OTHERWISE LAWFUL DISCLOSURES.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful disclosures of communications, records, or other information, including reporting of known or suspected criminal activity, by an entity to any other entity or the Federal Government under this Act; or

(2) to limit or prohibit otherwise lawful use of such disclosures by any Federal entity, even when such otherwise lawful disclosures duplicate or replicate disclosures made under this Act.

(b) **WHISTLE BLOWER PROTECTIONS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to prohibit or limit the disclosure of information pro-

ected under section 2302(b)(8) of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures of illegality, waste, fraud, abuse, or public health or safety threats), section 7211 of title 5, United States Code (governing disclosures to Congress), section 1034 of title 10, United States Code (governing disclosure to Congress by members of the military), section 1104 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3234) (governing disclosure by employees of elements of the intelligence community), or any similar provision of Federal or State law.

(c) **PROTECTION OF SOURCES AND METHODS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) as creating any immunity against, or otherwise affecting, any action brought by the Federal Government, or any agency or department thereof, to enforce any law, executive order, or procedure governing the appropriate handling, disclosure, or use of classified information;

(2) to affect the conduct of authorized law enforcement or intelligence activities; or

(3) to modify the authority of a department or agency of the Federal Government to protect classified information and sources and methods and the national security of the United States.

(d) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER LAWS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to affect any requirement under any other provision of law for an entity to provide information to the Federal Government.

(e) **PROHIBITED CONDUCT.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit price-fixing, allocating a market between competitors, monopolizing or attempting to monopolize a market, boycotting, or exchanges of price or cost information, customer lists, or information regarding future competitive planning.

(f) **INFORMATION SHARING RELATIONSHIPS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to limit or modify an existing information sharing relationship;

(2) to prohibit a new information sharing relationship;

(3) to require a new information sharing relationship between any entity and the Federal Government; or

(4) to require the use of the capability and process within the Department of Homeland Security developed under section 5(c).

(g) **PRESERVATION OF CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to amend, repeal, or supersede any current or future contractual agreement, terms of service agreement, or other contractual relationship between any entities, or between any entity and a Federal entity; or

(2) to abrogate trade secret or intellectual property rights of any entity or Federal entity.

(h) **ANTI-TASKING RESTRICTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to permit the Federal Government—

(1) to require an entity to provide information to the Federal Government;

(2) to condition the sharing of cyber threat indicators with an entity on such entity's provision of cyber threat indicators to the Federal Government; or

(3) to condition the award of any Federal grant, contract, or purchase on the provision of a cyber threat indicator to a Federal entity.

(i) **NO LIABILITY FOR NON-PARTICIPATION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to subject any entity to liability for choosing not to engage in the voluntary activities authorized in this Act.

(j) **USE AND RETENTION OF INFORMATION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to au-

thorize, or to modify any existing authority of, a department or agency of the Federal Government to retain or use any information shared under this Act for any use other than permitted in this Act.

(k) **FEDERAL PREEMPTION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This Act supersedes any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State that restricts or otherwise expressly regulates an activity authorized under this Act.

(2) **STATE LAW ENFORCEMENT.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede any statute or other provision of law of a State or political subdivision of a State concerning the use of authorized law enforcement practices and procedures.

(l) **REGULATORY AUTHORITY.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the promulgation of any regulations not specifically authorized by this Act;

(2) to establish or limit any regulatory authority not specifically established or limited under this Act; or

(3) to authorize regulatory actions that would duplicate or conflict with regulatory requirements, mandatory standards, or related processes under another provision of Federal law.

(m) **AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE TO RESPOND TO CYBER ATTACKS.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to develop, prepare, coordinate, or, when authorized by the President to do so, conduct a military cyber operation in response to a malicious cyber activity carried out against the United States or a United States person by a foreign government or an organization sponsored by a foreign government or a terrorist organization.

SEC. 9. REPORT ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS.

(a) **REPORT REQUIRED.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other appropriate elements of the intelligence community, shall submit to the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report on cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) An assessment of the current intelligence sharing and cooperation relationships of the United States with other countries regarding cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches, directed against the United States and which threaten the United States national security interests and economy and intellectual property, specifically identifying the relative utility of such relationships, which elements of the intelligence community participate in such relationships, and whether and how such relationships could be improved.

(2) A list and an assessment of the countries and nonstate actors that are the primary threats of carrying out a cybersecurity threat, including a cyber attack, theft, or data breach, against the United States and which threaten the United States national security, economy, and intellectual property.

(3) A description of the extent to which the capabilities of the United States Government to respond to or prevent cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, or data breaches, directed against the United States private sector are degraded by a delay

in the prompt notification by private entities of such threats or cyber attacks, theft, and breaches.

(4) An assessment of additional technologies or capabilities that would enhance the ability of the United States to prevent and to respond to cybersecurity threats, including cyber attacks, theft, and data breaches.

(5) An assessment of any technologies or practices utilized by the private sector that could be rapidly fielded to assist the intelligence community in preventing and responding to cybersecurity threats.

(c) **FORM OF REPORT.**—The report required by subsection (a) shall be made available in classified and unclassified forms.

(d) **INTELLIGENCE COMMUNITY DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003).

SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) **PUBLIC INFORMATION.**—Section 552(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (8), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (9), by striking “wells.” and inserting “wells; or”; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (9) the following:

“(10) information shared with or provided to the Federal Government pursuant to the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”.

(b) **MODIFICATION OF LIMITATION ON DISSEMINATION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION CONCERNING PENETRATIONS OF DEFENSE CONTRACTOR NETWORKS.**—Section 941(c)(3) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (Public Law 112-239; 10 U.S.C. 2224 note) is amended by inserting at the end the following: “The Secretary may share such information with other Federal entities if such information consists of cyber threat indicators and such information is shared consistent with the policies and procedures promulgated by the Attorney General under section 5 of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.”.

SA 2599. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 14, line 5, strike “provision of law,” and insert “statute or regulation.”.

SA 2600. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 13, line 6, strike “provision of law,” and insert “statute or regulation.”.

SA 2601. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, strike lines 4 through 10 and insert the following:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other statute or regulation, an entity may, for a cybersecurity purpose, and in accordance with the provisions of this Act and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

SA 2602. Mr. FRANKEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 3, line 21, strike “may” and insert “is reasonably likely to”.

SA 2603. Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. GILLIBRAND) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ APPREHENSION AND PROSECUTION OF INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINALS.

(a) **INTERNATIONAL CYBER CRIMINAL DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “international cyber criminal” means an individual—

(1) who is physically present within a country with which the United States does not have a mutual legal assistance treaty or an extradition treaty;

(2) who is believed to have committed a cybercrime or intellectual property crime against the interests of the United States or its citizens; and

(3) for whom—

(A) an arrest warrant has been issued by a judge in the United States; or

(B) an international wanted notice (commonly referred to as a “Red Notice”) has been circulated by Interpol.

(b) **BILATERAL CONSULTATIONS.**—The Secretary of State, or designee, shall consult with the appropriate government official of each country in which one or more international cyber criminals are physically present to determine what actions the government of such country has taken—

(1) to apprehend and prosecute such criminals; and

(2) to prevent such criminals from carrying out cybercrimes or intellectual property crimes against the interests of the United States or its citizens.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of State shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees an annual report that identifies—

(A) the number of international cyber criminals who are located in countries that do not have an extradition treaty or mutual legal assistance treaty with the United States, broken down by country;

(B) the dates on which an official of the Department of State, as a result of this Act, discussed ways to thwart or prosecute international cyber criminals in a bilateral conversation with an official of another coun-

try, including the name of each such country; and

(C) for each international cyber criminal who was extradited into the United States during the most recently completed calendar year—

(i) his or her name;

(ii) the crimes for which he or she was charged;

(iii) his or her previous country of residence; and

(iv) the country from which he or she was extradited into the United States.

(2) **APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate;

(B) the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate;

(C) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate;

(D) the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate;

(E) the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives;

(F) the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives;

(G) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives; and

(H) the Committee on Financial Services of the House of Representatives.

SA 2604. Mr. COATS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 51, strike line 8 and insert the following:

SEC. 10. STUDY ON CYBERSECURITY THREATS TO MOBILE DEVICES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall—

(1) complete a study on cybersecurity threats relating to mobile devices; and

(2) submit a report to Congress that contains the findings of such study and the recommendations developed under subsection (b)(3).

(b) **MATTERS STUDIED.**—In carrying out the study under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall—

(1) assess cybersecurity threats relating to mobile devices;

(2) assess the effect such threats may have on the cyber security of the information systems and networks of the Federal Government (except for the information systems and networks of the Department of Defense and the Intelligence Community); and

(3) develop recommendations for addressing such threats.

SEC. 11. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

SA 2605. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. STRENGTHENING PUBLIC NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

Section 501(b) of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6801(b)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(2) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), as so redesignated, by striking “In furtherance” and inserting the following:

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In furtherance”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(2) STANDARDS NOT LIMITED TO UNAUTHORIZED ACCESS OR USE OF SENSITIVE CUSTOMER RECORD OR INFORMATION.—The standards established in accordance with paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall require financial institutions to disclose the unauthorized access to or use of any customer record or information; and

“(B) shall not be limited to only require financial institutions to disclose the unauthorized access to or use of sensitive customer records or information.”.

SA 2606. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. IMPROVING EXPERTISE OF BANKING REGULATORS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “appropriate Federal banking agency” has the meaning given that term in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813);

(2) the term “banking regulators” means—

(A) the appropriate Federal banking agencies; and

(B) the National Credit Union Administration; and

(3) the term “covered entity” means any entity that—

(A) is subject to examination by a banking regulator;

(B) has more than \$10,000,000,000 in assets.

(b) PARTICIPATION IN EXAMINATION OF COVERED ENTITIES BY SPECIALISTS.—Each banking regulator shall ensure that an information security specialist participates in an examination by the banking regulator of a covered entity not less frequently than once every 3 years.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to alter the frequency of examinations conducted by a banking regulator.

SA 2607. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.

Title II of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1781 et seq.) is amended by striking section 206A (12 U.S.C. 1786a) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 206A. REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.

“(a) SERVICE PERFORMED BY CONTRACT OR OTHERWISE.—If an insured credit union that

is regularly examined or subject to examination by the Board, causes to be performed for itself, by contract or otherwise, any service authorized under this Act, or in the case of a State credit union, any applicable State law, whether on or off its premises—

“(1) such performance, including any cybersecurity practice, shall be subject to regulation and examination by the Board to the same extent as if such services were being performed by the insured credit union itself on its own premises; and

“(2) the insured credit union shall notify the Board of the existence of the service relationship not later than 30 days after the earlier of—

“(A) the date on which the contract is entered into; or

“(B) the date on which the performance of the service is initiated.

“(b) ADMINISTRATION BY THE BOARD.—The Board may issue such regulations and orders as may be necessary to enable the Board to administer and carry out this section and to prevent evasion of this section.”.

SA 2608. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 39, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(3) to protect an entity from liability for a failure to take action to address a cybersecurity threat or a security vulnerability.

SA 2609. Ms. WARREN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 6, after subsection (b), insert the following:

(c) LIABILITY FOR FAILURE TO ACT.—An entity that receives information regarding a cybersecurity threat or a security vulnerability under this Act shall take action to address the threat or vulnerability or the entity may be subject to liability for a failure to act.

SA 2610. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DHS ANNUAL REPORT ON ECONOMIC IMPLICATIONS OF CYBER ATTACKS.

(a) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and once every year thereafter, the Secretary of Homeland Security shall submit to Congress a report detailing the economic impact of cyber attacks during the year for which the report is prepared and the year-to-year trends of the economic impact of cyber attacks, in aggregate form, including—

(1) an estimate of losses (in dollars) as a result of cyber attacks; and

(2) the approximate number of cyber attacks on the networks of private entities that have been reported to the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) PROHIBITION.—Each report submitted under subsection (a) may not include the name, or other identifying information, of any private entity that has experienced a cyber attack.

SA 2611. Ms. KLOBUCHAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. GAO REPORT ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study on the implementation of the information sharing system developed under this Act.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the information sharing procedures described in this Act are implemented, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress a report on the study conducted under subsection (a), which shall include an assessment of—

(1) the effectiveness of the information sharing system in sharing cyber threat indicators, including an approximate number of cyber threat indicators shared;

(2) the extent to which the information sharing procedures described in this Act—

(A) are used by private entities; and

(B) are effective at screening out personal information or information that identifies a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat;

(3) the extent to which private entities have implemented procedures to remove personal information or information that identifies a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat prior to sharing cyber threat indicators with a Federal entity, consistent with the requirements of this Act;

(4) the extent to which the Department of Homeland Security has implemented procedures to remove personal information or information that identifies a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat prior to sharing cyber threat indicators with private entities or other Federal entities, consistent with the requirements of this Act; and

(5) the effectiveness of data security implemented by Federal entities that are involved in the sharing of cyber threat indicators.

SA 2612. Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Beginning on page 3, strike line 21 and all that follows through page 5, line 8, and insert the following:

system that is reasonably likely to result in an unauthorized effort to adversely impact the security, availability, confidentiality, or integrity of an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “cybersecurity threat” does not include any action that

solely involves a violation of a consumer term of service or a consumer licensing agreement.

(6) **CYBER THREAT INDICATOR.**—The term “cyber threat indicator” means information that is necessary to describe or identify—

(A) malicious reconnaissance, including anomalous patterns of communications that appear to be transmitted for the purpose of gathering technical information related to a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(B) a method of defeating a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(C) a security vulnerability, including anomalous activity that appears to indicate the existence of a security vulnerability;

(D) a method of causing a user with legitimate access to an information system or information that is stored on, processed by, or transiting an information system to unwittingly enable the defeat of a security control or exploitation of a security vulnerability;

(E) malicious cyber command and control;

(F) the harm caused by an incident, including a description of the information exfiltrated as a result of a particular cybersecurity threat;

(G) any other attribute of a cybersecurity threat, if disclosure of such information is not otherwise prohibited by law; or

SA 2613. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, strike lines 13 through 19 and insert the following:

(i) are shared in as close to real time as practicable with all appropriate Federal entities and in accordance with Attorney General policies, procedures, and guidelines and any applicable statutory requirements; and

On page 22, line 20, strike “(iii)” and insert “(ii)”.

On page 30, strike lines 4 through 8 and insert the following:

(C) ensures that the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators in as close to real time as practicable and in accordance with Attorney General policies, procedures, and guidelines and any applicable statutory requirements;

Beginning on page 31, strike line 20 and all that follows through page 32, line 6, and insert the following:

(B) the appropriate Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures through the process within the Department of Homeland Security in as close to real time as practicable and in accordance with Attorney General policies, procedures, and guidelines and any applicable statutory requirements.

(4) **OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—The process developed and implemented under paragraph (1) shall ensure that other Federal entities receive such cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared with the Federal Government through the process in as close to real time as practicable and in accordance with Attorney General policies, procedures, and guidelines and any applicable statutory requirements.

SA 2614. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cyber-

security in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike paragraph (1) of section 4(c) and insert the following:

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **SHARING WITH ALL ENTITIES.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and notwithstanding any other provision of law, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this Act and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, any other entity or the Federal Government in a manner consistent with section 5(c)(1)(B) a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

(B) **SHARING WITH FEDERAL ENTITIES.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2) and consistent with other applicable laws, an entity may, for the purposes permitted under this Act and consistent with the protection of classified information, share with, or receive from, the Federal Government a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure.

SA 2615. Mr. CARPER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 22, line 16, insert “unnecessary” after “delay.”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the nomination of David Malcolm Robinson to be Assistant Secretary of State (Conflict and Stabilization Operations), PN337; and Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization, PN336, dated August 4, 2015.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-215 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “A Way Back Home: Preserving Families and Reducing the Need for Foster Care.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on

Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “JCPOA: Non-Proliferations, Inspections, and Nuclear Constraints.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of the Bureau of Prisons: First-Hand Accounts of Challenges Facing the Federal Prison System.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SUPERFUND, WASTE MANAGEMENT, AND REGULATORY OVERSIGHT

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Superfund, Waste Management, and Regulatory Oversight of the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 4, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Oversight of Litigation at EPA and FWS: Impacts on the U.S. Economy, States, Local Communities and the Environment.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

U.S. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH COMPETITIVENESS ACT

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 159, S. 1297.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1297) to update the Commercial Space Launch Act by amending title 51, United States Code, to promote competitiveness of the U.S. commercial space sector, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which

had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 1297

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “U.S. Commercial Space Launch Competitiveness Act”.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES TO TITLE 51, UNITED STATES CODE.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, wherever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 3. LIABILITY INSURANCE AND FINANCIAL RESPONSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that it is in the public interest to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code, with a validated risk profile approach in order to consistently compute valid and reasonable maximum probable loss values.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than September 30, 2015, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector and insurance providers, shall—

(1) evaluate and, if necessary, develop a plan to update the methodology used to calculate the maximum probable loss from claims under section 50914 of title 51, United States Code;

(2) in evaluating or developing a plan under paragraph (1)—

(A) ensure that the Federal Government is not exposed to greater costs than intended and that launch companies are not required to purchase more insurance coverage than necessary; and

(B) consider the impact of the cost to both the industry and the Government of implementing an updated methodology; and

(3) submit the evaluation, and any plan, to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 4. LAUNCH LIABILITY EXTENSION.

Section 50915(f) is amended by striking “December 31, 2016” and inserting “December 31, 2020”.

SEC. 5. COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH LICENSING AND EXPERIMENTAL PERMITS.

Section 50906 is amended—

(1) in subsection (d), by striking “launched or reentered” and inserting “launched or reentered under that permit”;

(2) by amending subsection (d)(1) to read as follows:

“(1) research and development to test design concepts, equipment, or operating techniques;”;

(3) in subsection (d)(3) by striking “prior to obtaining a license”;

(4) in subsection (e)(1) by striking “suborbital rocket design” and inserting “suborbital rocket or suborbital rocket design”; and

(5) by amending subsection (g) to read as follows:

“(g) The Secretary may issue a permit under this section notwithstanding any license issued under this chapter. The issuance of a license under this chapter may not invalidate a permit issued under this section.”.

SEC. 6. LICENSING REPORT.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a

report on approaches for streamlining the licensing and permitting process of launch vehicles, reentry vehicles, or components of launch or reentry vehicles, to enable non-launch flight operations related to space transportation. The report shall include approaches to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints. The report shall also include an assessment of existing private and government infrastructure, as appropriate, in future licensing activities.

SEC. 7. SPACE AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, in consultation with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, and the commercial space sector, shall—

(1) assess current, and proposed near-term, commercial non-governmental activities conducted in space;

(2) identify appropriate oversight authorities for the activities described in paragraph (1);

(3) recommend an oversight approach that would prioritize safety, utilize existing authorities, minimize burdens, promote the U.S. commercial space sector, and meet the United States obligations under international treaties; and

(4) submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on the assessment and recommended approaches.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Nothing in this section shall apply to the activities of the ISS national laboratory as described in section 504 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18354), including any research or development projects utilizing the ISS national laboratory.

SEC. 8. SPACE SURVEILLANCE AND SITUATIONAL AWARENESS DATA.

Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation in concurrence with the Secretary of Defense shall—

(1) in consultation with the heads of other relevant Federal agencies, study the feasibility of processing and releasing safety-related space situational awareness data and information to any entity consistent with national security interests and public safety obligations of the United States; and

(2) submit a report on the feasibility study to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 9. EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EXTENSION OF CERTAIN SAFETY REGULATION REQUIREMENTS.—Section 50905(c)(3) is amended by striking “Beginning on October 1, 2015” and inserting “Beginning on October 1, 2020”.

(b) CONSTRUCTION.—Section 50905(c) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(5) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary to discuss potential regulatory approaches with the commercial space sector, including observations, findings, and recommendations from the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, prior to the issuance of a notice of proposed rulemaking.”.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial

Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report specifying key industry metrics that might indicate readiness of the commercial space sector and the Department of Transportation to transition to a regulatory approach under section 50905(c)(3) of title 51, United States Code, that considers space flight participant, government astronaut, and crew safety.

(d) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report that identifies the activities, described in subsections (c) and (d) of section 50905 of title 51, United States Code, most appropriate for regulatory action, if any, and a proposed transition plan for such regulations.

SEC. 10. INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.

(a) INDUSTRY VOLUNTARY CONSENSUS STANDARDS.—Section 50905(c), as amended in section 9 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) The Secretary shall continue to work with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, to facilitate the development of voluntary consensus standards based on recommended best practices to improve the safety of crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants as the commercial space sector continues to mature.”.

(b) BIENNIAL REPORT.—Beginning on December 31, 2016, and biennially thereafter, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation and coordination with the commercial space sector, including the Commercial Space Transportation Advisory Committee, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report detailing progress on the development of industry voluntary consensus standards under section 50905(c)(6) of title 51, United States Code.

SEC. 11. GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUTS.

(a) FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.—Section 50901(15) is amended by inserting “, government astronauts,” after “crew” each place it appears.

(b) DEFINITION OF GOVERNMENT ASTRONAUT.—Section 50902 is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (22) as paragraphs (7) through (25), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) ‘government astronaut’ means an individual who—

“(A) is either—

“(i) an employee of the United States Government, including the uniformed services, engaged in the performance of a Federal function under authority of law or an Executive act; or

“(ii) an international partner astronaut;

“(B) is identified by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration;

“(C) is carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

“(D) may perform or may not perform activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.

“(5) ‘international partner astronaut’ means an individual designated under Article 11 of the

International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement, by a partner to that agreement other than the United States, as qualified to serve as an International Space Station crew member.

“(6) ‘International Space Station Intergovernmental Agreement’ means the Agreement Concerning Cooperation on the International Space Station, signed at Washington January 29, 1998 (TIAS 12927).”.

(c) **DEFINITION OF LAUNCH.**—Paragraph (7) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking “and any payload, crew, or space flight participant” and inserting “and any payload or human being”.

(d) **DEFINITION OF LAUNCH SERVICES.**—Paragraph (9) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking “payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant” and inserting “payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant”.

(e) **DEFINITION OF REENTER AND REENTRY.**—Paragraph (16) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking “and its payload, crew, or space flight participants, if any,” and inserting “and its payload or human beings, if any,”.

(f) **DEFINITION OF REENTRY SERVICES.**—Paragraph (17) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by striking “payload, crew (including crew training), or space flight participant, if any,” and inserting “payload, crew (including crew training), government astronaut, or space flight participant, if any,”.

(g) **DEFINITION OF SPACE FLIGHT PARTICIPANT.**—Paragraph (20) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended to read as follows:

“(20) ‘space flight participant’ means an individual, who is not crew or a government astronaut, carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle.”.

(h) **DEFINITION OF THIRD PARTY.**—Paragraph (24)(E) of section 50902, as redesignated, is amended by inserting “, government astronauts,” after “crew”.

(i) **RESTRICTIONS ON LAUNCHES, OPERATIONS, AND REENTRIES; SINGLE LICENSE OR PERMIT.**—Section 50904(d) is amended by striking “activities involving crew or space flight participants” and inserting “activities involving crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants”.

(j) **LICENSE APPLICATIONS AND REQUIREMENTS; APPLICATIONS.**—Section 50905 is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(2), by striking “crews and space flight participants” and inserting “crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants”;

(2) in subsection (b)(2)(D), by striking “crew or space flight participants” and inserting “crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants”; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “crew and space flight participants” and inserting “crew, government astronauts, and space flight participants”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “to crew or space flight participants” each place it appears and inserting “to crew, government astronauts, or space flight participants”.

(k) **MONITORING ACTIVITIES.**—Section 50907(a) is amended by striking “crew or space flight participant training” and inserting “crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training”.

(l) **ADDITIONAL SUSPENSIONS.**—Section 50908(d)(1) is amended by striking “to crew or space flight participants” each place it appears and inserting “to any human being”.

(m) **ENFORCEMENT AND PENALTY.**—Section 50917(b)(1)(D)(i) is amended by striking “crew or space flight participant training site,” and inserting “crew, government astronaut, or space flight participant training site,”.

(n) **RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER EXECUTIVE AGENCIES, LAWS, AND INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS;**

NONAPPLICATION.—Section 50919(g) is amended to read as follows:

“(g) **NONAPPLICATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—This chapter does not apply to—

“(A) a launch, reentry, operation of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle, operation of a launch site or reentry site, or other space activity the Government carries out for the Government; or

“(B) planning or policies related to the launch, reentry, operation, or activity under subparagraph (A).

“(2) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—The following activities are not space activities the Government carries out for the Government under paragraph (1):

“(A) A government astronaut being carried within a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.

“(B) A government astronaut performing activities directly relating to the launch, reentry, or other operation of the launch vehicle or reentry vehicle under this chapter.”.

(o) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act, or the amendments made by this Act, may be construed to modify or affect any law relating to astronauts.

SEC. 12. STREAMLINE COMMERCIAL SPACE LAUNCH ACTIVITIES.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that eliminating duplicative requirements and approvals for commercial launch and reentry operations will promote and encourage the development of the commercial space sector.

(b) **REAFFIRMATION OF POLICY.**—Congress reaffirms that the Secretary of Transportation, in overseeing and coordinating commercial launch and reentry operations, should—

(1) promote commercial space launches and reentries by the private sector;

(2) facilitate Government, State, and private sector involvement in enhancing U.S. launch sites and facilities;

(3) protect public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States; and

(4) consult with the head of another executive agency, including the Secretary of Defense or the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as necessary to provide consistent application of licensing requirements under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code.

(c) **REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Transportation under section 50918 of title 51, United States Code, and subject to section 50905(b)(2)(C) of that title, shall consult with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate—

(A) to identify all requirements that are imposed to protect the public health and safety, safety of property, national security interests, and foreign policy interests of the United States relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle; and

(B) to evaluate the requirements identified in subparagraph (A) and, in coordination with the licensee or transferee and the heads of the relevant executive agencies—

(i) determine whether the satisfaction of a requirement of one agency could result in the satisfaction of a requirement of another agency; and

(ii) resolve any inconsistencies and remove any outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government relevant to any commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle.

(2) **REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually

thereafter until the Secretary of Transportation determines no outmoded or duplicative requirements or approvals of the Federal Government exist, the Secretary of Transportation, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the commercial space sector, and the heads of other executive agencies, as appropriate, shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives, and the congressional defense committees a report that includes the following:

(A) A description of the process for the application for and approval of a permit or license under chapter 509 of title 51, United States Code, for the commercial launch of a launch vehicle or commercial reentry of a reentry vehicle, including the identification of—

(i) any unique requirements for operating on a United States Government launch site, reentry site, or launch property; and

(ii) any inconsistent, outmoded, or duplicative requirements or approvals.

(B) A description of current efforts, if any, to coordinate and work across executive agencies to define interagency processes and procedures for sharing information, avoiding duplication of effort, and resolving common agency requirements.

(C) Recommendations for legislation that may further—

(i) streamline requirements in order to improve efficiency, reduce unnecessary costs, resolve inconsistencies, remove duplication, and minimize unwarranted constraints; and

(ii) consolidate or modify requirements across affected agencies into a single application set that satisfies the requirements identified in paragraph (1)(A).

(3) **DEFINITIONS.**—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) any applicable definitions set forth in section 50902 of title 51, United States Code, shall apply;

(B) the terms “launch”, “reenter”, and “reentry” include landing of a launch vehicle or reentry vehicle; and

(C) the terms “United States Government launch site” and “United States Government reentry site” include any necessary facility, at that location, that is commercially operated on United States Government property.

SEC. 13. OPERATION AND UTILIZATION OF THE ISS.

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) maximum utilization of partnerships, scientific research, commercial applications, and exploration test bed capabilities of the ISS is essential to ensuring the greatest return on investments made by the United States and its international partners in the development, assembly, and operations of that unique facility; and

(2) every effort should be made to ensure that decisions regarding the service life of the ISS are based on the station's projected capability to continue providing effective and productive research and exploration test bed capabilities.

(b) **CONTINUATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 501 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18351) is amended—

(A) in the heading, by striking “**THROUGH 2020**”; and

(B) in subsection (a), by striking “through at least 2020” and inserting “through at least 2024”.

(2) **MAINTENANCE OF THE UNITED STATES SEGMENT AND ASSURANCE OF CONTINUED OPERATIONS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SPACE STATION.**—Section

503 of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18353) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “through at least September 30, 2020” and inserting “through at least September 30, 2024”; and

(B) in subsection (b)(1), by striking “In carrying out subsection (a), the Administrator” and inserting “The Administrator”.

(3) RESEARCH CAPACITY ALLOCATION AND INTEGRATION OF RESEARCH PAYLOADS.—Section 504(d) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (42 U.S.C. 18354(d)) is amended by striking “September 30, 2020” each place it appears and inserting “at least September 30, 2024”.

(4) MAINTAINING USE THROUGH AT LEAST 2024.—Section 70907 is amended to read as follows:

“§70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024

“(a) *POLICY.*—The Administrator shall take all necessary steps to ensure that the International Space Station remains a viable and productive facility capable of potential United States utilization through at least September 30, 2024.

“(b) *NASA ACTIONS.*—In furtherance of the policy under subsection (a), the Administrator shall ensure, to the extent practicable, that the International Space Station, as a designated national laboratory—

“(1) remains viable as an element of overall exploration and partnership strategies and approaches;

“(2) is considered for use by all NASA mission directorates, as appropriate, for technically appropriate scientific data gathering or technology risk reduction demonstrations; and

“(3) remains an effective, functional vehicle providing research and test bed capabilities for the United States through at least September 30, 2024.”.

(5) *TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.*—

(A) *TABLE OF CONTENTS OF 2010 ACT.*—The item relating to section 501 in the table of contents in section 1(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act of 2010 (124 Stat. 2806) is amended by striking “through 2020”.

(B) *TABLE OF CONTENTS OF CHAPTER 709.*—The table of contents for chapter 709 is amended by amending the item relating to section 70907 to read as follows:

“70907. Maintaining use through at least 2024.”.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1297), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY OMAR BRADLEY PROPERTY TRANSFER ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from further consideration of S. 267 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 267) to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. ROUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 267) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 267

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “General of the Army Omar Bradley Property Transfer Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN ITEMS OF THE OMAR BRADLEY FOUNDATION TO THE DESCENDANTS OF GENERAL OMAR BRADLEY.

(a) *TRANSFER AUTHORIZED.*—The Omar Bradley Foundation, Pennsylvania, may transfer, without consideration, to the child of General of the Army Omar Nelson Bradley and his first wife Mary Elizabeth Quayle Bradley, namely Elizabeth Bradley, such items of the Omar Bradley estate under the control of the Foundation as the Secretary of the Army determines to be without historic value to the Army.

(b) *TIME OF SUBMITTAL OF CLAIM FOR TRANSFER.*—No item may be transferred under subsection (a) unless the claim for the transfer of such item is submitted to the Omar Bradley Foundation during the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE OBSERVANCE OF 1890 LAND-GRANT INSTITUTIONS QUASICENTENNIAL RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry Com-

mittee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 232.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 232) expressing the sense of the Senate that August 30, 2015, be observed as “1890 Land-Grant Institutions Quasicentennial Recognition Day.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 232) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 27, 2015, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2015

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, August 5; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 754; finally, that the time following leader remarks until the cloture vote be equally divided between the two managers or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:14 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, August 5, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MARY NELSON ADAMS

HON. EARL L. "BUDDY" CARTER

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Mary Nelson Adams and her many years of dedicated service as a USO volunteer.

Ms. Adams, 79, of Isle of Hope, has been a familiar face to the troops working and serving at Hunter Army Airfield's Truscott Air Terminal. Ms. Adams has been present for every deployment for the last 11 years, and she has either seen off or welcomed back more than 300,000 troops.

On July 31, 2015, Ms. Adams stood waving to the C-17 planes as they left carrying 22 soldiers bound for Iraq off from Hunter Army Airfield. However, this was the last time Ms. Adams would send off troops as a USO volunteer, as she has decided to step down after many years of service. On this day, a surprise ceremony was held in her honor. Col. Townley Hedrick, the commander at Fort Stewart, presented Ms. Adams with a pin and plaque declaring her a "Marne Rock Star."

Ms. Adams has been the recipient of additional honors throughout her years of service. In 2006, President George W. Bush gave her a pin to honor her service for soldiers. In 2008, the USO's World Headquarters named her "Volunteer of the Year," which she was the first ever to receive that recognition. The president of the USO of Georgia said Ms. Adams was "the epitome" of the organization's mission.

Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to honor and recognize Ms. Mary Nelson Adams for her patriotism and service to over 300,000 soldiers.

HONORING GARY KIEPER OF ANTIGO, WI, 2015 "PAUL BUNYAN SERVICE ABOVE SELF" RECIPIENT

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise today to recognize Mr. Gary Kieper of Antigo, Wisconsin for going above and beyond to serve our community.

Mr. Kieper has earned the 7th Congressional District's "2015 Paul Bunyan Service Above Self Award," which annually recognizes a constituent who takes a "larger than life" approach to serving our community.

Mr. Kieper is the Vice President of his local Habitat for Humanity chapter and has helped raise hundreds of thousands of dollars for the organization. Those who work closely with him

say that money has not only allowed them to build six new homes in the community, but has also given them the ability to expand their affiliate and repair existing homes for the residents.

Mr. Kieper's involvement in our community reaches beyond Habitat for Humanity. He has taken on a large role with the "Never Forgotten Honor Flight," which serves twelve counties around northern Wisconsin. Additionally, he just recently retired from the Antigo Unified School District after twenty-four years of distinguished service, including twelve as President. He continues to volunteer with his community fire department and is an active member of Peace Lutheran Church and the FFA.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the 7th District of Wisconsin and this body, it is my proud honor to recognize Mr. Gary Kieper for his outstanding service to our community.

SARAH STROUD WYNN

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a true public servant, Sarah Stroud Wynn in honor of her 100th birthday. Her remarkable career in public service has had a tremendous impact on the Tampa Bay community and is worthy of recognition by all.

Born in Rock Hill, South Carolina, Ms. Wynn moved to Florida at a young age. She graduated from Florida A&M College and the University of South Florida. Her diligent, caring nature and passion for service made Ms. Wynn an effective advocate for education. During her nearly 40 years of public service, Ms. Wynn taught elementary school students as well as served as a junior high school librarian. Through her tireless work, she has impacted a countless number of students' lives.

Ms. Wynn's outstanding service did not end with her work in education. She used her tremendous talent and vision for the good of Florida families by volunteering as a tax preparer for those needing assistance. She is also active in church as a supporter of Sunday school, White Robe Choir member, and secretary of the Trustee Board.

Ms. Wynn has always been an engaged community leader. She serves as a member of the Greater Tampa Urban League, the Retired Teachers Association, and the Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority. Her engagement and tireless work has created a legacy for her family and the Tampa Bay community at large.

Ms. Wynn has embodied servant leadership throughout her life. The education of the children of the Tampa Bay community is forever bettered thanks to her everlasting service. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of a grateful Tampa Bay

community, I am proud to recognize Sarah Stroud Wynn for her lifelong service to the State of Florida and wish her a happy birthday.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MICHAEL "MIKE" ROOS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. DAVIS, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON and Ms. WATERS to recognize our good friend, The Honorable Michael "Mike" Roos, for his outstanding career, and to congratulate him on the special milestone that is his 70th birthday.

Mike was born on August 6, 1945, in Memphis, Tennessee. He went on to attend Christian Brothers High School and Tulane University in New Orleans before ultimately accepting a National Institute of Child Health Fellowship at the University of Southern California, where he graduated with a master's degree in public administration.

During the late 1970's Mike began his legislative career, serving in the California State Assembly for over 14 years. In his second legislative term, he was chosen as Majority Floor leader by his caucus, and he served in this position for six years until he was elected Speaker Pro Tempore of the California State Assembly.

Some of Mike's landmark legislative achievements include the passage of the Roberti-Roos Weapons Control Act of 1989, which banned assault weapons, as well as the Mello Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982, which afforded local government an innovative, alternate method of financing public facilities. In 1985 Mike authored the first and strictest laws to date that protect the confidentiality of HIV test results, and he also authored the law that established the pioneer Alternative Test Sites Program, where individuals could receive free anonymous testing for the AIDS antibody.

Following his career in the State Assembly, Mike became the founder and Chief-consultant of Mike Roos and Company, a public affairs and management company that specializes in government relations, corporate issues, media relations, and ballot measure campaigns.

Apart from his successful career as a legislator and political strategist, Mike's longstanding philanthropic service is also notable. As President and CEO of LEARN—a coalition of civic leaders and representatives—Mike worked to help implement systematic reform and restructuring of the Los Angeles Unified School District. Mike has served as Chairman

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

of the Fraternity of Friends of the Music Center, the President of the Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Commission, and the Campaign Director for California Children and Families Initiative—an initiative that would go on to become the successful ballot measure known as Prop 10.

Because of his experience and contributions, Mike is often asked to speak about education reform and his knowledge of California politics. Today Mike resides in Los Angeles, and enjoys spending time with his four daughters Shelby, Melissa, Caroline, and Catherine.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. DAVIS, Mr. FARR, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. THOMPSON and Ms. WATERS and I ask our colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in honoring the service of Michael “Mike” Roos, a remarkable Californian legislative leader and public servant.

HONORING CYNTHIA MARTINEZ

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleagues Representative RON KIND, Representative ROBERT J. WITTMAN, and Representative FRANK LOBIONDO to recognize Cynthia Martinez upon her appointment as Chief of the National Wildlife Refuge System. Cynthia is a twenty-one-year veteran of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and a dedicated advocate of the agency's mission to conserve, protect, and enhance wildlife and habitats for the benefit of the American people. Ms. Martinez is also notably the first woman and first Latina to serve as the Chief of the National Wildlife Refuge System, a testament to her leadership and passion for protecting our nation's wildlife and most treasured natural habitats.

Over the past twenty-one years, Ms. Martinez has been a dedicated public servant within the Fish and Wildlife Service. Her first experience with the Fish and Wildlife Service as a student trainee in the Arizona State Office soon grew into an impressive career that includes managing the Desert National Wildlife Refuge Complex in Nevada and serving as the Deputy Chief of the Refuge System. Her long career of service to the Refuge System demonstrates her devotion to enhancing and protecting the habitats and recreational opportunities that we all enjoy.

While serving as the Chief of the Refuge System Division of Visitor Services and Communications, Cynthia developed the Conserving the Future vision document, which outlines the agency's strategic plan for a robust and resilient Refuge System. This forward-thinking vision, predicated on sound, science-based planning and monitoring, illustrates that the future of the Refuge System is bright under Cynthia's leadership. Ms. Martinez also spearheaded the Urban Wildlife Conservation Program, an initiative to engage and educate residents on the wildlife that share our urban spaces and to connect them with nearby refuges to promote stewardship and provide an opportunity to reconnect with nature.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting and proper that we honor Cynthia Martinez at this time. Her commitment and leadership of the National Wildlife Refuge System will ensure that our nation's pristine wildlife habitats and unparalleled recreational opportunities are preserved for years to come.

THE LOW ENRICHED URANIUM (LEU) FUEL BANK AND KAZAKHSTAN

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Kazakhstan and its commitment to nuclear nonproliferation. As the Chairman of the Energy and Commerce Subcommittee on Energy and Power, I recognize the complexities of nuclear power and would like to commend Kazakhstan for its leadership helping to prevent the spread of nuclear materials and to advance the responsible, peaceful use of existing civilian nuclear energy.

When it declared independence in 1991, Kazakhstan possessed the fourth largest arsenal of nuclear weapons in the world. By 1993, Kazakhstan had dismantled and secured its entire arsenal and chose to become an international partner in nuclear non-proliferation efforts.

On July 21, 2015, I had the opportunity to meet with His Excellency Kairat Umarov, the Ambassador of Kazakhstan. During the meeting we discussed Kazakhstan's ongoing commitment to these issues. On August 27th, Kazakhstan will partner with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to establish the world's first international fuel bank. This unprecedented facility, planned for nearly a decade, will help prevent the spread of nuclear materials and support the appropriate commercial use of nuclear energy. The fuel bank, controlled by the IAEA and operated in northern Kazakhstan, will maintain a reliable supply of low enriched uranium available to countries if they lose access to fuel supplies for their nuclear power plants.

The LEU Bank will provide a secure, guaranteed supply of nuclear fuel, paving the way for nations to pursue peaceful nuclear power under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) without the need for their own enrichment programs. Given the current global security environment and the recent focus on Iran's nuclear program, the establishment of the LEU Bank could also alleviate concerns that a country's peaceful energy program could be altered to produce weapons grade enriched uranium. As the world continues to explore the potential of nuclear power, we need a solution that removes the threat of enrichment from the peaceful development of nuclear energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Kazakhstan on this important announcement that will empower nations to unlock the power of nuclear energy, while eliminating the need for domestic enrichment programs that put our safety at risk.

HONORING CLARE WEBER OF HUDSON, WI, 2015 YOUTH “PAUL BUNYAN SERVICE ABOVE SELF” RECIPIENT

HON. SEAN P. DUFFY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand before you today to recognize Miss Clare Weber of Hudson, Wisconsin for her unparalleled dedication to serving our community.

Miss Weber is the youth recipient of the 7th District's 2015 “Paul Bunyan Service Above Self Award,” which recognizes a constituent who takes volunteering to new heights. I am proud to honor this young woman for her larger than life dedication to serving our community.

At just 17 years old, Miss Weber has already spent more than 1,000 hours volunteering with Youth Action Hudson, a local nonprofit: during that time she has played a big role in helping feed the hungry through both the Empty Bowl project and Hudson Backpack Program.

However, Miss Weber has also made it a priority to find new ways to give back. She recently organized an Operation Christmas Child project that collected dozens of gifts for children in Rwanda and Trinidad and Tobago and helped raise hundreds of dollars for the American Cancer Society.

From her nominator: “Since the first time I met her, I have continually been impressed and inspired by her dedication to service and I am certain that Clare will continue to be a catalyst for change in her school, church, and community.”

Mr. Speaker, please join me today to recognize Miss Weber for answering the call to selflessly serve our community.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY ON AUGUST 26, 2015

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in recognition of the 95th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, granting voting rights for women. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in marking August 26, known as Women's Equality Day, a significant landmark in American history as we acknowledge, honor and celebrate the vast and vital contributions that women have made to our country.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott and other dedicated supporters for women's equality convened the First Women's Rights Convention in July 1848 in Seneca Falls, New York. They advocated for the right to own property, protection from domestic violence, and other social reforms that promoted equality, including voting, and never wavered in that

pursuit. Stanton wrote a Declaration of Sentiments that called for "all men and women" to be recognized as created equal under the law, thus beginning the 72-year struggle for suffrage that ended in 1920.

2015 is the Bicentennial year for Elizabeth Cady Stanton who was born November 12, 1815 in Johnstown, New York. Celebrations of her extraordinary life are taking place throughout the year. Stanton met Susan B. Anthony in 1851 and they began a 50-year partnership advocating for suffrage and women's equality; however both women did not live to see the passage of the 19th Amendment. As the mother of seven children, Mrs. Stanton can be proud of the legacy she left to her descendants, one of whom is today spearheading a committee tasked with placing a new statue of these two amazing leaders in New York. They gave a voice to millions of women and changed history forever following Anthony's vow that "failure is impossible."

A unique crossroad of history resides at 77th and Central Park West in New York City with statues of two U.S. Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt astride a horse outside the American Museum of Natural History and Abraham Lincoln who stands on the steps of the New-York Historical Society. Near Lincoln is a statue of abolitionist Frederick Douglass symbolically carrying books at a building that safeguards history. I am pleased to announce that permission was granted in May 2015 for a suffragist statue to be installed at the West 77th Street entrance to Central Park. It will be the very first statue of a woman in this park's 160-year history.

New York City Park Commissioner Mitchell J. Silver awarded this site for a statue of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, pioneering leaders of the women's suffrage movement. Included in the sculpture design are the names of many remarkable women instrumental in the fight toward winning the vote. Its installation in September 2017 will coincide with New York State's Centennial of women's voting rights. The New-York Historical Society announced that in the transformation of its fourth floor there would be a new Center for the Study of Women's History that will present special exhibitions, as well as public and scholarly programs.

Over 50 million visitors each year are welcomed to New York City, with over half report-

ing they spend time in Central Park. Placing the Stanton and Anthony statue at this highly visible locale that resonates social justice will undoubtedly draw local residents and visitors of all nations to history lessons that include the story of the equal rights and suffrage movements in America.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that we give tribute on August 26, 2015, the 95th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment, to the early suffragists who were steadfast in their pursuit of equality for all citizens, which is a sacred trust that we must continue to support today.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF AMBASSADOR NUNO BRITO

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 4, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today along with my colleagues Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NUNES and Mr. VALADAO to recognize the service of our good friend Nuno Brito, the Ambassador of Portugal to the United States. After four years of hard work, Ambassador Brito deserves to be commended for all of his tireless efforts to strengthen the special bond between Portugal and the United States.

Born in Angola, Brito earned his degree in law from the University of Lisbon and joined the Portuguese diplomatic service shortly thereafter. He began his career with Portugal's Diplomatic Service in 1984 as part of the Americas Department. Brito first served at the Portuguese Embassy in Washington, DC, from 1987 to 1993. This time in Washington, DC, laid the foundation for his continued career as an effective statesman for the people of Portugal. Brito then served as Deputy Alternate Representative to the Security Council at the United Nations during Portugal's term as a non-permanent member for 1997/1998. Following a stint as Deputy Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations, Brito also served as Political Director of Portugal and co-chair of the Portuguese-U.S. Standing Bilateral Commission.

On February 23, 2011, Brito presented his credentials to President Barack Obama and

expressed his desire to focus on expanding the U.S.-Portugal relationship beyond political and military cooperation to science, technology, and energy initiatives. He pursued these goals by actively engaging with the Congressional Portuguese Caucus, especially on subjects that benefitted from Portuguese expertise such as issues with Africa, the Americas, and across the Atlantic. Furthermore, Brito's experiences from the United Nations, U.S.-Portuguese Standing Bilateral Commission, Luso-Spanish Commission for Trans-border Cooperation, and other roles within Portugal's Ministry of Foreign Affairs gave him an edge for practicing diplomacy and advocacy in the United States. This especially showed during Brito's work to bring understanding and cooperation to NATO maneuvers and to the operation of Lajes Field in the Azores.

Bruto led numerous initiatives to support and engage Portuguese-American communities throughout the United States. Earlier this year, Brito invited Portuguese-American federal, state, and local elected officials to celebrate Dia de Portugal in Washington, DC. The full day of events was a wonderful representation of not only the special relationship between our countries, but of Brito's innate ability to bring people together and raise awareness of Portuguese culture and values.

Another example of Brito's leadership on behalf of Portugal is bringing IBERIAN SUITE: global arts remix to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The IBERIAN SUITE featured dozens of performances from Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking communities over a three-week period. It was an unprecedented opportunity to explore the contributions of Portuguese and Spanish cultures to the development of the arts around the world.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. NUNES, Mr. VALADAO, and I ask our colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to recognize Ambassador Nuno Brito and his many contributions to the U.S.-Portugal relationship. His dedication to fostering cooperation between American and Portuguese society is surpassed by none. It is an honor to call him a friend and we wish him the best of luck in his next position.

SENATE—Wednesday, August 5, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Immortal, invisible, God only wise, continue to lead our lawmakers like a great shepherd. May they be watchful among the unwatchful and awake among those who sleep. Give them the wisdom to speak and act with such pure minds that joy will follow them like gentle winds.

Lord, guide their consciences so that our Senators may faithfully serve our Nation and uphold Your values and truths. As we near the August break may our lawmakers appreciate that substantive things have been accomplished, but much remains to be done.

Thank You that the illumination of Your wisdom enables us to more clearly see Your truth.

We pray in Your sacred Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The majority leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the administration's agreement with Iran comes under greater scrutiny, there is growing bipartisan concern. It is widespread, and it is well founded. The leading House Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee recently said the deal "troubled" him because "it doesn't prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, it just postpones it."

Yesterday another House Democrat said the deal lacks "sufficient safeguards" and "could lead to a dangerous regional weapons race." She warned that the agreement would leave the international community with limited options to prevent Iran's nuclear breakout.

These are strong words, and they are from congressional Democrats who are otherwise supportive of the President.

It is clear that this deal is making Members of both parties uneasy—and with good reason.

America's role in the world, its commitment to global allies, and the kind of future we will leave our children are all tied up in this issue. That is why I have called for a debate worthy of the importance of the agreement when the Senate takes it up in September.

I hope the President will echo this tone of seriousness in his remarks later today. I hope he will avoid tired, obviously untrue talking points about this being some choice between a bad deal and war. Of course it isn't. He knows it isn't. He himself has said that no deal is better than a bad deal.

There is also no need to insult the man who negotiated this agreement and the man who stood by his side when he announced it by falsely conflating debates from more than a decade ago with the unique and consequential realities of today.

Now is a time to aim higher. Now is a time to dig deeper. What I am asking is for President Obama to join us in rising to the moment.

Senators and the American people are being asked to weigh the consequences of what it would mean to allow Iran to become a nuclear-threshold state with the power to dominate its neighbors, spread its influence, and threaten our allies. This is a serious decision to make with serious consequences for our country. America deserves a debate worthy of it.

I imagine the many Democrats with serious reservations about this deal feel the very same way. Nearly every Member of both parties voted to have this debate when they passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act this spring. Given the widespread bipartisan concern about this deal, it is clear that a serious and proper debate, followed by a vote on the agreement, is now just exactly what our country needs.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, a cyber attack can feel like a very personal attack on your privacy. A criminal with your medical records, your credit cards, and your Social Security number; a stranger with emails from your boss, texts to your friends, and pictures of your kids—it is personally violating, financially crippling, and it can be just plain creepy. But with effective cyber security legislation, we can help protect America's privacy.

It seems the White House agrees too. We were glad to see such a strong statement of support yesterday for the

strong bipartisan and transparent cyber security bill before the Senate. The President's spokesman said "the Senate should take up this bill as soon as possible and pass it." That is what the President's spokesman said just yesterday about the bill that is currently on the floor. It is easy to see why. This bipartisan legislation would help the public and private sectors protect America's most private and personal information by defeating cyber attacks.

It contains important measures to protect "individual privacy and civil liberties," as the top Democrat on the issue put it. It has been scrutinized and supported overwhelmingly—14 to 1—by both parties in the Intelligence Committee.

Our colleagues said they would be happy to consider the bill in a timely fashion—a couple of days "at the most" is what the Democratic leader told us—if allowed to offer some amendments. That seemed reasonable enough to me. That is why I offered a fair proposal yesterday that would have ensured at least 10 relevant amendments to be pending and debated for each party. That is actually more than what Democrats have been asking for. So I think everyone was a little taken aback when they chose to block the proposal anyway.

I am still determined to see if we can find a way forward on this bipartisan bill. Republicans support it, Democrats support it, and President Obama supports it. I am asking colleagues to join me to open debate on it today. With a little cooperation, we can pass a strong bipartisan cyber security bill this week.

TRIBUTE TO RUSS THOMASSON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, on one final matter, I know my friend from Texas will have some words to say about the man who has been helping him run the whip operation so effectively the last few years, and I know Senator CORNYN won't mind if I share a few thoughts first.

Russ Thomasson is preparing to bid farewell to the Senate after many years in the trenches. He is one of the most approachable and good-humored staffers around here. He is also incredibly effective.

This former intelligence officer always has his ear to the ground. When he takes the pulse of the Senate, it is with uncommon precision.

Russ loves a good nail-biter too. And in a more open, more freewheeling, and, by definition, more unpredictable

Senate, you are inevitably going to have a few of those as well. What is important is that with Russ's help, we almost always seem to push through. Russ has all of the qualities you would look for in a highly successful member of our leadership team—always willing to take on the difficult but necessary tasks, unafraid to offer his candid advice, working each vote until the gavel falls, and defined by loyalty and integrity. This is someone whose judgment I value greatly.

I am glad Russ's son Austin got to see him in action. He has had a front-row seat as a page here in the Senate. We hope Austin will be seeing more of his dad soon, the same with his sister Sasha and Russ's wife Cindy.

Thank you, Russ, for your service to the Senate. You have been an invaluable member of our team, and you will be truly missed.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Iran accord is the result of many years of hard work by lots of people. Congressional committees are conducting hearings to listen to the administration's case and others. For example, this evening at 5 p.m., we will have an all-Senators classified briefing. At that meeting, we will hear from Dr. Moniz, the Secretary of Energy, a man imminently qualified as a scientist—an MIT physics professor who is world famous for his scientific prowess—and Wendy Sherman, one of America's truly great diplomats during the last 20 years.

We have yet to see the language of the legislative response to the accord that has been negotiated. I know that Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN are working on that, but it is not out yet. It is incumbent on Congress to review this agreement with the thoughtful, level-headed process that an agreement of this magnitude deserves.

Let's hopefully remember that we all agree, and now the world agrees, that a nuclear-armed Iran is unacceptable and a threat to our national security, the safety of Israel, and the stability of the Middle East. Like many Senators, I am continuing to consider this matter. I am looking forward to the briefing tonight. It is altogether appropriate for Senators to consider this deliberately and with the understanding that this is very important. I admire those Senators on both sides who have come to a conclusion on how they feel about this. A number of us have not and are looking for more information to better understand this very important time in the history of the world.

FUNDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on another matter, unless Congress acts, there will be a government shutdown on October 1. That is a short time away—less than 2 months. Every day that passes we are another day closer to the crisis of an unfunded Federal government.

For months we have been warning Republican leaders that there is a need to find a solution to these budget problems. We have offered to meet with them. We have urged them to negotiate. The answer is always no answer.

The Republican leader knows he must negotiate. Here is what he said yesterday: "Different parties control the Congress from control the White House, and at some point, we'll negotiate the way forward." I am sure that didn't come out exactly the way he wanted, but I think I get the picture. He believes we have two Houses of Congress that are different from the White House. I am quite certain that is what he meant to say.

Regardless, the question remains: Why does the Republican leader continue to decline our invitation to sit down and craft a bipartisan solution and do it now? Why does he continue to tell us no? This should not come as a surprise, however, because Republicans are in the habit of governing by manufactured crisis. We have seen that over the past 7 months.

Their obvious distaste—some say hatred—of government generally is so deep that many take pleasure in closing it. We hear that from the statements that have been made over the last few days. That could explain why they keep fighting to not move forward on negotiations and finding excuses to simply close the government. Lately it has been women's health. They are going to close the government because they don't like the way women are getting their health care.

In the 1990s Republicans shut the government to force cuts in Medicare. In 2013 they shut the government to force repeal of the Affordable Care Act. It is clear that both of those times were total failures.

Earlier this year Republicans came within hours of shutting down the Department of Homeland Security. That is the agency which is tasked with keeping our homeland safe. They came within hours of closing down the whole Department.

There is always a new reason—some grievance from the partisans at FOX News, some complaint from whiners on talk radio, some attack from radicals in the tea party. It makes one wonder: What will be next? Will the Republicans again use shutdown extortion to try to repeal ObamaCare or to attack immigrants or to cut Social Security or to privatize Medicare?

As I just said, there is a new one. They are targeting the health of

women in America. Could it be any more obvious that the Republican Party doesn't care about the health of women? That is obvious from the statements that have been made. The legislation before this body says money that goes to this organization which they dislike—other agencies will take care of it. Well, we have learned that in Texas alone, hundreds of thousands of people simply wouldn't be able to have the care they need. Yesterday Jeb Bush went so far as to say this, a direct quote: "I'm not sure we need half a billion dollars for women's health issues."

Unfortunately, the attack on women's health is only one example of the many legislative riders Republicans are pursuing. This isn't just talk; they have actually done it in the various bills that have come out of the House in the appropriations process and over here by the Republicans. These partisan riders have nothing to do with funding the government and everything to do with ideology and special interests.

For example, there is a legislative rider to block implementation of the Affordable Care Act, which would deny health coverage to millions of Americans—that, after almost three score different attempts to repeal ObamaCare. Each of them turned out the same: They were defeated overwhelmingly.

There is a legislative rider on behalf of Wall Street to protect institutions that are too big to fail, making taxpayers more vulnerable to future bailouts.

There is a legislative rider to undermine the President's work to address the dangers of climate change. And the dangers of climate change exist. Spread across all the news today is the fact that the Forest Service is going to be spending 75 percent of its money fighting fires in the future. There will be no money left for anything other than fighting fires.

There is a fire going on in California now. It is 15 or 20 percent contained. There are 7,000 or 8,000 firefighters trying to stop that fire from spreading even more. That is only one of the many fires burning as we speak.

There is a legislative rider in their legislation attacking immigrants by undermining President Obama's recent Executive actions.

There is a legislative rider to block the Federal Communications Commission from implementing its recent net neutrality order. Let's not forget that this is what the Republican leader wanted; in fact, this is what he promised. It was just last month that he told the Lexington Herald Leader that he and Republicans would "line the interior appropriations bill with every rider you can think of." In this instance, he certainly is a man of his word.

Democrats disagree with these Republican attacks, and we are going to

resist them. We believe in standing up not for billionaires and tea party ideologues but for everyday, working families. Take sequestration, for example. While Republicans want relief only for the Pentagon, we insist on equal, dollar-for-dollar treatment for the needs of America's middle class—for jobs, for education, for health care. We insist on strengthening Social Security and Medicare, not cutting and privatizing them. And we insist on supporting women's health, not gutting it.

We know that Republicans disagree with us about these middle-class priorities, but I hope these disagreements—serious though they are—won't get in the way of keeping the government operating. Whatever our differences, we should act responsibly. We should at least be able to agree to not shut down the government. Republicans should not once again take legislative hostages to get some rightwing prize that is within their grasp.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to S. 754, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 28, S. 754, a bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Under the previous order, the time until the cloture vote will be equally divided between the bill managers or their designees.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, it is my understanding that although the Senate had been scheduled to vote at 10:30 on a cloture motion, that time might be changed. However, I wish to make some further remarks in addition to what I said yesterday on the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act.

I think it is fair to say that I have been very disappointed over the past couple of days that we have not moved to this bill more quickly and that we haven't reached an agreement to take up and begin considering amendments. There has been a lot of talk about committee jurisdictions and germaneness of amendments and process issues that the American people just don't care about and which, frankly, don't make anyone safer. So I wish to take a few

minutes to point out what we are really talking about.

Here are a few facts and figures. As I said in my remarks yesterday, cyber attacks and cyber threats are getting more and more common and more and more devastating. This isn't going to stop. It is going to get worse, and it affects everyone. That is why last night the White House had a simple message, and I hope my colleagues will hear it. A White House spokesman said yesterday: "Cybersecurity is an important national security issue and the Senate should take up this bill as soon as possible and pass it."

Here is why this is so important.

Last year the cyber security company McAfee and the Center for Strategic and International Studies, which we call CSIS, estimated that the annual cost of cyber crime is more than \$400 billion—that is the annual cost—and could cost the United States as many as 200,000 jobs. That is not my analysis; that is the analysis of security experts. Also last year the cyber security company Symantec reported that over 348 million identities were exposed through data breaches—348 million people had their data exposed.

Poll information out this week from the Financial Services Roundtable shows that 46 percent of Americans were directly affected by cyber crime over the past year—that is almost one-half of the American population—and 66 percent are more concerned about cyber intrusions than they were last year. Why are people so concerned? Well, here is a list of 10 of the most noteworthy cyber breaches and attacks from the past year and a half.

Of course, we all know OPM. June of this year, Office of Personnel Management. There was an announcement that roughly 22 million government employees and security clearance applicants had massive amounts of personal information stolen from OPM databases.

Primera Blue Cross. In March of this year, Primera Blue Cross, a health insurer based in Washington State, said that up to 11 million customers could have been affected by a cyber breach last year.

Anthem. In February 2015, Anthem, one of the Nation's largest health insurers, said that hackers breached a database that contained as many as 80 million records of current and former customers.

Sony Pictures Entertainment. In November of last year, North Korean hackers broke into Sony Pictures Entertainment and not only stole vast amounts of sensitive and personal data but destroyed the company's whole internal network.

Defense Industrial Base. A 2014 Senate Armed Services Committee investigation found over 20 instances in the previous year of Chinese actors penetrating the networks of defense con-

tractors to the military's Transportation Command.

JPMorgan Chase. In September of last year, it was reported that hackers broke in to their accounts and took the account information of 76 million households and 7 million small businesses.

Home Depot. In September of last year, Home Depot discovered that hackers had breached their networks and may have accessed up to 56 million credit cards.

eBay. In May of last year, it was reported that up to 233 million personal records of eBay users were breached.

There are people here who are concerned with personal information. Look at the breach of personal information that has taken place because we haven't been able to stop it.

Destructive attack on Sands Casino. In early 2014, Iran launched a cyber attack on the Sands Casino in Las Vegas that rendered thousands of their electronic systems inoperable, according to public testimony of the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper.

Target. In December 2013, Target discovered that up to 70 million customers may have had their credit card information taken by hackers.

That is just the last year and a half. This Senator remembers, before this was disclosed in 2008, when hackers broke into Citibank and broke into the Royal Bank of Scotland and robbed individuals in each one of more than \$10 million. That was not made public for a long time because they didn't want anybody to know. That was 2008. That was 7 years ago, and we haven't done anything about it.

Those are some of the breaches from the past year and a half. There are cyber crimes, theft of personal information, intellectual property, and money every single day.

In 2011 and 2012, there were denial-of-service attacks against major Wall Street banks and Nasdaq, showing that our financial institutions are vulnerable. In 2012, Saudi Aramco, the world's largest energy oil and gas company, had three-quarters of its corporate computers wiped out in a cyber attack. We are vulnerable and these attacks will continue.

This legislation, which was approved by a 14-to-1 vote in March and has been significantly improved since then, will not end these attacks, but it will greatly enhance the ability of companies and the U.S. Government to learn from each other about the threats they see and the defenses they employ.

I would like to make a couple of comments about the bill on specific points, if I may. We have made some 15 privacy information improvements in this bill, and I would like to read page 16 of the bill on "Removal of Certain Personal Information."

An entity sharing a cyber threat indicator pursuant to this Act shall, prior to such sharing—

(A) review such cyber threat indicator to assess whether such cyber threat indicator contains any information that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat and remove such information; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove any information contained within such indicator that the entity knows at the time of sharing to be personal information of or identifying a specific person not directly related to a cybersecurity threat.

That is the first personal information scrub in this bill.

The second scrub is left to the agencies receiving the information. To that end, the Attorney General is directed to issue guidelines to all agencies once the information goes through the DHS portal and goes to the Defense Department or FBI or any other agency. Page 25 of the bill has details on the agencies' guidelines that will be developed to make a scrub:

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with the heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1), develop, submit to Congress, and make available to the public interim guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

(2) FINAL GUIDELINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall, in coordination with heads of the appropriate Federal entities and in consultation with officers designated under section 1062 of the National Security Intelligence Reform Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 2000ee-1) and such private entities with industry expertise as the Attorney General considers relevant, promulgate final guidelines relating to privacy and civil liberties which shall govern the receipt, retention, use and dissemination of cyber threat indicators by a Federal entity obtained in connection with activities authorized in this Act.

Then there is a section on periodic review.

Then there is a section on content:

The guidelines required by paragraphs (1) and (2) shall, consistent with the need to protect information systems from cybersecurity threats and mitigate cybersecurity threats—

(A) limit the impact on privacy and civil liberties of activities by the Federal Government under this Act;

(B) limit the receipt, retention, use, and dissemination of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific persons, including by establishing—

(i) a process. . . .

And it goes on through page 27 of the bill. Everyone can pick it up and read it.

Section (E) on line 27 says it must “protect the confidentiality of cyber threat indicators containing personal information of or identifying specific

persons to the greatest extent practicable. . . .”

Somebody can pick up this bill and read the section, pages 25, 26, and 27, and see the second personal information scrub that is in this bill. It happens, first, the company must scrub the information and then, second, the government must scrub the information. I think those are very substantial mandates.

I have been very disappointed by our inability to move this bill. Yesterday I cited the procedural history. This is the third bill we have dealt with. It gets into a question of committee jurisdiction, but the Intelligence Committee has been working on this issue for 5 years now. We have worked with companies. We have worked with technicians. Our staffs are very well aware of all the issues and the technical difficulties in putting together a bill.

The earlier bills were fragmented. This bill has a solid support from over 50 different companies and associations. I want to read just a few of them.

For the first time, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce supports the bill; the Software Alliance supports this bill; the Information Technology Council supports this bill; yesterday I received a letter from General Motors supporting this bill; the American Bankers Association; the American Financial Services Association; the American Insurance Association; Agricultural Retailers Association; Airlines for America; Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers; American Cable Association; American Chemistry Council; American Fuel and Petrochemical Manufacturers; American Gaming Association; American Gas Association; American Insurance Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Public Power Association; American Water Works Association; Association of American Railroads; Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies; The Clearing House; Consumer Bankers Association; Credit Union National Association; Electronic Transactions Association; Financial Services Forum; Independent Community Bankers of America; Investment Company Institute. It goes on and on and on.

I would point out Oracle and the National Association of Manufacturers support it; IBM; as I said, General Motors; and the U.S. Telecom Association support it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this list be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPORTERS OF THE CYBERSECURITY
INFORMATION SHARING ACT OF 2015

U.S. Chamber of Commerce; BSA: The Software Alliance; Information Technology Industry Council; American Bankers Association; American Financial Services Association; American Insurance Association;

Agricultural Retailers Association; Airlines for America; Alliance of Automobile Manufacturers; American Cable Association; American Chemistry Council; American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers; American Gaming Association; American Gas Association; American Insurance Association; American Petroleum Institute; American Public Power Association; American Water Works Association; ASIS International; Association of American Railroads.

Association of Metropolitan Water Agencies; The Clearing House; Consumer Bankers Association; Credit Union National Association; Electronic Transactions Association; Financial Services Forum; Financial Services Roundtable; Independent Community Bankers of America; Investment Company Institute; NACHA—The Electronic Payments Association; National Association of Federal Credit Unions; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association; BITS—Financial Services Roundtable; College of Healthcare Information Management Executives; CompTIA—The Computing Technology Industry Association; CTIA—The Wireless Association; Edison Electric Institute; Electronic Payments Coalition.

Electronic Transactions Association; Federation of American Hospitals; Food Marketing Institute; Global Automakers; GridWise Alliance; HIMSS—Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society; HTRUST—Health Information Trust Alliance; Large Public Power Council; National Association of Chemical Distributors; National Association of Manufacturers; National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies; National Association of Water Companies; National Business Coalition on e-Commerce & Privacy; National Cable & Telecommunications Association; National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; NTCA—The Rural Broadband Association; Property Casualty Insurers Association of America; The Real Estate Roundtable; Software & Information Industry Association; Society of Chemical Manufacturers & Affiliates.

Telecommunications Industry Association; Transmission Access Policy Study Group; Utilities Telecom Council; Oracle; National Association of Manufacturers Association; IBM; General Motors (GM); US Telecom Association.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. So I want to say something about jurisdiction of committees. The Homeland Security Committee is certainly free to do a bill. The Judiciary Committee is certainly free to do a bill. We have the one on the Intelligence Committee—and the Presiding Officer is a member of this committee—which has been working on this for a long time. We have done two bills previously. This bill, I believe, has hit the mark of support across the Nation, from the companies—both corporate and privately owned—that would have to use this.

It is all voluntary. It does not force anybody to do anything they do not want to do. If one does share, and share according to the strictures of this bill, you are protected with liability insurance. If you reduce it to its basic elemental truth, it is the on-ramp to cyber security protection in this country. It gives companies the ability to

talk to each other about a well-defined cyber threat indicator, to talk with the government, and to be able to take advice from the government. If they follow the bill, they don't have to worry about a lawsuit. That is what this bill does.

So this Senator must say we have made at least 15 different privacy amendments to meet individual Senators' needs. There is a managers' package, a substitute amendment, if you will, that takes out any use of this information from being used for any other purpose—violent crime—other than cyber security because a number of Senators weighed in, and they felt it could be used to be monitored as a surveillance bill.

This is not a surveillance bill. What it is meant to be is a voluntary effort that companies can enter into with some protection if they follow this law. It gives the Attorney General the obligation to come up with secure guidelines to protect private information.

It is very hard for me, candidly, to understand why this has become such a big issue because we protect privacy information. Today out in this vast land of the Internet, there is very little privacy protection. You can see that by the cyber interruptions. You can see that by the use of insurance data by company to company. You can see that by companies that are designed to accumulate data about an individual so they can sell that data to other companies, which can tell you who uses a credit card, how you use it, where you use it, and at what time you use it. To me that is a privacy violation.

We have taken every step to prevent privacy violations from happening under this bill. Yet there are individuals who still raise that as a major concern. I believe it is bogus. I believe it is a detriment to us in taking this first step to protect our American industries. If we don't pass it, the thefts are going to go on and on and on.

I understand that the cloture vote has been postponed until 2 o'clock. I will vote for cloture. I believe we have, in good faith—Senator BURR and I, the committee as a whole, the staffs on both sides of the aisle—gone out of our way to listen to Senators, to present amendments where they felt they were workable and applicable to the bill. We need to get on with it because the litany I read in the last year and a half of almost half of the American people being affected by cyber crime cannot go on.

I make these remarks and hope at least it can clear the air somewhat, so when a cloture vote does come at 2 o'clock, we will have the votes to proceed to the bill.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democratic leader and myself continue

to discuss the way forward on cyber. I think we have made some progress, but to make that more possible for us to reach some kind of agreement, I now ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture vote with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 754 occur at 2 p.m. today; further, that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during quorum calls be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, this is not the first time, nor will it be the last time that I speak in this Chamber about the Iran nuclear agreement. I listened to some of the hearings on this subject in both the House and the Senate, last week, and I want to provide a bit of my perspective on the challenge before us.

I was a law student in Washington during the 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis. My wife and I were living probably 2 miles from the White House, and we were paying very close attention to what might happen. Afterward, as more of the history came out, we realized that some of President Kennedy's top advisers and Members of Congress pushed for a military attack on Cuba—actually, a military attack against the then-Soviet Union. A war between the two nuclear superpowers would have at the very least risked the annihilation of both countries. Fortunately, President Kennedy had the thoughtfulness, patience, and fortitude to resist the pressure to go to war.

It is not easy to stick with the long road of tough negotiations when many are clamoring for a military solution rather than negotiations. It is the same today as it was back in the time of the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Today we are considering an agreement at the end of such negotiations between the United States and our allies, and Russia, China, and Iran to curb an illicit nuclear program that threatens the Middle East and the world.

I know from my conversations with the President and with Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz how difficult this was. I also know from my conversations with them that they were prepared to walk away rather than settle for a bad deal. But based on what I have heard so far, this is not a bad deal.

There are aspects of the agreement that I and others have legitimate questions about, but we already know a lot about it.

We know that prior to negotiations, Iran's nuclear program was hurtling forward despite multinational sanctions.

I remember back in September of 2012, I had been named the Senate delegate to the U.N., and Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke. He warned that Iran was within months—months—of producing a nuclear bomb. Well, whether or not that was accurate then, it certainly is not accurate if this agreement is implemented.

We know negotiations succeeded in freezing Iran's nuclear development in place, and now we have an agreement to roll back Iran's program.

We know that this is the most rigorous monitoring and inspection regimen ever included in a nonproliferation agreement. Actually, I think it is a lot more rigorous than many observers predicted it would be.

We know that without this deal, the monitoring and the onsite inspections would go away, and so would support for the international sanctions we painstakingly built. Remember, it took years for us to put together a coalition of other countries to impose the sanctions. Many of them did so at great economic cost to their own economies, but they stuck with us because they thought we would negotiate in good faith and that diplomacy could succeed. If we walk away now, many of these countries are going to say: OK, you are in this by yourself. The United States can impose sanctions, but they will be nowhere near as effective as they were when we joined you.

We know that the sanctions reprieve in this agreement is limited and reversible. It is structured so that many sanctions remain in place, sanctions in which other countries have joined us. If Iran fails to meet its commitments, we and our partners can revoke the limited relief and we can impose additional sanctions.

Some criticized this agreement within minutes of the agreement being announced. They are long on scorn, but they are short on alternatives.

Again, I remember that speech by Prime Minister Netanyahu years ago

when he warned that Iran was just months away from building a nuclear weapon. Today, people are expressing concern about what may happen 15 years from now, not a few months from now. They ignore the fact that if Congress rejects this agreement, Iran can immediately resume its development of highly enriched uranium. Iran can build a nuclear weapon in far less than 15 years. I would ask, is that the alternative they support?

Or is it another war in the Middle East, which our senior military leaders say could spiral out of control and at best would delay the resumption of Iran's nuclear weapons programs by 2 to 3 years, after which it would not be subject to international inspections?

Some of the most vociferous critics of this agreement reflexively supported sending American troops to overthrow Saddam Hussein and occupy Iraq. We did this after having hearings and meetings in which the Vice President of the United States implied that Iraq was involved in the attack on 9/11 and made it very clear that they had weapons of mass destruction.

I voted against that war because I read the intelligence files, and they were very clear that there was no credible evidence that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction, and it was very clear that they had nothing to do with 9/11. That colossal mistake killed or maimed thousands of Americans, hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqis, and by now has cost more than \$2 trillion and the meter is still running—\$2 trillion. It is the first time in this Nation's history when we went to war on a credit card; we didn't enact a tax to pay for it. Even unpopular wars, like Vietnam and Korea, were paid for.

Is it the critics' alternative to reject this agreement and then somehow convince the other parties to it—Russia, China, and the rest of the P5+1—to impose even stronger multilateral sanctions? Have they bothered to ask officials in any of those governments what the chances of that would be? Certainly the statements those officials have made make it very clear that those chances—to use a precise expression—are zilch.

I am as outraged as anyone by Iran's support of terrorism, its arbitrary arrests and imprisonment of Americans, its denial of due process, its use of torture and other violations of human rights, and its summary executions of political opponents, just as I object to similar abuses by many countries we deal with every day.

But as horrific as Iran's behavior is, it pales compared to the havoc Iran could wreak if it obtains a nuclear weapon. A nuclear-armed Iran could commit acts of terrorism that dwarf by thousands or even millions of times over those it engages in today. There is simply no comparison.

A workable agreement doesn't just buy more time, it can also buy more

opportunities. In Iran, the impetus for reforming its hostile and destabilizing foreign policy comes from the Iranian people. For decades, the Iranian middle class has been smothered—first by a revolution that crushed their aspirations and then by a regime that imposed the harsh consequences of its own criminal behavior on the Iranian population.

Ordinary Iranians overwhelmingly do not want an empire; they want more economic opportunities, freedom of expression, and to reengage peacefully with the world. With this agreement, the Iranian middle class can continue to be a factor in future negotiations.

It is well understood that in the Congress, we agree or disagree, we debate, and we vote. That is one of the reasons I wanted to be a Member of this body. Ideally, we do so in a manner that reflects the respect each of us owes to this institution. For a nation of over 300 million Americans, there are only 100 of us who have the privilege at any given time to serve in this body. We are but transitory occupants of the seats the voters have afforded us the opportunity to occupy. In carrying out our responsibilities, we should do our best to live up to the standards of those who created what we take pride in calling the world's oldest democracy.

I mention this because, as I said earlier, I listened to portions of the hearings in the various House and Senate committees on the Iran nuclear agreement at which the Secretaries of State and Energy testified. Presumably, they were asked to testify because the members of those committees had questions and concerns about those agreements and wanted to hear the witnesses' responses. However, rather than a respectful, substantive exchange, what has too frequently occurred has been an embarrassing display of political theater.

What we have heard is a series of speeches often containing assertions or accusations that are either contradicted by the actual words of the agreement or without factual basis, and then they are followed by questions the witnesses were unable to answer because when they tried, they were interrupted or told the time had expired.

Many Vermonters have talked to me about those hearings. They were often embarrassing to watch, and they did a disservice to the American people who deserve to know that their representatives are engaged in a substantive, in-depth exchange of views on the hugely important issue of how to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I have questions myself because, short of unilateral surrender by one party, every agreement involves compromise. That is as true for international diplomacy as it is for the Senate. Neither side gets everything it wants. Anyone who suggests that was a

possible outcome here is fooling themselves or, even worse, deceiving the voters who sent them here.

The President has been unwavering in his insistence that the goal of this agreement is to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. I commend him for his vision and resolve. I have spoken with him at length about this.

I will say to my colleagues what I said to the President. It is now up to Congress to carry out its oversight responsibility. We can strive to make this work, keeping in mind the vital national security interests at stake for our country and for our allies, or we can impulsively sabotage this chance.

But we should engage in this process in a manner that enhances the image of the U.S. Senate and that affords those in our government who spent years forging this agreement the respect and appreciation they deserve.

Mr. President, there have been many thoughtful articles and opinion pieces written about the Iran nuclear agreement. I am sure there will be many more. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD one of those articles, authored jointly by Eric Schwartz and Brian Atwood, two former Assistant Secretaries of State.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Commentary, July 30, 2015]

CHEERLEADERS FOR WAR ARE STILL SO WRONG
CONGRESS NEEDS TO "PRACTICE HISTORY" AND
OK THE AGREEMENT.

(By Eric Schwartz and Brian Atwood)

In "Practicing History," historian Barbara Tuchman observed that there are "two ways of applying past experience: One is to enable us to avoid past mistakes and to manage better in similar circumstances next time; the other is to enable us to anticipate a future course of events."

Tuchman would find it strange today that many of the loudest opponents of the Iran nuclear agreement are the same prominent individuals and organizations who unequivocally supported the most significant national security blunder by the U.S. in recent memory, the war of choice in Iraq.

As evidence has accumulated since the failure to find weapons of mass destruction in Iraq, the price of that foreign policy engagement has become obvious to most. The cost to the U.S. includes trillions of dollars lost to future generations of Americans, tens of thousands killed or injured, the opening of a Sunni-Shia Pandora's box of sectarian strife, the ascendance of Iran and the diminished influence of the U.S. in the Middle East.

Remarkably, there are still unrepentant cheerleaders for that war, as well as those who argue that the U.S. invasion was a good idea in principle that was just executed poorly. And they are among the most influential voices opposed to the agreement with Iran.

Why does it matter that the pundits who were so convinced about invading Iraq more than a decade ago now pursue with passionate certainty the defeat of the diplomatic effort involving Iran?

It matters because, then and now, these voices suffer from a greatly exaggerated view of the ability of the U.S. to unilaterally

dictate geopolitical outcomes that we desire. In the case of Iraq, this was perhaps best expressed by former Vice President Dick Cheney who, when pressed before the war on our capacity to remake Iraqi society, argued that we would be "greeted as liberators." Of course, the experience in Iraq, the resulting ascendance of Iran and reduced U.S. influence in the region have only further diminished our capacity to act without the support of others and have underscored the importance of smart power—diplomacy backed with all of the resources at our disposal to achieve our objectives.

The nuclear agreement, now endorsed unanimously by the United Nations Security Council, is long and complex, and it is presumed that Congress will study carefully the details. Are the verification provisions adequate and does the International Atomic Energy Agency have the resources to monitor compliance? What is the process by which sanctions could be reimposed if violations occur? Are all paths to a nuclear bomb blocked? What are the alternatives to this approach and are they acceptable to the American people?

Our expectation is that a serious examination of this agreement should win over a bipartisan majority. The agreement's substantial reductions in uranium stockpiles and installed centrifuges, robust inspection regime and dramatically diminished capacity for an Iranian breakout and "race to a bomb" provide unprecedented means to ensure Iran will meet its stated commitment to never build a nuclear weapon.

But these elements will not win over those with an unrealistic view of the capacity of the U.S. to play the Lone Ranger in international politics. And while opponents say they support diplomacy, the so-called alternatives they would prefer—like pressing for a harder line on sanctions relief—would put us at odds with our allies, be rejected by Iran and increase the risks of another war in the Middle East that would be tragic for both the U.S. and for Israel.

The nuclear agreement will of course pose challenges for U.S. policymakers, as sanctions relief will provide benefits to Iran and opportunities to make mischief in the region. But through our continued presence, support of regional friends and allies, and an enforceable nuclear agreement, we have the strongest capacity to manage such challenges effectively.

Americans must hope that Congress will be preoccupied with the substance of the Iran agreement and the poor alternatives to it, and not be influenced by voices of the past that cling to dangerous views about our prospects as a go-it-alone superpower. Congress should "practice history" and recognize that this agreement has the potential to interrupt the downward spiral in the region, from conventional war and terrorism to nuclear conflict.

Forcing the president to veto a rejection resolution would reflect badly on the Congress and the United States of America. Even worse, overriding a presidential veto would have grave implications for the U.S., for Israel and for the region for many years to come.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will speak further on this subject, but I see no other Senators seeking the floor. While I do appreciate the opportunity to be here, I must admit that, looking at the weather and live views of Vermont this morning, I will look forward to the time we complete our work

because after the last vote of this week, I will be on the first flight I can get on and look forward to being in Vermont. I will miss all of you, of course, but not so much I want you all to come and join me.

With that, Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WORKING TOGETHER IN THE SENATE

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, as Senators get ready to head home for the August recess, I think it is a good time to look back at what we have been able to achieve so far this year.

I would say, by any measure, the record of the Senate this year has been one of great accomplishments and bipartisan achievements because we have worked together to find solutions to help the country move ahead.

With Republicans in charge, the Senate set a very fast pace for the first 100 days of the new Congress. We have kept up that pace now over the first 6 months of the Congress, and we are going to continue to build on that momentum for the rest of the year and, I believe, achieve even greater success on behalf of all Americans.

Under Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL, Senate Republicans are now governing, and we are doing it in a bipartisan way, just as we promised.

The Senate passed the first budget resolution with the House since 2009—the first one since 2009. The Appropriations Committee passed all 12 spending bills for the first time in 6 years. We passed the longest reauthorization of the highway trust fund in almost a decade. The Senate passed trade promotion authority for the first time since 2002. We passed a permanent doc fix to prevent Medicare payment cuts—after 17 temporary patches since 2002. And the Senate ended Washington's test-based education policies by making States responsible and accountable.

A lot of people in Washington have written about gridlock, and they had gotten used to the gridlock when Democrats ran the Senate. Now they are starting to realize the Senate really is working again. They realize we can actually get things done. That is not me speaking. That is what the Bipartisan Policy Center recently said. This is a group of former Republican and Democratic Members of Congress. They came out with a report called their "Healthy Congress Index." They did it for the first 6 months of 2015.

The headline of the report was "Continued Signs of Life in Congress." Continued signs of life—imagine that—ac-

tual signs of life and activity taking place in Congress this year.

This bipartisan group reported that the total number of days worked is up from previous years—15 more days worked just so far in the first 6 months of the Senate compared to last year. That is 3 more weeks of work on the Senate floor than the year before under HARRY REID.

The Bipartisan Policy Center also said the committees are actually working again. "Congressional committees have been extremely active, reporting a significantly larger number of bills than the previous two Congresses." That is because the committees are working again. In the first 6 months of this year we had 102 bills reported out of committees in the Senate, compared to just 69 in the first 6 months of the last Congress and just 42 in the Congress before that. Now, that is just through the end of June. Our committees have produced even more bills since then. So committees are working—and we are working together—to push out bipartisan bills.

Right now both Houses of Congress are in a 60-day period of scrutinizing the Iran nuclear agreement. We are able to do that because the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act had unanimous support in the Foreign Relations Committee—Republicans and Democrats voting together—and then it got overwhelming bipartisan support on the Senate floor. That is just one more way the Senate is working again.

So far in this Congress we passed more than 64 different bills. The highway trust fund legislation was bipartisan. It will fund highways and transportation all across the country, and 26 Democrats voted in favor of that legislation. We passed the education reform bill with 40 Democrats in favor. When we passed the trade promotion authority, 14 Democrats joined Republicans to get that done. These important pieces of legislation are just part of our commitment to work together to solve problems for the American people.

Even Tom Daschle—Tom Daschle, the former Democratic Senate leader—recently said: "The good news is that Congress is continuing to move in the right direction: staying in session more often, empowering committees to work together." That is from a former Democratic majority leader in the Senate, Tom Daschle. He is exactly right. The Senate is working again, we are moving in the right direction, and we are just getting started. I am hopeful that we can continue to work together to find solutions on more issues that matter to the American people.

There is still a lot of work to be done, specifically related to our economy. People want a healthy economy. But there is still far too much redtape and regulation coming out of Washington, and it continues to strangle our economy.

New numbers came out last week about the slow pace of economic growth over the first half of the year. One of the headlines came out last Friday about the slow pace and it said: "Worst Expansion Since World War II Gets Even Worse." "Worst Expansion Since World War II Gets Even Worse." The article says: "The economy expanded at a 2.3 percent annual rate in the second quarter [of the year], once again falling short of projections for a decisive rebound and raising concerns that the six-year old expansion will never pick up steam"—will never pick up steam, ever. So the recovery from the last recession has been far weaker than recoveries from other recessions under Presidents Reagan and Clinton.

One reason is that the Obama administration has tied the hands of those who hire others. It makes it much harder to get our economy going again. Hard-working families are still struggling because their wages are not growing.

That is what another set of government numbers said on Friday. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, employment costs had their worst gains ever in the second quarter of the year.

What does the White House plan to do about it? What is President Obama's plan for "Worst Expansion Since World War II Gets Even Worse"? What does the President want to do about it? Well, on Monday President Obama and the administration announced its so-called—so-called—Clean Power Plan, and it is going to mandate massive new redtape and job-crushing regulations. It is a national energy tax.

More Americans will lose their jobs, and more hard-working families across the country will be hit with higher electric bills. Congress can stop this costly and destructive regulation from taking effect, and that is where we are headed.

The way to do it is by passing a bipartisan piece of legislation called the Affordable Reliable Electricity Now Act.

The American people have seen that Congress is capable of coming together to take on important issues, and this is certainly one.

Hardworking Americans are extremely anxious for us to continue working together to solve some of these problems that continue to face our country. We have done it before, and we can do it again, as long as we have a willing partner.

The Senate passed the bipartisan Keystone XL Pipeline jobs bill. Then President Obama vetoed it.

We passed an appropriations bill out of committee that funded the Department of Defense at the levels the President requested, and the Democrats here in the Senate have blocked those funds for our troops. In fact, Democrats are blocking all of the appropri-

tions bills, including ones that passed out of the committee with bipartisan support.

The American people want their elected representatives in the Senate to deal with these issues. The American people want to see us get past the gridlock once more—as we have already done so many times this year. The American people want us to tear down the barriers to stronger economic growth so they can get back to work, they can earn a decent wage, and they can take care of their families.

This Senate has accomplished a lot in the first half of the year. I believe we can do even more in the second half of the year. That is the commitment Republicans made to the American people, and we are keeping that commitment.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I have had the honor of serving in the Senate now for three terms, and I'm in my fourth term. I have been on the Senate floor a major part of my public life and witnessed a lot of things that have occurred here. I remember quite a few of them, but the one that sticks in my memory goes back to 2002. It was the end of September or the beginning of October—I will get the exact date—and there was a critical debate taking place on the floor of the Senate that went late into the night. The final vote happened around midnight. The question was whether the United States should be authorized to invade Iraq.

I remember that debate because we were still reeling from the tragedy of 9/11. We were still determined to keep America safe. We worried about our vulnerabilities and our strengths. The George W. Bush administration, after several months of preparing for this debate, led most Americans to believe that Saddam Hussein, the leader in Iraq, possessed weapons of mass destruction. Some of the testimony even suggested those weapons could threaten our allies, our friends, and even the United States of America.

It was in that context that a decision was made to invade Iraq, but first the decision had to come through Congress. The American people had their chance through their elected representatives in the Senate and the House to make that decision.

The public sentiment behind the war in Iraq was overwhelmingly positive as we voted. The belief was that we had to stop Saddam Hussein before there was another attack on the United States like 9/11. Sentiments ran very high. The rhetoric was heated.

I remember that night. I remember there were two of my colleagues on the floor after everyone had gone home. One was Kent Conrad, the Senator from North Dakota, and the other was Paul Wellstone, the Senator from Minnesota. Now, 23 of us had voted no on authorizing the war in Iraq. It included the three of us who remained.

I was up for reelection, as was Senator Wellstone. I went to Paul Wellstone in the well of the Senate and I said: Paul, I hope that vote doesn't cost you the election in a few weeks.

Paul Wellstone said to me: It is all right if it does. This is who I am and this is what I believe, and the people of Minnesota expect nothing less.

The story unfolds. In the ensuing weeks Paul Wellstone died in a plane crash before the election took place, but I still remember that moment, and I remember what I considered to be an act of conscience by my friend and colleague from Minnesota.

I thought about the thousands of votes that I have cast in the House and the Senate, and only a handful are still right there in front of me. They include the votes that you cast that relate to war. You know if you vote to go to war even under the right circumstances, innocent people will die. Americans will die. There is no more serious or grave responsibility than to take those questions of foreign policy as seriously as or more seriously than virtually any other issue.

Fast forward to where we are today. We will leave this week and be gone for 4 or 5 weeks and return in September. The first item of business will be the Iran agreement. I view this vote on the Iran agreement in the same class as the vote on the war in Iraq. It is a question, a serious foreign policy question, about whether Iran will be stopped from developing a nuclear weapon. We have added into this conversation the decision of Congress as to whether they approve the President's treaty. That doesn't often happen, but it will in this case.

We have to look at the possibility that Congress will reject the Iran treaty. Even if the President vetoes it, there is still a question as to whether Congress would override that veto. We have to ask ourselves: What happens if this Iran agreement comes to an end? Military action—some form of military action.

One of the Senators on the other side of the aisle assured us 4 days—we will take care of the Iranian nuclear problem in 4 days. He wasn't here when we were told the war in Iraq would last 2 weeks. So 4,844 American lives later,

with tens of thousands injured, and trillions of dollars spent, that war ended with a result that none of us really view as a success for American foreign policy. Now we face that same question. Those who would reject the Iranian agreement have a responsibility to come to this floor and explain what happens next.

Yesterday we called a meeting. I asked the Ambassadors from the five nations that joined us in the negotiations with Iran to come meet with Members of the Senate on the Democratic side. We had the Ambassador from Russia, the Ambassador from China, the Ambassador from the United Kingdom, and the Deputies Chief of Mission from Germany and France. About 30 Democratic Senators gathered to ask questions in a completely off-the-record, informal atmosphere.

The first question asked was, what happens if Congress rejects this Iranian agreement? What happens the next day? What is the next step? They said the notion that we will sit back down at the table with the Iranians, in the words of one of these Ambassadors, is far-fetched.

We have spent 35 years bringing Iran to this table. These nations joined us in an effort to try to stop Iranians from developing a nuclear weapon. These nations are satisfied that what we have put together is an agreement that is verifiable with inspections.

When I think back to Ronald Reagan, I didn't agree with him on a lot of things, but I sure agreed with what he said when it came to these agreements, "trust, but verify." There is verification in this agreement. The IAEA, which is the United Nations group that inspects atomic facilities around the world, is tasked with inspecting and reporting and continuing to investigate Iran throughout the life of this agreement.

Can we trust them? Well, just as a historic reminder, it was the IAEA that said to the United States: There are no weapons of mass destruction that we can find in Iraq.

We ignored them. We invaded. We paid a heavy price for it. It turns out they were right. Some of our leaders were just plain wrong. The agency has credibility, it has a track record, and it is authorized under this agreement to move forward.

What struck me, as I looked at those Ambassadors sitting across the table from 30 Members of the Senate yesterday, was how historic this moment is. China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the United States were all together negotiating, trying to bring at least some modicum of peace to the Middle East. Some of the statements that were made were compelling.

A gentleman from the German side said: I won't go into the history of Ger-

many—you know it well—but I will tell you we are more committed to the survival of Israel than any nation in Europe.

Any student of history knows exactly what he was speaking of. Now we have an opportunity to turn to diplomacy to avoid the military and avoid war. And what do we find? In April of this year, 47 Senators on the other side of the aisle sent a letter to the Ayatollah in Iran, the Supreme Leader of Iran, and said: Do not negotiate with President Obama and the United States. Whatever you think you have agreed to is subject to congressional approval, and don't expect the next President of the United States to abide by any agreement.

Forty-seven Senators from the other side of the aisle signed that letter. What would have happened if 47 Democratic Senators had sent a letter to Saddam Hussein before the invasion of Iraq and said the same thing: Don't negotiate with President Bush. Don't even think that you can avoid a war.

I think they would have had us up on charges. At least Vice President Cheney would have. But in April, before the agreement was even announced on the other side of the aisle, 47 Senators said: Don't waste your time negotiating. I think they are wrong.

I think we ought to go back to the words of John Kennedy. John Kennedy said: We should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.

Leaders in our country—Republican Presidents—have stepped up to that negotiating table with a flurry of criticism that they would even sit down with these enemies of the United States and try to find a more peaceful world. Ronald Reagan sat down with Gorbachev looking for containment of nuclear weapons. It was Richard Nixon, another Republican President, who sat down with the Chinese to open relations with them while the Chinese were supplying and fortifying the North Vietnamese fighting American forces. Despite that criticism, they had the courage to sit down and look for a diplomatic way to find a more peaceful world, and that is what we face today.

This Iran agreement is our opportunity to test diplomacy, and I invite Israel, our friends and allies in Israel, to join us in holding Iran to the letter of the law in this agreement. Join us in reviewing these inspections. Join us in calling for the availability of these facilities so we know exactly what is going on with Iran from this point forward. Let's join together in a force to make this a more peaceful world. I think this is our chance. I know this is a vote of conscience for me, and I am sure it is for all of my colleagues. I hope there will be the courage to try diplomacy before we turn to war.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, in the days ahead, we are facing one of the most consequential issues we will face as a nation—this issue of an agreement with Iran. Some people want to make this into a partisan conversation. It is not a partisan conversation. It is a national security issue, and it is a world security issue.

The Senate has already held multiple hearings on Iran and on this particular agreement with the Intelligence Committee I sit on, the Armed Services Committee, and the Foreign Relations Committee. I personally met with Secretary of Treasury Jack Lew, Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, and Secretary of State John Kerry. I have been through the agreement and the classified portion of this agreement in every detail.

I wish I could also go through the IAEA information about how the inspections will actually occur because the agreement itself gives broad statements. The IAEA agreement will be the narrow, practical version of how they will actually do inspections. I have been told over and over again by the administration and by officials that the United States will not have a role in determining how the inspections will be done and that they will not even see the methods of how we will do inspections before they actually begin.

They told me they have been orally briefed on the process, but they have not actually seen it, which means since they haven't seen it, I can't see it. It seems odd to me that the final aspect of the agreement that actually gives the greatest detail of how the inspections will occur none of us can actually see. It is difficult to have this "trust, but verify" attitude when we were not given the ability to verify how they are verifying it and to see how much trust is actually being given in this process.

The White House has told us over and over again that if you don't like this deal, there are two options—it is either war or provide a better solution. I am telling everyone: Let's slow down. Let's look at both of those things, and let's also back up and see where we are.

For years the United States and the United Nations said that Iran should not enrich uranium. In fact, there are six U.N. resolutions saying that Iran should not enrich uranium. Why? Because Iran is the single largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. Iran has propped up the Assad regime in Syria. They are paying the soldiers to walk side by side and to fight with Assad right now and hold up that Syrian Government. Iran is paying for and propping up the coup that is in Yemen right now on Saudi Arabia's southern border. They are still chanting in the streets "Death to America," and they are actively pursuing larger and larger weapons. I think there is a reason to take this seriously.

Now, back to the statement by the White House. They have said: If you

don't agree with this agreement, then it is either war or you come up with a better option.

I will briefly touch on those two issues. I think in many ways this agreement actually pushes us faster to a process towards war. Why would I say that? Because the conventional weapons ban is lifted under this agreement, and Iran can freely purchase weapons from around the world that have been banned by a U.N. treaty, and that is now lifted under this agreement.

To pacify the Gulf States and Israel, the administration immediately went to the Gulf States and said: We understand the conventional weapons ban is being lifted there, so we are going to provide you greater technology and weapons, and we are going to provide you greater access to weapons and help to be able to get those weapons.

So help me understand why encouraging the Middle East to start dialing up with more and more weapons on both sides of this doesn't actually push us towards war even faster?

Then there is this statement about providing a better solution, as if this is the only option that is sitting out there. Well, the agreement itself was written in such a way that the U.N. would approve this first, the European Union would approve it second, and then the U.S. Congress would get it third. That was intentionally done to try to add pressure to this Congress to say: You can't turn away from this. The rest of the world has signed on to it, so you can't turn away from it.

This Congress should not process things under fear, and this Congress should not process things by saying: You are the last in line so you better sign up to where the rest of the world is.

We have to look at this because we are directly affected by this issue. Remember, Iran has said over and over again that the United States is the great Satan in the world. Anyone who believes that Iran wants to be able to come alongside us and be a peaceful member of the club is not listening to what Iran is actually saying, not to mention this whole theory of, if you don't sign onto this agreement, there is no better deal.

Last week Bloomberg reported that the French senior diplomat, Jacques Audibert—the senior diplomatic adviser to President Hollande, the individual who led the French diplomatic team in discussions with Iran in the P5+1 group, and the one who was in the room—earlier this month directly disputed Kerry's claim that a congressional rejection of the Iran deal would result in the worst of all words, the collapse of sanctions, and Iran racing to a bomb without restrictions.

The French senior diplomat actually said: If Congress votes this down, there will be saber-rattling and chaos for a year or two, but in the end nothing will

change and Iran will come back to the table and negotiate a better deal that will be to our advantage.

I will run that by again. He said he thought if Congress votes this down, we will get a better deal. That means two things: He believes, again, that Iran will come back to the table on this, and he also believes there is a better deal out there, and that this is not the best deal we can get.

After going through the agreement, I have very serious concerns about it. I am concerned there are loopholes in this agreement that are big enough to drive a truck through. Specifically, this truck is the truck that is big enough to drive it through.

I will go through some of my concerns. This agreement assumes that the intelligence community can identify locations in a country the size of Texas—all the locations—for a possible inspection, notify the IAEA which places they should go, and that we would be able to contact Iran and get permission from them to visit those sites, which takes approximately 1 month—I will go into greater detail on that—and that we will actually access those sites and find the information we want there.

The IAEA is reporting that they can actually only track for uranium. So all of the other research that goes into building a nuclear weapon, they couldn't actually track that after 24 days, but if there was uranium there, they feel confident they could actually track that. So basically, if we are in the final stages of their assembling something, and we catch them and we are able to get permission to get in there, we could get to it. Not to mention the fact that the Iranian leaders have said over and over again since the agreement was signed that there is no way that the IAEA will get access to military sites in Iran. That is a loophole big enough to drive this truck through.

The IAEA has to give 24 hours' notice of its intent to inspect, and then Iran has 14 days to let the inspectors in. Of course, they can stall for 10 more days in the agreement itself. That is 25 days, minimum, to hide whatever they are working on. That is a lot of time to be able to move computer equipment and all sorts of installed things. At the end of it, the IAEA would say, we can actually determine if there were ever uranium there even after 25 days, but basically nothing else.

We have incredible people who work for us in the intelligence community that most Americans will never see and never meet. There are some amazing, patriotic Americans, but they can't see everything and they can't catch every needle in the haystack that is in Iran. It would help the intelligence community, and it would help us in our inspections, if we had access to the previous military dimensions for the nu-

clear weapons program that Iran has had on board. But the agreement itself only says we have to get all things from right now forward, that we don't have to have the documents previous. And if we do, Iran will actually pick the documents that we will see previous in their nuclear practice.

So now we have to find a location with no previous documents, with no way to be able to really see what research they have done and how far advanced they are. We are looking for different things, if there are different stages of their research and development on a nuclear weapon. To say in the agreement we are not going to have to get all the previous research they have done in the past is an enormous loophole and it is a definite detriment to what we are doing in our own discovery.

Iran has to dramatically decrease the number of centrifuges that are spinning and cascading to enrich uranium. That is true, and I am glad for that. They have to pull out what is a known stockpile and reduce it. I am glad of that, and that is a positive thing. But Iran can continue to enrich uranium with 5,000 cascading centrifuges, just in smaller amounts and using their older centrifuges. Again, that sounds like a win. But there is no reason, if they have peaceful purposes for uranium, to keep 5,000 centrifuges spinning—if they are only doing it for peaceful purposes.

Iran can continue testing their advanced centrifuges in small cascades—their IR-6s, their IR-8s.

Iran can continue doing research and development on their most advanced form of centrifuges. Worst of all, they can keep over 1,000 of their most advanced centrifuges still in a cascade in their most heavily fortified facility. They just have to promise they won't put uranium in there. But they can continue to do testing and development so when that time comes, they will be ready to accelerate uranium faster. So, basically, they can do everything in the process, except include uranium at that point.

We are allowing them time to increase their research, with 1,000 centrifuges in their most advanced level. Why would we agree to that? That doesn't seem to be a pathway to peaceful purposes. That seems to be a pathway to high-grade uranium and the development within country.

I have already mentioned that within just a very few years, the conventional weapons ban is lifted in this agreement, allowing additional conventional weapons to flood into the single largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world—not to mention the fact that what is flooding in before all of those conventional weapons are billions of dollars that have been held in sanctions.

Now, again, there has been no change on tactics of terrorism. There has been

no change of statement from the leadership of Iran, but they are getting billions of dollars. Under sanctions, they used their money to prop up Yemen to form a coup there and to prop up Assad in Syria. What are they going to do with an additional \$60 billion, \$70 billion?

The administration has said they desperately need that money so they can do infrastructure. They are getting billions of dollars. No one is going to tell me a major portion of that is not going to be used for terrorism.

As the administration has said, we have built in snapback sanctions so that if Iran violates something, immediately we will snap back the sanctions. But if we actually look at the details of how those snapback sanctions happen, it is months and months in the process of getting everyone back together and forming an agreement that we are going to do that. And if we snap back sanctions, written into the agreement it says Iran can then—if we snap back sanctions—kick out their part of the agreement as well and consider it a violation of the agreement and walk away, and now there are no restrictions on them. So, basically, we are the ones that are punished if we ever snap back sanctions. If we snap back sanctions, Iran could say, see, I told you so, and then immediately kick into the normal process they were into before. By the way, their advanced centrifuges are already spinning. They are still continuing. Nothing was diminished. I haven't even mentioned that their research and development can continue on all of their weapons systems. All of that is unabated. The only limitation seems to be around enriched uranium, but everything else continues the same.

I was also appalled as I went through this agreement and saw the leader of the Quds Force, General Suleimani, who personally coordinated the creation, distribution, and installation of improvised explosive devices in Iraq designed to kill Americans. This leader personally was engaged in killing hundreds of American soldiers in the war in Iraq—hundreds. The sanctions on that general are lifted so he can have normalized relationships worldwide, and four American hostages remain. Can someone tell me why for the murderer-of-Americans general, his sanctions are lifted, but American citizens still remain hostages in Iran?

I have to tell my colleagues, I was stunned by many things that were in this agreement and how many loopholes were built into it, but none surprised me more than the part of the agreement that we made as a country, apparently, that if Iran is attacked, the United States will now come to their defense. Help me understand this. As they continue a nuclear weapons program, if a country steps in and attacks them and says no, you can't do

that, that is a violation and we are going to stop that, the United States is now agreeing to come defend Iran as they are advancing their nuclear program? Have we lost our mind?

Now, the administration, when asked about this, just said it won't happen. If it won't happen, why did we put it in the agreement? Why is it there at all? There seems to be a struggle to be able to get an agreement more than it is a struggle to say we have to prevent the world's largest sponsor of terrorism from getting a nuclear weapon at any cost. This is not about slowing their nuclear program. It should be about stopping their nuclear program.

This cannot come to our doorstep. This cannot come to the Middle East. And while the Middle East further weaponizes to prepare for a more aggressive Iran, we continue to step up and say we will help you weaponize, and I don't see how that is deterring us from war.

There is a better agreement out there, and we should push to get it. We should take care of the loopholes that are big enough to drive a truck through. We should resolve this issue. We should not pretend this is a partisan issue. This is not about Republican versus Democrat. This is about peace. This is about trying to work out the differences—and the differences are strong—with all nations and Iran. Let's work that out together, and let's keep pushing until we get this resolved.

I cannot support this agreement with Iran.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in favor of the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015.

I wish to first recognize the hard work of Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN and their leadership on this very important legislation. As a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee, I am well aware of the need to strengthen our computer networks against our adversaries, whether they be nation-states, such as China, Russia, and Iran, or terrorist groups or hacktivists.

Along with former Senator Joe Lieberman, I authored the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004. This bill implemented many of the recommendations of the 9/11 Commission report in the wake of Al Qaeda's terrorist attack on our country that took the lives of nearly 3,000 people. Many of the reforms enacted in our law were well-known and recommended prior—far before—the attacks on our country on 9/11, but they simply were never implemented, despite the clear and present threat posed by Al Qaeda.

Today, my concern is that we are repeating much the same mistake when it comes to the cyber domain. Our Na-

tion has unparalleled strength, but cyber space allows much weaker adversaries to target our people, our economy, and our military.

Just as modern passenger planes designed in the United States were turned against us and used as weapons back in September of 2001, so too could the digital tools designed in the United States be turned against us to deal a devastating blow to our economy, our national security, and our way of life.

We already know many of the steps necessary to reduce the likelihood of a cyber 9/11, yet many of these actions have not yet been taken in either the government or the private sector. As one former official told the 9/11 Commission last year in preparation for its 10th anniversary report, "we are at September 10th levels in terms of cyber preparedness." How many experts have to tell us that it is not a matter of if we are going to be the subject of a major cyber attack but when? How many more serious intrusions do we have to have in the private sector with banks, major retailers affected or in the public sector, where we have had the huge and serious OPM breach which affects some 21 million Americans? How many more of these do we have to have occur before Congress finally acts?

Consider the fact that the economic and technological advantages that the United States enjoys today required decades of research and development and investment of literally billions of dollars. Yet these competitive edges are eroding because hackers and other countries are stealing the intellectual property that gives us our competitive edge in the world.

Three years ago, when I stood on the Senate floor with Senator Joe Lieberman to urge the passage of the Cyber Security Act of 2012, which we wrote, I quoted the then-NSA chief, General Keith Alexander, who said that we are in the midst of the greatest transfer of wealth in our Nation's history. Yet this transfer of wealth continues and accelerates. Information sharing remains fragmented, and the private sector is still hesitant about sharing and receiving information with government. We have lost 3 years and endured endless, expensive data breaches since the Senate refused to stop a filibuster on our cyber bill in 2012. I urge my colleagues: Let's not make the same mistake today.

Passing the Cybersecurity Information Sharing Act of 2015 would make it easier for public and private sector entities to share cyber threat vulnerability information to stop the theft of trade and national security secrets, to stop the theft of personally identifiable information, and to help stop the theft of important information that all of us hold dear and consider to be private.

The bill would eliminate some of the legal and economic disincentives impeding voluntary two-way information

sharing between private industry and government. It is a modest but essential first step, especially for businesses, large and small, trying to protect their networks and information.

Just this week, I met with an individual whose trade association has been compromised, according to the FBI. Indeed, back in 2012, when we were debating whether to bring the Lieberman-Collins cyber security bill to the Senate floor, one of the chief opponents was being hacked at that very time but did not know it until the FBI went to that business organization and informed them.

While this bill promotes sharing between the government and the private sector—and that is an important and essential step—it does little to harden the protection of Federal networks or to guard the critical infrastructure on which we rely every day. Thus, I am introducing, with several of my colleagues, two amendments to further strengthen our Nation's cyber security posture. It would be a good first step if we could just pass this bill as it was reported by the Intelligence Committee, but I believe also strengthening the civilian side of the Federal Government and our critical infrastructure is essential for us to do the job completely and effectively.

I want to make clear that I recognize there is no law we could ever write that is going to prevent every cyber attack. That is not possible. But there are effective actions we can and should take that would lessen the chances of these attacks occurring and that would decrease the opportunities for these intrusions. So we must act. It is incumbent upon us.

For the millions of current, former, and retired Federal employees whose personal data was stolen from the poorly secured databases at the Office of Personnel Management, the threat posed by adversaries to inadequately protected Federal networks is all too real. As the FBI Director testified before the Intelligence Committee in open session last month, this breach is a “huge deal” and represents a treasure trove of information for potential adversaries. But this cyber hack also points to a broader problem—the glaring gaps in the process for protecting sensitive information stored in Federal civilian agency networks.

To respond, 2 weeks ago I introduced bipartisan legislation with Senators WARNER, MIKULSKI, COATS, AYOTTE, and McCASKILL that would strengthen the security of the networks of Federal civilian agencies. Most importantly, our legislation would grant the Department of Homeland Security the authority to issue binding operational directives to Federal agencies to respond in the face of a substantial or imminent threat to Federal networks to ensure that immediate action is taken.

Think of all those IG reports that OPM leaders completely ignored. They

go back to 2008. Last fall the IG issued a report which sounded a warning which was so serious that he recommended that certain networks be taken down until they were better protected. But OPM officials largely ignored those warnings, those calls for action. That is why we need to empower the Department of Homeland Security in a situation like that to act, just as NSA acts to protect the dot-mil domain, the military and intelligence agencies in the Federal Government.

I am pleased to report that all of the key elements of our bill were incorporated into legislation unanimously approved last week by the Senate homeland security committee. I thank the chairman, Senator RON JOHNSON, and the ranking member, Senator TOM CARPER, for making those improvements in their bill and incorporating our bill. We have joined together to file an amendment to add the committee-approved bill to the cyber security legislation.

The primary problem our amendment would solve is that the Department of Homeland Security has the mandate to protect the dot-gov domain, but it only has limited authority to do so. As I said, this approach contrasts sharply with how the National Security Agency defends the dot-mil domain, the information in the military and intelligence agency networks. The Director of the NSA has the responsibility and the authority from the Secretary of Defense to monitor all DOD networks and to deploy countermeasures on those networks. If the Director finds that there is an insecure computer system and wants to take it off the network, he has the authority to do so.

Although the Secretary of Homeland Security is tasked with a similar responsibility to protect Federal civilian networks, he has far less authority to accomplish this task. Yet—think about it—Federal civilian agencies, such as OPM, the Internal Revenue Service, the Social Security Administration, and Medicare, are the repositories of vast quantities of very sensitive personal data of Americans that must be better protected. We have that obligation. Our bill would help ensure that occurs.

Our amendment would harden Federal computer networks from cyber threats. I urge my colleagues to support the Johnson-Carper-Collins-Warner amendment.

I have also filed a second amendment aimed at protecting our country's most vital critical infrastructure from cyber attacks. For 99 percent of private sector entities, the voluntary information sharing framework established in this cyber legislation will be sufficient, and the decision to share cyber threat information should be left up to them. It should be voluntary.

A second tier of reporting is necessary to protect the critical infra-

structure that affects the safety, health, and economic well-being of every American. My amendment would create a second tier of reporting to the government that would be mandatory but only for critical infrastructure where a cyber intrusion could reasonably be expected to result in catastrophic regional or national threats on public health or safety, economic security, or national security.

The Department of Homeland Security has already identified fewer than 65 entities—that is all we are talking about—out of all the hundreds of thousands of businesses and private sector entities in the United States, they have identified 65 entities where damage caused by a substantial but single cyber attack could cause catastrophic harm. How is “catastrophic harm” defined? It is defined as causing or having the likelihood to cause \$50 billion in economic damage, 2,500 fatalities, or a severe degradation of our national security. My amendment would just take that definition and require reporting from those entities—that would be mandatory if there were a cyber attack—and no one else.

Without information about intrusions into our most critical infrastructure, our government's ability to defend our country against advanced persistent threats will suffer in a domain where speed is critical.

Let me further explain why this amendment is necessary. The fact is that 85 percent of our country's critical infrastructure is owned by the private sector, and we are not nearly as prepared as we should be for a cyber attack that could cause deaths, destruction, and devastation. A recent study by the University of Cambridge and Lloyds Insurance found that a major cyber attack on the U.S. electric grid could result in a blackout in 15 States and Washington, DC, that could cause more than \$1 trillion in economic impact and \$71 billion in insurance claims.

Under my amendment, the owners and operators of our country's most critical infrastructure would be required to report significant cyber intrusions, similar to the manner in which incidents of communicable diseases must be reported to public health authorities and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Think about the ironic situation we have. Does it make sense that we require a single case of measles to be reported to the Federal Government but not an intrusion into the industrial controls controlling a piece of critical infrastructure that if it were attacked successfully could result in the deaths of 2,500 people?

The threats to our critical infrastructure are not hypothetical; they are already occurring in increasing frequency and severity. ADM Mike Rogers, the Director of NSA, has described

the cyber threat posed against critical infrastructure this way: "We have . . . observed intrusions into industrial control systems. . . . What concerns us is that . . . this capability could be used by nation-states, groups or individuals to take down the capability of the control systems."

Multiple natural gas pipeline companies were the targets of a sophisticated cyber intrusion campaign beginning in December of 2011, and our banks have been under cyber attacks repeatedly, most likely from Iran during the past 2 years.

By implementing this tiered reporting system for our country's critical infrastructure at greatest risk of a devastating cyber attack, our government can develop and deploy countermeasures to protect its own networks as well as the information systems of other critical infrastructure and help these critical infrastructure owners and operators to better safeguard their systems from further attacks.

Simply put, the current threat is too great and the existing vulnerability too widespread for us to depend solely on voluntary measures to protect the critical infrastructure on which our country and citizens depend.

Again, I want to emphasize, 99 percent of private sector entities would just have a voluntary system. I am talking about fewer than 65 entities that operate critical infrastructure that the Department of Homeland Security has identified as at risk and has described that the consequences would be either \$50 billion in economic damage, 2,500 deaths or a severe degradation of our national security.

Surely, if we have a cyber attack of that severity, we want to know about it. We will need to act. Our laws have simply not kept pace with the digital revolution. We must not wait any longer to make these reforms or be lulled into the mistaken belief that small incremental steps will be enough to stay ahead of our adversaries in cyber space or, worse yet, that we take no action, that we allow a filibuster against even a modest bill to help us be more secure.

By adopting the underlying legislation, plus the two amendments my colleagues and I have offered, we can begin the long overdue work of securing cyber space. In doing so, we will be securing our economic and national security for the next generation.

I was in the Senate on that terrible day in September of 2001, on 9/11/2001, when our Nation was attacked. I was assigned the responsibility, along with Joe Lieberman and the other members of what was then the Governmental Affairs Committee, to look at whether that attack could have been prevented if the dots had been connected. The 9/11 Commission's conclusion was that most likely it could have been.

I don't want to be here after a massive cyber attack that has resulted in

the deaths of thousands of our fellow Americans, severe economic damage or a terrible degradation of our national security and ask the question: Why did we not act? I am not saying any law can prevent every attack. Clearly, that is not the case. Our adversaries are infinitely creative, and they will keep probing our computer systems, our cyber networks, but surely we ought to be doing everything we can to make it far more difficult for any of these attacks to be successful, surely we ought to pass the bill reported with only one dissenting vote by the Intelligence Committee, and surely we ought to strengthen the protection of our critical infrastructure and our Federal civilian agencies.

We need to make sure we are doing everything we responsibly can do to lessen the possibilities of a cyber 9/11. I urge my colleagues to proceed to consider this important bill.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, for the information of my colleagues, I just wanted to list the cosponsors of the amendment that I described having to do with critical infrastructure. I listed the cosponsors of the amendment that deals with protecting civilian agencies but neglected to do so on the other. It is a bipartisan amendment. It is cosponsored by three other members of the Intelligence Committee: Senator WARNER, Senator COATS, and Senator HIRONO.

I just wanted that to be clear. I think it is significant that those members of the Intelligence Community do believe we need to go further in this arena.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

REMEMBERING DAVID "DAVE" RUHL

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, I rise to honor a fallen hero, David or "Dave" Ruhl of Rapid City, SD. Dave was an engine captain on the Mystic Ranger District of the Black Hills National Forest near Rapid City. Since June 14, Dave had been serving our country on a temporary assignment as the assistant fire management officer on the Big Valley Ranger District on the Modoc National Forest near Adin, CA.

Dave had been bravely and selflessly fighting the Frog Fire near Alturas, CA, along with many other firefighters who were risking their lives to protect the people and communities near that fire incident. Friends say he took this voluntary assignment to learn more about firefighting and improve his skills because he was so passionate about his profession.

Tragically, the team lost contact with Dave on Thursday evening, July 30. Search and rescue teams worked diligently to locate Dave with the hope that he would be found safe. Sadly, Dave did not survive.

An investigation will reveal details about this very unfortunate and tragic loss of life, and there will be a learning which comes from this. His death is a great loss to the State of South Dakota, and his legacy and heroism will not be forgotten. Dave will be memorialized forever on the South Dakota Firefighter Memorial in Pierre, his name etched in history for all to honor.

Professionally, Dave will be remembered as a passionate, knowledgeable, and well-trained firefighter. That is according to his colleagues who admired him and respected him. His commitment to helping others was evident throughout his life. Dave began his Forest Service career in 2001 as a seasonal forestry technician. Prior to that, he served in the U.S. Coast Guard and as a correctional officer with the State of South Dakota.

Dave will also be remembered personally as a dad, a husband, and a selfless public servant who longed to help others. Dave leaves behind his wife Erin and their two children Tyler and Ava of Rapid City. To them, I offer my deepest sympathy.

While we cannot take away the hurt, please know we will never forget the sacrifice Dave made, and we will not forget the sacrifice that you as his family have made. Not everyone is willing to put their life on the line to protect us, but Dave did just exactly that. He put others before himself. Dave is a true hero.

We ask the Good Lord to bless the Ruhl family and their friends during this difficult time and we ask all Americans to keep the Ruhl family in their thoughts and in their prayers.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, one thing we all agree on is that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon. That has been the foundation of American policy. For a long time, it has been at the root of these negotiations. That has been our guidepost as a body. It certainly has been my guiding principle as I review the course of these negotiations and the agreement that is now before us. That is because we know what a nuclear-armed Iran would mean for U.S. security, for Israeli security, and for regional security. Not only

would it make their provocations in the region even more dangerous by giving them a nuclear cover of protection, but it would also lead to a nuclear arms race in the region.

That doesn't mean Iran's unacceptable conduct begins and ends with its pursuit of a nuclear weapons program. This is one of the largest state sponsors of terrorism in the world. This is a country that has called for the obliteration of the Jewish State still to this day, chants for "Death to America," a country that denies basic human rights and political liberties to its own citizens, and executes and imprisons thousands upon thousands of people who disagree with the regime.

But this agreement and these negotiations from the beginning have been about the nuclear issue. It has not attempted to resolve all of these other very dangerous and malevolent behaviors that Iran engages in, in the region. We are focused on the nuclear issue because we frankly believe we are more likely to deal with this other activity if we remove the question of a potential nuclear weapons arsenal cover from the equation.

So the test for this agreement is simple: Is Iran less likely to obtain a nuclear weapon with this deal than without it? Because I answer yes to this question—because I believe they are less likely to get a nuclear weapon with this agreement than without it—I am going to support the agreement when it comes before the Senate for a vote this September.

That doesn't mean there aren't parts of this agreement that I find distasteful. I would have preferred for the duration of the agreement to be longer than the 10 to 15 years of many of its components. I would have preferred to see fewer conditions on the inspections and on our access to contested sites. I would like for Congress's ability to impose new sanctions on nonnuclear activity of Iran to be clearer and less clouded as part of this agreement.

That being said, I think we achieved our objectives. Our negotiators achieved their objectives that they set out at the beginning. We have lengthened the breakout time from 2 to 3 months to now over a year. We have reduced by 95 percent the amount of stored nuclear material that is housed within Iran's borders. We get an inspection regime which is absolutely unprecedented. No other country has been subject to this kind of an inspection regime, not just as a declared site, not just the ability to get to undeclared sites but a view of the entire supply chain that backs up their nuclear program.

There is an ability to snap back sanctions should they cheat, an ability that is not conditioned on the support of countries such as Russia and China, and then an international consensus that undergirds this entire agreement.

To me, this isn't a referendum on the agreement, the decision we are going to make in the Senate; it is a choice. It is a choice between one set of consequences that flow from supporting the agreement and then another set of consequences that flow from a congressional rejection of the agreement.

The set of consequences that occur if Congress rejects this agreement are pretty catastrophic. I would argue it would result in a big win for Iranians. What would happen? First, the sanctions would fray, at best; at worst, they would fall apart. Iran would resume their nuclear program. Maybe they wouldn't rush to a bomb, but they would get closer. Inspectors would be kicked out of the country so we lose eyes on what Iran is doing.

For those who believe we should just come back to the table and get a better deal, you have a very high bar to argue. You have to make a case that there are going to be a set of conditions that will cause Iran to come back to the table and agree to something different, more strenuous, and more rigorous than they did today. How does that happen if the sanctions are weaker and their nuclear program is stronger? It doesn't. So this idea that you can get a better deal to me appears to be pure fantasy.

Finally, I wish to spend a few minutes talking about this juxtaposition that the President has created that I know has caused some in this Chamber to blanch—the idea that this is a choice between this agreement or going to war. I understand that feels and sounds very unfair because no one who votes against this agreement believes they are voting to go to war. I want to make the case it is not as unfair as some may think it is because if there is no deal, if there is no ability to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon through a negotiation, and if we accept the premise that we are not going to stand still, do nothing, and take a wait-and-see approach if they were to move closer to a bomb, then the only option is the military option. And I frankly think it is time we start taking seriously the rhetoric we are hearing from some Members of this body. Senator COTTON said this week that we could bomb Iran back to day zero if we took a military route to divorcing Iran from a nuclear weapon.

Let us get back to reality for a second about what a military strike would mean. You can set back Iran's nuclear program for a series of years, but you cannot bomb Iran back to day zero unless you are also prepared to assassinate everyone in Iran who has worked on the nuclear program. Why? Because you can't destruct knowledge. You can't remove entirely from that country the set of facts that got them within 2 to 3 months of a nuclear weapon.

So I know Members bristle at this notion the President is suggesting that

it is a choice between an agreement or war, but there are Members of this body who are openly cheerleading for military engagement with Iran, who are oversimplifying the effect of military action, who are blind to the reality of U.S. military activity in that region over the course of the last 10 to 15 years. This belief in the omnipotent unfailing power of the U.S. military is not based in reality.

We could set back a nuclear program for a series of years, but the consequences to the region would be catastrophic. So I get that people don't like the choice the President presents, but at some point we have to take Senator COTTON and his allies seriously when they continue to make a case for war and oversimplify the effects of a military strike.

But let us be honest. This is all just a political agreement we are talking about here today. So we do have to reserve the possibility that if all else fails and there is no other way to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, we may have to take military action. None of us have taken that wholly off the table. But a military strike, if it is necessary, is made more effective if this deal is in place.

We will have more international legitimacy if we try diplomacy first and Iran rushes to the bomb in the context of this deal. We would have more partners in this military action if we stuck together on this agreement.

I won't say war isn't an option, but I know it is more likely to be successful and effective in the context of this agreement than without it. And I certainly would challenge anyone—Senator COTTON and others—who try to simplify the effects of a military strike or suggest that it is the immediate alternative to this agreement.

In 1993, Yitzhak Rabin said, when talking about Israel's decision to recognize the PLO, that "you don't make peace with your friends, you make it with very unsavory enemies." Diplomacy is never easy, and the results of diplomacy are never pretty.

This isn't peace with Iran. We still reserve the right to fight them tooth and nail on their support for terrorism, on their denial of the right of Israel to exist, and their miserable human rights record. But the question still remains: Is the world better off with this agreement or is the world better off if this agreement falls apart at the hands of the Congress and we are right back to square one?

I believe Iran is less likely to become a nuclear weapons state with this agreement than without it, and I am going to support it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PERDUE). The Senator from Iowa.

WHISTLEBLOWERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor, as I often do, to

speak about the efforts of whistleblowers. Many of you know my belief in and my respect for those patriotic people—men and women who, often at great cost to their own careers and personal well-being, raise their voices when they see things happening they know are wrong, usually against the law or the misuse of taxpayer money. So it was with great joy that I participated just last Thursday with about two dozen whistleblowers and hundreds of their families, friends, and supporters in the first annual congressional celebration of National Whistleblowers Day.

In my remarks to that group, I said that agency leadership needs to follow the example my colleagues and I set with the Whistleblower Protection Caucus. They need to send a strong signal that whistleblowers are valued and that retaliation will not be tolerated. After all, the need to protect whistleblowers is not new and it is not going away.

In the midst of the whistleblowers appreciation day celebration, I received yet another harsh reminder that retaliation is alive and well in the executive branch's bureaucracies. At the very time several of my colleagues and I shared our appreciation for whistleblowers, U.S. Marshals Service whistleblowers told me the hunt was on for folks in that agency who disclosed wrongdoing to my office.

How ironic, as we recognized the bravery and the benefits of whistleblowers in the past, a new set of truth-tellers were facing harsh consequences that all too often come with their brave action in exposing wrongdoing.

Agencies use many pretexts to hunt, to punish, and to intimidate whistleblowers. So what is the pretext the Marshals Service is using? I am told the Marshals Service has launched an internal affairs investigation to find what they describe as a leak to the media and what harm a leak to the media does.

Well, this is a dubious claim. For one, news stories about the problems at the Marshals Service are not new. Second, there are many stories in several different magazines and newspapers that strongly suggest there are many sources of those news leaks.

Finally, I understand the Marshals Service internal affairs has allegedly seized the personal property of at least one of its so-called targets. I also understand this personal property contains privileged communications with the target's attorneys and protected disclosures to Members of Congress.

I wish to note some things for leaders at the Marshals Service and at any Federal agency. First, protection for whistleblowers under the Whistleblowers Protection Act is not just there for reporting to Congress or reporting to the inspector general or re-

porting to the Office of Special Counsel. The Supreme Court has said disclosures to media may be covered if the disclosure is not specifically prohibited by statute or Executive order, even if such disclosure violates an agency rule.

So not only does this investigation appear to be retaliatory, but its supposed justification is obviously not legitimate.

Second, even if there were nothing suspicious or retaliatory about the so-called investigation, it cannot be true that investigators need protected and privileged material to carry it out.

Third, the recent track record of the Marshals Service on whistleblower protection is pretty dismal. The internal affairs inquiry follows months of investigation by Congress, the inspector general, and the Office of Special Counsel into allegations of misconduct at the U.S. Marshals Service. It also follows at least two inaccurate and misleading responses from the Marshals Service and the Justice Department to letters from my committee. And it follows numerous letters reporting allegations of widespread retaliation and very deep fears that employees have of such reprisal.

Just so we are very clear, over 60 current and former U.S. Marshals Service employees have made disclosures to my office since March. That is over 1.1 percent of the agency. Many of the reports include allegations that the Marshals Service frequently uses internal affairs investigations as mechanisms for reprisal. Reprisal for what, one might ask—for engaging in activities that are explicitly protected by law.

Multiple whistleblowers from all across the Marshals Service have also told me that internal affairs does whatever it can to charge employees with misconduct, regardless of what the evidence actually says. So I thought the Justice Department would understand why I have concerns about this investigation and about the way the marshals are apparently handling it.

Remarkably, the Justice Department has told me that is all none of my business, and, of course, I strongly disagree. When you hear these sorts of things once or twice, there is a bit of a problem. When you hear them more than 60 times, coming directly to my office in less than 5 months, you start to understand there is a pattern out there.

From where I sit, it seems to me the best thing for the agency to do is to get some outside input into this so-called investigation. The Department should be willing to work with me, other Members of Congress, the inspector general, and the Office of Special Counsel to ensure that whistleblower rights are fully protected as the law intends. But officials won't even sit down and talk to us about it.

Senator LEAHY and I sent a joint letter to the Attorney General last Friday

asking for a briefing as soon as possible. The answer? They claimed it would be inappropriate to discuss it with the two of us. I will tell you what would be inappropriate: using internal administrative inquiries to hunt down whistleblowers and stiff-arm a congressional scrutiny. That is what would be inappropriate.

If the Justice Department and the Marshals Service think I am going to go away or give up on this, they are even less competent than I fear.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. SULLIVAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1944 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. SULLIVAN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. HEINRICH. Mr. President, in the first decade of this century, when the policies of President George W. Bush entangled our Nation firmly in the war in Iraq, Iran's nuclear program surged ahead rapidly and unchecked. They added thousands and thousands of centrifuges. They built numerous and complex nuclear facilities. They stockpiled highly enriched uranium. As we evaluate the proposed nuclear accord with Iran, it is important to compare what we have achieved with our allies against this reality.

I firmly believe that as we work to ensure that Iran is never able to develop nuclear weapons, facts, data, and details actually matter far more than the rhetoric you hear here in Washington, DC. Perhaps it is just the engineer in me, but when the accord became public, I sat down that morning and I started highlighting numbers. People in Washington are amazingly adept at arguing that up is down and that right is left. But numbers and data are a little harder to bend to our rhetorical will.

Let's start with this most important and critical data point: Without a deal, Iran has enough nuclear material stockpiled that they could acquire enough highly enriched material for a bomb in 2 to 3 months. That is what you hear talked about on the news as breakout time. Today Iran's breakout time is 2 to 3 months. They have

enough material that were they to move forward, they could break out in just a matter of months. With this accord in place, their pathway forward is blocked. What is more, the breakout time is pushed back to over a year, giving us and our allies around the world enough time to make sure they don't move down this very dangerous path.

Let's move on to another key data point. If you went back to 2003, Iran only had 164 centrifuges. They surged forward—adding centrifuges, adding more advanced and complex centrifuges—to where they now have 19,000 centrifuges today.

With this deal, once again, that number has rolled back. It has rolled back by two-thirds. But more importantly, of the 6,000 that remain, 1,000 of those cannot be used for enrichment, and all of them are the most basic and primitive IR-1 models.

In addition, without a deal, Iran has amassed 12,000 kilograms, which is over 26,000 pounds of enriched uranium. This slide shows the public a representative example of what that would look like today. Under this accord, that is rolled back by 98 percent to just 300 kilograms. So starting from over 26,000 pounds, or 12,000 kilograms, and reducing it by 98 percent, they no longer have the capacity or the stockpile to be able to quickly move forward to a weaponization scenario.

In addition, it is important to realize Iran had enriched some of its stockpile to 20 percent. That is a very dangerous figure because 20 percent is actually a lot closer to weapons grade, and that would enable them to move quickly to weapons grade. It actually takes far longer to get to 4 percent than it does to get from 20 percent to a weaponized enrichment level.

Under this accord, what previously was an enormous stockpile—and where some of that stockpile had actually reached dangerous levels of enrichment—will be rolled back to a point where all of the very limited 300 kilograms have to be below 4 percent, a level of concentration and enrichment that is appropriate for peaceful energy purposes but not for a weapons program.

In addition, without this accord, Iran's uranium stockpile today is large enough to yield 10 to 12 nuclear bombs. With this accord, they won't have enough stockpile—enough material—to produce even a single nuclear bomb.

Now, we all know that verification is key to success, and under this deal Iran must allow 24/7 inspections and continuous video monitoring at its nuclear infrastructure, including Natanz, Fordow, the Arak reactor, and all of its uranium mining, milling, and processing facilities. Furthermore, there is a mechanism in place that will allow inspections of any additional sites, should we suspect covert action is being taken to build a bomb outside of

their existing supply chain. Consequently, this accord breaks each and every pathway that Iran has developed to create a weaponized nuclear device, including any potential covert effort that they might pursue. We should welcome each of those developments as a major step toward both regional and international security.

I have thought about these issues for a long time. I have thought about both the science and the politics of the nuclear age since I was a young boy. I remember growing up listening to my dad because he was there when this age started. He watched nuclear devices being exploded in the Marshall Islands in the South Pacific. He told me stories of what it was like to watch a mushroom cloud form over Enewetak Atoll.

When I was studying engineering at the University of Missouri, I worked at one of the largest research reactors in the country. I know what it is like to look down into that blue glow of a reactor pool. As a Senator from the State of New Mexico, I have seen firsthand many of the world's centrifuges which are housed in my home State of New Mexico and dedicated to the peaceful production of energy.

Serving on the Armed Services Committee, I helped set policy on non-proliferation and nuclear deterrence. As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, I have received numerous briefings on both Iran's nuclear program and their capabilities. I am well acquainted with the steps necessary to successfully construct a nuclear weapon and the steps necessary to detect that kind of activity. It is because of this familiarity that I am confident in this accord.

The comprehensive, long-term deal achieved earlier this month includes all of the necessary tools to break each potential Iranian pathway to a nuclear bomb. Further, it incorporates enough lead time—the breakout time that we talked about before, which we currently are in dire need of—so that should Iran change its course in the future, the United States and the world can react well before a device can be built. We hope that scenario never occurs, but should that happen—even with this accord—it truly leaves all of our options on the table, including the military option.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate object to this historical accomplishment, saying that we could have done better; however, none of them have offered any realistic alternatives. The only concrete alternative, should Congress reject this deal, has been to engage in a military strike against Iran. While the military option will always remain on the table for the United States, even as we implement this accord, it should remain our absolute last resort.

As one can imagine, our military and intelligence leaders have looked at the

potential repercussions should a direct military conflict with Iran occur. That dangerous path would provoke retaliation, instability, and would likely lead to a nuclear-armed Iran in a matter of just a few years rather than decades or never. Needless to say, this would be an irresponsible mistake.

As former Brigadier General and Deputy to Israel's National Security Advisor Shlomo Brom has said, "This agreement represents the best chance to make sure Iran never obtains a weapon and the best chance for Congress to support American diplomacy—without taking any options off the table for this or future presidents."

For too long, our country has been engaged in overseas military conflicts that have cost our Nation dearly in both blood and treasure. We must always be ready at a moment's notice to defend our country, to defend our allies, and even our interests, but we must also look to avoid conflict whenever a diplomatic option is present and possible. At this extraordinary moment, I am convinced that this accord is in the best interest of our Nation and that of our allies.

I am still deeply distrustful of Iran's leadership. To make peace, you negotiate with your enemies, not with your friends. Obviously any deal with Iran will not be without risk, but the risks and the consequences of rejecting this deal are far, far more dire. This deal sets the stage for a safer and more stable Middle East and, for that matter, a more secure United States of America. We must seize this historic opportunity.

I yield the rest of my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion with respect to the motion to proceed to S. 754.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, in consultation with the Democratic leader, the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 28, S. 754; I further ask that Senator BURR then be recognized to offer the Burr-Feinstein substitute amendment and that it be in order for the bill managers or their designees to offer up to 10 first-degree amendments relevant to the subject matter per side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all Senators, the first amendments on the Republican side will be the following: Paul No. 2564, Heller No. 2548, Flake No. 2582, Vitter No. 2578, Vitter No. 2579, Cotton No. 2581, Kirk No. 2603, Coats No. 2604, Gardner No. 2631, Flake No. 2580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I assume we would alternate with Republican and Democrat amendments; is that right?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Yes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be modified to allow 11 Democratic amendments instead of 10.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. REID. They will be as follows: Carper No. 2627, Coons No. 2552, Franken No. 2612, Tester No. 2632, Leahy No. 2587, Murphy No. 2589, Whitehouse No. 2626, Wyden No. 2621, Wyden No. 2622, Mikulski No. 2557, and Carper No. 2615.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I suggest the absence of quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 61

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following leader remarks on Tuesday, September 8, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 61 and that the majority leader or his designee be recognized to offer a substitute amendment related to congressional disapproval of the proposed Iran nuclear agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I want the debate we are going to have in a matter of weeks to be—and I think all of us do—dignified and befitting the gravity of one of the most important issues of the day. This is a step forward, and I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, with this agreement, we set up expedited consideration of the cyber bill and the Iran resolution. The Senate will hold voice votes on Executive nominations, but there will be no further rollcall votes this week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, so that all are clear with respect to where mat-

ters are with the cyber security legislation, a couple of days ago it was my fear that this bill would be brought up—it is a badly flawed bill—with no opportunity for Senators on either side of the aisle to fix the legislation. I was afraid that it would come up with no amendments and people would say “Oh my goodness, there are serious cyber threats.” And that is unquestionably correct. My constituents in Oregon, for example, have been hacked by the Chinese. I was concerned that people would say “We have all of these cyber threats; we have to act” and there would be no real opportunity to show how the legislation in its current form creates more problems than it solves.

So that all concerned understand where things are, there are going to be more than 20 amendments to this badly flawed bill. Those of us who want to make sure there is a full airing of the issues have come to understand that there is no time limit that has yet been agreed to on those amendments. So there is going to be a real debate, and, of course, that is what the Senate is all about.

I particularly wish to commend the millions of advocates around the country who spoke out. I understand there was something like 6 million faxes that were sent to Members of this body.

I am going to take a few minutes—I see my colleagues are here as well—to describe where I think this debate is and give a sense of what the challenge is going forward.

I start with the basic proposition that we have a very serious set of cyber security threats, and I touched on seeing it at home. Second, information sharing can be valuable. There is certainly a lot of it now. It can be constructive. Information sharing, however, without vigorous, robust privacy safeguards, will not be considered by millions of Americans to be a cyber security bill. Millions of Americans will say that legislation is a surveillance bill.

So what I am going to do tonight—just for a few minutes because it is my understanding there are colleagues who would also like to speak—is describe exactly where this debate is.

As written, the cyber security legislation prevents law-abiding Americans from suing private companies that inappropriately share their personal information with the government. When I say personal information, I am talking about the contents of emails, financial information, basically any data at all that is stored electronically. CISA, as the bill is called, would allow private companies to share large volumes of their customers’ personal information with the government after only a cursory review. Colleagues who want to look at that provision ought to take a look at page 16 of the bill.

We were told repeatedly that this legislation is voluntary. The fact is, it

is voluntary for the companies, but for the citizens of Pennsylvania, the citizens of Oregon, citizens across this country, it is not voluntary. The people of Pennsylvania won’t be asked first whether they want their information sent to the government. Oregonians won’t have the chance to say whether they want that information sent. For them, this legislation is mandatory.

To explain the damage that I believe this legislation would do, I want to take a minute to explain how cyber security information sharing works now. Right now the Department of Homeland Security operates a national cyber security watch center 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. This watch center receives cyber security threat information from around the Federal Government and from private companies, and this watch center sends out alerts and bulletins to security professionals to provide them with technical information about cyber security threats. In fiscal year 2014, this watch center sent out nearly 12,000 of these alerts to more than 100,000 recipients. That happens today, with lots of companies participating.

The system that is in place today includes rules to protect the privacy of law-abiding Americans. These rules ensure that companies have a strong interest in protecting the privacy of their customers. But the legislation as it has been written now overrides those rules. The bill in front of us prevents individual Americans from suing companies that have mishandled their private information. As a result, companies would suddenly, in my view, not have the same incentives with respect to caring about sharing their customers’ personal information with the government. And my concern and the concern, I believe, of millions of Americans is that the interests of some who are overzealous—overzealous in government, overzealous in the private sector—would overwhelm the interests of all of those customers who voluntarily handed over their information.

I thought I would give a couple of examples of the problems the bill in its current form causes. Imagine that a health insurance company finds out that millions of its customers’ records have been stolen. If that company has any evidence about who the hackers were or how they stole this information, of course it makes sense to share that information with the government. But that company shouldn’t simply say “Here you go” and hand millions of its customers’ financial and medical information over to a wide array of government agencies.

The records of the victims of a hack should not be treated the same way that information about the hacker is treated. If companies are sharing information for cyber security purposes,

they ought to be required to make reasonable efforts to remove personal information that isn't needed for cyber security before that information is handed over to the government. And those government agencies ought to focus on using that information to combat a cyber security threat.

That, I say to my colleagues, is not what the bill says. Page 16 of the bill would very clearly authorize companies to share large amounts of personal information that is unnecessary for cyber security, after only a cursory review.

Now I wish to speak about just one other issue specifically that I think Senators are not familiar with, and that is the issue of cyber signatures. Cyber signatures are essentially recognizable patterns in online code. A number of informed observers have raised the concern that once individual cyber signatures are shoveled over to the government by private companies, they could be used as the basis for broad surveillance affecting law-abiding Americans. I am not going to confirm or deny any of the press reports that have raised concerns about cyber signatures being used in this way, but I believe Senators should understand that this is certainly—and it is being widely discussed in the public arena—a theoretical possibility, and that helps underscore the importance of including a strong requirement for private companies to remove unrelated personal information about their customers before dumping data over to the government.

In wrapping up, I would be remiss if I didn't note that a secret Justice Department legal opinion that is clearly relevant to the cyber security debate continues to be withheld from the public. This opinion interprets common commercial service agreements, and in my judgment it is inconsistent with the public's understanding of the law. So once again we have this question of what happens when the people of Pennsylvania, Virginia, or Oregon think there is a law because they have read it in the public arena or on their iPad at home and then there is a secret interpretation.

I have urged the Justice Department to withdraw that secret Department of Justice opinion that relates directly to the cyber security debate. They have declined to do so. I suspect many Senators haven't had the chance to review it. As I have done before on this type of topic, I would urge Senators or their staffs to take the time to read it because I believe that understanding the executive branch's interpretation of these agreements is an important part of understanding the relevant legal landscape on cyber security.

I am going to close by speaking about the question of effectiveness. I think we all understand that we are facing very real cyber threats. I am of the view that this bill in its present

form would do little, if anything, to stop large, sophisticated cyber attacks like the Office of Personnel Management had.

I don't think Senators ought to just take my word for it. In April, 65 technologists and cyber security professionals expressed their opposition to the bill in a letter to Chairman BURR and Vice Chairman FEINSTEIN. In referring to the bill and two similar bills, they wrote:

We appreciate your interest in making our networks more secure, but the legislation proposed does not materially further that goal, and at the same time it puts our users' privacy at risk.

As they wrap up their letter, this group of technologists and cyber security professionals state:

These bills weaken privacy law without promoting security.

That has always been my concern. If we look back at our experiences, we have tried to write these new digital ground rules. Fortunately, we took a step in the right direction as it related to NSA rules. The challenge has always been the same. The people of our country want to be safe and secure in their homes and in their businesses and in their communities, and they want their liberty. Ben Franklin said anybody who gives up their liberty to have security doesn't deserve either.

What troubled me and why I am glad that the Senate has stepped back from precipitous action where we would have just passed this bill without any amendments—we will have a chance in the fall to look at ways to address cyber security in a fashion that I think does respond to what our people want, and that is to show that security—in this case, cyber security—and liberty are not mutually exclusive. It is sensible policies worked out in a bipartisan way that will respond to the needs of this country in what is unquestionably a dangerous time.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

ISLAMIC STATE

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, we are about to start our traditional August recess. Congress is in an interesting place because we not only get a recess—a vacation—as many Americans do, but we are legally required to take one. That is right. By an act of Congress, Congress is required, absent a separate agreement, to take a month off during August. I learned that just yesterday during a great presentation from one of our Senate Historians, Kate Scott.

This mandated August adjournment is part of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. The act provides that in odd-numbered years, the Houses adjourn from the first Friday in August until the Tuesday after Labor Day. There is an exception: The mandated recess “shall not be applicable if on

July 31 of such year a state of war exists pursuant to a declaration of war by Congress.” Again, the mandated recess is not applicable if on July 31 of such year a state of war exists pursuant to a declaration of war by Congress. This provision makes basic sense, doesn't it? Congress shouldn't go out for a mandatory 30-day vacation when the Nation is at war. It is not right that American troops should risk their lives overseas far from home while Congress takes a month off. The Congress that passed this bill in 1970 had an expectation about how serious war was and how Congress—the institution charged with declaring war—would treat such a serious obligation.

Well, we are about to go on a 1-month adjournment with the Nation at war. In fact, this Saturday, August 8, marks 1 year since President Obama initiated U.S. airstrikes against the Islamic State in northern Iraq.

In the past year, more than 3,000 members of the U.S. military have served in Operation Inherent Resolve—and thousands are there now—launching more than 4,500 airstrikes, carrying out Special Forces operations, and assisting the Iraqi military, the Kurdish Peshmerga, and Syrians fighting the Islamic State. Virginians connected with the USS *Roosevelt* carrier group are stationed there right now.

We have made major gains in northern Iraq and, more recently, in northern Syria, but the threat posed by the Islamic State continues to spread in the region and beyond. The war has cost over \$3.2 billion through mid-July—an average of \$9.5 million a day—and seven American servicemembers have lost their lives serving in support of the mission.

Recently we have heard that the administration may be expanding the scope of the war to defend U.S.-trained Syrian fighters against attacks, including from the Assad regime. We are expanding our cooperation with Turkey in the region. We even hear rumors of a U.S.-Turkish humanitarian zone in northern Syria. Each of these steps is potentially significant and could lead to even more unforeseen expansions of the ongoing war. We have already had testimony by military leaders to suggest that the war will likely go on for years.

But as the war expands and our troops risk their lives far from home and as we prepare to go on our traditional 1-month recess, a tacit agreement to avoid debating this war persists in Washington.

The President maintains that he can conduct this war without authorization from Congress. He waited more than 6 months after the war started to even send Congress a draft authorization of the mission.

Congressional behavior has been even more unusual. Although vested with the sole power to declare war by article

I of the Constitution, Congress has refused to meaningfully debate or vote on the war against the Islamic State. A Congress quick to criticize any Executive action by the President has nevertheless encouraged him to carry out an unauthorized war. As far as our allies, the Islamic State, or our troops know, Congress is indifferent to this war.

I first introduced a resolution to force Congress to do its job and to debate this war in September of 2014. That led in December to an affirmative vote by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to authorize the war with specific limitations. But the matter wasn't taken up on the floor because the Senate was about to change to a new majority, and that party wanted to analyze the issue afresh.

Six months then went by, and Senator JEFF FLAKE and I introduced, finally, a bipartisan war resolution in June to prod the Senate to take its constitutional responsibility seriously after so many months of inaction. We wanted to show there is a bipartisan consensus against the Islamic State. The result: a few discussions in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, but otherwise silence.

One year of war against the Islamic State has transformed a President who was elected in part because of his early opposition to the Iraq War into an Executive war President. It has stretched the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force that was passed to defeat the perpetrators of 9/11 far beyond its original meaning or intent. It has shown to all that neither the Congress nor the President feels obliged to follow the 1973 War Powers Resolution, which requires the President to cease any unilateral military action within 90 days unless Congress votes to approve it. And it has demonstrated that Congress would rather avoid its constitutional duty to declare war than have a meaningful debate about whether and how the United States should militarily confront the Islamic State.

This 1-year anniversary also coincides a few minutes ago with a vigorous congressional effort to challenge U.S. diplomacy regarding the Iranian nuclear agreement. The contrast between congressional indifference to war and its energetic challenge to diplomacy is most disturbing.

So, why isn't Congress doing its job?

Last month I asked Marine Commandant Joseph Dunford, nominated to be the next Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, whether congressional action to finally authorize the war against the Islamic State would be well received by American troops. His answer said it all. "I think what our young men and women need—and it's really all they need to do what we ask them to do—is a sense that what they're doing has purpose, has meaning, and has the support of the American people."

A debate in Congress by the people's elected representatives and a vote to authorize the most solemn act of war is how we tell our troops that what they are doing—what they are risking their lives for—"has purpose, has meaning, and has the support of the American people." Otherwise, we are asking them to risk their lives without even bothering to discuss whether the mission is something we support. Can there be anything—anything—more immoral than that—to order troops to risk their lives in support of a military mission that we are unwilling even to discuss?

One year in, our servicemembers are doing their jobs, but they are still waiting on us to do ours. And as I conclude—oh, yeah, what about that August recess? How can we go away and adjourn for a month in the midst of an ongoing war?

Why, that is easy. The part of the statute that creates an exception for the mandatory August adjournment applies only if there has been "a declaration of war by the Congress." Because we haven't even bothered to debate or authorize this war in the year since it started, we are still entitled by statute to take the month of August off.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

ECONOMIC SECURITY FOR AMERICAN WORKERS

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, in today's economy, too many of our workers across this country are underpaid, they are overworked, and they are treated unfairly on the job. In short, they lack fundamental economic security.

In Congress, we have got to act to give our workers much needed relief. We need to grow our economy from the middle out, not the top down. And we should make sure our country works for all Americans, not just the wealthiest few. There is no reason we can't get to work on legislation to do just that. That is why I am here this afternoon, joining my colleagues in calling for us in the Senate to move on some important policies that will help restore economic security and stability to more of our workers.

Mr. President, I understand that we are waiting for one of my Republican colleagues to come to the floor before I ask unanimous consent, so I will pause for just a minute.

But I will say while we are waiting that we are very concerned about many Americans today who make few dollars an hour, who don't have paid sick leave, who are told to go to work at hours that they cannot control or know about, and we are introducing legislation or asking to introduce legislation today to deal with all of those issues.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1150

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by

the majority leader, following consultation with the Democratic leader and no later than Friday, October 30, the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1150, the Raise the Wage Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time; that the Senate vote on passage of the bill, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the HELP Committee, Senator ALEXANDER, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 497

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Democratic leader, and no later than Friday, October 30, the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 497, the Healthy Families Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time; that the Senate vote on passage of the bill, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the HELP Committee, Senator ALEXANDER, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 1772

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at a time to be determined by the majority leader, following consultation with the Democratic leader and no later than Friday, October 30, the HELP Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1772, the Schedules That Work Act; that the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration; that the bill be read a third time; that the Senate vote on passage of the bill, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the HELP Committee, Senator ALEXANDER, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The Senator from Washington.

Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, reclaiming the floor, it is disappointing to us that the Republican majority has objected to bringing these bills forward

and blocking our efforts to provide some much needed economic stability and security for our workers in this country. Our workers have been waiting a long time for relief from the trickle-down system that has hurt our middle class.

This Senator wants to put the Senate on notice that the Democrats are going to keep working on ways to grow our economy from the middle out, not the top down, and we are going to be working to make sure our workers and our families have a voice at the table. We are going to continue to focus on making sure our country works for all Americans, not just the wealthy and few.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington knows how much I admire and respect her. We have had great opportunity to work together in a very productive way, but what we have just seen from our friends across the aisle is not designed to actually get anything done. It was a show to try to claim political advantage and to try to create a narrative which simply isn't borne out by the facts.

The facts are that these costly proposals are unfunded mandates designed to make it hard for Americans to find jobs or become employers and create jobs for millions of people working for a step up the economic ladder. What Americans need, rather than show votes, are more job opportunities, more flexibility at work, and the freedom to negotiate a schedule that works for them.

Our friends across the aisle have been in charge and we have seen the results: an economy that grew last year at 2.2 percent—as a matter of fact, in at least one quarter it actually contracted. So we know what the fruit of these policies are because they have had their chances.

Their policies will destroy jobs, smother innovative startups in job creators like Uber, and perpetuate the Obama part-time economy, which has left a shocking 6.5 million Americans in part-time work as they search in vain for full-time work—and, I might add, a 30-year low of the labor participation rate—the percentage of people actually in the workforce that are employed, people that would otherwise want to work. We have seen what the results are.

The voters last November decided to try something different. They have given us a chance to show what we can do while we are in the majority, and I think the results are pretty good. We passed a budget for the first time since 2009. We passed a 6-year highway bill just recently, and we are still working with the House to try to figure out how

to do that on a bicameral, bipartisan basis. We passed unanimously the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act to fight the scourge of human trafficking, which targets teenage girls predominantly for sex. We have passed the Defense authorization bill to make sure our men and women in uniform have the authority and what they need in order to keep us safe here and abroad.

We actually have had a very productive year so far in the 114th Congress under Republican leadership. What our Democratic colleagues want to do is take us to the past with slow economic growth and policies that simply don't work.

That is why I am happy to stand here today and object to these show requests that aren't actually designed to do anything but are designed for fundraising, press releases, and other publicity stunts that simply are not what is going to help the American people the most.

TRIBUTE TO RUSS THOMASSON

Mr. President, on another note, I want to talk a little bit about my chief of staff who is leaving. My chief of staff in the whip office is Russ Thomasson, who I hope is somewhere around here. He is at the back of the Chamber. His son Austin is down here as one of our pages.

The bottom line is, Russ and I learned together from the time he came as my military legislative assistant in 2003. From that time until now, we learned how to be effective on behalf of the 27 million people I work for in the State of Texas and to work with all of our colleagues to try to produce positive results for the American people.

He is leaving now for greener pastures. I mean that not exactly literally, but he is going into the private sector where he will no doubt be compensated for what his skills and experience are worth.

Back when I started in the Senate, Russ came on board as my military legislative assistant. He brought with him great experience as an Air Force intel officer. He is an engineer; I am not. It was helpful to bring with him the attention to detail that engineering training brings. He is also a Russian specialist, which we didn't need a lot of in my office in Texas, but he brought great knowledge and experience to the forefront, helping me in my job on the Armed Services Committee, given that great background.

We had some big challenges in 2005 as all of our colleagues here at the time remember. That was the Base Closure and Realignment Commission. Texas likes to tout the fact that 1 out of every 10 persons in uniform comes from Texas. Our military is very important to us. I was raised in a military family. Being effective on behalf of our men and women in uniform who happen to call Texas home is particularly impor-

tant to me, and Russ did a tremendous job there and elsewhere.

As a matter of fact, he did such a good job as my MLA, my military legislative assistant, that when the opportunity came, he was promoted to legislative director. There he got to apply his knowledge and expertise far beyond just national security and foreign affairs and helped me navigate all of the various policy issues we confronted during the time he was my legislative director from 2007 to 2012.

Some of these are issues that particularly hit home in Texas, things like immigration, Supreme Court nominations, and the ObamaCare debate. Not only did Russ bring valuable policy perspectives to that role as legislative director, but he was also able to help on the communications side because he understands it is not just important for us to do a decent job—or at least to the best of our ability—it is important to be able to communicate what you are doing in a way so the American people, and in particular the people of Texas, can understand. Yet he also understood the politics that go along sometimes with the job we have in the Senate.

Perhaps just as importantly, he brought with him his good judgment to help me hire an outstanding legislative staff. I believe firmly that part of my responsibility—and I am sure the Presiding Officer and our other colleagues feel the same way. I believe one of the most important things we can do is hire the best and brightest staffers because if we do that, and we work with them, we can benefit tremendously and our constituents benefit tremendously from their advice.

Russ has set a high bar as my legislative director. He is a tireless worker who has given a lot of himself.

Then I would like to say just a word about his job as my chief of staff—as the whip. When I became the whip, he came with me to the whip office. We have found ourselves in a few nail-biting situations in tense moments, and Russ's calmness and personality, his calm demeanor and his diligence have simply helped us get the job done for the Senate and for the new majority.

Whether it is trafficking, trade, highways, funding the government, a budget—the first budget that we have passed since 2009—his fingerprints are all over those, along with those of other members of my whip staff who have done a great job. As I learned from the majority leader, he wants to know where the votes are before the vote is actually cast. My whip team, both staff and my deputy whip team, of which the Presiding Officer is one, have done a great job providing that essential information and knowledge to the majority leader so we can efficiently and effectively represent our constituents in the Senate.

By the way, I would say that Russ's intelligence background has proven to

be invaluable—gathering information, talking to people, and understanding the situational awareness that is so necessary in order to be as effective as we can be. The results prove he has made a big contribution to helping us turn the Senate around, going from dysfunction to function and actually producing important results for the American people.

So here is how Russ describes the task ahead in the Senate. He likes to talk about the four P's. This is supposedly the key to what makes the Senate work and how to be effective in the Senate. The first P is policy. The second is pressure. The third is politics. The fourth is power. So I think by his four P's, he encapsulates one of the ways to be most effective in the Senate.

I guess, in the end, everything comes down to people and our relationships, the level of trust we are able to build working with each other because that is what helps us be effective and helps Russ be an effective chief of staff in the whip office. The truth is, as I have gone from No. 99 in the Senate when I came here, sitting in that back row over there, down to this desk over the last 12 years, I could not have done it without great staff like Russ Thomasson and all of my staff, both in the whip office as well as my staff in my official office. Many of them I know are here sitting in the back.

So on behalf of all of Team Cornyn, I want to wish Russ, his wife Cindy, Sasha, and Austin all the very best in the next chapter of their lives. We used to kid that it is sort of like the Eagles song "Hotel California," you can check out, but you can never leave, once you become part of Team Cornyn. That is as true today as it was then.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I have never faced a more difficult decision than the vote on the Iran nuclear weapons agreement which is currently scheduled for mid-September. The stakes could not be higher, the issues more complex or the risks more difficult to calculate. In approaching this decision, I have taken a two-pronged path. The first is to have learned everything I possibly could about the agreement itself and then carefully analyzed the alternatives.

This second step is critically important, particularly in this case. No negotiated agreement is perfect. It is easy to pick apart whatever agreement is before you, but the question is, Compared to what? Often, an imperfect agreement is preferable when compared to the likely alternatives. Starting with a close reading of the agreement over several nights and early mornings back in July, and following hearings, classified briefings and sessions, meet-

ing with experts inside and outside the administration, extensive readings about the agreement and its implications and discussions with my colleagues, this is where I have come out: First, if implemented effectively, I believe this agreement will prevent Iran from achieving a nuclear weapon for at least 15 years and probably longer; second, at the end of that 15 years, if we take the right steps, we will have the same options then that we have today if Iran moves toward the building of a bomb; third, the current alternatives, if this agreement is rejected, are either unrealistic or downright dangerous.

So based upon what we know now, I intend to vote in favor of the agreement. This is why: The deal itself, I believe, is strong and explicit in terms of the burdens it places upon Iran's nuclear program for the first 15 years—a 98-percent reduction in their current stockpile of enriched uranium, strict numerical limits on further enrichment, the effective dismantling of the plutonium reactor at Arak, and dismantlement of two-thirds of their current fleet of enrichment centrifuges.

But many argue that after 15 years, Iran could become a nuclear threshold state, which is certainly a possibility we need to be prepared to address, but Iran is a nuclear threshold state today. To be arguing about what may or may not be the case in 15 years and ignore the fact that they are a nuclear threshold state today, it seems to me, is the height of folly. If they decided to build a bomb today, they could get there in 2 to 3 months. After the rollbacks required in this agreement, however, this period is extended to at least 1 year, and we would know almost immediately if they were on track to a bomb.

I might mention that we will have a much greater insight into their activities if this agreement is enacted than we do today. The inspection and verification provisions, as I mentioned, which will be monitored and enforced by the International Atomic Energy Agency, coupled with the tools and capabilities of the U.S. intelligence community and those of our international partners which, by the way, is an important part of the verification regime.

There is a lot of discussion about the IAEA, as if those are the only people who will be watching, but indeed the intelligence agencies of at least half a dozen countries will also be watching. I believe the combination of the IAEA and our intelligence assets provide us with a high level of confidence that any attempt by Iran to cheat on its enrichment program will be detected.

IAEA inspections at known nuclear sites indeed are anytime, anywhere, and include Iran's entire uranium supply chain. While it is true that inspections at hidden sites—sites we don't know about—could be delayed for up to 24 days from when the IAEA requests

access and that some covert work at such a site could be harder to detect, it is in the nature of uranium that traces can be detected long after 24 days, no matter how much they try to clean it up.

The half-life of uranium-235 is 700 million years. They are not going to be able to clean it up in 24 days. In the end, to build a bomb, there has to be nuclear material. But what about after 15 years when most of the restrictions on enrichment are lifted? If the Iranians try to break out at that point, we have the same options we have today, including the reimposition of sanctions or a military strike.

In other words, we are in a similar place in 15 years to where we are now, but we will have achieved 15 years of a nuclear weapon-free Iran. If Iran violates the terms of the agreement at that point, I believe reimposing the effective international sanctions involving the rest of the world would be stronger and more likely than it would be today because it would be Iran breaching the agreement, not us walking away from it. I cannot argue, nor can anyone, that this deal is perfect. For example, I would prefer that the 15-year limits be 20 or 25 or 30 years or that the U.S. arms embargo would remain in place indefinitely. I would prefer to see that in the agreement.

In fact, I think Congress can and should have a role to play in seeking to ensure the strict enforcement of the agreement and to mitigate some of its weaknesses, as well as reassuring our regional allies and partners and further strengthening our ability to ensure Iran never becomes a nuclear weapons state, but then we get to the central question. As I said, it is easy to pick apart a deal: I don't like this aspect. I don't like that. I think it should be longer. I think it should be shorter.

But the question is, Compared to what? What are the alternatives? What happens next if we reject this agreement? The usual answers I have heard in this body, in hearings, and in meetings over the last month or so are sort of vague references to reimposing or strengthening the sanctions, bringing Iran back to the table, and getting a better deal.

The problem with this is that the countries which have joined us in the sanctions—and by doing so have considerably strengthened the impact of those sanctions on Iran—believe this deal is acceptable. They have accepted it. Our unilateral rejection would almost certainly lead to those sanctions eroding rather than getting stronger. I would not argue they will collapse, but they will definitely erode. It is hard to argue that the sanctions will get stronger when the countries that have helped us to enforce and make those sanctions effective believe we should endorse and enter into this agreement.

If that happens, we have the worst of all worlds: Iran is unfettered from the

terms of the agreement, and they are subject to a weaker sanctions regime. It is important to remember, and this often is not conveyed much in the information that is shared, this is not simply an agreement between the United States and Iran, this is an agreement between the United States and Germany and Great Britain and France and China and Russia and Iran. This is not a unilateral agreement. This is an agreement that has been entered into by the major world powers. They have found it acceptable.

The other option, if we cannot somehow find our way to a better deal—and I have not heard anybody credibly argue why or how that would happen. The only other option, of course, is a military strike, which the experts estimate would only set the Iranian nuclear program back between 2 and 3 years. Where are we then? Are we in a position where there would have to be follow-on strikes to prevent the reconstitution of Iran's nuclear facilities every 2 or 3 years? That would be at an unpredictable and incalculable cost.

It is true that as a result of Iran's acceptance of the limitations of the agreement, they get relief from the nuclear sanctions and the release of approximately \$50 billion of restricted foreign assets that they will be able to spend, but it is important to remember they only get that after they comply with the limitations. If we sign on to this agreement, they don't get the money the next day. They have to meet the limitations in the agreement and the IAEA has to verify that. Let me repeat. There is no sanctions relief until Iran implements and the IAEA verifies that its nuclear commitments have been met. To get that relief is why they entered into these negotiations in the first place. And to get them into the negotiations is why we led the imposition of the nuclear weapons sanctions in the first place.

In other words, sanctions relief in exchange for acceptance of limitations on their nuclear program is the essence of the deal. Neither the sanctions nor the negotiations were ever about Iran forswearing terrorism or recognizing Israel or releasing hostages. All of those things are things I wish we could do. I believe those are good policies, but that isn't what this negotiation was about. To try to add them now or argue that the deal falls short because they aren't included is simply unrealistic.

The United States, along with our allies and partners, must redouble our efforts outside of the nuclear agreement to address these issues. They are critically important issues. We need a strategy to deal with an expansionist Iran that is completely separate from the nuclear issue—I don't deny that—and to deal with Iran's malign activities in the region. It is also important to reiterate that all U.S. sanctions on

Iran related to terrorism and human rights will remain in place.

When President Kennedy was negotiating the removal of the Soviet missiles from Cuba, he did not throw in that Cuba had to depose Castro or that the Soviets had to forswear their dangerous enmity to the West. The phrase they used was this: "We will bury you."

He simply wanted to get those missiles out. He didn't try to settle all the issues in the Cold War. And, indeed, so it is with this deal. The idea is to constrain. The idea has always been to constrain Iran's nuclear capability, not settle all the issues of the Middle East—no matter how desirable that might be.

In my book there is only one thing worse than a rogue Iran seeking to make trouble for its neighbors and us, and that is a rogue Iran seeking to make troubles for its neighbors and us armed with nuclear weapons. That is the issue before us.

Finally, of equal importance as the terms themselves of the nuclear agreement is ensuring that it is effectively implemented. One of the principles of my life is that implementation and execution are as important as vision. If this agreement is approved, that is day 1 of the critical implementation and execution period. There is a real risk, I believe, that as time wears on, the attention of the international community on this issue will diminish. It will be vital to the United States, across successive Presidents, to maintain focus on implementing and enforcing the terms of the agreement.

Congress also will have a crucial role to play, both in oversight of the deal's implementation and in making certain that the IAEA and our intelligence agencies have the resources they need to monitor and assure compliance, and more broadly to ensure that all of our options to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon—whenever they may decide to take that step—remain viable if the agreement collapses.

I have negotiated lots of contracts over the years, and one side or the other rarely wins in a negotiation. The idea is that all sides get something they want or need, and, in the end, I believe that is what happened here. If this deal is implemented properly, I believe it will accomplish our national security objectives, while preserving or improving all of our existing options to ensure that Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

There is no certainty when it comes to this question. As I said at the beginning, I believe this is the most difficult decision I have ever had to make. There are risks in either direction, and there are credible arguments on both sides. But, in the end, I have concluded that the terms of this agreement are preferable to the alternatives—and that is the crucial analysis; what are

the alternatives—and that it would be in the best interests of the United States to join our partners in approving it.

I intend to remain deeply engaged in this issue in the weeks and months ahead because the process does not end the day of our vote. If this agreement moves forward, it will fall to future Presidents and future Congresses to oversee it and make it work. We owe the American people our best judgment, and it is my belief that this agreement, if implemented effectively and in conjunction with the other measures we must take to ensure its ongoing vitality, will serve our Nation, the region, and the world.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words about the deal negotiated between the P5+1 and Iran to deny Iran's access to a nuclear weapon.

First, I commend the administration and others involved in the negotiations for seeking a diplomatic solution. There always needs to be a credible threat of military force to deny Iran a nuclear weapon, but it is incumbent upon us to test every avenue for a peaceful solution before resorting to such force.

I am mindful that—like any agreement involving multiple parties that are friendly, belligerent, and somewhere in between—this agreement can't be used against the ideal. It has to be judged against the alternative. On the whole, this agreement measured against the ideal doesn't look all that good. Against the alternative, it is a much closer call.

I must say that I am not as sanguine as some of my colleagues about the ability to reassemble the multilateral sanctions regime that has brought Iran to the negotiating table.

On the nuclear side, Iran's ability to amass sufficient fissile material to assemble a nuclear weapon would be severely curtailed for up to 15 years. The inspections regime to ensure compliance, at least as it pertains to known nuclear facilities, is fairly detailed. That is no small achievement. Much credit is due to the scientists and others who assisted with the negotiations.

On the other hand, I have grave concerns regarding our ability—and if not our ability, our willingness—to respond to nefarious nonnuclear activities that Iran may be involved with in the region.

We are assured by the administration that under the JCPOA, Congress retains all tools, including the imposition of sanctions, should Iran involve itself in terrorist activity in the region. However, the plain text of the JCPOA does not seem to indicate this. In fact, it seems to indicate otherwise. Iran has made it clear that it believes

that the imposition of sanctions similar to or approximating those currently in place would violate the JCPOA.

My concern is that the administration would be reluctant to punish or deter the unacceptable nonnuclear behavior by Iran in the region if it would give Iran the pretext not to comply with the agreement as it stands. I don't believe this is an idle concern. The degree to which the administration has resisted even the suggestion that Congress reauthorize the Iran Sanctions Act, for example, which expires next year, just so that we might have sanctions to snap back, makes us question our willingness to confront Iran when it really matters down the road.

Now, if this were a treaty, that could be dealt with with what are called RUDs—or reservations, understandings and declarations—where we could clarify some of these misunderstandings. But since this was presented to Congress as an Executive agreement, we don't have that option.

We have had numerous hearings and briefings in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I commend Senator CORKER, the chairman of the committee, and the minority ranking member, Senator CARDIN, for the manner in which they have engaged in these hearings and briefings.

We have had a lot of questions raised. Some have been answered; some have not. These hearings will continue. I will leave from this Chamber to go to another briefing that we are having. I expect to hear more in the coming weeks and will seek to answer questions that I still have about the agreement. The bottom line is I can only support an agreement that I feel can endure—not just be signed but that can endure—and that will serve our national interests and the interests of our allies.

Again, I commend those who have been involved in this process. I commend those involved in ensuring that Congress had a say here. I will continue to evaluate this agreement based, as I said, not on the ideal but the alternative. There are many questions I wish to have answered.

I encourage the administration to work with Congress in the coming weeks on legislation that would clarify some of these misunderstandings. It would take the place of so-called RUDs if this were a treaty.

I have mentioned before that this kind of legislation is going to come. It will come prior to implementation day, and I think it behooves the administration and the Congress to begin now to work together on items that we can agree on that clarify this, assuming that this agreement will go into effect. It ought to be clarified now and not down the road. That would make it far more likely to be an enduring document rather than one that is simply signed and forgotten later.

With that, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

RECESS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 6:15 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:05 p.m., recessed until 6:15 p.m., and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. TILLIS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

DRINKING WATER PROTECTION ACT

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I come to the floor once again to make an attempt at passing a very important, commonsense piece of legislation that is bipartisan. It helps to ensure that the drinking water supplies in northern Ohio, Lake Erie, and throughout our State, the freshwater reservoirs and other lakes that are providing water—and also around the country—to make sure that will be something the U.S. Federal Government is helping with as much as possible through new legislation to get the EPA more involved.

I bring this legislation to the floor for the third time in the last several days to try to pass it. I do so with the hopes that we can get this done tonight.

I thank my colleague from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, who has been cosponsoring and supporting this effort. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for working with us. We have been working for several weeks to get this cleared. Most recently, we had an issue with regard to legislation the Democrats wanted to add to it. I think we have now resolved those issues. I thank Robert Duncan of the floor staff for working so closely with us on this. I thank my colleague from Rhode Island, Senator WHITEHOUSE, for working with us. This is legislation which is both important and urgent.

This week marks the 1-year anniversary since the water supplies in Toledo, OH, had to be cut off because there were toxic algal blooms in the lake that were going into the water intake system. There were 500,000 people who were told they couldn't drink the water. It was a crisis. I was there. I was given bottled water along with others.

Unfortunately, this year we are seeing toxic algal blooms growing again. We are seeing it not just near the water intake valve for the city of Toledo but also near other water intake valves where 3 million Ohioans get their drinking water, from Lake Erie. By the way, about 8 million people from other States get water from Lake Erie, including Michigan and other States represented here in this Chamber.

I am also very concerned by the fact that we have other reservoirs in Ohio that are seeing increased levels of toxic algal blooms. This includes Grand Lakes St. Marys, Buckeye Lake, and it includes the reservoirs in Columbus.

It is time to ensure that we are doing everything we possibly can at the local, State, and Federal level to ensure that we can deal with this issue and that it can be resolved.

Finally, I will say this is not just about drinking water; it is also about the recreational value of these waterways, including Lake Erie, which is an incredibly important economic asset for the State of Ohio, our No. 1 destination for tourism. Having been on the lake a couple of weeks ago fishing, I will tell you that toxic algal blooms make a huge difference and create a real problem for the recreational value of fishing but also people being able to use the beaches, people being concerned about having their pets in the water, and people being concerned that their kids may not be safe even being close to these bodies of water.

We passed legislation previously to help get the Federal Government more involved. About a year ago, we passed legislation to get EPA but also NOAA—the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—USGS, and other Federal entities more involved and engaged and working together better.

We also passed legislation to try to help with regard to getting EPA to give us what the standards ought to be in terms of the drinking water.

Now it is time to pass this legislation that requires the EPA to put out a report on how to mitigate the problem and how to encourage the local community and incentivize the local community to do more in terms of ensuring that the intake valves are in the right place, ensuring that the treatment is done properly, and provide the good science and the best practices that only the EPA can provide to be able to help with regard to the very serious problem we face on Lake Erie and throughout the State of Ohio.

With that, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to H.R. 212, which is at the desk, and that the bill be read a third time and the Senate vote on passage of the bill with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 212) to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill (H.R. 212) was passed.

Mr. PORTMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

AMENDING THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT TO REAUTHORIZE THE NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 1523, the National Estuary Program, and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1523) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the Whitehouse amendment, which is at the desk, be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2639) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To modify the authorization of appropriations)

On page 3, line 17, strike "\$27,000,000" and insert "\$26,000,000".

The bill (S. 1523), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1523

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM RE-AUTHORIZATION; COMPETITIVE AWARDS.

Section 320 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330) is amended—

(1) in subsection (g), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Using the amounts made available under subsection (i)(2)(B), the Administrator shall make competitive awards under this paragraph.

“(B) APPLICATION FOR AWARDS.—The Administrator shall solicit applications for awards under this paragraph from State, interstate, and regional water pollution control agencies and entities, State coastal zone management agencies, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals.

“(C) SELECTION OF RECIPIENTS.—The Administrator shall select award recipients under this paragraph that, as determined by the Administrator, are best able to address urgent and challenging issues that threaten the ecological and economic well-being of coastal areas, including—

“(i) extensive seagrass habitat losses resulting in significant impacts on fisheries and water quality;

“(ii) recurring harmful algae blooms;

“(iii) unusual marine mammal mortalities;

“(iv) invasive exotic species that may threaten wastewater systems and cause other damage;

“(v) jellyfish proliferation limiting community access to water during peak tourism seasons;

“(vi) flooding that may be related to sea level rise or wetland degradation or loss; and

“(vii) low dissolved oxygen conditions in estuarine waters and related nutrient management.”; and

(2) by striking subsection (i) and inserting the following:

“(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator \$26,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020 for—

“(A) making grants and awards under subsection (g); and

“(B) expenses relating to the administration of grants or awards by the Administrator under this section, including the award and oversight of grants and awards, subject to the condition that such expenses may not exceed 5 percent of the amount appropriated under this subsection for a fiscal year.

“(2) ALLOCATIONS.—

“(A) CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Not less than 80 percent of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used by the Administrator for the development, implementation, and monitoring of each conservation and management plan eligible for grant assistance under subsection (g)(2).

“(B) COMPETITIVE AWARDS.—Not less than 15 percent of the amount made available under this subsection for a fiscal year shall be used by the Administrator for making competitive awards under subsection (g)(4).”.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for the way we have worked together. There was a slight toll to be paid on the majority side for getting the National Estuary Program passed, but it was one we could live with, and I think these are both good pieces of legislation. I am glad we were able to pass them together.

If I could just briefly read from an editorial that was recently published by the Westerly Sun. Westerly is one of Rhode Island's cities. The area that

Westerly is in is called South County, RI. There is a South County coastkeeper whose name is David Prescott, and he went out in a boat that belongs to an environmental group in Rhode Island called Save the Bay. He took some press folk down the Pawcatuck River with elected leaders from both Rhode Island and Connecticut.

I will read from the editorial:

Prescott shared a jarful of smelly green algae from the bottom of Little Narragansett Bay to illustrate how lawn fertilizer, engine oil and all manner of interesting items flushed down storm drains end up below the surface of what appears to be a bucolic setting around Watch Hill, Napatree Point and Sandy Point.

“If we went further up the watershed, we would actually see stuff that came right off the land, down the stormwater outfalls,” Prescott said. “This is the stuff that we know is in our developed areas. We see stuff such as oil and gas and grease and sand and trash and dog waste, and guess where it ends up? Eventually, it ends up here in the Pawcatuck River estuary and into Little Narragansett Bay.”

Based on his eight-year study of the river and bay area using water sampling, Prescott urged leaders from both states to heed Save the Bay's “call to action,” which would require developing stormwater management plans to better filter runoff, ensuring septic systems are regularly tested, encouraging homeowners to reduce or eliminate use of lawn fertilizers and pesticides, and enforcing “no-discharge” laws.

The newspaper concluded:

The Wood-Pawcatuck watershed, from Worden's Pond in South Kingstown to Watch Hill, filters the water in our aquifers and provides a quality of life many envy. We need to protect all aspects of our watershed and treat the Pawcatuck River and Little Narragansett Bay with more respect than has been shown over the decades.

I thank the Westerly Sun for those thoughts. I think they are very helpful. I am glad to have the chance to put them here into the record on the Senate floor.

The reason I read this is because the work of doing that upland planning that allows an estuary to be clean for swimming, fishing, boating, and all of the things that Rhode Islanders and our summer visitors enjoy, is through this National Estuary Program. It shows the common link of the algae problem David Prescott referred to with the algae problem Senator PORTMAN has seen in Ohio.

I thank DAVID VITTER, the Senator from Louisiana, for his cosponsorship of this and for his work to get this through the Environment and Public Works Committee with me. I also thank SHERROD BROWN for cosponsoring this legislation.

If I am not mistaken, there is the Old Woman Creek National Estuarine Research Reserve in Ohio, and this will help support the work of the Old Woman Creek National Estuarine Reserve. This is in Huron, OH, on the south-central shore of Lake Erie. It is

one of Ohio's few remaining examples of a natural estuary that transitions between land and water, with a variety of habitats, from marshes and swamps, to upland forests, open water, tributary streams, barrier beach, and near shores of Lake Erie.

I am pleased both of these measures have been able to proceed.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from Rhode Island. I was in support of his legislation. I am glad we got both bills done, and I appreciate the fact that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle realize the urgency of dealing with this blue-green algae issue, which in many cases has become a toxic algal bloom that affects our drinking water, affects recreation, and affects fishing, and it is a significant issue in my State and others.

CYBERSECURITY INFORMATION
SHARING ACT OF 2015—MOTION
TO PROCEED—Continued

TAX CODE REFORM

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, if I could, I want to report on something that happened this week. I see that the chair of the Finance Committee, Senator HATCH, is here, and he is aware of this. This week we had a bipartisan hearing of the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on an issue that is also urgent. It is one that is imminent because right now many U.S. companies are leaving our shores. This means that jobs and investments are leaving America and going to other countries. It is something all of us should be concerned about because it is rapidly accelerating. It is because of one simple reason: Washington, DC, refuses to reform our outdated and antiquated Tax Code. It is Washington's fault. Unfortunately, the brunt of it is being borne by workers across our country.

I would like to put into the RECORD my statement with regard to this hearing. It was a hearing where we were able to hear directly from companies about the impact of the Tax Code. We were able to bring in companies that have left the United States, requiring them to determine why they left. Unfortunately, it was eye-opening to the point that it requires us to deal with our broken Tax Code if we are going to retain jobs in this country, keep investment in this country, and be able to attract more jobs and investment to deal with our historically weak recovery in which we currently find ourselves.

Mr. President, I wish to address an issue that is critical to unleashing job creation and boosting wages in this country—and that is the need to reform our broken, outdated tax code.

This Congress, I took on a new role as chairman of the Senate's main investigative panel, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, PSI, where I serve alongside my colleague Senator CLAIRE MCCASKILL, the subcommittee's ranking member. Last week, PSI held a hearing specifically concerning how the U.S. tax code affects the market for corporate control. It is a topic that involves the jargon of corporate finance, but the impact is measured in U.S. jobs and wages. We see headlines every week about the loss of American business headquarters—more often than not, to a country with a more competitive corporate tax rate, it is not hard to find one, and territorial system of taxation.

Our tax code makes it hard to be an American company, and it puts U.S. workers at a disadvantage. At a 39 percent combined State and Federal rate, the United States has the highest corporate rate in the industrialized world. To add insult to injury our government taxes American businesses for the privilege of reinvesting their overseas profits here at home.

Economists tell us that the burden of corporate taxes falls principally on workers—in the former of lower wages and fewer job opportunities. I am afraid this has helped create a middle-class squeeze that has made it harder for working families to make ends meet. Yet as almost all of our competitors have cut their corporate rates and eliminated repatriation taxes, America has failed to reform its outdated, complex tax code.

As a result, American businesses are headed for the exits, at a loss of thousands of jobs. The unfortunate reality is that U.S. businesses are often much more valuable in the hands of foreign acquirers who can reduce their tax bills. I believe that is one reason why the value of foreign takeovers of U.S. companies doubled last year to \$275 billion, and are on track to surpass \$400 billion this year according to Dealogic, far outpacing the increase in overall global mergers and acquisitions.

We should be very clear that foreign investment in the United States is essential to economic growth—we need more of it. But a tax code that distorts ownership decisions by handicapping U.S. business is not good for our economy—and that is what we have today. What is happening is that the current tax system increasingly drives U.S. businesses into the hands of those best able to reduce their tax liabilities, not necessarily those best equipped to create jobs and increase wages here at home. That is bad for American workers and bad for our long-term competitiveness as a country.

To better understand the trend and inform legislative debate on tax reform, PSI decided to take a hard look at this issue. Over the past couple months, the subcommittee reviewed

more than a dozen recent major foreign acquisitions of U.S. companies and mergers in which U.S. firms relocated overseas. This was a bipartisan project every step of the way with Senator MCCASKILL, and I am very grateful for that.

Last week's hearing was the culmination of that work. And we heard directly from both U.S. companies that have felt the tax-driven pressures to move offshore and from foreign corporations whose tax advantages have turbocharged their growth by acquisition.

Among the U.S. business leaders we heard from was Jim Koch, the founder and chairman of Boston Beer Company, maker of Sam Adams. At a U.S. market share between 1 percent to 2 percent each, Sam Adams and Pennsylvania-based Yuengling are actually the first and second largest U.S.-based brewers left. All of the great American beer companies—Miller, Coors, and Anheuser-Busch—are now foreign-owned. And Mr. Koch testified that if we fail to reform our tax code, his company could be next.

He explained that he regularly gets offers from investment bankers to facilitate a sale, at double-digit premiums, to a foreign acquirer who can dramatically reduce his tax bill from the 39 percent rate his company now pays. Mr. Koch said he can decline those attractive offers because he owns a majority of his company's voting shares. But when he is gone, he believes that company will be driven by financial pressure to sell.

We also heard from the longtime CEO of the pharmaceutical company Allergan, David Pyott. Allergan was purchased by the Irish acquirer Actavis last year for \$70 billion after a year-long takeover pursuit by Canadian business, Valeant Pharmaceuticals. Mr. Pyott estimated that foreign acquirers pursuing Allergan had about a \$9 billion valuation advantage over what would have been possible for an American company, "simply because they could reduce Allergan's tax bill and gain access to its more than \$2.5 billion in locked-out overseas earnings." Mr. Pyott testified that Allergan would be an independent American company today if it weren't for our tax code. Instead, Allergan is now headquartered in Ireland and Mr. Pyott projects that the new ownership will cut about 1,500 jobs, mostly in California.

To better understand the tax-driven advantages enjoyed by foreign acquirers, PSI took a look at Quebec-based Valeant Pharmaceuticals. Over the past 4 years, Valeant has managed to acquire more than a dozen U.S. companies worth more than \$30 billion. The subcommittee reviewed key documents to understand how tax advantages affected Valeant's three largest acquisitions to date, including the 2013 sale of

New York-based eye care firm Bausch & Lomb and the 2015 sale of the North Carolina-based drug maker Salix.

We learned that, in those two transactions alone, Valeant determined that it could shave more than \$3 billion off the target companies' tax bills by integrating them into its Canada-based corporate group. Those tax savings meant that Valeant's investments in its American targets would have higher returns and pay for themselves more quickly—two key drivers of the deals. The three recent Valeant acquisitions we studied resulted in a loss of about 2,300 U.S. jobs, plus a loss of about \$16 million per year of contract manufacturing that was moved from the U.S. to Canada and the UK.

Beyond inbound acquisitions, America is also losing corporate headquarters through mergers in which U.S. businesses relocate overseas. The latest news is the U.S. agricultural business Monsanto's proposed \$45 billion merger with its European counterpart Syngenta; a key part of that proposed deal is a new global corporate headquarters—not in the U.S., but in London.

To better understand this trend, the subcommittee examined the 2014 merger of Burger King with the Canadian coffee-and-donut chain Tim Hortons—an \$11.4 billion tie-up that sent Burger King's corporate headquarters north of the border. Our review showed that Burger King had strong business reasons to team up with Tim Hortons. But the record shows that when deciding where to locate the new headquarters of the combined company, tax considerations flatly ruled out the U.S. And it wasn't about the domestic tax rates—it was about international taxation.

At the time, Burger King estimated that pulling Tim Hortons into the worldwide U.S. tax net, rather than relocating to Canada, would destroy up to \$5.5 billion in value over just 5 years—\$5.5 billion in an \$11 billion deal. Think about that. The company concluded it was necessary to put the headquarters in a country that would allow it to reinvest overseas earnings back in the U.S. and Canada without an additional tax hit. They ultimately chose Tim Hortons' home base of Canada because their territorial system of taxation allowed them to do just that.

If there is a villain in these stories, it is the U.S. tax code. And if there is a failure, it is Washington's. Our job is to give our workers the best shot at competing in the global marketplace and yet we haven't reformed the tax code in decades while other countries have.

That fact is that if Washington fails to reform our tax code, foreign acquirers will do it for us—one American company at a time. And rather than more jobs and higher wages, we will continue to see a loss of U.S.-headquartered businesses and jobs.

With the deck stacked against American companies, I believe the solution is clear. We need a full overhaul of our current tax code. Cut both the individual and corporate rates to 25 percent, pay for the cuts by eliminating loopholes, and move to a competitive international system. Unfortunately, in our current political environment, that is simply not possible to do immediately. However, I do believe that we can take a positive first step towards reform this fall.

A big part of that first step is included in a bipartisan framework for international tax reform that Senator SCHUMER and I released last month. That includes 1) a move to an international tax system that doesn't provide disincentives for companies to bring their money home from overseas to invest in growing their business and hiring more workers; 2) a patent box to keep highly mobile intellectual property and the high-paying jobs that go with developing that property in the U.S.; and 3) sensible base erosion protections that discourage companies from doing business in tax haven jurisdictions.

I believe it should also include a tax extenders package that makes a lot of our current tax extenders permanent. I think that we can all agree that temporary tax policy is bad tax policy—and whether it is giving families certainty that there is going to be a mortgage insurance premium deduction, small businesses certainty that there is going to be expanded section 179 expensing, or innovative companies assurances that there is going to be an R&D credit, I believe that making these policies permanent would provide a big boost to our economy.

In fact, yesterday, the Joint Committee on Taxation found that the short-term extenders package passed by the Senate Finance Committee last month would create \$10.4 billion in dynamic tax revenue. Imagine the growth if those were made permanent?

If we don't start to take steps to reform our code now, I am worried that we are going to turn around in a couple of years and say, "what happened? Where did our jobs go? What happened to the American tax base?" If we do get to that place, we will have no one to blame but ourselves.

I thank the Chair for his indulgence this evening.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 272 through 295 and all the nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Air Force, Army, and Navy and that the commerce committee be discharged from further consideration of PN601 and PN641; that all the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. David S. Baldwin

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Aaron M. Prupas

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment as the Chief of Staff of the Army and appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 3033:

To be general

Gen. Mark A. Milley

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment as Chief of Naval Operations and appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5033:

To be admiral

Adm. John M. Richardson

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be brigadier general

Col. Christopher P. Azzano

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Commandant of the Marine Corps and appointment in the United States Marine Corps to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5043:

To be general

Lt. Gen. Robert B. Neller

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Air Force to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Theron G. Davis

IN THE ARMY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. John M. Murray

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Anthony R. Ierardi

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Garrett S. Yee

The following named officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 12203:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Patrick J. Reinert

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of admiral in the United States Navy while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601, and title 50, U.S.C., section 2511:

To be admiral

Vice Adm. James F. Caldwell, Jr.

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Joseph P. Aucoin

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., section 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Cedric E. Pringle

IN THE ARMY

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Colonel Brett W. Andersen
Colonel Wallace S. Bonds
Colonel John C. Boyd
Colonel David L. Boyle
Colonel Mark N. Brown
Colonel Robert D. Burke
Colonel Thomas M. Carden, Jr.
Colonel Patrick J. Center
Colonel Laura L. Clellan
Colonel Johanna P. Clyborne
Colonel Alan C. Cranford
Colonel Anita K.W. Curington

Colonel Darrell D. Darnbush
Colonel Aaron R. Dean, II
Colonel Damian T. Donahoe
Colonel John H. Edwards, Jr.
Colonel Lee M. Ellis
Colonel Pablo Estrada, Jr.
Colonel James R. Finley
Colonel Thomas C. Fisher
Colonel Lapthe C. Flora
Colonel Michael S. Funk
Colonel Michael J. Garshak
Colonel Harrison B. Gilliam
Colonel Michael J. Glisson
Colonel Wallace A. Hall, Jr.
Colonel Kenneth S. Hara
Colonel Marcus R. Hatley
Colonel Gregory J. Hirsch
Colonel John E. Hoefert
Colonel Lee W. Hopkins
Colonel Lyndon C. Johnson
Colonel Russell D. Johnson
Colonel Peter S. Kaye
Colonel Jesse J. Kirchmeier
Colonel Richard C. Knowlton
Colonel Martin A. Lafferty
Colonel Edwin W. Larkin
Colonel Bruce C. Linton
Colonel Kevin D. Lyons
Colonel Robert B. McCastlain
Colonel Mark D. McCormack
Colonel Marshall T. Michels
Colonel Michael A. Mitchell
Colonel Shawn M. O'Brien
Colonel David F. O'Donahue
Colonel John O. Payne
Colonel Troy R. Phillips
Colonel Rafael A. Ribas
Colonel Edward D. Richards
Colonel Hamilton D. Richards
Colonel John W. Schroeder
Colonel Scott C. Sharp
Colonel Cary A. Shillcutt
Colonel Bennett E. Singer
Colonel Raymond G. Strawbridge
Colonel Tracey J. Trautman
Colonel Suzanne P. Vares-Lum
Colonel David N. Vesper
Colonel Clint E. Walker
Colonel James B. Waskom
Colonel Michael J. Willis
Colonel Kurtis J. Winstead
Colonel David E. Wood

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. Laura L. Yeager

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be brigadier general

Col. William J. Edwards

The following Army National Guard of the United States officer for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Robert W. Enzenauer

The following Army National Guard of the United States officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army to the grade indicated under title 10, U.S.C., sections 12203 and 12211:

To be major general

Brigadier General Randy A. Alewel
Brigadier General Craig E. Bennett

Brigadier General Allen E. Brewer
Brigadier General Brian R. Copes
Brigadier General Benjamin J. Corell
Brigadier General Peter L. Corey
Brigadier General Steven Ferrari
Brigadier General Ralph H. Groover, III
Brigadier General William A. Hall
Brigadier General Brian C. Harris
Brigadier General Richard J. Hayes, Jr.
Brigadier General Samuel L. Henry
Brigadier General Barry D. Keeling
Brigadier General Keith A. Klemmer
Brigadier General William J. Lieder
Brigadier General Dana L. McDaniel
Brigadier General Rafael O'Ferrall
Brigadier General Joanne F. Sheridan

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named officer for appointment as Commander, Marine Forces Reserve, and appointment to the grade indicated in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 5144:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Rex C. McMillian

The following named officer for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general in the United States Marine Corps while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Robert R. Ruark

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C. section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Lt. Gen. Samuel D. Cox

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Gina M. Grosso

IN THE NAVY

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Navy to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Paul A. Grosklags

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

IN THE AIR FORCE

PN608 AIR FORCE nomination of Jesse L. Johnson, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 24, 2015.

PN665 AIR FORCE nomination of Jose M. Goyos, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 15, 2015.

PN691 AIR FORCE nomination of John C. Boston, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN692 AIR FORCE nomination of John A. Christ, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN720 AIR FORCE nomination of Richard H. Fillman, Jr., which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

IN THE ARMY

PN250 ARMY nomination of Thomas M. Cherepko which as received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of March 4, 2015.

PN417 ARMY nomination of Eric R. Davis, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of April 28, 2015.

PN693 ARMY nomination of Stephen T. Wolpert, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN694 ARMY nomination of Jenifer E. Hey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN695 ARMY nomination of Michael R. Starkey, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN696 ARMY nomination of Deepa Hariprasad, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN697 ARMY nomination of Dale T. Waltman, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN698 ARMY nominations (26) beginning VINCENT E. BUGGS, and ending JAMES M. ZEPP, III, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN699 ARMY nominations (216) beginning SHONTELLE C. ADAMS, and ending JOSEPH S. ZUFFANTI, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN700 ARMY nominations (66) beginning ANDREA C. ALICEA, and ending GIOVANNY F. ZALAMAR, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN701 ARMY nominations (263) beginning ERIC B. ABDUL, and ending SARA I. ZOESCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN702 ARMY nominations (185) beginning GARY S. ANSELMO, and ending JOHN G. ZIERDT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN721 ARMY nominations (3) beginning DEAN R. KLENZ, and ending JAMES J. RICHE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN722 ARMY nominations (2) beginning RICHARD L. BAILEY, and ending KENNETH S. SHEDAROWICH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN723 ARMY nominations (21) beginning WILLIAM ANDINO, and ending CHRISTOPHER P. WILLARD, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN724 ARMY nominations (47) beginning DAVID B. ANDERSON, and ending CARL W. THURMOND, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN725 ARMY nominations (5) beginning JERRY G. BAUMGARTNER, and ending MAURI M. THOMAS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN726 ARMY nominations (22) beginning ELIZABETH A. ANDERSON, and ending MARGARET L. YOUNG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN727 ARMY nominations (12) beginning TONTA M. CROWLEY, and ending CHERYL M. K. ZEISE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN728 ARMY nominations (6) beginning JENNIFER M. AHRENS, and ending TODD W. TRAVER, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN729 ARMY nominations (24) beginning RAMIE K. BARFUSS, and ending DENTONIO WORRELL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN730 ARMY nominations (119) beginning DAVID J. ADAM, and ending VICTORY Y. YU, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN731 ARMY nominations (7) beginning APRIL CRITELLI, and ending GREGG A. VIGEANT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN732 ARMY nominations (9) beginning THOMAS F. CALDWELL, and ending BRONSON B. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN733 ARMY nominations (3) beginning CAROL L. COPPOCK, and ending MARIE N. WRIGHT, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN734 ARMY nominations (3) beginning NORMAN S. CHUN, and ending HARRY W. HATCH, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

PN735 ARMY nominations (11) beginning LAVETTA L. BENNETT, and ending CRAIG W. STRONG, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

PN703 NAVY nomination of Audry T. Oxley, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN704 NAVY nomination of Mark B. Lyles, which was received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN705 NAVY nominations (4) beginning RUSSELL P. BATES, and ending HORACIO G. TAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN706 NAVY nominations (24) beginning SYLVESTER C. ADAMAH, and ending CHADWICK D. WHITE, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN707 NAVY nominations (46) beginning RUBEN A. ALCOCER, and ending MELISSIA A. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN708 NAVY nominations (50) beginning ACCURSIA A. BALDASSANO, and ending JACQUELINE R. WILLIAMS, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN709 NAVY nominations (18) beginning JASON S. AYEROFF, and ending BRENT E. TROYAN, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN710 NAVY nominations (50) beginning JERRY J. BAILEY, and ending ERIN R. WILFONG, which nominations were received

by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN711 NAVY nominations (21) beginning WILLIAM M. ANDERSON, and ending JEFFREY R. WESSEL, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

PN712 NAVY nominations (95) beginning MARIA A. ALAVANJA, and ending VINCENT A. I. ZIZAK, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of July 23, 2015.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officer for appointment as Vice Commandant, United States Coast Guard, and to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 47:

To be vice admiral

Vice Adm. Charles D. Michel

The following named officer for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14, U.S.C., section 211(a)(2):

To be lieutenant commander

Stephen R. Bird

NOMINATION OF DAVID HALE TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

NOMINATION OF ATUL KESHAP TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALDIVES

NOMINATION OF ALAINA B. TEPLITZ TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NEPAL

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM A. HEIDT TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA

NOMINATION OF GLYN TOWNSEND DAVIES TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND

NOMINATION OF JENNIFER ZIMDAHL GALT TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mongolia

NOMINATION OF SHEILA GWALTNEY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kyrgyz Republic

NOMINATION OF PERRY L. HOLLOWAY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana

NOMINATION OF KATHLEEN ANN DOHERTY TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cyprus

NOMINATION OF HANS G. KLEMM TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania

NOMINATION OF JAMES DESMOND MELVILLE, JR., TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Estonia

NOMINATION OF PETER F. MULREAN TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Haiti

NOMINATION OF LAURA FARNSWORTH DOGU TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua

NOMINATION OF PAUL WAYNE JONES TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland

NOMINATION OF MICHELE THOREN BOND TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS)

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 264, and 265; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of David Hale, of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan; Atul Keshap, of Virginia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Maldives; Alaina B. Teplitz, of Illinois, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal; William A. Heidt, of Pennsylvania, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Cambodia; Glyn Townsend Davies, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand; Jennifer Zimdahl Galt, of Colorado, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Mongolia; Sheila Gwaltney, of California, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the

United States of America to the Kyrgyz Republic; Perry L. Holloway, of South Carolina, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Co-operative Republic of Guyana; Kathleen Ann Doherty, of New York, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Cyprus; Hans G. Klemm, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Romania; James Desmond Melville, Jr., of New Jersey, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Haiti; Laura Farnsworth Dogu, of Texas, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Nicaragua; Paul Wayne Jones, of Maryland, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Career Minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland; and Michele Thoren Bond, of the District of Columbia, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be an Assistant Secretary of State (Consular Affairs)?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF RAFAEL J. LOPEZ TO BE COMMISSIONER ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

NOMINATION OF MONICA C. REGALBUTO TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT)

NOMINATION OF JONATHAN ELKIND TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS)

NOMINATION OF ERIC MARTIN SATZ TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

NOMINATION OF GREGORY GUY NADEAU TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

NOMINATION OF DENISE TURNER ROTH TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES

NOMINATION OF JOYCE LOUISE CONNERY TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

NOMINATION OF JOSEPH BRUCE HAMILTON TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

NOMINATION OF MARIE THERESE DOMINGUEZ TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 211, 216, 249, 251, 254, 255, 270, 271; that the commerce committee be discharged from further consideration of PN524 and that the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on all of the nominations en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Rafael J. Lopez, of California, to be Commissioner on Children, Youth, and Families, Department of Health and Human Services; Monica C. Regalbuto, of Illinois, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Environmental Management); Jonathan Elkind, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (International Affairs); Eric Martin Satz, of Tennessee, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee

Valley Authority for a term expiring May 18, 2018; Gregory Guy Nadeau, of Maine, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration; Denise Turner Roth, of North Carolina, to be Administrator of General Services; Joyce Louise Connery, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for a term expiring October 18, 2019; Joseph Bruce Hamilton, of Texas, to be a Member of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board for the remainder of the term expiring October 18, 2016; and Marie Therese Dominguez, of Virginia, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATION OF KRISTEN MARIE KULINOWSKI TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

NOMINATION OF VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

NOMINATION OF VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the following nominations en bloc: Calendar Nos. 250, 252, and 253; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Kristen Marie Kulinowski, of New York, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years; Vanessa Lorraine Allen Sutherland, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board for a term of five years; and Vanessa Lorraine Allen Sutherland, of Virginia, to be Chairperson of the Chemical Safety and Haz-

ard Investigation Board for a term of five years?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 5 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination: Calendar No. 82, Roseann Ketchmark to be U.S. District Judge; that there be 30 minutes for debate on the nomination equally divided in the usual form; that upon the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—NOMINATIONS IN STATUS QUO

Mr. McCONNELL. As in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that all the nominations received by the Senate during the 114th Congress, first session, remain in status quo, notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXXI, paragraph 6, of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate H. Con. Res. 72, which was received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) providing for a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives and a conditional recess or adjournment of the Senate.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements related to the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 72) was agreed to, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 72

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That when the House adjourns on any legislative day from Tuesday, August 4, 2015, through Friday, September 4, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns on any day from Tuesday, August 4, 2015, through Saturday, September 5, 2015, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, or such other time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until the time of any reassembly pursuant to section 3 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. (a) The Speaker or his designee, after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the House to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the House adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the House shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 3. (a) The Majority Leader of the Senate or his designee, after concurrence with the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the Senate to reassemble at such place and time as he may designate if, in his opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

(b) After reassembling pursuant to subsection (a), when the Senate adjourns on a motion offered pursuant to this subsection by its Majority Leader or his designee, the Senate shall again stand adjourned pursuant to the first section of this concurrent resolution.

SIGNING AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the junior Senator from West Virginia, the junior Senator from Arkansas, and the junior Senator from Missouri be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or joint resolutions today through September 8, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPOINTMENTS AUTHORITY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the upcoming adjournment of the Senate, the President of the Sen-

ate, the President pro tempore, and the majority and minority leaders be authorized to make appointments to commissions, committees, boards, conferences or interparliamentary conferences authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses or by order of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT REFERRAL—NOMINATION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, as in executive session, the nomination of Michael Herman Michaud, of Maine, to be Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training, sent to the Senate by the President, be referred jointly to the HELP and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to finish this speech regardless of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINANCE COMMITTEE'S REPORT ON ITS INVESTIGATION OF THE IRS

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, earlier today, the Senate Finance Committee finally and at long last issued its report on its bipartisan investigation of the IRS's treatment of organizations applying for tax-exempt status.

As you will recall, this investigation began 2 years and 2 months ago after we became aware of allegations that the IRS had targeted certain organizations for extra and undue scrutiny based on the groups' names and political views.

These were serious allegations. Indeed, they struck at the very heart of the principle—one that everyone should agree on—that our Nation's tax laws should be administered fairly and without regard to politics or partisanship. Despite the inherently political nature of these allegations, the Finance Committee, which has exclusive legislative jurisdiction and primary oversight jurisdiction over the IRS, immediately opened a full bipartisan investigation into this matter.

The investigation officially began on May 21, 2013, under the direction of former Chairman Max Baucus and myself, when I was the ranking member. When Senator WYDEN assumed the leadership of the committee last year, he agreed to continue the bipartisan work we had begun, and I am very grateful to him. This bipartisan cooperation has continued unabated since I became chairman in January of this year. That investigation concludes today with the release of our report.

While much has been reported about the IRS's political targeting over the

last 2 years, it is important to note that the Senate Finance Committee has conducted the only bipartisan investigation into the matter. Consequently, I believe the report we have issued today will serve as the definitive account of the personal political biases, management failures, and other factors that led the IRS to unfairly target certain organizations applying for tax-exempt status.

Once again, the public has a right to expect that the IRS will administer the Tax Code with integrity and fairness in every context. Yet, for many conservative organizations that applied for tax-exempt status during the last 5 years, the IRS fell woefully short of that standard. The committee's bipartisan report examined these events in great detail.

Let's take a look at what we now know after 2 years of exhaustive investigation. We know that the White House's focus on activities of tax-exempt organizations intensified after the Supreme Court issued its Citizens United decision in January 2010, culminating in many ways with President Obama's wrongheaded castigation of the Court in his State of the Union Address and continuing throughout 2010 until the midterm elections.

The Finance Committee's report contains clear evidence that the IRS and other agencies heeded the President's call. For example, just a few weeks after the President's speech before Congress, the IRS made a pivotal decision to set aside all incoming tea party applications for special processing—a decision that would subject these organizations to long delays, burdensome questions, and would ultimately prove fatal to some of their applications.

Around that same time, the Department of Justice was considering whether it could bring criminal charges against 501(c)(4) organizations that engaged in political activities. The Federal Election Commission had also opened investigations into conservative organizations that aired political ads.

The IRS met with both agencies, providing input on the proposals of Department of Justice and information to the Federal Election Commission on organizations that were under investigation. These actions leave little doubt that, when Congress did not pass legislation to reduce spending on political speech, the administration sought alternative ways to accomplish the same goal.

Regardless of whether an explicit directive was given, the President gave the order to target conservative groups at every opportunity—the State of the Union, in press conferences, and in TV interviews. He did not send a smoking gun email because he did not need to. He gave the order for everyone to hear, and his political allies at the IRS followed those orders.

The report clearly shows that conservative groups were singled out because of their political beliefs, and gross mismanagement at the IRS allowed this practice to continue for years.

We know the IRS systematically selected tea party and other conservative organizations for heightened scrutiny, in a manner wholly different from how the IRS processed applications submitted by left-leaning and nonpartisan organizations. Although the IRS knew that the tea party applications were too dissimilar to be grouped under a common template, it continued to segregate them for screening and processing based on the presence of certain key words or phrases in the applicants' names or applications, such as "Tea Party," "9/12," and "Patriots," as well as indicators of political views that included being concerned with government debt, government spending or taxes, educating the public via advocacy, lobbying "to make America a better place to live" or being critical of how the country was being run.

Some tried to mitigate these facts, claiming that the IRS similarly targeted left-leaning groups. Indeed, this argument is posited in the additional Democratic views.

However, as our investigation made clear, the IRS's treatment of conservative organizations was without question different from that given to left-leaning and nonpartisan organizations.

True enough, some liberal organizations were also denied tax-exempt status during this period. However, with one exception that affected just two organizations, all left-leaning organizations that were, according to the Democratic views, improperly treated had participated in activities that legitimately called their tax-exempt status into question.

The IRS did not target these groups based on their names or ideology. Instead, it evaluated their actual activities that were known to the IRS—activities that, in many cases, properly resulted in denial or revocation of tax-exempt status.

That same deference and attention to detail was not offered to tea party groups and other organizations. As a result, many of the tea party applicant groups gave up on the process, and some of these groups ceased to exist entirely, based, at least in part, on the failure to obtain tax-exempt status.

Once again, we know all this happened. It is spelled out in great detail in the committee's report. On top of all of this, our investigation revealed an environment at the IRS where the political bias of individual employees such as Lois Lerner—who was, once again, the Director of the Exempt Organizations unit—was allowed to influence agency decisionmaking.

The IRS's upper management gave Ms. Lerner free rein to manage applica-

tions for tax-exempt status. During our investigation, the Finance Committee found evidence that Lerner's personal political views directly resulted in disparate treatment for applicants affiliated with the tea party and other conservative causes.

Ms. Lerner orchestrated a process that subjected applicants to multiple levels of review by numerous components within the IRS, thereby ensuring they would suffer long delays and be required to answer burdensome and unnecessary questions. Lerner showed little concern for conservative applicants, even when Members of Congress inquired on their behalf, allowing their applications to languish in the IRS bureaucracy for as long as 2 years with little or no action. The IRS began to resolve these applications only after some of the problems became public in 2012, but, of course, by that time the damage had been done.

Our investigation also uncovered a pattern at the IRS of continually misleading Congress about its handling of applications submitted by tea party organizations. Specifically, top IRS officials, including Doug Shulman, Steve Miller, and, of course, Lois Lerner, made numerous misrepresentations to Congress in 2012 and 2013 regarding the IRS's mistreatment of these groups. As if that wasn't bad enough, the IRS impeded congressional investigations—including our investigation—by failing to properly preserve a significant portion of Ms. Lerner's emails and then concealing the fact that the emails had been lost from the committee for months.

Long before these allegations surfaced, the IRS was already one of the most feared and loathed agencies of the Federal Government. Virtually all Americans had some level of either apprehension or animosity toward the IRS, due in large part to the power it had to impact the lives of everyday, hard-working taxpayers. Then, beginning at least in 2010, if not sooner, the IRS made things even worse, demonstrating a pattern of incompetence, mismanagement, political bias, and obstruction toward congressional oversight. As a result, the agency has in many respects lost the public's confidence.

There is a lot of work that needs to be done if the agency is ever going to restore that confidence and regain the public's trust. I believe the Finance Committee's report gives the best account we have of how that trust was broken. It spells out in great detail the organizational and personnel problems that plagued the agency and allowed partisan agendas and political tribalism to influence important decisions. I hope all of my colleagues will take the time to examine this report and its findings. The report itself is over 400 pages long and includes roughly 5,000 pages of additional supporting docu-

ments. In other words, all of my colleagues have a lot of reading to do over the August recess. I hope we will take a close look at the events detailed in the report and come together to work on legislative solutions that will prevent this kind of misconduct from happening again in the future.

In closing, I want to acknowledge the hard work and countless hours of time spent by the Finance Committee staff who worked on this report. All told, they conducted over 30 exhaustive interviews and reviewed more than 1.5 million pages of documents. They also drafted numerous versions of this report and performed countless other tasks necessary to bring this investigation to a close. The bipartisan committee staff whose diligence and devotion to duty made this investigation and report possible include the following: John Angell, Kimberly Brandt, John Carlo, Austin Coon, Michael Evans, Daniel Goshorn, Christopher Law, Jim Lyons, Todd Metcalf, Harrison Moore, Mark Prater and Tiffany Smith. All of them deserve our gratitude for the work they have put in.

I also thank former Chairman Baucus for his work in starting this investigation, as well as my colleague Senator WYDEN, who once again continued to work with us in a bipartisan fashion to get us to this point. I personally appreciate both of those gentlemen very much. I have to say it wasn't easy for them to sit through some of this stuff. Nevertheless, it has been a privilege to work with them.

This is the first of a number of speeches I will probably give on this subject. Hopefully it gives everybody a little bit of an understanding as to why we are so upset and a little bit of understanding about the report we have issued today and have put on the Web page.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished chairman from Utah. As Members will see from the views I am going to articulate, we have some strong differences about how the facts ought to be interpreted, but we worked very closely together to ensure that there would be one bipartisan compilation of the underlying facts. The two of us certainly agree that there is evidence of vast bureaucratic bumbling at the IRS.

I will also say that a review of 1.5 million pages of emails and documents and interviews with more than 30 IRS officials does not point to a single shred of political interference. I think as colleagues look at particularly the majority views and the minority views—set them aside for a moment; the fact is, the facts of the report show that no order—no order was ever given to target political groups.

I am very pleased that we now have a bipartisan report that was conducted

here in the Congress. That is why the bipartisan findings are especially important. As I have stated, the findings contain absolutely no evidence to support the narrative that has been advanced by other committees and some in the media that tea party groups were targeted by the IRS because of their political views.

My own view is that groups on the progressive side and groups on the conservative side—both of them were handled in a fashion that was unacceptable. Both were handled badly. So as we kind of get into these issues—as I say, I think it was a very thorough and professional effort that was conducted to get at the facts. I want to kind of set the stage with some background.

Under our Federal tax laws, people can establish various types of tax-exempt groups. There are different rules for each type. Under Section 501(c)(4), an organization can be established as a social welfare organization. One of the rules for these social welfare organizations is they have to be operated exclusively for social welfare purposes. That has been interpreted since 1959 to mean, among other things, that the organization can engage in some political campaign activity, but that cannot be its primary activity. There is no precise meaning of “primary” for this purpose, and exactly what constitutes “political campaign activity” is similarly unclear.

Another type of tax-exempt organization is established under section 527. A 527 organization can engage in an unlimited amount of political campaign activity, but there is an important distinction because a 527 organization has to disclose the identity of its donors.

Finally, the type of tax-exempt entity Americans are most familiar with—501(c)(3)s are not allowed to engage in any political campaign activity.

So now, with that as some legal background, let's unpack the events we looked at.

In February of 2010, the IRS Exempt Organizations Determinations Office, located in Cincinnati, began processing the first application for 501(c)(4) status from a tea party group. Before long, the office was—as one IRS employee was quoted as saying, they were inundated with applications from tea party groups, other conservative groups, and some progressive-leaning organizations. The additional Republican views estimate that a total of 547 applications were the focus of our investigation; 65 percent were from tea party or conservative groups; 19 percent were from progressive organizations. To the IRS employees in the tax-exempt organizations division, these applications raised questions about whether the organizations were planning to engage in more political campaign activity than the 501(c)(4) law allowed.

We also tried to assess the cause of the surge in applications, and I think it

would be fair to say no one really knows what was behind that. It may have been related to the Supreme Court's Citizens United decision in January of 2010 which knocked down some of the key limits on political campaign spending. It may have been related to the rise in citizen activism embodied in the tea party movement, the Occupy movement. In any event, there was a surge in applications.

Now let's fast forward to May of 2013. At the conclusion of her remarks at an American Bar Association conference, the Director of the IRS tax-exempt organizations division, Lois Lerner, disclosed that IRS employees had selected 501(c)(4) applications by groups with terms like “tea party” and “patriot” in their name for further reviews. She stated that the IRS employees had done so simply because the applications had those names in the title. Lerner described this process of selecting cases for review because of a particular name as “wrong,” “insensitive,” “inappropriate.”

A few days later, the Treasury Inspector General For Tax Administration, who is known as TIGTA, released a report finding that the IRS “used inappropriate criteria that identified for rebuke Tea Party and other organizations applying for tax-exempt status based on their names or policy positions instead of indications of potential political campaign intervention.”

At the time of these disclosures from the IRS and the inspector general, there was a very serious concern that the singling out of conservative groups by name may have been a consequence of political bias or motivation on the part of IRS employees, possibly at the direction of political appointees at the IRS, the Treasury Department, or the White House. Although the inspector general report found no evidence of political bias or targeting by the IRS, this was obviously a serious matter.

The then-chairman of the Finance Committee, Chairman Baucus, and the then-ranking member of the committee, now our chairman, Senator HATCH, began an in-depth, bipartisan investigation to assess the facts. The investigation continued after I became chairman of the committee, and it has gone forward under Chairman HATCH this year. So our bipartisan inquiry has been underway for more than 2 years. In the course of the investigation, the bipartisan committee staff has reviewed more than 1.5 million pages of documents and interviewed 32 witnesses.

At the committee's request, the inspector general has undertaken several related but separate investigations. The results of the investigation are in the report the Finance Committee submitted to the Senate today. That consists of a bipartisan report prepared by the committee staff and represents the views of Chairman HATCH and myself;

additional views of Chairman HATCH's prepared by the majority staff, which I will refer to as the additional Republican views; and my own additional views, prepared by the minority staff, which I will refer to as the additional Democratic views.

In total, the principal parts of the report are 318 pages long, plus a 90-page chronology of events and another 5,000 or so pages of attached exhibits.

I certainly hope the report is going to clear away some of the smoke and cut through some of the rhetoric to ensure that all sides can see what really happened. The report also makes a series of recommendations, including bipartisan recommendations, about how to initiate reforms going forward.

I would like to now describe the main conclusions that I draw from the report. First and foremost, the IRS's handling of this matter was an unmitigated bureaucratic disaster. There were some extenuating circumstances.

The Citizens United decision had opened the floodgates to millions of dollars flowing into political activities, with 501(c)(4) organizations seeming to be one of the favored vehicles. As a result, the IRS was facing a dramatic increase in the number and complexity of applications for 501(c)(4) status. At the same time, the IRS was working with vague regulatory standards that have not been updated since 1959. So the staff at the IRS exempt organizations division has one tough job. They were racing against a late-model Mustang in a 1959 jalopy.

Even taking that into account, the IRS handled the situation badly. Essentially, the IRS froze. The bipartisan report shows that for more than 2 years, officials in the tax-exempt organizations division in both Cincinnati and Washington failed to develop a good system for processing 501(c)(4) applications that seemed to present issues about the group's potential involvement in political campaign activity.

During that time, the IRS staff and managers tried a variety of different approaches. They asked one of their experts on tax-exempt organization law to focus on two test cases—in effect, models. That took more than 8 months, and nothing really came of it.

Then they set up task forces, and they tried what has come to be known as the infamous BOLO or “be on the lookout” list. They tried to get more information from applicants by asking a long list of detailed questions. This approach actually backfired because of the volume and the inappropriate nature of the questions.

The bumbling and the bureaucratic paralysis just went on and on. By my count, there were seven different efforts over more than 2 years to figure out how to handle these applications, and the first six were for naught. By December 2011, a total of 290 applications for 501(c)(4) status had been set

aside for further review. Two of these applications have been successfully resolved, not 202. It wasn't until the late spring of 2012—more than 26 months after the first tea party application had arrived in Cincinnati—that the IRS finally started to get its act together, setting up a triage group that was able to work through the backlog of applications more quickly.

This process could and should have been handled better. Senior IRS leadership should have recognized or been made aware of the problem and should have stepped in much earlier to develop a system that provided fair and expeditious processing of these applications.

In light of all of this, the bipartisan report concludes that “between 2010 and 2013, the IRS failed to fulfill its obligation to administer the tax law with integrity and fairness to all.”

At a time of rising political activity and under increased political scrutiny and pressure after the Citizens United decision:

Senior IRS executives, including Lerner, failed to properly manage political advocacy cases with the sensitivity and promptness that the applicants deserve. Other employees in the IRS failed to handle the cases with a proper level of urgency, which was symptomatic of the overall culture within the IRS where customer service was not prioritized.

These are all findings of the bipartisan report.

Further, and I wish to make this clear, most of the applications caught up in this mismanagement were tea party or other conservative groups, including in some cases small and relatively unsophisticated groups who didn't have the resources to engage in a protracted review with the IRS. And I think we ought to make no mistake about it—these groups deserve much better treatment from their government.

If there is any good news in all of this, the Democratic view notes that there have been some positive steps. Four key employees in the IRS who failed to manage properly have been removed from their positions, the backlog of applications has largely been eliminated, and all but 10 of the applications have now been resolved.

The bipartisan report recommends several further steps that should be taken. It makes 16 recommendations, including such reforms promulgating objective criteria to trigger special review, prohibiting requests for donor lists, creating a position in the taxpayer advocate dedicated to assisting applicants for tax-exempt status, and improving the system for tracking resolution of pending applications, with a target of resolving applications within 270 days.

Now let me turn to this question of political influence. Beyond the indisputable gross management, another important focus of our investigation was to deal with these speculative

charges and issues with respect to political influence. When the original inspector general report was issued in 2013, there was a concern that it looked like most of the groups that were caught up in all of this were conservative-leaning groups, such as those with “tea party” in their names. In light of this, there was concern that we might be looking at something that was much worse than bureaucratic bungling. The concern was that there might have been an attempt to exert inappropriate political influence over the process of reviewing applications for tax-exempt status by disfavoring certain applications because of their perceived political views.

In my view, that would constitute a grave and completely legitimate concern not just for Republicans, not just for conservatives, but for every American. Among the fundamental principles underpinning our system of government are equal treatment for all and an inviolate right to freedom of speech and expression. Both of these principles are especially important when it comes to the IRS, which has great power that must be exercised in an evenhanded fashion. Of perhaps equal importance to an evenhanded exercise of its authority, it is incumbent on the IRS to take great care to ensure against any perception that it is acting because of bias, political or otherwise.

In the committee's investigation—which, as Chairman HATCH has noted, went for more than 2 years—the bipartisan staff carefully reviewed the evidence, and in contrast to the bipartisan analysis and recommendations I have just described, in this instance, the Democratic and Republican views have come to different conclusions. The additional Democratic views conclude that there is absolutely no evidence that there was an attempt to exert political influence. The additional Republican views—in contrast, in the 120 pages—are trying to make the case that there somehow, somehow, must have been political interference involved but without identifying any direct evidence, documentary or otherwise, to support the case.

I wish to explain first by laying out the basic facts and then by responding to the main points in the additional Republican view.

First, on the facts, according to the report, the staff found no evidence of involvement by the White House or by Treasury Department political officials. None. The staff found no evidence that any political appointee in the Obama administration was involved in the review of applications or in the establishment of standards for their review. None.

As a side note, during most of the relevant period, the IRS Commissioner was Mr. Douglas Shulman, who was appointed by President Bush, and the principal official responsible for the

management of the relevant IRS activities, Lois Lerner, was a career civil servant who was named to her position as Director of the tax-exempt organizations division by IRS Commissioner Mark Everson, who also was appointed by President Bush.

In addition to finding no emails, no memos, and no other documents indicating there was an attempt to exert political influence, the report indicates that the staff asked every IRS employee who was directly involved in the review of the applications whether there had been any attempt to exert political influence over the handling of applications or whether they saw anyone else processing applications in a politically biased way. The staff asked 25 people. Every single one of them said there was no political bias.

In addition, the inspector general audit that spurred the investigation also found no evidence of targeting or political bias. Let me repeat that because there have obviously been some misconceptions. The 2013 inspector general audit found no evidence of political bias in 501(c)(4) processing. This is discussed further in the committee's report, including an email from the deputy inspector general at the office stating: “There was no indication that pulling these applications was politically motivated.” There is an email from the inspector general chief counsel stating that the tea party was not targeted. The inspector general himself testified before our committee that no political motivation was found, and his office further stated that no relevant communications were found coming from the White House or Treasury.

Further, although more conservative-leaning than progressive-leaning groups were affected, several progressive organizations were subject to the same kind of gross mismanagement, long delays, and inappropriate information requests that were experienced by the conservative organizations. The bipartisan report notes that terms such as “progressive” and “ACORN,” as well as terms intended to capture the various Occupy Wall Street groups, were included with “tea party” and “9/12” on the IRS BOLO list. Again, “progressive” appeared on the same BOLO list as “tea party” from day one. The report also shows that progressive groups were subject to mismanagement, delays, and intrusive questions from the IRS.

I also would like to respond to several other particulars to the additional Republican views. Notwithstanding the plain fact that there is no evidence of any attempt to exert political influence over the process, the additional Republican views strive over the course of 120 pages to make the case that somehow, somehow, somewhere, there was something sinister going on. This is done through a combination of innuendo, speculation, and unjustified inference.

The additional Republican views make much of the fact that the head of the tax-exempt organizations division and the principal person responsible for the management issues involved, Lois Lerner, appears to have been a Democrat with liberal views about some issues. Much is also made of the fact that the President and some congressional Democrats wanted to impose tighter restrictions on campaign spending. Put these two facts together—say, Republicans—and it becomes clear in their view that the fix was in.

However, the actual evidence to support this theory is nonexistent. For example, the Republican views quote an email from Ms. Lerner's husband in which on election day he told her he had written in the names of Socialist Labor candidates on his ballot. They quote an email from Ms. Lerner—an email she wrote—celebrating Maryland's approval of same-sex marriage. And they note what they apparently consider to be particularly suspicious: that in the 1.5 million pages of documents, the Republican staff found no instance in which Ms. Lerner, members of her family, or her friends "expressed positive sentiments about the Republican Party, a specific Republican candidate, or the Tea Party."

So what we have is that Ms. Lerner's husband voted for Socialists, she is a Democrat, she supports same-sex marriage, and she apparently doesn't have a lot of Republican supporters among her family. You just have to ask yourself, what is this supposed to prove? There is no evidence that any of these views were brought to the actual review of the application process, and that, to me, is what is paramount.

Granted, the Republican views also quote various other emails in which Ms. Lerner expresses support for President Obama or is critical—sometimes harshly so—of the Republican Party and specific Republican officials. To my mind, this is pretty much irrelevant chitchat. It is gossip. It is coffee-shop talk, locker-room talk. As the Democratic views puts it, "There is no evidence that Lois Lerner allowed her political belief to affect how she carried out her duties as a manager of the Exempt Organizations office."

The Republican views also highlight Ms. Lerner's views about the Supreme Court Citizens United decision. It is pretty obvious she didn't like it. She thought it threatened to unleash a flood of unregulated money in the Federal campaign. The Republican views even suggests that it was somehow nefarious that Ms. Lerner was closely following the Citizens United decision.

All of this tells us nothing. She was the head of the IRS division responsible for applying the law regarding the appropriate level of political campaign activity undertaken by 501(c)(4) organizations. It would be odd, in my view, if she weren't closely following Citizens

United. It was an important decision with major implications for political campaign spending.

It is not surprising to me that she didn't like the decision. Eighty percent of Americans felt the same way. I am one of them.

The Republicans also were exercised that President Obama, various congressional Democrats, and the Democratic Party in general opposed the Citizens United decision and supported tighter limits on campaign spending. No question that is true. But the Republican views make a remarkable leap. They say:

Overall, it is apparent that the need for an explicit Presidential directive to target the Tea Party and conservative organizations was rendered unnecessary by the White House's frequent public statements condemning political spending. Government agencies were acutely aware of the President's wishes and responded accordingly.

So said the majority in their views.

Now, just think about that. Just kind of put your arms around that. The President wanted to limit campaign spending. So the Republicans on the committee would have us conclude that various relatively low-level career government officials, without any direct intervention whatsoever from the White House, from the Treasury Department or from anybody else in a position of political authority, just sprang into action and engaged in a conspiracy of some sort to harass conservative groups. I guess it was almost conspiracy by osmosis. I find these extraordinary leaps to just defy logic.

Federal civil servants are allowed to have a political opinion. The President of the United States and Members of Congress are allowed to express their views about the campaign finance system. Certainly some of Ms. Lerner's personal emails were in poor taste, and it may have been bad judgment for someone in her position to be sending emails to her friends on her office computer expressing political opinions, but the only pertinent question here—the only pertinent question—is whether the political views of Ms. Lerner or other officials influenced the even-handed administration of the law. Although the majority points to numerous embarrassing emails from Ms. Lerner, they cannot point to even a single one where she directed or encouraged employees to exercise political bias.

The majority views also make another argument. They assert that significantly more conservative-leaning groups than progressive-leaning groups were affected by the dysfunction at the IRS and that this, in and of itself, proves there was a bias against conservatives. This is a more serious argument, but when you unpack this one, it, too, falls short. As I have said before, it appears from the report that most of the groups affected were conservative, but progressive groups were

affected too. The bipartisan report indicates that progressive was on the BOLO list, along with ACORN and other terms such as "Occupy" that were considered to indicate progressive or Democratic-leaning political engagement.

The report also shows the IRS conducted workshops directing employees to look for terms such as "progressive" and "Emerge" as well as "tea party." Again, these groups suffered from the same sort of delays and intrusive questions that tea party and other conservative groups suffered from.

Nonetheless, Republicans on the committee insist the fact that more conservative than progressive groups were caught up in the IRS dysfunction necessarily means there was bias. However, this inference can be only drawn if there were equal volumes of applications coming into the IRS from conservative and progressive groups. There is just no evidence this was the case.

Moreover, there is good reason to believe that in the wake of Citizens United, the increasing volume of applications—particularly applications that raised serious issues about involvement in political campaign activity—came primarily from conservative-leaning groups. Independent watchdogs have determined that 80 percent of political campaign spending by 501(c)(4)s was supported by conservatives, and the IRS staff said they were inundated with tea party applications. If that is the case, it would be unsurprising that most of the delays and other problems included conservative groups. They were mostly the ones who were applying.

Again, I am not trying in any way to justify the poor treatment received by conservative groups, but the report found no evidence that the typical conservative application was any more likely to be mistreated than the typical progressive application, and without such evidence it is inappropriate to infer there was bias.

A third argument the Republican views assert, which also falls short, is that there was a double standard: on one hand the treatment of the conservative groups caught up in the 501(c)(4) dysfunction and on the other hand the treatment of some nonprofit groups supported by Democratic Senators. The Republican views cite three cases in which Democratic Senators asked that the review of applications for tax-exempt status be expedited and where that apparently was done. They contrast the relatively quick resolution of these cases to the delays experienced by tea party and other conservative applicants for 501(c)(4) status.

On the face of it, the facts the three cases relied on do not support the Republican inference there was a double standard. In the first place, according to the information in the report, the three groups supported by Democratic

Senators had applied for 501(c)(3) status, under which they can engage in no political activity. Further, in two of the three cases there is nothing in the report indicating the cases were particularly difficult or controversial.

In the Democratic views, it is noted the third case was a request for the expeditious consideration of an application for tax-exempt status by the One Boston Foundation in order to facilitate fundraising and assistance to those who were the victims of the Boston Marathon terrorist attacks in April of 2013. In that case, it appears from public reporting there was an unusual legal issue and that in part at the request of various public officials, the IRS did in fact cut through some redtape and resolve the issue so this organization could get up and running quickly.

As far as I know, there are no allegations that the One Boston Foundation was anything remotely like a political organization, and I am not aware of any partisan or other controversy surrounding it. I was surprised by the Republican views that apparently thought it was inappropriate or unfair for public officials to encourage the IRS to help get the organization up and running or that the IRS did anything wrong by handling this case well. To put it more pointedly, I was surprised this was considered to be in any way relevant to our investigation.

As the bipartisan report makes clear, the IRS took far too long to review 501(c)(4) applications from tea party and other groups, and it subjected many of the groups to unnecessary delay and inappropriate questioning, but the fact that the IRS was able to handle a few very different cases reasonably well does not show a double standard. In effect, the Republican views compare apples and oranges.

Before closing, I want to briefly address several other matters covered in our report. The first is the crash of Lois Lerner's hard drive in 2011 which resulted in the loss of some emails that may have been relevant to our inquiry.

Senator HATCH and I learned about the hard drive crash in June 2014, just before we were originally planning to release the committee's report. The two of us immediately asked the inspector general to investigate to determine whether there was evidence of intentional wrongdoing and whether any of the lost emails could be recovered from other sources.

The inspector general conducted a thorough investigation, which took more than 1 year. Here is what the inspector general found, as explained in the report: Although we do not know why her hard drive crashed, there is no evidence it was crashed intentionally. The inspector general was able to recover about 1,300 additional emails, and the inspector general found that some potentially relevant backup tapes had

been unintentionally mishandled and then destroyed, contrary to the document retention policy the IRS put in place after our investigation began. These findings have led to a significant amount of criticism about the current IRS Commissioner, Mr. John Koskinen.

Before closing, I want to make a couple of points in response to the criticism of Commissioner Koskinen. First, it is important to remember that the principal problems we have been talking about—in other words, Chairman HATCH and I have been talking about these issues here for probably close to an hour regarding the IRS handling of applications for section 501(c)(4) status—all occurred before Mr. Koskinen came on board as IRS Commissioner in December of 2013. In fact, during the entire period covered by the original 2013 inspector general investigation, the IRS Commissioner was Mr. Doug Shulman, as I stated, appointed by President Bush. Although Mr. Koskinen inherited these problems, he did not create them.

Second, looking at how the IRS handled the hard drive crash, I do think Mr. Koskinen waited too long to inform the Committee on Finance and that the senior IRS leadership could have done a better job keeping track of the backup tapes. That said, there is zero evidence that these mistakes were politically motivated, and there is no reason to believe the potential loss of some of Lois Lerner's emails compromised the investigation.

We recovered thousands of emails covering this period from the relevant people corresponding with Ms. Lerner. Even taking the potential loss of some emails into account, the bipartisan report concludes that “the large volume of information we have received gives us a high degree of confidence in the accuracy of the conclusions reached during our investigation.”

Looking forward, Commissioner Koskinen is a skilled and experienced leader. I am confident he is going to work closely and cooperatively with Chairman HATCH, with myself, with Democrats and Republicans on the Committee on Finance to continue to improve the operation of the IRS Exempt Organizations Division.

We also asked the inspector general to investigate four other cases in which there have been allegations of political motivation by the IRS. One involved a White House official who referred to a specific company when criticizing the use of tax loopholes. The question was whether he had received inside information from the IRS, and of course that would be a serious violation of the law.

The other cases involved conservative groups that unfortunately had some of their confidential tax information inappropriately made public. These cases have generated intense congressional interest and lawsuits.

The underlying concern, similar to the concern about the handling of the 501(c)(4) applications, was the serious and legitimate worry as to whether there had been an effort to exert political influence over the IRS—in effect, to use the IRS as a weapon against conservatives.

Here, based on the information in the report, the inspector general's investigations have led to clear conclusions. The inspector general investigation of the White House official found he did not receive any confidential information from the IRS. He apparently was just shooting from the hip, which may be bad judgment, but it is not a crime. In the three cases where confidential taxpayer information was inappropriately disclosed, it was because of unintentional mistakes by low-level IRS employees, some of whom have been subject to administrative discipline.

These mistakes were regrettable, and the staff has made bipartisan recommendations to prevent them from recurring, but the bottom line is that in each of these cases there was no effort to exert political pressure.

In summary, our report tells a regrettable story. Many applicants for tax-exempt status were treated badly. They were treated in an unacceptable way, and they deserved better service from their government, but in the end this is a story about gross bureaucratic dysfunction. It is not about an attempt to exert political influence over or inject political bias into how the IRS does its job.

Further, the main culprits are gone, the system has been improved, the committee has made a series of bipartisan recommendations to improve it further, and I think it is fair to say that both Democrats and Republicans on the Senate Committee on Finance—Chairman HATCH has worked very closely with me on this—are committed to making sure nothing like this vast bureaucratic bungling ever happens again.

So we here in the Senate have more to do. We are going to have to do some hard thinking about one of the underlying issues, which is the money and politics, including in the context of tax-exempt organizations that are not supposed to be engaged primarily in political activity.

As part of this—and I respect the views of Chairman HATCH and others who may disagree—I think the Congress has to come up with better standards. We ought to set—again, in a bipartisan way—to overhaul the 1959 regulatory jalopy. Just put our arms around that one. Here we are in the digital world with so many changes in our country, and we still have the basic 1959 approach to regulating these issues. We ought to establish rules of the road that fully respect First Amendment rights and also give all organizations—be they progressive, conservative or in between; whatever they

are—better guidance about what they can and cannot do given their tax-exempt status.

My own view is, when it comes to money and politics, we really can't get enough transparency. I hope we will be able to work on those issues in the future. In fact, the last time we had a bipartisan bill here was in the last Congress, when Senator MURKOWSKI, our colleague from Alaska, joined me on a bill that said all major spending from everywhere—wherever you were; progressive, conservative—essentially had to be disclosed. So my own view is that we need more transparency, not less.

Mr. President, I have some brief remarks to make on another subject, unless our chairman wants to make further comments. I will yield on this topic and let the chairman comment. Then after the chairman is done speaking, I will ask unanimous consent—and be certainly no more than 10 minutes on another subject—to speak after the chairman has had a chance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank my colleague.

Look, people can make up their own minds about this. Read the doggone report. We cannot read it and just say: Brush it off; there is just one rogue employee there. There are all kinds of employees that are mentioned in the report. We can't just wipe it off because we were unable to interview the Treasury Department or the White House. We can't just wipe it off, when we look at all the information there, and just say: Well, this was a bad apple in the IRS, and it was just an ordinary course of events. They mistreated liberal groups or progressive groups, so-called, as much as they did the conservative groups.

There is no question they didn't. There were very few progressive groups, and it was easy to understand which ones they were looking at. My gosh, some of those have had criminal accusations against them. There are only a few of them, compared to the wide group of people on the conservative side—that they knew were conservatives and they put on the BOLO list, the “be on the lookout” list.

Now, yes, we weren't able to get into the Treasury Department, and we weren't able to get into the White House and what they did or didn't do in these areas. I don't think we can read this report and conclude that this is just a terribly dysfunctional IRS. I think we can agree that we all knew that before we had this report. But this is a very serious report.

By the way, the report is signed off by both Democrats and Republicans. We can't just wipe it away and say: Well, this is just a bunch of bad apples at the IRS.

Lois Lerner took the Fifth Amendment. She refused to testify in front of

the House. Now, she had a right to do that, and I would be the first to stand for that right. But why would she do that?

The fact of the matter is that it was a dysfunctional IRS, and it was being managed by people who were bright enough to not be dysfunctional.

I am not going to say much more because we will answer every one of the distinguished Senator's approaches here this evening. I would just suggest: Read the report. It is signed off by Democrats and Republicans. We can't just blow it off by saying this was just the dysfunction at the IRS. We all know the IRS is dysfunctional, and part of the reason it is is that the IRS is supposed to represent every citizen in this country in a fair and balanced way. But it is governed by a union. They can't even fire somebody at the IRS without going through all kinds of hoops, and then they are going to have a rough time firing them no matter how bad they are. We all know that. We have seen it year after year here. To just brush this off like it is just one bad apple there—there are more apples there than Lois Lerner.

All I can say is this report is a very serious report. It can't be just brushed away. It is a serious report for many reasons.

One reason is that conservative groups, by a vast majority, were mistreated—and mistreated in election years, where they were trying to make a difference. I am not saying I agree with them. All I can say is they had a right to get their 501(c)(4) status determined and not just dragged out past the election.

That alone is something that ought to cause everybody in this country to be a little bit frightened that the IRS can do that. I don't want it done for liberal groups that way. If the Republicans were ever totally in control of the White House, the Justice Department, the IRS, and the Treasury, I wouldn't want anybody treated like these conservative groups were treated. I would probably differ with some of those conservative groups, myself. But they deserve to be treated with respect and with dignity and under the law. And they were not. And we can't just brush it off on just one person being out of line.

I am very concerned about it. I suggest people read the report. Read the report.

There were some things we weren't able to look into. I wish we had been able. I think we might have been able to more definitively lay this out. But to make a long story short, read the report—something that my colleagues on the other side agreed to. Then read the minority views, then read the majority views, and see what you think. But I will tell you this: You have to be alarmed.

The most dangerous agency in our government happens to be the IRS, the

Internal Revenue Service. They can break anybody overnight. People are afraid of the IRS, and with good cause. When we see what happened here, they are going to have to be even more fearful—unless we can straighten this mess up. I intend to see that it is straightened up—or straightened out, may be a better way of saying it.

I am very concerned about this. We had people who were mistreated. I might not agree with them, but they were mistreated, in comparison with the liberal groups, which you would have questions about them anyway—some of them.

Well, I am sure we will debate this even more. I don't want to take more of the Senate's time tonight. But I am extremely concerned because I don't think there is an agency in government that causes more fear in the hearts of people than the IRS. And when we see the mess they did, we can't just chalk it up to just a few rogue employees there at the IRS. When we see the mess they did, we have to stop and think: My, gosh, is this the way our country is run? Is this the way the IRS is run? Can we do anything about it? Or do we just have to, as citizens, sit back and forget about it?

Well, we are not going to let them forget about it. This is a very, very important report. I think the majority and minority views are worth reading. I don't see how we can conclude at the end of it that there is not a tremendous problem there.

Keep in mind that when the inspector general investigates and if he doesn't find an absolute, they say he doesn't find anything. They are not going to pick on anybody. I have a lot of respect for the inspector general at the IRS. I remember his being criticized because apparently he is a Republican. But he is not going to accuse anybody if he doesn't have the evidence.

In this case, there is a whole accumulation of evidence that we cannot ignore and just brush away under the guise that this is just a rogue person. There were other people there as well who caused this calamitous set of events, and we have to not just brush it away. We have to look at it, and we have to find a way of straightening out the IRS so it is not a partisan institution—which most Americans believe it is, and almost every conservative believes it is.

Now, we are making some strides here, and I am going to continue to push on to see that we make strides. But I have to say, ask the American people out there what they think. Read the report, and then we will talk about it some more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I will be very brief. I thank my colleague from Arkansas for his patience. I know he has things he has to have done as well.

FEDERAL WILDFIRE BUDGETING SYSTEM

Mr. WYDEN. I was down here on the floor last night talking about the need for actually getting some real progress to fix the mess that the wildfire budgeting system in our country has become.

I noted there have been several proposals offered, including one by myself and Senator CRAPO called the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, referred to the Budget Committee. There have been hearings held. There have been speeches given about the need to fix the broken system to provide Federal agencies with the help they need to battle the devastating blazes year in and year out. Senator CRAPO and I have introduced a bill to fix this broken system, and we need to get some real results.

In spite of all the talk, there hasn't been any real action. Twenty-four hours later and I am back, pleased to be able to stand here tonight to say several of our colleagues have heeded my call, and tomorrow I will be putting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a colloquy with all of our signatures—Democrats and Republicans—committed to resolving this issue in the fall. We have been working since last night to set aside a way to work together this summer, with the fires in the West literally fueling the hunger to take meaningful steps this fall, to finally end fire borrowing, and to ensure that Federal agencies have the resources they need to prevent these infernos from igniting in the first place.

Just today, the Forest Service released a report that makes the very clear point that, for the first time in its history, the Forest Service is routinely spending more than half of its budget battling wildfires. They note that the cost of fire suppression could well increase to almost \$1.8 billion by 2025. This vicious cycle of underfunding prevention work while huge infernos burn up Federal fire suppression accounts is going to get worse, and what we are going to see as it does is the Forest Service becoming the fire service. That is not in America's interest. It is particularly damaging to my part of the country.

I am pleased to be able to say that, in the last 24 hours, we have made some real progress in addressing this challenge. There is a commitment on both sides of the aisle now, here in the Senate, to get this fixed this fall.

(The remarks of Mr. WYDEN pertaining to the submission of S. Res. 246 are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

Mr. WYDEN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

JACOB TRIEBER FEDERAL BUILDING, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE, AND UNITED STATES COURT HOUSE

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I wish to talk about S. 1707, which will name the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, AR, as the Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Courthouse.

The Honorable Jacob Trieber paved the way for diversity on the Federal bench as the first Jewish Federal judge. His work on the bench helped fight injustice and laid the foundation for equality with a lasting civic legacy that continues to impact our country.

Born on October 6, 1853, in Raschkow, Prussia, a young Jacob Trieber and his family escaped the growing anti-Semitism in Prussia and moved to the United States. In a few short years they established their homestead and a family story in Helena, AR. In 1873, he began to study law, and 3 years later he entered the Arkansas Bar. In 1897, he was appointed U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas in Little Rock.

Three years later, on July 26, 1900, President William McKinley appointed Jacob Trieber to the Federal bench, where for 27 years Judge Trieber served on the U.S. Circuit Court for the Eastern District of Arkansas. Judge Trieber was committed to equal justice for all and ruled for equality for African Americans and women.

Judge Trieber had astounding foresight. Many of his rulings were important to civil rights and wildlife conservation. He also was committed to his local Arkansas community and served as elected official on the Helena City Council and as the Phillips County treasurer.

Judge Trieber played an influential role in saving the Old State House and establishing the Arkansas State Tuberculosis Sanatorium.

In honor of Judge Jacob Trieber, Senator COTTON, Senator COONS, and I have introduced this legislation that designates the Federal building in Helena-West Helena, AR, the Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and Court House.

Judge Trieber's name will appropriately mark this building and stand as a symbol of his significant work not only for the people of Arkansas but also for the entire United States.

I thank Senator BOXER and Senator INHOFE for helping us advance this in a timely fashion and also the staff of the EPW and the cloakroom staff who does such an outstanding job here.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be discharged from further consideration of S. 1707 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title. The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1707) to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1707) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. JACOB TRIEBER FEDERAL BUILDING, UNITED STATES POST OFFICE, AND UNITED STATES COURT HOUSE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House".

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House".

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING ED LANE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to mourn the loss of an honored Kentuckian, renowned businessman, and public servant, and my personal friend, Ed Lane. After battling cancer for more than 2 years, Ed passed away on August 2. He was 73 years old.

Ed was passionate about supporting his hometown of Lexington and the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He was well connected to the State's business community through his work as a commercial real estate broker. Seeing a need for a publication for and about Kentucky business, he founded and was the publisher of the Lane Report, a great business news magazine for Kentucky.

Encouraged by his friends in the community to seek public office, Ed also represented the 12th District of Lexington on the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Government Council

since 2005. He was reelected without opposition in 2014. As a council member, he brought his business experience and his wisdom to fight for and represent Lexington businesses and his district.

In addition to his public service as a council member, Ed supported his community through many philanthropic efforts and volunteer service. He served on the boards of many community, arts and civic organizations, including the Breeders' Cup Host Committee, the UK Sanders-Brown Center of Aging Foundation Board, the Lexington Downtown Development Authority Board, the Lexington-Fayette Urban County Airport Board, the Kentucky Arts Council, the 2010 FEI World Equestrian Games Advisory Committee, LexArts, the Lexington Ballet, the Lexington Philharmonic, the Better Business Bureau of Lexington, Junior Achievement of the Bluegrass, the Mayor's American Recovery and Reinvestment Act Committee, the Fayette County Equine Task Force, the Commerce Lexington Agribusiness Committee, and others.

Ed was an artist, photographer, and art collector. He loved cooking, reading, gardening, and talking politics. He also loved fast cars, earning him the nickname "Fast Eddie" in the 1960s. Ed is survived by his daughters Susan Brett Lane and Katherine Meredith Lane.

I was deeply saddened to hear of Ed's passing. He was a good friend, and I always enjoyed reading the Lane Report, especially Ed's engaging One-on-One interviews. Elaine and I send our condolences to his family.

The Lexington Herald-Leader recently published an article detailing Ed's life and achievements. I ask unanimous consent that said article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lexington Herald-Leader,
Aug. 3, 2015]

LEXINGTON COUNCIL MEMBER, BUSINESS MAGAZINE FOUNDER AND PUBLISHER ED LANE DIES AT 73

(By Greg Kocher and Karla Ward)

Lexington Urban County Councilman Edwin "Ed" Green Lane III, founder and publisher of The Lane Report magazine, died Sunday night. He was 73.

Lane, a longtime commercial real-estate broker, had battled cancer for more than two years, according to a statement Monday afternoon from The Lane Report, an online and monthly print magazine of business news.

He made his first run for public office in 2004, when he was elected to represent the 12th District on the council. He took office in 2005 and had been re-elected to two-year terms ever since.

Lane is survived by daughters Susan Brett Lane and Katherine Meredith Lane, who were with him when he died, according to The Lane Report.

"The staff is saddened by the passing of an amazing man, but it is lessened by how we marvel at the legacy Ed Lane leaves," said

Mark Green, editorial director of Lane Communications Group.

"His energy, his intelligence, his enthusiasm, his optimism and concern for his family, community and the nation will be missed but will continue to influence us. He was a true leader. The man had enthusiasm for life."

Mayor Jim Gray issued a statement: "Not only was Ed highly successful in his own business, he was an outstanding public servant who brought his business experience and expertise to City Hall to fight for Lexington's business men and women. He also was a strong advocate for his district. Our city will miss his leadership and experience."

Sen. Mitch McConnell said he "was saddened to hear of the passing of my good friend Ed Lane. Ed was a dedicated public servant and a tireless advocate for the people of Kentucky. He was also a successful businessman and publisher. I always enjoyed reading the Lane Report, a great publication for and about Kentucky's business community, especially Ed's engaging 'One-on-One' interviews."

Councilman Bill Farmer Jr. said Lane's knowledge about real estate proved valuable whenever the council considered whether to buy property.

"He could make or break any land deal," Farmer said. "He could sit and go through the numbers at the microphone, off the top of his head, about what the overhead would be, how much something would cost, what the cost would be per square foot. . . . He could look at any deal like that and criticize it or laud it, and immediately you would go, 'Yep, that's it and why.'"

That talent for finances made Lane a strong member of the council, former Mayor Jim Newberry said.

"His financial acumen was way above average," Newberry said. "He was really helpful when it came to budget issues or the pension problems, or whether or not we ought to refinance bonds."

He said Lane also was "a fun person to be around" and they became good friends.

"Ed just had a personality that I would characterize as delightful," Newberry said. He "had a good sense of humor, didn't get too worked up about things, certainly didn't take himself or what he was doing too seriously. . . . He gave a lot to the community and had so much more to give."

Lane was born in Nashville and graduated from the University of Georgia.

After college, he worked for a major advertising agency in New York for a couple of years, according to The Lane Report website. He later moved to Atlanta, where he was sales manager for WRNG radio and was president of the Atlanta Young Republicans.

He also got into the commercial real-estate business, which led to a job as national director of real estate for Lexington-based Jerico in its Atlanta regional office, The Lane Report said. Lane came to Lexington regularly as he scouted new locations for the company, and he was involved in many site acquisitions for Long John Silver's Seafood Shoppes nationwide.

In 1981, Lane started the Lexington-based commercial real-estate brokerage Lane Consultants and, later, Lane Communications Group, publisher of The Lane Report.

Running a magazine is "a risk that very few people have been able to be successful in," but Lane "did it terrifically well," said Jim Host, founder of Host Communications and former Kentucky secretary of commerce.

"It ended up kind of being the official business magazine of the state," he said.

Host said Lane was kind, insightful and had a non-threatening demeanor during interviews "but also really got to the core of what he was trying to communicate."

"I admired the dickens out of him," Host said.

Former councilman Doug Martin said he and Lane were from opposite ends of the political spectrum, but they enjoyed breaking bread together in a restaurant or at Lane's home.

"He was a fine chef," said Martin, who sat next to Lane in the council chambers from 2009 to 2013. "He was always very proud of coming up with some great concoction or some great recipe or some great ingredient that he'd found. He would have pots of herbs and fish and seasonings, and it would all just kind of stew together, and it would end up in this fabulous presentation."

Services will be at 7 p.m. Aug. 15 at Kerr Brothers Funeral Home on Harrodsburg Road. Visitation will begin at 6 p.m.

TRIBUTE TO JIM RUTLEDGE

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to recognize and congratulate a distinguished Kentuckian who is closely associated with the Commonwealth's most famous product. Jim Rutledge, the master distiller of Four Roses Bourbon, has announced his retirement from that position effective September 1, 2015.

Jim is in his 49th year working in the bourbon business, and has been the master distiller at Four Roses since 1995. As master distiller, Jim is in charge of perfecting each Four Roses bottle. He oversees every stage of the distillation process and oversees the character, quality and consistency of each barrel.

Jim began his career in the distilled spirits industry with Seagram's Louisville Research & Development operation in 1966. He was transferred to the Four Roses distillery in Lawrenceburg, as the Kentucky area manager, in 1994 and then named master distiller in 1995. In 1998, Jim received Seagram's top award, the Mel Griffin Quality Award for North America, and in 2001, Jim was inducted into the inaugural class of the Kentucky Bourbon Hall of Fame.

In 2007, Jim received the Lifetime Achievement Award from Malt Advocate Magazine, and in 2008, the leading liquor industry publication, Whisky Magazine, named him the Ambassador of the Year for American Whiskies as part of their annual Icons of Whisky Awards. Jim was also inducted into Whisky Magazine's Hall of Fame in 2013. He was only the second American inducted into this elite group.

Jim was also active with the Kentucky Distillers Association board of directors for 13 years, and served as chairman of the internationally attended Kentucky Bourbon Festival for 7 of the 9 years he was on the board. The Kentucky Bourbon Festival is a 6-day event that takes place in Bardstown, KY.

Jim graduated from the University of Louisville with a BSC in marketing and a minor in chemistry. Let me add that not only did Jim and I both attend the University of Louisville, we are also fraternity brothers.

In retirement, Jim hopes to stay involved with bourbon and the distilled spirits industry. I suspect he will also get to spend more time with his wife Beverly Anne, as well as his children Dennis, Deborah, Cynthia, and Doralee, and his grandchildren.

Jim will be missed as the face of Four Roses Bourbon but I know the entire distilled spirits industry in Kentucky joins me in recognizing his lifetime of accomplishment and wishing him the best in retirement. I want to wish congratulations again to Jim Rutledge for his many successes in the world of bourbon.

TRIBUTE TO DANIELLE BLAKENEY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to an honored Kentuckian who is bringing home Olympic gold. Danielle Blakeney of Erlanger is a rhythmic gymnast who has won three gold medals at the 2015 Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles.

Danielle won the gold medal in the ball routine competition. She also won gold in all-around rhythmic gymnastics, and was part of the gold medal-winning team in the group ball competition.

Danielle also won a silver medal in the ribbon competition, a bronze medal in the clubs competition, and placed fifth in the hoop competition.

Danielle is 24 years old and a graduate of Boone County High School. She is one of six Kentucky athletes competing in this year's Special Olympics, among 7,000 athletes representing 177 countries.

Danielle is no stranger to winning medals. She is competing in her second Special Olympics World Games. In addition to winning the all-around gold medal in rhythmic gymnastics at the 2011 Games in Athens, Greece, she won two golds, a silver and a bronze in individual events at that games as well.

The mission of the Special Olympics is to provide year-round sports training and athletic competition in a variety of Olympic-type sports for children and adults with intellectual disabilities, giving them the opportunity to see the power of sport change lives. The first Special Olympics Games was held in 1968 in Chicago, and saw a thousand people with intellectual disabilities from 26 States and Canada participate.

Today, Danielle Blakeney and her fellow athletes are the inheritors of that legacy. I want to congratulate Danielle for her many athletic achievements. She truly makes Kentucky proud and we are pleased she will be bringing her medals home to the Bluegrass State.

RECOGNIZING THE ANNIVERSARIES OF SOCIAL SECURITY, MEDICARE, AND MEDICAID

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the respective anniversaries of three of the most important programs for American seniors: Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid.

On August 14, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law. Among other things, this bill created the Social Security Program and made a promise to all Americans: that if you work hard, contribute, and play by the rules, you can retire and live in dignity.

Before Social Security, more than 50 percent of older Americans in this country lived in poverty. Many of these seniors worked hard their entire lives but became dependent on others and often had to beg for basic necessities, such as food, shelter, and medical care. "Poverty-ridden old age" was a pressing national concern both for seniors and younger Americans, who wondered if their years of hard work would provide enough for them to survive in their old age.

Today, less than 9 percent of seniors live in poverty. This significant decrease in poverty among seniors is a direct result of Social Security and the secure retirement it provides.

As we approach the program's 80th anniversary, Social Security is the most successful program in American history, and its trust fund contains sufficient assets to fully fund all promised benefits for almost 20 years. Yet, notwithstanding its success, Social Security remains deeply controversial among many Republicans and super-wealthy Americans, who are committed to weakening and ultimately destroying the program.

Just 10 years ago, President George W. Bush tried to privatize Social Security, which would have forced deep cuts to guaranteed benefits and a massive increase in debt. More recently, several leading Republicans have called for delaying the retirement age and cutting benefits. I have strongly opposed all these proposals to break our promises to seniors, and I will continue to do so.

On July 30, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson expanded our Nation's commitment to seniors by signing into law the Social Security Amendments of 1965—the legislation that created Medicare. For 50 years, this program has helped millions of American seniors live longer, healthier lives and has also provided them with the peace-of-mind and economic security that comes with having comprehensive health coverage.

I remember what it was like for seniors who became sick or injured before Medicare was enacted. In fact, Medicare was implemented during my tenure on the board of trustees for the Southern Nevada Memorial Hospital, now the University Medical Center of Southern Nevada. Prior to Medicare, 40

percent of seniors who came into that hospital were required to have a signature from a friend or relative who agreed to be responsible for their medical bill if they could not pay. If the patient could not produce a signature, they were turned away. Nationwide, nearly half of all seniors age 65 and older were uninsured, and if you were fortunate enough to have health insurance, you paid more than 50 percent of the cost out-of-pocket. That is how bad it was for seniors. Today, 98 percent of all seniors are insured and can go to the hospital or see their doctor when they need care. This program has truly been a lifeline for millions of seniors throughout the country.

And let us not forget about Medicaid, which was also created under the Social Security Amendments of 1965. Medicaid provides health care and long-term services to 16 million low-income seniors and individuals with disabilities. Medicaid pays for services that Medicare does not cover. It ensures that low-income seniors and individuals with disabilities have access to a wide variety of services. These options often allow them to remain in their communities rather than relocating to nursing homes.

I have long worked to protect and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid for the millions of seniors and younger Americans who depend on these benefits. In 2010, I proudly cast my vote in support of the Affordable Care Act, which is strengthening Medicare and working to keep seniors' hard-earned savings in their own pockets. Since this law was enacted, millions of seniors throughout the country have saved more than \$15 billion dollars on their prescription drug costs and the program's solvency has been extended for 13 years. The Affordable Care Act has also given States the option of expanding their Medicaid Programs so that more low-income Americans can access the care they need.

Sadly, Republicans have repeatedly attacked and tried to eliminate Medicare and Medicaid, just as they have done with Social Security. Throughout the last 50 years, they have tried to privatize Medicare, convert Medicaid into a block grant program, and cut benefits for both programs. Now, they have set their sights on the Affordable Care Act, with repeated challenges to the law before the courts, more than 50 votes to repeal or undermine the law, and Republican Governors turning back millions of Federal dollars to expand their Medicaid Programs and expand access to health care in their States. Republicans are determined to destroy effective health care programs in spite of all the good they have done, but my Democratic colleagues and I will continue to work to prevent this from happening.

As President Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law 80 years

ago, he said, "Today, a hope of many years' standing is in large part fulfilled . . . We have tried to frame a law which will give some measure of protection to the average citizen and to his family against the loss of a job and against poverty-ridden old age." Similarly, five decades ago President Johnson declared, "No longer will Americans be denied the healing miracle of modern medicine. No longer will illness crush and destroy the savings that they have so carefully put away over a lifetime so that they might enjoy dignity in their later years." Let us remain mindful of these words and the promise that our country has made to seniors as we commemorate the 80th anniversary of Social Security and the 50th anniversary of Medicare and Medicaid. I am committed—just as President Roosevelt and President Johnson were decades ago—to giving Americans the health and economic security they need, deserve, and have earned.

CELEBRATING THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNITED LABOR AGENCY OF NEVADA

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the 20th anniversary of the United Labor Agency of Nevada.

Since it was established in a joint venture with United Way of Southern Nevada and Nevada State AFL-CIO in 1995, the United Labor Agency of Nevada, ULAN, has been assisting Nevada families who are experiencing unexpected crises. Whether it be job loss or a medical emergency, ULAN provides individuals and families throughout our community with assistance so they may have access to vital resources, such as housing and nutrition, during their time of need. ULAN also offers guidance to those battling hardship to prepare plans for long-term self-sufficiency and financial stability. These imperative services have made a lasting impact on Nevadans, and the benefits of ULAN's services are felt across the Silver State.

ULAN began as a small dream, with only Audrey Arnold and \$30,000 to help the community. Under Ms. Arnold's steadfast leadership, ULAN has grown into a \$2 million organization. Today, Ms. Arnold and her dedicated staff and volunteers are now able to provide a one-stop shop for those experiencing hardship. By offering immediate housing, nutrition, job outreach, and financial counseling services, the organization works to prevent financial situations from becoming worse and helps individuals and families transition to living within their means on a new reduced income through federal programs and other resources. This two-pronged approach has had a remarkable effect on countless families over the past 20 years.

I applaud ULAN on their decades of dedicated public service and extend my

best wishes for much continued success.

WOOD DALE AND GRAYSLAKE, ILLINOIS STORMS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, once again, Illinois communities are assessing damage from severe storms. A confirmed tornado along with heavy winds, hail, and lightning moved through the Chicago area on Sunday leaving a path of damage in several communities.

The city of Wood Dale was hit Sunday afternoon during the last day of its Prairie Fest, an annual 4-day festival with rides, food, and music. Due to the storm, rides were stopped and organizers tried to evacuate. But the storm approached too quickly, and its winds knocked down the festival's main tent where many people had gathered to take shelter.

Twenty people were hurt and, tragically, Steven Nincic was killed. He was at the festival with his wife and two young daughters. Our thoughts and prayers are with Steven Nincic's family, as they are with those who were injured by the storm. I spoke this morning with Wood Dale's Mayor Nunzio Pulice, and I know he is leading the community through this loss.

Severe weather continued throughout the day in the Chicago area. Chicago's Lollapalooza music festival evacuated its festival grounds at Grant Park before its scheduled closing. Mayor Emanuel and I also spoke this morning. He is working to assess the damage and help residents clean up and recover from the damage.

My office is also in touch with Mayor Rhett Taylor of the Village of Grayslake, Mayor Kristina Kovarik with Village of Gurnee, and Illinois Representative Sam Yingling. These communities are hurting in the aftermath of Sunday's terrible storms that brought winds at 60 miles an hour and golf ball-sized hail.

A tornado touched down in Grayslake, ripping the roof off the high school and damaging several other buildings and homes. These storms also toppled power lines and trees, making several roads in the area impassable. Crews are working to clean up debris and restore electricity. Over 16,000 people were left without power this morning. Thankfully, no injuries were reported as a result of the Grayslake storms.

Along with other members of the Illinois congressional delegation, I stand ready to help in any way I can as the people in Dale Wood and Grayslake begin the clean-up and recovery from this weekend's deadly storms.

The State of Illinois has sustained extensive damage and managed clean-up costs following a number of severe storms already this year. I stand ready to support any request for Federal dis-

aster aid, including the Governor's request today for FEMA's assistance with damage assessments in downstate communities still recovering from earlier storms.

COMPOUNDED PHARMACEUTICALS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we all know the Department of Defense's record with bungled acquisitions that led to \$500 hammers and \$7,000 coffee makers. The Pentagon has a tough time keeping up with unscrupulous contractors who have figured out how to get rich on the taxpayer's dime, and unfortunately I have learned of yet another example of this.

Several dozen pharmacies around the country specialize in compound pharmaceuticals. These are drugs that are combinations of two or more prescription medications. Many of these pharmacies are on the up-and-up, helping people, and our servicemembers, recover from illnesses or wounds. But a good number of these compounding pharmacies have linked up with high-pressure salesmen and disreputable physicians to scam the Department of Defense out of as much as \$1.2 billion in taxpayer money in this year alone.

The sales pitch went like this. A U.S. servicemember, a military retiree, or their spouse might get a phone call at home asking whether a TRICARE beneficiary is suffering from pain. The telemarketer might ask a few simple questions, get a little bit of personal information, and suddenly, weeks later, prescription creams would start showing up in the mail. In other cases, a food truck may pull up in front of a military base. If a servicemember wanted a hot dog, he or she could listen to a pitch about compounded pharmaceuticals and sign a piece of paper. In many cases, that servicemember had no idea they were signing up for an expensive prescription that might have no medical value. These sneaky marketers would pass personal information on to doctors, often hundreds or thousands of miles away, who would then write prescription after prescription, never having seen the patient.

These ointments and creams were then custom made by a compounding pharmacy, and the bill was sent to the Department of Defense. According to health officials in the Department of Defense, one of these pain creams had a value of about \$150 each. But the Defense Health Program was billed more than \$9,000 each. This scam has added up to big dollars. In 2004, the Department of Defense spent just \$5 million on compound pharmaceuticals. By 2014, as these efforts began to ramp up, the total rose to \$514 million. In April of 2015, just 1 month alone, the bill to the Pentagon was nearly \$500 million. DOD says the total cost of compound pharmaceuticals for this fiscal year could be as much as \$1.2 billion.

What is tragic about this waste of money is that it could have been prevented. In 2013, the Pentagon considered policy changes it could make to the approval process for compound pharmaceuticals. DOD officials came under heavy pressure, both from Members of Congress and from some of these companies, not to move forward. This pressure continued right up through March of this year.

Finally, in May, the Department of Defense was able to institute a screening procedure to get at this problem. And the costs charged to TRICARE have dropped dramatically—down to \$10 million per month.

Let me repeat that. The Department paid \$500 million for compound drugs in April. The Department changed its approval process, and it now pays \$10 million a month for compound drugs. I met with Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs Dr. Jonathan Woodson about this. He is confident that this safeguard—and others—will protect the taxpayer in the future. Regrettably, in this case, the horse ran out of the barn and cost the American taxpayer \$1.2 billion before anyone could stop these scams. But no one can escape the long arm of the law forever. The Department of Justice has opened more than 100 criminal investigations, and \$60 million has been recovered so far. The DOD has suspended 26 providers for wrongdoing, and identified 71 individuals or entities who are believed to be associated with these scheme.

As vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, working with Chairman COCHRAN, we have the responsibility to look after how the Pentagon is spending its funds. I bring this episode to light because there are many lessons to be learned about the need to demand a bureaucracy agile enough to catch profiteers and about the ways that congressional oversight can hamper enforcement rather than encourage it. I hope my colleagues takes those lesson to heart.

I will also say that THAD COCHRAN and I will continue to root out these incidents wherever they occur and work in partnership with the department to provide for our servicemembers in ways faithful to the taxpayer.

RECOGNIZING WENDY WERTHEIMER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to acknowledge Wendy Wertheimer, an outstanding Federal employee who has spent decades working to advance the domestic and international HIV/AIDS research effort. Wendy is about to complete nearly 30 years of Federal service that began in the Senate and is now coming to an end at the National Institutes of Health.

Like many bright young people in Washington, Wendy began her career right here in the U.S. Senate, working

for Senator Jacob Javits. Later she joined the legislative staff of what was then called the Senate Labor and Human Resources Committee, led by Chairman Edward Kennedy and Ranking Member Jacob Javits. Wendy's first assignment was the Venereal Diseases Control Act, which many on staff saw as a form of hazing for a new, young staff member. But Wendy was personally connected to the issue. Her grandfather had been the chair of Dermatology and Syphilology at a hospital in Pittsburgh and had conducted early clinical studies of syphilis. She embraced the assignment, and the bill passed with bipartisan support. It was the first bill Wendy had ever worked on—she was off to a good start.

In 1979, the American Social Health Association established the first advocacy group for venereal disease control and research, and Wendy was offered a job as its director of government affairs. After hearing the news, Wendy's mother was horrified and told her she will never get another date because everyone will assume that she has a venereal disease. Wendy accepted the job anyway and became the first venereal disease, or VD, advocate in Washington. She was a pioneer in the field and began working on a number of new education and research training programs, including the National VD Hotline.

On June 5, 1981, the first cases of what we now know as AIDS were reported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. By the end of 1981, five to six new cases of the disease were being reported each week and an epidemic of fear was breaking out. The American Social Health Association became one of the first organizations to advocate bringing attention to this disease, and Wendy found herself on the frontlines combatting the HIV/AIDS pandemic. In 1991, she was recruited by the NIH to help establish the Office of Research on Women's Health. And since 1992, Wendy has been the senior advisor, responsible for planning, policy, legislation and communications at the Office of AIDS Research at the NIH.

It is hard to imagine, but when Wendy Wertheimer began at the NIH, an AIDS diagnosis meant a sure and agonizing death. We have come a long way since the disease was first reported, and in many ways progress on HIV/AIDS is one of the most remarkable success stories in the history of biomedical research. Wendy Wertheimer shares in this success and the research accomplishments that led to lifesaving treatments and a hopeful future about what more can be achieved.

For more than two decades, Wendy has worked with Dr. Jack Whitescarver—the longest serving director at the Office of AIDS Research at NIH—who is also retiring this year. And here is what he said:

We have made critical and even breathtaking progress in AIDS research against many odds. We have been challenged to confront and address stigma, homophobia, racial disparities, and criticisms of the AIDS research investment. We have come a long way, but the AIDS pandemic is far from over and remains a threat to global populations. Any declaration that the end is near is premature, inaccurate, and perilous to progress against the pandemic.

He is right. Being HIV-positive is not the death sentence it once was, but the battle is far from over. And although Dr. Whitescarver and Wendy Wertheimer are retiring, the fight goes on, and the work continues. I want to thank them for all they have done and all they will do to combat this terrible disease. They have set a high bar for the dedicated public servants who follow them.

I will close with this. I strongly believe in the role of public service to create change and make a difference. Wendy Wertheimer's years of service reflect these values. I am honored to congratulate her on a job well done, and I am lucky to count her as a friend.

REMEMBERING YOSHI KATSUMURA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, last Sunday, the legendary chef Yoshi Katsumura passed away after a battle with cancer.

You would never guess that a 15-minute walk from Wrigley Field, where hot dogs and beer reign supreme, would take you to a place bringing together the foods of Tokyo, Paris, Lyon, and Chicago. But that is what Yoshi built at the quiet, unassuming place known simply as Yoshi's Café. Honored by his peers for the past 30 years of exquisite food preparation, Yoshi was a master of his art.

Yoshi was born in Japan's Ibaraki Prefecture—a region on the main island of Japan—in 1950. At the age of 20, he apprenticed under another legendary chef, Hiroyuki Sakai in Tokyo. Through Sakai, Yoshi began learning the complexities of French cooking.

In 1973, Yoshi ventured to Chicago, where he quickly advanced in fine French culinary arts. He studied under Chicago's first celebrity chef, Jean Banchet, at Le Francais. Yoshi would go on to refine his skills in Paris and Lyon, and he returned to Chicago as a chef and partner at the city's premier French fusion restaurant, Jimmy's Place. In 1982, Yoshi opened his own restaurant with his wife Nobuko, Yoshi's Place.

For more than three decades, Yoshi's Café has won the hearts and stomachs of Chicago and the country. Yoshi's has been featured on the Food Network and listed among "America's Top Tables" by Conde Nast's Gourmet magazine. His fusion of cultures brought diners to North Halsted Street for dishes like

Hamachi tartare and the Wagyu burger.

If you look closely for a sign next to Yoshi's Café, you will find that Aldine Avenue east of Halsted is designated "Yoshi Katsumura Way." His way was creating wonderful food for his community and making it a better place. He served on the Northalsted Business Alliance board and organized charitable events, including Hurricane Sandy relief and aid for victims of the 2011 Japanese tsunami. And he always took the time to talk to his customers.

Loretta and I love Yoshi's. I once showed up at the restaurant on a Monday evening, forgetting it was closed. Stranded on the corner, trying to decide where to go, I heard someone call my name. It was Yoshi, who lived above the restaurant, calling down to me and offering to fix a meal for me on his day off. That was the moment when service became friendship and I came to know the goodness of this man.

Yoshi was indeed a special kind of man. His last message was to keep Yoshi's Café going. He will be missed. Loretta and I send our prayers and thoughts to his wife, Nobuko; his daughter, Mari; his son, Ken; his brother Kazuhiro Katsumura; and grandson Hiro.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we began this year with a new Republican majority in the Senate promising to govern responsibly. Unfortunately, this promise has so far proven hollow. Beginning with the shameful treatment of the nomination of Loretta Lynch to be Attorney General, the Republican leadership has used excuse after excuse to keep the Senate from voting on those nominated to serve in our justice system.

It took 4 months for the Republican majority to schedule a vote on a single judicial nomination. So far this year, the Republican-controlled Senate has allowed confirmation votes on just five judicial nominees. The slow trickle of confirmations is a dereliction of the Senate's constitutional duty to provide advice and consent on judicial nominees. Since the beginning of this year, the number of Federal court vacancies deemed to be "judicial emergencies" by the nonpartisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has increased by 158 percent. There are now 31 judicial emergency vacancies that are affecting communities across the country. Many are concerned that this obstruction threatens the functioning of our independent judiciary, as Juan Williams recently pointed out. I ask unanimous consent that his column in *The Hill* titled "The GOP's judicial logjam" be printed in the RECORD.

There is a different way to lead. Similar to the balance of power today, in the last 2 years of the George W.

Bush administration the Democrats were in control of the Senate. And by this time in 2007, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we had confirmed 26 judges. In contrast, this Congress, the Republican majority has confirmed just five judicial nominees appointed by President Obama. That is more than five times more judges confirmed under a Democratic majority with a President of the opposite party than today's Senate Republican majority.

The delay and obstruction is occurring even though all 14 of the current judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar have bipartisan support and were voted out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote.

These nominees are highly qualified and deserve better treatment from Senate Republicans. Of great concern is the treatment of Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo, who will fill an emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Pennsylvania. Judge Restrepo was unanimously confirmed 2 years ago by the Senate to serve as a district court judge. I have heard no objection to his nomination. Yet it took 7 months just to get him a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

He has strong bipartisan support from the two Pennsylvania Senators, and was voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote. Once confirmed, Judge Restrepo will be the first Hispanic judge from Pennsylvania to ever serve on this court and only the second Hispanic judge to serve on the Third Circuit. He has the strong endorsement of the nonpartisan Hispanic National Bar Association, HNBA. At his hearing in June, Senator TOOMEY stated that "there is no question [Judge Restrepo] is a very well qualified candidate to serve on the Third Circuit" and underscored the fact that he recommended Judge Restrepo to the White House. Senator TOOMEY then described Judge Restrepo's life story as "an American Dream story" recounting how Judge Restrepo, born in Medellin, Colombia, came to the United States, became a U.S. citizen, and rose to the very top of his profession by "virtue of his hard work, his intellect, his integrity."

Given his remarkable credentials, recent Senate confirmation, and strong bipartisan support, you would think this Chamber would have confirmed Judge Restrepo months ago. No Senate Democrat opposes a vote on his nomination. Senate Republicans are the only thing holding up his nomination. I know Senator TOOMEY can be a fierce advocate for issues he cares passionately about, and I hope he will get a firm commitment from the majority leader on a date for a vote on his confirmation. The continued delay on such a qualified judicial nominee is a poor reflection on this body. I ask unanimous consent that a recent column by

Carl Tobias in the Pittsburgh Tribune-Review titled "Confirm Judge Restrepo" also be printed in the RECORD.

Another eminently qualified nominee who is also strongly supported by the HNBA is Armando Bonilla. Mr. Bonilla has been nominated to serve on the U.S. Court of Federal Claims, and would be the first Hispanic judge to hold a seat on that court. Mr. Bonilla has spent his entire career—now spanning over two decades—as an attorney for the Department of Justice. He was hired out of law school in the Department's prestigious Honors Program, and has risen to become the Associate Deputy Attorney General in the Department. Despite these outstanding credentials, the junior Senator from Arkansas objected to a request to vote on his nomination, along with any of the four other nominations to the Court of Federal Claims. These CFC nominees have been waiting for more than 10 months for a vote, and were twice voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote.

Those who serve in this body understand that no one Senator can stop a judicial nominee from being confirmed. One Senator can stop a unanimous consent agreement, but not a vote. The delay and obstruction of the 14 judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar, including Judge Restrepo and Mr. Bonilla, is at the hands of the Republican leadership and in the hands of the other Republican Senators, who have allowed their leadership to delay these accomplished jurists and prosecutors, even when it hurts their own constituents.

Republican leadership can still reverse course and lead responsibly. Although they have only allowed 5 judicial nominees to be confirmed this year, they can make immediate progress by moving to confirm the 14 nominees pending on the Executive Calendar. They should schedule a vote for outstanding nominees like Judge Restrepo and Mr. Bonilla. They should schedule a vote for the pending judicial nominees from Missouri, California, New York, and Tennessee.

In the last 2 years of President Bush's tenure, the Democratic majority moved 68 district and circuit judges through the process to confirmation. In the last 2 years of President Reagan's tenure, a Democratic majority confirmed 85 judges. Let us go back to treating the Federal judiciary like the coequal branch that it is and hold confirmation votes on the nominees before us. There is no reason for the double standard based on who is in the majority. We made it clear we would not do that with President Reagan and President Bush. We should uphold the same standard for President Obama.

I hope that we return to the regular order that existed for the nominees of past administrations and clear the Senate Executive Calendar of consensus

nominations before the upcoming recess. The time to act on the 14 consensus judicial nominations pending before the full is Senate is now.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Hill, July 27, 2015]

THE GOP'S JUDICIAL LOGJAM

(By Juan Williams)

As the hot Washington summer approaches August, the Senate's Republican majority is already on vacation from the work of confirming judges. At the current torpid pace, they will put the lowest number of judges on the federal bench in any year since 1969.

Do you think this crashed system for filling the federal bench has anything to do with the GOP Senate majority's distaste for the liberal in the White House—even if he was chosen by the American people twice as their president and given the constitutional authority to nominate judges?

Yes, this involves a heavy dose of simple obstruction by the GOP. Keep in mind that if it were not for Republican judges blocking President Obama's executive order on immigration, the GOP would have already lost that fight. So in a politically polarized nation, Republicans have reason to keep an eye on the partisan make-up of the courts.

That is just one of the many political backroom plots being played out in the Senate over control of the nation's courts.

The game begins with GOP payback for the Democrats having changed the filibuster rules in 2013 to allow confirmation with a simple majority vote. That "nuclear option" broke the GOP hold on judicial nominations while Democrats still held the majority and cleared the way for 96 judges to take their seats.

Now the GOP holds the Senate majority and Republicans have slammed the lid on new judges from Obama. This makes judicial nominations a valuable point of leverage in future negotiations with the White House over budget issues, regulation and more.

And with a presidential election next year, the GOP hopes to soon have a president of its own sending over nominations, beginning January 2017. Then, there is the reality that four of the five current Supreme Court justices are over the age of 75—including Justice Anthony Kennedy, the "swing vote." Republicans have little incentive to allow Obama to put more Democrats throughout the nation's judiciary.

The extreme Republican anger at the federal courts is already a big issue in the 2016 presidential race. Last week, Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Texas), chairman of the Judiciary Committee's oversight panel for the federal courts, held a hearing titled: "With Prejudice: Supreme Court Activism and Possible Solutions." He called the hearing to show the depths of his upset with the recent decisions to uphold ObamaCare and grant same-sex couples the right to marry.

Cruz, a former Supreme Court law clerk, used the hearing to trash a court with a majority of five conservatives, led by a conservative—Chief Justice John Roberts—and by all measures a strongly conservative record in rulings on guns, campaign spending, and blocking Environmental Protection Agency regulation of airborne chemicals.

As a candidate for the GOP's 2016 presidential nomination, Cruz knows the high court's standing among Republican voters is low. After the ObamaCare and gay marriage decisions, only 18 percent of Republicans told Gallup last week that they approve of the

court. Cruz set the tone for his hearing by saying he wanted to review "options the American people have to rein in judicial tyranny."

Sen. Cruz is a fan of extreme action to deal with this "tyranny." He is proposing having Supreme Court justices stand for retention election every eight years.

Former Arkansas Gov. Mike Huckabee, another candidate for the GOP presidential nomination, favors term limits.

Sen. Jeff Sessions (R-Ala.) declared during the hearing that the current court has a "foreign, unhistorical approach to law."

Between the Senate Republicans' success at clogging the judicial appointment process and the burst of harsh rhetoric, there is a growing risk of a serious erosion of the public trust in the nation's judicial system.

Obama also is playing the dangerous game. He has not nominated anyone to fill 47 of the 63 open seats on the federal bench. No doubt he feels it would be a waste of time to keep pushing good money—in this case judicial nominees—down a hole. The president does have seven judicial nominees before the Senate and three would help with the judicial emergencies.

For both liberals and conservatives, the current roadblock has consequences. According to www.uscourts.gov, 28 federal courts have now declared "judicial emergencies" because they lack enough judges to hear pending cases.

Earlier this month, the Senate confirmed its fifth federal judge for the year, Kara Stoll. The current Senate is so far behind they have not reached the half-way point to match the previous record low for confirmations, 12, set in President Obama's first year in office.

The number of judges confirmed during President George W. Bush's second term, higher than the current rate for Obama, is still less than the number of judges confirmed in the final two years of Presidents Reagan and Clinton.

But now that Republicans are in charge, the Bush record looks generous.

"It's ridiculous," said Sen. Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.). He chaired the Senate Judiciary Committee with the Democrats in the majority. "They are trying to politicize the courts. And it's irresponsible. I refused to do it with President Reagan. I refused to do that with President [George W.] Bush."

Can the Senate expect better results with a President Hillary Clinton or President Bernie Sanders? How about President Jeb Bush or President Donald Trump? Most likely it will be more of the same—a continuing loss of the bipartisan trust and respect that once made America's courts the gold standard of justice for the world.

[From Pittsburgh Tribune-Review,
July 30, 2015]

CONFIRM JUDGE RESTREPO

(By Carl Tobias)

Today, as in 2007, a Pennsylvania federal district court judge's unopposed nomination to the Third Circuit requires a final vote in a Senate the president's party does not control. On March 15, 2007, a Democrat Senate confirmed President George W. Bush's nomination of Pittsburgh District Judge Thomas Hardiman one week after his Judiciary Committee approval.

This precedent is one reason Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, R-Ky., must schedule an immediate vote on Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo's nomination, which the committee approved on July 9. Restrepo

would fill one of 28 vacancies the courts have declared judicial emergencies.

President Obama nominated the experienced, uncontroversial jurist in November on the strong bipartisan recommendation of Pennsylvania Sens. Bob Casey (D) and Pat Toomey (R). Moreover, on July 1, Third Circuit Judge Marjorie Rendell assumed senior status. This means that Judge Hardiman is one of six active Pennsylvania members on the court, which experiences two vacancies in 14 positions.

Toomey's spokesperson says that the senator has spoken directly with McConnell "to emphasize the importance of getting Judge Restrepo confirmed" but did not indicate Toomey urged a prompt vote. As Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, D-Nev., said on July 7, if Toomey simply asked "to confirm Judge Restrepo immediately, (I'm confident) we could confirm Judge Restrepo to the Third Circuit next week."

Obama has consulted with Casey and Toomey, who have cooperated in helping to fill one Pennsylvania Third Circuit seat and 14 district court posts since 2011. They have carefully reviewed applicants and proposed excellent individuals whom Obama usually nominates.

However, the Senate slowly processes nominees. Most critical have been Republican delays of floor votes. For example, between November 2013 and late March 2014, the Eastern District faced seven openings. The many prolonged vacancies have slowed federal court litigation, requiring people and businesses to wait interminably for case resolution.

Casey and Toomey suggested Restrepo for the Eastern District, and the Senate approved him on a June 2013 voice vote. Each assumed credit for proposing Restrepo's Third Circuit nomination in November press releases. Toomey exclaimed that Restrepo would "make a superb addition to the Third Circuit," but the legislator retained his "blue slip"—which permits a nominee to proceed—from Nov. 12 until May 14, even though Casey submitted his in November. The jurist's June 10 hearing was long overdue.

At his hearing, Restrepo comprehensively and candidly answered questions and senators appeared satisfied. For example, Sen. Thom Tillis, R-N.C., who chaired the hearing, observed that Restrepo has been reversed only twice.

McConnell has not publicly stated when he would arrange a floor debate and vote. However, on June 4, he suggested he might not allow ballots for more Obama circuit nominees, although he did finally accord Kara Fernandez Stoll, a Federal Circuit candidate who had waited 10 weeks, July floor consideration.

The Third Circuit needs all its members to deliver justice, and Restrepo has languished over eight months. The Senate must confirm him before the August recess.

NOMINATION OBJECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I intend to object to any unanimous consent request at the present time relating to the appointment of Bradley Duane Arsenault, of FL; Bret Thomas Campbell, of TX; Karen Stone Exel, of CA; Gloria Jean Garland, of CA; Michael H. Hryshchyshyn, Jr., of VA; Ying X. Hsu, of CA; Stephen S. Kelley, of VA; Mary Catherine Leherr, of VA; Denise G. Manning, of VA; Paul Karlis

Markovs, of MI; Scott Currie McNiven, of AZ; Hanh Ngoc Nguyen, of CA; Denise Frances O'Toole, of ME; Marisol E. Perez, of NJ; Ronald F. Savage, of NM; Adam P. Schmidt, of CT; Anna Toness, of TX; Michael J. Torreano, of FL; Nicholas John Vivio, of DC; Jamshed Zuberi, of CA as Foreign Service Officer Class Two, Consular Officer and Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America.

I will object because, in addition to the multiple inquiries I have made that are still unanswered, I sent another letter to the State Department today and the Department has failed to confirm receipt, yet again. In addition, my staff placed multiple phone calls to Department personnel to inquire as to the status of the most recent letter. Department personnel have failed even to return phone calls.

I warned the Department that if they failed to change their ways that I would be forced to escalate the scope of my intent to object to unanimous consent requests by including Foreign Service officer candidates. My objection is not intended to question the credentials of the individuals up for appointment. However, the Department must recognize that it has an obligation to respond to congressional inquiries in a timely and reasonable manner.

APPROPRIATIONS

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, this month the Senate Appropriations Committee completed its work on 12 bills to fund the government for fiscal year 2016, which begins October 1, 2015.

I congratulate Chairman COCHRAN and his subcommittee chairs for a full and open process. They worked hand in hand with me and my ranking Democratic members. But their bills are based on the postsequester levels of the Republican budget resolution. The bills reported by the committee are too spartan to meet the needs of the American people.

The difference between the Republican budget and the President's budget request is \$74 billion. That is a lot. But even with that increase, the discretionary top line will be equal to what we spent in 2010, 6 years ago.

I would like to talk about one example of the real impact of the Republican sequester level budget—failing our veterans.

Veterans deserve promises made and promises kept. Instead, the Senate fiscal year 2016 Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies bill is at least \$857 million short of what is needed for veteran health care. And the House is even worse, at least \$1.4 billion below what is needed. At those levels, about 70,000 fewer veterans will receive medical care.

Despite record demand for services, our veterans are still waiting to get ap-

pointments at hospitals and clinics. In fact, the electronic wait list has grown by almost 10,000 over the past 2 months. Sequester will result in waitlists growing exponentially.

Sequester budgeting for veterans' medical care means almost 150,000 veterans living with hepatitis C will be in limbo, not receiving new, lifesaving drugs.

It is not just care that is short-changed. Sequester budgeting means hospitals and clinics continue to deteriorate. The VA has identified between \$10 billion and \$12 billion of backlogged code violations and deficiencies at hospitals and clinics across the country. In fiscal year 2013, the VA spent \$1.3 billion repairing clinics, but for fiscal year 2016 the Republican bills cut funding in half, even as the backlog grows.

Yesterday, the Republican leader stated that he did not want a government shutdown. Encouragingly, he added, "At some point we'll negotiate the way forward."

Democrats are ready. Since May, we have been asking to negotiate to eliminate sequester with a sequel to Murray-Ryan. The only way we will have shutdown, showdown, and government by self-made crisis is if the Republican majority refuses to send the President bills he can sign and instead sends bills that are too spartan or contain poison pill riders like prohibiting funding for Planned Parenthood or signature initiatives like the Affordable Care Act and climate pollution rules.

Whether it is funding our troops or keeping our promises to veterans, we can't do it without a new budget deal. Freezing Federal spending doesn't meet the growing, complex needs of the Nation.

None of us were elected to make America weaker. Yet sequester makes us weaker and sequester hollows out America.

America deserves better, but we need a new budget deal to do it. Democrats are ready to get serious and get to the table. We need to end sequester for defense with no more gimmicks and end sequester for programs not funded in the defense bill that protect our country and make it great.

DRIVE ACT

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President last week the Senate passed a multiyear surface transportation bill, the Developing a Reliable and Innovative Vision for the Economy Act, H.R. 22, referred to as the DRIVE Act. I was pleased to vote for this bipartisan bill. For the first time in 3 years, the Senate has passed a long-term surface transportation bill. Unfortunately, the House adjourned before taking up our bipartisan legislation—forcing the Senate to pass a short-term funding patch, the 34th since 2009.

I am disappointed that we were not able to get the long-term bill to the

President's desk. However, I believe the Senate has laid the groundwork to make the most recent short-term extension the last for the next few years. I look forward to working with my colleagues in both houses of Congress to complete a long-term bill before the October 29 deadline, and I expect the DRIVE Act to be the baseline for those efforts.

While the DRIVE Act's most important feature is that it provides certainty to construction firms and state governments to invest in rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges, it also includes several provisions to improve the way we move goods and people across our nation. In the last few years, I have become very concerned with the way one particular good—Bakken oil—moves through the country. The fiery explosions that accompany Bakken oil train derailments have many in Wisconsin rightfully concerned as we have unwittingly become one of the most traveled oil train routes in the country.

The DRIVE Act includes a rail safety bill that was added thanks to the leadership of Senate Commerce Committee Chairman THUNE, Ranking Member NELSON, and Senators BOOKER and WICKER. I was pleased that the bipartisan bill that passed out of committee included provisions to require a railroad liability study and comprehensive oil spill response plans. These provisions were similar to what is included in the Crude-by-Rail Safety Act, on which I worked closely with Senator CANTWELL to introduce.

While the liability study and oil spill response plans are steps in the right direction, as the bill moved to the Senate floor, I believed we needed to do more to improve rail infrastructure, transparency, and first responder preparedness. That is why I was pleased to work with Environment and Public Works Ranking Member BARBARA BOXER, Commerce, Science, & Transportation Committee Chairman JOHN THUNE and Ranking Member BILL NELSON as well as Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL to include two sections in the bill that passed the Senate on July 30. I was able to add these sections to the substitute amendment, No. 2266, that was adopted on July 29, 2015, and the provisions were included in the final version of the bill that passed the Senate.

The first section, section 35416, would require that the Federal Railroad Administration keep on file the most recent bridge inspection report prepared by a private railroad bridge owner and provide that report to appropriate state and local officials upon request. This allows State and local officials who are responsible for public infrastructure integrity and public safety to have access to information they need to keep the public safe. The substance of this section is also contained in amendment 2538.

The second section, section 35431, addresses concerns raised by the first responder community who have had to fight for access to real-time information about hazmat trains entering their jurisdictions. Firefighters want to know in advance when hazmat trains will arrive in order to better prepare and keep their communities safe. The substance of this section is also contained in amendment 2539.

The section modified the bill's original language that only required real-time hazmat train information to go to Department of Homeland Security Fusion Centers. The centers would then provide the information to local first responders only in the event of an accident, when it is less useful. My provision requires fusion centers to provide the real-time information to State and local first responders at least 12 hours prior to a hazmat train arriving in their jurisdiction. The transmission must also include the best estimate of the train's arrival.

I believe these two sections significantly improve transparency and safety in communities along oil train routes. This is also a significant achievement for state and local organizations, who are often powerless to take action against federally regulated railroads—despite being responsible for any problems they cause. In closing, I again would like to thank Senators MCCONNELL, THUNE, NELSON, BOXER, and INHOFE for their leadership on this legislation. And I pledge to work with my colleagues in the House and Senate to pass a long-term surface transportation bill in the next three months.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, today marks the 50th anniversary of one of the most important civil rights bills we have ever come together as a nation to pass: the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

I am proud to commemorate this anniversary as the Senator for Maryland. Marylanders have a rich history of battling discrimination, going back to the darkest days of slavery. The brilliant Frederick Douglass was the voice of the voiceless in the struggle against slavery. The courageous Harriet Tubman delivered 300 slaves to freedom on her Underground Railroad. And the great Thurgood Marshall went from arguing *Brown v. Board of Education* to serving as a Supreme Court Justice. All were Marylanders.

Not just Marylanders but civil rights leaders and activists from all over this country fought hard for the right to vote. Over 600 people marched from Selma to Montgomery. They were stopped and beaten but not defeated. These brave men and women continued to march, continued to fight until they got the right to vote. They had to challenge the establishment and to say

“now” when others told them to “wait”.

Their fight and their struggle culminated in the passage of the Voting Rights Act. This legislation guaranteed one of our most important civil rights and reflected one of our most fundamental values: that all men and women have the right to vote.

The struggle to truly fulfill this fundamental value—this fundamental right—is far from over. There are too many neighborhoods in this country, particularly in minority communities, that are the target of voter intimidation, barriers to access, and ever-changing requirements.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Shelby County v. Holder* only made this problem worse by stripping the Federal Government of its ability to protect voters from this kind of disenfranchisement—whether it was the old-fashioned kind or the new-fashioned kind.

The fight for equal access to the ballot continues today, and like those who came before us, we cannot take “no” for an answer. We must ensure that any and all undue barriers to participation in our democracy are broken down. We must restore the protections of the Voting Rights Act that were struck down by the Supreme Court so that the promise of the right to vote is extended to all men and women.

So while we look back proudly on the passage of the Voting Rights Act, we must recognize that the need for its protections is as great today as it was 50 years ago. The words of Justice Thurgood Marshall still ring true:

“I wish I could say that racism and prejudice were only distant memories. We must dissent from the indifference. We must dissent from the apathy. We must dissent from the fear, the hatred and the mistrust. . . . We must dissent because America can do better, because America has no choice but to do better.”

Today marks an important milestone in our history. As we come together to celebrate this anniversary, we must come together to defend the rights that this legislation was enacted to protect because if discrimination of any kind exists anywhere in America, we can and we must do better.

REMEMBERING RICHARD SCHWEIKER

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President. I rise today to remember Richard Schweiker, who passed away on July 31, 2015. Congressman, Senator, and Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services Dick Schweiker honorably served his country in public office for more than two decades. Prior to his years of government service, he served his country in the Navy during World War II.

As a Congressman from Pennsylvania's 13th District, he was the coauthor

of a House Armed Services Committee proposal to end the military draft and make service voluntary and sponsored legislation to allow the government to give extra money to military service personnel if they showed they could reduce expenses. He also supported the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 along with legislation that created the Medicare and Medicaid Programs.

As a Senator, he served on the Labor and Human Resources Committee, eventually becoming its ranking member. This committee is now known as the Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee on which I serve. Senator Schweiker was a strong supporter of public health initiatives, including the National Diabetes Mellitus Research and Education Act that authorized the National Commission on Diabetes to put together a plan to fight this disease. Dick Schweiker also worked to achieve compromise. In a 2000 Associated Press interview, he commented on that approach:

I was a World War II veteran. Our primary objective was to get things done and solve problems. The partisanship and heated rhetoric that have taken over the political landscape wasn't always in vogue.

Dick Schweiker decided not to run for reelection in 1980 and worked to help elect Ronald Reagan that November. After the election, President Reagan appointed Schweiker as the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. While in that position, he set up the Medicare prospective payment system in an effort to reduce costs rather than leaving them open-ended. He also continued to support funding for medical research and protected funding for the Head Start early childhood education program. He stepped down as Secretary in 1983. At that time, Senator Ted Kennedy said the following:

Dick Schweiker has been a good friend and colleague for many years. As secretary of HHS, he has too often been a lonely voice of compassion and humanity.

After leaving public service, Dick Schweiker spent 11 years as president of the American Council of Life Insurance before retiring. Today, we remember and thank Dick Schweiker for his service to Pennsylvania and the Nation. We send our thoughts and prayers to his family.

RECOGNIZING THE 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE END OF WORLD WAR II

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on August 14, 1945, World War II came to an end. The official ceremony aboard the battleship USS *Missouri* 2 weeks later was brief, barely 18 minutes long. The low-key nature of the event stood in stark contrast to the unprecedented horror and violence of the preceding years, years in which the fate of civilization itself hung in the balance. I rise

today to express our Nation's gratitude to all veterans of the Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine for their service and sacrifice seven decades ago.

It is said that crisis builds character. For an entire generation of Americans, crisis did not build character; it revealed it. With the perfect hindsight history books provide, the Second World War can seem today to be a series of events that followed an inevitable course from Pearl Harbor to Normandy to Iwo Jima to the deck of the Battleship *Missouri*. Yet those who were there, those who made that history, know that the outcome was far from certain. All that stood between humanity and the abyss of tyranny was their courage, their faith, and their devotion to duty.

As the war began, the United States was not a rich or powerful country. We had only the 17th largest army in the world. Our industries were still struggling to overcome a decade of economic depression. With two great oceans as a buffer, many Americans thought the answer to aggression was isolationism.

Yet when the crisis came, Americans responded. More than 16 million American men put on the uniforms of our Armed Forces. More than 400,000 died wearing those uniforms. Thousands of American women also put on the uniform, serving—and dying—in field hospitals and in such dangerous work as ferrying aircraft from production plant to airfield. They rolled up their sleeves and turned the factories of a peacetime economy into the arsenal of democracy. Throughout the country, Americans of all ages worked and saved and rationed and sacrificed as never before. Families planted victory gardens—20 million of them, producing 40 percent of the Nation's vegetables in backyards and on rooftops. Two out of every three citizens put money into war bonds.

The people of Maine were part of this great endeavor. Some 80,000 Mainers served in World War II, more than any previous war. More than 2,500 laid their lives upon the altar of freedom.

I have had the honor of meeting many of Maine's heroes. Edward Dahlgren of Perham—just a few miles from my hometown of Caribou—fought his way through Italy, France, and Germany, and received the Medal of Honor for his astonishing rescue of a trapped American platoon. Charles Shay, a member of the Penobscot Nation, was among the first wave ashore at Omaha Beach and the first Native American to be awarded the Legion of Honor Medal, France's highest tribute. Bert Skinner of Belfast answered the call for volunteers for the extremely dangerous mission of serving behind enemy lines with Merrill's Marauders in Burma. Through his uncommon service to his community and to his fellow veterans, Galen Cole of Bangor has kept the promise he made to himself on a battlefield in Germany in early 1945.

Maine women served with distinction. Patricia Chadwick Ericson of Houlton stepped forward to serve as a Women's Airforce Service Pilot, or WASP, flying newly built aircraft from the factories to combat zones. Mary Therese Nelson of Indian Island was the first Native American woman from Maine to enlist in the Marine Corps. Each of the stories of the men and women from Maine are unique. Yet they are united by valor and devotion to duty.

On the homefront, Maine was on the frontlines. Eighty-two destroyers were built at Bath Iron Works during the war, more than the entire Japanese output. The South Portland shipyard launched 274 Liberty ships that carried troops and arms overseas. More than 70 submarines were built at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in Kittery, with 3 of those vital warships launched on the same day.

Maine's seafaring heritage contributed greatly to the Merchant Marine, and at least 60 Mainers lost their lives to enemy attack. The Coast Guard and the Civil Air Patrol protected our shores against Nazi U-boats and saboteurs.

These men and women did not come from a society steeped in militarism and the lust for conquest. Whether they came from our cities, farms or fishing villages of Maine, they came from places that desired peace and that cherished freedom. When the crisis came, the American character bound the "greatest generation" together in a great common cause on behalf of humanity.

I am fortunate to be a daughter of that generation. One of my earliest childhood memories is going with my father to the Memorial Day parade in our hometown. He hoisted me high above his head and from the best vantage point along the route—my father's shoulders—I saw hats go off and hands go over hearts as Caribou paid its respects to our flag and honored our veterans. Some Memorial Days, my father would wear his Army jacket to the parade. As a child, I thought it was just an old jacket. Only as an adult did I learn the price he had paid for it.

Donald Collins enlisted in the Reserve Corps as a college freshman in November of 1943 and was called to Active Duty in the U.S. Army before the year's end. He saw action in the European theater and fought at the Battle of the Bulge. He earned the Combat Infantry Badge, two Purple Hearts, and the Bronze Star. Sergeant Collins was discharged in January of 1946.

Then he did what truly distinguishes the men and women of America's Armed Forces. He came home, gratefully and modestly. He never talked much about his sacrifice and the hardships of war. Instead, he worked hard raising six children, running a business, serving as Scout leader, Rotarian, mayor, and State senator.

From the strong shoulders of those like him who defended our freedom, all Americans learn about commitment, service, and patriotism. We learn that the burden of service must be borne willingly. We learn that challenges must be met and threats must be confronted. We learn that the mantle of hero must be worn with humility. It is because of the quiet courage of those who serve our country that we take those lessons to heart and resolve to pass them on to the generations to come. On this 70th anniversary of victory in World War II, let us recommit ourselves to the spirit that guided our Nation through its darkest days and that lights our way into the future.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this month, 70 years ago, the greatest crisis of the 20th century came to an end. Lasting 6 full years and involving participants from over 30 countries, World War II was the most widespread and devastating war in human history. America's isolation from this dreadful conflict abruptly ended when, on the morning of December 7, 1941, our Nation came under sudden and deliberate attack. In less than 2 hours, thousands of lives were lost as bombs fell across the island of Oahu and that quiet Sunday morning quickly turned into a terrible scene of violence and horror.

But the attacks on Pearl Harbor did not break the American spirit. In this darkest of moments, our country discovered a renewed sense of strength, courage and resiliency; qualities that define us. And, following the attack on Pearl Harbor, American forces joined the Allied Powers, fighting side-by-side against Nazi oppression in Europe and Japanese expansion in the Pacific. Sixteen million Americans bravely served in these two theaters of conflict, and it was through their patriotism and courage that freedom was able to triumph over tyranny.

I also want to recognize Maine's important role in the war effort. In northern Maine, Army airfields in Bangor, Presque Isle, and Houlton provided strategic air basing and training sites which facilitated the deployment of personnel and equipment overseas to the frontlines. And along the coast, where the Kennebec River meets the sea, Bath Iron Works established its reputation for producing the "best-built" destroyers in the world. The shipyard delivered a total of 83 new ships to the U.S. Navy—hitting a 2-year peak production of 21 ships a year or an average of 1 destroyer every 17 days. Bath-built ships survived the attack on Pearl Harbor, landed troops at Normandy, supported Marines at Iwo Jima, and sank Nazi U-boats in the Atlantic. Maine's support to our Armed Forces during the war years was unparalleled in terms of dedication, scope, and impact.

And, above all else, we must honor the immeasurable contributions of our

servicemembers. As a State with one of the highest percentages of veterans per capita in the Nation, the war's legacy resonates strongly in Maine. During World War II, nearly 80,000 Maine citizens served overseas. Their steadfast perseverance, patriotism, and bravery in the face of grave danger helped secure a better future for generations to come.

On this 70th anniversary of World War II, we remember all the American and Allied servicemembers who bravely served on land, air, and sea; as well as those on the homefront providing for our warfighters. Their service and sacrifices contributed to international peace and stability and ensured the continued promise of the freedoms we enjoy today.

TRIBUTE TO ADA DEER

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I recognize and honor Ada Deer on the occasion of her 80th birthday. Throughout her life, Ada has been an effective advocate and leader whose trailblazing work has improved the lives of Native Americans, women, students and others in Wisconsin and across the Nation. The celebration of this milestone birthday is a special opportunity to celebrate her dedication to service and social engagement.

Ada Deer was born on the Menominee Indian Reservation in Keshena, WI. She was the first Menominee to graduate from the University of Wisconsin-Madison and the first Native American to receive a masters of social work from Columbia University.

She has been a champion for Indian rights throughout her remarkable career. When the Federal Government established a policy to terminate the sovereign status of tribes, the Menominee was among the first to go through the process of termination, and they suffered greatly under it. Ada organized a grassroots organization, Determination of Right and Unity for Menominee Shareholders, DRUMS, and fought successfully to restore Federal recognition of the Menominee tribe. Ada's leadership led to her election as the first woman to chair the Menominee tribe in Wisconsin.

She spent many years as a lecturer in the School of Social Work at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, and also guided the university's American Indian Studies Department. Ada worked as a house director, community coordinator, school social worker, and professor.

In 1978, she became the first Native American to run for secretary of State in Wisconsin, and in 1992 she was the first Native American woman to run for Congress in Wisconsin. In 1993, Ada became the first Native American woman to head the Bureau of Indian Affairs. She subsequently served as Chair of the National Indian Gaming Commission.

I am proud to call Ada a friend, and I am grateful for her lifelong leadership and commitment to social justice. Her vital work continues today, focused on efforts to reduce the prison recidivism rate and create a reentry program for American Indians. Her lifetime of work, coupled with an enduring passion to instill in young people the drive to change their society through education and social engagement, shows what a determined person will continue to do—even when they have stated that they are "retired."

I wish Ada good health and happiness for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO BRYCE LUCHTERHAND

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I honor Bryce Luchterhand on his retirement from Federal and public service. He has dedicated his career to improving the quality of life and the vitality of communities throughout the State of Wisconsin. The occasion of his retirement presents a special opportunity to celebrate his dedication to public service and social justice.

Bryce was born in Colby, WI, and raised on the Luchterhand family farm—a fixture in the local rural community since 1902. He graduated from Colby High School and earned his bachelor's degree in secondary education broadfield social studies from Northland College in Ashland, WI. Growing up on a Wisconsin farm, Bryce was instilled with the values of hard work, love of the land, Central Wisconsin optimism, and a sense for social justice that would serve him well throughout his career and life.

In 1970 he started his lifelong path in public service as teacher of social studies on the Navajo Indian Reservation at Many Farms High School in Many Farms, AZ, where he inspired and mentored the youth of the Navajo reservation. Working with the impoverished youth of the Navajo reservation sparked within Bryce his passion for equal opportunity, creating bonds and lifelong friendships that became a foundation for his life of service.

Throughout his public service career, Bryce has been guided by his love of the land. In 1973, Bryce took an opportunity to return to Colby, WI, to buy a dairy farm next to the Luchterhand family farm. And with the same drive and determination that have become his trademark, he and his wife, Max, milked dairy cows and raised beef cows for the past 42 years, even developing a new breed of cow called a Gloucester Lineback. As a farmer, Bryce greets every season with the same grit and resolve he learned as a child in rural Wisconsin. However, the time of year he holds most dear is the maple syrup season each spring. Bryce and Max spend many early mornings and late nights tending to the taps, boiling down the

sap, and bottling one of Wisconsin's treasures—Wisconsin maple syrup. Each bottle of Luchterhand maple syrup is a labor of love, and I have been honored to be among the select individuals to receive this special gift.

Bryce's years of public service are comprised of distinguished service on various boards, committees, and associations, often in roles as chairman or advisor. He is most proud of his roles as instructor for the Presidential Classroom in Washington, DC, executive council member of Wisconsin Rural Partners, member of the Board of Directors for Wisconsin Farm Progress/Technology Days, as well as a founding and current member of 1000 Friends of Wisconsin, an organization dedicated to giving citizens a voice in land use planning.

Bryce's career in public service has also included serving the President of the United States, the Governor of Wisconsin and two U.S. Senators. He served as President Clinton's Director of Rural Development for the State of Wisconsin for 8 years, helping to make critical economic and agricultural development investments in rural Wisconsin. He served as the director of Wisconsin Governor Jim Doyle's northern office, serving residents of 40 counties for 8 years, and as Senator Herb Kohl's area representative for 2 years in 14 counties. As my Deputy State Director of Outreach for the past 2 years, it was not uncommon for Bryce to travel in excess of 1,000 miles a week representing me at meetings and events in northern Wisconsin. Of course, these trips were made easier if you knew the "Luchterhand shortcuts" that often took Bryce snaking along the back county roads of northern Wisconsin, inevitably getting him to his destination quicker. In all of these capacities, Bryce served the people of Wisconsin with distinction and honor.

I am proud to call Bryce a friend and I am grateful that in choosing the path of public service, he has impacted countless people's lives, changed communities for the better, and strengthened rural communities of Wisconsin. In retirement, I wish Bryce and his wife Max all the best, including good health and happiness, for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO MARTY BEIL

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, today I recognize and honor Marty Beil of Madison, WI, for his 30 years of leadership as executive director of AFSCME Council 24. I have known Marty for many years, and have been proud to stand in solidarity with him. Marty has been a leader in the labor community, and his passion for the rights of working persons will be missed by all who have worked alongside him and who have benefited from his strong leadership.

Marty began his professional life in service to his union as a member of the WSEU Professional Services Bargaining team in 1973. He continued his service as a member, leader and activist in Council 24 until 1985, when he was appointed executive director. Throughout that time, Marty has been passionate in his advocacy for the rights of working people, to the honor and value of public service, and to insuring that working people have a level playing field on which to compete. Marty has dedicated his career to protecting and serving his members in the collective bargaining and political process, always with a sense of fairness and compassion.

Marty's work is exemplified by his long-term efforts in support of American workers, the American labor movement, and those fighting for civil rights for all Americans. Among many other important priorities, he supported the expansion of antidiscrimination laws to protect the LGBT community, and defended workers from discrimination and retaliation for political activities. He was a staunch defender of labor's right to back candidates who made a commitment to support the goals and activities of union members regardless of partisan affiliation. His 30 years of service at the helm of Council 24 has inspired a new generation of workers to lead the union into the 21st century.

I am proud to call Marty a friend, and I am grateful for his important contributions to our State and the labor community. I know that his passion and dedication, in the model of his forebears such as Roy Kubista and John Lawton will serve as a lasting example for generations of future labor leaders. I wish him all the best in his future endeavors.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE NEW JERSEY-INDIA RELATIONSHIP

• Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I am honored to serve a State with one of the largest Indian American diasporas in the country.

The Indian diaspora community in New Jersey is an active, vocal and engaged constituency whose contributions to the State reach across all sectors. When given the opportunity, the very first caucus I joined in the Senate was the U.S.-India caucus. Soon after I joined the caucus, I had the opportunity to meet Prime Minister Modi during his visit to the United States. His visit signaled a meaningful moment in the relations between the United States and India. It became clearer that the oldest and newest democracies can forge a transformational relationship to leverage the historic opportunities before us.

Together, the United States and India represent over one-fifth of the world's population and share long-term strategic imperatives in the areas of energy efficiency and environmental sustainability, social and economic development, and regional and global security that are rooted in our shared commitment to democratic ideals. President Obama has aptly referred to this relationship as the "defining partnership of the 21st century." As the United States pursues greater clean energy production and sustainable manufacturing here at home, we can and should take advantage of opportunities to further collaborate on technologically advanced clean energy solutions.

Together, we can leverage both American and Indian assets to address the challenges both our countries face in job creation, social mobility, and clean energy. Prime Minister Modi has also emphasized the importance of sustainable growth and ensuring that diversified, environmentally conscious energy sources are made accessible to all Indians. I am encouraged by Prime Minister Modi's commitment to economic and social policies that not only invest in infrastructure but that also develop India's human capacity. With half of its population under the age of 25 and a recent election that saw a 66-percent voter turnout, it is clear that India is set to harness the potential of its most valuable resource—its young people.

In order to compete in a global economy, the United States and India must both expand opportunities for youth education and employment. By engaging private sector actors in our mutual development goals, I believe together we can address these challenges and turn them into opportunities for cooperation.

As this partnership continues to grow, so will the benefits for both of our countries and for New Jersey. The Indian American population in New Jersey has grown by 73 percent in the past decade, and many Indian Americans serve our state as industry and community leaders. New Jersey is the No. 1 benefactor of Indian investment in job creation, with approximately 9,278 jobs and over \$1 billion in investment in a variety of sectors from telecom and technology to healthcare and manufacturing.

As the Senate adjourns for the summer recess, I do not want to miss the opportunity to highlight India Day, which will be observed next week. India Day celebrates the rich history and legacy of India's contributions to communities across the United States.

On August 10, I will have the distinct honor and privilege to welcome Ambassador Singh to New Jersey. I look forward to working with Ambassador Singh as we partner together to foster investment opportunities, create col-

laborations between our world-renowned higher education institutions, and cultivate platforms to facilitate volunteerism and giving. I look forward to fostering the continued growth of the strong relationship between New Jersey and India.●

REMEMBERING SARAH ANDERSON

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life of Sarah Anderson, a beloved mother, wife, daughter, sister, friend, colleague, and passionate advocate for improving the health and lives of people throughout our country. Sarah passed away on July 28, 2015, at the age of 49.

I met Sarah when she came to work on my first campaign for the U.S. Senate. At the time, this impressive young Fort Collins, CO native was just a few years into her political career, having moved to Washington, DC, to work for Senator Tim Wirth right after graduating from the University of Colorado.

Sarah was passionate about helping to elect women, and she wanted to be part of what turned out to be an historic 1992 election. With her wit, intelligence, talent, dedication, sense of humor, and ever-present twinkle in her piercing blue eyes, it was immediately clear to all of us that Sarah was special.

However, one young campaign staff member named Matt Kagan seemed to notice all of Sarah's unique gifts even more than anyone else. While working 20-hour days on our campaign, Sarah and Matt somehow managed to find time to fall in love. At the time, I would sometimes joke that while I was falling in the polls, they were falling in love. But the truth is, Matt and Sarah's beautiful marriage and son were among the most important results of that first campaign. Sarah and Matt always shared a fierce commitment to making the world a better place.

For more than 25 years, Sarah worked tirelessly for the causes she believed in—whether it was protecting the environment at the Sierra Club and the League of Conservation Voters; serving the people of Oregon and California as press secretary to Congresswoman Elizabeth Furse and Congresswoman LORETTA SANCHEZ; or helping to prevent and stop pandemics as an Assistant Dean at UCLA's School of Public Health for nearly a decade.

Sarah and Matt always managed to fill their homes—first in DC and then in California—with love, laughter, good conversation, and great food. But their most important addition happened 10 years ago when they joyfully welcomed their son, Spencer, into their lives. Whenever Spencer's name was mentioned, Sarah's face always lit up with

such pride and love, and there are no words to express how sorry I am for Spencer and Matt's loss. I also want to extend my deepest condolences to Sarah's entire family, especially her mother and stepfather, Sue and Ed Sparling; her sister, Jennifer Enright; and stepbrothers, Erik and Bret Sparling.

Sarah, Matt, and Spencer will always be part of our extended family of Boxer staff members, all of whom join me today in mourning Sarah's loss and celebrating her amazing legacy, which will always live on in the causes she championed, the friendships she forged, and the family she loved and lived for.●

RECOGNIZING VICE ADMIRAL THOMAS R. WESCHLER

● Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the service of a fellow Pennsylvanian, VADM Thomas R. Weschler, Retired, who served this country valiantly for 3½ decades. Vice Admiral Weschler is one of the highest ranking Naval officers to come from Erie, PA, and I am profoundly grateful for his service to our Nation.

Admiral Weschler began his service in 1940, following his graduation from the United States Naval Academy in 1939. He served on the USS *WASP*, CV-7, in World War II, seeing combat in both the Mediterranean and the Pacific, including the invasion of Guadalcanal, and was onboard when the *WASP* was torpedoed by a Japanese submarine.

Admiral Weschler would then go on to command the USS *CLARENCE K. BRONSON* in action during the Korean war. During the Vietnam war, he commanded amphibious operations against Viet Cong forces in 1965 to 1966, during which time he was awarded the Legion of Merit. In 1966, Admiral Weschler became Commander Naval Support Activity, Danang Republic of Vietnam, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal. Following his service in Vietnam, he was awarded a Gold Star for his accomplishments in pioneering and developing the *Spruance* Class destroyer and the *Virginia* Class cruiser.

In 1970, Vice Admiral Weschler assumed command of Cruiser-Destroyer Flotilla TWO, and in 1971 he became Commander Cruiser-Destroyer Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet. For both of these tours he was awarded a Gold Star. In 1973, he was selected for promotion to vice admiral and reported to Washington for duty as Director for Logistics, Joint Staff, Office of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Vice Admiral Weschler retired on June 30, 1975 as a three-star vice admiral following more than 34 years of service in the U.S. Navy.

After his retirement from the Navy, he continued his service as a professor of Naval Operations at the United States War College, Newport, RI, for more than a decade.

On August 28 and 29, 2015, Vice Admiral Weschler will be honored for his service at the opening of the Hagen History Center in Erie, PA, where the Military Gallery will also be dedicated in his honor. I am proud to share in the celebration of Vice Admiral Weschler's career, his meritorious conduct, his extraordinary leadership, and his distinguished and unwavering service to this great Nation. I extend my sincerest gratitude to Vice Admiral Weschler, a native son of Erie, PA, whom we are proud to call one of our own, and wish him and his family all the best in their future endeavors.●

HURRICANE KATRINA

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, 10 years ago, Hurricane Katrina came ashore on the Mississippi gulf coast with devastating force, inflicting billions of dollars in property and personal damages. It was amazing that more were not killed.

The tragic loss of life and horrible property destruction shocked us all. Our recovery has required enormous dedication and determination, and thousands of Mississippians rose to that challenge.

In the days, months, and years after the storm, Mississippians pitched in to help neighbors and strangers alike. The dedication and sacrifice of the Coast Guard, the National Guard and other first responders saved lives and helped enable the large-scale rebuilding that would follow. The resilience and hard work of the people, as well as the outpouring of church and volunteer workers from across the State and Nation, made recovery possible.

Over the past decade, State, local, and Federal elected officials have also aggressively promoted and assisted in the gulf coast's recovery. But our recovery is not yet complete.

While the serious problems exposed by the Katrina recovery effort have been used to improve our national response to emergencies and natural disasters, work remains to be done to ensure a full recovery in Mississippi and along the gulf coast. Unsustainable insurance practices and overbearing Federal regulations continue to hamper recovery and economic development efforts.

Those challenges, however, cannot diminish the pride I have in the people of Mississippi for exemplifying the strength, vision, and resilience necessary to ensure the cultural and economic vitality of our State.

This August, we commemorate the decade since Hurricane Katrina claimed lives and left indelible marks on our State. Mr. President, 10 years after Katrina, I remain confident that we will continue to work together to rebuild Mississippi and to advocate for commonsense policies and intelligent investments that will ensure the continued vitality of the Gulf Coast.●

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM P. GARDNER

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, as I have served Montana's veterans and military members in Congress, I continue to be amazed and humbled by the incredible stories of Montanans fighting for our country in all corners of the world. Montana is home to more veterans per capita than almost any other State in the Nation, and tribal members enroll in the military at a higher rate than any other minority. I wish to recognize one of America's heroes who exemplifies the best of Montana, who is also an enrolled Crow tribal member: William P. "Butch" Gardner.

Mr. Gardner served our country during the Vietnam war. This brave gentleman selflessly served for a number of years during the conflict before he was honorably discharged. Mr. Gardner's commitment to service did not stop when he took off the uniform; in his community, he and a handful of other veterans serve as the color guard on the Crow Reservation. He continues to serve in the honor guard despite losing his leg to an amputation 2 years ago. His peers describe Mr. Gardner as the backbone to the color guard.

Montanans are proud of our diverse heritage, and it is truly an honor to celebrate an individual who so humbly embody the spirit of patriotism.●

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING MONTANA TEENS

● Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the work of the impressive Montana teens who attended the Family, Career and Community Leaders of America, FCCLA, STAR Event in Washington, DC. This group of young men and women made our State proud at their national conference, and brought home a combined 31 gold medals, 26 silver medals, and 3 bronze medals.

Some of the standouts in the Montana FCCLA that I would like to recognize are Garrett Christiaens of Valier, MT, who was just made the new national vice president of programs, and Mariah Pierce, Katlyn Gillen, and Loren Minnick—three Park High School students who not only took first place at the FCCLA State competition, but also went on to win gold medals at the national level.

The Montana FCCLA has approximately 70 chapters across the State, and is part of the Family and Consumer Sciences curriculum offered in over 100 of Montana's high schools. Members of these chapters actively work to make a difference in their families, careers, and communities. I had the opportunity to meet a group of these students last month during their national conference, and I was impressed by their work ethic and dedication to those around them. Their success at the National Leadership Conference affirms that they are indeed

making a difference and demonstrates how Montana students can effectively rise to meet both local and national challenges.●

RECOGNIZING THE 95TH ANNIVERSARY OF WOMEN'S EQUALITY DAY

● Mrs. GILLIBRAND. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in recognition of the 95th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, granting voting rights for women. I ask my colleagues to join me in marking August 26, known as Women's Equality Day, a significant landmark in American history as we acknowledge, honor, and celebrate the vast and vital contributions that women have made to our country.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Lucretia Mott, and other dedicated supporters for women's equality convened the First Women's Rights Convention on July 1848 in Seneca Falls, NY. They advocated for the right to own property, protection from domestic violence, and other social reforms that promoted equality, including voting, and never wavered in that pursuit. Stanton wrote a Declaration of Sentiments that called for "all men and women" to be recognized as created equal under the law, thus beginning the 72-year struggle for suffrage that ended in 1920.

Mr. President, 2015 is the bicentennial year for Elizabeth Cady Stanton, who was born November 12, 1815, in Johnstown, NY. Celebrations of her extraordinary life are taking place throughout the year. Stanton met Susan B. Anthony in 1851, and they began a 50-year partnership advocating for suffrage and women's equality; however, both women did not live to see the passage of the 19th Amendment. As the mother of seven children, Mrs. Stanton can be proud of the legacy she left to her descendants, one of whom is today spearheading a committee tasked with placing a new statue of these two amazing leaders in New York. They gave a voice to millions of women and changed history forever following Anthony's vow that "failure is impossible."

A unique crossroad of history resides at 77th and Central Park West in New York City with statues of two U.S. Presidents, Theodore Roosevelt astride a horse outside the American Museum of Natural History and Abraham Lincoln who stands on the steps of the New-York Historical Society. Near Lincoln is a statue of abolitionist Frederick Douglass symbolically carrying books at a building that safeguards history. I am pleased to announce that permission was granted in May 2015 for a suffragist statue to be installed at the West 77th Street entrance to Central Park. It will be the very first statue of a woman in this park's 160-year history.

New York City park commissioner Mitchell J. Silver awarded this site for a statue of Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Susan B. Anthony, pioneering leaders of the women's suffrage movement. Included in the sculpture design are the names of many remarkable women instrumental in the fight toward winning the vote. Its installation in September 2017 will coincide with New York State's centennial of women's voting rights. The New-York Historical Society announced that in the transformation of its fourth floor there would be a new Center for the Study of Women's History that will present special exhibitions, as well as public and scholarly programs.

Over 50 million visitors each year are welcomed to New York City, with over half reporting they spend time in Central Park. Placing the Stanton and Anthony statue at this highly visible locale that resonates social justice will undoubtedly draw local residents and visitors of all nations to history lessons that include the story of the equal rights and suffrage movements in America.

I ask that we give tribute on August 26, 2015, the 95th anniversary of the passage of the 19th Amendment, to the early suffragists who were steadfast in their pursuit of equality for all citizens, which is a sacred trust that we must continue to support today.●

CONGRATULATING RAY HAGAR

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to congratulate Ray Hagar on his retirement after decades of bringing Northern Nevada extraordinary news coverage. It gives me great pleasure to recognize Ray's hard work and unwavering dedication to the local community and for showcasing journalistic integrity and excellence to the Silver State.

Ray is truly a role model to many in the local community, embodying the battle-born spirit of genuine loyalty, determination, and resilience. He is a fifth-generation Nevadan, bringing unique insight to an array of topics, especially in his political coverage. Ray has spent time at several news outlets, including the Reno Evening Gazette and the Nevada State Journal, and most recently served as a member of the political team with the Reno Gazette Journal and as a regular host on Nevada's most-watched political talk show, Nevada Newsmakers. His 15 years of political coverage with the Reno Gazette Journal brought Nevadans only the most accurate journalism. He is also the co-author of Johnson-Jeffries: Dateline Reno, a novel about the 1910 fight between Jack Johnson and Jim Jeffries and its effects on Nevada. His lengthy and extensive career touched the lives of many across the State, keeping residents up-to-date and knowledgeable on key topics.

Ray always made sure to place himself in the middle of the action to gain a full understanding of what he was reporting on. Even as a young boy growing up, he was eager to be fully engrossed in his surroundings. One story that Ray references as a good learning experience was during his football career with Bishop Manogue High School. It was 1969 and the Bishop Manogue High School Miners, coached by Christ Ault, were playing against Carson High School, my alma mater. The Miners were behind but were inside the 5-yard line with enough time to clench a final victory. At the time, Ray was playing offensive guard and was punched in the face by an opposing player. Ray retaliated, ultimately receiving a penalty that caused the Miners to lose the game and was kicked off the football team. Later that night, he turned up at Coach Ault's home, asking for a second chance and continued on in the season. Though I am sure this was devastating at the time, it shows Ray's sense of commitment and humility.

Throughout his career, Ray was a true journalist, gaining insight from all sides to convey a thorough picture to his audience. If anything important was going on, you could always count on Ray to have an accurate story ready to share. I will never forget some of the stories that Ray reported on, especially his interaction with former New York Yankee manager, Billy Martin. If that doesn't illustrate a sincere effort to get the real story, then I don't know what does. I had the pleasure of working with Ray using an open-door policy and appreciate the relationship we built throughout the years.

Ray left his footprint on Nevada journalism, a mark that will remain in the northern Nevada community for years to come. His legacy of thorough and fair coverage will never be forgotten. Surely, future political writers will have big shoes to fill after his incredible career.

Ray has demonstrated absolute dedication to excellent reporting, bringing Nevada politics outside of the walls of the legislature and Congress to audiences across the State. I am both humbled and honored by his hard work and am proud to call him a fellow Nevadan. Today, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating an upstanding Nevadan and friend, Ray Hagar, on his retirement. I give my deepest appreciation for all that he has done and offer him my best wishes for many successful and fulfilling years to come.●

RECOGNIZING DAVIDSON ACADEMY'S 10TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 10th anniversary of Davidson Academy, an institution with a noble mission to support northern Nevada's profoundly gifted students. I am proud to honor this institution that has worked so hard to prepare

Nevada's youth for successful and positive futures.

Davidson Academy was established in 2005 through State legislation, designating the institution as a university school for gifted students. The academy officially opened in fall of 2006 and is a free public school located on the University of Nevada, Reno, UNR, campus. Students at both the middle school and high school levels attend the academy. Individual students develop a Personalized Learning Plan, which guides them through their academic and personal goals and prepares them for their futures. Students are also able to participate in UNR courses as part of a dual enrollment agreement. The academy works to challenge its students and gives them a great opportunity to develop their knowledge and skills in an advanced environment.

As a father of four children who attended Nevada's public schools, and as the husband of a life-long teacher, I understand the important role that different institutions play in enriching the lives of Nevada's students. Ensuring that America's youth are prepared to compete in the 21st century is critical for the future of our country. Profoundly gifted students are often under-served and unfortunately, do not receive the curriculum they need to excel. The State of Nevada is fortunate to have institutions like Davidson Academy available to support students with unique needs.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in recognizing Davidson Academy on its 10th anniversary. This institution is truly dedicated to enriching the lives of Nevada's students, and I am honored to congratulate them on hitting an important milestone. I wish Davidson Academy well in all of its future endeavors and in creating greater opportunity for Nevada's youth.●

TRIBUTE TO MIKE MCCARTHY

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the hard work and dedication of Michael McCarthy, the principal of King Middle School in Portland, ME, who has served for 27 years and is moving on to a much deserved retirement. Mike has left a remarkable legacy and his hard work and dedication will continue to help Maine students for years to come.

About one-fifth of King Middle School's students speak a native language other than English, 28 different languages in all, and students at the school come from 17 countries. More than half of the student body qualifies for free or subsidized lunch. Such factors can often contribute to poor academic performance, and for many years, parents did not view King Middle as a viable institution for their children. That view changed when Mike McCarthy took over 27 years ago.

Mike possesses the qualities required of a strong leader. He is intelligent, but

understands he may not always have the right answers, making him a good listener. He is dedicated to his students and faculty, and makes decisions that benefit the entire community. As a former teacher, Mike understands the classroom atmosphere and devotes his time to creating a positive learning environment. Perhaps most importantly, Mike is willing to take risks.

Under Mike's leadership, King Middle School was one of the first schools in Maine to embrace 1:1 digital learning. This new approach helped to put technology in the hands of his students and teachers, and helped to open doors and unlock new potential in and out of the classroom. Mike also had the courage to implement an innovative approach called the Expeditionary Learning model, through which groups of teachers and students work together on hands-on projects that require them to have an understanding of many different disciplines. He also has demonstrated the courage to do what he thought was right, even when decisions were controversial. His approach earned him the respect of the teachers and the entire school community, and it has helped turn King Middle School into a real success story.

I cannot say enough good things about Mike and his impact on King Middle School, the city of Portland, and Maine education as a whole. When I recently convened a panel of Maine educators to share their perception on reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Mike brought his strong voice to the table. His has always been an invaluable perspective. Through his experience and input, educators across Maine are better off as they work—just like Mike—to broaden their students' horizons and prepare them for success in a rapidly changing world.●

CELEBRATING THE "YEAR OF DAWES"

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I recognize former Illinois resident and Vice President of the United States, Charles Gates Dawes, in honor of the 150th anniversary of his birth on August 27, 1865. Charles Dawes holds a special place in American history, devoting much of his life to public service, and today his memory lives on in Evanston, IL, the place where Dawes and his family called home for nearly 60 years.

Serving as Vice President of the United States from 1925 to 1929 under President Calvin Coolidge, Dawes distinguished himself in the service of his country on a national and international scale. Dawes served as brigadier general in charge of the American Expeditionary Force Office of Supply during World War I, where he led the Allied Supply Board and subsequently received medals for distinguished service from each of the Allied countries.

On December 10, 1926, Dawes was awarded the 1925 Nobel Peace Prize for his work on the "Dawes Plan" that restructured German reparation repayments following World War I and temporarily helped to restore balance to Europe, easing tensions between Germany and France.

In addition to his work under the Coolidge administration, Dawes served four other U.S. Presidents in various offices that included Comptroller of the Currency, First Director of the Federal Bureau of the Budget, and President of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Dawes also served as U.S. Ambassador to Great Britain, a position he held until 1931. As Ambassador, Dawes successfully helped to negotiate treaties in international law and arms limitations. As the American delegate to the London Naval Conference in 1930, he specifically worked to broker an agreement between Japan, France, Italy, Great Britain, and the United States to limit the number of Navy war vessels and regulate submarine warfare. Dawes was also a dedicated humanitarian, who personally established and funded extensive networks of food and housing for the homeless and less fortunate.

Charles Dawes is also remembered for his contributions and service to his local community of Evanston, IL. Dawes owned an Evanston based utility business, and he and his extended family were a part of the fabric of the community, attending local schools and participating in countless Evanston organizations. In 1942, he arranged to bequeath his home to Northwestern University and the broader Evanston community for the conservation of its cultural history. Today the Dawes home serves as the headquarters of the Evanston History Center, which will be honoring the life of Charles Dawes and the 150th anniversary of his birth through its "Year of Dawes" celebration. I commend the Evanston History Center for its dedication to educating the public on the remarkable life of Charles Dawes and preserving the Dawes family history for future generations.

I ask all my colleagues to join me in celebrating the "Year of Dawes" and honoring the 150th birthday anniversary of Charles Gates Dawes.●

TRIBUTE TO JAN THOMPSON

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, today I commemorate my constituent from Carbondale, IL, Ms. Jan Thompson, for her extraordinary work on behalf of American veterans. Ms. Thompson is a professor at Southern Illinois University and the founder and president of the American Defenders of Bataan and Corregidor—ADBC—Memorial Society. On Sunday, July 19, 2015, Ms. Thompson and ADBC had the historic responsibility of being offered the first Japanese corporate apology for forced labor

by American prisoners of war—POWS—during World War II.

Over 900 American civilian and military POWs were slave laborers in four mines owned by Mitsubishi Mining Company Ltd. during World War II. Ms. Thompson, whose organization represents surviving POWs, their families, descendants, and researchers working on POW history, accepted on their behalf an apology offered by Mitsubishi Mining's successor company, Mitsubishi Materials.

Thompson's father, Robert E. Thompson, was a Pharmacist's Mate aboard the USS *Canopus*—AS-9—a submarine tender moored in Manila Bay at the outbreak of the war on December 8, 1941. The tender was the only heavy ship left to service the submarines during the defense of the Philippines. The crew scuttled her the night before Bataan was surrendered on April 9, 1942 and escaped to fight on Corregidor Island.

Robert Thompson attended to the wounded during the final month of the siege of Corregidor. Surrendering on May 6, 1942 in the face of great odds, he was assigned to the Bilibid Prison Hospital in Manila and survived the three "Hell ships" *Oryoku Maru*, *Enoura Maru*, and *Brazil Maru*.

On July 19th, Mr. Hikaru Kimura, a Senior Corporate Executive of Mitsubishi Materials Corporation and Senior General Manager of Global Business Management at the Paint Finishing System Division of Taikisha Ltd delivered the apology at a ceremony held at the Museum of Tolerance in Los Angeles.

I applaud Mitsubishi Materials' courage and good corporate citizenship. I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Jan Thompson be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JAN THOMPSON, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN DEFENDERS OF BATAAN & CORREGIDOR MEMORIAL SOCIETY

DELIVERED AT THE MUSEUM OF TOLERANCE
SIMON WIESENTHAL CENTER—LOS ANGELES, CA,
JULY 19, 2015

Thank you Rabbi [Abraham] Cooper for moderating today and for having the Museum of Tolerance as the venue for today's meeting.

I thank [Ms.] Kinue Tokodome, Mr. [Hikaru] Kimura, Mr. [Yukio] Okamoto and the Mitsubishi Materials Corporation for inviting me to be a witness to this extraordinary occasion.

I have known Kinue for many years as a dear friend and an advocate for our former POWs. She has worked very hard over the years to bring all of us together today for this important event and she should be recognized for her dedication and perseverance.

I had three roles in the room: one role as a daughter of a former POW, Robert E. Thompson; another role as a filmmaker; and as President of the American Defenders of Bataan & Corregidor [ADBC] Memorial Society.

Being a witness today is meaningful to me.

Seventy years ago our countries were at war and we were enemies. Terrible things happen during war. Our 16th President, Abraham Lincoln stated "We cannot escape history," and perhaps Prime Minister [Shinzo] Abe was paying homage by saying at his recent address to Congress: "We cannot avert our eyes . . ."

For some former POWs an apology is important and they are grateful.

For others, the apology is 70 years too late. Unfortunately for those who have passed away [they] were not able to hear the moving words of Mr. Kimura.

The mission of the ADBC Memorial Society is education and to preserve the legacy of those who had been POWs of Imperial Japan. Our mission is to preserve their history accurately. We see this apology today as an acknowledgment that their use of forced labor for Mitsubishi Mining violated their human rights and their dignity. This apology is important to silence those who deny these facts.

It is obvious that this decision to apologize did not happen overnight. It took people with the same mind, the same goal, and the same courage to make this happen.

Mitsubishi Materials Corporation should be a role model for other Japanese corporations: to come forward and apologize. We hope the citizens of Japan will support today's action. The employees of Mitsubishi Materials Corporation should be proud of their company.

We thank Mr. Kimura for his sincere apology and we hope today starts a relationship between the ADBC Memorial Society and Mitsubishi Materials Corporation to further our goal of reconciliation and education for generations to come.

We see this apology as one very important step forward and we cannot let what happened today die or be forgotten.

STATEMENT BY MITSUBISHI MATERIALS CORPORATION SENIOR EXECUTIVE OFFICER HIKARU KIMURA IN THE MEETING WITH A FORMER AMERICAN POW AND FAMILIES OF FORMER POWS

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen, speaking on behalf of Mitsubishi Materials, thank you very much for this opportunity to meet with you today at the Museum of Tolerance.

Mitsubishi Mining Company Limited, the predecessor of Mitsubishi Materials, was engaged in coal and metal mining during World War II. As the war intensified, prisoners of war were placed in a wide range of industries to offset labor shortages. As part of this, close to 900 American POWs were allocated to four mines operated by Mitsubishi Mining in Japan.

I joined Mitsubishi Materials as a postwar baby-boomer and have worked in the company for 34 years. I have read the memoirs of Mr. James Murphy, who is present here at this ceremony, and those of other former POWs, as well as records of court trials. Through these accounts, I have learned about the terrible pain that POWs experienced in the mines of Mitsubishi Mining.

The POWs, many of whom were suffering from disease and injury, were subjected to hard labor, including during freezing winters, working without sufficient food, water, medical treatment or sanitation. When we think of their harsh lives in the mines, we cannot help feeling deep remorse.

I would like to express our deepest sense of ethical responsibility for the tragic experiences of all U.S. POWs, including Mr. James Murphy, who were forced to work under

harsh conditions in the mines of the former Mitsubishi Mining.

On behalf of Mitsubishi Materials, I offer our sincerest apology.

I also extend our deepest condolence to their fellow U.S. POWs who worked alongside them but have since passed away.

To the bereaved families who are present at this ceremony, I also offer our most remorseful apology.

This cannot happen again, and of course, Mitsubishi Materials intends to never let this happen again.

We now have a clear corporate mission of working for the benefit of all people, all societies and indeed the entire globe. Respecting the basic human rights of all people is a core principle of Mitsubishi Materials, and we will continue to strongly adhere to this principle.

Our management team wishes for the health and happiness of our employees every day, and we ask that all of them work not only diligently, but also with a sense of ethics.

Mitsubishi Materials supplies general materials that enrich people's lives, from cement to cellphone components and auto parts, all of which are closely related to people's lives. We also place a strong emphasis on recycling for more sustainable societies, such as recovering valuable metals from used electrical appliances and other scrapped materials.

Here in the United States, we have plants for cement and ready-mixed concrete, and a sales headquarters for our advanced materials and tools business, all in California, as well as a polysilicon plant in Alabama. We believe that our company provides fulfilling jobs for local employees and contributes to host communities through its business.

The American Defenders of Bataan & Corregidor Museum in Wellsburg, West Virginia archives extensive records and memorabilia of POWs. These records and memorabilia will be handed down to future generations for educational purposes.

I will visit the museum the day after tomorrow to view the exhibits and visualize how POWs were forced to work under harsh conditions. For now, however, I am pleased to announce that Mitsubishi Materials has donated 50,000 U.S. dollars to the museum to support its activities.

Finally, I sincerely thank Ms. Kinue Tokudome and the members of the American Defenders of Bataan & Corregidor Memorial Society for creating this opportunity to meet with you today. I also express my sincere thanks to Rabbi Abraham Cooper for offering the Museum of Tolerance as a venue for the ceremony. And I express my deep gratitude to all others involved in arranging this gathering.

I would also like to thank the family members of a non-U.S. POW [Mr. Stanley Gibson from Scotland, whose late father James Gibson, a private in the Argyll and Sutherland Highlanders captured in Malaya in 1942, was also a slave laborer in the Mitsubishi Osarizawa mine] who have come from very far away to attend this ceremony.

I truly hope that this gathering marks the starting point of a new relationship between former POWs and Mitsubishi Materials.

Thank you very much.●

TRIBUTE TO MELBA CURLS

● Mrs. McCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask the Senate to join me in congratulating my good friend Melba Curls on

her retirement from her many years of service to the city of Kansas City and the State of Missouri.

Melba's journey as an agent of change began early in her life as a member of one of the first classes to integrate Kansas City's Central High School. Soon thereafter she found herself active in the NAACP's Youth Program. It was through that involvement that she met her future husband and my good friend State senator Phil B. Curls. While Phil passed from us far too soon, it was not before spending 43 wonderful years wed to Melba.

Melba began her career in public service as a valued staff member to former Kansas City mayor Charles Wheeler and then to U.S. Senator Tom Eagleton. She then dedicated nearly 15 years of her life to improving the lives of countless Missourians, through her work at KCMC Child Development Corporation and its Head Start Program.

The people of Missouri's 41st House District elected Melba to represent them in the Missouri House of Representatives in 1999. Her 7 years in the general assembly saw her work across the political aisle, with both urban and rural legislators and with officials from executive departments in order to make her community and her State a better place for us all.

In 2007, Melba was elected as city councilwoman for the third District, At-Large in Kansas City, MO. In typical fashion, Melba jumped in feet first to tackle a wide range of issues facing the city. Whether it was housing, transportation and infrastructure, or issues pertaining to public safety, Melba was going to be a leader fighting for the good of her community.

Melba is now completing her second and final term on the city council. During her time in elected office, she has earned the respect of her colleagues, civic organizations, and the community at large.

I know Melba is now looking forward to traveling and spending more time with her beautiful family. However, I also know Melba—when she sees work that needs to be done, she will be there. While her time as an elected official may be coming to an end, her time as a force for good is not. Thanks to her lifelong passion and drive, her neighborhood, the city of Kansas City, and the State of Missouri are, and will continue to be, better places for us all.

I ask that the Senate join me in congratulating Melba Curls on a job well done, and wishing her nothing but the best in the years to come.●

STURGIS MOTORCYCLE RALLY 75TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I wish to commemorate the 75th anniversary of the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally, taking place this week in Sturgis, SD. No single week in the en-

tire year boasts a greater influx in the State's overall population than the week of the annual event the first week of August. During that week, motorcyclists gather together in perhaps the largest bike gathering of all time. This year, more than 1 million visitors from across the world are estimated to attend the rally—more than the entire population of South Dakota.

What began as a single motorcycle race in 1938, the weeklong rally takes place in the small town of Sturgis in the Black Hills of western South Dakota, a normally quiet town with a population of just over 6,000. During the week of the rally, however, Main Street Sturgis evolves into a platform for chrome, leather, and denim, where motorcycle enthusiasts and other tourists come to enjoy like-minded company, various forms of entertainment, the South Dakota landscape, and local food and grub.

The economic impact of the rally is impressive. A study conducted by the Rally Department of the city of Sturgis gauged the economic impact of the 2010 rally, which hosted 466,000 attendees, as generating roughly \$817 million dollars in economic activity for the State. That is just in 1 year.

And not just the city of Sturgis benefits. Though the rally only lasts a week, the magnificence of the State often compels visitors to stick around even longer. Many attendees travel to South Dakota weeks before the rally begins or extend their stay afterward to travel our State and take in its beauty and many tourist attractions. With the Black Hills National Forest, Badlands National Park, Mount Rushmore National Monument, and the Crazy Horse Memorial all within driving distance, visitors can experience the buzzing commotion of bikers and chrome one day and the pristine beauty of South Dakota's Black Hills the next. The contrast is captivating, and it boosts economic activity throughout the region. By all accounts, this year has been no different. It appears the 75th Annual Sturgis Motorcycle Rally is already off to a great start, and it could very well be a record-breaking year.

Rally week is always an exciting time to be in South Dakota, and I wish everyone attending this year's rally a safe, happy, and fun-filled trip. Congratulations to everyone who has worked to make the rally a world-renowned event over the past 75 years. I wish our State and the city of Sturgis many more successful years of hosting the Sturgis Motorcycle Rally.●

TRIBUTE TO CHLOE CHRISTENSEN

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, today I recognize Chloe Christensen, an intern in my Rapid City office as well as my leadership office at the Senate Republican Conference, for all of the hard

work she has done for me, my staff, and the State of South Dakota.

Chloe will begin attending George Washington University this fall where she will major in international affairs. Chloe is a dedicated worker who has been committed to getting the most out of her experience.

I extend my sincere thanks and appreciation to Chloe Christensen for all of the fine work she has done and wish her continued success in the years to come.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MEASURES DISCHARGED

The following bill was discharged from the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, pursuant to the order of May 27, 1988, and placed on the calendar:

S. 710. A bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1603. A bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers (Rept. No. 114-116).

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Report to accompany S. 710, a bill to reauthorize the Native American Housing Assistance and Self-Determination Act of 1996, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-117).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance, without amendment:

S. 1946. An original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend expiring provisions, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-118).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Finance:

Special Report entitled "The Internal Revenue Service's Processing of 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) Applications for Tax-Exempt Status Submitted by 'Political Advocacy' Organizations from 2010-2013" (Rept. No. 114-119).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HATCH for the Committee on Finance.

Marisa Lago, of New York, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador.

*W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

By Mr. ALEXANDER for the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

*Walter A. Barrows, of Ohio, to be a Member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term expiring August 28, 2019.

*Kathryn K. Matthew, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years.

*Karen Bollinger DeSalvo, of Louisiana, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services.

*W. Thomas Reeder, Jr., of Virginia, to be Director of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1938. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the approval of certain programs of education for purposes of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. SHAHEEN (for herself and Mr. HATCH):

S. 1939. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for institutional ineligibility based on low cohort repayment rates and to require risk sharing payments of institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHATZ:

S. 1940. A bill to improve the retirement security of American families by increasing Social Security benefits for current and future beneficiaries while making Social Security stronger for future generations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1941. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. GARDNER:

S. 1942. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

S. 1943. A bill to modify the boundary of the Shiloh National Military Park located in the State of Tennessee and Mississippi, to establish Parker's Crossroads Battlefield as an affiliated area of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1944. A bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 1945. A bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1946. An original bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Finance; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1947. A bill to exclude the discharge of certain Federal student loans from the calculation of gross income; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 1948. A bill to increase awareness of the Federal student loan income-based repayment plan, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 1949. A bill to make it unlawful to alter or remove the unique equipment identification number of a mobile device; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1950. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to provide for online voter registration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1951. A bill to amend the Help America Vote Act of 2002 to require the availability of early voting or no-excuse absentee voting; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1952. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to modify the procedures for change of address; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. CASEY:

S. 1953. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. WYDEN:

S. 1954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax incentive to individuals teaching in public elementary and secondary schools located in rural or high unemployment areas and to individuals who achieve certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1955. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equi-

table allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 1956. A bill to require the Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere to conduct an assessment of cultural and historic resources in the waters of the Great Lakes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1957. A bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1958. A bill to establish additional protections and disclosures for students and co-signers with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 1959. A bill to provide greater controls and restrictions on revolving door lobbying; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1960. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SCHUMER (for himself, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1961. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. GARDNER):

S. 1962. A bill to authorize 2 additional district judgeships for the district of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself and Mr. KING):

S. 1963. A bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to establish advisory boards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 1964. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1965. A bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. KIRK, Mr. BROWN, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1966. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. KIRK:

S. 1967. A bill to provide for the conveyance of land of the Illiana Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Danville, Illinois; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1968. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain companies to disclose information describing any measures the company has taken to identify and address conditions of forced labor, slavery, human trafficking, and the worst forms of child labor within the company's supply chains; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1969. A bill to designate Federal election day as a public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 1970. A bill to establish national procedures for automatic voter registration for elections for Federal Office; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1971. A bill to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 1972. A bill to require air carriers to modify certain policies with respect to the use of epinephrine for in-flight emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 1973. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the deduction for interest on education loans, to extend and expand the deduction for qualified tuition and related expenses, and eliminate the limitation on contributions to Coverdell education savings accounts; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 1974. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to amend its regulations relating to qualified mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 1975. A bill to establish the Sewall-Belmont House National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1976. A bill to prohibit the distribution in commerce of children's products and upholstered furniture containing certain flame retardants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1977. A bill to provide family members and close associates of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KIRK (for himself and Mr. DONNELLY):

S. 1978. A bill to amend the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to prevent duplicative regulation of advisers of small business investment companies; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mrs. MURRAY:

S. 1979. A bill to direct the Chief of Engineers to transfer an archaeological collection, commonly referred to as the Kennewick Man or the Ancient One, to the Washington State Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. BOOKER):

S. 1980. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Alice Paul, in recognition of her role in the women's suffrage movement and in advancing equal rights for women; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Ms. WARREN (for herself, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 1981. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1982. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1983. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LANKFORD:

S. 1984. A bill to prevent Indian tribes and tribal organizations that cultivate, manufacture, or distribute marijuana on Indian land from receiving Federal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 1985. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Washington County, Utah, to authorize the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1986. A bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. INHOFE (for himself, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 1987. A bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 1988. A bill to enhance the security of military personnel at United States military installations and operating locations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CASSIDY:

S. 1989. A bill to improve access to primary care services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HATCH (for himself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 1990. A bill to require Inspectors General and the Comptroller General of the United States to submit reports on the use of logical access controls and other security practices to safeguard classified and personally identifiable information on Federal computer systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1991. A bill to eliminate the sunset date for the Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand eligibility for such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Mr. THUNE, Mr. DAINES, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1992. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1993. A bill to establish the 21st Century Conservation Service Corps to place youth and veterans in the United States in national service positions to protect, restore, and enhance the great outdoors of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 1994. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase certain fuel taxes and to strengthen the earned income tax credit and make permanent certain tax provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

S. 1995. A bill to provide grants for projects to acquire land and water for parks and other outdoor recreation purposes and to develop new or renovate existing outdoor recreation facilities; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 1996. A bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1997. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide for wildfire mitigation grants and financial assistance in certain areas affected by wildfires; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. HEINRICH (for himself and Ms. HIRONO):

S. 1998. A bill to improve college affordability; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1999. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to act, without liability for certain damages, to prevent and respond to the threat of damage from pollution of the sea by crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. MANCHIN):

S. 2000. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain agreements with non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care providers if the Secretary is not feasibly able to provide health care in facilities of the Department or through contracts or sharing agreements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2001. A bill to phase out special wage certificates under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 that allow individuals with disabilities to be paid at subminimum wage rates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2002. A bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE):

S. Res. 246. A resolution commemorating 80 years since the creation of Social Security; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. Res. 247. A resolution commemorating and honoring the actions of President Harry S. Truman and the crews of the Enola Gay and Bockscar in using the atomic bomb to bring World War II to an end; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 248. A resolution designating September 2015 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ard for determining whether an organization is operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare for purposes of section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 497

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 497, a bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families.

S. 564

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 564, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 142

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 142, a bill to require the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate a rule to require child safety packaging for liquid nicotine containers, and for other purposes.

S. 210

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for amounts paid by a spouse of a member of the Armed Forces for a new State license or certification required by reason of a permanent change in the duty station of such member to another State.

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 210, *supra*.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 271

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 283

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 283, a bill to prohibit the Internal Revenue Service from modifying the stand-

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 242. A resolution celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 243. A resolution celebrating the 35th anniversary of the Small Business Development Centers of the United States; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS):

S. Res. 244. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding the "Laudato Si" encyclical of Pope Francis, and global climate change; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 245. A resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN,

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 661

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 661, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to enhance the dependent care tax credit, and for other purposes.

S. 706

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. 706, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require institutions of higher education to have an independent advocate for campus sexual assault prevention and response.

S. 776

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 776, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to improve access to medication therapy management under part D of the Medicare program.

S. 799

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 799, a bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

S. 804

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory

board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1061

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1061, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1062

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1062, a bill to improve the Federal Pell Grant program, and for other purposes.

S. 1090

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1090, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the names of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) and the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. COATS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, *supra*.

S. 1107

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1107, a bill to provide for an equitable management of summer flounder based on geographic, scientific, and economic data and for other purposes.

S. 1358

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1358, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to inter in national cemeteries individuals who supported the United States in Laos during the Vietnam War era.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1523

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1523, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1526, a bill to amend title 10 and title 41, United States Code, to improve the manner in which Federal contracts for construction and design services are awarded, to prohibit the use of reverse auctions for design and construction services procurements, to amend title 31 and 41, United States Code, to improve the payment protections available to construction contractors, subcontractors, and suppliers for work performed, and for other purposes.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1566

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY), the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1566, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to require group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans to provide for coverage of oral anticancer drugs on terms no less favorable than the coverage provided for anticancer medications administered by a health care provider.

S. 1589

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1589, a bill to facilitate efficient investments and financing of infrastructure projects and new, long-term job creation through the establishment of an Infrastructure Financing Authority, and for other purposes.

S. 1603

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1603, a bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

S. 1609

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1609, a bill to provide support for the development of middle school career exploration programs linked to career and technical education programs of study.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1711

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1711, a bill to provide for a temporary safe harbor from the enforcement of integrated disclosure requirements for mortgage loan transactions under the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 and the Truth in Lending Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1728

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1728, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equal access to declaratory judgments for organizations seeking tax-exempt status.

S. 1772

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island

(Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to permit employees to request changes to their work schedules without fear of retaliation and to ensure that employers consider these requests, and to require employers to provide more predictable and stable schedules for employees in certain occupations with evidence of unpredictable and unstable scheduling practices that negatively affect employees, and for other purposes.

S. 1775

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1775, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1819

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the names of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1819, a bill to improve security at Armed Forces recruitment centers.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to safeguard military personnel on Armed Forces military installations by repealing bans on military personnel carrying firearms, and for other purposes.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1838

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1838, a bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to ensure State and local compliance with all Federal immigration detainers on aliens in custody and for other purposes.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1860

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1860, a bill to protect and promote international religious freedom.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award job training Federal Pell Grants.

S. 1925

At the request of Mr. HEINRICH, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1925, a bill to extend the secure rural schools and community self-determination program and to make permanent the payment in lieu of taxes program and the land and water conservation fund.

S. RES. 148

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 148, a resolution condemning the Government of Iran's state-sponsored persecution of its Baha'i minority and its continued violation of the International Covenants on Human Rights.

AMENDMENT NO. 2612

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2612 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

S. 1944. A bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce S. 1944, the RED Tape Act of 2015.

The letters R-E-D stand for Regulations Endanger Democracy. They do, and they are. This bill will help cut burdensome regulations—regulations that I think everybody agrees have been strangling our economy, regulations that many of my colleagues and I and economists around the country and around the world believe are at the heart of why we can't grow the great American economy.

Let me spend a few minutes on the economy, what the regulations are doing, and why I believe this bill is so important and why we are working hard to get bipartisan support for it.

There is a debate going on in this country and on the Senate floor: Are we in decline? Is America in decline? Are our best days behind us? Is China going to own the 21st century the way we did the last century?

Now, I am an optimist. I don't think we are in decline. We don't need to be in decline. Here is the reason why. We don't hear about it much, but when we look and compare the United States to other countries, we have so many comparative advantages. We still have so many comparative advantages.

Imagine the United States is in a global poker game with all the other major nations of the world around the table. We don't hear this much, but relative to other countries, we look at our hand and we hold aces. As a matter of fact, we hold most of the aces. Let me give a few examples.

The high-tech sector. Whether it is Silicon Valley, Massachusetts, places throughout the entire country, we still have the most vibrant, innovative high-tech sector of anyplace in the world, the ability to commercialize ideas with private equity and financing. If you have a good idea, an entrepreneurial idea in America, you can commercialize that, you can take that to market more quickly, more efficiently than any other place in the world.

Our agriculture sector for decades has been probably the most efficient agriculture sector in the world, feeding the world, literally.

Universities. Look at America's universities relative to any other place, any other country. I had the great honor—my oldest daughter of my three teenaged daughters graduated from high school last year. My wife and I took her to a number of universities she was looking at across the country. We have States—Massachusetts, Cali-

fornia—that probably have better top research universities just in those States than other countries have in their entire country. In my State of Alaska, we have great universities. It is a huge advantage.

Energy. Once again through American innovation, we are the world's energy superpower again, the way we used to be, producing more oil, more gas, more renewables than any other country in the world. It is a huge advantage.

Fisheries. We are one of the top countries in the world in terms of the harvest of fisheries, and my State of Alaska is the superpower of American seafood. We harvest more than 50 percent of all seafood in America—a huge advantage for our country.

The military. I don't have to say much more about the military. We have the best, most professional military in the world, probably in the history of the world, unrivaled by any other nation, not even close.

Then even issues like—we talk a lot about immigration and how our system is broken and how the border needs to be secured. Absolutely. But we are still the country of the world that other people of the world want to come to. They want to come here.

I recently attended a naturalization ceremony in Juneau, AK. If you want to take pride in our country, if you want to see something great, go to a naturalization ceremony. See people who have been thinking about becoming an American for most of their lives finally achieving that goal. It will bring tears to your eyes. It brought tears to my eyes.

Then, of course, in terms of comparative advantages, there is our form of government, our Framers, our Constitution—the longest standing constitutional democracy in the world. It certainly is not perfect, but again, relative to other countries, it is a huge advantage.

So, as I mentioned, we have all the aces. In that big global game of poker, we have a great hand. As President Reagan said a couple decades ago, we are “the greatest, freest, strongest nation on earth.” And I believe we still are.

But, of course, like all countries, we have challenges. Here is the biggest challenge, I believe: If we have all the aces, if we have all these comparative advantages, why can't we grow our economy anymore? Why can't we create opportunities for young college graduates?

Our gross domestic product shrunk the first quarter of this year for the third time in the last 9 years. That hasn't happened in more than 60 years. From 2011 through 2014, our gross domestic product only grew at a little bit below 2 percent.

The comparative advantage, the growth rate that made our country

great from 1790 to 2014—U.S. real GDP growth in real dollars—averaged an annual rate of 3.7 percent—almost 4 percent GDP growth. That is the average for our country's history. That is real, robust American growth. That is what made us great. The Obama administration's average is 1.36 percent per year.

Just last week—and I know this is an issue that you and I have talked a lot about—it was revealed that we now have officially the worst economic recovery in 70 years.

An article in the Wall Street Journal says that new GDP revisions show the worst recovery in 70 years and it was even weaker than we thought. This is a huge problem. We can no longer grow our economy. When that happens, we hurt the most vulnerable in society. But what is even more frustrating than that is when you come to Washington, it seems that nobody actually seems to care about this topic anymore or that we are going to dumb down our expectations.

It was pretty amazing. Some economists cheered. Our growth rate that was announced last quarter was a little bit over 2 percent GDP growth, and they cheered it. But, again, the issue doesn't even seem to be something that people here are focused on.

Let me give you an example. The first quarter of this year, the U.S. economy—the greatest economy in the world—went back into recession. We shrunk. That is a big deal. That should frighten people. Did the White House say anything? Did the Secretary of the Treasury come out and say: Oh, my gosh, we are back in a recession; here is what we are going to do to grow this economy because we know growth is the key to almost everything.

Not a word—in fact, what is starting to happen is—and it is a very, very dangerous trend in Washington—we are just going to dumb down our expectations. Yes, traditional levels of U.S. economic growth are almost 4 percent since the founding of our Nation. But guess what we are going to call it now. We are going to call 2 percent growth—which is all we can achieve, it seems—the new normal. We are not going to try to get back to 4 percent, the traditional levels. Democrats and Republicans have done that for decades, centuries. We are going to say: No, America, you need to be satisfied with the new normal—2 percent GDP growth.

Terms such as the “new normal,” “secular stagnation”—some are even talking that this is our destiny as a nation. I don't like that term—“new normal.” It is a surrender. It is a surrender of American greatness. It is a surrender of our future, and it is a surrender of our kids' future.

If we stay at these levels of growth—1.5 percent, 2 percent of GDP growth; the Obama administration growth levels—the challenges that we face are huge debt, infrastructure, funding the

military, funding social programs, and even the cohesion of our great American country. All of these challenges will be much, much harder to address.

I believe one of the most important things we can do in this body, which we are not doing enough of, is to focus on this issue. Why are we not growing the American economy anymore? We have to get back to these robust levels of growth—Democratic, Republican levels. We have to get back to traditional levels of growth.

We can do better. Our history is better. This is the greatest economy in the world, and we need to unleash it. What is the problem? How do we do this? How do we get back to these levels of growth? If we are holding all the aces, what is holding us back?

I believe a huge part of the problem of what is holding us back is actually this town, the Federal Government, and the agencies here that are stifling economic growth with redtape from the alphabet soup of agencies—the IRS, the EPA, and the BLM—that are constantly promulgating new regulations. As opposed to being partners in opportunity, our Federal Government wants to regulate everything, all aspects of our economy.

Regulations across the country, from Alaska to Maine, are hurting businesses, are hurting the economy, and are hurting our citizens, especially the most vulnerable. Again, this is not a partisan issue. Almost all of us on both sides of the aisle agree that we need to cut redtape. Even President Obama's own Small Business Administration puts the number—the annual cost of regulations that grow every year—at \$1.7 trillion per year. It is almost \$1.8 trillion per year. If that were the economy, that would be one of the largest economies in the world. That is a staggering number, and they are growing. Regulatory costs amount to an average of almost \$15,000 per household. It is around 29 percent of an average family budget of \$51,000. People are noticing, not only in this country but globally.

On Friday, the Financial Times had an article: "The land of free markets, tied down by red tape."

Every nation needs a unifying idea. Americans love to see themselves as champions of free markets and entrepreneurial zeal.

That halo is coming off America because of regulations. What should we do? I believe we need to freeze the growth of regulations. That is what my bill, the RED Tape Act of 2015, does.

The cumulative Federal rules since 1976 is what we do here. We grow them like some irresistible force of nature. But it doesn't have to be that way. Unfortunately, my State has been ground zero for many overburdensome regulations—bridges, roads, and mines that take years simply to permit, not to build.

In rural Alaska, we are letting trash pile up because they don't make small,

portable incinerators that comply with EPA regulations. Because of Federal roadless rules in southeast Alaska, we can't even build new alternative energy plants for energy-starved citizens of my State. Nationally, bridges are crumbling and can't get built because of overly burdensome regulations.

Let me provide one more example that you are aware of, Mr. President. Banks are failing. Because of regulations and a bad economy, over 1,300 small community banks have disappeared since 2010, and only two new banks in the United States have been chartered in the last 5 years. Even during the Great Depression we had on average 19 new banks a year. In the last 5 years, we have had two. As the article said, "the entrepreneurial halo is starting to slip, too, since increasing quantities of red tape are making life harder for start-ups."

Let me be clear. Regulations are not all bad. Many of them keep us safe from harm. But the mountains and stacks of regulations over the decades undermine our future.

What my bill would do is very simple. It is using a simple one-in, one-out method. New regulations that cause financial or administrative burdens on businesses for the people of the United States would need to be offset by repealing existing regulations. You issue a new reg and you repeal an old reg. If an agency doesn't want to do this, the cost of living adjustments for the agency personnel will be withheld until the agency abides by this law. It is very simple.

What we need to do is stop this growth of regulations on the American people and on our economy. This bill will help keep the regulatory system under control. It will help cut the redtape that binds us. It will bind the regulatory system instead, and it will help bring back the shine of that entrepreneurial halo in great American spirit that we all yearn for.

Finally, it will make sure that the aces we have in our hand—the comparative advantages that we have over every other country in the world—are used to benefit our country, grow our economy, and create a brighter future for our children.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself,
Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. COTTON,
Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. LEAHY, Mr.
MERKLEY, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 1957. A bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the State Li-

censing Efficiency Act with my colleagues Senators LANKFORD, COTTON, CAPITO, LEAHY, MERKLEY, and CRAPO.

This bill provides a simple, common-sense change to the Secure and Fair Enforcement for Mortgage Licensing Act, SAFE Act, which became law in 2008 as part of the Housing and Economic Recovery Act.

Overall, this bipartisan bill streamlines the licensing process for financial service providers, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

The SAFE Act required that state banking regulators use the electronic Nationwide Mortgage Licensing System, NMLS, to license or register mortgage loan originators.

As the author of the SAFE Act, I have been pleased to see the NMLS' success over the past five years in facilitating mortgage loan originator licensing.

The use of the NMLS for mortgage loan originators benefits state regulators, those seeking licenses to conduct financial services, and consumers.

First, it increases efficiency and consolidates the licensing process and relevant information in one place for state regulators. This also allows for easier coordination between regulators.

Second, it provides a uniform licensing process for mortgage loan originators seeking licenses.

Finally, it allows consumers to verify the credentials of financial service providers to ensure that they are truly licensed or registered in the state in which they are conducting business.

Today, over half of the States now use the NMLS for licensing entities other than mortgage loan originators, including for non-depository financial service providers like check cashers, debt collectors, and money transmitters.

Many States require Federal background checks as part of the licensing process for financial service providers.

However, the SAFE Act only provided the Attorney General with the authority to share federal background check information with the NMLS for mortgage loan originators.

The FBI does not have the authority to share this information with the NMLS for any other financial service provider.

This means that while the rest of the licensing process for other financial service providers can be conducted through the NMLS, the background check cannot.

I believe background checks are a critical component of State licensing and regulation. It does not make sense to allow for the licensing process to be delayed by barring certain background checks from being coordinated through the NMLS.

The State Licensing Efficiency Act would provide the authorization needed for the Attorney General to allow the FBI to share background check information for non-depository financial

service providers with state regulators through the NMLS, just as it currently does for mortgage loan originators.

Let me be clear that this bill does not change any state licensing requirements or impact any state laws. States fully retain the ability to determine when they want to use the NMLS for other financial service providers.

However, should states continue to expand their utilization of the NMLS, it makes sense to allow them to fully do so by ensuring federal background checks can be coordinated through the NMLS.

Additionally, this bill will help financial service providers seeking licenses in multiple states.

Instead of submitting federal background check requests for each State where they are seeking a license, they can submit one request via the NMLS for Federal background check information, which will be sent to the NMLS.

States conducting the licensing process will then have access to the information through the NMLS.

This should reduce the number of background check processing fees paid by financial service providers seeking licenses and reduce the processing period for the background checks so that financial service providers can get licensed more efficiently.

The State Licensing Efficiency Act makes a reasonable change to allow state regulators who use the NMLS for licensing financial service providers to fully benefit from a streamlined, transparent, and more efficient process.

Many regulatory associations support this bill including: the Conference of State Bank Supervisors, the American Association of Residential Mortgage Regulators, the Money Transmitter Regulators Association, the North American Collection Agency Regulatory Association, and the National Association of Consumer Credit Administrators.

Additionally, associations representing a variety of financial service providers have voiced support, including: the Appraisal Institute, the Mortgage Bankers Association, and the Money Services Round Table.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this legislation and am hopeful that this Congress will move it forward.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mrs. SHAHEEN):

S. 960. A bill to establish a statute of limitations for certain actions of the Securities and Exchange Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing legislation that extends the time period the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, would have to seek civil monetary penalties for securities law violations.

This legislation continues to be necessary in light of the Supreme Court's decision in *Gabelli v. SEC* in which the Court held that the 5 year clock to take action against wrongdoing starts when the fraud occurs, not when it is discovered. Unfortunately, *Gabelli* has made it more difficult for the SEC to protect investors by shortening the amount of time that the SEC has to investigate and pursue securities law violations.

Financial fraud has evolved considerably over the years and now often consists of multiple parties, complex financial products, and elaborate transactions that are executed in a variety of securities markets, both domestic and foreign. As a result, the evidence of wrongdoing needed to initiate an action may go undetected for years. Securities law violators may simply run out the clock, now with greater ease in the aftermath of *Gabelli*.

Couple this with the reality that while we have given the SEC even greater responsibilities, Congress, despite my ongoing efforts to urge otherwise, has not provided the agency with all the resources necessary to carry out its duties.

To give an example of the impact of this resource shortfall, SEC Chair White on May 5, 2015, before the Senate Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Subcommittee testified that "even with the SEC's efficient use of limited resources to improve its risk assessment capabilities and focus its examination staff on areas posing the greatest risk to investors—efforts that helped to increase the number of investment adviser examinations approximately 20 percent from fiscal year 2013—the SEC was only able to examine 10 percent of registered investment advisers in fiscal year 2014. A rate of adviser examination coverage at that level presents a high risk to the investing public."

This legislation would address some of these challenges by giving the SEC the breathing room it needs to better protect our markets and investors. Specifically, this bill extends the time period the SEC has to seek civil monetary penalties from five years to ten years, thereby strengthening the integrity of our markets, better protecting investors, and empowering the SEC to investigate and pursue more securities law violators, particularly those most sophisticated at evading detection.

In addition, the bill would align the SEC's statute of limitations with the limitations period applicable to complex civil financial fraud actions initiated pursuant to the Financial Institutions Reform, Recovery, and Enforcement Act of 1989, FIRREA. For more than 20 years, the Department of Justice, DOJ, has benefited from FIRREA, which allows the DOJ to seek civil penalties within a 10-year time period against persons who have committed

fraud against financial institutions. The SEC, which pursues similarly complex financial fraud cases, should have the same time necessary to bring wrongdoers that violate the securities laws to justice.

I thank Public Citizen, U.S. PIRG, Consumer Action, the Consumer Federation of America, and Americans for Financial Reform for their support, and I urge my colleagues to join Senator SHAHEEN and me in supporting this legislation.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. CASEY, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BROWN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 964. A bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss an issue of great importance: helping vulnerable children stay safe and cared for by strengthening their families and connecting them to kin.

I would like to begin with a hypothetical. Imagine a single mom with two kids and multiple part time jobs. She works long hours to provide for her family, but even then it is a struggle to pay the bills and keep food on the table. Reliable child care is extremely costly and out of reach. Because her work schedule changes week to week she is forced to leave her children unattended at times. Out of concern, a neighbor places a call to Child Protective Services, and a social worker then has to choose between two bad options—breaking up the family, or doing nothing at all to help them.

Today, most youngsters in foster care aren't there because of physical or sexual abuse. Kids predominantly wind up in foster care because their biological families, like that hypothetical single mom, are ensnared in terribly desperate circumstances that lead to neglect.

The fact is, whenever you talk with kids who have aged out of foster care about what could have helped them the most, you hear them say things like, "helping my mom . . . helping my dad . . . helping my family." What that tells me is that youngsters know they're best served when a family can be propped up, not dismantled.

Unfortunately, the child welfare system has too few tools for that to happen. Yesterday, the Finance Committee held a hearing to explore how to turn that system around—how to make a difference for kids early on so that they can grow up surrounded by family in a safe and loving home. I commend Chairman HATCH for his commitment to improving the lives of vulnerable

kids and their families. The hearing was an important step forward.

Back in the mid-1990s, there was a debate over whether sending kids to orphanages was the right idea. And I saw an opportunity for our child welfare policies to break into the enormous, untapped potential of kin. So I authored the Kinship Care Act, which said that aunts and uncles or grandparents who met the right standards would have first preference when it came to caring for a niece or nephew or grandchild. It became the first federal law of its kind.

Now in 2015, I see an opportunity for Congress to take a similar approach, but go even further. I believe that building child welfare policies around proactivity and flexibility will help a lot more families stay together and thrive. States have already shown that with waivers from the rigid Federal funding system, they're able to turn smart ideas into meaningful results for kids and their families. There is a tremendous example that my home state of Oregon is currently putting in place. It's called Differential Response. Differential Response, as I see it, is all about recognizing that every kid is different, and every family faces unique challenges. So Oregon's system is approaching every case with the nuance it deserves.

Today I—along with Senators STABENOW, BENNET, CASEY, BROWN, CANTWELL, SCHUMER, and MENENDEZ—am introducing the Family Stability and Kinship Care Act that will make badly needed flexibility a core part of our child welfare system. The purpose of this bill is to give states and tribes the ability to make modest front-end investments in family services and kinship placement in order to reduce costly and traumatic stays in foster care. Under current law, title IV-E of the Social Security Act, the nation's largest child welfare funding stream, provides states and tribes with a Federal funding match for children only after they are placed in foster care. In contrast, State and tribal innovations implemented through title IV-E waivers suggest that permitting spending for preventive family services can reduce the prevalence and length of foster care placements while maintaining or improving safety and permanency outcomes for children. Further, State experiences with subsidized guardianship demonstrate that when children cannot remain with their parents, they do best when placed with kin.

This bill enhances Federal funding available under parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act for prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their parents or other family members. It gives states and tribes the flexibility to adapt evidence-based family services to the specific needs of each family. It ensures that states and

tribes are held accountable for allocating services in ways that maximize safety, permanency, and well-being for children, while minimizing the prevalence of lengthy foster care placements.

We need more than two options—foster care or nothing—when the child protection system gets involved. By helping families afford child care, maybe it is possible to prevent outright neglect. Maybe mom or dad needs counseling or medical help. Maybe they need help covering the bills or finding employment. Oftentimes, a youngster's aunt, uncle, or grandparents could step up and take them in, but they shouldn't have to take on that job without assistance. More often than not, in my judgement, it's absolutely worth exploring those avenues before breaking a family apart. In fact, it can save resources in the long run without compromising on safety.

I look forward to working with Chairman HATCH and the full Senate to advance this legislation and I am hopeful that together, we can make this critical investment in children and their families.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mr. LEE, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 1965. A bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, today I am proud to stand here with Senators RAND PAUL, MIKE LEE, and DICK DURBIN in introducing the Maintaining dignity and Eliminating unnecessary Restrictive Confinement of Youths Act of 2015, or the MERCY Act. This bipartisan bill would prohibit juvenile detention facilities from placing federally adjudicated delinquents in solitary confinement and would limit the use of such confinement for all juveniles in federal pretrial detention. Prolonged use of solitary confinement of young people often results in severe psychological harm and it is time the federal government leads on this issue and bans the practice.

The juvenile justice system was created because it has always been understood that children are different than adults and need special protection. It was founded on the principle that youth are malleable and, therefore, the focus should be on rehabilitation rather than punishment. Adolescents are still developing psychologically and physiologically and have different needs than adults. In fact, research has shown that brains in humans do not fully develop in most individuals until the age of 25, which underscores the fragility of these young Americans. Unfortunately, our juvenile justice system has lost its way and the emphasis has shifted from one of rehabilitation to punishment. Children are finding

themselves trapped in a criminal justice system that does more harm than good and nowhere is that more evident than in the practice of solitary confinement.

In 2011 alone, more than 95,000 youth were held in prisons and jails, and a significant number were held in isolation. In 2013, the Department of Justice found that 47 percent of juvenile detention centers locked youth in solitary confinement for more than four hours at a time, and some held youth for up to 23 hours a day with no human interaction. Words can hardly explain the horrors many children face while placed in isolation. Young people held in solitary suffer from resounding psychological and neurological damage, including depression, hallucinations, paranoia, anger, and anxiety. U.S. Supreme Court Justice Anthony Kennedy recently commented on the practice of solitary confinement in an opinion and said, "The penal system has a solitary confinement regime that will bring you to the edge of madness, perhaps to madness itself." The negative impact that this practice can have on youth is evidenced by the fact that studies have shown that half of all suicides by juveniles in detention facilities occurred in isolation.

Medical experts to civil and human rights advocates have made calls to end this horrible practice. The United Nations Special Rapporteur on Torture called for the practice to be banned across the globe. Despite the extensive data that demonstrates the harmful nature of solitary, the United States continues to use solitary confinement at alarming rates. It is time the United States catch up to international standards and ban the use of unnecessary juvenile solitary confinement.

The MERCY Act would prohibit the use of solitary confinement of youth adjudicated delinquent in the Federal system, unless it is a temporary response to a serious risk of harm to the juvenile or others. Additionally, it would preclude the use of solitary confinement of any youth awaiting trial in federal court regardless of whether that person is being tried as an adult or juvenile. The bill ensures that before a juvenile is placed in room confinement, the staff member must use the least restrictive techniques, including de-escalation techniques or discussions with a qualified mental health professional. It mandates that juveniles be informed of why the room confinement placement occurred and that release will occur upon the youth regaining self-control or a certain period of time has elapsed. The Mercy Act limits solitary confinement on juveniles that pose a risk of harm to others to no more than 3 hours and to juveniles who pose a risk of harm to themselves to no more than half an hour. Finally, after the maximum periods of confinement

expires, the bill mandates that juveniles be transferred to a facility where appropriate services can be provided.

If we truly want our criminal justice system to reflect our founding principles as a nation of liberty and justice for all, we must promote a more compassionate, common sense approach to rehabilitation that helps restore promise in our young people. It is time we ban the solitary confinement of youth and I urge the speedy passage of the bipartisan MERCY Act.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1971. A bill to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce the California Coastal National Monument Expansion Act, legislation that would expand the current Monument to include about 6,200 acres of pristine public lands across four California counties. I am proud to be joined in this effort by my friend from California, Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN.

In 2000, President Clinton made history when he designated the California Coastal National Monument, which stretches the entire 1,100 miles of California's coastline and protects more than 20,000 small islands, rocks, exposed reefs and islands between Mexico and Oregon. It also protects the habitat for a variety of wildlife including seabirds, California sea lions and southern sea otters.

In 2012, I introduced legislation with Senator FEINSTEIN and Congressman MIKE THOMPSON to expand the Monument to include the Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands in Mendocino County. We were grateful when President Obama took action last year to add these spectacular lands as the first onshore addition to the monument.

The legislation we are introducing today would expand the California Coastal National Monument again to include five more onshore sites, creating a new network of federal coastal properties for the public to enjoy. By highlighting these sites, the measure would also boost tourism and the economy of communities up and down the coast.

Each one of these new areas is unique, with its own rugged landscape, its own majestic views of the Pacific Ocean and its own history. Each piece tells us part of the fascinating story of the development of California and our Nation.

In Humboldt County, one of my State's northern most counties, this legislation would protect Trinidad Head—13 acres of rocky shoreline which offers visitors breathtaking views of offshore sea stacks and the City of Trinidad, the oldest town on

the northern California coast. The land is also home to the historic Trinidad Head lighthouse, which dates back to 1871 when it helped guide vessels carrying lumber up and down the Redwood Coast.

The Lost Coast Headlands in Humboldt County would also be included, providing visitors access to 440 acres of some of the most spectacular scenery in northern California. From alpine forests and rolling mountains to coastal bluffs south of the mouth of the Eel River, this area offers a little something for every outdoor enthusiast, whether it is hiking, bird watching or beachcombing. These lands also played an important role during the Cold War when the U.S. Navy opened a post there to monitor Soviet submarines.

The Monument would be expanded to encompass Lighthouse Ranch, about 11 miles south of Eureka, which sits on eight acres of a former U.S. Coast Guard station once used as a Christian commune. Today, it offers breathtaking, panoramic views of the Eel River Delta, Humboldt Bay and the Pacific Ocean.

Drive about 350 miles south of Humboldt County to Santa Cruz County and you will discover the Cotoni-Coast Dairies—5,780 acres of former dairy and cement plant lands. Its name is a nod to the Cotoni Indians, who lived there for thousands of years, and the Swiss dairy farmers who ran the land as a farm and ranch for much of the 20th century. The area, which would also be included in the Monument, draws in visitors with its redwoods, coastal grasslands, foothills and watersheds that flow directly into the northern Monterey Bay.

The bill would also preserve Piedras Blancas—20 acres with 425 state-owned acres cooperatively managed by the Bureau of Land Management, BLM, in Big Sur. Named for three white rocks just off the end of the point, the area is well-known for its historic 19th century lighthouse and is also an important ecological research area. Tourists come to catch a glimpse of a beautiful landscape untouched by development and see wildlife like Elephant Seals, sea lions and sea birds.

Additionally our legislation would protect one offshore site—a group of small rocks and islands off the coast of Orange County. Back in the 1930s, the Coast Guard considered using these properties for lighthouses, but the agency now agrees they should be permanently protected as part of the National Monument. Under this bill, these amazing rocks and islands will remain a pristine part of California's natural heritage.

These are some of the most magnificent lands in the country, and we have a responsibility to protect them for current and future generations. That is why expanding the California Coastal National Monument is so critical.

The new designation would permanently protect each site from development and would ensure stronger protections for a diverse array of wildlife that call the area home, many of which are endangered. It would also help restore habitats and protect water quality by placing these properties under one management plan to allow for better coordination of available resources.

Expanding the Monument is not just good for our conservation efforts—it is also good for the economy. Each of these natural treasures showcases the breathtaking coastlines and recreational opportunities that draw visitors from California and across the world.

Listen to the numbers from these three California counties: In Humboldt County, tourism is responsible for more than \$330 million every year. In Santa Cruz County, tourism brings in more than \$700 million every year and is one of the county's top industries. Tourism in San Luis Obispo County produces more than \$1 billion annually and is also the county's largest industry, supporting 15,570 jobs in 2011.

Designating these sites as part of the National Monument will not only generate more economic activity, it will help attract increased resources to support the needs of the area, including additional conservation programs.

The expansion of this National Monument has strong support from a large coalition of local governments, elected officials, business owners, landowners, farmers, private individuals, and many conservation and outdoor industry groups. This impressive grassroots effort shows how deeply our citizens care about the future of these public lands, and I am proud to support their hard work and commitment.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to expand the California Coastal National Monument and help protect these spectacular lands for generations to come.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 1974. A bill to require the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to amend its regulations relating to qualified mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, the mid-2000s housing bubble was fueled by cheap access to credit and unsound, deceptive, and sometimes fraudulent mortgage lending practices. Borrowers were offered risky, high-cost loans they could neither afford nor understand by originators who abandoned traditional underwriting process, accepted loan applications with little or no documentation, and directly profited from selling unsustainable loans wholesale. The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act contains many necessary and important reforms to the mortgage origination industry

to prevent future abuses. However, the law is complex and has, unintentionally, imposed onerous, one-size-fits-all rules on community banks and local financial institutions that originate mortgages to entrepreneurs and farmers.

For over a decade, and under supervision of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, the Federal Home Loan Banks, FHLBanks, have operated a set of mortgage programs that ensure small financial institutions can expand access to credit and originate affordable mortgages in their communities. The Mortgage Partnership Finance program—and the similar Mortgage Purchase Program—provides members an alternative secondary mortgage market. A FHLBank purchases a mortgage and manages the liquidity, interest rate, and prepayment risks while the originating bank member assumes some credit risk for the loans.

The FHLB mortgage programs' guidelines prior to the passage of the Dodd-Frank Act often met or exceeded the standards that we now know as Qualified Mortgage, QM, but the requirements were flexible and not unduly burdensome. QM status provides originators the legal and regulatory certainty they need to expand safe access to affordable mortgages. The FHLBanks have since harmonized their standards with QM, but some member banks struggle to comply due to the strict requirements, such as Appendix Q, for assessing a consumer's ability to repay. For example, the general QM option in some circumstances prevents community banks and credit unions that originate mortgages to the self-employed from selling those loans to the FHLBanks. This outcome is problematic because the FHLBank System is the only avenue for mortgage resale for many small financial institutions; without the ability to resell to the FHLBanks, credit availability is constrained in communities served by these institutions.

Small financial institutions that participate in the FHLBank System engage in relationship lending—their customers are their neighbors, their youth sports coaches, their community leaders—and they should not be required to comply with burdensome regulations designed to clamp down on unsound mortgage lending practices at large institutions. The legislation I am introducing today, the Relationship Lending Preservation Act, would allow these financial institutions to continue serving farmers and entrepreneurs while ensuring the safety and soundness of the mortgage origination system. The bill simply requires the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, CFPB, to establish a distinct QM option for loans eligible to be purchased by a FHLBank or loans participating in a credit risk sharing program established by a FHLBank pursuant to regulations

issued by the Federal Housing Finance Agency. This legislation is supported by The Council of FHLBanks and others in the financial community.

In practice, the bill will provide QM status to loans sold to the FHLBanks that would have otherwise qualified for the general QM option except for the income and debt rules. Institutions would still be required, by FHLBank regulation, to adhere to underwriting and documentation requirements. The legislation provides parity between the FHLBanks and Fannie and Freddie, and it mirrors a request by the FHLBanks to the CFPB to modify QM to accommodate sales to the FHLBanks. Just as mortgages sold to Fannie and Freddie qualify for QM status, participants of the FHLBank mortgage programs should be eligible for QM.

It is important to note that this legislation is narrowly tailored to benefit truly community financial institutions—the new option is limited to the commonly accepted definition of community banks, those institutions with less than \$10 billion in assets—and does not increase systemic risk. Sixty-seven percent of participants in the FHLB mortgage programs are institutions with less than \$500 million in total assets—these are the smallest of the small lenders. Additionally, the FHLB mortgage programs require lenders to retain a portion of the loan's credit risk. This “skin in the game” provision ensures originators are making quality loans that will be repaid; in fact, loans participating in the FHLB mortgage programs have a 1.47 percent 90-day delinquency rate, less than 2/3 the national average of 2.29 percent.

Community-based financial institutions are central to promoting growth and economic prosperity in small and rural communities throughout North Dakota and the Nation. These institutions were not the cause of the housing and financial crises and should not be subject to regulations meant for large-scale mortgage-origination institutions. The Relationship Lending Preservation Act will ensure small financial institutions can continue to do what they do best: serve their communities by providing affordable mortgages. I urge my colleagues to support this bill—community financial institutions, and the families they serve, are too important for our country's future.

By Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mrs. McCASKILL, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, and Ms. WARREN);

S. 1975. A bill to establish the Sewall-Belmont House National Historic Site as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Com-

mittee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to speak about the urgent need to authorize the Sewall-Belmont House & Museum as part of the National Park Service.

Sewall-Belmont is a critical piece of our Nation's history. It was the home of Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, whose perseverance brought the movement for women's suffrage over the finish line with the enactment of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution. Today it helps tell the story of one of the most important chapters in our Nation's history by highlighting the political strategies and techniques of Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party, which became the blueprint for civil rights organizations throughout the 20th century.

The Sewall-Belmont House was more than a house—it was a home to great minds and leaders, thanks to the generosity of women like Alva Belmont. It was a place where women could live, rest, and work without fear of harassment while they fought boldly for the ballot.

In the 1970s, when they were threatening to tear down this building to make way for the Senate offices, Pat Schroeder and the women of the House rallied to save it. Now it is a museum where today's generation can learn about the courageous women who came before them. This house has always been the scene of making history, and has always stood for women's empowerment.

However, today Sewall-Belmont is in dire need of federal support if it is to continue to serve the public. While the National Woman's Party has been successfully operating the House and managing its historic collection, it has been forced to cut back on public tours, research requests, and educational programs due to the growing capital needs of managing an aging building.

Sewall-Belmont is a National Historic Landmark, listed on the National Register of Historic Places, and one of four designations supported by the Save America's Treasures legislation. The National Park Service recently completed a feasibility study which concluded that Sewall-Belmont's deep historical significance and unique contribution to our Nation's history warrants its full inclusion into the National Park Service. This would not only give it the resources it needs to continue to educate the public, but would send a powerful message that women's history is an important part of our Nation's history.

Women fought for decades against great onslaught to secure the right to vote. One hundred and sixty-seven years ago, in July 1848, the first-ever women's rights convention was held in Seneca Falls. This convention was the

beginning of one of the greatest social movements of all time, kicking off the actions of the first generation of suffragists and making women's suffrage a national topic.

At this convention, Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Lucretia Mott stood up to meet the challenges of their time. They mobilized and they organized the American women's rights movement. They called for a convention; they called for action; they made history; they changed history. And that revolution keeps on going.

In the 20th century, Alice Paul took the lead in the women's suffrage movement. In 1916, she formed the National Woman's Party which would fight for suffrage until the 19th Amendment to the Constitution was finally enacted in 1920—long overdue.

Alice Paul was a groundbreaker and a changemaker, risking arrest and inhumane treatment so the women of America could be part of a true democracy. With their banners and sashes, Alice Paul led the Iron Jawed Angels marching on Washington to President Wilson's White House. Her Silent Sentinels stood in rain, sleet, and snow as daily reminders of America's conscience. They called for women's right to vote at a time when women didn't have a voice. Their cause captivated the nation! With each step they took, they marched toward a future where women weren't just able to vote, but were on the ballot.

Wouldn't Alice Paul be so proud to see twenty women in the United States Senate? I'm so proud to be one of them. The women of the Senate are changing history by changing the tide and changing the tone. When I arrived in the Senate in 1986, I was the first Democratic woman elected in her own right, and the sixteenth woman to serve. There are more women serving right this minute, today—fourteen Democrats and six Republicans—than had served in all of American history when I arrived.

I am so proud of all of the accomplishments made by the women of the Senate. But we didn't get here by ourselves. Not a single one of us would be here without Alice Paul and the National Woman's Party. That is why it is so important that we not only preserve the place where they fought for women's full inclusion in society, the Sewall-Beimont House, but elevate it to its rightful spot among our Nation's most important national treasures.

There are very few sites in the National Park System that celebrate women's history. I am proud that Maryland is home to one of those sites with the newly authorized Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Historical Park in Cambridge. But it is not enough.

Today, women have the right to vote and the right to be on the ballot. But we have so much more to accomplish

to become fully equal members of society. It is critical that we remind today's generation of women and men of this long and important history so that we can keep in mind the lessons learned from these movements as we march toward full equality. As I serve my last term in the United States Senate, there is nothing more important to me than preserving the legacy of this fight.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 1982. A bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the Korean War Veterans Memorial and the legislation I am introducing along with Senator BOOZMAN. This legislation authorizes the addition of a "Wall of Remembrance" to the Korean War Veterans Memorial, without the use of public funds.

The Korean War, often referred to as the "Forgotten War," began on June 25, 1950. During the three-year course of the war, some 5.7 million Americans were called to serve, and by the time the Korean Armistice Agreement was signed in July 1953, more than 36,000 Americans sacrificed their lives, 103,284 were wounded, 7,140 were captured, and 664 were missing.

To honor the Americans who served during the Korean War, on October 28, 1986, Congress passed H.R. 2005, Public Law 99-572, authorizing the construction of the Korean War Veterans Memorial located in West Potomac Park, southeast of the Lincoln Memorial and just south of the Reflecting Pool on the National Mall. For those of you who have visited this memorial, it is quite a moving experience. But unlike some other memorials, it does not list the names of those who died while serving their country.

My legislation authorizes the addition of a Wall of Remembrance to the existing Korean War Veterans Memorial. The Wall of Remembrance would list the names of members of the Armed Forces of the United States who died in theater in the Korean War, as well as the number of service members who were wounded in action, are listed as missing in action, or who were prisoners of war during the Korean War. The Wall would also list the number of members of the Korean Augmentation to the U.S. Army, the Republic of Korean Armed Forces, and other nations of the United Nations Command who were killed in action, wounded in action, are listed as missing in action, or were prisoners of war.

Korean War Veterans Memorials that display the names of a nation's fallen

soldiers can be found across the globe. Authorizing a Wall of Remembrance here in the United States is just one way we can help ensure that those who died while serving our country in the "Forgotten War" are no longer forgotten. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself and Mrs. FEINSTEIN):

S. 1983. A bill to authorize the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased to reintroduce the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians Water Rights Settlement Act of 2013. This legislation will implement a settlement concerning the water rights of the Pechanga Band of Luiseno Mission Indians, who have been engaged for several decades in a struggle for recognition and protection of their federally reserved groundwater rights.

Since 1951, the Pechanga have been involved in litigation initiated by the United States concerning water rights in the Santa Margarita watershed. The Pechanga's interest has been in protecting their groundwater supplies, which are shared with municipal developments in the San Diego region. Beginning in 2006, the Pechanga worked with local water districts to negotiate a cooperative solution and put an end to their dispute.

The Pechanga Settlement Agreement is a comprehensive agreement negotiated among the Pechanga, the United States on their behalf, and several California water districts, including the Rancho California Water District, Eastern Municipal Water District, and the Metropolitan Water District. The Settlement recognizes the Pechanga's tribal water right to 4994 acre-feet of water per year and outlines a series of measures to guarantee this amount. It is a watershed wide solution that protects the rights of the Pechanga while providing greater certainty and resources to the management of the basin's water supplies.

I am pleased to be joined by Senator FEINSTEIN in introducing this legislation. Our bill not only provides the Pechanga with long-overdue assurances of their water rights, but also exemplifies all the good that can be accomplished when parties put aside their differences and come to the table to negotiate collaborative solutions.

By Mr. REID:

S. 1986. A bill to provide for a land conveyance in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Moapa Band of Paiutes Land Conveyance Act”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **MAP.**—The term “map” means the map entitled “Moapa River Reservation Expansion”, dated August 5, 2015, and on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) **TRIBE.**—The term “Tribe” means the Moapa Band of Paiutes.

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST FOR THE MOAPA BAND OF PAIUTES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF LAND.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 25,977 acres of land administered by the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Reclamation as generally depicted on the map as “Reservation Expansion Land”.

(c) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

(d) **GAMING.**—Land taken into trust under this section shall not be eligible, or considered to have been taken into trust, for class II gaming or class III gaming (as those terms are defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)).

SEC. 4. TRIBAL FEE LAND TO BE HELD IN TRUST.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—All right, title, and interest of the Tribe in and to the land described in subsection (b) shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **DESCRIPTION OF THE LAND.**—The land referred to in subsection (a) is the approximately 88 acres of land held in fee by the Tribe as generally depicted on the map as “Fee Into Trust Lands”.

(c) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

By Mr. MCCAIN:

S. 1991. A bill to eliminate the sunset date for the Choice Program of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand eligibility for such program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, this Friday marks 1 year since the Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability and Transparency Act was signed into law by President Obama. This bipartisan legislation was intended to address the nationwide scandal involving the death of at least 40 veterans who had been waiting for weeks, months, and even years for nec-

essary care from the VA. Ultimately, we learned that senior VA officials purposely denied care and lied about it to obtain financial bonuses. We are still cleaning-up the aftermath of this scandal and Congress' work continues today.

The hallmark of that law is the VA Choice Card, which for the first time allows veterans who can't make an appointment in a reasonable time frame or who live far from a VA medical facility, to see the doctor of their choice to get the care they need. But, with all the bureaucratic hoops that the VA has required veterans to jump through to use the Choice Card since that law's enactment and the lack of information the VA has provided veterans and relevant providers on how to get and use the Card, the VA has clearly been reluctant to expanding choice for veterans. Even after a year, I continue to get e-mails, letters and phone calls from veterans and their caregivers who are extremely frustrated with the inability to use the VA Choice Card.

As I said at the time, last year's bill was meant as a beginning, not an end, to addressing inadequate care for our veterans. While the current law authorizes a three-year pilot program to begin implementation of the VA Choice Card, the year that has passed since its enactment has shown is that there is overwhelming demand for veterans to have the same freedom of choice for their health care that military and civilian retirees have.

I have long advocated for our veterans to have the flexibility to choose where and when they receive the care they have earned. And the Permanent VA Choice Card Act that I am introducing today moves us in that direction.

The Permanent VA Choice Card Act makes the current 3-year pilot program for the VA Choice Card permanent. This would help remove uncertainty both within the VA, among providers, and especially among our disabled veterans that this program is here to stay.

Also, the Permanent VA Choice Card Act would expand eligibility for the Choice Card. Any service-connected veteran enrolled through the VA should have access to this level of choice. It would do so by removing the requirement that a qualified veteran live more than 40 miles from a VA facility or have to wait 30 days for an appointment.

It is clear our veterans are in need of care and are not able to receive it. More than a year after the VA scandal and a year since the Choice Act was signed into law, wait-times are still too long and in some facilities are even longer than they were a year ago. The VA has made it challenging for those with the VA Choice Card to make appointments, get follow-ups, and to see specialists near their homes. By enacting the Permanent VA Choice Card

Act, we will make sure that no veteran should be denied needed care due to wait times or distance to a VA facility.

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1999. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating to act, without liability for certain damages, to prevent and respond to the threat of damage from pollution of the sea by crude oil, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, tourists flock every year to enjoy the inviting waters of the South Florida—sunbathing on Miami Beach, boating in Biscayne Bay National Park, snorkeling on treasured coral reefs of the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary. And you might take a souvenir picture at the Southernmost Point in Key West. Standing there, you are closer to Cuba—90 miles away—than you are to Miami, which is 160 miles away.

In 1977, the U.S. negotiated a Maritime Boundary with Cuba for fisheries and other continental shelf activities, like oil exploration, roughly halfway between our nations—or 45 miles from the Southernmost Point in Key West. Since 2005, several oil companies have leased blocks in Cuban waters south of that line to drill for oil. Can you imagine the damage to our environment and our economy if oil was to coat two national parks, a national marine sanctuary, a national wildlife refuge, iconic coral reefs, world-class fisheries, and beloved beaches? It would be catastrophic. In fact, the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary was created specifically to protect against threats like an oil spill.

In 2012, four companies tried and failed to find oil. But recently, an Angolan company has ramped up plans to drill in late 2016. We are simply not prepared to protect U.S. interests from an oil spill off Cuba. The loop current that saved South Florida from the brunt of the damage from Deepwater Horizon becomes the Florida current as it runs between the Keys and Cuba and then those waters enter the Gulf Stream hugging the coast of Florida and heading north along the eastern seaboard. An oil spill in Cuban waters would almost certainly follow that same path.

For a decade, I have fought tooth and nail to protect our environment and economy from a Cuban spill. Given the news that drilling will resume next year, it is imperative that the agencies we rely on to prevent and respond to oil spills are prepared. And even though Cuba is the closest threat, an oil spill off Mexico, Bahamas, or Jamaica could enter U.S. waters. So today, I am introducing the Caribbean Oil Spill Intervention, Prevention, and Preparedness Act—a comprehensive framework to protect U.S. interests from foreign oil spills.

The bill would strengthen the authority of the Coast Guard to intervene and make sure that we have up-to-date accurate information about the ocean currents off of Cuba's coast so that we know where an oil spill might go. It requires the relevant Federal agencies to negotiate oil pollution prevention and response with countries bordering the Gulf of Mexico and Straits of Florida especially to protect our National Marine Sanctuaries like the Florida Keys. The bill ensures we have a plan to protect coral reef ecosystems all through the Straits of Florida—because domestic fisheries rely on healthy corals. Finally, it requires any oil company that wants to drill in both U.S. waters and Cuban waters to show they have the resources and plans to adequately prepare for a worst-case oil spill in both areas.

These common-sense provisions should have broad support. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

By Mr. CORNYN:

S. 2002. A bill to strengthen our mental health system and improve public safety; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2002

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MENTAL HEALTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES

Sec. 101. Law enforcement grants for crisis intervention teams, mental health purposes, and fixing the background check system.

Sec. 102. Assisted outpatient treatment programs.

Sec. 103. Federal drug and mental health courts.

Sec. 104. Mental health in the judicial system.

Sec. 105. Forensic assertive community treatment initiatives.

Sec. 106. Assistance for individuals transitioning out of systems.

Sec. 107. Co-occurring substance abuse and mental health challenges in drug courts.

Sec. 108. Mental health training for Federal uniformed services.

Sec. 109. Advancing mental health as part of offender reentry.

Sec. 110. School mental health crisis intervention teams.

Sec. 111. Active-shooter training for law enforcement.

Sec. 112. Co-occurring substance abuse and mental health challenges in residential substance abuse treatment programs.

Sec. 113. Mental health and drug treatment alternatives to incarceration programs.

Sec. 114. National criminal justice and mental health training and technical assistance.

Sec. 115. Improving Department of Justice data collection on mental illness involved in crime.

Sec. 116. Reports on the number of mentally ill offenders in prison.

TITLE II—COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Findings.

Sec. 203. Sequential intercept model.

Sec. 204. Veterans treatment courts.

Sec. 205. Prison and jails.

Sec. 206. Allowable uses.

Sec. 207. Law enforcement training.

Sec. 208. Federal law enforcement training.

Sec. 209. GAO report.

Sec. 210. Evidence based practices.

Sec. 211. Transparency, program accountability, and enhancement of local authority.

Sec. 212. Grant accountability.

TITLE III—NICS REAUTHORIZATION AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

Sec. 301. Reauthorization of NICS.

Sec. 302. Definitions relating to mental health.

Sec. 303. Incentives for State compliance with NICS mental health record requirements.

Sec. 304. Protecting the second amendment rights of veterans.

Sec. 305. Applicability of amendments.

Sec. 306. Clarification that Federal court information is to be made available to the national instant criminal background check system.

TITLE IV—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OFFSET

Sec. 401. Reauthorization of appropriations.

Sec. 402. Offset.

TITLE I—MENTAL HEALTH AND SAFE COMMUNITIES

SEC. 101. LAW ENFORCEMENT GRANTS FOR CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS, MENTAL HEALTH PURPOSES, AND FIXING THE BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

(a) EDWARD BYRNE MEMORIAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE GRANT PROGRAM.—Section 501(a)(1) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3751(a)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(H) Mental health programs and related law enforcement and corrections programs, including behavioral programs and crisis intervention teams.

“(I) Achieving compliance with the mental health records requirements of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (Public Law 110-180; 121 Stat. 2259).”.

(b) COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING SERVICES PROGRAM.—Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (21);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) to provide specialized training to law enforcement officers to—

“(A) recognize individuals who have a mental illness; and

“(B) properly interact with individuals who have a mental illness, including strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises;

“(18) to establish collaborative programs that enhance the ability of law enforcement agencies to address the mental health, behavioral, and substance abuse problems of individuals encountered by law enforcement officers in the line of duty;

“(19) to provide specialized training to corrections officers to recognize individuals who have a mental illness;

“(20) to enhance the ability of corrections officers to address the mental health of individuals under the care and custody of jails and prisons, including specialized training and strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises; and”; and

(4) in paragraph (21), as redesignated, by striking “through (16)” and inserting “through (20)”.

(c) MODIFICATIONS TO THE STAFFING FOR ADEQUATE FIRE AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE GRANTS.—Section 34(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2229a(a)(1)(B)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: “and to provide specialized training to paramedics, emergency medical services workers, and other first responders to recognize individuals who have mental illness and how to properly intervene with individuals with mental illness, including strategies for verbal de-escalation of crises”.

SEC. 102. ASSISTED OUTPATIENT TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 2201 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ii) is amended—

(1) by inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—” before “The Attorney General”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by inserting before the semicolon the following: “, or court-ordered assisted outpatient treatment when the court has determined such treatment to be necessary”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

“(1) COURT-ORDERED ASSISTED OUTPATIENT TREATMENT.—The term ‘court-ordered assisted outpatient treatment’ means a program through which a court may order a treatment plan for an eligible patient that—

“(A) requires such patient to obtain outpatient mental health treatment while the patient is living in a community; and

“(B) is designed to improve access and adherence by such patient to intensive behavioral health services in order to—

“(i) avert relapse, repeated hospitalizations, arrest, incarceration, suicide, property destruction, and violent behavior; and

“(ii) provide such patient with the opportunity to live in a less restrictive alternative to incarceration or involuntary hospitalization.

“(2) ELIGIBLE PATIENT.—The term ‘eligible patient’ means an adult, mentally ill person who, as determined by a court—

“(A) has a history of violence, incarceration, or medically unnecessary hospitalizations;

“(B) without supervision and treatment, may be a danger to self or others in the community;

“(C) is substantially unlikely to voluntarily participate in treatment;

“(D) may be unable, for reasons other than indigence, to provide for any of his or her basic needs, such as food, clothing, shelter, health, or safety;

“(E) has a history of mental illness or condition that is likely to substantially deteriorate if the patient is not provided with timely treatment; or

“(F) due to mental illness, lacks capacity to fully understand or lacks judgment to make informed decisions regarding his or her need for treatment, care, or supervision.”.

SEC. 103. FEDERAL DRUG AND MENTAL HEALTH COURTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “eligible offender” means a person who—

(A)(i) previously or currently has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness, mental retardation, or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders; or

(ii) manifests obvious signs of mental illness, mental retardation, or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders during arrest or confinement or before any court; and

(B) is determined by a judge to be eligible.

(2) the term “mental illness” means a diagnosable mental, behavioral, or emotional disorder—

(A) of sufficient duration to meet diagnostic criteria within the most recent edition of the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders published by the American Psychiatric Association; and

(B) that has resulted in functional impairment that substantially interferes with or limits 1 or more major life activities.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall establish a pilot program to determine the effectiveness of diverting eligible offenders from Federal prosecution, Federal probation, or a Bureau of Prisons facility, and placing such eligible offenders in drug or mental health courts.

(c) PROGRAM SPECIFICATIONS.—The pilot program established under subsection (b) shall involve—

(1) continuing judicial supervision, including periodic review, of program participants who have a substance abuse problem or mental illness; and

(2) the integrated administration of services and sanctions, which shall include—

(A) mandatory periodic testing, as appropriate, for the use of controlled substances or other addictive substances during any period of supervised release or probation for each program participant;

(B) substance abuse treatment for each program participant who requires such services;

(C) diversion, probation, or other supervised release with the possibility of prosecution, confinement, or incarceration based on noncompliance with program requirements or failure to show satisfactory progress;

(D) programmatic offender management, including case management, and aftercare services, such as relapse prevention, health care, education, vocational training, job placement, housing placement, and child care or other family support services for each program participant who requires such services;

(E) outpatient or inpatient mental health treatment, as ordered by the court, that carries with it the possibility of dismissal of charges or reduced sentencing upon successful completion of such treatment;

(F) centralized case management, including—

(i) the consolidation of all cases, including violations of probations, of the program participant; and

(ii) coordination of all mental health treatment plans and social services, including life skills and vocational training, housing and job placement, education, health care, and relapse prevention for each program participant who requires such services; and

(G) continuing supervision of treatment plan compliance by the program participant for a term not to exceed the maximum allowable sentence or probation period for the charged or relevant offense and, to the extent practicable, continuity of psychiatric care at the end of the supervised period.

(d) IMPLEMENTATION; DURATION.—The pilot program established under subsection (b) shall be conducted—

(1) in not less than 1 United States judicial district, designated by the Attorney General in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, as appropriate for the pilot program; and

(2) during fiscal year 2017 through fiscal year 2020.

(e) CRITERIA FOR DESIGNATION.—Before making a designation under subsection (d)(1), the Attorney General shall—

(1) obtain the approval, in writing, of the United States Attorney for the United States judicial district being designated;

(2) obtain the approval, in writing, of the chief judge for the United States judicial district being designated; and

(3) determine that the United States judicial district being designated has adequate behavioral health systems for treatment, including substance abuse and mental health treatment.

(f) ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER FEDERAL ENTITIES.—The Administrative Office of the United States Courts and the United States Probation Offices shall provide such assistance and carry out such functions as the Attorney General may request in monitoring, supervising, providing services to, and evaluating eligible offenders placed in a drug or mental health court under this section.

(g) REPORTS.—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall monitor the drug and mental health courts under this section, and shall submit a report to Congress on the outcomes of the program at the end of the period described in subsection (d)(2).

SEC. 104. MENTAL HEALTH IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

Part V of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 3796ii et seq.) is amended by inserting at the end the following:

“SEC. 2209. MENTAL HEALTH RESPONSES IN THE JUDICIAL SYSTEM.

“(a) PRETRIAL SCREENING AND SUPERVISION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may award grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, non-profit agencies, or any combination thereof, to develop, implement, or expand pretrial services programs to improve the identification and outcomes of individuals with mental illness.

“(2) ALLOWABLE USES.—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) universal behavioral health needs and risk screening of defendants, including verification of interview information, mental health evaluation, and criminal history screening;

“(B) assessment of risk of pretrial misconduct through objective, statistically validated means, and presentation to the court of recommendations based on such assessment, including services that will reduce the risk of pre-trial misconduct;

“(C) follow-up review of defendants unable to meet the conditions of release;

“(D) evaluation of process and results of pre-trial service programs;

“(E) supervision of defendants who are on pretrial release, including reminders to defendants of scheduled court dates;

“(F) reporting on process and results of pretrial services programs to relevant public and private mental health stakeholders; and

“(G) data collection and analysis necessary to make available information required for assessment of risk.

“(b) BEHAVIORAL HEALTH ASSESSMENTS AND INTERVENTION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may award grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, non-profit agencies, or any combination thereof, to develop, implement, or expand a behavioral health screening and assessment program framework for State or local criminal justice systems.

“(2) ALLOWABLE USES.—Grants awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) promotion of the use of validated assessment tools to gauge the criminogenic risk, substance abuse needs, and mental health needs of individuals;

“(B) initiatives to match the risk factors and needs of individuals to programs and practices associated with research-based, positive outcomes;

“(C) implementing methods for identifying and treating individuals who are most likely to benefit from coordinated supervision and treatment strategies, and identifying individuals who can do well with fewer interventions; and

“(D) collaborative decision making among system leaders, including the relevant criminal justice agencies, mental health systems, judicial systems, and substance abuse systems, for determining how treatment and intensive supervision services should be allocated in order to maximize benefits, and developing and utilizing capacity accordingly.

“(c) RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF GRANT FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or non-profit agency that receives a grant under this section shall, in accordance with subsection (b)(2), use grant funds for the expenses of a treatment program, including—

“(A) salaries, personnel costs, equipment costs, and other costs directly related to the operation of the program, including costs relating to enforcement;

“(B) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to program participants, including aftercare supervision, vocational training, education, and job placement; and

“(C) payments to public and nonprofit private entities that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to provide alcohol and drug addiction treatment to offenders participating in the program.

“(d) SUPPLEMENT OF NON-FEDERAL FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Grants awarded under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for programs described in this section.

“(2) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share of a grant made under this section may not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the program described in an application under subsection (e).

“(e) APPLICATIONS.—To request a grant under this section, a State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency shall submit an application to the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.

“(f) GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.—The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the distribution of grants under this section is equitable and includes—

“(1) each State; and

“(2) a unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency—

“(A) in each State; and

“(B) in rural, suburban, Tribal, and urban jurisdictions.

“(g) REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.—For each fiscal year, each grantee under this section during that fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the effectiveness of activities carried out using such grant. Each report shall include an evaluation in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require. The Attorney General shall specify the dates on which such reports shall be submitted.

“(h) ACCOUNTABILITY.—Grants awarded under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under subparagraph (C) that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 1 year after the date on which final audit report is issued.

“(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of grantees under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) FINAL AUDIT REPORT.—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit a final report on each audit conducted under subparagraph (B).

“(D) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—Grantees under this section about which there is an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 1-year period described in subparagraph (A).

“(E) PRIORITY.—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(F) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity receives a grant under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is prohibited from receiving grants under subparagraph (D), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant that was improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) NONPROFIT AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant program under this section, the term ‘nonprofit agency’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this section to a nonprofit agency that holds money in an offshore account for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 511(a)).

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit agency that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—Not more than \$20,000 of the amounts made available to the Department of Justice to carry out this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded a grant under this section to host, or make any expenditures relating to, a conference unless the Deputy Attorney General provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference or make such expenditure.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all final audit reports issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(D) have been issued; and

“(iii) any reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(F) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grantees excluded under paragraph (1)(D) from the previous year.

“(i) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant

under this section, the Attorney General shall compare the possible grant with any other grants awarded to the applicant under this Act to determine whether the grants are for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards multiple grants to the same applicant for the same purpose, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any such grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”.

SEC. 105. FORENSIC ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT INITIATIVES.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (k), as added by section 205, the following:

“(1) FORENSIC ASSERTIVE COMMUNITY TREATMENT (FACT) INITIATIVE PROGRAM.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Attorney General may make grants to States, units of local government, territories, Indian Tribes, nonprofit agencies, or any combination thereof, to develop, implement, or expand Assertive Community Treatment initiatives to develop forensic assertive community treatment (referred to in this subsection as ‘FACT’) programs that provide high intensity services in the community for individuals with mental illness with involvement in the criminal justice system to prevent future incarcerations.

“(2) ALLOWABLE USES.—Grant funds awarded under this subsection may be used for—

“(A) multidisciplinary team initiatives for individuals with mental illnesses with criminal justice involvement that addresses criminal justice involvement as part of treatment protocols;

“(B) FACT initiatives that involve mental health professionals, criminal justice agencies, chemical dependency specialists, nurses, psychiatrists, vocational specialists, forensic peer specialists, forensic specialists, and dedicated administrative support staff who work together to provide recovery oriented, 24/7 wraparound services;

“(C) services such as integrated evidence-based practices for the treatment of co-occurring mental health and substance-related disorders, assertive outreach and engagement, community-based service provision at participants’ residence or in the community, psychiatric rehabilitation, recovery oriented services, services to address criminogenic risk factors, and community tenure;

“(D) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the State or Indian Tribe and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program, including behavioral health services and aftercare supervision; and

“(E) training for all FACT teams to promote high-fidelity practice principles and technical assistance to support effective and continuing integration with criminal justice agency partners.

“(3) SUPPLEMENT AND NOT SUPPLANT.—Grants made under this subsection shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, non-Federal funds that would otherwise be available for programs described in this subsection.

“(4) APPLICATIONS.—To request a grant under this subsection, a State, unit of local government, territory, Indian Tribe, or nonprofit agency shall submit an application to

the Attorney General in such form and containing such information as the Attorney General may reasonably require.”.

SEC. 106. ASSISTANCE FOR INDIVIDUALS TRANSITIONING OUT OF SYSTEMS.

Section 2976(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(f)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) provide mental health treatment and transitional services for those with mental illnesses or with co-occurring disorders, including housing placement or assistance; and”.

SEC. 107. CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES IN DRUG COURTS.

Part EE of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797u et seq.) is amended—

(1) in section 2951(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3797u(a)(1)), by inserting “, including co-occurring substance abuse and mental health problems,” after “problems”; and

(2) in section 2959(a) (42 U.S.C. 3797u-8(a)), by inserting “, including training for drug court personnel and officials on identifying and addressing co-occurring substance abuse and mental health problems” after “part”.

SEC. 108. MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING FOR FEDERAL UNIFORMED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Homeland Security, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and the Secretary of Commerce shall provide the following to each of the uniformed services (as that term is defined in section 101 of title 10, United States Code) under their direction:

(1) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Programs that offer specialized and comprehensive training in procedures to identify and respond appropriately to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals with mental illnesses are involved.

(2) IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY.—Computerized information systems or technological improvements to provide timely information to Federal law enforcement personnel, other branches of the uniformed services, and criminal justice system personnel to improve the Federal response to mentally ill individuals.

(3) COOPERATIVE PROGRAMS.—The establishment and expansion of cooperative efforts to promote public safety through the use of effective intervention with respect to mentally ill individuals encountered by members of the uniformed services.

SEC. 109. ADVANCING MENTAL HEALTH AS PART OF OFFENDER REENTRY.

(a) REENTRY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS.—Section 2976(f) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797w(f)), as amended by section 106, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3)(C), by inserting “mental health services,” before “drug treatment”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(8) target offenders with histories of homelessness, substance abuse, or mental illness, including a prerelease assessment of the housing status of the offender and behavioral health needs of the offender with clear coordination with mental health, substance abuse, and homelessness services systems to achieve stable and permanent housing outcomes with appropriate support service.”.

(b) MENTORING GRANTS.—Section 211(b)(2) of the Second Chance Act of 2007 (42 U.S.C.

17531(b)(2)) is amended by inserting “, including mental health care” after “community”.

SEC. 110. SCHOOL MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS INTERVENTION TEAMS.

Section 2701 of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797a(b)) is amended by—

(1) redesignating paragraphs (4) and (5) as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively; and

(2) inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) the development and operation of crisis intervention teams that may include coordination with law enforcement agencies and specialized training for school officials in responding to mental health crises.”.

SEC. 111. ACTIVE-SHOOTER TRAINING FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT.

The Attorney General, as part of the Preventing Violence Against Law Enforcement and Ensuring Officer Resilience and Survivability Initiative (VALOR) of the Department of Justice, may provide safety training and technical assistance to local law enforcement agencies, including active-shooter response training.

SEC. 112. CO-OCCURRING SUBSTANCE ABUSE AND MENTAL HEALTH CHALLENGES IN RESIDENTIAL SUBSTANCE ABUSE TREATMENT PROGRAMS.

Section 1901(a) of title I of Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796ff(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) developing and implementing specialized residential substance abuse treatment programs that identify and provide appropriate treatment to inmates with co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders or challenges.”.

SEC. 113. MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS.

Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) is amended by striking part CC and inserting the following:

“PART CC—MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS

“SEC. 2901. MENTAL HEALTH AND DRUG TREATMENT ALTERNATIVES TO INCARCERATION PROGRAMS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State, unit of local government, Indian tribe, or nonprofit organization; and

“(2) the term ‘eligible participant’ means an individual who—

“(A) comes into contact with the criminal justice system or is charged with an offense;

“(B) has a history of or a current—

“(i) substance use disorder;

“(ii) mental illness; or

“(iii) co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders; and

“(C) has been approved for participation in a program funded under this section by, the relevant law enforcement agency, prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation official, corrections official, judge, representative of a mental health agency, or representative of a substance abuse agency.

“(b) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible entities to develop, implement, or expand a treatment alternative to incarceration program for eligible participants, including—

“(1) pre-booking treatment alternative to incarceration programs, including—

“(A) law enforcement training on substance use disorders, mental illness, and co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders;

“(B) receiving centers as alternatives to incarceration of eligible participants;

“(C) specialized response units for calls related to substance use disorders, mental illness, or co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders; and

“(D) other arrest and pre-booking treatment alternatives to incarceration models; or

“(2) post-booking treatment alternative to incarceration programs, including—

“(A) specialized clinical case management;

“(B) pre-trial services related to substance use disorders, mental illness, and co-occurring mental illness and substance use disorders;

“(C) prosecutor and defender based programs;

“(D) specialized probation;

“(E) treatment and rehabilitation programs; and

“(F) problem-solving courts, including mental health courts, drug courts, co-occurring mental health and substance abuse courts, DWI courts, and veterans treatment courts.

“(c) APPLICATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—An eligible entity desiring a grant under this section shall submit an application to the Attorney General—

“(A) that meets the criteria under paragraph (2); and

“(B) at such time, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Attorney General may require.

“(2) CRITERIA.—An eligible entity, in submitting an application under paragraph (1), shall—

“(A) provide extensive evidence of collaboration with State and local government agencies overseeing health, community corrections, courts, prosecution, substance abuse, mental health, victims services, and employment services, and with local law enforcement agencies; and

“(B) demonstrate consultation with the Single State Authority for Substance Abuse;

“(C) demonstrate that evidence-based treatment practices will be utilized; and

“(D) demonstrate that evidenced-based screening and assessment tools will be used to place participants in the treatment alternative to incarceration program.

“(d) REQUIREMENTS.—Each eligible entity awarded a grant for a treatment alternative to incarceration program under this section shall—

“(1) determine the terms and conditions of participation in the program by eligible participants, taking into consideration the collateral consequences of an arrest, prosecution or criminal conviction;

“(2) ensure that each substance abuse and mental health treatment component is licensed and qualified by the relevant jurisdiction;

“(3) for programs described in subsection (b)(2), organize an enforcement unit comprised of appropriately trained law enforcement professionals under the supervision of the State, Tribal, or local criminal justice agency involved, the duties of which shall include—

“(A) the verification of addresses and other contacts of each eligible participant who participates or desires to participate in the program; and

“(B) if necessary, the location, apprehension, arrest, and return to court of an eligible participant in the program who has absconded from the facility of a treatment provider or has otherwise significantly violated the terms and conditions of the program, consistent with Federal and State confidentiality requirements;

“(4) notify the relevant criminal justice entity if any eligible participant in the program absconds from the facility of the treatment provider or otherwise violates the terms and conditions of the program, consistent with Federal and State confidentiality requirements;

“(5) submit periodic reports on the progress of treatment or other measured outcomes from participation in the program of each eligible offender participating in the program to the relevant State, Tribal, or local criminal justice agency, including mental health courts, drug courts, co-occurring mental health and substance abuse courts, DWI courts, and veterans treatment courts;

“(6) describe the evidence-based methodology and outcome measurements that will be used to evaluate the program, and specifically explain how such measurements will provide valid measures of the impact of the program; and

“(7) describe how the program could be broadly replicated if demonstrated to be effective.

“(e) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An eligible entity shall use a grant received under this section for expenses of a treatment alternative to incarceration program, including—

“(1) salaries, personnel costs, equipment costs, and other costs directly related to the operation of the program, including the enforcement unit;

“(2) payments for treatment providers that are approved by the relevant State or Tribal jurisdiction and licensed, if necessary, to provide needed treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program, including aftercare supervision, vocational training, education, and job placement; and

“(3) payments to public and nonprofit private entities that are approved by the State or Tribal jurisdiction and licensed, if necessary, to provide alcohol and drug addiction treatment to eligible offenders participating in the program.

“(f) **SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT.**—An eligible entity shall use Federal funds received under this section only to supplement the funds that would, in the absence of those Federal funds, be made available from other Federal and non-Federal sources for the activities described in this section, and not to supplant those funds. The Federal share of a grant made under this section may not exceed 50 percent of the total costs of the program described in an application under subsection (d).

“(g) **GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION.**—The Attorney General shall ensure that, to the extent practicable, the geographical distribution of grants under this section is equitable and includes a grant to an eligible entity in—

“(1) each State;

“(2) rural, suburban, and urban areas; and

“(3) Tribal jurisdictions.

“(h) **REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.**—Each fiscal year, each recipient of a grant under this section during that fiscal year shall submit to the Attorney General a report on the outcomes of activities carried out using that grant in such form, containing such information, and on such dates as the Attorney General shall specify.

“(i) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section

shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(E) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) **NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

“(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney Gen-

eral, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

“(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

“(5) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(B) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”.

SEC. 114. NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

Part HH of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“SEC. 2992. NATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH TRAINING AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.

“(a) **AUTHORITY.**—The Attorney General may make grants to eligible organizations to provide for the establishment of a National Criminal Justice and Mental Health Training and Technical Assistance Center.

“(b) **ELIGIBLE ORGANIZATION.**—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘eligible organization’ means a national nonprofit organization that provides technical assistance and training to, and has special expertise and

broad, national-level experience in, mental health, crisis intervention, criminal justice systems, law enforcement, translating evidence into practice, training, and research, and education and support of people with mental illness and the families of such individuals.

“(c) **USE OF FUNDS.**—Any organization that receives a grant under subsection (a) shall establish and operate a National Criminal Justice and Mental Health Training and Technical Assistance Center to—

“(1) provide law enforcement officer training regarding mental health and working with individuals with mental illnesses, with an emphasis on de-escalation of encounters between law enforcement officers and those with mental disorders or in crisis, which shall include support the development of in-person and technical information exchanges between systems and the individuals working in those systems in support of the concepts identified in the training;

“(2) provide education, training, and technical assistance for States, Indian tribes, territories, units of local government, service providers, nonprofit organizations, probation or parole officers, prosecutors, defense attorneys, emergency response providers, and corrections institutions to advance practice and knowledge relating to mental health crisis and approaches to mental health and criminal justice across systems;

“(3) provide training and best practices around relating to diversion initiatives, jail and prison strategies, reentry of individuals with mental illnesses in into the community, and dispatch protocols and triage capabilities, including the establishment of learning sites;

“(4) develop suicide prevention and crisis intervention training and technical assistance for criminal justice agencies;

“(5) develop a receiving center system and pilot strategy that provides a single point of entry into the mental health and substance abuse system for assessments and appropriate placement of individuals experiencing a crisis;

“(6) collect data and best practices in mental health and criminal health and criminal justice initiatives and policies from grantees under this part, other recipients of grants under this section, Federal, State, and local agencies involved in the provision of mental health services, and non-governmental organizations involved in the provision of mental health services;

“(7) develop and disseminate evaluation tools, mechanisms, and measures to better assess and document performance measures and outcomes;

“(8) disseminate information to States, units of local government, criminal justice agencies, law enforcement agencies, and other relevant entities about best practices, policy standards, and research findings; and

“(9) provide education and support to individuals with mental illness involved with, or at risk of involvement with, the criminal justice system, including the families of such individuals.

“(d) **ACCOUNTABILITY.**—Grants awarded under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) **AUDIT REQUIREMENT.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice under subparagraph (C) that the audited grantee has used grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 1 year after

the date on which the final audit report is issued.

“(B) **AUDITS.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this section, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of grantees under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) **FINAL AUDIT REPORT.**—The Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall submit a final report on each audit conducted under subparagraph (B).

“(D) **MANDATORY EXCLUSION.**—Grantees under this section about which there is an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive a grant under this section during the 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 1-year period described in subparagraph (A).

“(E) **PRIORITY.**—In making grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(F) **REIMBURSEMENT.**—If an entity receives a grant under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is prohibited from receiving grants under subparagraph (D), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant that was improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment under clause (i) from the grantee that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) **NONPROFIT AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.**—

“(A) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant program under this section, the term ‘nonprofit agency’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(a)).

“(B) **PROHIBITION.**—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this section to a nonprofit agency that holds money in an offshore account for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 511(a)).

“(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Each nonprofit agency that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) **CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.**—

“(A) **LIMITATION.**—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made avail-

able by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) **WRITTEN APPROVAL.**—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) **REPORT.**—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) **ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.**—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all final audit reports issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(D) have been issued; and

“(iii) any reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(F) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grantees excluded under paragraph (1)(D) from the previous year.

“(5) **PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(B) **REPORT.**—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(i) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(ii) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”.

SEC. 115. IMPROVING DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE DATA COLLECTION ON MENTAL ILLNESS INVOLVED IN CRIME.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on or after the date that is 90 days after the date on which the Attorney General promulgates regulations under subsection (b), any data prepared by, or submitted to, the Attorney General or the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation with respect to the incidences of homicides, law enforcement officers killed, seriously injured, and assaulted, or individuals killed or seriously injured by law enforcement officers shall include data with respect to the involvement of mental illness in such incidences, if any.

(b) **REGULATIONS.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall promulgate or revise regulations as necessary to carry out subsection (a).

SEC. 116. REPORTS ON THE NUMBER OF MENTALLY ILL OFFENDERS IN PRISON.

(a) **REPORT ON THE COST OF TREATING THE MENTALLY ILL IN THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.**—Not later than 12 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report detailing the cost of imprisonment for individuals who have serious mental illness by the Federal Government or a State or unit of local government, which shall include—

(1) the number and type of crimes committed by individuals with serious mental illness each year; and

(2) detail strategies or ideas for preventing crimes by those individuals with serious mental illness from occurring.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of Mental Health and Substance Use Disorders shall define “serious mental illness” based on the “Health Care Reform for Americans with Severe Mental Illnesses: Report” of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, *American Journal of Psychiatry* 1993; 150:1447–1465.

TITLE II—COMPREHENSIVE JUSTICE AND MENTAL HEALTH ACT**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the “Comprehensive Justice and Mental Health Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) An estimated 2,000,000 individuals with serious mental illnesses are booked into jails each year, resulting in prevalence rates of serious mental illness in jails that are 3 to 6 times higher than in the general population. An even greater number of individuals who are detained in jails each year have mental health problems that do not rise to the level of a serious mental illness but may still require a resource-intensive response.

(2) Adults with mental illnesses cycle through jails more often than individuals without mental illnesses, and tend to stay longer (including before trial, during trial, and after sentencing).

(3) According to estimates, almost ¾ of jail detainees with serious mental illnesses have co-occurring substance use disorders, and individuals with mental illnesses are also much more likely to have serious physical health needs.

(4) Among individuals under probation supervision, individuals with mental disorders are nearly twice as likely as other individuals to have their community sentence revoked, furthering their involvement in the criminal justice system. Reasons for revocation may be directly or indirectly related to an individual’s mental disorder.

SEC. 203. SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MODEL.

(a) **REDESIGNATION.**—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by redesignating subsection (i) as subsection (o).

(b) **SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MODEL.**—Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (h) the following:

“(i) **SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT GRANTS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term ‘eligible entity’ means a State, unit of local government, Indian tribe, or tribal organization.

“(2) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The Attorney General may make grants under this subsection to an eligible entity for sequential intercept mapping and implementation in accordance with paragraph (3).

“(3) **SEQUENTIAL INTERCEPT MAPPING; IMPLEMENTATION.**—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this subsection may use funds for—

“(A) sequential intercept mapping, which—

“(i) shall consist of—

“(I) convening mental health and criminal justice stakeholders to—

“(aa) develop a shared understanding of the flow of justice-involved individuals with mental illnesses through the criminal justice system; and

“(bb) identify opportunities for improved collaborative responses to the risks and needs of individuals described in item (aa); and

“(II) developing strategies to address gaps in services and bring innovative and effective programs to scale along multiple intercepts, including—

“(aa) emergency and crisis services;

“(bb) specialized police-based responses;

“(cc) court hearings and disposition alternatives;

“(dd) reentry from jails and prisons; and

“(ee) community supervision, treatment and support services; and

“(ii) may serve as a starting point for the development of strategic plans to achieve positive public health and safety outcomes; and

“(B) implementation, which shall—

“(i) be derived from the strategic plans described in subparagraph (A)(ii); and

“(ii) consist of—

“(I) hiring and training personnel;

“(II) identifying the eligible entity’s target population;

“(III) providing services and supports to reduce unnecessary penetration into the criminal justice system;

“(IV) reducing recidivism;

“(V) evaluating the impact of the eligible entity’s approach; and

“(VI) planning for the sustainability of effective interventions.”.

SEC. 204. VETERANS TREATMENT COURTS.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (i), as added by section 203, the following:

“(j) **ASSISTING VETERANS.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection:

“(A) **PEER TO PEER SERVICES OR PROGRAMS.**—The term ‘peer to peer services or programs’ means services or programs that connect qualified veterans with other veterans for the purpose of providing support and mentorship to assist qualified veterans in obtaining treatment, recovery, stabilization, or rehabilitation.

“(B) **QUALIFIED VETERAN.**—The term ‘qualified veteran’ means a preliminarily qualified offender who—

“(i) served on active duty in any branch of the Armed Forces, including the National Guard or Reserves; and

“(ii) was discharged or released from such service under conditions other than dishonorable.

“(C) **VETERANS TREATMENT COURT PROGRAM.**—The term ‘veterans treatment court program’ means a court program involving collaboration among criminal justice, veterans, and mental health and substance abuse agencies that provides qualified veterans with—

“(i) intensive judicial supervision and case management, which may include random and frequent drug testing where appropriate;

“(ii) a full continuum of treatment services, including mental health services, substance abuse services, medical services, and services to address trauma;

“(iii) alternatives to incarceration; and

“(iv) other appropriate services, including housing, transportation, mentoring, employment, job training, education, and assistance in applying for and obtaining available benefits.

“(2) **VETERANS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, may award grants under this subsection to applicants to establish or expand—

“(i) veterans treatment court programs;

“(ii) peer to peer services or programs for qualified veterans;

“(iii) practices that identify and provide treatment, rehabilitation, legal, transitional, and other appropriate services to qualified veterans who have been incarcerated; and

“(iv) training programs to teach criminal justice, law enforcement, corrections, mental health, and substance abuse personnel how to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving qualified veterans.

“(B) **PRIORITY.**—In awarding grants under this subsection, the Attorney General shall give priority to applications that—

“(i) demonstrate collaboration between and joint investments by criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, and veterans service agencies;

“(ii) promote effective strategies to identify and reduce the risk of harm to qualified veterans and public safety; and

“(iii) propose interventions with empirical support to improve outcomes for qualified veterans.”.

SEC. 205. PRISON AND JAILS.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (j), as added by section 204, the following:

“(k) **CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES.**—

“(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—

“(A) **CORRECTIONAL FACILITY.**—The term ‘correctional facility’ means a jail, prison, or other detention facility used to house people who have been arrested, detained, held, or convicted by a criminal justice agency or a court.

“(B) **ELIGIBLE INMATE.**—The term ‘eligible inmate’ means an individual who—

“(i) is being held, detained, or incarcerated in a correctional facility; and

“(ii) manifests obvious signs of a mental illness or has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness.

“(2) **CORRECTIONAL FACILITY GRANTS.**—The Attorney General may award grants to applicants to enhance the capabilities of a correctional facility—

“(A) to identify and screen for eligible inmates;

“(B) to plan and provide—

“(i) initial and periodic assessments of the clinical, medical, and social needs of inmates; and

“(ii) appropriate treatment and services that address the mental health and substance abuse needs of inmates;

“(C) to develop, implement, and enhance—

“(i) post-release transition plans for eligible inmates that, in a comprehensive manner, coordinate health, housing, medical, employment, and other appropriate services and public benefits;

“(ii) the availability of mental health care services and substance abuse treatment services; and

“(iii) alternatives to solitary confinement and segregated housing and mental health screening and treatment for inmates placed

in solitary confinement or segregated housing; and

“(D) to train each employee of the correctional facility to identify and appropriately respond to incidents involving inmates with mental health or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.”.

SEC. 206. ALLOWABLE USES.

Section 2991(b)(5)(I) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(b)(5)(I)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) TEAMS ADDRESSING FREQUENT USERS OF CRISIS SERVICES.—Multidisciplinary teams that—

“(I) coordinate, implement, and administer community-based crisis responses and long-term plans for frequent users of crisis services;

“(II) provide training on how to respond appropriately to the unique issues involving frequent users of crisis services for public service personnel, including criminal justice, mental health, substance abuse, emergency room, healthcare, law enforcement, corrections, and housing personnel;

“(III) develop or support alternatives to hospital and jail admissions for frequent users of crisis services that provide treatment, stabilization, and other appropriate supports in the least restrictive, yet appropriate, environment; and

“(IV) develop protocols and systems among law enforcement, mental health, substance abuse, housing, corrections, and emergency medical service operations to provide coordinated assistance to frequent users of crisis services.”.

SEC. 207. LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.

Section 2991(h) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(h)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by adding at the end the following:

“(F) ACADEMY TRAINING.—To provide support for academy curricula, law enforcement officer orientation programs, continuing education training, and other programs that teach law enforcement personnel how to identify and respond to incidents involving persons with mental health disorders or co-occurring mental health and substance abuse disorders.”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(4) PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.—The Attorney General, in awarding grants under this subsection, shall give priority to programs that law enforcement personnel and members of the mental health and substance abuse professions develop and administer cooperatively.”.

SEC. 208. FEDERAL LAW ENFORCEMENT TRAINING.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall provide direction and guidance for the following:

(1) TRAINING PROGRAMS.—Programs that offer specialized and comprehensive training, in procedures to identify and appropriately respond to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals who have a mental illness are involved, to first responders and tactical units of—

(A) Federal law enforcement agencies; and

(B) other Federal criminal justice agencies such as the Bureau of Prisons, the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and other agencies that the Attorney General determines appropriate.

(2) IMPROVED TECHNOLOGY.—The establishment of, or improvement of existing, computerized information systems to provide timely information to employees of Federal

law enforcement agencies, and Federal criminal justice agencies to improve the response of such employees to situations involving individuals who have a mental illness.

SEC. 209. GAO REPORT.

Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States, in coordination with the Attorney General, shall submit to Congress a report on—

(1) the practices that Federal first responders, tactical units, and corrections officers are trained to use in responding to individuals with mental illness;

(2) procedures to identify and appropriately respond to incidents in which the unique needs of individuals who have a mental illness are involved, to Federal first responders and tactical units;

(3) the application of evidence-based practices in criminal justice settings to better address individuals with mental illnesses; and

(4) recommendations on how the Department of Justice can expand and improve information sharing and dissemination of best practices.

SEC. 210. EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICES.

Section 2991(c) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (3), by striking “or” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (6); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (3), the following:

“(4) propose interventions that have been shown by empirical evidence to reduce recidivism;

“(5) when appropriate, use validated assessment tools to target preliminarily qualified offenders with a moderate or high risk of recidivism and a need for treatment and services; or”.

SEC. 211. TRANSPARENCY, PROGRAM ACCOUNTABILITY, AND ENHANCEMENT OF LOCAL AUTHORITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2991(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (7)—

(A) in the heading, by striking “MENTAL ILLNESS” and inserting “MENTAL ILLNESS; MENTAL HEALTH DISORDER”; and

(B) by striking “term ‘mental illness’ means” and inserting “terms ‘mental illness’ and ‘mental health disorder’ mean”; and

(2) by striking paragraph (9) and inserting the following:

“(9) PRELIMINARILY QUALIFIED OFFENDER.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘preliminarily qualified offender’ means an adult or juvenile accused of an offense who—

“(i)(I) previously or currently has been diagnosed by a qualified mental health professional as having a mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders;

“(II) manifests obvious signs of mental illness or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorders during arrest or confinement or before any court; or

“(III) in the case of a veterans treatment court provided under subsection (i), has been diagnosed with, or manifests obvious signs of, mental illness or a substance abuse disorder or co-occurring mental illness and substance abuse disorder;

“(ii) has been unanimously approved for participation in a program funded under this section by, when appropriate—

“(I) the relevant—

“(aa) prosecuting attorney;

“(bb) defense attorney;

“(cc) probation or corrections official; and

“(dd) judge; and

“(II) a representative from the relevant mental health agency described in subsection (b)(5)(B)(i);

“(iii) has been determined, by each person described in clause (ii) who is involved in approving the adult or juvenile for participation in a program funded under this section, to not pose a risk of violence to any person in the program, or the public, if selected to participate in the program; and

“(iv) has not been charged with or convicted of—

“(I) any sex offense (as defined in section 111 of the Sex Offender Registration and Notification Act (42 U.S.C. 16911)) or any offense relating to the sexual exploitation of children; or

“(II) murder or assault with intent to commit murder.

(B) DETERMINATION.—In determining whether to designate a defendant as a preliminarily qualified offender, the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge, and mental health or substance abuse agency representative shall take into account—

“(i) whether the participation of the defendant in the program would pose a substantial risk of violence to the community;

“(ii) the criminal history of the defendant and the nature and severity of the offense for which the defendant is charged;

“(iii) the views of any relevant victims to the offense;

“(iv) the extent to which the defendant would benefit from participation in the program;

“(v) the extent to which the community would realize cost savings because of the defendant’s participation in the program; and

“(vi) whether the defendant satisfies the eligibility criteria for program participation unanimously established by the relevant prosecuting attorney, defense attorney, probation or corrections official, judge and mental health or substance abuse agency representative.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 2927(2) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797s-6(2)) is amended by striking “has the meaning given that term in section 2991(a).” and inserting “means an offense that—

“(A) does not have as an element the use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against the person or property of another; or

“(B) is not a felony that by its nature involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.”.

SEC. 212. GRANT ACCOUNTABILITY.

Section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa) is amended by inserting after subsection (k), as added by section 205, the following:

“(m) ACCOUNTABILITY.—All grants awarded by the Attorney General under this section shall be subject to the following accountability provisions:

“(1) AUDIT REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—In this paragraph, the term ‘unresolved audit finding’ means a finding in the final audit report of the Inspector General of the Department of Justice that the audited grantee has utilized grant funds for an unauthorized expenditure or otherwise

unallowable cost that is not closed or resolved within 12 months from the date when the final audit report is issued.

“(B) AUDITS.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, and in each fiscal year thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of Justice shall conduct audits of recipients of grants under this section to prevent waste, fraud, and abuse of funds by grantees. The Inspector General shall determine the appropriate number of grantees to be audited each year.

“(C) MANDATORY EXCLUSION.—A recipient of grant funds under this section that is found to have an unresolved audit finding shall not be eligible to receive grant funds under this section during the first 2 fiscal years beginning after the end of the 12-month period described in subparagraph (A).

“(D) PRIORITY.—In awarding grants under this section, the Attorney General shall give priority to eligible applicants that did not have an unresolved audit finding during the 3 fiscal years before submitting an application for a grant under this section.

“(E) REIMBURSEMENT.—If an entity is awarded grant funds under this section during the 2-fiscal-year period during which the entity is barred from receiving grants under subparagraph (C), the Attorney General shall—

“(i) deposit an amount equal to the amount of the grant funds that were improperly awarded to the grantee into the General Fund of the Treasury; and

“(ii) seek to recoup the costs of the repayment to the fund from the grant recipient that was erroneously awarded grant funds.

“(2) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION REQUIREMENTS.—

“(A) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this paragraph and the grant programs under this part, the term ‘nonprofit organization’ means an organization that is described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code.

“(B) PROHIBITION.—The Attorney General may not award a grant under this part to a nonprofit organization that holds money in offshore accounts for the purpose of avoiding paying the tax described in section 511(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“(C) DISCLOSURE.—Each nonprofit organization that is awarded a grant under this section and uses the procedures prescribed in regulations to create a rebuttable presumption of reasonableness for the compensation of its officers, directors, trustees, and key employees, shall disclose to the Attorney General, in the application for the grant, the process for determining such compensation, including the independent persons involved in reviewing and approving such compensation, the comparability data used, and contemporaneous substantiation of the deliberation and decision. Upon request, the Attorney General shall make the information disclosed under this subparagraph available for public inspection.

“(3) CONFERENCE EXPENDITURES.—

“(A) LIMITATION.—No amounts made available to the Department of Justice under this section may be used by the Attorney General, or by any individual or entity awarded discretionary funds through a cooperative agreement under this section, to host or support any expenditure for conferences that uses more than \$20,000 in funds made available by the Department of Justice, unless the head of the relevant agency or department, provides prior written authorization that the funds may be expended to host the conference.

“(B) WRITTEN APPROVAL.—Written approval under subparagraph (A) shall include a written estimate of all costs associated with the conference, including the cost of all food, beverages, audio-visual equipment, honoraria for speakers, and entertainment.

“(C) REPORT.—The Deputy Attorney General shall submit an annual report to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives on all conference expenditures approved under this paragraph.

“(4) ANNUAL CERTIFICATION.—Beginning in the first fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Attorney General shall submit, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, an annual certification—

“(A) indicating whether—

“(i) all audits issued by the Office of the Inspector General under paragraph (1) have been completed and reviewed by the appropriate Assistant Attorney General or Director;

“(ii) all mandatory exclusions required under paragraph (1)(C) have been issued; and

“(iii) all reimbursements required under paragraph (1)(E) have been made; and

“(B) that includes a list of any grant recipients excluded under paragraph (1) from the previous year.

“(n) PREVENTING DUPLICATIVE GRANTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Before the Attorney General awards a grant to an applicant under this section, the Attorney General shall compare potential grant awards with other grants awarded under this Act to determine if duplicate grant awards are awarded for the same purpose.

“(2) REPORT.—If the Attorney General awards duplicate grants to the same applicant for the same purpose the Attorney General shall submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report that includes—

“(A) a list of all duplicate grants awarded, including the total dollar amount of any duplicate grants awarded; and

“(B) the reason the Attorney General awarded the duplicate grants.”.

TITLE III—NICS REAUTHORIZATION AND NICS IMPROVEMENT

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION OF NICS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 103(e) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by striking “fiscal year 2013” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS RELATING TO MENTAL HEALTH.

(a) TITLE 18 DEFINITIONS.—Chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in section 921(a), by adding at the end the following:

“(36)(A) Subject to subparagraph (B), the term ‘has been adjudicated mentally incompetent or has been committed to a psychiatric hospital’, with respect to a person—

“(i) means the person is the subject of an order or finding by a judicial officer, court, board, commission, or other adjudicative body—

“(I) that was issued after—

“(aa) a hearing—

“(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

“(BB) at which the person had an opportunity to participate with counsel; or

“(bb) the person knowingly and intelligently waived the opportunity for a hearing—

“(AA) of which the person received actual notice; and

“(BB) at which the person would have had an opportunity to participate with counsel; and

“(II) that found that the person, as a result of marked subnormal intelligence, mental impairment, mental illness, incompetency, condition, or disease—

“(aa) was a danger to himself or herself or to others;

“(bb) was guilty but mentally ill in a criminal case, in a jurisdiction that provides for such a verdict;

“(cc) was not guilty in a criminal case by reason of insanity or mental disease or defect;

“(dd) was incompetent to stand trial in a criminal case;

“(ee) was not guilty by reason of lack of mental responsibility under section 850a of title 10 (article 50a of the Uniform Code of Military Justice);

“(ff) required involuntary inpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital for any reason, including substance abuse; or

“(gg) required involuntary outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital based on a finding that the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others; and

“(ii) does not include—

“(I) an admission to a psychiatric hospital for observation; or

“(II) a voluntary admission to a psychiatric hospital.

“(B) In this paragraph, the term ‘order or finding’ does not include—

“(i) an order or finding that has expired or has been set aside or expunged;

“(ii) an order or finding that is no longer applicable because a judicial officer, court, board, commission, or other adjudicative body has found that the person who is the subject of the order or finding—

“(I) does not present a danger to himself or herself or to others;

“(II) has been restored to sanity or cured of mental disease or defect;

“(III) has been restored to competency; or

“(IV) no longer requires involuntary inpatient or outpatient treatment by a psychiatric hospital; or

“(iii) an order or finding with respect to which the person who is subject to the order or finding has been granted relief from disabilities under section 925(c), under a program described in section 101(c)(2)(A) or 105 of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note), or under any other State-authorized relief from disabilities program of the State in which the original commitment or adjudication occurred.

“(37) The term ‘psychiatric hospital’ includes a mental health facility, a mental hospital, a sanitarium, a psychiatric facility, and any other facility that provides diagnoses or treatment by licensed professionals of mental retardation or mental illness, including a psychiatric ward in a general hospital.”; and

(2) in section 922—

(A) in subsection (d)(4)—

(i) by striking “as a mental defective” and inserting “mentally incompetent”; and

(ii) by striking “any mental institution” and inserting “a psychiatric hospital”; and

(B) in subsection (g)(4)—

(i) by striking “as a mental defective or who has” and inserting “mentally incompetent or has”; and

(ii) by striking “mental institution” and inserting “psychiatric hospital”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking “as a mental defective” each place that term appears and inserting “mentally incompetent”;

(2) by striking “mental institution” each place that term appears and inserting “psychiatric hospital”;

(3) in section 101(c)—

(A) in paragraph (1), in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(i), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “to the mental health of a person” and inserting “to whether a person is mentally incompetent”;

(4) in section 102(c)(3)—

(A) in the paragraph heading, by striking “AS A MENTAL DEFECTIVE OR COMMITTED TO A MENTAL INSTITUTION” and inserting “MENTALLY INCOMPETENT OR COMMITTED TO A PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL”;

(B) by striking “mental institutions” and inserting “psychiatric hospitals”.

SEC. 303. INCENTIVES FOR STATE COMPLIANCE WITH NICS MENTAL HEALTH RECORD REQUIREMENTS.

Section 104(b) of the NICS Improvement Amendments Act of 2007 (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraphs (1) and (2);

(2) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2);

(3) in paragraph (2), as redesignated, by striking “of paragraph (2)” and inserting “of paragraph (1)”;

(4) by inserting before paragraph (2), as redesignated, the following:

“(1) INCENTIVES FOR PROVIDING MENTAL HEALTH RECORDS AND FIXING THE BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.—

“(A) DEFINITION OF COMPLIANT STATE.—In this paragraph, the term ‘compliant State’ means a State that has—

“(i) provided not less than 90 percent of the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; or

“(ii) in effect a statute that—

“(I) requires the State to provide the records required to be provided under sections 102 and 103; and

“(II) implements a relief from disabilities program in accordance with section 105.

“(B) INCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE.—During the period beginning on the date that is 18 months after the enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015 and ending on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of such Act, the Attorney General—

“(i) shall use funds appropriated to carry out section 103 of this Act, the excess unobligated balances of the Department of Justice and funds withheld under clause (ii), or any combination thereof, to increase the amounts available under section 505 of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3755) for each compliant State in an amount that is not less than 2 percent nor more than 5 percent of the amount that was allocated to such State under such section 505 in the previous fiscal year; and

“(ii) may withhold an amount not to exceed the amount described in clause (i) that would otherwise be allocated to a State

under any section of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et seq.) if the State—

“(I) is not a compliant State; and

“(II) does not submit an assurance to the Attorney General that—

“(aa) an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) will be used solely for the purpose of enabling the State to become a compliant State; or

“(bb) the State will hold in abeyance an amount that is not less than the amount described in clause (i) until such State has become a compliant State.

“(C) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 180 days after the enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Attorney General shall issue regulations implementing this paragraph.”.

SEC. 304. PROTECTING THE SECOND AMENDMENT RIGHTS OF VETERANS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes

“(a) PROTECTING RIGHTS OF VETERANS WITH EXISTING RECORDS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Secretary shall provide written notice in accordance with subsection (b) of the opportunity for administrative review under subsection (c) to all persons who, on the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, are considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18 as a result of having been found by the Department to be mentally incompetent.

“(b) NOTICE.—The Secretary shall provide notice under this section to a person described in subsection (a) that notifies the person of—

“(1) the determination made by the Secretary;

“(2) a description of the implications of being considered to have been adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18; and

“(3) the right of the person to request a review under subsection (c)(1).

“(c) ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW.—

“(1) REQUEST.—Not later than 30 days after the date on which a person described in subsection (a) receives notice in accordance with subsection (b), such person may request a review by the board designed or established under paragraph (2) or by a court of competent jurisdiction to assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others. In such assessment, the board may consider the person’s honorable discharge or decorations.

“(2) BOARD.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of the Mental Health and Safe Communities Act of 2015, the Secretary shall designate or establish a board that shall, upon request of a person under paragraph (1), assess whether the person is a danger to himself or herself or to others.

“(d) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—A person may file a petition with a Federal court of competent jurisdiction for judicial review of an assessment of the person under subsection (c) by the board designated or established under subsection (c)(2).”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 55 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“5511. Conditions for treatment of certain persons as adjudicated mentally incompetent for certain purposes.”.

SEC. 305. APPLICABILITY OF AMENDMENTS.

With respect to any record of a person prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm under subsection (d)(4) or (g)(4) of section 922 of title 18, United States Code, before the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General shall remove such a record from the National Instant Criminal Background Check System—

(1) upon being made aware that the person is no longer considered as adjudicated mentally incompetent or committed to a psychiatric hospital according to the criteria under paragraph (36)(A)(i)(II) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code (as added by this title), and is therefore no longer prohibited from possessing or receiving a firearm;

(2) upon being made aware that any order or finding that the record is based on is an order or finding described in paragraph (36)(B) of section 921(a) of title 18, United States Code (as added by this title); or

(3) upon being made aware that the person has been found competent to possess a firearm after an administrative or judicial review under subsection (c) or (d) of section 5511 of title 38, United States Code (as added by this title).

SEC. 306. CLARIFICATION THAT FEDERAL COURT INFORMATION IS TO BE MADE AVAILABLE TO THE NATIONAL INSTANT CRIMINAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM.

Section 103(e)(1) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) APPLICATION TO FEDERAL COURTS.—In this paragraph—

“(i) the terms ‘department or agency of the United States’ and ‘Federal department or agency’ include a Federal court; and

“(ii) for purposes of any request, submission, or notification, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts shall perform the functions of the head of the department or agency.”.

TITLE IV—REAUTHORIZATIONS AND OFFSET

SEC. 401. REAUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) ADULT AND JUVENILE COLLABORATION PROGRAMS.—Subsection (o) of section 2991 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3797aa), as redesignated by section 203, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(C), by striking “2009 through 2014” and inserting “2016 through 2020”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) LIMITATION.—Not more than 20 percent of the funds authorized to be appropriated under this section may be used for purposes described in subsection (j) (relating to veterans).”.

(b) MENTAL HEALTH COURTS AND QUALIFIED DRUG TREATMENT PROGRAMS.—Section 1001(a) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (20), by striking “2001 through 2004” and inserting “2016 through 2020”; and

(2) in paragraph (26), by striking “2009 and 2010” and inserting “2016 through 2020”.

SEC. 402. OFFSET.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this subsection, the term “covered amounts” means the unobligated balances of discretionary appropriations accounts, except for the discretionary

appropriations accounts of the Department of Defense, the Department of Veterans Affairs, and the Department of Homeland Security.

(b) RESCISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Effective on the first day of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, there are rescinded from covered amounts, on a pro rata basis, the amount described in paragraph (2).

(2) AMOUNT OF RESCISSION.—The amount described in this subparagraph is the sum of the amounts authorized to be appropriated under paragraphs (20) and (26) of section 1001(a) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3793(a)).

(3) REPORT.—Not later 60 days after the first day of each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit to Congress and the Secretary of the Treasury a report specifying the account and amount of each rescission under this subsection

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 242—CELEBRATING 25 YEARS OF SUCCESS FROM THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON WOMEN'S HEALTH AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions:

S. RES. 242

Whereas, on September 10, 1990, the Office of Research on Women's Health (in this resolution referred to as "ORWH") was established at the National Institutes of Health (in this resolution referred to as "NIH") to—

(1) ensure that women were included in NIH-funded clinical research;

(2) set research priorities to address gaps in scientific knowledge; and

(3) promote biomedical research careers for women;

Whereas ORWH was established in law by the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-43; 107 Stat. 122) and implemented the law requiring researchers to include women in NIH-funded tests of new drugs and other clinical trials;

Whereas, today, more than ½ of the participants in NIH-funded clinical trials are women, enabling the development of clinical approaches to prevention, diagnosis, or treatment appropriate for women;

Whereas, in 2015, ORWH, with enthusiastic support from NIH leadership, announced that, beginning in January 2016, NIH-funded scientists must account for the possible role of sex as a biological variable in vertebrate animal and human studies;

Whereas ORWH, along with NIH leadership, enhances awareness of the need to adhere to principles of rigor and transparency, including the need to publish sex-specific results to inform the treatment of women, men, boys, and girls;

Whereas, over the past 25 years, ORWH has helped expand research on women's health beyond its roots in reproductive health to include—

(1) the study of the health of women across the lifespans of women; and

(2) biomedical and behavioral research from cells to selves;

Whereas, by studying both sexes, ORWH is leading the scientific community to make discoveries headed toward treatments that are more personalized for both women and men;

Whereas, today, ORWH communicates through programs and policies that sex and gender affect health, wellness, and how diseases progress;

Whereas turning discovery into health for all, the NIH motto, means studying both females and males across the biomedical research continuum;

Whereas the ORWH Specialized Centers of Research on Sex Differences program supports established scientists who do basic, clinical, and translational research with a sex and gender focus;

Whereas all NIH Institutes and Centers fund and encourage scientists at universities across the nation to conduct research on the health of women and on sex and gender influences;

Whereas, over the past 25 years, ORWH has established several career-enhancement initiatives for women in biomedicine, including the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health program that connects junior faculty with mentors who share interests in women's health research;

Whereas ORWH co-directs the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers, which develops and evaluates policies to promote the recruitment, retention, and sustained advancement of women scientists;

Whereas the Women's Health Initiative (in this resolution referred to as "WHI") marked the first long term study of its kind and resulted in a wealth of information so that women and their physicians can make more informed decisions regarding postmenopausal hormone therapy;

Whereas WHI reduced the incidence of breast cancer by 10,000 to 15,000 cases per year, and the overall health care savings far exceeded the WHI investment;

Whereas ORWH supported the National Cancer Institute's development of a vaccine that prevents the transmission of Human Papilloma Virus, resulting in a decrease in the number of cases of cervical cancer;

Whereas, in 1994, ORWH co-sponsored with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases a landmark study, the results of which showed that giving the drug AZT to HIV-infected women with little or no prior antiretroviral therapy reduced the risk of mother-to-child transmission of HIV by ⅓;

Whereas, according to the CDC, perinatal HIV infections in the United States have dropped by more than 90 percent;

Whereas ORWH co-funded a large clinical study of the genetic and environmental risk factors for ischemic stroke, which identified a strong relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the probability of ischemic stroke in young women, prompting the targeting of smoking as a preventable and modifiable risk factor for cerebrovascular disease in young women; and

Whereas, over the past 25 years, ORWH has contributed support toward major advances in knowledge about the genetic risk for breast cancer, and discovery of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic risk markers has enabled better-informed genetic counseling and treatment for members of families that carry mutant alleles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) ORWH has improved and saved the lives of countless women worldwide and must remain intact for this and future generations;

(2) there remain striking sex and gender differences in many diseases and conditions,

on which ORWH should continue to focus, including—

- (A) autoimmune diseases;
- (B) cancer;
- (C) cardiovascular diseases;
- (D) depression and brain disorders;
- (E) Alzheimer's disease;
- (F) diabetes;
- (G) chronic diseases and disorders;
- (H) infectious diseases;
- (I) obesity; and
- (J) addictive disorders;

(3) ORWH must continue to focus on ensuring that NIH funds biomedical research that considers sex as a basic biological variable, across the research spectrum from basic to clinical studies; and

(4) the Director of the NIH should continue to consult and involve ORWH on all matters related to the influence of sex and gender on health, especially those pertaining to the consideration of sex as a biological variable in research with vertebrate animals and humans.

SENATE RESOLUTION 243—CELEBRATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. VITTER (for himself, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. ENZI, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. PETERS, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship:

S. RES. 243

Whereas America's Small Business Development Center (referred to in this preamble as "SBDC") network will celebrate the 35th anniversary of the SBDC network at a conference to be held September 8 through 11, 2015, in San Francisco, California;

Whereas the conference will be held—

(1) to continue the professional development of employees of SBDCs; and

(2) to commemorate the educational and technical assistance offered by SBDCs to small businesses across the United States;

Whereas for 35 years, SBDCs have been among the preeminent organizations in the United States for providing business advice, 1-on-1 counseling, and in-depth training to small businesses;

Whereas, during the 35 years before the date of approval of this resolution, the SBDC network has grown from 9 fledgling centers to a nationwide network of 63 State and regional centers with more than 4,200 business advisors providing free counseling at nearly 1,000 individual locations;

Whereas the SBDC network has worked for 35 years with the Small Business Administration, institutions of higher education, State governments, Congress, and others, to significantly enhance the economic health and strength of small businesses in the United States;

Whereas SBDCs—

(1) have assisted more than 22,500,000 small businesses during the 35 years before the date of approval of this resolution; and

(2) continue to aid and support hundreds of thousands of small businesses annually;

Whereas 28 percent of all SBDC clients are minorities, 44 percent of SBDC clients are women, and 9 percent of all SBDC clients are veterans;

Whereas SBDCs provide over 1,250,000 hours of counseling to small businesses and invest

over \$140,000,000 annually in supporting small business;

Whereas, since 2012, SBDCs have helped small businesses create over 750,000 jobs, add \$67,500,000,000 in sales and attract over \$38,000,000,000 in capital;

Whereas, since the inception of SBDCs, SBDCs have continued to redefine and transform the services offered by SBDCs, including training and advising, and have taken on new missions, in order to ensure that small businesses have relevant and significant assistance in all economic conditions; and

Whereas Congress continues to support SBDCs and the role of SBDCs in assisting small businesses and building the economic success of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) celebrates the 35th anniversary of America's Small Business Development Center network; and

(2) expresses appreciation for—

(A) the steadfast partnership between America's Small Business Development Center network and the Small Business Administration; and

(B) the work of America's Small Business Development Center network in ensuring quality assistance to small business and access for all to the American dream.

SENATE RESOLUTION 244—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE “LAUDATO SI” ENCYCLICAL OF POPE FRANCIS, AND GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. FRANKEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. SANDERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works:

S. RES. 244

Whereas on June 18, 2015, Pope Francis published an encyclical letter on the environment that—

(1) declares, “A very solid scientific consensus indicates that we are presently witnessing a disturbing warming of the climatic system. In recent decades this warming has been accompanied by a constant rise in the sea level and, it would appear, by an increase of extreme weather events, even if a scientifically determinable cause cannot be assigned to each particular phenomenon. Humanity is called to recognize the need for changes of lifestyle, production and consumption, in order to combat this warming or at least the human causes which produce or aggravate it. It is true that there are other factors (such as volcanic activity, variations in the earth's orbit and axis, the solar cycle), yet a number of scientific studies indicate that most global warming in recent decades is due to the great concentration of greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide, methane, nitrogen oxides and others) released mainly as a result of human activity.”;

(2) states, “If present trends continue, this century may well witness extraordinary climate change and an unprecedented destruction of ecosystems, with serious consequences for all of us. A rise in the sea level, for example, can create extremely serious situations, if we consider that a quarter of the world's population lives on the coast or nearby, and that the majority of our megacities are situated in coastal areas.”;

(3) affirms, “There is an urgent need to develop policies so that, in the next few years,

the emission of carbon dioxide and other highly polluting gases can be drastically reduced, for example, substituting for fossil fuels and developing sources of renewable energy. Worldwide there is minimal access to clean and renewable energy. There is still a need to develop adequate storage technologies.”;

(4) emphasizes, “The deterioration of the environment and of society affects the most vulnerable people on the planet: ‘Both everyday experience and scientific research show that the gravest effects of all attacks on the environment are suffered by the poorest.’”; and

(5) proclaims, “Climate change is a global problem with grave implications: environmental, social, economic, political and for the distribution of goods. It represents one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.”;

Whereas leading scientific organizations in the United States have affirmed that human activity is the primary cause of climate change, including the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Academy of Sciences, the American Meteorological Society, the American Chemical Society, the American Geophysical Union, the American Institute of Biological Sciences, and many others;

Whereas the U.S. Global Change Research Program's 2014 National Climate Assessment documents that, over the past several decades, as a result of climate change, the United States has experienced more frequent and intense heat waves, record droughts, increased flooding in certain regions, increased hurricane intensity, frequency, and duration, increased frequency and intensity of winter storms, rising sea levels, and other ecologically problematic trends; and

Whereas if present climate trends persist, the effects of a warming planet will become more catastrophic, as the 2014 National Climate Assessment states, “Children, the elderly, the sick, and the poor are especially vulnerable. There is mounting evidence that harm to the nation will increase substantially in the future unless global emissions of heat-trapping gases are greatly reduced.”; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate stands with Pope Francis and the scientific consensus that—

(1) human activity is the primary driver of climate change;

(2) present climate trends are unsustainable; and

(3) immediate action must be taken to significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions in order to limit the deleterious effects of human-induced climate change.

SENATE RESOLUTION 245—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 13, 2015, AS “NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS RECOGNITION WEEK”

Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KING, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Ms. AYOTTE, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 245

Whereas direct support professionals, direct care workers, personal assistants, per-

sonal attendants, in-home support workers, and paraprofessionals (in this resolution collectively referred to as “direct support professionals”) are the primary providers of publicly funded long-term support and services for millions of individuals with disabilities;

Whereas a direct support professional must build a close, respectful, and trusting relationship with an individual with disabilities;

Whereas a direct support professional assists individuals with disabilities with intimate personal care assistance on a daily basis;

Whereas direct support professionals provide a broad range of individualized support, including—

(1) preparation of meals;

(2) helping with medications;

(3) assisting with bathing, dressing, and other aspects of daily living;

(4) assisting individuals with physical disabilities in accessing their environment;

(5) providing transportation to school, work, religious activities, and recreational activities; and

(6) helping with general daily affairs, such as assisting with financial matters, medical appointments, and personal interests;

Whereas direct support professionals provide essential support to help keep individuals with disabilities connected to the families, friends, and communities of the individuals;

Whereas direct support professionals support individuals with disabilities in making choices that lead to meaningful, productive lives;

Whereas direct support professionals are integral to helping individuals with disabilities live successfully in the communities of the individuals, avoiding more costly institutional care;

Whereas the participation of direct support professionals in medical care planning is critical to the successful transition from medical events to post-acute care and long-term support and services;

Whereas many direct support professionals are the primary financial providers for the families of the direct support professionals;

Whereas direct support professionals are a critical element in supporting individuals—

(1) who receive health care services for severe chronic health conditions; and

(2) with functional limitations;

Whereas direct support professionals are hardworking, taxpaying citizens who provide an important service to individuals with disabilities, yet many direct support professionals continue to earn low wages, receive inadequate benefits, and have limited opportunities for advancement, resulting in high turnover and vacancy rates, adversely affecting the quality of support for, and the safety and health of, individuals with disabilities;

Whereas there is a documented critical and increasing shortage of direct support professionals throughout the United States;

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, 527 U.S. 581 (1999), recognized the importance of community-based services for individuals with disabilities in holding that, under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (42 U.S.C. 12101 et seq.), States must provide community-based treatment to individuals with disabilities when—

(1) the services are appropriate;

(2) the affected individuals do not oppose community-based treatment; and

(3) community-based treatment can be reasonably accommodated, taking into account the resources available to the State and the

needs of other individuals with disabilities; and

Whereas, in 2015, the majority of direct support professionals are employed in home-based and community-based settings, and this trend is projected to increase over the next decade: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning September 13, 2015, as “National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week”;

(2) recognizes the dedication and vital role of direct support professionals in enhancing the lives of individuals with disabilities of all ages;

(3) appreciates the contribution of direct support professionals in supporting individuals with disabilities and their families in the United States;

(4) commends direct support professionals as integral to the long-term support of and services for individuals with disabilities; and

(5) finds that the successful implementation of the public policies affecting individuals with disabilities in the United States depends on the dedication of direct support professionals.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to submit, with my colleague Senator COLLINS, a resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as “National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week.” The Senate has passed a similar resolution each year for the past seven years, and National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week holds special significance this year as we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act, ADA.

Direct support professionals play an incredibly important role in providing essential community supports to millions of Americans with disabilities. These dedicated workers assist individuals with disabilities with daily life activities such as dressing, eating, and bathing, and they help ensure that people with disabilities can be active participants in their communities.

Let me share with you the story of Ed Wainwright, Jr., a direct support professional who was recognized this year for his incredible work and dedication when he was given Maryland’s Direct Support Professional, DSP, of the Year Award by the American Network of Community Options and Resources, ANCOR. Ed works for New Horizons Supported Services in Upper Marlboro, MD, and has been a direct support professional for over 6 years. He and his staff provide essential support to 33 individuals with disabilities. Ed’s primary job is to teach and reinforce practical life skills for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities by integrating strategic goal setting with daily living, with the goal of achieving self-sufficiency.

Ed is committed to helping individuals with disabilities realize their full potential. For example, Ed once worked with a man who had suffered a traumatic brain injury in a car accident as a youth. After the accident, he could not walk, and the prognosis for

regaining his mobility was poor. After work, Ed would often take this young man to the gym with him to help rebuild his strength, on Ed’s own time and using his personal gym membership. Recognizing this young man’s creative abilities, Ed also took it upon himself to research and apply for a grant to help pay for his college expenses. Thanks in large part to Ed’s commitment and dedication, that young man is now a graphic designer and, as he continues to work on his rehabilitation, taking steps again is a real possibility.

As Ed’s story demonstrates, the job of a direct support professional is not easy. The hours are often long, and the wages are low. The job can be physically laborious, as well as emotionally draining. The reward for direct support professionals, however, is that they are able to improve the lives of individuals with disabilities and help fulfill the promise of the ADA by making it possible for these Americans to participate in their communities to the fullest extent possible.

Today, we have the opportunity to recognize the millions of direct support professionals who provide essential services to individuals with disabilities, to thank them for their commitment and dedication, and to express our appreciation for the critically important work they do every day throughout our country.

I urge my colleagues to join me and Senator COLLINS in expressing our appreciation for our country’s direct support professionals and supporting the resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as “National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week.”

SENATE RESOLUTION 246—COMMEMORATING 80 YEARS SINCE THE CREATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY

Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. CASEY, Mr. WARNER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. COONS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SCHATZ, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. UDALL, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. WHITEHOUSE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Finance:

S. RES. 246

Whereas on August 14, 1935, President Franklin D. Roosevelt signed the Social Security Act into law, thereby establishing a

vital—and ultimately universal—insurance program for workers and families under which workers earn coverage by working and paying Social Security taxes on their earnings;

Whereas Congress further strengthened Social Security over the years by enacting improvements to, and expansion of, retirement, survivors, and disability benefits for workers and their families, and now Social Security provides economic security to the Nation, and touches the life of nearly every American;

Whereas Social Security is one program that offers two essential earned benefits that are fundamentally linked: benefits for workers with disabilities and benefits for retired workers;

Whereas in 2014, more than 48,000,000 retirement and survivors beneficiaries and about 11,000,000 disability beneficiaries, including eligible family members, received Social Security benefits;

Whereas Social Security benefits are modest but fundamental to the economic security of our Nation, with the average disability benefit less than \$1,200 per month, or less than \$14,000 per year—falling just above the poverty line—and the average retirement benefit of close to \$1,300 per month, or less than \$16,000 per year;

Whereas older Americans rely heavily on Social Security, with 9 out of 10 individuals age 65 and older receiving Social Security benefits, and among elderly Social Security beneficiaries, 52 percent of married couples and 74 percent of unmarried persons receive more than half of their income from Social Security;

Whereas the Social Security Administration will issue almost \$900,000,000,000 in earned benefits this year, while more than 1,200 Social Security field offices nationwide provide essential, accurate, and face-to-face services to millions of Americans each day;

Whereas workers who are supported by disability benefits today will receive retirement benefits at full retirement age because Social Security Disability Insurance ensures that workers who are no longer able to work and their families are protected from the loss of future retirement benefits;

Whereas Social Security’s Disability Insurance protections are especially important to older workers, with 70 percent of Social Security Disability Insurance beneficiaries are older than 50 and 30 percent are older than 60;

Whereas Social Security has evolved with changes in the American workforce, with the number of working women who are fully insured for Social Security benefits more than doubling between 1970 and today;

Whereas Social Security provides fundamental protection to workers of every age, including young workers, who have a one-in-three chance of dying or needing Social Security disability benefits before reaching retirement age;

Whereas Social Security is America’s “family insurance plan,” providing more than 9 out of 10 American workers and their families basic but critical protection in the event they can no longer work to support themselves and their families due to a severe medical condition;

Whereas, Social Security provides a lifeline for almost 7,000,000 children nationwide who receive benefits directly because a parent has died, become disabled, or retired, or indirectly because they live with a relative who is eligible to collect benefits;

Whereas Social Security is efficient—administrative expenses are less than one percent of benefits paid—and benefit payments are 99 percent accurate; and

Whereas Social Security has dramatically reduced poverty, with research indicating that the entire reduction in elderly poverty between 1967 and 2000 was due to Social Security, that without Social Security 40 percent of the population older than 65 would be poor, and that Social Security benefits lifted an estimated 2,000,000 children out of poverty in 2013: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) Social Security provides earned benefits that are crucial to the economic security of our Nation and must be preserved to ensure future generations of Americans are protected;

(2) with the strong support of the Federal Government, Social Security must continue to deliver guaranteed retirement and life insurance benefits for workers and their families, as well as serve as an indispensable safety net for the most vulnerable segments of American society, including children, persons with disabilities, the elderly, and the poor; and

(3) while the Trust Funds that support Social Security are projected to pay all benefits through 2034, Congress should act to ensure this vital program can support workers and families far into the future, but should reject proposals that weaken or privatize Social Security and should consider proposals to strengthen Social Security benefits.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I wish to take a few minutes in my capacity as ranking Democrat on the Committee on Finance to talk about the upcoming 80th anniversary of a great moment in our country's history—the creation of the Social Security Program on August 14, 1935.

I am very pleased to be joined by all of my colleagues on this side of the aisle in the introduction of a resolution demonstrating how much we appreciate this historic anniversary. Thanks in large part to Social Security, old age in America is no longer synonymous with hardship. American workers have the great comfort of knowing that if the worst happens, Social Security will be there for them and their families.

I remember how essential Social Security was to many of the older people I worked with when I was director of the Oregon Gray Panthers. However, eight short decades ago, seniors often lived in poverty and hard-working Americans had no guarantee of economic security. Our country was in the throes of the Great Depression. Unemployment topped 20 percent. You had bread lines for blocks, and the homeless population was growing. There was no social safety net, no lifeline that offered some measure of dignity. If a person lost their job, became disabled, suffered the loss of a family member, they were on their own. There was nowhere to turn. Life was difficult for many Americans but none more so than the poor, the elderly, or the disabled. Tragically, many aging and disabled Americans without family to care for them ended up destitute or on the street.

America is now a different place, thanks in no small part to the protection of Social Security. It is one of the strongest threads in America's safety net, protecting the well-being of millions and keeping millions more out of poverty. This year nearly 60 million American workers and eligible family members will receive nearly \$900 billion in retirement, survivors, and disability benefits.

Among older Social Security beneficiaries, more than half of married couples and nearly three-quarters of unmarried individuals get the majority of their income from Social Security. As of 2014, 151 million Americans had earned the protection of disability insurance. That is a tremendous accomplishment. Well over 100 million workers and their families can go about their days with the confidence that they are financially protected in the event of a medical catastrophe because of Social Security.

The program also provides indispensable benefits to nearly 7 million children. Without those benefits, many of the youngsters would face dire circumstances after the death or disability of a parent. None of this could have happened without the continuing support of the Congress.

Time and time again, Members have come together on a bipartisan basis to ensure this vital program remains strong. The 1939 amendments to Social Security expanded retirement benefits. In 1954, the Congress passed amendments that provided protection for workers who became disabled. The Social Security amendments of 1980 and 1983 also made important changes that helped ensure the program's long-term viability.

Social Security is one of America's great economic successes. The program is robust. In my view, there is big bipartisan interest in keeping it that way. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the ranking Democrat on the Finance Committee so that on both sides of the aisle we work together to ensure that Social Security continues to thrive for generations to come.

SENATE RESOLUTION 247—COMMEMORATING AND HONORING THE ACTIONS OF PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN AND THE CREWS OF THE ENOLA GAY AND BOCKSCAR IN USING THE ATOMIC BOMB TO BRING WORLD WAR II TO AN END

Mr. ISAKSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 247

Whereas, during World War II, in 1945, war in the Pacific Theater between the United States and Japan had entered its fourth year;

Whereas Allied military commanders were preparing to invade Japan;

Whereas President Harry S. Truman made the tactical decision to use the newly developed atomic bomb against Japan instead of invading Japan;

Whereas, on August 6, 1945, the crew of the Enola Gay, under the command of Colonel Paul W. Tibbets, Jr., dropped an atomic bomb on Hiroshima, Japan; and

Whereas, on August 9, 1945, the crew of the Bockscar, under the command of Major Charles W. Sweeney, dropped an atomic bomb on Nagasaki, Japan: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commemorates and honors the courageous decision of President Harry S. Truman to use atomic bombs against Japan to bring an end to World War II; and

(2) commemorates and honors the courageous actions by the crews of the Enola Gay and the Bockscar in carrying out missions against Hiroshima and Nagasaki, respectively, that accomplished tactical terminal objectives and saved a countless number of lives of citizens of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 248—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2015 AS “NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. SESSIONS (for himself, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. MORAN, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KING, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 248

Whereas over 2,900,000 families in the United States live with prostate cancer;

Whereas 1 in 7 males in the United States will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in their lifetimes;

Whereas prostate cancer is the most commonly diagnosed non-skin cancer and the second leading cause of cancer-related deaths among males in the United States;

Whereas in 2015, the National Cancer Institute estimates that 220,800 men will be diagnosed with, and more than 27,000 men will die of, prostate cancer;

Whereas 40 percent of newly diagnosed prostate cancer cases occur in males under the age of 65;

Whereas the odds of developing prostate cancer rise rapidly after age 50;

Whereas African-American males suffer from a prostate cancer incidence rate that is significantly higher than White males and have double the prostate cancer mortality rate of White males;

Whereas obesity is a significant predictor of the severity of prostate cancer;

Whereas the probability that obesity will lead to death and high cholesterol levels is strongly associated with advanced prostate cancer;

Whereas having a father or brother with prostate cancer more than doubles the risk of a man developing prostate cancer, with a particularly high risk for men who have a brother with the disease;

Whereas screening by a digital rectal examination and a prostate-specific antigen blood test can detect the disease at the earlier, more treatable stages, which could increase the chances of survival for more than 5 years to nearly 100 percent;

Whereas only 38 percent of males survive more than 5 years if diagnosed with prostate cancer after the cancer has metastasized;

Whereas there are no noticeable symptoms of prostate cancer while prostate cancer is in the early stages, making appropriate screening critical;

Whereas ongoing research promises further improvements in prostate cancer prevention, early detection, and treatment; and

Whereas educating people in the United States, including health care providers, about prostate cancer and early detection strategies is crucial to saving the lives of males and preserving and protecting families: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2015 as “National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month”;

(2) declares that steps should be taken—

(A) to raise awareness about the importance of screening methods for, and treatment of, prostate cancer;

(B) to encourage research so that screening and treatment for prostate cancer may be improved, the causes of prostate cancer may be discovered, and a cure for prostate cancer may be developed; and

(C) to continue to consider ways for improving access to, and the quality of, health care services for detecting and treating prostate cancer; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States, interest groups, and affected persons—

(A) to promote awareness of prostate cancer;

(B) to take an active role in the fight to end the devastating effects of prostate cancer on individuals, families, and the economy; and

(C) to observe National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2616. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2617. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2618. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2619. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2620. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2621. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2622. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2623. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. COATS) sub-

mitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2624. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2625. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2626. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2627. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2628. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2629. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2630. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2631. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2632. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2633. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Ms. Ayotte to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2634. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. GRAHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Ms. Ayotte to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2635. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2636. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2637. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2638. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2639. Mr. WHITEHOUSE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1523, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2616. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 11. EFFECTIVE PERIOD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), this Act and the amendments made by this Act shall cease to have effect 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) EXCEPTION.—With respect to any action authorized by this Act or information obtained pursuant to an action authorized by this Act, which occurred before the date on which the provisions referred to in subsection (a) cease to have effect, the provisions of this Act shall continue in effect.

SA 2617. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, line 9, insert “make reasonable efforts to” before “review”.

On page 16, line 11, strike “knows” and insert “reasonably believes”.

On page 16, line 17, insert “identify and” before “remove”.

On page 16, line 19, strike “knows” and insert “reasonably believes”.

SA 2618. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—COMMERCIAL PRIVACY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Commercial Privacy Bill of Rights Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Personal privacy is worthy of protection through appropriate legislation.

(2) Trust in the treatment of personally identifiable information collected on and off the Internet is essential for businesses to succeed.

(3) Persons interacting with others engaged in interstate commerce have a significant interest in their personal information, as well as a right to control how that information is collected, used, stored, or transferred.

(4) Persons engaged in interstate commerce and collecting personally identifiable information on individuals have a responsibility to treat that information with respect and in accordance with common standards.

(5) On the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, the laws of the Federal Government and State and local governments provided inadequate privacy protection for individuals engaging in and interacting with persons engaged in interstate commerce.

(6) As of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, with the exception of Federal Trade Commission enforcement of laws against unfair and deceptive practices, the Federal Government has eschewed general commercial privacy laws in favor of industry self-regulation, which has led to several self-policing schemes, some of which are enforceable, and some of which provide insufficient privacy protection to individuals.

(7) As of the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, many collectors of personally identifiable information have yet to provide baseline fair information practice protections for individuals.

(8) The ease of gathering and compiling personal information on the Internet and off, both overtly and surreptitiously, is becoming increasingly efficient and effortless due to advances in technology which have provided information gatherers the ability to compile seamlessly highly detailed personal histories of individuals.

(9) Personal information requires greater privacy protection than is available on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act. Vast amounts of personal information, including sensitive information, about individuals are collected on and off the Internet, often combined and sold or otherwise transferred to third parties, for purposes unknown to an individual to whom the personally identifiable information pertains.

(10) Toward the close of the 20th Century, as individuals' personal information was increasingly collected, profiled, and shared for commercial purposes, and as technology advanced to facilitate these practices, Congress enacted numerous statutes to protect privacy.

(11) Those statutes apply to the government, telephones, cable television, e-mail, video tape rentals, and the Internet (but only with respect to children and law enforcement requests).

(12) As in those instances, the Federal Government has a substantial interest in creating a level playing field of protection across all collectors of personally identifiable information, both in the United States and abroad.

(13) Enhancing individual privacy protection in a balanced way that establishes clear, consistent rules, both domestically and internationally, will stimulate commerce by instilling greater consumer confidence at home and greater confidence abroad as more and more entities digitize personally identifiable information, whether collected, stored, or used online or offline.

SEC. 203. DEFINITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), in this title:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Trade Commission.

(2) COVERED ENTITY.—The term “covered entity” means any person to whom this title applies under section 241.

(3) COVERED INFORMATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the term “covered information” means only the following:

(i) Personally identifiable information.

(ii) Unique identifier information.

(iii) Any information that is collected, used, or stored in connection with personally identifiable information or unique identifier information in a manner that may reasonably be used by the party collecting the information to identify a specific individual.

(B) EXCEPTION.—The term “covered information” does not include the following:

(i) Personally identifiable information obtained from public records that is not merged with covered information gathered elsewhere.

(ii) Personally identifiable information that is obtained from a forum—

(I) where the individual voluntarily shared the information or authorized the information to be shared; and

(II) that—

(aa) is widely and publicly available and was not made publicly available in bad faith; and

(bb) contains no restrictions on who can access and view such information.

(iii) Personally identifiable information reported in public media.

(iv) Personally identifiable information dedicated to contacting an individual at the individual's place of work.

(4) ESTABLISHED BUSINESS RELATIONSHIP.—The term “established business relationship” means, with respect to a covered entity and a person, a relationship formed with or without the exchange of consideration, involving the establishment of an account by the person with the covered entity for the receipt of products or services offered by the covered entity.

(5) PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term “personally identifiable information” means only the following:

(A) Any of the following information about an individual:

(i) The first name (or initial) and last name of an individual, whether given at birth or time of adoption, or resulting from a lawful change of name.

(ii) The postal address of a physical place of residence of such individual.

(iii) An e-mail address.

(iv) A telephone number or mobile device number.

(v) A social security number or other government issued identification number issued to such individual.

(vi) The account number of a credit card issued to such individual.

(vii) Unique identifier information that alone can be used to identify a specific individual.

(viii) Biometric data about such individual, including fingerprints and retina scans.

(B) If used, transferred, or stored in connection with 1 or more of the items of information described in subparagraph (A), any of the following:

(i) A date of birth.

(ii) The number of a certificate of birth or adoption.

(iii) A place of birth.

(iv) Unique identifier information that alone cannot be used to identify a specific individual.

(v) Precise geographic location, at the same degree of specificity as a global positioning system or equivalent system, and not including any general geographic information that may be derived from an Internet Protocol address.

(vi) Information about an individual's quantity, technical configuration, type, destination, location, and amount of uses of voice services, regardless of technology used.

(vii) Any other information concerning an individual that may reasonably be used by the party using, collecting, or storing that information to identify that individual.

(6) SENSITIVE PERSONALLY IDENTIFIABLE INFORMATION.—The term “sensitive personally identifiable information” means—

(A) personally identifiable information which, if lost, compromised, or disclosed without authorization either alone or with other information, carries a significant risk of economic or physical harm; or

(B) information related to—

(i) a particular medical condition or a health record; or

(ii) the religious affiliation of an individual.

(7) THIRD PARTY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “third party” means, with respect to a covered entity, a person that—

(i) is—

(I) not related to the covered entity by common ownership or corporate control; or

(II) related to the covered entity by common ownership or corporate control and an ordinary consumer would not understand that the covered entity and the person were related by common ownership or corporate control;

(ii) is not a service provider used by the covered entity to receive personally identifiable information or sensitive personally identifiable information in performing services or functions on behalf of and under the instruction of the covered entity; and

(iii) with respect to the collection of covered information of an individual, does not have an established business relationship with the individual and does not identify itself to the individual at the time of such collection in a clear and conspicuous manner that is visible to the individual.

(B) COMMON BRANDS.—The term “third party” may include, with respect to a covered entity, a person who operates under a common brand with the covered entity.

(8) UNAUTHORIZED USE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “unauthorized use” means the use of covered information by a covered entity or its service provider for any purpose not authorized by the individual to whom such information relates.

(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the term “unauthorized use” does not include use of covered information relating to an individual by a covered entity or its service provider as follows:

(i) To process and enforce a transaction or deliver a service requested by that individual.

(ii) To operate the covered entity that is providing a transaction or delivering a service requested by that individual, such as inventory management, financial reporting and accounting, planning, and product or service improvement or forecasting.

(iii) To prevent or detect fraud or to provide for a physically or virtually secure environment.

(iv) To investigate a possible crime.

(v) That is required by a provision of law or legal process.

(vi) To market or advertise to an individual from a covered entity within the context of a covered entity's own Internet website, services, or products if the covered information used for such marketing or advertising was—

(I) collected directly by the covered entity; or

(II) shared with the covered entity—

(aa) at the affirmative request of the individual; or

(bb) by an entity with which the individual has an established business relationship.

(vii) Use that is necessary for the improvement of transaction or service delivery through research, testing, analysis, and development.

(viii) Use that is necessary for internal operations, including the following:

(I) Collecting customer satisfaction surveys and conducting customer research to improve customer service information.

(II) Information collected by an Internet website about the visits to such website and the click-through rates at such website—

(aa) to improve website navigation and performance; or

(bb) to understand and improve the interaction of an individual with the advertising of a covered entity.

(ix) Use—

(I) by a covered entity with which an individual has an established business relationship;

(II) which the individual could have reasonably expected, at the time such relationship was established, was related to a service provided pursuant to such relationship; and

(III) which does not constitute a material change in use or practice from what could have reasonably been expected.

(C) SAVINGS.—A use of covered information regarding an individual by a covered entity or its service provider may only be excluded under subparagraph (B) from the definition of “unauthorized use” under subparagraph (A) if the use is reasonable and consistent with the practices and purposes described in the notice given the individual in accordance with section 121(a)(1).

(9) UNIQUE IDENTIFIER INFORMATION.—The term “unique identifier information” means a unique persistent identifier associated with an individual or a networked device, including a customer number held in a cookie, a user ID, a processor serial number, or a device serial number.

(b) MODIFIED DEFINITION BY RULEMAKING.—If the Commission determines that a term defined in any of paragraphs (3) through (8) is not reasonably sufficient to protect an individual from unfair or deceptive acts or practices, the Commission may by rule modify such definition as the Commission considers appropriate to protect such individual from an unfair or deceptive act or practice to the extent that the Commission determines will not unreasonably impede interstate commerce.

Subtitle A—Right to Security and Accountability

SEC. 211. SECURITY.

(a) RULEMAKING REQUIRED.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to require each covered entity to carry out security measures to protect the covered information it collects and maintains.

(b) PROPORTION.—The requirements prescribed under subsection (a) shall provide for security measures that are proportional to the size, type, nature, and sensitivity of the covered information a covered entity collects.

(c) CONSISTENCY.—The requirements prescribed under subsection (a) shall be consistent with guidance provided by the Commission and recognized industry practices for safety and security on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) TECHNOLOGICAL MEANS.—In a rule prescribed under subsection (a), the Commission may not require a specific technological means of meeting a requirement.

SEC. 212. ACCOUNTABILITY.

Each covered entity shall, in a manner proportional to the size, type, and nature of the covered information it collects—

(1) have managerial accountability, proportional to the size and structure of the covered entity, for the adoption and implementation of policies consistent with this title;

(2) have a process to respond to non-frivolous inquiries from individuals regarding the collection, use, transfer, or storage of covered information relating to such individuals; and

(3) describe the means of compliance of the covered entity with the requirements of this Act upon request from—

(A) the Commission; or

(B) an appropriate safe harbor program established under section 241.

SEC. 213. PRIVACY BY DESIGN.

Each covered entity shall, in a manner proportional to the size, type, and nature of the covered information that it collects, implement a comprehensive information privacy program by—

(1) incorporating necessary development processes and practices throughout the product life cycle that are designed to safeguard the personally identifiable information that is covered information of individuals based on—

(A) the reasonable expectations of such individuals regarding privacy; and

(B) the relevant threats that need to be guarded against in meeting those expectations; and

(2) maintaining appropriate management processes and practices throughout the data life cycle that are designed to ensure that information systems comply with—

(A) the provisions of this title;

(B) the privacy policies of a covered entity; and

(C) the privacy preferences of individuals that are consistent with the consent choices and related mechanisms of individual participation as described in section 222.

Subtitle B—Right to Notice and Individual Participation

SEC. 221. TRANSPARENT NOTICE OF PRACTICES AND PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to require each covered entity—

(1) to provide accurate, clear, concise, and timely notice to individuals of—

(A) the practices of the covered entity regarding the collection, use, transfer, and storage of covered information; and

(B) the specific purposes of those practices;

(2) to provide accurate, clear, concise, and timely notice to individuals before implementing a material change in such practices; and

(3) to maintain the notice required by paragraph (1) in a form that individuals can readily access.

(b) COMPLIANCE AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS.—In the rulemaking required by subsection (a), the Commission—

(1) shall consider the types of devices and methods individuals will use to access the required notice;

(2) may provide that a covered entity unable to provide the required notice when information is collected may comply with the requirement of subsection (a)(1) by providing an alternative time and means for an individual to receive the required notice promptly;

(3) may draft guidance for covered entities to use in designing their own notice and may include a draft model template for covered entities to use in designing their own notice; and

(4) may provide guidance on how to construct computer-readable notices or how to use other technology to deliver the required notice.

SEC. 222. INDIVIDUAL PARTICIPATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to require each covered entity—

(1) to offer individuals a clear and conspicuous mechanism for opt-in consent for any use of their covered information that would otherwise be unauthorized use;

(2) to offer individuals a robust, clear, and conspicuous mechanism for opt-in consent for the use by third parties of the individuals' covered information for behavioral advertising or marketing;

(3) to provide any individual to whom the personally identifiable information that is covered information pertains, and which the covered entity or its service provider stores, appropriate and reasonable—

(A) access to such information; and

(B) mechanisms to correct such information to improve the accuracy of such information; and

(4) in the case that a covered entity enters bankruptcy or an individual requests the termination of a service provided by the covered entity to the individual or termination of some other relationship with the covered entity, to permit the individual to easily request that—

(A) all of the personally identifiable information that is covered information that the covered entity maintains relating to the individual, except for information the individual authorized the sharing of or which the individual shared with the covered entity in a forum that is widely and publicly available, be rendered not personally identifiable; or

(B) if rendering such information not personally identifiable is not possible, to cease the unauthorized use or transfer to a third party for an unauthorized use of such information or to cease use of such information for marketing, unless such unauthorized use or transfer is otherwise required by a provision of law.

(b) UNAUTHORIZED USE TRANSFERS.—In the rulemaking required by subsection (a), the Commission shall provide that with respect to transfers of covered information to a third party for which an individual provides opt-in consent, the third party to which the information is transferred may not use such information for any unauthorized use other than a use—

(1) specified pursuant to the purposes stated in the required notice under section 221(a); and

(2) authorized by the individual when the individual granted consent for the transfer of the information to the third party.

(c) ALTERNATIVE MEANS TO TERMINATE USE OF COVERED INFORMATION.—In the rulemaking required by subsection (a), the Commission shall allow a covered entity to provide individuals an alternative means, in lieu of the access, consent, and correction requirements, of prohibiting a covered entity from use or transfer of that individual's covered information.

(d) SERVICE PROVIDERS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The use of a service provider by a covered entity to receive covered information in performing services or functions on behalf of and under the instruction of the covered entity does not constitute an unauthorized use of such information by the covered entity if the covered entity and the service provider execute a contract that requires the service provider to collect, use, and store the information on behalf of the covered entity in a manner consistent with—

(A) the requirements of this title; and

(B) the policies and practices related to such information of the covered entity.

(2) TRANSFERS BETWEEN SERVICE PROVIDERS FOR A COVERED ENTITY.—The disclosure by a service provider of covered information pursuant to a contract with a covered entity to another service provider in order to perform the same service or functions for that covered entity does not constitute an unauthorized use.

(3) LIABILITY REMAINS WITH COVERED ENTITY.—A covered entity remains responsible and liable for the protection of covered information that has been transferred to a service

provider for processing, notwithstanding any agreement to the contrary between a covered entity and the service provider.

Subtitle C—Rights Relating to Data Minimization, Constraints on Distribution, and Data Integrity

SEC. 231. DATA MINIMIZATION.

Each covered entity shall—

(1) collect only as much covered information relating to an individual as is reasonably necessary—

(A) to process or enforce a transaction or deliver a service requested by such individual;

(B) for the covered entity to provide a transaction or delivering a service requested by such individual, such as inventory management, financial reporting and accounting, planning, product or service improvement or forecasting, and customer support and service;

(C) to prevent or detect fraud or to provide for a secure environment;

(D) to investigate a possible crime;

(E) to comply with a provision of law;

(F) for the covered entity to market or advertise to such individual if the covered information used for such marketing or advertising was collected directly by the covered entity; or

(G) for internal operations, including—

(i) collecting customer satisfaction surveys and conducting customer research to improve customer service; and

(ii) collection from an Internet website of information about visits and click-through rates relating to such website to improve—

(I) website navigation and performance; and

(II) the customer's experience;

(2) retain covered information for only such duration as—

(A) with respect to the provision of a transaction or delivery of a service to an individual—

(i) is necessary to provide such transaction or deliver such service to such individual; or

(ii) if such service is ongoing, is reasonable for the ongoing nature of the service; or

(B) is required by a provision of law;

(3) retain covered information only for the purpose it was collected, or reasonably-related purposes; and

(4) exercise reasonable data retention procedures with respect to both the initial collection and subsequent retention.

SEC. 232. CONSTRAINTS ON DISTRIBUTION OF INFORMATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each covered entity shall—

(1) require by contract that any third party to which it transfers covered information use the information only for purposes that are consistent with—

(A) the provisions of this title; and

(B) as specified in the contract;

(2) require by contract that such third party may not combine information that the covered entity has transferred to it, that relates to an individual, and that is not personally identifiable information with other information in order to identify such individual, unless the covered entity has obtained the opt-in consent of such individual for such combination and identification; and

(3) before executing a contract with a third party—

(A) assure through due diligence that the third party is a legitimate organization; and

(B) in the case of a material violation of the contract, at a minimum notify the Commission of such violation.

(b) TRANSFERS TO UNRELIABLE THIRD PARTIES PROHIBITED.—A covered entity may not

transfer covered information to a third party that the covered entity knows—

(1) has intentionally or willfully violated a contract required by subsection (a); and

(2) is reasonably likely to violate such contract.

(c) APPLICATION OF RULES TO THIRD PARTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), a third party that receives covered information from a covered entity shall be subject to the provisions of this Act as if it were a covered entity.

(2) EXEMPTION.—The Commission may, as it determines appropriate, exempt classes of third parties from liability under any provision of subtitle B if the Commission finds that—

(A) such class of third parties cannot reasonably comply with such provision; or

(B) with respect to covered information relating to individuals that is transferred to such class, compliance by such class with such provision would not sufficiently benefit such individuals.

SEC. 233. DATA INTEGRITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Each covered entity shall attempt to establish and maintain reasonable procedures to ensure that personally identifiable information that is covered information and maintained by the covered entity is accurate in those instances where the covered information could be used to deny consumers benefits or cause significant harm.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to covered information of an individual maintained by a covered entity that is provided—

(1) directly to the covered entity by the individual;

(2) to the covered entity by another entity at the request of the individual;

(3) to prevent or detect fraud; or

(4) to provide for a secure environment.

Subtitle D—Enforcement

SEC. 241. GENERAL APPLICATION.

The requirements of this title shall apply to any person who—

(1) collects, uses, transfers, or stores covered information concerning more than 5,000 individuals during any consecutive 12-month period; and

(2) is—

(A) a person over which the Commission has authority pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2));

(B) a common carrier subject to the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.), notwithstanding the definition of the term “Acts to regulate commerce” in section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44) and the exception provided by section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)) for such carriers; or

(C) a nonprofit organization, including any organization described in section 501(c) of the Internal Revenue code of 1986 that is exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code, notwithstanding the definition of the term “Acts to regulate commerce” in section 4 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 44) and the exception provided by section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)) for such organizations.

SEC. 242. ENFORCEMENT BY THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

(a) UNFAIR OR DECEPTIVE ACTS OR PRACTICES.—A reckless or repetitive violation of a provision of this title shall be treated as an

unfair or deceptive act or practice in violation of a regulation under section 18(a)(1)(B) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 57a(a)(1)(B)) regarding unfair or deceptive acts or practices.

(b) POWERS OF COMMISSION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Commission shall enforce this title in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.) were incorporated into and made a part of this title.

(2) PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), any person who violates a provision of this title shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 41 et seq.).

(3) COMMON CARRIERS AND NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS.—The Commission shall enforce this title with respect to common carriers and nonprofit organizations described in section 241 to the extent necessary to effectuate the purposes of this title as if such carriers and nonprofit organizations were persons over which the Commission has authority pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. 45(a)(2)).

(c) RULEMAKING AUTHORITY.—

(1) LIMITATION.—In promulgating rules under this title, the Commission may not require the deployment or use of any specific products or technologies, including any specific computer software or hardware.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE.—The Commission shall promulgate regulations under this title in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this title shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commission under any other provision of law.

SEC. 243. ENFORCEMENT BY STATES.

(a) CIVIL ACTION.—In any case in which the attorney general of a State has reason to believe that an interest of the residents of that State has been or is adversely affected by a covered entity who violates any part of this title in a manner that results in economic or physical harm to an individual or engages in a pattern or practice that violates any part of this title, the attorney general may, as parens patriae, bring a civil action on behalf of the residents of the State in an appropriate district court of the United States—

(1) to enjoin further violation of this title or a regulation promulgated under this title by the defendant;

(2) to compel compliance with this title or a regulation promulgated under this title; or

(3) for violations of this title or a regulation promulgated under this title to obtain civil penalties in the amount determined under section title.

(b) RIGHTS OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(1) NOTICE TO FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), the attorney general of a State shall notify the Commission in writing of any civil action under subsection (b), prior to initiating such civil action.

(B) CONTENTS.—The notice required by subparagraph (A) shall include a copy of the complaint to be filed to initiate such civil action.

(C) EXCEPTION.—If it is not feasible for the attorney general of a State to provide the notice required by subparagraph (A), the State shall provide notice immediately upon

instituting a civil action under subsection (b).

(2) **INTERVENTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—Upon receiving notice required by paragraph (1) with respect to a civil action, the Commission may—

(A) intervene in such action; and

(B) upon intervening—

(i) be heard on all matters arising in such civil action; and

(ii) file petitions for appeal of a decision in such action.

(c) **PREEMPTIVE ACTION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—If the Commission institutes a civil action for violation of this title or a regulation promulgated under this title, no attorney general of a State may bring a civil action under subsection (a) against any defendant named in the complaint of the Commission for violation of this title or a regulation promulgated under this title that is alleged in such complaint.

(d) **INVESTIGATORY POWERS.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prevent the attorney general of a State from exercising the powers conferred on such attorney general by the laws of such State to conduct investigations or to administer oaths or affirmations or to compel the attendance of witnesses or the production of documentary and other evidence.

(e) **VENUE; SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—

(1) **VENUE.**—Any action brought under subsection (a) may be brought in—

(A) the district court of the United States that meets applicable requirements relating to venue under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code; or

(B) another court of competent jurisdiction.

(2) **SERVICE OF PROCESS.**—In an action brought under subsection (a), process may be served in any district in which the defendant—

(A) is an inhabitant; or

(B) may be found.

(f) **ACTIONS BY OTHER STATE OFFICIALS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In addition to civil actions brought by attorneys general under subsection (a), any other officer of a State who is authorized by the State to do so may bring a civil action under subsection (a), subject to the same requirements and limitations that apply under this section to civil actions brought by attorneys general.

(2) **SAVINGS PROVISION.**—Nothing in this section may be construed to prohibit an authorized official of a State from initiating or continuing any proceeding in a court of the State for a violation of any civil or criminal law of the State.

SEC. 244. CIVIL PENALTIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In an action brought under section 243, in addition to any other penalty otherwise applicable to a violation of this title or any regulation promulgated under this title, the following civil penalties shall apply:

(1) **SUBTITLE A VIOLATIONS.**—A covered entity that recklessly or repeatedly violates subtitle A is liable for a civil penalty equal to the amount calculated by multiplying the number of days that the entity is not in compliance with such subtitle by an amount not to exceed \$33,000.

(2) **SUBTITLE B VIOLATIONS.**—A covered entity that recklessly or repeatedly violates subtitle B is liable for a civil penalty equal to the amount calculated by multiplying the number of days that such an entity is not in compliance with such subtitle, or the number of individuals for whom the entity failed to obtain consent as required by such subtitle, whichever is greater, by an amount not to exceed \$33,000.

(b) **ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.**—Beginning on the date that the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers is first published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics that is after 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each year thereafter, each of the amounts specified in subsection (a) shall be increased by the percentage increase in the Consumer Price Index published on that date from the Consumer Price Index published the previous year.

(c) **MAXIMUM TOTAL LIABILITY.**—Notwithstanding the number of actions which may be brought against a covered entity under section 243, the maximum civil penalty for which any covered entity may be liable under this section in such actions shall not exceed—

(1) \$6,000,000 for any related series of violations of any rule promulgated under subtitle A; and

(2) \$6,000,000 for any related series of violations of subtitle B.

SEC. 245. EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.

(a) **PREEMPTION OF STATE LAWS.**—The provisions of this title shall supersede any provisions of the law of any State relating to those entities covered by the regulations issued pursuant to this title, to the extent that such provisions relate to the collection, use, or disclosure of—

(1) covered information addressed in this title; or

(2) personally identifiable information or personal identification information addressed in provisions of the law of a State.

(b) **UNAUTHORIZED CIVIL ACTIONS; CERTAIN STATE LAWS.**—

(1) **UNAUTHORIZED ACTIONS.**—No person other than a person specified in section 243 may bring a civil action under the laws of any State if such action is premised in whole or in part upon the defendant violating this title or a regulation promulgated under this title.

(2) **PROTECTION OF CERTAIN STATE LAWS.**—This title shall not be construed to preempt the applicability of—

(A) State laws that address the collection, use, or disclosure of health information or financial information; or

(B) other State laws to the extent that those laws relate to acts of fraud.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION RELATING TO REQUIRED DISCLOSURES TO GOVERNMENT ENTITIES.**—This title shall not be construed to expand or limit the duty or authority of a covered entity or third party to disclose personally identifiable information to a government entity under any provision of law.

SEC. 246. NO PRIVATE RIGHT OF ACTION.

This title may not be construed to provide any private right of action.

Subtitle E—Co-regulatory Safe Harbor Programs

SEC. 251. ESTABLISHMENT OF SAFE HARBOR PROGRAMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Commission shall initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish requirements for the establishment and administration of safe harbor programs under which a nongovernmental organization will administer a program that—

(1) establishes a mechanism for participants to implement the requirements of this title with regards to—

(A) certain types of unauthorized uses of covered information as described in paragraph (2); or

(B) any unauthorized use of covered information; and

(2) offers consumers a clear, conspicuous, persistent, and effective means of opting out of the transfer of covered information by a covered entity participating in the safe harbor program to a third party for—

(A) behavioral advertising purposes;

(B) location-based advertising purposes;

(C) other specific types of unauthorized use; or

(D) any unauthorized use.

(b) **SELECTION OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS TO ADMINISTER PROGRAM.**—

(1) **SUBMITTAL OF APPLICATIONS.**—An applicant seeking to administer a program under the requirements established pursuant to subsection (a) shall submit to the Commission an application therefor at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commission may require.

(2) **NOTICE AND RECEIPT OF APPLICATIONS.**—Upon completion of the rulemaking proceedings required by subsection (a), the Commission shall—

(A) publish a notice in the Federal Register that it will receive applications for approval of safe harbor programs under this subtitle; and

(B) begin receiving applications under paragraph (1).

(3) **SELECTION.**—Not later than 270 days after the date on which the Commission receives a completed application under this subsection, the Commission shall grant or deny the application on the basis of the Commission's evaluation of the applicant's capacity to provide protection of individuals' covered information with regard to specific types of unauthorized uses of covered information as described in subsection (a)(2) that is substantially equivalent to or superior to the protection otherwise provided under this title.

(4) **WRITTEN FINDINGS.**—Any decision reached by the Commission under this subsection shall be accompanied by written findings setting forth the basis for and reasons supporting such decision.

(c) **SCOPE OF SAFE HARBOR PROTECTION.**—The scope of protection offered by safe harbor programs approved by the Commission that establish mechanisms for participants to implement the requirements of the title only for certain uses of covered information as described in subsection (a)(2) shall be limited to participating entities' use of those particular types of covered information.

(d) **SUPERVISION BY FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Commission shall exercise oversight and supervisory authority of a safe harbor program approved under this section through—

(A) ongoing review of the practices of the nongovernmental organization administering the program;

(B) the imposition of civil penalties on the nongovernmental organization if it is not compliant with the requirements established under subsection (a); and

(C) withdrawal of authorization to administer the safe harbor program under this subtitle.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORTS BY NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.**—Each year, each nongovernmental organization administering a safe harbor program under this section shall submit to the Commission a report on its activities under this subtitle during the preceding year.

SEC. 252. PARTICIPATION IN SAFE HARBOR PROGRAM.

(a) **EXEMPTION.**—Any covered entity that participates in, and demonstrates compliance with, a safe harbor program administered under section 251 shall be exempt from

any provision of subtitle B or subtitle C if the Commission finds that the requirements of the safe harbor program are substantially the same as or more protective of privacy of individuals than the requirements of the provision from which the exemption is granted.

(b) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in this subtitle shall be construed to exempt any covered entity participating in a safe harbor program from compliance with any other requirement of the regulations promulgated under this title for which the safe harbor does not provide an exception.

Subtitle F—Application With Other Federal Laws

SEC. 261. APPLICATION WITH OTHER FEDERAL LAWS.

(a) **QUALIFIED EXEMPTION FOR PERSONS SUBJECT TO OTHER FEDERAL PRIVACY LAWS.**—If a person is subject to a provision of this title and a provision of a Federal privacy law described in subsection (d), such provision of this title shall not apply to such person to the extent that such provision of Federal privacy law applies to such person.

(b) **PROTECTION OF OTHER FEDERAL PRIVACY LAWS.**—Nothing in this title may be construed to modify, limit, or supersede the operation of the Federal privacy laws described in subsection (d) or the provision of information permitted or required, expressly or by implication, by such laws, with respect to Federal rights and practices.

(c) **COMMUNICATIONS INFRASTRUCTURE AND PRIVACY.**—If a person is subject to a provision of section 222 or 631 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 222 and 551) and a provision of this title, such provision of such section 222 or 631 shall not apply to such person to the extent that such provision of this title applies to such person.

(d) **OTHER FEDERAL PRIVACY LAWS DESCRIBED.**—The Federal privacy laws described in this subsection are as follows:

(1) Section 552a of title 5, United States Code (commonly known as the Privacy Act of 1974).

(2) The Right to Financial Privacy Act of 1978 (12 U.S.C. 3401 et seq.).

(3) The Fair Credit Reporting Act (15 U.S.C. 1681 et seq.).

(4) The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act (15 U.S.C. 1692 et seq.).

(5) The Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 (15 U.S.C. 6501 et seq.).

(6) Title V of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act of 1999 (15 U.S.C. 6801 et seq.).

(7) Chapters 119, 123, and 206 of title 18, United States Code.

(8) Section 2710 of title 18, United States Code.

(9) Section 444 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232g) (commonly referred to as the "Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974").

(10) Section 445 of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1232h).

(11) The Privacy Protection Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 2000aa et seq.).

(12) The regulations promulgated under section 264(c) of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2 note), as such regulations relate to a person described in section 1172(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-1(a)) or to transactions referred to in section 1173(a)(1) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d-2(a)(1)).

(13) The Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act (47 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(14) Section 227 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 227).

Subtitle G—Development of Commercial Data Privacy Policy in the Department of Commerce

SEC. 271. DIRECTION TO DEVELOP COMMERCIAL DATA PRIVACY POLICY.

The Secretary of Commerce shall contribute to the development of commercial data privacy policy by—

(1) convening private sector stakeholders, including members of industry, civil society groups, academia, in open forums, to develop codes of conduct in support of applications for safe harbor programs under subtitle E;

(2) expanding interoperability between the United States commercial data privacy framework and other national and regional privacy frameworks;

(3) conducting research related to improving privacy protection under this title; and

(4) conducting research related to improving data sharing practices, including the use of anonymised data, and growing the information economy.

SA 2619. Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. FLAKE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. REVIEW AND NOTIFICATIONS OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS GRANTED FOR NEXT GENERATION FLIGHT PROCEDURES.

Section 213(c) of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (Public Law 112-95; 49 U.S.C. 40101 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **NOTIFICATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS.**—Not less than 30 days before granting a categorical exclusion under this subsection for a new procedure, the Administrator shall notify and consult with the affected public and the operator of the airport at which the procedure would be implemented.

“(4) **REVIEW OF CERTAIN CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall review a decision of the Administrator made on or after February 14, 2012, and before the date of the enactment of this paragraph to grant a categorical exclusion under this subsection with respect to a procedure to be implemented at an airport to determine if the implementation of the procedure had a significant effect on the human environment in the community in which the airport is located if the operator of that airport requests such a review and demonstrates that there is good cause to believe that the implementation of the procedure had such an effect.

“(B) **CONTENT OF REVIEW.**—If, in conducting a review under subparagraph (A) with respect to a procedure implemented at an airport, the Administrator, in consultation with the operator of the airport, determines that implementing the procedure had a significant effect on the human environment in the community in which the airport is located, the Administrator shall—

“(i) consult with the operator of the airport to identify measures to mitigate the effect of the procedure on the human environment; and

“(ii) in conducting such consultations, consider the use of alternative flight paths.”.

SA 2620. Mr. WHITEHOUSE (for himself and Mr. BLUNT) submitted an

amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—CYBERSECURITY PUBLIC AWARENESS ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Cybersecurity Public Awareness Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. ENFORCEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY LAWS.

(a) **PROSECUTION FOR CYBERCRIME.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the United States Secret Service, the Director of U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall submit to Congress a report—

(A) describing investigations and prosecutions relating to cyber intrusions, computer or network compromise, or other forms of illegal hacking the preceding year, including—

(i) the number of investigations initiated relating to such crimes;

(ii) the number of arrests relating to such crimes;

(iii) the number and description of instances in which investigations or prosecutions relating to such crimes have been delayed or prevented because of an inability to extradite a criminal defendant in a timely manner; and

(iv) the number of prosecutions for such crimes, including—

(I) the number of defendants prosecuted;

(II) whether the prosecutions resulted in a conviction; and

(III) the sentence imposed and the statutory maximum for each such crime for which a defendant was convicted;

(B) identifying the number of employees, financial resources, and other resources (such as technology and training) devoted to the enforcement, investigation, and prosecution of cyber intrusions, computer or network compromise, or other forms of illegal hacking; and

(c) discussing any impediments under the laws of the United States or international law to prosecutions for cyber intrusions, computer or network compromise, or other forms of illegal hacking, including discussion of ways to improve the mutual legal assistance process used to obtain evidence abroad and to provide domestic evidence to foreign requestors.

(2) **UPDATES.**—The Attorney General, in consultation with the Director of the United States Secret Service, the Director of Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, shall annually submit to Congress a report updating the report submitted under paragraph (1) at the same time the Attorney General submits annual reports under section 404 of the Prioritizing Resources and Organization for Intellectual Property Act of 2008 (42 U.S.C. 3713d).

(b) **PREPAREDNESS OF FEDERAL COURTS TO PROMOTE CYBERSECURITY.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Attorney General, in coordination with

the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, shall submit to Congress a report—

(1) on whether Federal courts have granted timely relief in matters relating to botnets and other cybercrime and cyber threats; and

(2) that includes, as appropriate, recommendations on changes or improvements to—

(A) the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure;

(B) the training and other resources available to support the Federal judiciary;

(C) the capabilities and specialization of courts to which such cases may be assigned; and

(D) Federal civil and criminal laws.

SEC. 203. CYBERSECURITY PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS.

(a) **EVALUATION OF EXISTING CYBERSECURITY PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report examining—

(1) the number of cybersecurity public awareness campaigns run by Federal agencies;

(2) the estimated costs of Federal cybersecurity public awareness campaigns; and

(3) the effectiveness of Federal cybersecurity public awareness campaigns.

(b) **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING CYBERSECURITY PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include recommendations for improving and, if appropriate, consolidating Federal cybersecurity public awareness campaigns.

SEC. 204. DEVELOPING TECHNOLOGIES TO ENHANCE CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE CYBERSECURITY.

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “critical infrastructure sector” has the meaning given the term in section 203.

(b) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall enter into a contract with the National Research Council, or another Federally funded research and development corporation, under which the Council or corporation shall submit to Congress a report on opportunities to develop innovative or experimental technologies or technological approaches that would enhance the cybersecurity of the critical infrastructure sector.

(2) **LIMITATIONS.**—The report required under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) consider only technologies or technological options that can be deployed consistent with constitutional and statutory privacy rights; and

(B) identify any technologies or technological options described in subparagraph (A) that merit Federal research support.

(3) **TIMING.**—The contract entered into under paragraph (1) shall require that the report described in paragraph (1) be submitted not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act. The Secretary of Homeland Security may enter into additional subsequent contracts as appropriate.

SA 2621. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes;

which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 16, strike lines 9 through 21 and insert the following:

(A) review such cyber threat indicator and remove, to the extent feasible, any personal information of or identifying a specific individual that is not necessary to describe or identify a cybersecurity threat; or

(B) implement and utilize a technical capability configured to remove, to the extent feasible, any personal information of or identifying a specific individual contained within such indicator that is not necessary to describe or identify a cybersecurity threat.

SA 2622. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Ms. BALDWIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, between lines 7 and 8, insert the following:

(F) include procedures for notifying in a timely manner any person whose personal information is known or determined to have been shared or disclosed in contravention of this Act.

SA 2623. Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. COATS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____. **REPORTING ON INTRUSIONS OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS ESSENTIAL TO OPERATION OF CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE AT GREATEST RISK.**

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **APPROPRIATE AGENCY.**—The term “appropriate agency” means, with respect to a covered entity—

(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), the applicable sector-specific agency; or

(B) in the case of a covered entity that is regulated by a Federal entity, such Federal entity.

(2) **APPROPRIATE AGENCY HEAD.**—The term “appropriate agency head” means, with respect to a covered entity, the head of the appropriate agency.

(3) **COVERED ENTITY.**—The term “covered entity” means an entity that owns or controls critical cyber infrastructure.

(4) **CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The term “critical infrastructure” means a system or asset, whether physical or virtual, that is so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such system or asset would have a debilitating impact on security, national economic security, national public health or safety, or any combination of those matters.

(5) **CRITICAL CYBER INFRASTRUCTURE.**—The term “critical cyber infrastructure” means critical infrastructure identified pursuant to section 9(a) of Executive Order 13636 of February 12, 2013 (78 Fed. Reg. 11742; relating to

identification of critical infrastructure where a cybersecurity incident could reasonably result in catastrophic regional or national effects on public health or safety, economic security, or national security), or any successor order.

(6) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(7) **SECTOR-SPECIFIC AGENCY.**—The term “sector specific agency” has the meaning given such term in Presidential Policy Directive-21, issued February 12, 2013, or any successor directive.

(b) **REPORTING REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Notwithstanding subsections (f) and (h) of section 8, if an information system of a covered entity that is essential to the operation of critical cyber infrastructure is successfully intruded upon, such covered entity shall submit to the Secretary or the appropriate agency head a report on such intrusion as soon as practicable after the covered entity discovers such intrusion.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—Each report submitted by a covered entity under paragraph (1) with respect to an intrusion shall include the following:

(A) A description of the technique or method used in such intrusion.

(B) A sample of the malicious software, if discovered and isolated by the covered entity, involved in such intrusion.

(C) Damage assessment.

(D) Such other matters as the Secretary or the appropriate agency head, as the case may be, consider appropriate.

(3) **CONSISTENCY.**—Reports submitted under paragraph (1) shall be submitted in a manner that is consistent with the other requirements of this Act.

(c) **PROTECTION FROM LIABILITY.**—A submittal of a report under subsection (b)(1) shall be treated as a sharing of a cyber threat indicator or defensive measure under section 4(c) for purposes of section 6.

(d) **POLICIES AND PROCEDURES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall, in consultation with the appropriate agency heads of covered entities, promulgate policies and procedures to carry out this section.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—The policies and procedures promulgated under paragraph (1) shall include the following:

(A) Policies and procedures for submitting reports under subsection (b).

(B) Policies and procedures for making cyber threat indicators available under subsection (e).

(C) Policies and procedures for taking action under subsection (f).

(3) **EXISTING PROCESSES, ROLES, AND RESPONSIBILITIES.**—The Secretary shall ensure that the policies and procedures promulgated pursuant to paragraph (1) incorporate, to the greatest extent practicable, processes, roles, and responsibilities of appropriate agencies and entities, including sector specific information sharing and analysis centers, that were in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(e) **TWO-WAY SHARING.**—In a case in which the Secretary or an appropriate agency head receives a report under subsection (b) from a covered entity, the Secretary or appropriate agency head, as the case may be, shall, pursuant to section 3 and to the greatest extent practicable, make available to such covered entity such cyber threat indicators as the Secretary or appropriate agency head considers appropriate.

(f) **PROTECTION FROM IDENTIFICATION.**—In a case in which the Secretary or an appropriate agency head shares with a non-Federal entity information from or information derived from a report submitted by a covered entity under this section, the Secretary or the appropriate agency head (as the case may be) shall take such actions as the Secretary or the appropriate agency head (as the case may be) considers appropriate to protect from disclosure the identity of the covered entity.

(g) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The requirements of subsection (b) shall take effect on the date on which the Secretary first promulgates policies and procedures under subsection (d)(1) and shall apply with respect to intrusions of critical cyber infrastructure occurring on or after such date.

SA 2624. Mr. MENENDEZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 15, lines 4 and 5, strike “paragraph (2)” and insert “paragraphs (2) and (3)”.

On page 15, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

(3) **COMPLIANCE WITH CYBERSECURITY CROSS-AGENCY PRIORITY GOAL.**—

(A) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this paragraph—

(i) the term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(I) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(II) the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform of the House of Representatives; and

(ii) the term “independent auditor” means—

(I) for each Federal entity with an Inspector General appointed under the Inspector General Act of 1978, the Inspector General or an independent external auditor, as determined by the Inspector General of the Federal entity; and

(II) for each Federal entity not described in subclause (I), an independent external auditor as determined by the head of the Federal entity.

(B) **REQUIREMENTS.**—A Federal entity may not receive defensive measures under this Act unless the independent auditor for the Federal entity certifies that the Federal entity—

(i) is capable of properly using any defensive measures received; and

(ii) meets any additional metrics, as determined by Secretary of Homeland Security.

(C) **RULES.**—Not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall promulgate rules for updating the certification of the compliance of a Federal entity with the Cybersecurity Cross-Agency Priority Goal for purposes of receiving defensive measures.

(D) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the independent auditor for each Federal entity, in consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, shall submit to the appropriate

committees of Congress and the head of the Federal entity a report detailing whether the Federal entity is capable of—

(I) adequately protecting the information shared or received under this Act;

(II) determining the original source of a cybersecurity threat; and

(III) determining whether a cybersecurity threat originates from a foreign entity.

(ii) **FORM.**—Each report required under clause (i) shall be submitted in writing and in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

On page 15, line 17, strike “(3)” and insert “(4)”

SA 2625. Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. CARPER, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code;

(2) the term “agency information system” has the meaning given the term in section 228 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a);

(3) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(4) the terms “cybersecurity risk” and “information system” have the meanings given those terms in section 227 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as so redesignated by section 203(a);

(5) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(6) the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)); and

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 203. IMPROVED FEDERAL NETWORK SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 228 as section 229;

(2) by redesignating section 227 as subsection (c) of section 228, as added by paragraph (4), and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) by redesignating the second section designated as section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center) as section 227;

(4) by inserting after section 227, as so redesignated, the following:

“SEC. 228. CYBERSECURITY PLANS.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency information system’ means an information system used or operated by an agency or by another entity on behalf of an agency;

“(2) the terms ‘cybersecurity risk’ and ‘information system’ have the meanings given those terms in section 227;

“(3) the term ‘information sharing and analysis organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 212(5); and

“(4) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(b) **INTRUSION ASSESSMENT PLAN.**—

“(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall develop and implement an intrusion assessment plan to identify and remove intruders in agency information systems.

“(2) **EXCEPTION.**—The intrusion assessment plan required under paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.”;

(5) in section 228(c), as so redesignated, by striking “section 226” and inserting “section 227”; and

(6) by inserting after section 229, as so redesignated, the following:

“SEC. 230. FEDERAL INTRUSION DETECTION AND PREVENTION SYSTEM.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code;

“(2) the term ‘agency information’ means information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency;

“(3) the term ‘agency information system’ has the meaning given the term in section 228; and

“(4) the terms ‘cybersecurity risk’ and ‘information system’ have the meanings given those terms in section 227.

“(b) **REQUIREMENT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall deploy, operate, and maintain, to make available for use by any agency, with or without reimbursement—

“(A) a capability to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system; and

“(B) a capability to prevent network traffic associated with such cybersecurity risks from transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system or modify such network traffic to remove the cybersecurity risk.

“(2) **REGULAR IMPROVEMENT.**—The Secretary shall regularly deploy new technologies and modify existing technologies to the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities described in paragraph (1) as appropriate to improve the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

“(c) **ACTIVITIES.**—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary—

“(1) may access, and the head of an agency may disclose to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2), information transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system, regardless of the location from which the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2) accesses such information, notwithstanding any other provision of law that would otherwise restrict or prevent the head of an agency from disclosing such information to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2);

“(2) may enter into contracts or other agreements with, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities to

deploy and operate technologies in accordance with subsection (b);

“(3) may retain, use, and disclose information obtained through the conduct of activities authorized under this section only to protect information and information systems from cybersecurity risks;

“(4) shall regularly assess through operational test and evaluation in real world or simulated environments available advanced protective technologies to improve detection and prevention capabilities, including commercial and non-commercial technologies and detection technologies beyond signature-based detection, and utilize such technologies when appropriate;

“(5) shall establish a pilot to acquire, test, and deploy, as rapidly as possible, technologies described in paragraph (4);

“(6) shall periodically update the privacy impact assessment required under section 208(b) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note); and

“(7) shall ensure that—

“(A) activities carried out under this section are reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information and agency information systems from a cybersecurity risk;

“(B) information accessed by the Secretary will be retained no longer than reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information and agency information systems from a cybersecurity risk;

“(C) notice has been provided to users of an agency information system concerning access to communications of users of the agency information system for the purpose of protecting agency information and the agency information system; and

“(D) the activities are implemented pursuant to policies and procedures governing the operation of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

“(d) PRIVATE ENTITIES.—

“(1) CONDITIONS.—A private entity described in subsection (c)(2) may not—

“(A) disclose any network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system to any entity without the consent of the Department or the agency that disclosed the information under subsection (c)(1); or

“(B) use any network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system to which the private entity gains access in accordance with this section for any purpose other than to protect agency information and agency information systems against cybersecurity risks or to administer a contract or other agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or as part of another contract with the Secretary.

“(2) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—No cause of action shall lie in any court against a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary in accordance with this section and any contract or agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (c)(2).

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to authorize an Internet service provider to break a user agreement with a customer without the consent of the customer.

“(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall review the policies and guidelines for the program carried out under this section to ensure that the policies and guidelines are consistent with applicable law governing the acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications.”.

(b) PRIORITIZING ADVANCED SECURITY TOOLS.—The Director and the Secretary, in

consultation with appropriate agencies, shall—

(1) review and update governmentwide policies and programs to ensure appropriate prioritization and use of network security monitoring tools within agency networks; and

(2) brief appropriate congressional committees on such prioritization and use.

(c) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act or 2 months after the date on which the Secretary makes available the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities under section 230(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), whichever is later, the head of each agency shall apply and continue to utilize the capabilities to all information traveling between an agency information system and any information system other than an agency information system; and

(B) not later than 6 months after the date on which the Secretary makes available improvements to the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities pursuant to section 230(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), the head of each agency shall apply and continue to utilize the improved intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by striking the items relating to the first section designated as section 226, the second section designated as section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center), section 227, and section 228 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 226. Cybersecurity recruitment and retention.

“Sec. 227. National cybersecurity and communications integration center.

“Sec. 228. Cybersecurity plans.

“Sec. 229. Clearances.

“Sec. 230. Federal intrusion detection and prevention system.”.

SEC. 204. ADVANCED INTERNAL DEFENSES.

(a) ADVANCED NETWORK SECURITY TOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall include in the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program advanced network security tools to improve visibility of network activity, including through the use of commercial and free or open source tools, to detect and mitigate intrusions and anomalous activity.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Director shall develop and implement a plan to ensure that each agency utilizes advanced network security tools, including those described in paragraph (1), to detect and mitigate intrusions and anomalous activity.

(b) IMPROVED METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Director, shall review and update the metrics used to measure security under section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to include measures of intrusion and incident detection and response times.

(c) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall increase transparency to the public on agency cybersecurity posture, including by increasing the number of metrics available on Federal Government perform-

ance websites and, to the greatest extent practicable, displaying metrics for department components, small agencies, and micro agencies.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 3553(b)(6)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, operating, and maintaining” after “deploying”.

SEC. 205. FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS.—Consistent with section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall exercise the authority to issue binding operational directives to assist the Director in ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with policies and standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, United States Code, for securing agency information systems.

(b) CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS AT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with policies, standards, guidelines, and directives on information security under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, and the standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, United States Code, and except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall—

(A) identify sensitive and mission critical data stored by the agency consistent with the inventory required under the first subsection (c) (relating to the inventory of major information systems) and the second subsection (c) (relating to the inventory of information systems) of section 3505 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) assess access controls to the data described in subparagraph (A), the need for readily accessible storage of the data, and individuals' need to access the data;

(C) encrypt or otherwise render indecipherable to unauthorized users the data described in subparagraph (A) that is stored on or transiting agency information systems;

(D) implement a single sign-on trusted identity platform for individuals accessing each public website of the agency that requires user authentication, as developed by the Administrator of General Services in collaboration with the Secretary; and

(E) implement identity management consistent with section 504 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7464), including multi-factor authentication, for—

(i) remote access to an agency information system; and

(ii) each user account with elevated privileges on an agency information system.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community; or

(B) an agency information system for which—

(i) the head of the agency has personally certified to the Director with particularity that—

(I) operational requirements articulated in the certification and related to the agency information system would make it excessively burdensome to implement the cybersecurity requirement;

(II) the cybersecurity requirement is not necessary to secure the agency information system or agency information stored on or transiting it; and

(III) the agency has all taken necessary steps to secure the agency information system and agency information stored on or transiting it; and

(ii) the head of the agency or the designee of the head of the agency has submitted the certification described in clause (i) to the appropriate congressional committees and the authorizing committees of the agency.

(3) **RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(A) to alter the authority of the Secretary, the Director, or the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in implementing subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) to affect the National Institute of Standards and Technology standards process or the requirement under section 3553(a)(4) of title 44, United States Code; or

(C) to discourage continued improvements and advancements in the technology, standards, policies, and guidelines used to promote Federal information security.

SEC. 206. ASSESSMENT; REPORTS.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

(1) the term “intrusion assessments” means actions taken under the intrusion assessment plan to identify and remove intruders in agency information systems;

(2) the term “intrusion assessment plan” means the plan required under section 228(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act; and

(3) the term “intrusion detection and prevention capabilities” means the capabilities required under section 230(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act.

(b) **THIRD PARTY ASSESSMENT.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and publish a report on the effectiveness of the approach and strategy of the Federal Government to securing agency information systems, including the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities and the intrusion assessment plan.

(c) **REPORTS TO CONGRESS.**—

(1) **INTRUSION DETECTION AND PREVENTION CAPABILITIES.**—

(A) **SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY REPORT.**—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of implementation of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities, including—

(i) a description of privacy controls;

(ii) a description of the technologies and capabilities utilized to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic, including the extent to which those technologies and capabilities include existing commercial and non-commercial technologies;

(iii) a description of the technologies and capabilities utilized to prevent network traffic associated with cybersecurity risks from transiting or traveling to or from agency information systems, including the extent to which those technologies and capabilities include existing commercial and non-commercial technologies;

(iv) a list of the types of indicators or other identifiers or techniques used to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from agency information systems on each iteration of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities and the number of each such type of indicator, identifier, and technique;

(v) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities detected a cybersecurity risk in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from

agency information systems and the number of times the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities blocked network traffic associated with cybersecurity risk; and

(vi) a description of the pilot established under section 230(c)(5) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, including the number of new technologies tested and the number of participating agencies.

(B) **OMB REPORT.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress, as part of the report required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code, an analysis of agency application of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities, including—

(i) a list of each agency and the degree to which each agency has applied the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities to an agency information system; and

(ii) a list by agency of—

(I) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities detected a cybersecurity risk in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system and the types of indicators, identifiers, and techniques used to detect such cybersecurity risks; and

(II) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities prevented network traffic associated with a cybersecurity risk from transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system and the types of indicators, identifiers, and techniques used to detect such agency information systems.

(2) **OMB REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INTRUSION ASSESSMENT PLAN, ADVANCED INTERNAL DEFENSES, AND FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY BEST PRACTICES.**—The Director shall—

(A) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and 30 days after any update thereto, submit the intrusion assessment plan to the appropriate congressional committees;

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, submit to Congress, as part of the report required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code—

(i) a description of the implementation of the intrusion assessment plan;

(ii) the findings of the intrusion assessments conducted pursuant to the intrusion assessment plan;

(iii) advanced network security tools included in the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program pursuant to section 204(a)(1);

(iv) the results of the assessment of the Secretary of best practices for Federal cybersecurity pursuant to section 205(a); and

(v) a list by agency of compliance with the requirements of section 205(b); and

(C) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(i) a copy of the plan developed pursuant to section 204(a)(2); and

(ii) the improved metrics developed pursuant to section 204(b).

SEC. 207. TERMINATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The authority provided under section 230 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, and the reporting requirements under section 206(c) shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to affect

the limitation of liability of a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary under section 230(d)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, if such assistance was rendered before the termination date under subsection (a) or otherwise during a period in which the assistance was authorized.

SEC. 208. IDENTIFICATION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS RELATING TO NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other agencies, shall—

(A) identify all unclassified information systems that provide access to information that may provide an adversary with the ability to derive information that would otherwise be considered classified;

(B) assess the risks that would result from the breach of each unclassified information system identified in subparagraph (A); and

(C) assess the cost and impact on the mission carried out by each agency that owns an unclassified information system identified in subparagraph (A) if the system were to be subsequently designated as a national security system, as defined in section 11103 of title 40, United States Code; and

(2) the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings under paragraph (1).

(b) **FORM.**—The report submitted under subsection (a)(2) shall be in unclassified form, and shall include a classified annex.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—The requirements under subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.

SEC. 209. DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) **DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), in response to a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or incident that represents a substantial threat to the information security of an agency, the Secretary may issue an emergency directive to the head of an agency to take any lawful action with respect to the operation of the information system, including such systems owned or operated by another entity on behalf of an agency, that collects, processes, stores, transmits, disseminates, or otherwise maintains agency information, for the purpose of protecting the information system from, or mitigating, an information security threat.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not apply to a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

“(2) **PROCEDURES FOR USE OF AUTHORITY.**—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in coordination with the Director, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which a directive may be issued under this subsection, which shall include—

“(i) thresholds and other criteria;

“(ii) privacy and civil liberties protections; and

“(iii) providing notice to potentially affected third parties;

“(B) specify the reasons for the required action and the duration of the directive;

“(C) minimize the impact of a directive under this subsection by—

“(i) adopting the least intrusive means possible under the circumstances to secure the agency information systems; and

“(ii) limiting directives to the shortest period practicable;

“(D) notify the Director and the head of any affected agency immediately upon the issuance of a directive under this subsection;

“(E) consult with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology regarding any directive issued under this subsection that implements standards and guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

“(F) ensure that directives issued under this subsection do not conflict with the standards and guidelines issued under section 11331 of title 40;

“(G) consider any applicable standards or guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 11331 of title 40; and

“(H) not later than February 1 of each year, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the specific actions the Secretary has taken pursuant to paragraph (1)(A).

“(3) IMMINENT THREATS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3554, the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary for communications or other system traffic transiting to or from or stored on an agency information system for the purpose of ensuring the security of the information or information system or other agency information systems, if—

“(i) the Secretary determines that there is an imminent threat to agency information systems;

“(ii) the Secretary determines that a directive issued under subsection (b)(2)(C) or paragraph (1)(A) is not reasonably likely to result in a timely response to the threat;

“(iii) the Secretary determines that the risk posed by the imminent threat outweighs any adverse consequences reasonably expected to result from the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary;

“(iv) the Secretary provides prior notice to the Director and the head and chief information officer (or equivalent official) of each agency to which specific actions will be taken pursuant to this subparagraph, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees and authorizing committees of each such agencies within 7 days of taking an action under this subparagraph, of—

“(I) any action taken under this subparagraph; and

“(II) the reasons for and duration and nature of the action;

“(v) the action of the Secretary is consistent with applicable law; and

“(vi) the Secretary authorizes the use of protective capabilities in accordance with the advance procedures established under subparagraph (C).

“(B) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The authority under subparagraph (A) may not be delegated by the Secretary.

“(C) ADVANCE PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, in coordination with the Director and in consultation with the heads of agencies, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall submit the procedures to Congress.

“(4) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may direct or authorize lawful action or protective capability under this subsection only to—

“(A) protect agency information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction; or

“(B) require the remediation of or protect against identified information security risks with respect to—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(ii) that portion of an information system used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency.

“(i) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the specific actions the Director has taken pursuant to subsection (a)(5), including any actions taken pursuant to section 11303(b)(5) of title 40.

“(j) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 3554(a)(1)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “(v) emergency directives issued by the Secretary under section 3553(h); and”.

“(v) emergency directives issued by the Secretary under section 3553(h); and”.

SA 2626. Mr. WHITEHOUSE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ STOPPING THE SALE OF AMERICANS’ FINANCIAL INFORMATION.

Section 1029(h) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking “if—” and all that follows through “therefrom.” and inserting “if the offense involves an access device issued, owned, managed, or controlled by a financial institution, account issuer, credit card system member, or other entity organized under the laws of the United States, or any State, the District of Columbia, or other Territory of the United States.”.

SEC. ____ SHUTTING DOWN BOTNETS.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 1345 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the heading, by inserting “and abuse” after “fraud”;

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking “or” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (C), by inserting “or” after the semicolon; and

(iii) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) violating or about to violate paragraph (1), (4), (5), or (7) of section 1030(a) where such conduct would affect 100 or more protected computers (as defined in section 1030) during any 1-year period, including by denying access to or operation of the computers, installing malicious software on the computers, or using the computers without authorization;”;

(B) in paragraph (2), by inserting “, a violation described in subsection (a)(1)(D),” before “or a Federal”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(c) A restraining order, prohibition, or other action described in subsection (b), if issued in circumstances described in subsection (a)(1)(D), may, upon application of the Attorney General—

“(1) specify that no cause of action shall lie in any court against a person for complying with the restraining order, prohibition, or other action; and

“(2) provide that the United States shall pay to such person a fee for reimbursement for such costs as are reasonably necessary and which have been directly incurred in complying with the restraining order, prohibition, or other action.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of section for chapter 63 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1345 and inserting the following:

“1345. Injunctions against fraud and abuse.”.

SEC. ____ AGGRAVATED DAMAGE TO A CRITICAL INFRASTRUCTURE COMPUTER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1030 the following:

“§ 1030A. Aggravated damage to a critical infrastructure computer

“(a) OFFENSE.—It shall be unlawful, during and in relation to a felony violation of section 1030, to knowingly cause or attempt to cause damage to a critical infrastructure computer, if such damage results in (or, in the case of an attempted offense, would, if completed have resulted in) the substantial impairment—

“(1) of the operation of the critical infrastructure computer; or

“(2) of the critical infrastructure associated with such computer.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall, in addition to the term of punishment provided for the felony violation of section 1030, be fined under this title, imprisoned for not more than 20 years, or both.

“(c) CONSECUTIVE SENTENCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

“(1) a court shall not place any person convicted of a violation of this section on probation;

“(2) except as provided in paragraph (4), no term of imprisonment imposed on a person under this section shall run concurrently with any term of imprisonment imposed on the person under any other provision of law, including any term of imprisonment imposed for the felony violation of section 1030;

“(3) in determining any term of imprisonment to be imposed for the felony violation of section 1030, a court shall not in any way reduce the term to be imposed for such violation to compensate for, or otherwise take into account, any separate term of imprisonment imposed or to be imposed for a violation of this section; and

“(4) a term of imprisonment imposed on a person for a violation of this section may, in the discretion of the court, run concurrently, in whole or in part, only with another term of imprisonment that is imposed by the court at the same time on that person for an

additional violation of this section, if such discretion shall be exercised in accordance with any applicable guidelines and policy statements issued by the United States Sentencing Commission pursuant to section 994 of title 28.

“(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section

“(1) the terms ‘computer’ and ‘damage’ have the meanings given the terms in section 1030; and

“(2) the term ‘critical infrastructure’ has the meaning given the term in section 1016(e) of the USA PATRIOT Act (42 U.S.C. 5195c(e)).”

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS.—The table of sections for chapter 47 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 1030 the following:

“1030A. Aggravated damage to a critical infrastructure computer.”.

SEC. ____ STOPPING TRAFFICKING IN BOTNETS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following:

“(6) knowing such conduct to be wrongful, intentionally traffics in any password or similar information, or any other means of access, further knowing or having reason to know that a protected computer would be accessed or damaged without authorization in a manner prohibited by this section as the result of such trafficking;”;

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (2), by striking “, (a)(3), or (a)(6)” each place it appears and inserting “or (a)(3)”; and

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (C)(i), by striking “or an attempt to commit an offense”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) an offense, or an attempt to commit an offense, under subsection (a)(6);”;

(3) in subsection (g), in the first sentence, by inserting “, except for a violation of subsection (a)(6),” after “of this section”.

SA 2627. Mr. CARPER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. WARNER) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY ENHANCEMENT ACT

SECTION 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Federal Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2015”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITIONS.

In this title—

(1) the term “agency” has the meaning given the term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code;

(2) the term “agency information system” has the meaning given the term in section 228 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a);

(3) the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives;

(4) the terms “cybersecurity risk” and “information system” have the meanings given those terms in section 227 of the Homeland

Security Act of 2002, as so redesignated by section 203(a);

(5) the term “Director” means the Director of the Office of Management and Budget;

(6) the term “intelligence community” has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)); and

(7) the term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Homeland Security.

SEC. 203. IMPROVED FEDERAL NETWORK SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle C of title II of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 141 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 228 as section 229;

(2) by redesignating section 227 as subsection (c) of section 228, as added by paragraph (4), and adjusting the margins accordingly;

(3) by redesignating the second section designated as section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center) as section 227;

(4) by inserting after section 227, as so redesignated, the following:

“SEC. 228. CYBERSECURITY PLANS.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency information system’ means an information system used or operated by an agency or by another entity on behalf of an agency;

“(2) the terms ‘cybersecurity risk’ and ‘information system’ have the meanings given those terms in section 227;

“(3) the term ‘information sharing and analysis organization’ has the meaning given the term in section 212(5); and

“(4) the term ‘intelligence community’ has the meaning given the term in section 3(4) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3003(4)).

“(b) INTRUSION ASSESSMENT PLAN.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary, in coordination with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall develop and implement an intrusion assessment plan to identify and remove intruders in agency information systems.

“(2) EXCEPTION.—The intrusion assessment plan required under paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.”;

(5) in section 228(c), as so redesignated, by striking “section 226” and inserting “section 227”; and

(6) by inserting after section 229, as so redesignated, the following:

“SEC. 230. FEDERAL INTRUSION DETECTION AND PREVENTION SYSTEM.

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘agency’ has the meaning given that term in section 3502 of title 44, United States Code;

“(2) the term ‘agency information’ means information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency;

“(3) the term ‘agency information system’ has the meaning given the term in section 228; and

“(4) the terms ‘cybersecurity risk’ and ‘information system’ have the meanings given those terms in section 227.

“(b) REQUIREMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall deploy, operate, and maintain, to make available for use by any agency, with or without reimbursement—

“(A) a capability to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system; and

“(B) a capability to prevent network traffic associated with such cybersecurity risks from transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system or modify such network traffic to remove the cybersecurity risk.

“(2) REGULAR IMPROVEMENT.—The Secretary shall regularly deploy new technologies and modify existing technologies to the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities described in paragraph (1) as appropriate to improve the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

“(c) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out subsection (b), the Secretary—

“(1) may access, and the head of an agency may disclose to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2), information transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system, regardless of the location from which the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2) accesses such information, notwithstanding any other provision of law that would otherwise restrict or prevent the head of an agency from disclosing such information to the Secretary or a private entity providing assistance to the Secretary under paragraph (2);

“(2) may enter into contracts or other agreements with, or otherwise request and obtain the assistance of, private entities to deploy and operate technologies in accordance with subsection (b);

“(3) may retain, use, and disclose information obtained through the conduct of activities authorized under this section only to protect information and information systems from cybersecurity risks;

“(4) shall regularly assess through operational test and evaluation in real world or simulated environments available advanced protective technologies to improve detection and prevention capabilities, including commercial and non-commercial technologies and detection technologies beyond signature-based detection, and utilize such technologies when appropriate;

“(5) shall establish a pilot to acquire, test, and deploy, as rapidly as possible, technologies described in paragraph (4);

“(6) shall periodically update the privacy impact assessment required under section 208(b) of the E-Government Act of 2002 (44 U.S.C. 3501 note); and

“(7) shall ensure that—

“(A) activities carried out under this section are reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information and agency information systems from a cybersecurity risk;

“(B) information accessed by the Secretary will be retained no longer than reasonably necessary for the purpose of protecting agency information and agency information systems from a cybersecurity risk;

“(C) notice has been provided to users of an agency information system concerning access to communications of users of the agency information system for the purpose of protecting agency information and the agency information system; and

“(D) the activities are implemented pursuant to policies and procedures governing the operation of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

“(d) PRIVATE ENTITIES.—

“(1) CONDITIONS.—A private entity described in subsection (c)(2) may not—

“(A) disclose any network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system to any entity without the consent of the Department or the agency

that disclosed the information under subsection (c)(1); or

“(B) use any network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system to which the private entity gains access in accordance with this section for any purpose other than to protect agency information and agency information systems against cybersecurity risks or to administer a contract or other agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (c)(2) or as part of another contract with the Secretary.

“(2) LIMITATION ON LIABILITY.—No cause of action shall lie in any court against a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary in accordance with this section and any contract or agreement entered into pursuant to subsection (c)(2).

“(3) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall be construed to authorize an Internet service provider to break a user agreement with a customer without the consent of the customer.

“(e) ATTORNEY GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this section, the Attorney General shall review the policies and guidelines for the program carried out under this section to ensure that the policies and guidelines are consistent with applicable law governing the acquisition, interception, retention, use, and disclosure of communications.”.

(b) PRIORITIZING ADVANCED SECURITY TOOLS.—The Director and the Secretary, in consultation with appropriate agencies, shall—

(1) review and update governmentwide policies and programs to ensure appropriate prioritization and use of network security monitoring tools within agency networks; and

(2) brief appropriate congressional committees on such prioritization and use.

(c) AGENCY RESPONSIBILITIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2)—

(A) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act or 2 months after the date on which the Secretary makes available the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities under section 230(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), whichever is later, the head of each agency shall apply and continue to utilize the capabilities to all information traveling between an agency information system and any information system other than an agency information system; and

(B) not later than 6 months after the date on which the Secretary makes available improvements to the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities pursuant to section 230(b)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by subsection (a), the head of each agency shall apply and continue to utilize the improved intrusion detection and prevention capabilities.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.

(d) TABLE OF CONTENTS AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 101 note) is amended by striking the items relating to the first section designated as section 226, the second section designated as section 226 (relating to the national cybersecurity and communications integration center), section 227, and section 228 and inserting the following:

“Sec. 226. Cybersecurity recruitment and retention.

“Sec. 227. National cybersecurity and communications integration center.

“Sec. 228. Cybersecurity plans.

“Sec. 229. Clearances.

“Sec. 230. Federal intrusion detection and prevention system.”.

SEC. 204. ADVANCED INTERNAL DEFENSES.

(a) ADVANCED NETWORK SECURITY TOOLS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall include in the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program advanced network security tools to improve visibility of network activity, including through the use of commercial and free or open source tools, to detect and mitigate intrusions and anomalous activity.

(2) DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Director shall develop and implement a plan to ensure that each agency utilizes advanced network security tools, including those described in paragraph (1), to detect and mitigate intrusions and anomalous activity.

(b) IMPROVED METRICS.—The Secretary, in collaboration with the Director, shall review and update the metrics used to measure security under section 3554 of title 44, United States Code, to include measures of intrusion and incident detection and response times.

(c) TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY.—The Director, in consultation with the Secretary, shall increase transparency to the public on agency cybersecurity posture, including by increasing the number of metrics available on Federal Government performance websites and, to the greatest extent practicable, displaying metrics for department components, small agencies, and micro agencies.

(d) MAINTENANCE OF TECHNOLOGIES.—Section 3553(b)(6)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, operating, and maintaining” after “deploying”.

SEC. 205. FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY STANDARDS.—Consistent with section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, the Secretary, in consultation with the Director, shall exercise the authority to issue binding operational directives to assist the Director in ensuring timely agency adoption of and compliance with policies and standards promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, United States Code, for securing agency information systems.

(b) CYBERSECURITY REQUIREMENTS AT AGENCIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with policies, standards, guidelines, and directives on information security under subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, and the standards and guidelines promulgated under section 11331 of title 40, United States Code, and except as provided in paragraph (2), not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the head of each agency shall—

(A) identify sensitive and mission critical data stored by the agency consistent with the inventory required under the first subsection (c) (relating to the inventory of major information systems) and the second subsection (c) (relating to the inventory of information systems) of section 3505 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) assess access controls to the data described in subparagraph (A), the need for readily accessible storage of the data, and individuals’ need to access the data;

(C) encrypt or otherwise render indecipherable to unauthorized users the data described in subparagraph (A) that is stored on or transiting agency information systems;

(D) implement a single sign-on trusted identity platform for individuals accessing

each public website of the agency that requires user authentication, as developed by the Administrator of General Services in collaboration with the Secretary; and

(E) implement identity management consistent with section 504 of the Cybersecurity Enhancement Act of 2014 (15 U.S.C. 7464), including multi-factor authentication, for—

(i) remote access to an agency information system; and

(ii) each user account with elevated privileges on an agency information system.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under paragraph (1) shall not apply to—

(A) the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community; or

(B) an agency information system for which—

(i) the head of the agency has personally certified to the Director with particularity that—

(I) operational requirements articulated in the certification and related to the agency information system would make it excessively burdensome to implement the cybersecurity requirement;

(II) the cybersecurity requirement is not necessary to secure the agency information system or agency information stored on or transiting it; and

(III) the agency has all taken necessary steps to secure the agency information system and agency information stored on or transiting it; and

(ii) the head of the agency or the designee of the head of the agency has submitted the certification described in clause (i) to the appropriate congressional committees and the authorizing committees of the agency.

(3) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(A) to alter the authority of the Secretary, the Director, or the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology in implementing subchapter II of chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code;

(B) to affect the National Institute of Standards and Technology standards process or the requirement under section 3553(a)(4) of title 44, United States Code; or

(C) to discourage continued improvements and advancements in the technology, standards, policies, and guidelines used to promote Federal information security.

SEC. 206. ASSESSMENT; REPORTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

(1) the term “intrusion assessments” means actions taken under the intrusion assessment plan to identify and remove intruders in agency information systems;

(2) the term “intrusion assessment plan” means the plan required under section 228(b)(1) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act; and

(3) the term “intrusion detection and prevention capabilities” means the capabilities required under section 230(b) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act.

(b) THIRD PARTY ASSESSMENT.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Government Accountability Office shall conduct a study and publish a report on the effectiveness of the approach and strategy of the Federal Government to securing agency information systems, including the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities and the intrusion assessment plan.

(c) REPORTS TO CONGRESS.—

(1) INTRUSION DETECTION AND PREVENTION CAPABILITIES.—

(A) SECRETARY OF HOMELAND SECURITY REPORT.—Not later than 6 months after the

date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Secretary shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report on the status of implementation of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities, including—

(i) a description of privacy controls;

(ii) a description of the technologies and capabilities utilized to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic, including the extent to which those technologies and capabilities include existing commercial and non-commercial technologies;

(iii) a description of the technologies and capabilities utilized to prevent network traffic associated with cybersecurity risks from transiting or traveling to or from agency information systems, including the extent to which those technologies and capabilities include existing commercial and non-commercial technologies;

(iv) a list of the types of indicators or other identifiers or techniques used to detect cybersecurity risks in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from agency information systems on each iteration of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities and the number of each such type of indicator, identifier, and technique;

(v) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities detected a cybersecurity risk in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from agency information systems and the number of times the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities blocked network traffic associated with cybersecurity risk; and

(vi) a description of the pilot established under section 230(c)(5) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, including the number of new technologies tested and the number of participating agencies.

(B) OMB REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Director shall submit to Congress, as part of the report required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code, an analysis of agency application of the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities, including—

(i) a list of each agency and the degree to which each agency has applied the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities to an agency information system; and

(ii) a list by agency of—

(I) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities detected a cybersecurity risk in network traffic transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system and the types of indicators, identifiers, and techniques used to detect such cybersecurity risks; and

(II) the number of instances in which the intrusion detection and prevention capabilities prevented network traffic associated with a cybersecurity risk from transiting or traveling to or from an agency information system and the types of indicators, identifiers, and techniques used to detect such agency information systems.

(2) OMB REPORT ON DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF INTRUSION ASSESSMENT PLAN, ADVANCED INTERNAL DEFENSES, AND FEDERAL CYBERSECURITY BEST PRACTICES.—The Director shall—

(A) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, and 30 days after any update thereto, submit the intrusion assessment plan to the appropriate congressional committees;

(B) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, submit to Congress, as part of the re-

port required under section 3553(c) of title 44, United States Code—

(i) a description of the implementation of the intrusion assessment plan;

(ii) the findings of the intrusion assessments conducted pursuant to the intrusion assessment plan;

(iii) advanced network security tools included in the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation Program pursuant to section 204(a)(1);

(iv) the results of the assessment of the Secretary of best practices for Federal cybersecurity pursuant to section 205(a); and

(v) a list by agency of compliance with the requirements of section 205(b); and

(C) not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the appropriate congressional committees—

(i) a copy of the plan developed pursuant to section 204(a)(2); and

(ii) the improved metrics developed pursuant to section 204(b).

SEC. 207. TERMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The authority provided under section 230 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, and the reporting requirements under section 206(c) shall terminate on the date that is 7 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to affect the limitation of liability of a private entity for assistance provided to the Secretary under section 230(d)(2) of the Homeland Security Act of 2002, as added by section 203(a) of this Act, if such assistance was rendered before the termination date under subsection (a) or otherwise during a period in which the assistance was authorized.

SEC. 208. IDENTIFICATION OF INFORMATION SYSTEMS RELATING TO NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act—

(1) the Director of National Intelligence, in coordination with the heads of other agencies, shall—

(A) identify all unclassified information systems that provide access to information that may provide an adversary with the ability to derive information that would otherwise be considered classified;

(B) assess the risks that would result from the breach of each unclassified information system identified in subparagraph (A); and

(C) assess the cost and impact on the mission carried out by each agency that owns an unclassified information system identified in subparagraph (A) if the system were to be subsequently designated as a national security system, as defined in section 11103 of title 40, United States Code; and

(2) the Director of National Intelligence shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees, the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives a report that includes the findings under paragraph (1).

(b) FORM.—The report submitted under subsection (a)(2) shall be in unclassified form, and shall include a classified annex.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under subsection (a)(1) shall not apply to the Department of Defense or an element of the intelligence community.

SEC. 209. DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3553 of title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) DIRECTION TO AGENCIES.—

“(1) AUTHORITY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), in response to a known or reasonably suspected information security threat, vulnerability, or incident that represents a substantial threat to the information security of an agency, the Secretary may issue an emergency directive to the head of an agency to take any lawful action with respect to the operation of the information system, including such systems owned or operated by another entity on behalf of an agency, that collects, processes, stores, transmits, disseminates, or otherwise maintains agency information, for the purpose of protecting the information system from, or mitigating, an information security threat.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—The authorities of the Secretary under this subsection shall not apply to a system described in paragraph (2) or (3) of subsection (e).

“(2) PROCEDURES FOR USE OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary shall—

“(A) in coordination with the Director, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which a directive may be issued under this subsection, which shall include—

“(i) thresholds and other criteria;

“(ii) privacy and civil liberties protections; and

“(iii) providing notice to potentially affected third parties;

“(B) specify the reasons for the required action and the duration of the directive;

“(C) minimize the impact of a directive under this subsection by—

“(i) adopting the least intrusive means possible under the circumstances to secure the agency information systems; and

“(ii) limiting directives to the shortest period practicable;

“(D) notify the Director and the head of any affected agency immediately upon the issuance of a directive under this subsection;

“(E) consult with the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology regarding any directive issued under this subsection that implements standards and guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

“(F) ensure that directives issued under this subsection do not conflict with the standards and guidelines issued under section 11331 of title 40;

“(G) consider any applicable standards or guidelines developed by the National Institute of Standards and issued by the Secretary of Commerce under section 11331 of title 40; and

“(H) not later than February 1 of each year, submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the specific actions the Secretary has taken pursuant to paragraph (1)(A).

“(3) IMMINENT THREATS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding section 3554, the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary for communications or other system traffic transiting to or from or stored on an agency information system for the purpose of ensuring the security of the information or information system or other agency information systems, if—

“(i) the Secretary determines that there is an imminent threat to agency information systems;

“(ii) the Secretary determines that a directive issued under subsection (b)(2)(C) or paragraph (1)(A) is not reasonably likely to result in a timely response to the threat;

“(iii) the Secretary determines that the risk posed by the imminent threat outweighs

any adverse consequences reasonably expected to result from the use of protective capabilities under the control of the Secretary;

“(iv) the Secretary provides prior notice to the Director and the head and chief information officer (or equivalent official) of each agency to which specific actions will be taken pursuant to this subparagraph, and notifies the appropriate congressional committees and authorizing committees of each such agencies within 7 days of taking an action under this subparagraph, of—

“(I) any action taken under this subparagraph; and

“(II) the reasons for and duration and nature of the action;

“(v) the action of the Secretary is consistent with applicable law; and

“(vi) the Secretary authorizes the use of protective capabilities in accordance with the advance procedures established under subparagraph (C).

“(B) LIMITATION ON DELEGATION.—The authority under subparagraph (A) may not be delegated by the Secretary.

“(C) ADVANCE PROCEDURES.—The Secretary shall, in coordination with the Director and in consultation with the heads of agencies, establish procedures governing the circumstances under which the Secretary may authorize the use of protective capabilities under subparagraph (A). The Secretary shall submit the procedures to Congress.

“(4) LIMITATION.—The Secretary may direct or authorize lawful action or protective capability under this subsection only to—

“(A) protect agency information from unauthorized access, use, disclosure, disruption, modification, or destruction; or

“(B) require the remediation of or protect against identified information security risks with respect to—

“(i) information collected or maintained by or on behalf of an agency; or

“(ii) that portion of an information system used or operated by an agency or by a contractor of an agency or other organization on behalf of an agency.

“(i) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than February 1 of each year, the Director shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report regarding the specific actions the Director has taken pursuant to subsection (a)(5), including any actions taken pursuant to section 11303(b)(5) of title 40.

“(j) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—In this section, the term ‘appropriate congressional committees’ means—

“(1) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

“(2) the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on Homeland Security, the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives.”.

(b) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 3554(a)(1)(B) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in clause (iii), by striking “and” at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following: “(v) emergency directives issued by the Secretary under section 3553(h); and”.

“(v) emergency directives issued by the Secretary under section 3553(h); and”.

SA 2628. Mr. WYDEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RECONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED RULE ON IMPLEMENTATION OF WASSENAAR ARRANGEMENT 2013 PLenary AGREEMENTS RELATING TO INTRUSION AND SURVEILLANCE ITEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall—

(1) review, and consider public comments received with respect to, the proposed rule of the Bureau of Industry and Security, entitled “Wassenaar Arrangement 2013 Plenary Agreements Implementation: Intrusion and Surveillance Items” and published on May 20, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 28,853); and

(2) revise the proposed rule in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) REQUIREMENTS FOR REVISED RULE.—In revising the proposed rule described in subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall—

(1) develop the revisions in close consultation with civil society organizations, including privacy advocates, public and private sector technologists, security researchers, and public and private sector software developers;

(2) ensure that the proposed rule is—

(A) limited to the scope of the agreements reached at the plenary meeting of the Wassenaar Arrangement on Export Controls for Conventional Arms and Dual-Use Goods and Technologies in December 2013; and

(B) consistent with the regulation of cybersecurity items by other countries participating in the Wassenaar Arrangement, as appropriate;

(3) exclude cybersecurity items available for mass-market purchase from regulation under the proposed rule; and

(4) ensure that, before issuing a final rule—

(A) the proposed rule is available for public comment for not less than 60 days; and

(B) a public hearing is held on the proposed rule.

(c) REGULATORY IMPACT ANALYSIS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after issuing a final rule based on the proposed rule described in subsection (a)(1) and revised in accordance with subsection (b), the Secretary shall conduct a regulatory impact analysis of the effects of the rule on the development and export of cybersecurity items.

(2) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the analysis required by paragraph (1) available to the public.

SA 2629. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ REPORT ON ACCOUNTABILITY FOR THE DATA BREACH OF THE OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS.—The term “appropriate committees of Congress” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Homeland Security, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

(2) DATA BREACH.—The term “data breach” means the data breach of systems of the Office of Personnel Management that occurred during fiscal year 2015 which resulted in the theft of sensitive information of at least 21,500,000 Federal employees and their families.

(b) REQUIREMENT FOR REPORT.—Not later than 30 days after date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress and make available to the public a report that—

(1) identifies the perpetrator, including any state sponsor, of the data breach;

(2) includes a plan to impose penalties on such perpetrator under United States law; and

(3) describes a strategy to initiate diplomatic discussions with any state sponsor of the data breach.

(c) ELEMENTS.—The report required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) Identification of any individual perpetrator of the data breach, by name and nationality.

(2) Identification of any state sponsor of the data breach, including each agency of the government of the state sponsor that was responsible for authorizing, performing, or endorsing the data breach.

(3) A description of the actions proposed to penalize each individual identified under paragraph (1) under United States law.

(4) The strategy required by subsection (a)(3) shall include—

(A) a description of any action the President has undertaken to initiate or carry out diplomatic discussions with any state sponsor identified under paragraph (2); and

(B) a strategy to initiate or carry out diplomatic discussions in high-level forums and interactions during the 180-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SA 2630. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ BIENNIAL CYBER REVIEW.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR REVIEW.—Beginning in 2016 and not less frequently than once every two years thereafter, the President shall complete a review of the cyber posture of the United States, including an unclassified summary of roles, missions, accomplishments, plans, and programs.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of each such review are—

(1) to assess the cyber security of the United States;

(2) to determine and express the cyber strategy of the United States; and

(3) to establish a revised cyber program for the next 2-year period.

(c) CONTENT.—Each review required by subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a comprehensive examination of the cyber strategy, force structure, personnel,

modernization plans, infrastructure, and budget plan of the United States;

(2) an assessment of the ability of the United States to recover from a cyber emergency;

(3) an assessment of other elements of the cyber program of the United States;

(4) an assessment of critical national security infrastructure and data that is vulnerable to cyberattacks and cybertheft; and

(5) an assessment of international engagement efforts to establish viable norms of behavior in cyberspace to implement the 2011 International Strategy for Cyberspace.

(d) INVOLVEMENT OF CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY PANEL.—

(1) REQUIREMENT TO INFORM.—The President shall inform the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel established or designated under section _____, on an ongoing basis, of the actions carried out to conduct each review required by subsection (a).

(2) ASSESSMENT PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF REVIEW.—Not later than 1 year prior to the date of completion of each review required by subsection (a), the Chairman of the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel shall submit to the President, the assessment of such Panel of actions carried out to conduct the review as of the date of the submission, including any recommendations of the Panel for improvements to the review or for additional matters to be covered in the review.

(3) ASSESSMENT OF COMPLETED REVIEW.—At the time each review required by subsection (a) is completed and in time to be included in a report required by subsection (d), the Chairman of the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel shall submit to the President, on behalf of the Panel, an assessment of such review.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2016, and not less frequently than once every two years thereafter, the President shall submit to Congress a comprehensive report on each review required by subsection (a). Each report shall include—

(1) the results of the review, including a comprehensive discussion of the cyber strategy of the United States and the collaboration between the public and private sectors best suited to implement that strategy;

(2) a description of the threats examined for purposes of the review and the scenarios developed in the examination of such threats;

(3) the assumptions used in the review, including assumptions relating to the cooperation of other countries and levels of acceptable risk; and

(4) the assessment of the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel submitted under subsection (c)(3).

SEC. _____. CYBERSECURITY ADVISORY PANEL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall establish or designate a Cybersecurity Advisory Panel.

(b) APPOINTMENT.—The President—

(1) shall appoint as members of the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel representatives of industry, academic, nonprofit organizations, interest groups, and advocacy organizations, and State and local governments who are qualified to provide advice and information on cybersecurity research, development, demonstrations, education, personnel, technology transfer, commercial application, or societal and civil liberty concerns;

(2) shall appoint a Chairman of the Panel from among the members of the Panel; and

(3) may seek and give consideration to recommendations for appointments to the Panel from Congress, industry, the cybersecurity community, the defense community,

State and local governments, and other appropriate organizations.

(c) DUTIES.—The Cybersecurity Advisory Panel shall advise the President on matters relating to the national cybersecurity program and strategy and shall assess—

(1) trends and developments in cybersecurity science research and development;

(2) progress made in implementing the strategy;

(3) the need to revise the strategy;

(4) the readiness and capacity of the Federal and national workforces to implement the national cybersecurity program and strategy, and the steps necessary to improve workforce readiness and capacity;

(5) the balance among the components of the national strategy, including funding for program components;

(6) whether the strategy, priorities, and goals are helping to maintain United States leadership and defense in cybersecurity;

(7) the management, coordination, implementation, and activities of the strategy;

(8) whether the concerns of Federal, State, and local law enforcement entities are adequately addressed; and

(9) whether societal and civil liberty concerns are adequately addressed.

(d) REPORTS.—Not less frequently than once every 4 years, the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel shall submit to the President a report on its assessments under subsection (c) and its recommendations for ways to improve the strategy.

(e) TRAVEL EXPENSES OF NON-FEDERAL MEMBERS.—Non-Federal members of the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel, while attending meetings of the Panel or while otherwise serving at the request of the head of the Panel while away from their homes or regular places of business, may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for individuals in the Government serving without pay. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit members of the Panel who are officers or employees of the United States from being allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, in accordance with law.

(f) EXEMPTION FROM FACA SUNSET.—Section 14 of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Cybersecurity Advisory Panel.

SA 2631. Mr. GARDNER (for himself and Mr. CARDIN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. DEPARTMENT OF STATE INTERNATIONAL CYBERSPACE POLICY STRATEGY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State shall produce a comprehensive strategy relating to United States international policy with regard to cyberspace.

(b) ELEMENTS.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall include the following:

(1) A review of actions and activities undertaken by the Secretary of State to date to support the goal of the President's International Strategy for Cyberspace, released in

May 2011, to “work internationally to promote an open, interoperable, secure, and reliable information and communications infrastructure that supports international trade and commerce, strengthens international security, and fosters free expression and innovation.”

(2) A plan of action to guide the diplomacy of the Secretary of State, with regard to foreign countries, including conducting bilateral and multilateral activities to develop the norms of responsible international behavior in cyberspace, and status review of existing discussions in multilateral fora to obtain agreements on international norms in cyberspace.

(3) A review of the alternative concepts with regard to international norms in cyberspace offered by foreign countries that are prominent actors, including China, Russia, Brazil, and India.

(4) A detailed description of threats to United States national security in cyberspace from foreign countries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors to Federal and private sector infrastructure of the United States, intellectual property in the United States, and the privacy of citizens of the United States.

(5) A review of policy tools available to the President to deter foreign countries, state-sponsored actors, and private actors, including those outlined in Executive Order 13694, released on April 1, 2015.

(6) A review of resources required by the Secretary, including the Office of the Coordinator for Cyber Issues, to conduct activities to build responsible norms of international cyber behavior.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In preparing the strategy required by subsection (a), the Secretary of State shall consult, as appropriate, with other agencies and departments of the United States and the private sector and nongovernmental organizations in the United States with recognized credentials and expertise in foreign policy, national security, and cybersecurity.

(d) FORM OF STRATEGY.—The strategy required by subsection (a) shall be in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(e) AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION.—The Secretary of State shall—

(1) make the strategy required in subsection (a) available to the public; and

(2) brief the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives on the strategy, including any material contained in a classified annex.

SA 2632. Mr. TESTER (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 40, between lines 12 and 13, insert the following:

(i) The number of cyber threat indicators and defensive measures shared under this Act, including a breakdown of—

(I) the total number of cyber threat indicators shared through the capability described in section 5(c);

(II) a good faith estimate of the number of cyber threat indicators shared by entities with civilian Federal entities through capabilities other than those described in section 5(c);

(III) a good faith estimate of the number of cyber threat indicators shared by entities with military Federal entities through capabilities other than those described in section 5(c);

(IV) the number of times personal information or information that identifies a specific person was removed from a cyber threat indicator shared under section 5(c);

(V) an assessment of the extent to which personal information or information that identifies a specific person was shared under this Act though such information was not necessary to describe or mitigate a cybersecurity threat or security vulnerability;

(VI) a report on any known harms caused by any defensive measure operated or shared under the authority of this Act;

(VII) the total number of times that information shared under this Act was used to prevent, investigate, disrupt, or prosecute any offense under title 18, United States Code, including an offense under section 1028, 1028A, or 1029, or chapter 37 or 90 of such title 18; and

(VIII) the total number of times that information shared under this Act was used to prevent, investigate, disrupt, or prosecute a terrorism offense under chapter 113B of title 18, United States Code.

SA 2633. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. GRAMHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Ms. AYOTTE to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 9, add the following:

(f) **ASSESSMENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include an assessment of the implications of the Memorandum Opinion for the Assistant Attorney General dated September 20, 2011, for cybersecurity, including the potential for thefts of personally identifiable information and for the creation of opportunities for organized crime and terrorist groups to generate revenue and launder money through related online activities; provided that the Department of Justice shall not follow such Opinion with respect to which activities are covered by section 1084 of title 18, United States Code, until 18 months after such report has been received and the President certifies to Congress that the Director of National Intelligence, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Secretary of Homeland Security are in agreement that the Opinion will not increase the threat of thefts of personally identifiable information or the exploitation of online activities for criminal purposes, and that such agencies have sufficient resources and legal tools to protect consumers from such threat, and deter such criminal activities.

SA 2634. Ms. AYOTTE (for Mr. GRAMHAM) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by Ms. AYOTTE to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ RESTORATION OF AMERICA'S WIRE ACT.

(a) **SHORT TITLE.**—This section may be cited as the “Restoration of America’s Wire Act”.

(b) **WIRE ACT CLARIFICATION.**—Section 1084 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “bets or wagers or information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers on any sporting event or contest,” and inserting “any bet or wager, or information assisting in the placing of any bet or wager;”;

(B) by striking “result of bets or wagers” and inserting “result of any bet or wager”; and

(C) by striking “or for information assisting in the placing of bets or wagers;”;

(2) by striking subsection (e) and inserting the following:

“(e) As used in this section—

“(1) the term ‘bet or wager’ does not include any activities set forth in section 5362(1)(E) of title 31;

“(2) the term ‘State’ means a State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or a commonwealth, territory, or possession of the United States;

“(3) the term ‘uses a wire communication facility for the transmission in interstate or foreign commerce of any bet or wager’ includes any transmission over the Internet carried interstate or in foreign commerce, incidentally or otherwise; and

“(4) the term ‘wire communication’ has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 153).”.

(c) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this section, or the amendments made by this section, shall be construed—

(1) to preempt any State law prohibiting gambling; or

(2) to alter, limit, or extend—

(A) the relationship between the Interstate Horseracing Act of 1978 (15 U.S.C. 3001 et seq.) and other Federal laws in effect on the date of enactment of this Act;

(B) the ability of a State licensed lottery (including in conjunction with its supplier) or State licensed retailer to make on-premises retail lottery sales, including through a self-service retail lottery terminal, or to transmit information ancillary to such sales (including information relating to subscriptions or fulfillment of game play), in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws;

(C) the ability of a State licensed gaming establishment or a tribal gaming establishment to transmit information assisting in the placing of a bet or wager on the physical premises of the establishment, in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws; or

(D) the relationship between Federal laws and State charitable gaming laws.

SA 2635. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 46, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

(g) **FINANCIAL SERVICES INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS CENTER.**—As the sector-specific agency for the financial sector under Presidential Policy Directive-21, issued February 12, 2013, the Department of the Treasury shall collaborate with the private sector to—

(1) facilitate membership of depository institutions (as defined in section 19(b)(1) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)(1))) that have not more than \$10,000,000,000 in total consolidated assets (in this subsection referred to as “small depository institutions”) in the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center at no cost to the small depository institutions; and

(2) ensure that the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center provides to its members that are small depository institutions information that is comprehensible to and useable by small depository institutions.

SA 2636. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 49, between lines 3 and 4, add the following:

(n) **RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.**—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or modify the authority of the appropriate Federal financial institutions regulatory agency (as defined in section 8(e)(7)(D) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1818(e)(7)(D))) to interpret, or take enforcement action under, any other provision of Federal law for the purposes of—

(1) safety and soundness; or

(2) consumer protection.

SA 2637. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, after line 23, add the following:

(d) **COLLABORATION BETWEEN INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS CENTERS.**—

(1) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subsection—

(A) the term “critical infrastructure sector” means any sector identified as a critical infrastructure sector in Presidential Policy Directive-21, issued February 12, 2013 (or any successor thereto); and

(B) the term “Sector-Specific Agency” has the meaning given the term in Presidential Policy Directive-21, issued dated February 12, 2013 (or any successor thereto).

(2) **COLLABORATION.**—The Sector-Specific Agencies associated with critical infrastructure sectors shall facilitate collaboration between the sector-specific information sharing and analysis centers to share cyber threat information across sectors.

(3) **FINANCIAL SERVICES INFORMATION SHARING AND ANALYSIS CENTER.**—As the head of the Sector-Specific Agency for the financial sector under Presidential Policy Directive-21, issued February 12, 2013, the Secretary of the Treasury shall collaborate with the private sector to ensure that risks that may impact the financial sector are shared appropriately with entities in the financial sector, which shall include facilitating information sharing between the Financial Services Information Sharing and Analysis Center and—

(A) other information sharing and analysis centers; and

(B) other information sharing and analysis organizations.

SA 2638. Mr. BROWN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill S. 754, to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. _____. IMPROVED REGULATION AND EXAMINATION OF SERVICE PROVIDERS.

(a) **BANK SERVICE COMPANY ACT.**—Section 7 of the Bank Service Company Act (12 U.S.C. 1867) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **REQUIRED EXAMINATIONS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the appropriate Federal banking agency shall, not less than once during each 12-month period, conduct a full-scope, on-site examination of each bank service company.

“(2) **STATE EXAMINATIONS ACCEPTABLE.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the examinations required by paragraph (1) may be conducted in alternate 12-month periods, as appropriate, if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that an examination of the bank service company conducted by the State during the intervening 12-month period carries out the purpose of this subsection.

“(3) **18-MONTH RULE FOR CERTAIN BANK SERVICE COMPANIES.**—The examinations conducted under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be conducted during an 18-month period, tailored as needed to align with a lengthened examination cycle of a bank service company, if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that a bank service company—

“(A) was well managed at the most recent examination of the bank service company;

“(B) is not subject to a formal enforcement proceeding or order by the appropriate Federal banking agency (as of the date on which the determination is made); and

“(C) satisfies any other requirement that the appropriate Federal banking agency determines is appropriate.

“(4) **AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT MORE FREQUENT EXAMINATIONS.**—Each appropriate Federal banking agency may examine any bank service company as frequently as the appropriate Federal banking agency determines is necessary.”

(b) **HOME OWNERS’ LOAN ACT.**—Section 5(d)(7) of the Home Owners’ Loan Act (12 U.S.C. 1464(d)(7)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(F) **REQUIRED EXAMINATIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the appropriate Federal banking agency shall, not less than once during each 12-month period, conduct a full-scope, on-site examination of each service company.

“(ii) **STATE EXAMINATIONS ACCEPTABLE.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the examinations required by clause (i) may be conducted in alternate 12-month periods, as appropriate, if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that an examination of the service company conducted by the State during the intervening 12-month period carries out the purpose of this subparagraph.

“(iii) **18-MONTH RULE FOR CERTAIN SERVICE COMPANIES.**—The examinations conducted under clauses (i) and (ii) shall be conducted during an 18-month period, tailored as needed to align with a lengthened examination cycle of a service company, if the appropriate Federal banking agency determines that a service company—

“(I) was well managed at the most recent examination of the service company;

“(II) is not subject to a formal enforcement proceeding or order by the appropriate Federal banking agency (as of the date on which the determination is made); and

“(III) satisfies any other requirement that the appropriate Federal banking agency determines is necessary.

“(iv) **AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT MORE FREQUENT EXAMINATIONS.**—Each appropriate Federal banking agency may examine any service company as frequently as the appropriate Federal banking agency determines is necessary.”

SA 2639. Mr. WHITEHOUSE proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1523, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 3, line 17, strike “\$27,000,000” and insert “\$26,000,000”.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO OBJECT TO PROCEEDING

I, Senator CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, intend to object to proceeding to the appointments of Bradley Duane Arsenault, Bret Thomas Campbell, Karen Stone Exel, Gloria Jean Garland, Michael H. Hryshchyshyn, Jr., Ying X. Hsu, Stephen S. Kelley, Mary Catherine Leherr, Denise G. Manning, Paul Karlis Markovs, Scott Currie McNiven, Hanh Ngoc Nguyen, Denise Frances O’Toole, Marisol E. Perez, Ronald F. Savage, Adam P. Schmidt, Anna Toness, Michael J. Torreano, Nicholas John Vivio, and Jamshed Zuberi to be Foreign Service Officers of Class Two, dated August 5, 2015.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “The Implications of Sanctions Relief Under The Iran Agreement.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5,

2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Implications of the JCPOA for U.S. Policy in the Middle East.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Opportunities to Improve Student Success.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on August 5, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-106 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled “‘All’ Means ‘All’: the Justice Department’s Failure to Comply With Its Legal Obligation to Ensure Inspector General Access to All Records Needed for Independent Oversight.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for my State Department fellow, Tovan McDaniel, to be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this work period.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GERARDO HERNANDEZ AIRPORT SECURITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 163, H.R. 720.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 720) to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The term “Administration” means the Transportation Security Administration.

SEC. 3. SECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE AT AIRPORTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with other Federal agencies as appropriate, conduct outreach to all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures, and provide technical assistance as necessary, to verify such airports have in place individualized working plans for responding to security incidents inside the perimeter of the airport, including active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

(b) **TYPES OF PLANS.**—Such plans may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons inside the perimeter of the airport, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for non-airport-specific law enforcement and fire response.

(3) A schedule for regular testing of communications equipment used to receive emergency calls.

(4) An evaluation of how emergency calls placed by persons inside the perimeter of the airport will reach airport police in an expeditious manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with travelers and all other persons inside the perimeter of the airport.

(6) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum timeframe for law enforcement response to active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger security-screening checkpoints.

(7) A schedule of joint exercises and training to be conducted by the airport, the Administration, other stakeholders such as airport and airline tenants, and any relevant law enforcement, airport police, fire, and medical personnel.

(8) A schedule for producing after-action joint exercise reports to identify and determine how to improve security incident response capabilities.

(9) A strategy, where feasible, for providing airport law enforcement with access to airport security video surveillance systems at category X airports where those systems were purchased and installed using Administration funds.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings from its outreach to airports

under subsection (a), including an analysis of the level of preparedness such airports have to respond to security incidents, including active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

SEC. 4. DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON BEST PRACTICES.

The Assistant Secretary shall—

(1) identify best practices that exist across airports for security incident planning, management, and training; and

(2) establish a mechanism through which to share such best practices with other airport operators nationwide.

SEC. 5. CERTIFICATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that all screening personnel have participated in practical training exercises for active shooter scenarios.

SEC. 6. REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an analysis of how the Administration can use cost savings achieved through efficiencies to increase over the next 5 fiscal years the funding available for checkpoint screening law enforcement support reimbursable agreements.

SEC. 7. SECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, and other relevant agencies, conduct outreach to all passenger transportation agencies and providers with high-risk facilities, as identified by the Assistant Secretary, to verify such agencies and providers have in place plans to respond to active shooters, acts of terrorism, or other security-related incidents that target passengers.

(b) **TYPES OF PLANS.**—As applicable, such plans may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to individuals, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command.

(3) A plan for frontline employees to receive active shooter training.

(4) A schedule for regular testing of communications equipment used to receive emergency calls.

(5) An evaluation of how emergency calls placed by individuals using the transportation system will reach police in an expeditious manner.

(6) A practiced method and plan to communicate with individuals using the transportation system.

(c) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings from its outreach to the agencies and providers under subsection (a), including an analysis of the level of preparedness such transportation systems have to respond to security incidents.

(d) **DISSEMINATION OF BEST PRACTICES.**—The Assistant Secretary shall identify best practices for security incident planning, management, and training and establish a mechanism through which to share such practices with passenger transportation agencies nationwide.

SEC. 8. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, and this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

SEC. 9. INTEROPERABILITY REVIEW.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, conduct a review of the interoperable communications capabilities of the law enforcement, fire, and medical personnel responsible for responding to a security incident, including active shooter events, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints, at all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the review, the Assistant Secretary shall report the findings of the review to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 720), as amended, was passed.

REPRESENTATIVE PAYEE FRAUD PREVENTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 167, S. 1576.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1576) to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments, as follows:

(The parts of the bill intended to be stricken are shown in boldface brackets and the parts intended to be inserted in the bill are shown in italic.)

S. 1576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPRESENTATIVE PAYEE FRAUD.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) CSRS.—Subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8345 the following:

“§ 8345a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person that is authorized by the Office under section 8345(e) to receive payments on behalf of a minor or an individual mentally incompetent or under other legal disability to embezzle or in any manner convert all or any part of the amounts received from such payments to a use other than for the use and benefit of such minor or individual.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(c) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—Any willful neglect or refusal to make and file proper accountings or reports concerning the amounts received from payments authorized under section 8345(e) as required by law shall be taken to be sufficient evidence prima facie of the embezzlement or conversion of such amounts.”.

(2) FERS.—Subchapter VI of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8466 the following:

“§ 8466a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person that is authorized by the Office under section 8466(c) to receive payments on behalf of a minor or an individual mentally incompetent or under other legal disability to embezzle or in any manner convert all or any part of the amounts received from such payments to a use other than for the use and benefit of such minor or individual.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(c) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—Any willful neglect or refusal to make and file proper accountings or reports concerning the amounts received from payments authorized under section 8466(c) as required by law shall be taken to be sufficient evidence prima facie of the embezzlement or conversion of such amounts.”.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of sections for chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8345 the following:

“8345a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments.”.

(B) The table of sections for chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8466 the following:

“8466a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments.”.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON APPOINTMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.—

(1) CSRS.—Section 8345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) The Office may not authorize a person to receive payments on behalf of a minor or individual of legal disability under subsection (e) if that person has been convicted of a violation of—

“(1) section 8345a or 8466a;
“(2) section 208 or 1632 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408 and [1632] 1383a); or
“(3) section 6101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

(2) FERS.—Section 8466 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) The Office may not authorize a person to receive payments on behalf of a minor or individual of legal disability under subsection (c) if that person has been convicted of a violation of—

“(1) section 8345a or 8466a;
“(2) section 208 or 1632 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408 and [1632] 1383a); or
“(3) section 6101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendments be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendments were agreed to.

The bill (S. 1576), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1576

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Representative Payee Fraud Prevention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. REPRESENTATIVE PAYEE FRAUD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) CSRS.—Subchapter III of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8345 the following:

“§ 8345a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person that is authorized by the Office under section 8345(e) to receive payments on behalf of a minor or an individual mentally incompetent or under other legal disability to embezzle or in any manner convert all or any part of the amounts received from such payments to a use other than for the use and benefit of such minor or individual.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(c) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—Any willful neglect or refusal to make and file proper accountings or reports concerning the amounts received from payments authorized under section 8345(e) as required by law shall be taken to be sufficient evidence prima facie of the embezzlement or conversion of such amounts.”.

(2) FERS.—Subchapter VI of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 8466 the following:

“§ 8466a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments

“(a) IN GENERAL.—It shall be unlawful for any person that is authorized by the Office under section 8466(c) to receive payments on behalf of a minor or an individual mentally incompetent or under other legal disability to embezzle or in any manner convert all or any part of the amounts received from such payments to a use other than for the use and benefit of such minor or individual.

“(b) PENALTY.—Any person who violates subsection (a) shall be fined under title 18, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

“(c) PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE.—Any willful neglect or refusal to make and file proper ac-

countings or reports concerning the amounts received from payments authorized under section 8466(c) as required by law shall be taken to be sufficient evidence prima facie of the embezzlement or conversion of such amounts.”.

(3) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) The table of sections for chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8345 the following:

“8345a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments.”.

(B) The table of sections for chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 8466 the following:

“8466a. Embezzlement or conversion of payments.”.

(b) LIMITATIONS ON APPOINTMENTS OF REPRESENTATIVE PAYEES.—

(1) CSRS.—Section 8345 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after subsection (e) the following:

“(f) The Office may not authorize a person to receive payments on behalf of a minor or individual of legal disability under subsection (e) if that person has been convicted of a violation of—

“(1) section 8345a or 8466a;
“(2) section 208 or 1632 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408 and 1383a); or
“(3) section 6101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

(2) FERS.—Section 8466 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) The Office may not authorize a person to receive payments on behalf of a minor or individual of legal disability under subsection (c) if that person has been convicted of a violation of—

“(1) section 8345a or 8466a;
“(2) section 208 or 1632 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 408 and 1383a); or
“(3) section 6101 of title 38, United States Code.”.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar Nos. 172 and 173, en bloc.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bills en bloc.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bills be read a third time and passed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bills be printed in the RECORD, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIALIST JOSEPH W. RILEY POST OFFICE BUILDING

The bill (S. 1596) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the “Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building,” was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1596

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SPECIALIST JOSEPH W. RILEY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the “Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building”.

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES “MAGGIE” MEGELLAS POST OFFICE

The bill (S. 1826) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James “Maggie” Megellas Post Office, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1826

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. LIEUTENANT COLONEL JAMES “MAGGIE” MEGELLAS POST OFFICE.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, shall be known and designated as the “Lieutenant Colonel James ‘Maggie’ Megellas Post Office”.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Lieutenant Colonel James ‘Maggie’ Megellas Post Office”.

ELECTRONIC HEALTH FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 185, S. 1347.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1347) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to the treatment of patient encounters in ambulatory surgical centers in determining meaningful EHR use, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Electronic Health Fairness Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Ambulatory surgery centers were not covered under the provisions of the HITECH Act of

2009, which created certification standards and incentives for adopting electronic health record (EHR) technology in the physician office and hospital settings.

(2) The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) defines a meaningful EHR user as an eligible professional having 50 percent or more of the professional’s outpatient encounters at practices or locations equipped with certified EHR technology.

(3) Physicians with patient encounters in an ambulatory surgical center are at a disadvantage when attempting to meet meaningful use requirements because there currently is not certified EHR technology for such centers.

(4) Until such time as EHR technology is certified specifically for use in the ambulatory surgical centers, patient encounters that occur in such a center should not be used when calculating whether an eligible professional meets meaningful use requirements, unless an eligible professional elects to include those encounters.

SEC. 3. TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS IN AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS IN DETERMINING MEANINGFUL EHR USE.

Section 1848(o)(2) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395w-4(o)(2)) is amended by adding at the end of the following new subparagraph:

“(E) TREATMENT OF PATIENT ENCOUNTERS AT AMBULATORY SURGICAL CENTERS.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), any patient encounter of an eligible professional occurring at an ambulatory surgical center (described in section 1832(i)(1)(A)) shall not be treated as a patient encounter in determining whether an eligible professional qualifies as a meaningful EHR user.

“(ii) SUNSET.—Clause (i) shall no longer apply as of the first year that begins more than 3 years after the date the Secretary certifies EHR technology for the ambulatory surgical center setting.”.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1347), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

AMENDING TITLE XI OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 187, S. 1362.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1362) to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs).

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF WAIVER AUTHORITY REGARDING PACE PROGRAMS.

Subsection (d)(1) of section 1115A of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1315a) is amended by striking “and 1903(m)(2)(A)(iii)” and inserting “1903(m)(2)(A)(iii), and 1934 (other than subsections (b)(1)(A) and (c)(5) of such section)”.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to; that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1362), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

LAND MANAGEMENT WORKFORCE FLEXIBILITY ACT

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 192, H.R. 1531.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1531) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1531) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

J. WATIES WARING JUDICIAL CENTER

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2131 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2131) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the “J. Waties Waring Judicial Center.”

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2131) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

PFC MILTON A. LEE MEDAL OF HONOR MEMORIAL HIGHWAY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Environment and Public Works Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 2559 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2559) to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 2559) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL OVARIAN CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 228.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 228) designating September 2015 as "National Ovarian Cancer Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 228) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 23, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary

Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 230 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 230) designating September 25, 2015, as "National Lobster Day."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 230) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of July 27, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 248, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 248) designating September 2015 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 248) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session for the consideration of all nominations on the Secretary's desk in the Foreign Service except for the list which is at the desk; that the nominations be confirmed en bloc; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order; that any statements related to

the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK

FOREIGN SERVICE

PN573—3 Foreign Service nominations (161) beginning Maura Barry Boyle, and ending Anthony Wolak, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record of June 10, 2015.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE BILLS AND REPORTS

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, committees be allowed to file bills and reports on August 6, from 11:30 a.m. until 1:30 p.m., and August 28, from 12 noon until 2 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECORD TO REMAIN OPEN

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the Senate, that the RECORD be kept open on August 6, from 11:30 a.m. until 1:30 p.m. for the introduction of bills and resolutions, statements, and cosponsor requests.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, AUGUST 6, 2015, AND TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 11:30 a.m., Thursday, August 6, for a pro forma session with the only business conducted being that under the previous orders; further, that when the Senate adjourns on August 6, 2015, it next convene on Tuesday, September 8, at 2 p.m., pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 72; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; and that following leader remarks, the Senate begin consideration of H.J. Res. 61, as under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:19 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, August 6, 2015, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

MARCEL JOHN LETTRE, II, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR INTELLIGENCE, VICE MICHAEL VICKERS, RESIGNED.

PATRICK JOSEPH MURPHY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE BRAD R. CARSON.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

THOMAS F. SCOTT DARLING, III, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL MOTOR CARRIER SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, VICE ANNE S. FERRO, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

CHERRY ANN MURRAY, OF KANSAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, VICE WILLIAM F. BRINKMAN.

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

CHARLES P. BLAHOUS, III, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

CHARLES P. BLAHOUS, III, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

CHARLES P. BLAHOUS, III, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL OLD-AGE AND SURVIVORS INSURANCE TRUST FUND AND THE FEDERAL DISABILITY INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE FEDERAL HOSPITAL INSURANCE TRUST FUND FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

LINDA I. ETIM, OF WISCONSIN, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE EARL W. GAST, RESIGNED.

UNITED NATIONS

LAURA S. H. HOLGATE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE VIENNA OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY

LAURA S. H. HOLGATE, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

RICHARD OTTO BUCKIUS, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, VICE CORA B. MARRETT, RESIGNED.

DISCHARGED NOMINATIONS

The Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation was discharged from further consideration of the following nominations unanimous consent and the nominations were confirmed:

MARIE THERESE DOMINGUEZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF VICE ADM. CHARLES D. MICHEL, TO BE VICE ADMIRAL.

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. BIRD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 5, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DAVID HALE, OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN.

ATUL KESHAP, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA, AND TO SERVE CONCURRENTLY AND WITHOUT ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION AS AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MALDIVES.

ALANA B. TEPLITZ, OF ILLINOIS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NEPAL.

WILLIAM A. HEIDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA.

GLYN TOWNSEND DAVIES, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF THAILAND.

JENNIFER ZIMDAHL GALT, OF COLORADO, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO MONGOLIA.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

RAFAEL J. LOPEZ, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE COMMISSIONER ON CHILDREN, YOUTH, AND FAMILIES, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

MONICA C. REGALBUTO, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT).

JONATHAN ELKIND, OF MARYLAND, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF ENERGY (INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS).

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

KRISTEN MARIE KULINOWSKI, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

ERIC MARTIN SATZ, OF TENNESSEE, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY FOR A TERM EXPIRING MAY 18, 2018.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

VANESSA LORRAINE ALLEN SUTHERLAND, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE CHAIRPERSON OF THE CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FIVE YEARS.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

GREGORY GUY NADEAU, OF MAINE, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

DENISE TURNER ROTH, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SHEILA GWALTNEY, OF CALIFORNIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MIN-

ISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KYRGYZ REPUBLIC.

PERRY L. HOLLOWAY, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE CO-OPERATIVE REPUBLIC OF GUYANA.

KATHLEEN ANN DOHERTY, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF CYPRUS.

HANS G. KLEMM, OF MICHIGAN, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO ROMANIA.

JAMES DESMOND MELVILLE, JR., OF NEW JERSEY, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA.

PETER F. MULREAN, OF MASSACHUSETTS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI.

LAURA FARNSWORTH DOGU, OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF NICARAGUA.

PAUL WAYNE JONES, OF MARYLAND, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER MINISTER, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND.

MICHELE THOREN BOND, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE (CONSULAR AFFAIRS).

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

JOYCE LOUISE CONNERY, OF MASSACHUSETTS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2019.

JOSEPH BRUCE HAMILTON, OF TEXAS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 18, 2016.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. DAVID S. BALDWIN

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. AARON M. PRUPAS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS THE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 3033:

To be general

GEN. MARK A. MILLEY

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5033:

To be admiral

ADM. JOHN M. RICHARDSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be brigadier general

COL. CHRISTOPHER P. AZZANO

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5043:

To be general

LT. GEN. ROBERT B. NELLER

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. THERON G. DAVIS

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. JOHN M. MURRAY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ANTHONY R. IERARDI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. GARRETT S. YEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. PATRICK J. REINERT

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601, AND TITLE 50, U.S.C., SECTION 2511:

To be admiral

VICE ADM. JAMES F. CALDWELL, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. JOSEPH P. AUCCOIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. CEDRIC E. PRINGLE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COLONEL BRETT W. ANDERSEN
COLONEL WALLACE S. BONDS
COLONEL JOHN C. BOYD
COLONEL DAVID L. BOYLE
COLONEL MARK N. BROWN
COLONEL ROBERT D. BURKE
COLONEL THOMAS M. CARDEN, JR.
COLONEL PATRICK J. CASTER
COLONEL LAURA L. CLELLAN
COLONEL JOHANNA P. CLYBORNE
COLONEL ALAN C. CRANFORD
COLONEL ANITA K.W. CURINGTON
COLONEL DARRELL D. DARNBUSH
COLONEL AARON R. DEAN II
COLONEL DAMIAN T. DONAHOE
COLONEL JOHN H. EDWARDS, JR.
COLONEL LEE M. ELLIS
COLONEL PABLO ESTRADA, JR.
COLONEL JAMES R. FINLEY
COLONEL THOMAS C. FISHER
COLONEL LAPTHE C. FLORA
COLONEL MICHAEL S. FUNK
COLONEL MICHAEL J. GARSHAK
COLONEL HARRISON B. GILLIAM
COLONEL MICHAEL J. GLISSON
COLONEL WALLACE A. HALL, JR.
COLONEL KENNETH S. HARA
COLONEL MARCUS R. HATLEY
COLONEL GREGORY J. HIRSCH
COLONEL JOHN E. HOEFERT
COLONEL LEE W. HOPKINS
COLONEL LYNDON C. JOHNSON
COLONEL RUSSELL D. JOHNSON
COLONEL PETER S. KAYE
COLONEL JESSE J. KIRCHMEIER
COLONEL RICHARD C. KNOWLTON

COLONEL MARTIN A. LAFFERTY
COLONEL EDWIN W. LARKIN
COLONEL BRUCE C. LINTON
COLONEL KEVIN D. LYONS
COLONEL ROBERT B. MCCASTLAIN
COLONEL MARK D. MCCORMACK
COLONEL MARSHALL T. MICHELS
COLONEL MICHAEL A. MITCHELL
COLONEL SHAWN M. O'BRIEN
COLONEL DAVID F. O'DONAHUE
COLONEL JOHN O. PAYNE
COLONEL TROY R. PHILLIPS
COLONEL RAFAEL A. RIBAS
COLONEL EDWARD D. RICHARDS
COLONEL HAMILTON D. RICHARDS
COLONEL JOHN W. SCHROEDER
COLONEL SCOTT C. SHARP
COLONEL CARY A. SHILLCUTT
COLONEL BENNETT E. SINGER
COLONEL RAYMOND G. STRAWBRIDGE
COLONEL TRACEY J. TRAUTMAN
COLONEL SUZANNE P. VARES-LUM
COLONEL DAVID N. VESPER
COLONEL CLINT E. WALKER
COLONEL JAMES B. WASKOM
COLONEL MICHAEL J. WILLIS
COLONEL KURTIS J. WINSTEAD
COLONEL DAVID E. WOOD

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. LAURA L. YEAGER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM J. EDWARDS

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. ROBERT W. ENZENAUER

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be major general

BRIGADIER GENERAL RANDY A. ALEWEL
BRIGADIER GENERAL CRAIG E. BENNETT
BRIGADIER GENERAL ALLEN E. BREWER
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRIAN R. COPES
BRIGADIER GENERAL BENJAMIN J. CORELL
BRIGADIER GENERAL PETER L. COREY
BRIGADIER GENERAL STEVEN FERRARI
BRIGADIER GENERAL RALPH H. GROOVER III
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM A. HALL
BRIGADIER GENERAL BRIAN C. HARRIS
BRIGADIER GENERAL RICHARD J. HAYES, JR.
BRIGADIER GENERAL SAMUEL L. HENRY
BRIGADIER GENERAL BARRY D. KEELING
BRIGADIER GENERAL KEITH A. KLEMMER
BRIGADIER GENERAL WILLIAM J. LIEDER
BRIGADIER GENERAL DANA L. MCDANIEL
BRIGADIER GENERAL RAFAEL O'FERRALL
BRIGADIER GENERAL JOANNE F. SHERIDAN

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES RESERVE, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 5144:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. REX C. MCMILLIAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. ROBERT R. RUARK

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. SAMUEL D. COX

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. GINA M. GROSSO

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. PAUL A. GROSCLKAS

IN THE AIR FORCE

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JESSE L. JOHNSON, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOSE M. GOYOS, TO BE MAJOR.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN C. BOSTON, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF JOHN A. CHRIST, TO BE COLONEL.

AIR FORCE NOMINATION OF RICHARD H. FILLMAN, JR., TO BE COLONEL.

IN THE ARMY

ARMY NOMINATION OF THOMAS M. CHEREPKO, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF ERIC R. DAVIS, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF STEPHEN T. WOLPERT, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF JENIFER E. HEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATION OF MICHAEL R. STARKEY, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DEEPA HARIPRASAD, TO BE MAJOR.

ARMY NOMINATION OF DALE T. WALTMAN, TO BE COLONEL.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH VINCENT E. BUGGS AND ENDING WITH JAMES M. ZEPP III, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SHONTHELLE C. ADAMS AND ENDING WITH JOSEPH S. ZUFFANTI, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ANDREA C. ALICEA AND ENDING WITH GIOVANNY P. ZALAMAR, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ERIC B. ABDUL AND ENDING WITH SARA I. ZOESCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH GARY S. ANSELMO AND ENDING WITH JOHN G. ZIERDT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DEAN R. KLENZ AND ENDING WITH JAMES J. RICHE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RICHARD L. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH KENNETH S. SHEDAROWICH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM ANDINO AND ENDING WITH CHRISTOPHER P. WILLARD, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID B. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH CARL W. THURMOND, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY G. BAUMGARTNER AND ENDING WITH MAURI M. THOMAS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ELIZABETH A. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH MARGARET L. YOUNG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH TONIA M. CROWLEY AND ENDING WITH CHERYL M. K. ZEISE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JENNIFER M. AHRENS AND ENDING WITH TODD W. TRAVER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RAMIE K. BARFUSS AND ENDING WITH DENTONIO WORRELL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH DAVID J. ADAM AND ENDING WITH VICTOR Y. YU, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH APRIL CRITELLI AND ENDING WITH GREGG A. VIGEANT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH THOMAS F. CALDWELL AND ENDING WITH BRONSON B. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH CAROL L. COPPOCK AND ENDING WITH MARIE N. WRIGHT, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH NORMAN S. CHUN AND ENDING WITH HARRY W. HATCH, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

ARMY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH LAVETTA L. BENNETT AND ENDING WITH CRAIG W. STRONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 29, 2015.

IN THE NAVY

NAVY NOMINATION OF AUDRY T. OXLEY, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

NAVY NOMINATION OF MARK B. LYLES, TO BE CAPTAIN.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUSSELL P. BATES AND ENDING WITH HORACIO G. TAN, WHICH NOMI-

NATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH SYLVESTER C. ADAMAH AND ENDING WITH CHADWICK D. WHITE, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH RUBEN A. ALCOCER AND ENDING WITH MELISSIA A. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH ACCURSIA A. BALDASSANO AND ENDING WITH JACQUELINE R. WILLIAMS, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JASON S. AYEROFF AND ENDING WITH BRENT E. TROYAN, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH JERRY J. BAILEY AND ENDING WITH ERIN R. WILFONG, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH WILLIAM M. ANDERSON AND ENDING WITH JEFFREY R. WESSEL, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

NAVY NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MARIA A. ALAVANJA AND ENDING WITH VINCENT A. I. ZIZAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JULY 23, 2015.

FOREIGN SERVICE

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH MAURA BARRY BOYLE AND ENDING WITH ANTHONY WOLAK, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE RECEIVED BY THE SENATE AND APPEARED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD ON JUNE 10, 2015.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS VICE COMMANDANT, UNITED STATES COAST GUARD, AND TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 47:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. CHARLES D. MICHEL

COAST GUARD NOMINATION OF STEPHEN R. BIRD, TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDER.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

MARIE THERESE DOMINGUEZ, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE PIPELINE AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS**SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS**

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and

any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, August 6, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED**SEPTEMBER 10**

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Adam J. Szubin, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury.

SD-538

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

SENATE—Thursday, August 6, 2015

The Senate met at 11:30 and 5 seconds a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2015.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PERDUE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MORNING BUSINESS

WILDFIRE FUNDING

• Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, Congress needs to find a fiscally-responsible solution to wildfire funding and fire borrowing. While the Forest Service still has half a billion dollars remaining for fire suppression, there are years when firefighting costs exceed predicted funding levels. We need a focused discussion on this issue and I plan to begin the conversation with key offices and States—Wyoming, Oregon, Idaho, Arizona, Alaska, Washington, California, Nevada, Montana, Colorado, and others that would like to join and will be constructive to its resolution. I know there are differences of opinion out there as to how to solve this problem, but the key to solving it is getting everyone in a room to discuss it. As cap adjustments are under the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee, I look forward to working with my colleagues on a durable and long-lasting solution that fits our fiscal priorities and is responsible budgeting.

• Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Wyoming that we need to find a solution to this problem and I have introduced legislation with Senator CRAPO that currently sits in the Budget Committee. Oregon is on fire and the Forest Service tells me that with current fire seasons getting longer and current budgetary constraints, the days of spending over 50 percent of their budget on suppressing

fires is here to stay. The time for talking is coming to an end and the time to negotiate a fix to this very serious problem is at hand. I would like to work under the leadership of my friend, the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, over the summer, on an answer to this chronic problem.

• Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Wyoming. Senator MURKOWSKI and I have been working together to propose a solution to this problem as well, and I am proud to be able to say that we have been working with Senator ENZI, Senator WYDEN, and our other colleagues. We have to enable the Forest Service to have both the resources it needs to deal with wildfires, but also the resources it needs to manage the National forests. The current system of paying for wildfires by, perpetually, taking funding away from the programs that enable the Agency to maintain recreation facilities and complete important restoration projects is simply unacceptable. We can't sit idle and expect this budget issue to fix itself. We all agree a budget cap adjustment of some sort is the solution needed to end the practice of fire borrowing. I appreciate Senator WYDEN's efforts to fix this problem, and I appreciate Senator MURKOWSKI's recent work to fix this problem. Most of these solutions have the common theme of requiring a budget cap adjustment, and we are looking to your leadership, Senator ENZI, to assist us with that. People's homes are burning because of these wildfires. We need to get the Forest Service and the Department of the Interior the money they need to respond to wildfires, but we also need to ensure the money is being well spent. We have a number of ideas to round out the solution. I will be working over the summer with my colleagues to develop comprehensive legislation that solves this budget problem, but also ensures we see fewer large wildfires and fewer houses being lost to them. Our solution—and I want to emphasize our—will be a solution that is easy to explain to the public and that is able to get to the President's desk to be enacted.

• Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman of the Budget Committee for his leadership on the important issue of wildfire budgeting. I think we all agree that the way wildfire management has been funded is broken and that it is past time that we fix it. Earlier this year, the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that I chair reported the Interior Appropriations bill. My bill provided full funding for the average an-

nual cost of fire fighting over the past 10 years, and included a limited cap adjustment to access disaster relief funding only if the agencies exhaust 100 percent of that 10-year average of wildfire suppression funds. This proposal would end the disruptive and unsustainable practice of borrowing from, and later repaying money to, other government programs to deal with fire emergencies, while also providing up front the resources the agencies need to fight fires in all but the most extreme years. But there is more to the issue of wildfire budgeting as my colleague, Senator CANTWELL, points out. We need to ensure the dollars Congress appropriates are well spent. Senator CANTWELL has some good ideas on how to do that. I stand ready to work with my colleagues to advance a solution that will finally fix this longstanding problem in a fiscally responsible manner.

• Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I rise to support the efforts of the Senator from Wyoming to address budgetary issues impacting how our Nation fights wildfires. Like the State of Wyoming, Idaho's forested lands are consistently under threat of catastrophic wildfires. According to the National Interagency Fire Center in Boise, in the last year alone there were 1,456 wildland fires in Idaho that burned 714,057 acres. As more resources go toward fire suppression, resources that could be used to implement projects that improve forest health, benefit forest communities, and enhance public safety are squeezed. We know that wildfires are going to continue to be a threat, and we can better prepare for the increasing costs of wildland fire management by making needed changes that will support the preparation of firefighters and land managers. That is why I partnered with Senator RON WYDEN in introducing legislation, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, to provide for more efficient and effective fire management. I look forward to working with my colleagues across the West, and in the Senate Budget Committee in particular, on legislation that would better budget for our Nation's fire suppression activities.

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I want to commend the Budget Committee chairman for his ongoing efforts to tackle the fire-borrowing issue. We all agree that the Forest Service should receive the funding it needs to fight fires. I am also glad that there is growing agreement that the Forest Service should budget for 100 percent of its wildfire suppression costs as proposed in legislation introduced by me and my

colleagues, Senator FLAKE and Senator BARRASSO. We also know that science has shown how forest restoration is highly effective in reducing wildfire severity. I look forward to working with Senator WYDEN and the chairman of the Senate Budget Committee on an agreeable solution that protects wildfire prevention and wildfire suppression as the two top priorities of the Forest Service.

• Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, there is wide agreement that the current wildfire funding system is broken. There is no doubt that wildfires are disastrous and the cost to suppress them continues to grow. But we cannot let the costly and disastrous nature of wildfire make us lose sight that many of the costs of fighting fire can be anticipated. Like Senator MCCAIN, I am pleased that there is growing consensus that the fiscally responsible way to deal with these wildfires is to allow access to additional funds through a limited process only after agencies have been appropriated for 100 percent of the anticipated costs of suppression. I look forward to working with my colleagues on enacting this funding fix as well as incorporating provisions that ease the removal of the hazardous fuels that create fire-prone landscapes.

• Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I want to thank the senior Senator from Wyoming and chairman of the Senate Budget Committee for his steadfast approach to addressing budget priorities in a responsible and fiscally sound manner. There is bipartisan agreement to end the practice of fire borrowing. If Congress is going to consider budgetary cap adjustments under the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee, the Forest Service should first budget for 100 percent of its wildfire suppression costs before cap adjustments are made. In order to bring down the long-term cost of wildfire suppression, Congress should also actively engage in supporting activities which reduce the cost and severity of wildfire such as hazardous fuels treatments, thinning, and other active forest management projects. I have joined with Senators MCCAIN and FLAKE on legislation to address these issues. I have also put forward legislation to treat more acres to improve forest health and reduce the risk of wildfire. I want to work with my colleagues in the Senate, and specifically Chairman ENZI, to prevent future fire borrowing and reduce the long-term economic and ecological costs associated with wildfires.

• Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the Forest Service announced that for the first time in its 110-year history, it is spending more than 50 percent of its budget just to fight wildfires. The Forest Service expects this problem to keep getting worse. Within a decade, they are projecting that firefighting costs will rise to two thirds of the Forest Service budget.

The Forest Service can no longer sustain these costs of fighting wildfires while continuing other critical functions of managing our Federal forests. It is long overdue that Congress eliminate the vicious cycle of fire borrowing, where the Forest Service is forced to dig further and further into its budget to fight fires at the expense of critical work to reduce hazardous fuels from the forest and other forest management. I am very grateful that we have such a strong bipartisan group of colleagues working together on this critical matter. I thank my colleagues who are joining me today, and I note that it is this kind of bipartisan cooperation that gets the issues done, along with the strong leadership of Senator WYDEN who has championed this issue with a bipartisan bill for the last two Congresses, in addition to the strong leadership of Senator MURKOWSKI which allowed us to take a big step in the right direction in the Interior Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016. It is crucial to our communities facing threats of wildfire that we keep this cooperation going. I will keep working with my colleagues to solve this urgent budgetary crisis.

• Mr. DAINES. I want to thank Chairman ENZI for his commitment to solving the wildfire funding challenge that is increasingly forcing the Forest Service to spend more of its budget suppressing fires rather than preventing them through enhanced management. Like many other Western States, Montana has already experienced several high-intensity fires this year. The fire season thus far has been one of the worst in the past decade and has only made more evident the urgent need for a wildfire funding solution. As a co-sponsor of the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act, I believe it is critical that Congress end fire borrowing and ensure that the Forest Service can spend more of its budget on making our National forests more resilient to fire, while also equipping the Agency with the tools and authorities it needs to restore active management. I look forward to working with Chairman ENZI, other Budget Committee members, and fellow colleagues to find consensus on these high-priority reforms.

• Mr. TESTER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues in wanting to fix the way we fund fire. We have to start using common sense and budget for catastrophic wildfires like we do for other natural disasters. Unfortunately, due to congressional inaction and growing costs associated with fighting wildfires, the Forest Service is increasingly turning into a firefighting agency. This means fewer resources for smart public land management. Montana's National forests benefit our outdoor recreation economy, support timber jobs in rural communities, and preserve the drinking water that Montanans rely on. I look forward to work-

ing with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address both the issues of fire borrowing and the increasing costs of fighting fires. The Forest Service cannot continue to absorb these increasing costs without undermining other critical priorities, from timber harvest and research to conservation and recreation management. There is real bipartisan support for getting something done on this issue and I am confident a growing number of our colleagues will join us as we push forward this fall.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT

• Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which we will celebrate today, August 6. I want to spend a few minutes talking about Freedom Summer, the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the civil rights challenges we still face today, and how Senators can work together to make this a more perfect union and guarantee equal justice under the law to all Americans, as promised by our Constitution.

On January 23, 1964, the States ratified the 24th Amendment to the Constitution, which provides that "the rights of citizens of the United States to vote in any primary or other [Federal] election . . . shall not be denied or abridged . . . by any State by reason of failure to pay any poll tax or other tax."

Freedom Summer was a campaign in Mississippi to register Black voters during the summer of 1964. In 1964, most Black voters were disenfranchised by law or practice in Mississippi, notwithstanding the 15th Amendment to the Constitution, which was ratified in 1870. The 15th Amendment provides that "the rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by . . . any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

The national uproar in response to the deaths of three civil rights workers—James Earl Chaney, Andrew Goodman and Michael "Mickey" Schwerner—helped lead to the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Southern States, however, continued to impose barriers on African-American citizens' right to vote even after the enactment of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

The following summer, Martin Luther King, Jr. and other civil rights leaders led a series of voter registration marches from Selma to Montgomery, AL. Ultimately, the marchers were met with force on March 7, 1965, known as Bloody Sunday, at the Edmund Pettus Bridge in Montgomery, AL. Television news reports shocked the conscience of Americans, who could not believe that their fellow citizens were ruthlessly beaten by the police

while exercising their First Amendment right to peaceably assemble and petition their government for redress of grievances.

A few days later, President Lyndon B. Johnson addressed a joint session of Congress and called for the enactment of the Voting Rights Act, ended his speech with the old refrain from the civil rights movement: we shall overcome. Congress did act and pass the Voting Rights Act, as this week we celebrate the 50th anniversary.

So as we celebrate the anniversaries of these landmark pieces of civil rights legislation, we are reminded that there is more work to be done. Today I must urge my colleagues to address the recent pernicious efforts to restrict the franchise and limit access to the fundamental right to vote. This past weekend, *The New York Times Magazine* ran an article entitled "Overcome," about a systematic effort by a small group of activists to dismantle the protections in the Voting Rights Act. I commend this article for review by my colleagues.

Two summers ago, the Supreme Court issued its decision in *Shelby County v. Holder*, which struck down section 4 of the Voting Rights Act, invalidating the coverage formula that determines which jurisdictions are subject to the preclearance provisions of the act.

Congress must act to reverse the decision by the Supreme Court which overturned several important precedents. As much as we wish it wasn't so, racism has not disappeared from America and there continue to be individuals and groups who would use our voting system to deliberately minimize the rights of minority voters. Congress overwhelmingly reauthorized the Voting Rights Act in 2006 after building an extensive record that made a compelling case for the continued need to protect minority voters from discrimination.

I strongly agree with Justice Ginsburg's dissent that "in truth, the evolution of voting discrimination into more subtle second-generation barriers is powerful evidence that a remedy as effective as preclearance remains vital to protect minority voting rights and prevent backsliding." I am deeply disappointed that the Court put voting rights in jeopardy by ignoring reality and disregarding the power of Congress to enforce the 15th Amendment of the Constitution by appropriate legislation.

I am a proud co-sponsor of Senator LEAHY's legislation, S. 1659, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015. The Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 responds to current conditions in voting today by restoring the full protections of the original, bipartisan Voting Rights Act of 1965, which was last reauthorized on a bipartisan vote by Congress in 2006, but significantly weakened by the Supreme Court in 2013.

Following the *Shelby County* decision 2 years ago, several States passed sweeping voter suppression laws that disproportionately prevent minorities, the elderly, and the youth from voting. The Leahy bill provides the tools to address these discriminatory practices and seeks to protect all Americans' right to vote.

The Leahy bill establishes a targeted process for reviewing voting changes in jurisdictions nationwide, focused on measures that have historically been used to discriminate against voters. The process for reviewing changes in voting is limited to a set of measures, such as voter IDs, that have historically been found to have the greatest discriminatory impact.

Congress should also take up and pass the Democracy Restoration Act, DRA, S. 772, which I have introduced. The Democracy Restoration Act would restore voting rights in Federal elections to approximately 5.8 million citizens who have been released from prison and are back living in their communities.

Notwithstanding the 15th Amendment, many States passed laws during the Jim Crow period after the Civil War to make it more difficult for newly-freed slaves to vote in elections. Such laws included poll taxes, literacy tests, and disenfranchisement measures.

Some disenfranchisement measures applied to misdemeanor convictions and in practice could result in lifetime disenfranchisement, even for individuals that successfully reintegrated into their communities as law-abiding citizens.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 did sweep away numerous State laws and procedures that had denied African Americans and other minorities their constitutional right to vote. For example, the act outlawed the use of literacy or history tests that voters had to pass before registering to vote or casting their ballot.

The act specifically prohibits States from imposing any "voting qualification or prerequisite to voting, or standard, practice, or procedure . . . to deny or abridge the right of any citizen of the United States to vote on account of race or color."

In 2015, I am concerned that there are still several areas where the legacy of Jim Crow laws and State disenfranchisement statutes lead to unfairness in Federal elections.

First, State laws governing the restoration of voting rights vary widely throughout the country, such that persons in some States can easily regain their voting rights, while in other States persons effectively lose their right to vote permanently.

Second, these State disenfranchisement laws have a disproportionate impact on racial and ethnic minorities.

Third, this patchwork of State laws results in the lack of a uniform stand-

ard for eligibility to vote in Federal elections, and leads to an unfair disparity and unequal participation in Federal elections based solely on residence.

Finally, studies indicate that former prisoners who have voting rights restored are less likely to reoffend, and disenfranchisement hinders their rehabilitation and reintegration into their community.

The legislation would restore voting rights to prisoners after their release from incarceration. It requires that prisons receiving Federal funds notify people about their right to vote in Federal elections when they are leaving prison, sentenced to probation, or convicted of a misdemeanor.

The legislation is crafted to apply to Federal elections, and retains the States' authorities to generally establish voting qualifications. This legislation is consistent with congressional authority under the Constitution and voting rights statutes.

I am pleased that this legislation has been endorsed by a large coalition of public interest organizations, including: civil rights and reform organizations; religious and faith-based organizations; and law enforcement and criminal justice organizations. In particular I want to thank the Brennan Center for Justice, the ACLU, the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, and the NAACP for their work here.

I also urge Congress to take up legislation that I have introduced in the past with Senator SCHUMER, the Deceptive Practices and Voter Intimidation Prevention Act. Voter suppression and intimidation are still very much alive in our Nation.

From misleading and fraudulent information about elections to voter intimidation and robocalls designed to suppress the vote, deceptive voting practices are often aimed at depriving minority communities of their voice in our democracy. The U.S. Constitution guarantees and protects the right of every American citizen to vote, and we have a duty to protect and ensure that right.

Unfortunately, we have seen a resurgence of deceptive voter practices in recent years. In 2006, during my own election to the Senate, thousands of minority voters in Maryland were targeted for misleading information designed to suppress their vote. Nationwide, there have been numerous reports of efforts to suppress the minority vote by putting out wrong information about election dates and location of polling places, along with suggestions that voters who had outstanding parking tickets would be arrested if they tried to vote.

This legislation is designed to protect voters across the Nation from election fraud and voter intimidation by creating criminal penalties for deceptive voting practices and by giving

individual voters the right to take action. If deceptive practices are found to have occurred before election day, the U.S. Attorney General can take corrective action to halt distribution of such information and to set the record straight. After Federal elections, the Attorney General also would be required to report to Congress on the allegations of deceptive practices and the actions taken to correct such practices.

Let me also mention another issue relating to civil rights, which is the right to serve on a Federal jury. My view is that after release from prison, ex-offenders should be given both rights and responsibilities. So in addition to restoring the right to vote as we seek to reduce recidivism and successfully integrate ex-offenders back into the community, I would also permit ex-offenders to perform the civic duty of serving on a jury of their peers.

This legislative change is a part of my BALTIMORE Act, S. 1610, the Building and Lifting Trust In Order to Multiply Opportunities and Racial Equality. I introduced this legislation after the death of Freddie Gray in Baltimore while in police custody. It also includes my End Racial Profiling Act, ERPA.

Next month the NAACP, which is headquartered in Baltimore, and other civil rights groups will conclude its Journey for Justice march at the U.S. Capitol as part of their Justice Summer campaign. This historic 860-mile march from Selma, AL to Washington, DC, will mobilize activists and advance a focused national policy agenda.

This policy agenda seeks to protect the right of every American to a fair criminal justice system and uncorrupted and unfettered access to the ballot box.

In particular, the march will call for the enactment of the Voting Rights Advancement Act and the End Racial Profiling Act. Congress should take up and pass these two critically important pieces of legislation.

It would be the appropriate way to celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act of 1965.●

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

● Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss one of the great moral challenges of our time—human trafficking. The term human trafficking involves crimes of forced labor, sexual exploitation, debt bondage, forced marriage, and the sale and exploitation of children. Trafficking in persons destroys people and corrodes communities. It distorts labor markets and undermines stability and the rule of law. It is fueled by greed, violence, and corruption.

There are at least 21 million victims of human trafficking in the world—and over 5 million of them are children, ac-

cording to the International Labor Organization, ILO. Forced labor alone generates more than \$150 billion in profits annually, making it one of the largest income sources for international criminals, second only to drug trafficking. Trafficking victims range from women enslaved as domestic workers in countries as diverse as Saudi Arabia and Singapore to Nepali construction workers building stadiums for the 2022 World Cup in Qatar. It also ensnares Rohingya and Cambodian men and boys on Thai fishing boats working to put fish in European and American grocery stores. It includes countless Venezuelan women and girls, some lured from poor towns in the interior to urban centers, who are then subjected to sex trafficking. Even in our own country, cases of human trafficking have been reported in all 50 States.

Traffickers take advantage of conflict, the collapse of state institutions, and even natural disasters—like the recent earthquake in Nepal—to prey on vulnerable civilians. We are witnessing terrorist groups like ISIL and Boko Haram that proudly build their “states” on the trade in and enslavement of women and children.

There has been some progress. This year marks the 15th anniversary of the Trafficking Victims Protection Act. The TVPA, and the annual Trafficking In Persons, TIP, Report it mandates, have played a major role in raising global awareness of human trafficking and galvanizing both civil society and governments to address both labor and sex trafficking crimes. The report analyzes the efforts of foreign governments, and our own, to comply with minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking in persons, as set out by the TVPA.

The TIP Report has been widely regarded as the “gold standard” for trafficking information, and as an essential tool for ensuring continued progress against the scourge of human trafficking. The value of the TIP Report, and the United States’ credibility on this critical issue, relies heavily on the integrity of that report.

On Monday, July 27, the Department of State released the 2015 TIP Report. I have great respect for the small, dedicated staff at the Department of State’s Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, as well as our numerous embassies around the world that help collect credible information for the report. Nevertheless, I was struck by the strong response to the 2015 report by outside country experts and frontline advocates who have worked in the trenches on human trafficking for years. They raised significant questions about the integrity and neutrality of the 2015 TIP Report and the decision to upgrade Uzbekistan, Saudi Arabia, Cuba, and Malaysia, among others. We need to listen carefully to their views.

Of particular concern is the upgrade of Malaysia, which I want to discuss briefly. Malaysia has a serious human trafficking problem, which is why the State Department downgraded Malaysia last year to a Tier 3 country in the TIP Report, a level that includes the worst human trafficking offenders in the world. In Malaysia, the use of forced labor is pervasive in agriculture, construction, electronics, and textile industries, and the sex trade industry.

This year, the State Department upgraded Malaysia to the Tier 2 Watch List on the grounds that the government had made significant efforts to comply with the minimum standards to combat human trafficking. Those efforts by the government included beginning to reform its flawed victim protection regime, along with its legal framework, and consultations with civil society. The Malaysian authorities increased the number of investigations and prosecutions—although the low number of convictions remained disproportionate to the scale of the problem. The 2015 TIP Report states that the Malaysian Government had three convictions of traffickers in 2014, a substantial decrease from the nine convictions reported in the 2014 TIP Report.

While Malaysia has taken small steps that seem to indicate some recent progress, these steps do not appear to me to be sufficient to justify an upgrade. Evidence of the trafficking problems in Malaysia continued outside of the 2015 TIP reporting period, which ended on March 31, 2015. For example, in May 2015, mass graves believed to contain bodies of 139 Rohingya trafficking victims were found in abandoned jungle camps along Malaysia’s northern border, along with pens likely used as cages for the victims.

Malaysia is a party to the Trans-Pacific Partnership, TPP, negotiations. The juxtaposition of the administration’s pursuit of the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement in the case of Malaysia and the upgrade of Malaysia’s TIP tier ranking at the same time has raised concerns among some observers regarding the integrity and veracity of the 2015 ranking process.

I look forward to hearing more from the administration in the days ahead about the considerations taken into account for the TIP ranking process and, in particular, the decision to upgrade Malaysia. That is why Chairman CORKER and I scheduled a hearing on this issue in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Archibald MacLeish, the writer and former Librarian of Congress, said:

There are those who will say that the liberation of humanity, the freedom of man and mind, is nothing but a dream. They are right. It is the American Dream.

We owe it to the millions of men, women, and children around the world who suffer from the horrifying depredations of modern slavery to maintain

America's leadership, reputation, and resolve in the fight against human trafficking.●

RECOGNIZING YORK COUNTY COMMUNITY COLLEGE

● Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on September 5, 1995, York County Technical College opened its doors in a hotel in Wells, ME, with five associate's degree and certificate programs and 156 students. Now known as York County Community College, the college in 2015 has three campuses, more than 30 programs, and some 1,700 full and part-time students. I congratulate this remarkable institution for 20 years of contributions to the people of Maine's southernmost county and to our entire State.

This truly is a community effort. In the years before the school was established, business, civic, and education leaders in York County formed Partners for Progress, a coalition to address the challenge of developing a better-trained workforce for a fast-changing global economy. The demand for technical education was immediately apparent: by 1997, in just its third year, the numbers for enrollment and programs both tripled. In recent years, York County Community College has twice been named one of the fastest-growing community colleges in the Nation.

In 2003, Maine's outstanding technical college system expanded its mission to become a community college system that enhances skills, strengthens our State's economy, and increases access to college. Nearly one-half of York County Community College students are first-generation college students, and some 40 percent of graduates go on to enroll at a 4-year college. Under the leadership of President Barbara Finkelstein, a dedicated faculty and staff, and a committed YCCC Foundation, York County Community College reaches out in many ways. With programs for seniors and students of high school age and younger, lifelong learning is a core part of the school's mission. The Center for Entrepreneurship encourages the innovation that is essential to our economy. Arts and culture offerings and the "Eggs and Issues" speakers program enrich the entire community.

The people of Maine are proud of our community college system. The reason is clear: students of all ages and backgrounds are finding affordable tuition and the skills they need to succeed. They are finding real value.

York County Community College is an important part of that success. Since its inception, the college has educated more than 20,000 people in many fields, including medical fields, technology, business management, skilled trades, and many other occupations. It has fueled the economy, cre-

ated opportunity, and helped improve the quality of life for all. The accomplishments of York County Community College during the past 20 years are inspiring, and I know the best is yet to come.●

RECOGNIZING OUTSTANDING MINNESOTA LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICIALS

● Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize three outstanding Minnesota police officers. The Minnesota Police and Peace Officers Association, the largest association representing Minnesota's rank-and-file police officers, recently met for its annual conference and named Sergeant Mark Ficcadenti of the St. Paul Police Department Police Officer of the Year and gave Honorable Mention Awards to Officer Mark Ross of the St. Paul Police Department and State Trooper Brian Beuning.

Sergeant Ficcadenti is a 30-year veteran of the St. Paul Police Department where he serves an indispensable role performing community outreach and forging relationships with the most vulnerable immigrant populations. Sergeant Ficcadenti organizes events such as the East African Junior Police Academy, Ramadan celebrations with the local Somali community, and the "Safe and Sound" program that allows people to meet and get to know local police officers. His tireless efforts to ensure that the police department serves all communities has promoted safety, encouraged community cooperation, and fostered trust in law enforcement.

Honorable Mention Award recipient Officer Mark Ross of the St. Paul Police Department is a former school resource officer, whose awareness prompted him to look into a female high school student's frequent absences and suspicious relationship with her father. After some investigation, Ross revealed that the student's father had been abusing and neglecting the young girl for years. The father was convicted and is now serving a 25-year sentence in prison. As a result of Officer Ross' actions, the young woman has graduated from high school and has been accepted into a Minnesota college.

The second Honorable Mention Award recipient, Minnesota State Trooper Beuning, exhibited heroism and outstanding professionalism when dispatched last year to help a woman trapped in her car during a flash flood in Beaver Creek, MN. After wading through knee-deep waters, State Trooper Beuning calmed the trapped woman by standing next to the car and speaking to her through a cracked window. Seconds after Trooper Beuning and firefighters removed the woman through the window of her car, the vehicle was swept away by floodwaters. Three months after his act of bravery,

Beuning was given the Officer of the Month Award by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund.

I join all of my fellow Minnesotans in applauding these three distinguished public servants. I would also like to thank not only these three individuals but all of Minnesota's brave law enforcement officers who keep our communities safe.●

RECOGNIZING INTERMOUNTAIN HEALTHCARE

● Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to one of the country's exemplary organizations, Intermountain Healthcare, which this year celebrates 40 years of service to people in Utah and the surrounding area. Based in Salt Lake City, Intermountain Healthcare has been a longtime provider of top-of-the-line care, as well as a leading example among the country's integrated health systems.

Prior to the organization's inception in 1975, the 15 hospitals that would become Intermountain Healthcare were administered and operated by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. After deciding it would divest its hospitals, the church yielded its responsibilities to a new, secular, not-for-profit organization known as Intermountain Healthcare.

Since that time, Intermountain Healthcare has grown to include 21 hospitals across the State of Utah, as well as one in Idaho. In addition to its hospitals, Intermountain also includes more than 185 clinics and 1,400 multi-specialty doctors and advanced-practice clinicians. Its not-for-profit health plan, SelectHealth, serves more than 750,000 members. Its integrated structure allows Intermountain to work with people at all stages of their lives, before and after they may require medical care, to optimize health. Intermountain Healthcare has been completely dedicated to its mission of "helping people live the healthiest lives possible," and for the last 40 years it has successfully accomplished that mission.

Intermountain strives to provide the highest quality care and services to all at an affordable cost, at times, even providing care for those unable to finance their own medical needs. In 2014, in more than 268,000 cases, Intermountain Healthcare donated more than \$384 million in services to those who were unable to pay. In addition, Intermountain operates safety net community clinics for people who are uninsured or who have low incomes, and it provides financial support to 30 independent community clinics in the region. These clinics cared for people in more than 366,000 visits last year. Among its many other community benefits, Intermountain also provided \$33 million to support medical training

programs, residencies, and other health-related education. Intermountain Healthcare is a vital leader within the Utah community and truly embodies its values of integrity, trust, excellence, accountability, and mutual respect that are critical in the provision of health care. Led by a volunteer board of trustees who donate their time without pay themselves, Intermountain is making a huge impact in the world of health care, as well as in the lives of the individuals it serves.

Intermountain Healthcare has for years been recognized as one of the leading organizations of its kind. This year Intermountain Healthcare had five hospitals included on the Truven Health Analytics annual 100 Top Hospitals study. There was only one other health system in the U.S. that had five hospitals on the list. In 2014, Intermountain was named to the InformationWeek Elite 100 rankings, which compiles a list of top business technology innovators in the U.S. These are just a few examples from the resumé of accomplishments and recognition Intermountain Healthcare has rightfully earned.

In addition to the administration of its health services and medical group, Intermountain Healthcare provides key emergency transport services in its region. In 1978, Intermountain Life Flight made its first helicopter patient transport, making it only the seventh air medical helicopter service in the United States. Life Flight now owns and operates 7 helicopters and 3 fixed-wing aircraft. This operation has been crucial to locating, rescuing, and saving patients who are in time-sensitive, critical condition.

The growth, quality, and innovation of Intermountain Healthcare is impressive, but what stands out even more is this organization's character. It has always sought to follow the highest ethical standard, even in cases when legal standards were lower or when transparency may have led to embarrassment. One example was its decision to proactively notify certain patients of possible exposure to a rare disease, even though the risk was very low and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention said that notification was not required. Another example was its decision to voluntarily self-disclose potential compliance issues with a Federal law to the U.S. attorney, even though it exposed itself to significant penalties. Intermountain is an organization that always takes the high road, seeks to do the right thing, and raises the bar for ethical behavior.

When I look at Intermountain Healthcare, I see an example to the country of what it means to serve. I see health care providers who make people a priority rather than profit. I see an organization that values honesty and ethical conduct with its patients, its peers, and the government. We in Utah

are blessed by such a high standard of conduct. May we all follow this example as we fulfill our duty to honorably serve our fellow citizens and contribute to our community.

Please join me in commending Intermountain Healthcare on the leadership it has demonstrated and the positive influence it has had on American health care in its first 40 years of service.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 5, 2015, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 6, 2015:

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 833. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out certain major medical facility projects for which appropriations were made for fiscal year 2015, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. KING:

S. 2003. A bill to facilitate the free market for distributed energy resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. LEE (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2004. A bill to amend section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, to modify the authority of the President of the United States to declare national monuments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. VITTER:

S. 2005. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. KING, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. JOHNSON, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2006. A bill to reform the process by which Federal agencies analyze and formulate new regulations and guidance documents; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. 2007. A bill to create a consistent framework to expedite the recruitment of highly qualified personnel who perform information technology, cybersecurity, and cyber-related functions to enhance cybersecurity across the Federal Government; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. MERKLEY:

S. 2008. A bill to enhance transportation programs in order to achieve an interconnected transportation system which connects people to jobs, schools, and other essential services through a multimodal network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. RUBIO):

S. 2009. A bill to prohibit the sale of arms to Bahrain; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 256

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 256, a bill to amend the definition of "homeless person" under the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act to include certain homeless children and youth, and for other purposes.

S. 330

At the request of Mr. HELLER, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the special rule for contributions of qualified conservation contributions, and for other purposes.

S. 471

At the request of Mr. PETERS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 471, a bill to improve the provision of health care for women veterans by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 952

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 952, a bill to provide for duty-free treatment of certain recreational performance outerwear, and for other purposes.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1190

At the request of Mrs. CAPITO, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1190, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure equal access of Medicare beneficiaries to community pharmacies in underserved areas as network pharmacies under Medicare prescription drug coverage, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from New York

(Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1309

At the request of Mr. PETERS, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1309, a bill to provide for the removal of default information from a borrower's credit report with respect to certain rehabilitated education loans.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1513

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1513, a bill to reauthorize the Second Chance Act of 2007.

S. 1819

At the request of Mr. DAINES, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1819, a bill to improve security at Armed Forces recruitment centers.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve ac-

countability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1919, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1948

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1948, a bill to increase awareness of the Federal student loan income-based repayment plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1967

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1967, a bill to provide for the conveyance of land of the Illiana Health Care System of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Danville, Illinois.

S. 1972

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to require air carriers to modify certain policies with respect to the use of epinephrine for in-flight emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1994

At the request of Mr. CARPER, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1994, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase certain fuel taxes and to strengthen the earned income tax credit and make permanent certain tax provisions under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.

S.J. RES. 1

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 1, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to limiting the number of terms that a Member of Congress may serve.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 245, a resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week".

AMENDMENT NO. 2590

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2590 intended to be proposed to S. 754, an original bill to improve cybersecurity in the United States through enhanced sharing of information about cybersecurity threats, and for other purposes.

APPOINTMENTS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that pursuant to the consent obtained on August 5, 2015, granting the leaders authority to make appointments during the recess of the Senate, the following appointments were made on August 6, 2015.

The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, appoints the following Members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable TOM COTTON of Arkansas, the Honorable STEVE DAINES of Montana, and the Honorable JAMES LANKFORD of Oklahoma.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 113-146, appoints the following individual to serve as a member of the Commission on Care: Lt. General Martin Steele (Ret) of Florida.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 8, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, pursuant to the provisions of H. Con. Res. 72.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 11:30 and 39 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 8, 2015, at 2 p.m.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 8, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our King, we praise You for providing for our needs. Great is Your faithfulness.

Abide with our lawmakers, enabling them to discover the unshakeable even as they labor during shaken times. In this perishable world, show them what is truly secure and constant. Lord, keep them humble, tolerant, and open-minded, always aware of their limited, fallible knowledge. Remind them that the anvil of Your everlasting truth will wear out the many hammers of skepticism, cynicism, and despair.

Lord, thank You for being the same yesterday, today, and forever.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The majority leader is recognized.

**IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT
RESOLUTION OF DISAPPROVAL**

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, today we will begin consideration of the resolution to disapprove the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the United States. This resolution seeks to constrain Iran's nuclear weapons program. I will ask all Senators to be present in the Chamber beginning tomorrow afternoon to commence debate on this important issue.

Let me extend my appreciation for the time and research many of our colleagues have given to understanding the details, the strengths, and the weaknesses of this agreement. For many, this has been a very difficult decision. For some, it was made even more difficult by assertions from the administration that the only choice

was between this agreement and war. Of course, that was never, never true. All such political statements really say is that the administration lacks the will and the leadership to pursue a stronger agreement, additional sanctions, and policies intended to end Iran's enrichment program if it cannot attain congressional agreement on the President's deal with Iran.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act passed the Senate by a vote of 98 to 1 earlier this year. It provided each of us with the opportunity to truly represent our constituents on this important issue. I expect that every Senator who voted for that measure is now entitled to an up-or-down vote—not a filibuster or artificial limits on passage but an important vote—on this resolution.

Along with the Americans we were sent here to represent, countries, businesses, and proliferation networks seeking to expand ties with Iran stand to have a simple question answered. All of the people involved in this around the world deserve to have a simple question answered: Does the Senate disapprove of this deal with Iran? Does the Senate disapprove of this deal with Iran? The Senate should not hide behind procedural obfuscation to shield the President or our individual views.

This debate should not be about a President who will leave office in 16 months; it should be about where our country will be in 16 years.

The Democratic leader said that his party strove to preserve the Corker-Cardin bill and that it was incumbent on Congress to review this agreement with the thoughtful, level-headed process this agreement deserves. I agree that is exactly what is needed right now. I know that is exactly what nearly every Senator in this body voted for. And I call on every Senator to resist attempts to obstruct a final vote and deny the American people and Congress the say they deserve on this extremely important matter.

The facts have already led many of our Democratic colleagues—including the top Democrat on the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate and the Foreign Affairs Committee in the House, as well as the likely next leader of the Democratic Party in the Senate—to come out in opposition to this agreement. Certainly those were not easy decisions for them. But these Democrats are joined in their skepticism by Americans of every political persuasion who believe this deal will make our country less safe—less safe.

Even those lawmakers who have come out in favor of the President's

agreement use terms such as “deeply flawed” to describe it. Let's remember why that is. The American people were led to believe that negotiations with Iran would be about ending its nuclear program, but that is not what the deal before us would do. We know the President's deal with Iran will not end its nuclear program but will instead leave Iran with a threshold nuclear capability recognized as legitimate by the international community—quite the opposite of the original goal. We know the President's deal with Iran will leave it with thousands of centrifuges, an advanced research and development program, and access to billions of dollars, at least some of which the President himself has acknowledged will be used to support terrorism. We know the President's deal with Iran will allow it to further ballistic missile research and strengthen its economy. In short, by almost any measure, we know Iran will emerge stronger from this deal in nearly every aspect of its national power and better positioned to expand its sphere of influence.

The Iranian nuclear program was never intended to produce nuclear energy for peaceful civilian purposes. That was never what they had in mind. Certainly Iran does not need an underground enrichment facility for those purposes or long-range ballistic missiles. Iran has employed every aspect of national power to defend the regime and the Islamic revolution to include support for terrorism, unconventional warfare, public diplomacy, cyber warfare, suppression of internal dissent, and, of course, support for proxies and terrorist groups.

We already know Iran is undertaking many activities relevant to the development of a nuclear explosive device. As the International Atomic Energy Agency revealed in a November 2011 report, it has attempted to, No. 1, procure nuclear-related equipment and materials through individuals and entities related to the military; No. 2, develop pathways for the production of nuclear material; No. 3, acquire nuclear weapons development information and documentation from a clandestine nuclear supply network; and No. 4, develop an indigenous design of a nuclear weapon, as well as test components. All of that has been done, according to the IAEA.

Moreover, as Secretaries of State Henry Kissinger and George Shultz recently observed:

The final stages of the nuclear talks have coincided with Iran's intensified efforts to expand and entrench its power in neighboring states.

They warned:

Iranian or Iranian client forces are now the pre-eminent military or political element in multiple Arab countries. Unless political restraint is linked to nuclear restraint, an agreement freeing Iran from sanctions risks empowering Iran's hegemonic efforts.

I will have more to say later in the week concerning my opposition to this agreement, and I expect every Senator will wish to explain his or her respective vote. But I would ask every Senator to keep this in mind as well: The President has said that "no deal is better than a bad deal." And while he will be out of office in a few months, the rest of the country and the world will have to deal with the predictable consequences of the President's deal for far longer than the next year and a half.

If lawmakers determine that this deal is indeed a bad one, then they have a duty to vote that way. We can work together to prepare suitable sanctions legislation and other measures required to maintain our capabilities to deal with the threat from Iran, but no matter what, we should conduct a respectful and serious debate that is consistent with the serious ramifications of this agreement.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader is recognized.

WELCOMING EVERYONE BACK

Mr. REID. Mr. President, first of all, I am very happy to welcome everyone back from our long recess. I am sure everyone worked as hard as I did. I had a week off, and I enjoyed it very much.

I also think it is important to recognize the new class of pages we have. I am always very happy to see these bright young men and women here who will devote the rest of the semester to us. They do so much and get so little recognition for it, so I appreciate all they do for us.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I gave a speech this morning at Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and it is, I think, directly how I feel about this. I am glad it got some coverage this morning.

I ask unanimous consent that the full remarks of the speech I made this morning at 10 o'clock be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR HARRY REID: REMARKS ON IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT, CARNEGIE ENDOWMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

When the Senate is gavelled into session a few hours from now, a debate that has ig-

nited passions from Tehran to Tel Aviv, from Beijing to Berlin, and from coast to coast across the United States will take center stage in the world's greatest deliberative body.

The question at hand is no small matter: Is the agreement between Iran and the international community, led by the United States, the best pathway to peace and security for America, Israel and our partners and interests?

I believe the answer is yes. And today I am gratified to say to my fellow Americans, our negotiating partners, and our allies around the world: this agreement will stand. America will uphold its commitment and we will seize this opportunity to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

While the formal debate begins this afternoon, the private negotiations that brought us to this point have been going on for years—and the public's review of the agreement has gone on for months.

During that long period, President Obama and Secretary Kerry were clear in their goals: above all, that the United States will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon.

The United States also would not sign any agreement that takes Iran at its word or relies on trust Iran has not earned.

And at the most difficult crossroads of this time-consuming and technical negotiation, President Obama and Secretary Kerry made clear that the hard choices belonged to Iran.

Now it's our turn. Now the United States has a choice to make: We can enforce an agreement that forces Iran to walk away from any nuclear-weapons program, or we can walk away from that agreement and assume responsibility for the consequences.

We can take the strongest step ever toward blocking Iran from getting a nuclear bomb, or we can block this agreement and all but ensure Iran will have the fissile material it would need to make a bomb in a matter of months. But we cannot have it both ways.

Make no mistake: blocking the bomb and blocking this agreement are two distinct choices that lead to very different futures.

I've spent a lot of time talking, listening, and thinking about the various elements of this agreement, and so have my colleagues. I've heard from nuclear scientists, the intelligence community and our military leaders.

I've listened to diplomats and experts.

I've been briefed by Secretary Kerry and Undersecretary Sherman, by Secretaries Lew and Moniz—the brilliant nuclear physicist who knows more than almost anyone of the reality of this threat, the science behind the agreement and the agreement itself.

I've heard ardent supporters and passionate opponents. I've talked with Nevadans from all walks of life. I've spoken with Israel's leaders, including Prime Minister Netanyahu and Ambassador Dermer. And I've read the text of this agreement carefully.

In all my years, I cannot think of another debate with so much expertise, passions and good faith on both sides.

It is clear to me and to the overwhelming majority of my caucus that this agreement gives us the best chance to avoid one of the worst threats in today's world—a nuclear-armed Iran. In fact, I believe this agreement is not just our best chance to avert what we fear most—I fear it is our last best chance to do so.

Before I explain why, let me first acknowledge some of the people who helped us get to this historic moment.

I mentioned President Obama and his Cabinet Secretaries, who achieved a remarkable diplomatic breakthrough.

I also want to acknowledge my colleagues, led by Senator Menendez, who helped set the stage for those negotiations by rallying the Senate and the world behind sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

I also acknowledge Senators Cardin and Corker for their leadership. The legislation they wrote created the process to review the agreement in the Congress.

I support this agreement—and the United States Senate will support President Obama's veto of any effort to undermine it—for two simple reasons:

First, this agreement will do a tremendous amount of good.

And second, blocking this agreement would lead to a tremendous amount of bad outcomes.

The bottom line is that enforcing this agreement can prevent the things we most dread—but undermining it would permit those very same dreadful consequences.

And those consequences are, in fact, unacceptable.

We all recognize the threat Iran poses to Israel, with powerful weapons and hateful words, with anti-Semitic smears and pledges of the Jewish state's destruction. No one can underestimate this menace. And no one should dismiss how much more dangerous Iran would be in this regard if it were armed with a nuclear bomb.

We also recognize the threat of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps—the threat from Iran's support for Hezbollah and Assad—of Iran's brazen human rights violations toward its own people and the Americans it holds as political prisoners and those who have disappeared. We recognize the danger Iran poses to our allies, our interests, and our own troops and diplomats serving in the Middle East.

No one is blind to the threat Iran poses. But again, no one should forget that Iran would become a threat of an entirely different magnitude if it ever were to have a nuclear weapon. I cannot think of a single challenge in the region that wouldn't get worse in that nightmare scenario.

That is why our goal, first and foremost, must be to keep Iran from getting its hands on one.

We have no illusions about the Iranian regime—which is exactly why when we are presented with the best way to stop its nuclear ambitions, we must not let that chance slip through our fingers. We must support and enforce the agreement we have reached.

The agreement that Congress now assumes the responsibility to review does a better job than any other proposal of reducing Iran's chance to get a bomb.

When our negotiators came to the table, they did so with Andrew Carnegie's advice in mind. The man who gave his name and fortune to this institution once said that "our duty is with what is practicable now—with the next step possible in our day and generation."

In our day, we know it is not practical to bomb away knowledge of how to build a nuclear weapon or erase that knowledge with sanctions. So our negotiators said, even though we cannot take away the recipe to build a bomb, we can take away both the ingredients and the use of equipment to cook one. That's what we're doing—but only if the United States upholds and enforces this agreement.

The good news is this agreement does more than take away Iran's ability to build a bomb—it gives us the ability to watch its every move.

Through strict limits and intrusive inspections, this agreement takes away Iran's

highly enriched material, and takes away Iran's ability to make more of it.

This agreement takes away Iran's ability to build any facilities or fissile material secretly and with impunity.

The agreement Iran signed forbids it from pursuing, building, or having a nuclear weapon ever. There is no expiration date on that commitment—and it is not grounded in any way in trust.

This isn't a peace treaty with Iran or a gift out of the goodness of our hearts. If we trusted Iran, we wouldn't need the video cameras and inspectors and seals and all manner of technology to make sure Iran complies.

We're not asking Iran to promise us anything and taking it at its word—we are demanding Iran prove to us it is complying with every last letter of this agreement.

Before it gets sanctions relief, Iran has to take specific actions. And if it doesn't happen, as some fear, sanctions will be imposed on Iran.

We have done everything possible to make sure that if Iran cheats, we'll know, we'll know quickly, and we'll act immediately and with the international community behind us.

That makes us safer. That makes Israel safer. That makes the world safer. That's what nuclear experts around the world know, what diplomats know, and what the overwhelming majority of my caucus knows. That is why this agreement will stand.

And to make sure this agreement succeeds, Congress must provide the oversight to ensure monitoring and enforce verification. At the same time, Congress must continue to hold the line against Iranian arms trafficking, its funding of terrorism, and demanding the return of Americans who have been taken as political prisoners and those who disappeared—priorities that were never meant to be part of this negotiation but must never be forgotten.

This agreement offers a number of different ways to cut off Iran's pathways to a bomb. There is, on the other hand, one sure-fire way to open Iran's path to destruction—and that is to reject this agreement.

As I mentioned, the second reason I support this agreement is because of what happens if we walk away from it. That would leave Iran with no limitations on any nuclear weapons program and leave the United States with no leverage to do anything about it.

If we walk away from the agreement we helped secure, think about what happens the very next day: Iran gets to keep as many centrifuges as it wants, and build as many more as it would like. Iran gets to build its stockpile of the kind of uranium and plutonium you'd need to build a bomb. Iran gets to test more advanced technologies that bring it closer to a bomb—and to do so as quickly as it wants. And when those weapons are ready, Iran gets to point them at Israel—or worse, launch them and make good on its threat to wipe Israel off the map.

Iran also gets to kick out the inspectors and hide all of this from the world.

Forget worries about 15 years or 20 years from now. All of this is what would happen tomorrow.

If we walk away from this agreement, the international sanctions regime also falls apart, meaning the tool Congress imposed to bring Iran to the table disappears from our arsenal.

Sanctions don't work if it's our idea alone—the world has to be on the same page. Here's why: America doesn't do business with Iran. We haven't for decades. But other countries made their own economic sac-

rifices in the name of pressuring Iran—and now they want to buy Iran's oil and trade with it.

So as much as we'd like for the sanctions that brought Iran to the table to also bring Iran to its knees, it's only with international cooperation that sanctions actually do anything. Like it or not, we need our partners in this effort. And our partners have told us in no uncertain terms that if the United States walks away, we'll walk away alone.

Sanctions have isolated Iran and brought us to this moment. But if we squander it and turn our backs on our international partners, it is we—the United States—who will be isolated. And worse, we would surrender our leverage to negotiate in the future.

Put it all together, and what does it mean if America blocks this agreement instead of blocking Iran's pathways to a bomb? It means Iran gets more money and more impunity to develop a nuclear weapon. It means we get far less scrutiny and far less security. It means we'll have put ourselves at a disadvantage at the very moment we let Iran become more dangerous.

Of course we still have the military option. President Obama has been crystal clear about that. But military strikes cannot solve this problem nearly as effectively as the solution before us today. Clearly, a military option could also come with significant costs and risks for both Israel and the United States. After all, that's why diplomacy is our first resort and the military option is our last.

This is why I believe blocking the agreement would actually achieve the opposite of what opponents intend. Instead of being tougher on Iran, voting against this agreement is a vote against a smart international sanctions regime, against inspections, against any international requirement that Iran backs off its nuclear program in any way. Blocking this agreement pushes the Iranians closer to a bomb rather than pushing it farther away.

General Brent Scowcroft's national-security expertise served four Republican presidents. As he said, we would be sowing further turmoil in the Middle East rather than seizing a chance and a responsibility to stabilize it. That would be a tragedy of our own making—one we cannot allow.

I respect greatly the concerns I've heard about what this agreement means for Israel. I believe this agreement makes Israel safer, and in no small part that is why I support it.

Over my decades in the Senate, my support for the safety and security of the Israeli people has been at the core of my views on the Middle East and the national security of the United States. From the Bonds for Israel dinners I attended 50 years ago, to the history of my own wife's family, my support for the State of Israel and the Jewish people has been personal and unimpeachable. And I have not been afraid to disagree with the President of the United States when it comes to Israel, whether on settlements or when the Administration opposed Congress passing specific sanctions.

We must build on our firm commitment to make sure Israel can defend itself. It will take more money and military support, but we must provide the one true democracy in the region and the one and only Jewish state in the world with the resources it needs.

The United States must also maintain its staunch support of Israel, including by using our veto in the United Nations for resolutions that isolate Israel unfairly or make it less secure.

I have read closely the letter that Secretary Kerry sent to the Senate on Sep-

tember 2. That letter lays out a number of important steps that the United States would take to support Israel's security.

One of those steps is protecting Israel's Qualitative Military Edge. Another is negotiating a new ten-year Memorandum of Understanding on military assistance. And yet another step is continuing to work with Israel on joint efforts to deal with shared threats, as well as confronting both conventional and asymmetric threats.

I've also closely reviewed the legislation that Senator Cardin is proposing, which will provide additional security assistance and assurances to Israel.

After looking at the letter and the legislation, I plan work with the White House and with both Democrats and Republicans to guarantee that the United States is doing everything possible to protect the safety and security of Israel.

And as the Administration has promised, we'll continue funding the missile-defense system that has already saved so many Israeli civilian lives. We'll also grow our strategic relationship even stronger, collaborating to detect and destroy tunnels used to terrorize Israeli civilians.

Now, after all the good this agreement will do in blocking Iran's pathways to a bomb—after all the dangers rejecting it will do by letting Iran grow more dangerous while our clout and credibility slip down the drain—after all the assurances that our commitment to Israel's security is stronger than ever—after all that, some still say they want a better deal.

But there is no such thing. There is no more plausible alternative. There is no better deal.

Opponents of this agreement, who I respect, talk often about how very real the Iranian threat is to Israel and the region—and it absolutely is. But for all the talk about what is real, the idea that we can somehow get a better deal is imaginary.

Diplomats, scientists and our international counterparts tell us it is fantasy. The agreement before us is the result of many years of hard work. We live in the real world—and in the real world, this really is the best option to keep Iran from a nuclear bomb.

Let me say a brief word about the details of getting this done.

The Senate, of course, has an important oversight role to play. When we voted nearly unanimously for the Iran Review Act, we voted to give the Senate that role. We voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. It is absurd to argue—as some are doing now—that by voting for a process with three possible and very different outcomes, senators somehow obligated themselves to vote to advance a specific outcome. They did no such thing.

I hope we can avoid the usual and unnecessary procedural hurdles. Democrats have already agreed to forgo our opportunity to filibuster, and I've offered Leader McConnell the chance to go straight to a vote on passage of the resolution. But of course, as he has noted many times in the past, everything of importance in the Senate requires 60 votes. So passage will require 60 votes.

There is no precedent in recent history for an issue of this magnitude getting consideration in the Senate without having to secure 60 votes. This is not about how any one leader manages the floor—this is a precedent stretching back decades.

Finally, of all the many important things at stake here, American leadership is one of them.

After convening our international partners in common cause, rallying the world behind tough sanctions, after negotiating and negotiating and negotiating some more—the way America acts now will inform the way we are viewed on the world stage and the credibility with which we can negotiate in the future.

If America reneges on this agreement, we will lose more than the compliance of our adversary—we will lose the confidence of our allies.

America led the negotiations to stop any Iranian nuclear program, and now it is time for Congress to reaffirm America's leadership by supporting this agreement. We cannot and will not allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon. Neither the United States, nor Israel, our Gulf partners, a volatile Middle East, or anyone in the world can risk that danger. I believe it is our responsibility to avoid that threat.

Let's heed Andrew Carnegie's reminder of our duty to respect what is practical and to respond with pragmatic solutions—solutions like the one before us. As he said, "When a statesman has in his keeping the position and interests of his country, it is not with things as they are to be in the future, but with things as they are in the present."

The agreement on the table at present is a good one.

It is our best chance to ensure Iran never builds the worst weapon on earth. I will do everything in my power to make sure it is enforced and effective—to make sure, in turn, we are safer and more secure—in our day and generation, and in the days and generations to come.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I note that there are a lot of things in this speech that I think are important, but the one thing certainly that is so vitally important is that no one has come up with an alternative. Any alternative is imaginary. It is fantasy land. I speak about that in my remarks.

Today we face one of the most critical national security issues of our time: whether to support the Iran agreement which would stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. That is what the agreement is—to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

From the beginning, Senate Democrats have done everything possible to move the debate on the Iran agreement forward in the quickest way possible. We agreed to skip procedural votes and allow the Senate to begin debate on the resolution itself. And today I am proposing that the Senate move forward in the most efficient way possible. I am proposing that after the Senate concludes 3 days of serious debate on this issue, we then move to a vote on passage of the resolution, of course with a 60-vote threshold. But Republicans are insisting that the Senate go through all procedural steps, including cloture, on their own bill.

As the Republican leader, Senator MCCONNELL, has stated numerous times—not a few times, not many times, but numerous times—requiring 60 votes on matters of enormous importance is simply "the way the Senate operates."

Here are a few examples of the statements he has made. I could spend lit-

erally all afternoon talking about quotes that are very similar to what I am about to recite. July 30, 2011, Senator MCCONNELL:

Now, look, we know that on controversial matters in the Senate, it has for quite some time required 60 votes. So I would say again to my friend—

That is me—

it is pretty hard to make a credible case that denying a vote on your own proposal is anything other than a filibuster.

Listen, everybody, that is what Senator MCCONNELL said. Again, just a few days later:

I wish to make clear to the American people Senate Republicans are ready to vote on cloture on the Reid proposal in 30 minutes, in an hour, as soon as we can get our colleagues over to the floor. We are ready to vote. By requiring 60 votes, particularly on a matter of this enormous importance, is not at all unusual. It is the way the Senate operates.

Again he came back a few months later:

Mr. President, I can only quote my good friend the majority leader who repeatedly has said, most recently in 2007, that in the Senate it has always been the case we need 60 votes. This is my good friend the majority leader when he was the leader of this majority in March of 2007, and he said it repeatedly both when he was in the minority as leader of the minority or leader of the majority, that it requires 60 votes certainly on measures that are controversial.

He also said a short time later:

So who gets to decide who is wasting time around here? None of us. None of us have that authority to decide who is wasting time. But the way you make things happen is you get 60 votes at some point, and you move a matter to conclusion, and the best way to do that is to have an open amendment process. That is the way this place used to operate.

So says Senator MCCONNELL.

A few months later:

Madam President, reserving the right to object, what we are talking about is a perpetual debt ceiling grant, in effect, to the President. Matters of this level of controversy always require 60 votes. So I would ask my friend—

That is me—

if he would modify his consent request to set the threshold for this vote at 60?

We could fill in month by month, but let's go to August 6 of this year, just a short time ago:

Well, as we all know, it takes 60 votes to do everything except the budget process. We anticipate having a vote to proceed to the 20-week Pain-Capable bill sometime before the end of the year as well.

Recently, the Republican leader told his own Senators and conservative news outlets that any attempts to defund Planned Parenthood or repeal ObamaCare would need at least 60 votes. So why is the Iran agreement any different? It isn't.

Even more perplexing is that some would argue that because the Senate passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, all Senators would then be

obligated to vote for any cloture vote. Voting for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was a vote to review the agreement, not a commitment to vote either for or against it. Voting for the Iran review act did not commit any Senator to take a particular position on the Iran agreement. Voting for the Iran review act was simply a vote to review the Iran agreement, and that is what we have done. It was a vote for three possible outcomes: a resolution of approval, a resolution of disapproval, or no action at all. It did not and does not obligate Senators to advance any one result. The Iran review act clearly included a 60-vote threshold for either a resolution of approval or disapproval. That is it. Every Senator knew that. For any Senator to suggest otherwise is absurd and factually wrong. Incorrect.

No Senator who voted for the Iran review act voted to give up the 60-vote threshold. In fact, everyone who voted for it actually voted for the 60-vote threshold. In fact, one Republican Member, the junior Senator from Arkansas, said the reason he didn't vote for it is because it required a 60-vote threshold.

If, however, we are forced to have a vote on cloture, it will be because the Republican leader has rejected Democrats' reasonable and responsible proposal.

There is not on either side of this aisle a more respected U.S. Senator than the Senator from Virginia, TIM Kaine. He was coauthor of the Iran nuclear agreement, referred to properly as the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. He said this morning:

I was the co-author of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act under which Congress is considering the international agreement to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The bipartisan bill—to give Congress a deliberate and constructive review of the final nuclear agreement with Iran—was drafted so that 60 votes would be required in the Senate to pass either a motion of approval or a motion of disapproval.

Let me read this again. One of the people who helped write this bill, a respected Member of this body, said:

I was the co-author of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act under which Congress is considering the international agreement to prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. The bipartisan bill—to give Congress a deliberate and constructive review of the final nuclear agreement with Iran—was drafted so that 60 votes would be required in the Senate to pass either a motion of approval or a motion of disapproval.

He continued:

We should follow the procedure that was explicitly discussed and agreed to when we voted on this act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1.

That is a direct quote from one of the authors of this legislation.

It was never any Senator's intention to forgo the 60-vote threshold.

Republicans are trying to pull a bait-and-switch that is born out of desperation. They haven't had a good August; let's face it.

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with Democrats to keep our government open and funded? There wasn't a day that went by during the recess that we didn't have some Republican Senator talk about closing the government. Every time that happened, the Republican leader would say: Well, we are not going to do that. So there is a lot of talk among Republican circles about the Republicans doing everything they can to force votes on things that have nothing to do with funding this government long term. So are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with Democrats to keep our government open and funded? Do they want to wait until the last minute to jam us with something?

Are Republicans stalling on this issue so they don't have to work with us on a bipartisan cyber security bill? Every day that goes by without legislation in this body is a day that bad guys are doing bad things to our businesses and to our country—stealing our names and addresses, trade secrets, everything they can, is what they are doing.

Perhaps Republicans are stalling on this critical legislation so they don't have to address our distressed infrastructure, insolvent highway system, crumbling roads and bridges?

I hope that instead of forcing the Senate to jump through unnecessary procedural hurdles, the Republicans will join with the Senate Democrats and agree to vote on final passage.

It takes a lot of nerve for the Republican leader, after the numerous speeches he has given about the 60-vote threshold on everything important—is he suggesting this Iran agreement is not important?

Let's hope that instead of forcing the Senate to jump through unnecessary procedural hurdles—in fact, the Republicans are filibustering their own resolution. I hope they will join with Senate Democrats and agree to vote on final passage.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration

from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a substitute amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2640.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike line three and all that follows and insert:

That Congress does not favor the agreement transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, under subsection (a) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e) for purposes of prohibiting the taking of any action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to such agreement under subsection (c)(2)(B) of such section.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2641 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2641 to amendment No. 2640.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2642 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2641

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2642 to amendment No. 2641.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

AMENDMENT NO. 2643

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows: The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2643 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2644 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2643

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2644 to amendment No. 2643.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2645

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a motion to commit with instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit the joint resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2645.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2646

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2646 to the instructions (amendment No. 2645) of the motion to commit H.J. Res. 61.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2647 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2646

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2647 to amendment No. 2646.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “6” and insert “7”.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending amendments, with the exception of the McConnell substitute amendment, be withdrawn; that no other amendments, points of order, or motions be in order to the joint resolution or the McConnell substitute prior to the vote on the McConnell substitute; that at 5:30 p.m. on Thursday, September 10, the Senate proceed to vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; further, that if the McConnell amendment is agreed to, H.J. Res. 61, as amended, be read a third time and passed; that the time today until 5 p.m. be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; that following leader remarks on Wednesday, September 9, until 6 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; and that following leader remarks on Thursday, September 10, until 5:30 p.m., the time be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. President, that is my unanimous consent request.

Let me say a brief word, and I will turn it over to my friend the Republican leader.

If the Republicans want more debate time, they can have it, but I think 3 days would be adequate. There is a definite time for doing this, and I think that is important.

If anyone thinks this is not a serious issue, I don't know what could be a serious issue. Based upon the underlying foundation that has been laid by my friend for these many years, this is going to require a 60-vote threshold. Everyone knows that. This goes back long before this dialogue started today on the floor. It has been going on for some time, as my friend the assistant Democratic leader, when he has an opportunity to address the Senate, will discuss.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time, and the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I also want to propound the following request. I ask unanimous consent that if cloture is invoked on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61, the amendment be agreed to, the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time, and there be 4 hours of debate equally divided between the two leaders or their designees, and that following the use or yielding back of time, the Senate vote on passage of the resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for all the reasons I have mentioned previously and the fact that I believe the Republican leader is way ahead of himself, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this has been one of the most extraordinary measures that has come before the Senate in the time that I have served here. It is rare to have an issue of this historic moment, of this importance, one that literally raises a question about war and peace in the Middle East, and one that has been considered so carefully by both sides of the aisle for such a long period of time.

When I left for the August recess, here in the Senate most of the Members on my side of the aisle—the Democratic side—were still processing and reviewing the proposed agreement. And, over the course of August, these Members announced their public positions on the matter.

As of today, there are 41 of the 46 Democratic Senators who have announced they will support the Iran agreement. There are another four who are opposed to it, and one who is yet to announce her position. We expect that to happen shortly.

This is a unique matter. I asked my staff and others to research one particular aspect of this debate. The aspect I asked them to research was a letter sent on March 9 of this year by 47 Republican Senators. Forty-seven Republican Senators sent a letter to the leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Ayatollah.

To take you back in history, at that point in time when 47 Republican Senators sent that letter, the United States of America was in negotiation with Iran to see whether or not we could come to any kind of an agreement or understanding when it came to limit Iran's development of a nuclear weapon, something that I am sure all of us—both political parties—want to stop from happening. But in the midst of this delicate negotiation that was going on in Switzerland, 47 Republican Senators, including every Member of the Senate Republican leadership, sent a letter to the Ayatollah in Iran. It said:

It has come to our attention while observing your nuclear negotiations with our government that you may not fully understand our constitutional system. Thus, we are writing to bring to your attention two features of our Constitution—the power to make binding international agreements and the different character of federal offices—which you should seriously consider as negotiations progress.

Forty-seven Republican Senators wrote to the Ayatollah in the midst of these delicate negotiations. It went on to say:

First, under our Constitution, while the president negotiates international agreements, Congress plays the significant role of ratifying them. In the case of a treaty, the Senate must ratify it by a two-thirds vote. A so-called congressional executive agreement requires a majority vote in both the House and the Senate (which, because of procedural rules, effectively means a three-fifths vote in the Senate).

Forty-seven Republican Senators are advising the Ayatollah in Iran, in March, that he should know more about our constitutional form of government and understand that it will take Senate approval, which they say effectively means a three-fifths vote. They continue:

Anything not approved by Congress is a mere executive agreement.

Second, [the 47 Republican Senators advised the Ayatollah] the offices of our Constitution have different characteristics. For example, the president may serve only two 4-year terms, whereas senators may serve an unlimited number of 6-year terms. As applied today, for instance, President Obama will leave office in January, 2017, while most of us will remain in office far beyond then—perhaps decades.

Then the 47 Republicans Senators, in their March letter to the Ayatollah of Iran, say:

What these two constitutional provisions mean is that we will consider any agreement regarding your nuclear-weapons program that is not approved by the Congress as nothing more than an executive agreement between President Obama and Ayatollah Khamenei. The next president could revoke such an executive agreement with the stroke of a pen and future Congresses could modify the terms of the agreement at any time.

We hope this letter enriches your knowledge of our constitutional system and promotes mutual understanding and clarity as nuclear negotiations progress.

Forty-seven Republican Senators in March of this year, writing to the Ayatollah and basically telling him: Don't get your hopes up if you are negotiating with the United States, reminding him they will have the last word as Members of Congress, and also stipulating that a three-fifths vote will be required in the U.S. Senate.

Then they go on to say: Keep in mind we are going to be here a lot longer than any President; we may be the last person or the last group to make a decision on the future of these agreements. Then they are basically reminding them that Presidents come and go, and don't assume the next President will even honor an agreement reached by this President.

Think back 12 years ago. What if 47 Democratic Senators—in the midst of our negotiation as to whether or not we should invade Iraq—had sent a letter to Saddam Hussein saying: Don't negotiate with President Bush. Don't pay any attention to his negotiations. We are the Congress. We will have the last word.

I cannot imagine what the public response would have been, but that is exactly what happened here—47 Republican Senators intervening in a negotiation process with Iran, basically telling those sitting at the table: Don't worry about reaching an agreement with the United States of America and this President.

I know what would have happened if that would have come up when Dick Cheney was Vice President of the United States. We would have had 47 Democrats up on charges of treason.

Well, in this circumstance, this was not good judgment. I would like to stipulate that the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee did not sign this letter. I want to make sure that is clear on the floor. But the 47 who did have to answer a question: Why? When we are in delicate negotiations as the United States of America, and we don't have a final agreement, why would 47 Republican Senators want to intervene in those negotiations? Why would they want to say to the Ayatollah: Don't waste your time negotiating with this President.

It is troublesome. Many of them had reached a conclusion even before the agreement was written that they were going to oppose it. Witness this letter.

But others took time to consider it, to measure it, and to announce their position when it came to this matter. I respect them for doing that, even if they came to a different conclusion than I did. I know what happened on our Democratic side because I was in contact with virtually with every Member of our Senate Democratic Caucus during the month of August, talking to them about this.

There is real soul-searching here, real serious consideration. Some of them, of course, went to the source, met with our intelligence agencies, the State Department, Department of Defense, and came back to Washington when we were in recess. One Senator I know sat down for 5 hours in closed meetings with our intelligence agencies to ask questions that were on his mind about this agreement.

Others, of course, met with their constituents, talked about it, found differences of opinion within their own States. They thought about it long and hard, prayed over it.

I talked to them, always wanting to hear where they were, but never pushing them because I knew this was serious, and they took it seriously. That is where we find ourselves today.

I salute the Senator from Tennessee. As the chairman of the Senate Foreign

Relations Committee, he and I may disagree on substance, but I respect him very much. He is a man of honor and a man of integrity, and he brings to this process the kind of attitude toward the Senate as an institution which I respect and I will continue to respect.

I also believe my colleague from Maryland, a close personal friend, Senator CARDIN—though we see this issue differently—has really thought long and hard about it. We have been on the phone together many, many times during the course of August. I ruined a lot of his vacation trying to figure out where he was and what his process was. He took it very seriously. I respect him, although we came out to different positions on this matter.

That is the way it should be, and what the American people expect of us now is a debate befitting this great institution of the Senate. They expect us to come and conscientiously consider this matter on its merits and express our points of view, and virtually every Senator has already done that publicly, save one. In the course of this debate, the American people can follow it because it is a critical debate. What is at issue here is whether Iran will develop a nuclear weapon.

We believe that they have the capacity now to create as many as 10 nuclear weapons. We don't want that to happen. It would be disastrous for the world—certainly disastrous for the Middle East and Israel—and that is why leaders from around the world, 100 different nations, support what President Obama is striving to do.

What the President is trying to do is something I believe should be the starting point in every critical foreign-policy decision: Use diplomacy, use negotiation, and try to solve our problems in a thoughtful, diplomatic way. And if that fails, never rule out other possibilities, but start with diplomacy. That is what the President has done.

During the course of this Presidency, he organized nations around the world to join us in this effort. If this were just the United States versus Iran, we wouldn't be where we are today, but the President engaged countries which historically and recently have not been our allies.

Before we left for the August recess, we sat down with the five Ambassadors from nations that joined us in the negotiation. I looked across the table there to see the Ambassadors from China, from Russia, from the United Kingdom, and representatives of the embassies of Germany and France. I thought to myself, if you are a student of history, this is an amazing coalition: China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the United States all working together. And we brought into the sanctions regime other countries that didn't have the same direct involvement in negotia-

tions but were with us. South Korea is a good example. Japan, another good example, joined us in this effort to put pressure on Iran. President Obama led this effort, and he was successful in this effort. The Iranians came to the negotiating table because we put the pressure on them—economic pressure that brought them to that moment.

Now we have before us this agreement. Some have said: You can never trust Iran no matter what they say. I would just harken back to the days of Ronald Reagan, who said of our enemies around the world when it came to agreements: "Trust, but verify."

Just recently we had an announcement made by Colin Powell, a man I respect very much, in support of this agreement. It was an announcement which surprised me in a way. I didn't know if he was going to take a position on this matter, but this article states:

Former Secretary of State Colin Powell expressed support for the [Obama] nuclear agreement with Iran on Sunday, calling the various planks Iranian leaders accepted "remarkable" and dismissing critics' concerns over its implementation.

"It's a pretty good deal," he said on NBC's "Meet the Press."

Critics concerned that the deal will expedite Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Powell added, are "forgetting the reality that [Iranian leaders] have been on a super-highway, for the last 10 years, to create a nuclear weapon or a nuclear weapons program with no speed limit."

He said the reduction in centrifuges, Iran's uranium stockpile and their agreement to shut down their plutonium reactor were all "remarkable."

"These are remarkable changes, and so we have stopped this highway race that they were going down—and I think that's very, very important," Powell said.

He also pushed back on skeptics who have expressed worries about the ability of independent inspectors to verify that Iran is following the agreement. Powell said that, "with respect to the Iranians—don't trust, never trust, and always verify."

"And I think a very vigorous verification regime has been put into place," he said.

"I say, we have a deal, let's see how they implement the deal. If they don't implement it, bail out. None of our options are gone," Powell added.

I think he hit the nail on the head. General Colin Powell, who served our country in the military and as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, then as Secretary of State, brings a perspective to this which very few can. He is a man who risked his life on the battlefield, a man who knows the true cost of war, but a man who was empowered by another Republican President to lead us in diplomatic negotiations. This is the kind of clear-eyed approach that we need and want when it comes to an issue of this gravity.

I will have other things to say on this matter, as others will.

I yield the floor to my colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am going to have more lengthy comments

to make on this topic a little later, but I did want first of all to thank the Senator from Illinois for his comments, and I certainly want to thank Senator CARDIN—and I will do so more fully in just a moment. But I would like to remind the body that, yes, we went through several steps along the way to get to where we are today that certainly created consternation on both sides of the aisle. There were lots of things that occurred. A letter was referred to. There was an address to the joint Congress. There have been numbers of things along the way that have caused people to concern themselves that maybe this debate would end up being something that was partisan and of low level.

What we have done is that we have actually marshaled ourselves through that, and we ended up with the Iran review act in short terms. That gives us the opportunity, as the distinguished Senator mentioned, to actually review this. We have done that. We have had 12 hearings on this topic—extensive hearings—in the Foreign Relations Committee, and many other committees have done the same.

What we ended up putting in place, with 98 votes in the Senate—98 to 1; we had one Senator who was absent—is a process where all Senators could review this, could have the documents at their disposal to go through it, to go to classified briefings so they could understand—and should understand—fully what this agreement says and then have the right to vote.

Certainly, some things happened along the way that, as I mentioned, created some consternation, but as a body, in Senate fashion, in lieu of letting that divide us and letting that create a scenario where we wouldn't review it and not vote on it, we created a process where we would review it and vote on it.

It is my hope—and I know I have had a very nice conversation with the distinguished Senator from Illinois, and certainly multiple conversations with the distinguished Senator from Maryland—that over the process of this week that is what continues. I know that is what all of us want to see happen.

I do think the American people deserve to know where Senators and House Members stand on this serious piece of foreign policy that is before us, and I want to thank everyone for their role in getting it here.

As a matter of fact, I will move on, if I could, to what I had planned to say. I first want to thank Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID for allowing this debate to take place this week without having a motion to proceed. I couldn't thank Senator CARDIN more for being a colleague who really works to try to figure out a way for the Senate to play its appropriate role in foreign policy. It has been nothing but

outstanding in dealing with him since he assumed this role, and I want to thank him for the way he has conducted himself.

I would also like to remind people that without the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act there would be no role for Congress. One of the things I think has confused a lot of the American people—and there are a lot of people who would prefer this to have been a treaty—is the fact that under our form of government, the President is able to decide whether he is going to submit an agreement as a treaty or as an executive agreement. An executive agreement stays in place during the duration of that President's tenure and could be altered by the next President. A treaty is binding on future Presidents.

This President, as we know, decided to go directly to the U.N. Security Council and, by the way, lift some congressionally mandated sanctions that we all helped put in place that actually brought Iran to the table. So with the knowledge of that, Congress stepped in and passed this piece of legislation that now gives us the right to review what the President has negotiated and to prevent him from lifting those congressionally mandated sanctions should we decide we disapprove of this deal.

So this is a place where Congress came together and said: No, we want to play a role, even though a role is not contemplated under an executive agreement. I know this has been confusing to numbers of people, but this was the only vehicle capable of winning a veto-proof majority to provide Congress with this chance—a chance for the American people to have us, on their behalf, review this agreement and then vote.

As I mentioned, we have had more than a dozen hearings. I have spent a great deal of time, as has the ranking member, as have all of our committee members—and the Presiding Officer the same—as have so many people going through this agreement, and I oppose implementation of this deal. I oppose its implementation.

When the President first stated his goal—his goal of ending Iran's nuclear program—that was something that could have achieved tremendous bipartisan support in this body. As a matter of fact, onward there were discussions of dismantling the program. And as we all know today—and I will speak more fully on this tomorrow—rather than ending it, this agreement industrializes it. It allows the industrialization of the program run by the world's leading state sponsor of terror, and it does so with our approval.

Now, that is a large step from where we began these negotiations. Had the President achieved the goal, I think what we would have in this body is 100 Senators standing up and supporting what he said he wished to do with these

negotiations. But we have ended up with something that certainly is a far cry from that.

Instead of having anytime, anywhere inspections, I think everyone understands there is a managed inspection process. Certainly, there are some issues relative to the IAEA that have given many Members tremendous concern.

The thing that is one of the most troubling aspects of this is that through the course of these negotiations, the leverage—where right now, basically, the world community has had its boot on a rogue nation's throat—in 9 months the leverage shifts from these nations—our nation being one of those—having them in a position where we might negotiate something that ends their program to now, where instead what happens is the leverage shifts to Iran. The leverage shifts to Iran.

They are going to receive, as we know, billions of dollars. Most people think the number is around \$100 billion. By the way, they have a \$406 billion gross domestic product. That is the size of their economy. We are going to release to them over the next 9 months about \$100 billion—25 percent of their economy in 9 months.

The President has said, and surely others, that some of this is going to be used to sponsor terrorism. We know that. Think about if we had 25 percent of our GDP given to us over the next 9 months. We have an \$18 trillion GDP—\$4 trillion or \$5 trillion given to us over the next 9 months. Certainly, this is going to have an impact on what they are able to do.

What Iran is going to be able to say in 9 months—when we push back on violations in the agreement, when we push back on terrorism and we push back on human rights violations—is that because most of the sanctions will be lifted at that moment, they will have their money, and their economy will be growing, well, look, if you push back, we think this is unfair. They are already making these statements in Iran: We will just resume our nuclear program.

So instead of our having leverage over them, they are going to have leverage over us. They are going to have leverage over us. This is in the vacuum of having no Middle Eastern policy. I don't say this to be pejorative. We know we have no policy in the Middle East to push back against Iran. We know that. So this agreement is going to end up being our de facto policy, and everything is going to be measured by this: What will Iran do if we push back?

What if we push back against the fact that they are giving Hamas rockets to fire into Israel? What if we push back against what Hezbollah is doing in Lebanon and what they are doing in Syria? What if we push back against what the IRGC—the arm of the Supreme Leader—is doing right now to protect

Assad? They are the shock force to keep Assad in power right now.

We know that right now in prisons in Syria people are being tortured. We saw it firsthand. The ranking member and I went over to see what was happening at the Holocaust Memorial Museum presentation where Caesar, someone working for the Assad regime, took photographs. We know as we stand here in these comfortable settings in the Chamber of the Senate, people are being tortured, their genitals are being removed, and Iran is supporting that. We know that—the fact that they are going to have some resources to do more of that, to do the same thing with the Houthis in Yemen, to support terrorists and people who are trying to disrupt the Government of Bahrain.

Look, the leverage shifts to them. All they can say—what they are going to be able to say—if we push back against those activities is this: Well, look, we think you are being unfair. We are just going to resume our program.

I don't understand. This is beyond me. I have had no one explain it to me. I know the Senator from Illinois had the diplomats from the other countries come in. I have no idea why in this last meeting in Geneva we agreed to lift the conventional weapons ban after 5 years. What did that have to do with the nuclear file? And then we lifted the ballistic missile technology embargo in 8 years? What was that about? Then, as we know, with some really weird language that is in the agreement, we immediately lifted the ban on ballistic missile testing.

I think everyone here knows—the people sitting in the audience, people watching—that Iran has no practical need whatsoever for this program—none. Let me say that one more time. Here is a country with 19,000 centrifuges—10,000 of them operating. They have an underground facility at Fordow. They have a facility at Arak that produces plutonium. They have all kinds of research and development.

And by the way, this agreement approves further research and development of their centrifuges. As a matter of fact, it paves the way for them and also times it out perfectly for them to be in a position to be at zero breakout time, which is exactly what the President said they would be at, in 13 years. They can just agree to this agreement, and they can just continue to implement this agreement and be in that position. But they have no practical need—none.

Some people have said: Well, if they really want to pursue the technology of medical isotopes, maybe—maybe—they could use 500 centrifuges. Think about this. We have a country with one nuclear reactor, a country that could buy the enriched uranium to provide the energy for that cheaply on the market. Instead, they have put their entire society through grinding sanctions that

have harmed families. They have been doing that for years for something they have no practical need for. There is only one need, and we all know that, which is to be in the position to be a nuclear-armed country.

So let me say one more time that every Senator here supported this process except for one. The American people deserve to know where their elected officials stand on this consequential agreement. I hope people on both sides will cause this to be a sober debate. I know it will be impassioned, and people will certainly be speaking strongly about the pros and cons of this agreement.

I do hope at the end of the day—while I was gone—I digress—there were discussions about filibustering the right to vote on this Iran agreement. I read about it in some magazines here, that instead of this being about people expressing themselves relative to a policy they felt was important to the country, apparently all of a sudden it became about something else.

I would just say to my colleagues, I don't know how we can be in a place where we have said to our constituents that we want to review and vote on this agreement and then, over some revisionist statement or thought, come up with a process that says: No, we are going to filibuster it; we really don't want people to vote.

It is my hope that over the course of the next several days cooler heads will prevail and that we of course will have, I believe, a very sober debate. I think my friends on the other side of the aisle have seen what the leader just did to try to ensure that we keep the debate about approval or disapproval—in this case, disapproval—of this particular deal, and I hope that very soon we will all be able to express ourselves with a vote on the deal itself, whether we believe it is in our Nation's interest. I do not. Some do. Let's have a debate in a sober way.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORKER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I say to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee how much I appreciate his good work, together with the ranking member Senator CARDIN, whom he alluded to earlier, but the Senator from Tennessee just said something which I think every American should find troubling, and that is perhaps the single-most important national security issue facing the country since the authorization for use of force in Iraq in 2002; that there might be a partisan filibuster of our ability even to have that up-or-down vote on the resolution of disapproval.

I ask the Senator from Tennessee, is he aware of reports that the Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khomeini has said

the Iranian Parliament will have the final word on this deal in Iran?

I wonder how the Senator would characterize a partisan filibuster in the U.S. Senate, preventing such an up-or-down vote in the Senate, while the Iranian Parliament would have the ability for that up-or-down vote in that institution.

Mr. CORKER. I did read those reports. I said to my friend from Illinois earlier: Look, there has been so much that has occurred from the very beginning that has caused people on each side to, in some cases, raise the partisan flag or think that this is a debate which could devolve into something that was of that orientation. What we have done, as the Senator mentioned, is we have risen above that, and we passed something that allows us to debate and to vote.

I read with interest what the Supreme Leader has said. I think he is hedging his bets, and no doubt he is going to take it to their Parliament and allow them to vote and debate. I hope that here, the citizens of our country will be shown that same respect and expect that their Senators and their House Members will have the opportunity to vote on the actual policy which has been negotiated and agreed to by these various countries. I hope that will be the case and, yes, I was very aware of that.

With that, without objection, I wish to yield the floor to my great friend, the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee. Together, we have marched through some incredible hearings. I think all of us have studied this dutifully. That could not have occurred without his incredible cooperation and that of his staff. I thank him for his leadership. I thank him for his willingness to seek a place where the Senate can deal with this in the appropriate way.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, let me first thank my friend Senator CORKER for his leadership but, more importantly, thank him on behalf of the Senate for standing up for what I think is the appropriate role of the United States Senate in reviewing a major foreign policy issue.

I have had the opportunity to serve with four different chairmen in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee since I have been in the Senate: Senator CORKER, Senator MENENDEZ, Secretary Kerry, and Vice President BIDEN. All four fought for the Senate having the appropriate role in establishing foreign policy.

We are a country that believes our system of democracy serves our country the best; that is, with separation of branches of government. We don't have a parliamentary system. We have an independent Congress—a Congress that

is expected to provide independence in its reviews of the laws of our country and the policies of our Chief Executive, and that is exactly what we are doing in this debate.

I thank Senator CORKER for his extraordinary leadership of our committee. I know I speak for both Democrats and Republicans in saying that we support the independence of the Senate in reviewing our work.

Senator DURBIN—I listened to his comments. Senator DURBIN is a dear friend of mine. The two of us have fought together on human rights issues around the globe. We have fought for civil liberties in the United States. We have worked together on so many important issues, including in the Middle East. I deeply respect his views.

There are Members on both sides who have reached different conclusions, but we are all committed to making sure Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state, and we honestly believe our view is the best way for that to be accomplished. I don't challenge any other Member's decision, and I certainly don't question their resolve against Iran becoming a nuclear weapons state or their support for our regional allies. I think each has demonstrated that throughout their career. Some of us have come to different conclusions.

I strongly believe we must prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. It is a game-changer in the region. We have already heard from my colleagues that Iran is one of the principal purveyors of terrorism in that region. It would accelerate an arms race that already has too many arms in its region. It would make it so much more difficult to confront Iranian policy if they possess a nuclear weapon. President Obama is right to say we will not let that happen and that all options are on the table to make sure that doesn't happen, and Congress is right to say we support all options being on the table to make sure Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state. That is a goal we all have.

In this independent review, some of us believe the best way to accomplish that is to move forward with the agreement negotiated by the Obama administration. Others believe that is not the case.

I wish to second what Senator CORKER said about the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I was proud to be part of putting that bill together and gaining broad support in the Congress and the support of the administration. I think it put us in a much stronger position in negotiating in Vienna. I think the fact that we had set up the right way for a congressional review—that it was going to be a transparent review, a critical review—put our negotiators in the strongest possible positions in Vienna. I also think it provided the right type of review, so that after the agreement was reached,

information would be made available to us, we would have an open process, the American people would learn more about it, and we would be in a better position to make our own judgment. It was clear in the review act that no action is required. We can't pass resolutions of approval or disapproval.

I wish to mention one thing, though, that I disagree with Senator CORKER, but maybe in the end we will come together on this issue. I wasn't part of the original negotiations on the review act. I came into it and was able to resolve the differences between the White House and the Congress and many Members of Congress, but it was clear, in talking to the architects of this legislation, that they always anticipated there would be a 60-vote threshold for the passage of this resolution in the Senate.

I agree with Senator CORKER that we shouldn't have to use filibusters and we shouldn't have to have procedural votes; that we should have a vote on the merits. I thought Senator REID's suggestion was the right way to go. I hope we can find a way that we can avoid the procedural battles and be able to take up this issue and let every Member vote their conscience as to whether to support or disapprove of the resolution.

I told the people of Maryland after the review—let me say how this review went. We had 2½ weeks of review before the recess, and Senator CORKER worked our committee unmercifully as far as what we did. We had hearings, we had briefings, we had classified briefings, we had Member meetings, and to the credit of the Members of the committee, all 19 showed up. These meetings went on for about 4 hours each. So we were back-to-back-to-back in our briefings and in trying to understand what was in the agreement for the 2½ weeks we were here.

I then went back to Maryland, as I am sure my colleagues went back to their States, and had a chance for the first time to meet with Marylanders and to talk with Marylanders, to express and talk with them and get their views, and to evaluate whether I thought it was best to go forward. It was a close call, but I decided I could not support the agreement.

I just wish to share why I cannot support the agreement—and Senator CORKER mentioned this: It places Iran, after a time period, in the position of enrichment of uranium that is dangerously close to being able to break out to a nuclear weapon in compliance with the agreement. Being legal, they can get to that point. At that point, they have already gotten sanctions relief, so they are in a much better financial position to be able to withstand any pressures that could be put on Iran. We know they want to become a nuclear weapons state. They have tried in the past. We know that. That has

pretty well been documented. We have no reason to believe they are going to change their intentions. So if they want to become a nuclear weapons state and they make the calculation that we really don't have a sanctioned way to stop them—because at that point their economic strength is strong enough and sanctions take too long to really bite and take effect—it would not be an effective deterrent to erase the breakout.

Here is the key point of concern to me—and I acknowledge to all my colleagues that I don't know what is going to happen in the future. This is a close call, but I think there is a higher risk of potential military operation if we go forward with this agreement because we don't have effective sanctions once they have been removed. That concerns me because I don't think a military option is a good option. I don't believe it will eliminate the threat, and it has a lot of collateral issues involved with the military operation.

I acknowledge that if we do not go forward with this agreement, there is a risk. There is no question about it. There is high risk in either direction. But if we were to reject the agreement, what would happen? Well, no one can tell for sure. No one can tell for sure. There is a risk factor.

In my conversations with our European allies, they certainly want us to approve this agreement—don't get me wrong—but they know they have to work with the United States. They know Europe and the United States need to be in this together, and for their companies to be able to get full access to Iran, they have to work with the United States on a sanctions regime. They understand that.

Iran also understands that if we reject this agreement and they were to rush out to try to develop a nuclear weapon, it would ignite unity in the international community of action against Iran. They know that. They have to make that calculation. Iran also wants sanctions relief from the United States.

I can't predict the future, but I believe all parties will want a diplomatic solution. I understand that is not going to be easy, and maybe we will have to mix it up a little bit and put some other issues on the table. We have a lot of issues with Iran. We know about their terrorism, their interference in the region, et cetera. It may give us that opportunity. My point is, no one can predict the future. I came to that conclusion, and I understand others came to different conclusions.

There are other concerns I have with the agreement, including the 24-day delay. That doesn't concern me on known sites. It concerns me on undeclared sites and whether that will be adequate based on our intelligence information.

I am concerned about the possible military dimension that there isn't any consequence, as I see it, in the agreement if there is not an accurate account of what happened in the past. I wish it was more clear. I don't think the arms embargo relief should have been in this agreement.

I must say, I am concerned with the language in the agreement that talks about the United States and Iran with mutual respect and normalization. I don't know how we can have mutual respect for a country that actively foments regional instability and advocates Israel's destruction, kills innocents, and shouts "Death to Americans," so I came to the conclusion that I couldn't support the agreement.

Others came to opposite views. Each of us did what we thought was best, and I respect that this is a vote of conscience. I do want to point out one comment that was made a little bit earlier by my colleague about the Iraq war. I voted against the Iraq war. It was not a hard vote for me because, quite frankly, I didn't see the intelligence information that would have justified the authorization for use of military force. But it was a controversial vote.

In my congressional district, it was an extremely unpopular vote, and the reactions were not too much different than the reactions we are getting today in regards to this particular agreement with Iran. I voted against that, along with a lot of my colleagues.

When that vote was over and it was a done deal and we pursued our military operations in Iraq, I joined with all my colleagues and the administration to give us the best possible chance for America to succeed because that is our responsibility. That is our system. Our system is independent review. But when the review is over, it is time for us to come together.

So, yes, I have been talking to my Republican colleagues. I have been talking to my colleagues who are voting for the agreement and those who are voting against it as to how we can work together in a responsible manner when this debate is over so the United States can be in the strongest possible position, working with the administration, to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapon state. Working together, I think we can help the administration have a stronger position, knowing the independence of Congress.

The administration has said and we can underscore that all options are on the table to make sure Iran will not become a nuclear weapon power. The administration has said and we can underscore that there is a need for a regional security strategy so that our partners know of our commitment to the region against whatever happens with Iran. The administration has suggested and we can reinforce that our closest ally in the region, Israel, will

have the security it needs as a partner with the United States. The administration has stated and we can reinforce that we will be active and pursue terrorism by Iran if they increase their terrorism or attempt terrorism against the United States. We can speak to that. We can make sure that we are better informed and that we have the information we need to see whether Iran is using their sanctions relief so that we can act timely with the administration to protect U.S. interests.

I think we can speak with a strong voice when this debate is over, and I hope that during the next 2 weeks the debate that takes place on the floor of the Senate and the House of Representatives reflects the best tradition of the Congress in our independent review and our firm commitment to work on behalf of America. We must stand firm in our determination to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We must agree to counter Iranian support for terrorism and confront Iranian violations of ballistic missile protocols and international human rights obligations. Congress and the administration cannot dwell on past disagreements. Together we must find a functional bipartisan approach to Iran. I stand ready to work with my colleagues and the administration to achieve such a result.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Maryland for his comments and his tremendous leadership on this issue. I note that Senator COLLINS is here to speak. It is my understanding that she will speak for approximately 30 minutes. Senator CORNYN may be down shortly thereafter to speak and then Senator Kaine.

I know some people referred to the fact that it is only those who wanted to go to war with Iraq who are supporting this. But not only did the ranking member not support going to war with Iraq, neither did Senator MENENDEZ from New Jersey, who, again, opposes this agreement. That type of characterization certainly is not the way that this is. The two most knowledgeable Democrats in the Senate on this issue by far both oppose it.

With that, I yield the floor to the distinguished Senator from Maine, who represents a beautiful State. We thank her for her contributions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I want to thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his leadership on this issue, for briefing us, for arranging for briefings, and for his very thorough analysis. I also want to commend the Senator from Maryland for his vote of conviction, for doing what he believed was correct, for showing

the courage to cast a vote of true conscience. I was honored to be here on the Senate floor to listen to his comments today.

President Obama's agreement with the Iranian Government with respect to its nuclear program is one of the most important foreign policy decisions ever to face the Senate. The vote that we shall cast will not be an easy one. The security of our Nation and the stability of the Middle East, as well as America's leadership in the world, are affected by this agreement, known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA.

Thus, I have devoted countless hours to studying the agreement and its annexes, attending Intelligence Committee sessions and other classified briefings, questioning Secretary of State John Kerry, Secretary of Energy Ernie Moniz, and our intelligence officials, including the top manager for Iran, talking with our negotiators and with ambassadors, and discussing the agreement with experts with divergent views to ensure that my decision is as well informed as possible.

Let me begin by making clear that I supported the administration's undertaking these negotiations with Iran. Indeed, I was heartened when President Obama initially said in October of 2012 that "our goal is to get Iran to recognize it needs to give up its nuclear program and abide by the U.N. resolutions that have been in place." He went on to say: "The deal we'll accept is, they end their nuclear program. It's very straightforward."

I was optimistic that the administration would produce an agreement that would accomplish the goals the President laid out. Along with six of my Republican colleagues, I did not sign a letter to the leaders of the Iranian Government sent in the midst of the negotiations because I wanted to give the administration every opportunity to complete an agreement that would have accomplished the goals the President himself originally set forth as the purpose of these negotiations.

I have long believed that a verifiable diplomatic agreement with Iran that dismantled its nuclear infrastructure and blocked its pathways to the development of a nuclear weapon would be a major achievement—an accomplishment that would make the world a safer place. Regrettably, that does not describe the agreement that the administration negotiated. The agreement is fundamentally flawed because it leaves Iran as capable of building a nuclear weapon at the expiration of the agreement as it is today. Indeed, at that time, Iran will be a more dangerous and stronger nuclear threshold state—exactly the opposite of what these negotiations should have produced.

Mark Dubowitz, a noted expert on sanctions, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee: "Even if

Iran doesn't violate the JCPOA . . . it will have patient pathways to nuclear weapons, an ICBM program, access to heavy weaponry, an economy immunized against sanctions pressure, and a more powerful regional position . . ."

Under the agreement, not a single one of Iran's 19,000 centrifuges, used to enrich uranium to produce the fissile material for a nuclear bomb, will be destroyed. Not a single one. Iran will be able to continue its research and development on advanced centrifuges able to enrich uranium more rapidly and more effectively. Not only will Iran retain its nuclear capability, but it will also be a far richer nation and one that has more conventional weapons and military technology than it possesses today.

The lifting of sanctions will give Iran's leaders access ultimately to more than \$100 billion in the form of frozen assets and overseas accounts. Iran also will once again be able to sell its abundant oil in global markets.

The administration has repeatedly argued that Iranian leaders will invest those billions of dollars into their own country to improve the lives of their citizens. The record strongly suggests otherwise.

Iran today is the world's foremost exporter of terrorism, pouring billions of dollars into terrorist groups throughout the region and into funding the murderous Assad regime in Syria. If Iran is financing, arming, and equipping terrorist groups in Iraq, Lebanon, Gaza, Syria, and Yemen when its own economy is in shambles and its citizens are suffering, why would anyone believe that it would invest the proceeds of sanctions relief only in its own economy?

I do expect that Iran's leaders will invest in a few high-profile projects to help their own citizens. But given their history, it is inevitable that billions more will be used to finance terrorism and strengthen Iran's power and proxies throughout the Middle East.

It is deeply troubling that the administration secured no concessions at all from Iran, designated by our government—by the Director of National Intelligence—as the number one state sponsor of terrorism, to cease its support of terrorist groups. Whether it is Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Shiite militias in Iraq or the Houthis in Yemen, Iran's proxies are terrorizing innocent civilians, forcing families to flee their homes, and causing death and destruction. And incredibly, the JCPOA will end the embargoes on selling Iran intercontinental ballistic missile technology and conventional weapons, which the Russians, among others, are very eager to sell them.

Think about that for a moment. Why would Iran want to buy intercontinental ballistic missile technology? It already has the deeply troubling capacity to launch missile strikes at Israel,

which it has pledged to wipe off the face of the Earth. ICBM technology poses a direct threat to our Nation from a nation whose leaders continue to chant "Death to America."

We should also remember that the Iranian Quds forces were the source of the most lethal improvised explosive devices that were responsible for the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers in Iraq.

Why would we ever agree to lift the embargo on the sales of conventional weapons that could endanger our forces in the region?

Let me now turn to the issue of the enforcement of the agreement by posing the obvious question: Will Iran abide by the agreement and the corresponding U.N. Security Council resolution or will it cheat? Despite being a signatory to the U.N. Charter, Iran has repeatedly violated or ignored the United Nations Security Council resolutions aimed at curbing its nuclear program.

In 2006, the U.N. Security Council passed a resolution prohibiting Iran from enriching uranium. What happened? Iran cheated. It has literally thousands of centrifuges spinning to enrich uranium. Multiple U.N. Security Council resolutions require Iran to cooperate fully with the International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, and to come clean on what is known as the possible military dimensions of its nuclear activities to understand how far Iran has progressed toward developing a nuclear device and to have a verified baseline to evaluate future nuclear-related activities. What happened?

Iran cheated. Not only did it never report to international arms control experts about the experiments at its military installation at Parchin, where Iran is suspected of developing detonators for nuclear devices, but also Iran sanitized buildings at Parchin in a manner that the IAEA has described as likely to have undermined the agency's ability to conduct effective verification. Remarkably, according to public reporting, Iran has continued these sanitation activities while Congress was holding hearings on the agreement this summer.

In 2010, the U.N. Security Council adopted another resolution requiring Iran to cease any activities related to ballistic missile activities capable of delivering nuclear weapons. What happened?

Iran cheated. It launched ballistic missiles in July 2012. Given this history, there is no question in my mind that Iran will try to cheat on the new agreement and exploit any loophole in the text or in the implementing Security Council resolution that was, by the way, as the chairman has pointed out, adopted before Congress even had a chance to vote on the agreement. Given Iran's history of noncompliance, one would think an ironclad inspection

process would be put in place. Sadly, that is far from the reality of this agreement.

Let me make four points about how Iran can stymie inspections. First, throughout the term of the agreement, Iran has the authority to delay inspections of undeclared sites. Those are the sites where inspectors from the IAEA believe that suspicious activities are occurring. Inexplicably the JCPOA establishes up to a 24-day delay between when the agency requests access to a site and when access is granted. The former Deputy Director General for Safeguards at the IAEA notes that 24 days is sufficient time for Iran to sanitize suspected facilities and points out that past concealment activities carried out by Iran in 2003 left no traces to be detected. This is a long way from the anytime, anywhere inspections that should have been part of this agreement given Iran's sorry history.

Second, no American or Canadian experts will be allowed to be part of the IAEA inspection team unless these countries reestablish official diplomatic relations with Iran. I recognize that the IAEA has many highly qualified experts, but the exclusion of some of the most highly skilled and experienced experts in the world does not inspire confidence.

Third, and most outrageous, according to press reports, the Iranians themselves will be responsible for the photographs and environmental sampling at Parchin, a large military installation where nuclear work is suspected to have been conducted and may still be underway. IAEA weapons inspectors will be denied physical access to Parchin. Note that I said "according to press reports." That is because the actual agreement between the IAEA and Iran is secret and has been withheld from Congress.

As a member of the Intelligence Committee, I have been briefed on the agreement, but like every other Member of Congress, I have been denied access to the actual document despite how significant this issue is. The actual text matters because of Iran's repeated efforts to exploit loopholes and particularly in light of press reports on what is in that document.

Fourth, Iran is not required to ratify the Additional Protocol before sanctions relief is granted, if ever. The Additional Protocol allows the IAEA permanent inspection access to declared and suspected nuclear sites in a country in order to detect covert nuclear activities. Ratification of the protocol would make the AP permanently and legally binding in Iran.

Mr. President, 126 countries, including our country, have already ratified the Additional Protocol. Yet the agreement negotiated by the administration only requires Iran to "seek ratification" of the Additional Protocol 8 years from now—in the 8th year of the

agreement—and to comply with its terms until then. If Iran's past behavior is any guide, Iran may never ratify the Additional Protocol and thus be subject to its permanent, legally binding inspection regime.

To prevent Iran from cheating, the administration has repeatedly pointed to the prospect of an immediate snapback of sanctions as the teeth of the agreement. I will be surprised if they work as advertised. First, the rhetoric on the snapback of sanctions is inconsistent. On the one hand, the administration says the United States can unilaterally cause the international sanctions to be reimposed. At the same time, the administration repeatedly warns us that the sanctions regime is falling apart. Which is it?

Second, Iran has already made explicit in the text of the agreement that the imposition of any sanctions will be treated as grounds to restart its nuclear program. Included in the JCPOA is this clear statement: "Iran has stated that if sanctions are reinstated in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitments under this JCPOA in whole or in part." In effect, Iran has given advance notice that if the United States or any of its partners insist on reimposing sanctions, Iran can simply walk away from the deal. Given their investment in the deal, I am very skeptical that any of the P5+1 countries will be willing to take that action.

After the United Nations Security Council endorsed this agreement on July 20, the Iranians actually released a statement saying they may reconsider its commitments if new sanctions impair the business and trade resulting from the lifting of nuclear sanctions, "irrespective of whether such new sanctions are introduced on nuclear-related or other grounds."

Let's think about the implications of that for a moment. The Iranians are saying a sanction is a sanction is a sanction, and Iran appears ready to resume its nuclear activities if any sanctions are reimposed, even if the purpose is nonnuclear, even if the purpose is to halt Iran's financing of terrorists groups.

That means, if the United States reimposes a sanction in response to the Iranians continuing to finance, train, arm, and equip terrorist groups all over the world, Iran, the foremost exporter of terrorism, according to our own Director of National Intelligence, can just walk away from the agreement we are being asked to approve.

Third, according to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, the agreement states that sanctions would not be applied "with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party and Iran or Iranian entities prior to the date of application." This grandfathering clause will create an immediate rush of businesses to lock in

long-term business contracts with Iran. Iranian Foreign Minister Zarif assured Iranian lawmakers that the swarming of business for reinvesting their money is the biggest barrier to the reimposition of sanctions, and he is right.

The State Department insists that each case will be worked on an individual basis, but there is no guarantee that any case, much less every case, will be resolved in the short time period necessary.

There are alternatives to the deeply flawed agreement reached in Vienna. While I recognize that it would be difficult, the fact is, the administration could renegotiate a better deal. As Orde Kittrie, the former lead State Department attorney for nuclear issues, recently noted in the Wall Street Journal, the Senate has required changes to more than 200 treaties that were ultimately ratified after congressional concerns were addressed.

This is not unusual. For example, the 1997 resolution of ratification regarding the multilateral Chemical Weapons Convention included 28 conditions inserted by the Senate. The treaty was ultimately ratified and currently is in force in 191 participating nations, including Iran and the United States. Similarly, the Senate insisted that the Threshold Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union have additional provisions strengthening compliance measures before it was ratified.

Of course, one of the problems with this agreement is that it is not in the form of a treaty, which precludes the Senate from inserting reservations, understandings, or declarations. But that does not mean this agreement cannot be renegotiated, and there are so many precedents for side agreements or renegotiations of treaties themselves—more than 200 times.

Another alternative to this agreement would be to further wield our unilateral financial and economic power against those conducting business with key Iranian entities. Juan Zarate, the first Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Terrorist Financing and Financial Crimes, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

We can't argue in the same breath that "snapback" sanctions as constructed offer a real Sword of Damocles to be wielded over the heads of the Iranians for years while arguing that there is no way now for the United States to maintain the crippling financial and economic isolation which helped bring the Iranians to the table.

Every country and every business would have to choose whether to do business with a nuclear Iran or with the United States. I am confident that most countries and most businesses would make the right choice.

Despite these options, the administration negotiated a pact in which its redlines were abandoned, compromised, or diluted, while the Iranians held firm to their core principles.

The Iranians have secured the following if this agreement moves for-

ward: broad sanctions relief, a U.N.-blessed domestic uranium enrichment capability, international acceptance of Iran as a nuclear threshold state, international acceptance of its indigenous ballistic missile program, the lifting of the arms and the ICBM embargoes, repeal of all previous U.N. Security Council resolutions, and removal of the Iranian nuclear issue from the U.N. Security Council agenda.

Accordingly, I shall cast my vote for the motion of disapproval. I believe Iran will bide its time, perfect its R&D on advanced centrifuges, secure an ICBM capability, and build a nuclear weapon as the JCPOA is phased out.

It is time for Congress to reject the JCPOA and for the administration to negotiate a new agreement, as has been done so many times in the past when the Senate raised serious concerns. The stakes are simply too high and the risks too great for us to do otherwise.

Thank you, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT JOE GLINIEWICZ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are many brokenhearted people today in the small town of Fox Lake, IL. They are mourning the loss of Lieutenant Charles Joseph Gliniewicz. His friends and family called him Joe. At work they called him GI Joe. That all-American nickname was an admiring tribute to Lieutenant Gliniewicz's nearly 30 years of service to the U.S. Army, the Army Reserves, and to his appearance and demeanor.

At age 52, Lieutenant Gliniewicz was fit and strong. He stood ramrod straight. He wore his hair high and tight like a drill sergeant. But the physical characteristic people mention most about Lieutenant Gliniewicz was his smile.

Everyone knew GI Joe in Fox Lake, IL. He served on the town's police force for 32 years. He was supposed to retire at the end of last month, but he stayed on just 1 more month to ensure the smooth transition of a volunteer youth program to which he devoted thousands of hours over nearly 30 years.

A week ago today, September 1—the day that would have been Lieutenant Gliniewicz's first day of retirement—he was shot and killed in the line of duty. It was 8 o'clock in the morning. Lieutenant Gliniewicz was driving down a road lined with open fields and abandoned-looking businesses when he spotted three men who raised suspicion. He radioed the police dispatcher that he was going to pursue them on foot. The dispatcher asked if he needed help. Lieutenant Gliniewicz said: Sure, send them. When backup officers arrived 3

minutes later, they couldn't find him. A few minutes later, they found Lieutenant Gliniewicz 50 yards from his patrol car. He had been fatally shot.

Law enforcement agencies are still searching for the three men responsible. They have only a very sketchy description: three men, two White, one Black.

In the days that followed the murder, hundreds of law enforcement officers poured into Fox Lake in Lake County. They were joined by members of just about every major law enforcement agency, all people can think of, including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives, the FBI, and even the Secret Service. Dozens of officers suffered heat exhaustion as they searched the woods and swamps. They are still searching today for his killers. We all want to see them brought to justice swiftly.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was married for 26½ years to his wife Melodie. They call her Mel for short. They were parents of four sons ranging in age from early twenties to their teens. One of his sons serves in the U.S. Army.

The day after Lieutenant Gliniewicz's murder, hundreds of local folks turned out for a rally in Fox Lake to show their love for him and his family. It would just break your heart to see pictures of Melodie Gliniewicz and her four now fatherless sons smiling through their anguish, trying to support each other and their grieving neighbors.

Folks in Fox Lake said that Joe Gliniewicz loved his town and he was always the first to volunteer at whatever local administration needed help with an event. One resident told the local newspaper:

Everyone in town knew who he was. Whether you were on a first-name basis or knew his rank, you knew he was a great guy.

This resident added:

Just being involved in his community, he took pride in it. This is where he lived, and it's what he fought to protect. He took great pride in making the town of Fox Lake the place it is.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was a volunteer with the Special Olympics and a lot of other groups. The organization he was closest to was the Fox Lake Police Department Explorers, a group who mentors young people who want to aspire to law enforcement. Joe Gliniewicz established Fox Lake's Explorer Post No. 300 nearly 30 years ago. Over the years, he has seen hundreds of explorers in training get into law enforcement and the military. His death is felt so deeply by these young people, by Lieutenant Gliniewicz's family, friends, and neighbors, and by his brothers and sisters in blue not only in Fox Lake but throughout Illinois and across America.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz was the first on-duty officer fatally shot in Lake County, IL, since 1980 and the third law

enforcement fatality in Illinois this year, according to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. According to the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund, firearms-related deaths of law enforcement officers in the United States are down 24 percent this year compared to the same period last year, January 1 to September 8. There were 34 last year and 26 this year. While that downward trend is good news, even one police officer killed in the line of duty is way too many.

In Fox Lake and in towns across America, countless families have replaced the lightbulbs on their front porches with blue lightbulbs to show their support for their local police.

Yesterday, on Labor Day, there was a memorial service at the high school for Lieutenant Gliniewicz. They packed it with law enforcement officials from all over—not just Lake County, IL, but the Midwest and across the Nation. It was an 18-mile funeral parade or funeral caravan that went off to the cemetery afterward—18 miles long—and it was filled with admirers and friends and people standing on the roads with homemade signs.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz really made a difference in people's lives. It is sad to lose him. When we reflect on the great contribution he made to his community, to his county, to my State of Illinois, and to our Nation, it is with heartfelt gratitude that we say to his family: We are by your side.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republican whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, as have all of our colleagues, I have been traveling around my State over the last few weeks listening to my constituents and trying to understand what their concerns are. I have to tell my colleagues that Washington is not in high repute. People sense the country is heading in the wrong direction. They have entrusted us with the way to navigate that, and they feel as though we have not succeeded in getting our country back on the right track. I know that when it comes to security issues—and of all the issues the Federal Government deals with, national security is the only one we can't delegate to someone else. It is our No. 1 responsibility as a Federal Government. State government can't do it. Local government can't do it. We can't do it for ourselves, so we depend on the Federal Government to make sure our Nation is safe and secure, which is a precondition for all of the other liberties and privileges we enjoy.

As part of the roundtables and visits I had, I took part in one in Houston, TX, where we addressed a wide variety of issues, but the No. 1 issue that came up was the Iranian nuclear deal. There is no issue more compelling or concerning to this particular group of

folks or my constituents back home than the President's deal with Iran because people recognize that Iran is a state sponsor of international terrorism, and what this does is it paves the way to them getting bigger and more lethal weapons.

They are also very concerned, as they should be, that this deal requires us to trust an adversary who has done nothing to earn it. I know the President has said there is no trust involved, but in the absence of trust, one would at least think there would be adequate verification mechanisms.

Of course, I know Secretary Moniz has disavowed his earlier comments about anytime, anywhere inspections, and we then learned that there is this convoluted process of 24 days' notice and some arbitration before the IAEA will gain access to some sites and then, as the Associated Press reported, the sidebar deals, which, if these reports in the public domain are accurate, would basically require Iran to inspect itself.

The reason people are so anxious and concerned about this is there is no doubt about that. Their concerns are well taken, but I think of all the things that concern my constituents and the people I talked to during August about this deal, it is Iran's long history of supporting terrorism, including attacks on the United States and our allies.

It is no exaggeration to say the Iranian regime has American blood on its hands, and it has had for many years. Former Secretary of State and National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice put it well when she said: Iran has been the country that has, in many ways, been kind of a central banker for terrorism. It is Iran that has been conducting these proxy wars against Israel, the United States, and our allies since the regime came into power as a result of the revolution in 1979.

Even President Obama and his National Security Advisor Susan Rice admitted earlier this summer that the Iranian Government could use the \$100 billion in cash they are going to get as a result of sanctions relief to help fund terrorist attacks, to help fund these terrorist groups.

Here is what the President said. I guess he has resigned himself to it. He said: "The truth is that Iran has always found a way to fund these efforts." Well, that does not make me feel any more at ease, nor should it make any of our allies feel any more at ease about Iran and its intentions and what it will do with these funds that will be relieved from sanctions. That does not even address the million barrels of oil a day which now Iran will be able to ply to markets all around the world and the revenue they will be able to generate from that.

The President may believe that there is nothing we can do about Iran funneling money to terrorist groups that

seek to attack us and our allies, but we cannot afford to just shrug our shoulders with indifference. That seems to be what the President's reaction is: Well, Iran has always done it and they will do it with this money. But he acts as if there is nothing he nor we can or should do about it. Iran's history of bankrolling terrorist activity deserves our attention and should be the focus of this deal, and it should be a major consideration as we proceed to assess the merits of this nuclear arrangement and vote on a resolution of disapproval.

I wish to pause a minute just to tell the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, not just because he is sitting next to me but because it is true, that I admire and appreciate his leadership through this very convoluted maze we have had to proceed down until we have gotten to this point. But how ironic would it be that after the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, working with the ranking member and getting a vote of Congress and a signature of the President allowing a resolution of disapproval—how ironic would it be if a partisan filibuster blocks an up-or-down vote on that resolution of disapproval. It is just shocking to me, but that is what the minority leader, Senator REID, and indeed the President of the United States himself apparently are talking about—blocking a vote on the resolution of disapproval that they cooperated in crafting and that bears the President's signature, that process by which that is to play out.

But, again, that is another reason people get so disgusted with what they see in Washington—because they feel there is no accountability. People get away with whatever they can. There is no right and wrong anymore. There are no rules that apply to everyone evenly and evenhandedly. There is no—in the words above the Supreme Court of the United States—there is no “equal justice under the law.” It does not seem to apply.

Well, just digressing a moment and talking again about this threatened partisan filibuster of the resolution of disapproval—and again I hope and pray our colleagues across the aisle, the 41 who have said they will vote against the resolution of disapproval, I hope they will reconsider if they are even thinking about a partisan filibuster of the resolution itself and not even getting to the resolution of disapproval.

They have every right to vote according to their conscience and as they believe they should vote on the resolution of disapproval, but the idea of blocking a vote by a filibuster—it just strikes me as reckless and irresponsible, especially in light of this: I mentioned this to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee a few moments ago, but I will come back to it because I find it so shocking.

A few days ago in the Wall Street Journal, there was a discussion or ac-

tually a report from the Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, the Supreme Leader of Iran, who declared Thursday—it said in this story of September 3—that the Iranian Parliament would have the final word on the deal. It says the Parliament speaker delivered a similar message to reporters in New York later in the day, saying he supports the deal which would lift crippling economic sanctions on Iran in return for curbs on the country's nuclear activities. The speaker of the Iranian Parliament said the agreement needs to be discussed and it needs to be approved by the Iranian Parliament. There will be heated discussions and debates.

I would hate the fact, if it was to occur—and I hope it does not—that the Iranian Parliament would have a more open, accountable, and democratic process than the Senate. I hope we do not head down the road of a partisan filibuster, no matter how this resolution turns out. It would be a mistake, it would be a self-inflicted wound to the Senate and to the respect which we would like to garner from the American people.

They would see this as business as usual, and I think it would add to their disgust. I hope Members, as they return to Washington today and as we begin to debate this deal, I hope they will recall—and let me, just in a brief few minutes, refresh some of their collective live memories about Iran's long history of terrorism against the United States and our allies. I actually had a chance last week when I was in Dallas, TX, to discuss this matter with a gentleman named Rick Kupke in Dallas, TX. He actually lives in Arlington, TX, right between Fort Worth and Dallas.

But Rick was a former U.S. Foreign Service officer. He has learned firsthand how the Iranian regime targets and attacks Americans because he was the last American captured in 1979 at the U.S. Embassy in Iran during the Iranian hostage crisis. He was one of dozens of Americans held in captivity for 444 days under the constant threat of death. But many will also remember two other terrorist bombings that occurred in 1983 that targeted American citizens. One blew up the U.S. Embassy in Beirut and the other blew up the U.S. Marine barracks at Beirut International Airport. Combined, these bombings killed more than 250 American citizens, including 8 Texans, 7 of them marines and another a soldier.

It is well known and documented that these attacks were perpetrated by the terrorist group Hezbollah under the direction of the Iranian regime. That is how the Iranian regime does its dirty work. It does it through proxies, not directly but through proxies like Hezbollah.

Iran, while it has denied any involvement in these attacks, does not shy away from celebrating these bombings

that have killed hundreds of Americans. In 2004, a little more than 20 years after the bombings, the Iranian Government erected a monument—a monument in its capital to commemorate the “martyrs” who carried out those attacks.

Later in 1985, Hezbollah, together with another terrorist group, hijacked a Trans World Airlines flight, holding hostages and beating its passengers for 2 weeks. More than half of those passengers were American citizens, including a group of six U.S. Navy sailors, one of whom was murdered.

In 1996, a bombing on a housing complex in Saudi Arabia was linked to Iranian officials that resulted in the death of 19 U.S. servicemembers, wounding more than 500.

More recently, the Defense Department has acknowledged that during Operation Iraqi Freedom, at least 500 Americans died at the hands of Shiite militias who were equipped by Iran with different types of lethal weapons. It became well known that the explosively formed penetrators, which melted the armor used to shield Americans and our allies in Iraq, were produced by the Iranian Government, and the Quds Force trained people to use those against Americans and our allies.

Then, right here in our Nation's Capital just 4 years ago, Iranian officials were implicated in a plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador to the United States. That plot reportedly included plans to bomb the Israeli Embassy in Washington as well. That is a staggering list of aggressions against the United States and our allies, both at home and abroad since the Iranian regime came to power in 1979.

I don't have the time right now to discuss the Iranian fingerprints on the havoc being wreaked in the Middle East, from Yemen to Syria, to Iraq. In all the major hotspots of the world, Iranian fingerprints are all over these activities. Of course, Iran has long sponsored militant groups on Israel's borders, which have attacked Israel with rockets, hundreds of rockets and terrorism.

In southern Lebanon, Iran funds and supplies Hezbollah, which threatens Israel's northern border, against which Israel went to war in 2006. In Gaza, on Israel's southwestern border, Iran has long sponsored Hamas. Particularly as Iranian-Hamas relations have frayed in recent years, Iran has sponsored the Palestinian Islamic Jihad.

Suffice it to say that over the years, Iran has sown chaos across the Middle East, attacking the United States and our allies, while publicly celebrating the death of Americans in Tehran. So with this regime's long history of aggression against the United States and its allies, I find it troubling that the President characterizes any thoughtful questioning of the merits of this deal as akin to warmongering. That is what

the President has said: If you don't like this deal, the alternative is war. To which I would say: Wrong, Mr. President. The alternative to this deal is a better deal.

According to the President's twisted logic, those who are skeptical of this same Iran, which I have described has time and time again demonstrated its aggression against the United States and which has articulated its principle opposition to this deal—the President would characterize the critics of this deal as the real belligerents encouraging war. In fact, he went so far as to say that Republican opponents of this deal—he has not said this yet about the opponents of this deal who are members of his political party, but he has about Republicans, that those who share the concerns are “making common cause” with Iranian hardliners who chant “Death to America.”

Well, this debate and this vote are simply too important for it to degenerate into partisanship. I know this is something the Senator from Tennessee feels very strongly about. He has tried to elevate the debate and to work in a bipartisan way to bring us to this vote on a resolution this week.

I hope we don't follow the President down this low road of partisan rhetoric, which actually only serves to distract us from examining the deal and identifying the true character of the regime that we are somehow making common cause with and hoping against hope that they won't continue at some point to break out and pursue those nuclear weapons.

This is not like the Soviet Union. This is not Ronald Reagan negotiating with the Soviet Union. This is a theocratic regime that is led by an Islamic extremist who has American and other allied blood on his hands and makes no bones about it.

So this debate needs to help the American people find the answer to this crucial question. I think it boils down to this: Will this deal make America and our allies safer? I think that ultimately is the question.

As we prepare to vote on this resolution of disapproval, I hope that we will have a civil, enthusiastic, and spirited debate, as the speaker of the Iranian Parliament said they will have in their body, and we will be able to openly and honestly discuss different points of view. That is the Senate is supposed to be—a place where that can happen and where it should happen. The American people deserve that kind of debate, not a partisan filibuster that cuts off the debate prematurely and tries to hide accountability for the ultimate outcome on the resolution of disapproval.

I look forward to that spirited debate, and I hope any thought that any of our colleagues might have had about engaging in a partisan filibuster of this important resolution will fade quickly from their minds.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

REMEMBERING ALISON PARKER AND ADAM WARD

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I rise today for a sad occasion, and that is to remember the lives of two Virginians, Alison Parker and Adam Ward, the journalists who were gunned down on live TV in Roanoke, VA, just a couple of weeks ago, as they covered a local news story.

There was a third victim in that shooting, Vicki Gardner, the president of the local chamber of commerce at Smith Mountain Lake, who is recovering. She was released from the hospital today, but she still has a long recovery ahead of her.

We saw during the summer a set of these tragedies in Roanoke, VA, my wife's hometown, in Charleston, SC, in Lafayette, LA, and in Chattanooga, TN. My friend, the Senator from Tennessee, is on the floor.

In Virginia, the shooting in Roanoke, which was carried out on live television, was horrific in itself, but it also was horrific because it brought up a lot of bad memories. The Roanoke community is within about 25 miles from Virginia Tech, where the horrible shooting happened in 2007 that killed 32 people and wounded dozens of others.

I spoke on the Senate floor in April on the eighth anniversary of that shooting. I talked, as is my habit to do in April, about the lives of those who lost their lives but also about some who survived and what they are doing today. I am saddened to be here because it is just another example of a horrible shooting in my Commonwealth. It is also sad because we really haven't made any progress in this body since I came to it in terms of trying to address this issue.

There is a lot of work to be done—legislative and otherwise—to try to address the growing litany of these horrific crimes, which deeply scar our own psyche and, frankly, I think, portray a picture of who we are as a nation to the rest of the world that is not accurate about who we are. I am going to introduce a bill that I think can help us address it. It is not the end-all solution because there isn't a single solution. But I am going to talk a little bit about Alison and Adam, and then I wish to talk about the bill.

Alison and Adam worked on a show on WDBJ, the “Mornin’” program. They were sort of hometown heroes. Not only were they popular because they worked for the station, they were both from the hometown. Roanoke is where my wife grew up. I am very, very familiar with the wonderful Roanoke community. They both interned at WDBJ when they were in college. They were passionate members of this journalistic profession, and they were just starting on these great careers.

Alison Parker grew up in Martinsville, which is just up the road

from Roanoke, about a 45-minute drive. She played the trumpet and French horn in high school. She graduated from James Madison University. When she was at James Madison, she interned at WDBJ. They loved her work, and they gave her a recommendation.

Her first job was not there at WDBJ, but it was in North Carolina. But as soon as she could move from North Carolina back to Virginia, that is what she did. She came back to her hometown station. She covered all kinds of news and human interest stories, including a recent piece on child abuse that was a very powerful one. Her colleagues describe her as “proactive” and “wise beyond her years.” She met her boyfriend, whom she was planning to marry, while working at WDBJ.

Adam Ward went to Salem High School. Salem is the city that adjoins Roanoke. He graduated in 2007 and played football on two State championship football teams. Teachers there describe him as “vivacious,” “kind,” “giving,” “respectful,” and “genuine.” He had passion for Virginia Tech, the local college. He started to go to Tech football games with his dad when he was 3 years old. He interned also at WDBJ when he was a communications student at Tech.

His colleagues remembered him as somebody willing to get the image that reporters need. We all know in this line of work the guys behind the camera are so important to it. They make the on-camera talent shine, and that was the way Adam was. He loved to play tricks on the on-camera talent, kind of tweak them and make them not get above their station in life, but he was a wonderful guy.

He found love at the station too. He had become engaged to a producer at the station who sadly was watching in the station the day that the footage of him being killed was shown, which shocked the world.

I really feel for these families. I know we all do. You couldn't have watched that without having a feeling, even if you were a thousand miles away from the Ward and Parker families.

I remember having said to the Virginia Tech families this: It would be presumptuous of me, and so I am not going to say I know what you have lost, because I don't know what you have lost. But when you hear about these people, I do feel like I have a sense of what the world lost, I have a sense of what the community lost. I don't know what the parents and the siblings lost, but you kind of have a sense when you hear about these people from those at WDBJ, the Roanoke community, the community of journalists. You kind of have a sense of what we lost as a society when they were killed.

I should just say a word. Since 2002, Vicki Gardner has worked at the Smith Mountain Lake Regional Chamber of

Commerce. It is a major tourism area in Virginia, a State park. It is a feature that was created by a hydroelectric dam, and they were celebrating its 35th anniversary. She was deeply involved in the planning.

Again, she was badly wounded. She has described maneuvering around to try to duck bullets as she was shot in her back. She has had a couple of operations, but, thank God, she has been released to go home today, and we are thinking about her too.

I said the shooting opened a lot of old wounds in Virginia, and especially in this community, sadly, because Virginia Tech is so close. When I spoke on the floor in April, I talked about two of these young people, Colin Goddard and Lily Habtu, who survived that shooting. Just think of the effect upon their lives 8 years later, as they deal with injuries that continue to be a challenge, and they deal with the horrible memories of that day. That was probably one of the most scarring events in modern history in Virginia. Everybody knows where they were, and everybody knew somebody connected to it.

We have revisited the cycle of shock, then anger, then calls for change, then wondering what the right changes were, and sympathy for the families. But we haven't really changed, and I would just humbly submit that I think there are things that we can do—reasonable things we can do that will bring some accountability. It will not eliminate these instances. It is beyond our power to eliminate evil. We cannot do that. We have to be humble about it. But in every area we work on, we can work in this body with the thought that we can do things that will make situations better and that will promote incremental improvements.

RESPONSIBLE TRANSFER OF FIREARMS ACT

Mr. President, I wish to speak about a bill that I am going to introduce called the Responsible Transfer of Firearms Act. As we all know, current Federal law prohibits nine categories of people from getting weapons. Probably the most known are convicted felons, people who have been adjudicated mentally ill and dangerous, and people who are under domestic violence prevention orders.

This is a bipartisan Federal law. Categories have been added over time in a bipartisan way by the House and the Senate. As far as I know, there is bipartisan support for this provision because you never see bills introduced to eliminate these categories of what I will call prohibited persons. These are people whom many in Congress—bipartisanly and bipartisanship—have determined should not possess weapons.

Now, the problem is a whole lot of those people do get weapons because folks either give or sell them to them.

What is the current law with respect to giving or selling a weapon to somebody who is prohibited?

The current law basically is kind of a no-responsibility law. You are criminally liable if you give or sell a weapon to somebody who is in those nine prohibited categories, but you are only criminally liable if you knew or should have known that they were prohibited. I practiced law for a while. That makes prosecution virtually impossible, because somebody will give somebody a weapon or sell it to them and then they will say: Well, I didn't know he was a felon. I didn't know he had been adjudicated mentally ill or dangerous.

There is no obligation on behalf of the seller. Now, we have put obligations on sellers all the time—affirmative duties and obligations—but in this area, we don't put an obligation on the part of a seller other than a registered and licensed gun dealer, who must go through a background check. We don't put any kind of obligation on anybody to do even minimal, reasonable steps to make sure that somebody is lawfully able to possess a weapon.

So what the Responsible Transfer of Firearms Act would do is it would revise the current formula. The current formula does have a liability for sellers but only under an elevated standard that really is almost impossible to meet. We would amend the Federal code, not to change the nine categories—those are the same—not to change the punishments for selling or transferring to them—that would stay the same—but we adjust the responsibility. It is a responsibility and accountability act.

So if you are putting a weapon in somebody's hands, either selling it or transferring it, you have to take "reasonable steps" to determine that the recipient is not prohibited from having that weapon. "Reasonable steps" is included in the statute—just those words. We don't say: You can only do that by showing one of the following five things. You can take any reasonable steps you think are necessary, but you have to take reasonable steps.

That is what this change in law would do. If you cannot show satisfaction to a court that you have taken reasonable steps, then you will be liable for putting the weapon into somebody's hands whom the Federal Government has said is not able to possess such a weapon.

This shift from the current framework would promote accountability and responsibility. Why should we let a seller just casually put a firearm into the hands of somebody who is prohibited by law from having it? Why should we do that? Why shouldn't there be some minimal accountability for a seller who is putting a weapon in the hands of somebody who has been determined not able to possess a weapon?

We put burdens on sellers. This is not a precise analogy, but if you go in and try to buy beer in a place, you are going to get carded. Why is that? Well,

because we have put an affirmative burden on the sale of alcohol so that the seller has to make some effort to determine that the recipient is not prohibited from having it. We do the same thing with tobacco. There are other laws that put burdens on sellers as well, and this a minimal one—take reasonable steps.

To me the lives of some of these people who have been gunned down in those horrible crimes are just worth it. Let's just take reasonable steps. The reasonable steps won't solve all the cases, but it will help keep weapons out of the hands of those whom we have determined, in this body, shouldn't have them.

I close and just say this: Of course, we have to be humble enough to acknowledge there is no one solution to the epidemic of gun violence nor is there a complete solution to it. There is nothing that we can do that will eliminate the possibility that we could wake up tomorrow and see the same thing on TV. Human beings will do evil things. That is not going to change. That is not going to be eliminated by what we do here.

But what we do as legislators in legislation is basically believe—and if we didn't believe this, we wouldn't be in this body—that as we legislate, we can improve situations. We cannot eliminate the possibility, but we can improve it. We can make it less likely that one of these prohibited individuals will get a weapon in their hands and use it against others.

So I just conclude where I started.

Alison and Adam were wonderful people. This is a community that is still really grieving. What compounds grief in my experience—not as a legislator but as a person—what compounds and deepens grief is a sense of hopelessness. Wow, this horrible thing happened. We have had this horrible loss, and there is nothing we can do about it. That tends to turn grief into despair and depression.

Sadly, I was Governor when the shooting at Virginia Tech took place, and I had to deal with 32 families and more who had been injured, and the broader community was hurting so much. When you have gone through an experience—and we see this in our own personal life because everybody has had grief in their own personal lives. If you go through an experience where there is a lot of grief and loss and you feel that it is pointless or there is nothing you can do to improve it or transform it into something better or improve it so that maybe somebody else won't have to suffer through the same experience, that tends to take grief and turn it into something even more damaging—despair and hopelessness. I think one of the things we are called to do as legislators in situations where there is grief is to show there is some hope we can improve, because I

believe we can improve. I have seen too many instances legislatively and in the lives of people that we can improve and we can get better, and as a nation we need to get better on this issue. This bill won't do it all, but I think it will be a sensible way to get better and to show those who are suffering and maybe even despairing under this epidemic of gun violence that we are not just going to accept it and sink deeper into despair and grief, but grab on to it and try to make improvements.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, I rise today to discuss the Iran nuclear deal. We are here today because several months ago Senators CORKER and CARDIN, the respective chair and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee worked out an agreement to allow us to have this debate voted on here in the Senate, and there were 98 votes in support of allowing a vote on the Iranian nuclear agreement. In fact, it went to the President's desk, and the President then signed it into law. That set in place a process, which is where we end up today.

I certainly hope our colleagues who voted for this allow us to have that debate. It is an important debate. It has serious consequences for America's national security interests, and it certainly is something that shouldn't be minimized in any way. The American people need to have their voices heard in this discussion, which will take place if we are allowed to get on that resolution here in the U.S. Senate.

So I would hope that our colleagues on the other side—there was some discussion I read reporting of statements made by the President or by members of his administration, statements made by some of our colleagues here that perhaps they might block us from even proceeding to this resolution. I think that would be a big mistake. It would be a tragic outcome with respect to something that is this important to America's national security. It certainly is something which the American people deserve and have a right to have their voices heard.

So I am looking forward to this discussion. I hope throughout the course of the next few days we will have a chance to air this out because it is clear that one of the greatest threats to our national security is the possibility of a nuclear-armed Iran and a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Unfortunately, President Obama's Iran nuclear deal, which is really a nuclear concessions deal, increases rather than decreases that possibility.

There are numerous reasons to be concerned about a nuclear-armed Iran. Iran is the world's leading state spon-

sor of terrorism. That is well documented. It has been talked about a lot. Iran actively supports Hezbollah and Hamas, both of which pose an immediate threat to our ally Israel.

Iran incites regional instability, supporting the Houthis in Yemen and the Assad regime in Syria. Iran continues to commit human rights abuses against its own people, and Iran has a history of taking extreme measures to hide its nuclear enrichment program from the international community.

In response to Iran's nuclear activities 9 years ago, in 2006, the U.N. and the United States began to impose sanctions on Iran's nuclear enrichment program. These sanctions were dramatically increased in 2010. The sanctions targeted Iranian businesses and financial institutions as well as members of Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps or IRGC, who were responsible for killing hundreds of Americans and froze Iranian assets that would have been used by Iran to support terrorism throughout the region. This had a tremendous impact, effectively bringing Iran to its knees.

Thanks to the pressures the sanctions exerted on Iran's economy, Iran's leadership was under immense pressure to negotiate with the United States and its allies. In 2013 Iran agreed to engage in talks regarding its nuclear program. However, soon after Iran agreed to come to the negotiating table, the Obama administration inexplicably began making concession after concession, with Iran giving up very little in return. The result—a weak deal that is highly unlikely to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear power.

We have already heard from many of my colleagues why this agreement is a bad deal. Once this deal goes into effect, right off the bat Iran will have access to roughly \$140 billion, which even President Obama and Secretary Kerry acknowledge would be partly used to finance terrorism. The deal will also increase access to conventional weapons, allowing Iran to defend its nuclear infrastructure from military strike. By lifting the ban on ballistic missiles, Iran will be able to purchase a delivery system capable of carrying a nuclear warhead well beyond the confines of the Middle East. The deal will also allow Iran to continue its research and development into advanced centrifuges, permitting Iran to modernize its enrichment infrastructure and reducing the breakout period for a nuclear weapon to a few weeks instead of months.

The outcome of this agreement will be a more prosperous, better armed, more dangerous Iran, exerting its regional influence and continuing to sponsor terror. All of that will be achieved without Iran violating the terms of the agreement.

However, if Iran does decide to cheat, this deal will make that more possible.

To begin with, for suspicious sites not currently on the list of Iran's nuclear facilities, Iran gets 24 days' notice before inspections can take place. Even more concerning, however, is the information leaked recently that the secret International Atomic Energy Agency agreement with Iran will allow Iran to provide its own soil samples to inspectors from enrichment sites such as the facility at Parchin. Think about that. The regime which has broken these agreements in the past and cheated in the past—again, well documented—will be able to furnish its own soil inspections.

Unfortunately, instead of acknowledging this when it was raised in committee, Secretary Kerry took on the role of apologist for Iran, defending the deal by saying that private agreements with the IAEA are the norm. However, if the leaked information regarding soil samples is correct, this calls into question the entire credibility of the inspections regime. For this reason and many others, I strongly oppose President Obama's nuclear arms concession agreement with Iran, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

By rejecting this agreement, we can negotiate a better deal—one that will actually stop Iran's nuclear program and prevent Iran from getting a nuclear bomb. It is unfortunate that when we have the majority of the American people clearly opposing this deal that the President is not only willing to veto their opposition but to call doing so a victory.

I would like to expand a little bit of detail on some of the national security concerns with this nuclear agreement with Iran.

Since the Iran agreement was first announced in July, the Obama administration has repeatedly stated that we should at least give this deal a try, arguing that if Iran breaks its side of the agreement and pursues a nuclear weapon, we will have the same military options down the road that we have today. However, that is not true. We will not have the same options in the future that we have today. Right now, if a situation arose where Iran entered a breakout period and was pursuing a nuclear weapon, the United States or our allies in the region could conduct a targeted air strike on Iran's enrichment facilities.

For example, if we knew that Iran was using its nuclear enrichment facility at Fordow to enrich weapons-grade uranium, we could utilize our air superiority with bunker-buster bombs. Obviously, we would prefer to avoid a military strike, but if needed, we have that option, and Iran knows this.

However, under this agreement, in 10 years' time, Iran will have faster, far more efficient centrifuges that can operate in significantly smaller facilities that can be placed deeper underground

with increased levels of fortification, making a military strike much more complex.

Right now Iran is using IR-1 centrifuges, which are basically 1960s technology; but under this agreement, starting around year 8, Iran can begin testing IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges. In fact, as stated in page 10 of Annex 1, after the agreement has been in place for 8½ years, Iran can construct up to 30 IR-6 centrifuges and 30 IR-8 centrifuges. Why is this so significant? IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges are far more advanced and estimated to be up to 15 times more efficient than the IR-1 centrifuges that they are using today. By increasing the efficiency of the enrichment process, Iran can significantly reduce the breakout period that is necessary to create a bomb.

On page 17 of Annex 1 of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, under the section titled "Centrifuge Manufacturing," the agreement states that at the end of year 8:

Iran will commence manufacturing of IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges without rotors through year 10 at a rate of up to 200 centrifuges per year for each type.

The administration has repeatedly asserted that even if we destroyed Iran's enrichment facilities with an air strike, we can't turn back time and erase Iran's nuclear enrichment know-how.

While that may be true, we absolutely can and should prevent Iran from increasing its nuclear expertise, but this deal doesn't do that. Instead, it ensures Iran's knowledge will increase by solidifying its ability to develop more advanced centrifuges. Because these IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges are so much more efficient in speeding up the uranium enrichment process, they will make it far easier for Iran to conceal and protect its nuclear program.

Referring once again to the facility at Fordow, when Fordow was first constructed, it was built to contain 3,000 IR-1 centrifuges, which meant that the facility had to be significant in size. IR-8 centrifuges, however, are estimated to be 15 times more efficient than the IR-1 centrifuges used at Fordow, which means that by using IR-8 centrifuges, Iran could replicate the enrichment capability of a facility like Fordow with a building containing not 3,000 centrifuges, but only 200 centrifuges. Such a facility can be the size of a house. By reducing the size of the facilities by this magnitude, Iran could build many Fordows in multiple locations, hiding them more easily and putting them deeper underground. Such facilities could be built within existing mines, making them extremely difficult to find.

As mentioned before, this agreement guarantees Iran will have the manufacturing capacity it needs to build these advanced centrifuges. Even within the

parameters of this agreement, Iran could manufacture 200 IR-6 centrifuges and 200 IR-8 centrifuges per year starting around year 8. Since Iran would already have the manufacturing capacity for building IR-8 centrifuges, it would merely need to ramp up the production beyond the terms of the agreement and in a short period of time it could have operating enrichment facilities in multiple locations throughout the country. By the time these violations had been discovered and conformed, the advanced centrifuges would likely be in place, and Iran would have likely enough enriched uranium for a bomb.

But there is much more to it than that. Currently, according to publicly available sources, Iran's air defense capabilities consist of domestically produced, short-range surface-to-air missiles and Russian made, longer range SA-2 and SA-5 surface-to-air missiles, as well as a few Chinese CSA-1s. These systems are vulnerable to electronic countermeasures and pose very little threat to American or even Israeli aircraft.

However, that is not where Iran's air defenses will be in 10 years. Under this agreement, the ban on conventional weapons sales to Iran will be lifted after 5 years. Russia has already agreed to sell Iran four batteries of S-300 vehicle-launched surface-to-air missiles. Depending upon the sophistication of these S-300 missile systems, they may be able to engage aircraft up to 200 miles away.

As we saw last month with Iran unveiling its new solid-fuel missiles, Iran's domestic military infrastructure will not remain static. Over the next decade, as Iran acquires more and more increasingly advanced weapons systems, its area denial capability will make airstrikes even more difficult. Will a future American President, therefore, have the same military options that we have today, as President Obama and Secretary Kerry claim? The answer is no.

We will still have military options available to us, but the calculus for carrying out a targeted airstrike will be much different down the road. Therefore, it is not realistic for President Obama to claim that future Presidents will have the same military options against Iran we have today. And the more the realistic possibility of a military strike decreases, the more likely Iran will be to violate the terms of the agreement and go after a bomb.

In 10 years' time, under this agreement, our best hope for Iran not attaining a nuclear weapon will be the Iranian Government voluntarily deciding it doesn't want one. That is not something I am willing to bank on.

Madam President, I also want to speak for a moment about Iran's support for terrorism and the idea put forward by President Obama that Iran will spend most of the soon-to-be-ac-

quired economic wealth on its own economy. Even if we assume Iran's military spending remains what it is today as a percentage of Iran's budget, what would that mean going forward?

Well, there are many estimates on how much Iran spends on its military. Some experts put the figure at around \$10 billion per year, while others estimate the figure to be closer to \$15 billion or even higher. In addition, of the amount spent on Iran's military, about 65 percent is spent on Iran's Revolutionary Guard Corps—the IRGC.

In the first year of this agreement, between unfrozen assets and increased revenue from oil sales, Iran is expected to see an initial influx of around \$140 billion. Now, using conservative numbers, if Iran's military spending stayed the same in this coming year as a percentage of GDP, it would increase to almost \$15 billion, with \$9.5 billion going to the IRGC.

One of the main national security concerns we have regarding the IRGC is that Iran uses it to support terrorist organizations. Iran is the main supporter of Hezbollah in Lebanon and Hamas in Gaza, both of which have provoked conflicts with Israel in recent years.

In addition, Iran's support of instability in the region is well known, with the Iranian Government providing funding to the Houthis in Yemen and military assistance to Assad in Syria. Many of our own casualties in Iraq were the result of Iranian-made bombs provided to insurgents by the Iranian Quds Force.

Last summer, the missiles being launched at Israel out of Gaza were primarily imported from Iran. It is no wonder Israel has been so opposed to this deal.

Even the Iron Dome system, which proved so successful during the last Israeli-Palestinian conflict, can be overwhelmed if enough missiles are fired at once. And now Iran, a country bent on Israel's destruction, is going to see a huge increase in military spending.

Even the Quds Force commander, Qassem Suleimani, the man responsible for supplying Iraqi insurgents with bombs that killed U.S. soldiers, will see United Nations and European Union sanctions lifted as a result of this deal.

President Obama keeps arguing that the danger of a nuclear-armed Iran far outweighs the short-term impact of Iran's increased support for terrorism. As we have discussed, I don't think this agreement prevents Iran from getting a nuclear bomb. But even if my colleagues disagree with me on that point, are we really willing to trade the lives of our allies in the short term to try to achieve this goal? That is not a risk I am willing to take.

In urging my colleagues to vote against this deal, I would also like to

speak for just a moment about what would happen if Congress is able to stop this deal?

The President keeps saying a “no” vote on this deal will lead to war. Well, that is unrealistic and a clear attempt by the President to garner support for the agreement by stoking people’s fears.

Iran is very aware of its own military limitations, and it knows what the outcome of such a war would be. For Iran, in the short term, a much more realistic response would be for it to try to keep its side of the agreement in an attempt to gain United Nations and EU sanctions relief. However, despite this attempt, the United States could double down on the U.N. sanctions that were in place prior to the December framework and threaten to use secondary sanctions against foreign businesses who wish to do business with Iran.

Given the size of the U.S. economy compared to Iran, this is a powerful deterrent. Since Iran’s economy is already hurting, maintaining sanctions would provide more leverage for the P5+1 to get a better deal.

However, another plausible outcome following congressional rejection of the deal would be for Iran to try to capitulate on congressional disapproval by seeking to divide Russia and China from the West to undermine the multilateral sanctions regime. Iran could try to achieve this by implementing certain commitments from the agreement but not others.

But even if China and Russia wish to do business with Iran, they both still have an incentive to try to achieve the original goal of the negotiations. It is not in China’s interest for a nuclear-armed Iran to cause greater instability with global energy prices, and Russia doesn’t want an Islamist regime in its backyard, which is prone to regional conflicts, acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities.

These scenarios I am describing have already been echoed by a chorus of experts who have pointed out the flaws in this agreement and offered alternatives. The vote this week is not—is not—a choice between supporting a bad deal or going to war. The vote this week is an opportunity to reject a bad deal in order to achieve a better outcome.

That is what we ought to be doing, and I hope we get the chance to get on this resolution and that we have the chance to get a full debate here in the Senate where the people’s voices can be heard. I hope when it is all said and done, Members here in the Senate will come to the same conclusion I and many of my colleagues have, which is that this is a bad deal for our country, it is a bad deal for our allies in the region, and there is a much better outcome that can be achieved if the Senate will reject this bad deal and get us

back to negotiations where we can achieve a better outcome.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Roseann A. Ketchmark, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 30 minutes of debate equally divided in the usual form.

The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUNT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today we are going to vote on the nomination of Roseann Ketchmark. She has been nominated to be a Federal district judge in the Western District of Missouri. Now, this is only the sixth judicial nominee that we have voted on since the Senate Republicans took over the majority 8 months ago, so less than 1 a month. In fact, if we continue at this rate the Republican majority has established, the Senate this year will confirm the fewest number of judges in more than a half century—resulting in a judicial vacancy crisis. I am concerned because the Senate Republican leadership has refused to schedule timely confirmation votes for consensus judicial nominees which, I think, demonstrates an astounding neglect of the needs of our independent

third branch, which borders on contempt.

I am proud to be a lawyer. I have practiced both in the criminal and civil bars and served as a prosecutor. I have appeared before many different courts. I look at the men and women who have been on our courts, and I say: Here is an example of the way the judicial system should be—something every country in the world wants to emulate. But now, we are treating that third branch almost with contempt—with partisan contempt—and that is going to hurt the whole of the Federal judiciary.

When Senate Democrats were in the majority, we worked hard to reduce the number of judicial vacancies to just 43—the lowest level since this President took office. This was accomplished through the unyielding efforts of then-Majority Leader REID and Senate Democrats, who prioritized filling judicial vacancies so that our independent judiciary would be sufficiently staffed. Our success in reducing the number of judicial vacancies to such a level in 2014 was remarkable, given that we had begun the year with over 90 vacancies and the fact that Senate Republicans filibustered every single judicial nominee.

Throughout President Obama’s tenure, we have seen Senate Republicans consistently prioritize partisan politics over the Senate’s constitutional duty of advice and consent. Their relentless obstruction over the last 6 years has resulted in an unacceptable number of vacancies—often hovering close to or exceeding 90. By the end of last year, the Senate made progress in reducing judicial vacancies to 43, but now we are seeing those gains reversed due to the Republicans’ refusal to even schedule confirmation votes this year. In the 8 months since Republicans have been in the majority, judicial vacancies have increased by more than 50 percent. If Republicans keep on this dangerous course, we are heading to a judicial vacancy crisis. This is made worse by the fact that the number of Federal court vacancies deemed to be “judicial emergencies” by the non-partisan Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts has increased by 158 percent since the beginning of the year. There are now 31 judicial emergency vacancies that are affecting communities across the country.

I am going to show a couple of things. Republicans campaigned last year on the promise they would govern responsibly if they won the majority, but instead they have created divisive issues that play openly to their political base. One needs to look no further than the recent show vote to defund critical health services for women.

I was in Vermont all last month. Everywhere I went—especially rural Vermont, where it is so difficult and so essential to get health care to women—they are asking: Why do the Republicans want to cut off the health care

for women in rural parts of our country? Rather than spending 2 days in an unnecessary political exercise, the Senate should have voted to confirm the many judicial nominees pending on the calendar. In fact, rather than pushing bills to strip funding from local law enforcement for obeying the rules on immigration enforcement, we should be confirming judges to ensure our entire criminal justice system works for everyone.

Let's give one example. The last 2 years of President Bush's tenure in office, the Democrats controlled the Senate. By this time, we had confirmed 26 of his judges. Now, with exactly the same situation, with Republicans controlling, they have only allowed five judges. What we did as Democrats for President Bush, we put through five times as many judges as Republicans have for President Obama. What you are seeing actually is we are going to politicize the Federal courts.

Supporting and strengthening our Federal judiciary is not a Democratic or Republican priority; it is a fundamental and constitutional duty of the Senate that we all must share. In fact, the Senate Republican leadership's decision to shirk this body's constitutional duty of advice is doing the most harm to States with at least one Republican Senator. Of the 67 current vacancies that exist, 48 of them—or more than 70 percent—are in States with at least one Republican Senator. Texas, for example, has nine judicial vacancies. Seven of those nine are considered judicial emergencies. Incredibly, one of those district court positions has been vacant for over 4 years. A Fifth Circuit position in Texas has been vacant for more than 3 years. Pennsylvania and Alabama face similar crises. They have six and five current vacancies, respectively. Federal courts in several other States are grappling with extended vacancies. They desperately need to be filled.

The length of time that some of these vacancies have remained unfilled is staggering. In Texas, none of these vacancies currently have nominees because the Texas Senators have been slow in providing recommendations to the President. A similar pattern can be seen with the Alabama vacancies, where two of the positions have been vacant for over 2 years, and another has remained vacant for over 1½ years.

In Pennsylvania, there are six current vacancies and five nominees pending. Senate Republicans should be trying to move these nominees as expeditiously as possible. Of great concern is the treatment of Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo, who will fill an emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit. Judge Restrepo was unanimously confirmed 2 years ago by the Senate to serve as a district court judge in Pennsylvania. I have heard no objection to his nomination,

yet it took 7 months just to get him a hearing in the Judiciary Committee.

Judge Restrepo has strong bipartisan support from both Pennsylvania Senators, and he was voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote. Once confirmed, Judge Restrepo will become the first Hispanic judge from Pennsylvania to serve on this court and only the second Hispanic judge ever to serve on the Third Circuit. No Senate Democrat opposes a vote on his nomination. Senate Republicans are the only thing holding up his nomination. I hope the Republican Senator from Pennsylvania will implore his leadership to bring this highly qualified nominee up for a vote. The continued delay of Judge Restrepo is a poor reflection on this body.

In the Western District of New York, located in Buffalo, there is not a single active Federal district judge, even though it has one of the busiest case-loads in the country. And there are more criminal cases than in Washington, DC, Boston, Cleveland, and they don't have a single active judge because Republicans will not allow a vote, up or down, even though they have the majority. If you don't like the judge, you vote them down. They will not even allow a vote. I should note that the highly qualified nominee to serve in Buffalo was voted unanimously out of the Judiciary Committee. They will not allow them to have a vote on the Senate floor.

Look at this, how we brought vacancies down when we controlled the Senate, and now look at how they shoot up when the Republicans control the Senate. It makes no sense at all. In fact, as I said earlier, the Republican-controlled Senate allowed confirmation votes on just five judges—one, two, three, four, five. They have taken vacations, recesses, long weekends, and leave early—but we don't have time to vote on judges, which are normally unanimous votes anyway.

We are going to vote on the sixth today. Whoop-de-i-ay. Good for us. My goodness gracious. It hasn't been this way before. As I said, when I was chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, in the last 2 years of President Bush's term, I had put through 26 judges by now. The Republicans have only allowed five judges. This kind of partisanship is really wrong. In fact, it is on pace to be the lowest in recent history.

President Eisenhower had 47 judges confirmed in his last 2 years in office; President Reagan had 85 judges confirmed in his last 2 years in office; President Clinton had 73 judges confirmed in his last 2 years in office; and President George W. Bush had 68 judges confirmed in his last 2 years in office. This is a clear double standard that is being applied to President Obama's nominees.

Republicans can provide some real leadership if the majority leader would

go ahead and allow for a vote on all 14 of the judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar. All of these nominees have bipartisan support and were voted out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote. Five of them would fill judicial emergency vacancies, including Judge Restrepo of Pennsylvania. Others would fill judicial emergencies in California, New York, and Tennessee. And the five nominees to the U.S. Court of Federal Claims have now been pending before the full Senate for a year or more.

Today we are voting on the nomination of Roseann Ketchmark to fill a judicial vacancy in the Federal district court in the Western District of Missouri. She has spent her entire 25-year legal career as a prosecutor on both the State and Federal levels. Since 2001, Ms. Ketchmark has served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney with the U.S. Attorney's Office for the Western District of Missouri. During her time in the U.S. Attorney's Office, Ms. Ketchmark has served in supervisory and management capacities as both the First Assistant U.S. Attorney and as the Executive Assistant Attorney. She began her legal career as an Assistant Prosecutor in Kansas City, MO, at the Jackson County Prosecutor's Office, and subsequently joined the Platte County Prosecutor's Office in Platte City, MO, as a First Assistant Prosecutor. Ms. Ketchmark has the bipartisan support of her two home State Senators, Senator McCASKILL and Senator BLUNT. She was voted out of the Judiciary Committee by voice vote more than 4 months ago. She has a strong background as a criminal prosecutor and I will support her nomination.

The majority leader has spoken recently about his desire to avoid another Republican-led government shutdown. I agree, the American people deserve something better than obstructionist shutdowns. While the focus has been on the threat of Republicans shutting down the government over women's health services, the Senate Republicans have virtually shut down the judicial confirmation process. It is harming our justice system in the short and long term.

I have spoken to a number of Republican Senators who realize this is wrong. These are the same Senators who came to me at the time of President Bush and asked: Can you move these judges, even though you are in charge? And I said, of course, we will. Some have come sheepishly and said: We are sorry we didn't return the favor. What I say is reverse course; I urge Senate Republicans to reverse course and realize the short-term partisan decisions are undermining the ability of the judicial system to serve our communities.

Tonight's vote to confirm a district court nominee from Missouri is long overdue. I urge the Senate Republican

leadership to schedule votes for the remaining 13 consensus judicial nominees on the Executive Calendar. They could all be done tomorrow morning in half an hour's time.

I have been in the Senate longer than any Member of this body. I have been here in the majority and the minority, numerous times in both. I have been here with Republican Presidents and Democratic Presidents, with the Republican leaders—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LEAHY. I see nobody else seeking recognition. I ask unanimous consent for another 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. I have been here with both Republican and Democratic leadership of this body, Republican and Democratic Presidents. I have never, in 41 years, seen the Federal judiciary treated in such a cavalier, mean-spirited and, I would say, irresponsible fashion. I know most Senators want to do the right thing. Let's start doing it. This Third Branch of government should be treated with respect. If you have a person who is not competent who is nominated, then vote them down, but if they are competent, let's have a vote on it. Let's not have this.

You are not going to find good men and women to agree to serve on the Federal bench if they think they are going to be delayed for partisan reasons for a year or more at a time. We can do better. We are all proud of our Federal judiciary. It is the best in the world, but this kind of partisanship could turn it into one of the worst in the world. This Senator does not want to see that happen.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Roseann A. Ketchmark, of Missouri, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Missouri?

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 96, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 263 Ex.]

YEAS—96

Alexander	Fischer	Murphy
Ayotte	Flake	Murray
Baldwin	Franken	Nelson
Barrasso	Gardner	Paul
Bennet	Gillibrand	Perdue
Blumenthal	Graham	Peters
Blunt	Grassley	Portman
Booker	Hatch	Reed
Boozman	Heinrich	Reid
Boxer	Heitkamp	Risch
Brown	Heller	Roberts
Burr	Hirono	Rounds
Cantwell	Hoeven	Sanders
Capito	Inhofe	Sasse
Cardin	Isakson	Schatz
Carper	Johnson	Schumer
Casey	Kaine	Scott
Cassidy	King	Sessions
Coats	Kirk	Shaheen
Cochran	Klobuchar	Shelby
Collins	Lankford	Stabenow
Cooms	Leahy	Sullivan
Corker	Lee	Tester
Cornyn	Manchin	Thune
Cotton	McCain	Tillis
Crapo	McCaskill	Toomey
Daines	McConnell	Vitter
Donnelly	Menendez	Warner
Durbin	Merkley	Warren
Enzi	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Ernst	Moran	Wicker
Feinstein	Murkowski	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will resume legislative session.

The Senator from South Dakota.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Presiding Officer.

CELEBRATING LABOR DAY AND AMERICAN WORKERS

Mr. BROWN. President Lincoln said:

It has so happened in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others have, without labor, enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and it should not continue.

Early in President Obama's term, I printed out that quote and handed it to him because it underscores to me the value of labor and the wealth that labor creates for our country, our society, and for those workers and their families. I gave the President that quote because it is my hope that all of us as elected officials remember how important it is that we stand up for workers, organized and unorganized, labor union and nonlabor union members.

It is important to stand up for the workers who have built this country. They laid down the railroad tracks that move people and products across the country. They work on shop floors. They innovate as they labor. They toil in mines. They dug the coal that would power our trains and our factories. These workers built our strong middle class and they continue to be the backbone of our economy.

Over the past month, as many of us did in our States, I visited factory floors across Ohio. At each stop, I witnessed the ingenuity and dedication of workers. Last Thursday I visited All American Clothing in Arcanum, OH. It is a family business and a classic American success story. In 2002, Lawson Nickol worked for a blue jeans manufacturing company. He watched as his company outsourced more and more of its operations, more and more of its production to other countries. Lawson Nickol was appalled as he saw coworkers and friends losing their jobs all the way down the supply chain of this company. He knew he had to do something.

He left his job and he founded All American Clothing Company in Darke County, a rural county west and north of Dayton, OH. He started making jeans in Arcanum, OH.

The first few years were difficult. The company survived on family savings, taking financial risks, working long hours, and having a little bit of luck. But 13 years later, All American is proof that you should never bet against American workers. The jeans aren't only made in Ohio; they are made in other places all over this country. The company is growing. The company expanded in 2012 with the help of a \$150,000 low-interest CDBG development loan. Its products are 100 percent American made and support Ohio jobs.

Lawson's business is a family affair. His son, B.J. Nickol, is a co-owner and company president. B.J. told me that "it is not about greed for us. It is about giving people jobs and making a decent living."

Travel across Ohio and across the country, and you will find more companies like All American thriving on the talent, tenacity, and hard work, blood, sweat, toil, and tears of American workers.

I visited an Airstream plant in Shelby County and a Continental

ContiTech plant in St. Mary's. I toured the Honda Logistics North America plant in East Liberty and the GE Testing Facility in Peebles. I attended the grand opening of the Hart Schaffner Marx suit facility in Brooklyn, OH, a suburb of Cleveland.

I wear this suit today, made in Cleveland, OH, by union workers in a Hugo Boss plant. Since then that plant has been sold to Hart Schaffner Marx, which is opening its production right now. When I visited that plant in my Hugo Boss suit and talked about the fact that this suit had been made at this plant with 150 unionized workers, a worker walked up to me and said, "Senator," and she touched me on the chest and said, "I made that pocket." All of these operations are flourishing because of Ohio workers.

While our workers support our economy, we are not doing enough to support them. Too often workers have no paid sick leave, no paid family leave, and no overtime pay.

President Obama is taking important steps to help working families. New overtime rules would expand overtime pay so that 40 percent of salaried workers would be eligible. Think of it this way. A worker—an employee who is the shift manager on the second shift at a fast-food restaurant who is classified as management may be making only \$30 or \$35,000 a year. They work that worker more than 40 hours a week. Yet that worker gets no overtime because that worker is classified as supervisory. That is wrong. Under the President's plan, the rule he passed down, 160,000 more Ohioans will earn overtime pay for the work they are already doing at their place of business.

This week the administration announced that Federal contractors will be required to provide up to 7 days of paid sick leave each year. It will mean 300,000 Americans working on Federal contracts will be able to stay home if they get sick or take a day off to care for a sick child. It means they are less likely to show up to work when they might infect somebody else with the illness they have, so everybody is more productive. These are important steps, but there are limits to Executive action.

Too many workers are left without paid sick leave, without maternity leave, without overtime pay, without predictable work schedules. Too many women still earn less than men for the same work. The President, through Executive action, can solve some of this, as he should, as he is given power by Congress to do, but we need legislative action.

Previous generations of workers fought for the protections we take for granted: child labor laws, workplace safety protections, unemployment insurance. They fought in union halls, they organized in union halls and church basements. They demanded a

government that respects the dignity of work, that passes laws recognizing the decency and dedication of workers.

After decades of attacks on our unions, laws are often the only protections workers have. Fifty years ago, one in three workers was a member of a union—one-third of workers were members of unions. Now that number is 1 in 10. That is why action from this body is needed more than ever. Workers, when they are organized, when they have a union, are protected so they are paid the overtime they earn. They are protected often with provided sick leave and maternity leave. They are protected because of their union from injury in the workplace.

Because not as many people belong to unions today—that is why we need to pass the Healthy Families Act, we need to pass the Paycheck Fairness Act, we need to pass the Schedules That Work Act, and we need to pass the Pregnant Workers Fairness Act. This is action we can take today in celebration of Labor Day that would make a tremendous difference in the lives of American workers who built this economy.

This past weekend, we celebrated Labor Day with picnics and barbecues and time spent with families, we issued statements honoring American workers. Let's not just honor them with words, let's honor them with deeds. Let's move forward in a way that puts labor, that puts the American worker front and center.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS'S ACQUISITION OF THOMAS JEFFERSON'S PERSONAL LIBRARY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, this year is the 200th anniversary of one of the wisest decisions Congress ever made. In 1815, Congress acquired the entirety of Thomas Jefferson's personal library to replace Congress's library, which was burnt by the British Army the previous year.

I would like to take a few moments to recognize this anniversary and to focus on the good work one small Library of Congress program does today.

Though the Library of Congress was established in 1800, for the first 15 years of its existence it was mainly a law library. It was not until the acquisition of Jefferson's personal library that the Library became the broad repository of knowledge that it is today.

Some Members of Congress opposed the idea of buying Jefferson's entire library, which included books in many languages, and on a variety of topics, including science, math, philosophy, and religion. However, Thomas Jefferson famously replied, "I do not know that it contains any branch of science which Congress would wish to exclude from their collection; there is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer." Fortunately, this view won the day, and today the Library contains an unparalleled number of items from every branch of knowledge, making it the largest library in the world.

Forever growing, the Library of Congress receives 20,000 new items every day. However, only about half are kept for the Library's permanent collection. It is the program designed to bridge that divide which has grown to touch so many Oregonians, as well as regular folks around the country.

The Library of Congress's Surplus Books Program takes the books not needed for the Library's collections and provides them to schools, libraries, and nonprofit institutions around the country. Each week, staff from my office are able to select books, box them up, and send them to Oregon.

One recipient in Oregon has been the new library in Halsey, OR. Halsey is a small town, but the community has come together to build a fantastic new library. I have been able to send them several hundred new books to help them grow and diversify their collection. I expect to be able to send them hundreds more, thanks to the Library of Congress's Surplus Books Program.

I would be remiss if I failed to recognize Joseph Maher, acquisitions specialist and librarian for the Surplus Books Program. Mr. Maher almost singlehandedly runs the program and often goes above and beyond to identify books for particular organizations. Mr. Maher works to find a good home for each of the books, while simultaneously balancing the needs of the many congressional offices, schools, universities, and Federal agencies that select books from the program. He works tirelessly knowing that the books they send around the country are going to make a positive impact on many lives.

Reading sparks creativity, learning, passion, and imagination, and the Library of Congress continues to help ignite it. I could not be more pleased to see communities in Oregon benefitting from this program.

CONGRATULATING KATIE ROTH

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to congratulate a constituent and a great friend of mine, Katie Roth of West Des Moines. This summer Katie was named the 2015 Woman Business Owner of the Year, presented by the Business Record.

In the spring of 2005, Katie, who is never shy to take on a challenge, opened her own staffing agency and has built it from the ground up. Ten years later, Portico Staffing has thrived under her exceptional leadership, business savvy, and highly regarded reputation as a people person. Katie knows how to build relationships and find opportunities needed to grow a business. Along the way, she has helped countless Iowa employers and job-seekers find one another. You might say she is a perfect matchmaker. For the last decade, Katie has worked hard to carve out a slice of the American dream by owning and growing her own business. She knows it comes with sacrifice and risk. And she has worked hard to make her dream come true. Katie is a great mentor and role model for the next generation. She shows that perseverance and persistence pay off. Always on the job, whether networking in the community or listening to her clients, Katie makes good connections happen. And that is a good thing for job seekers and employers looking to hire and grow their business.

Katie was nominated by her peers for consideration of this prestigious award. It is no surprise to me that my fellow Iowans would sing her praises. Without hesitation, I endorse Katie's selection as the 2015 Business Owner of the Year. I have had the pleasure of knowing Katie Roth since 1980 when she joined my first campaign for the U.S. Senate. Always a tireless worker, I have enjoyed watching Katie thrive and succeed throughout the years. A loving wife and mother, Katie is fiercely loyal and Barbara and I hold her in our highest regard.

Barbara and I extend our congratulations to Katie Roth for this well-deserved honor. We wish her the very best as she blazes the trail for many years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING THE GREATER KANSAS CITY CRIME STOPPERS

• Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, as co-chair of the Senate Law Enforcement Caucus, I call to the attention of my colleagues an effective public-private partnership that was pioneered by the Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers.

This partnership, which empowers citizens to assist law enforcement on behalf of public safety, has been a model for the Nation, and beyond.

Crime Stoppers is separate from the police emergency phone system or other standard methods of contacting police, as it allows a member of the community to provide anonymous information about criminal activity. In 1982, the Kansas City Crime Commission launched a hotline for anonymous tips—Crime Stoppers. That first year, 30 tips came in, clearing 8 cases.

Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers emerged as a top program, earning global recognition. In 1999, Sergeant Craig Sarver of the Kansas City Police Department was named International—Crime Stoppers—Coordinator of the Year.

An innovator, Sergeant Sarver nurtured an idea that has evolved into a common tool for law enforcement.

In the summer of 2002, 19-year-old Ali Kemp was murdered in the pump house at a community swimming pool near Kansas City. Her father, Roger Kemp, suggested to police and the local office of Lamar Advertising Company that billboards could help find the killer.

Eventually, a tip generated by donated billboards helped resolve this case. A suspect was arrested in Connecticut, tried, and convicted.

Since then, “wanted” billboards have led to arrests in more than 20 murder cases in the Kansas City area. Sarver, who retired in 2008 after 33 years on the force, cites two reasons why billboards help generate solid tips for police.

First, he says, is the frequency of the message. Tipsters have said they had seen “wanted” billboards multiple times before they shared tips. Second is the emphasis on anonymity, important to those who fear retribution, according to Sergeant Sarver.

Now this tactic—to feature a tip line number on billboards along with a suspect's photo—is a common tool for law enforcement. In 2007 in Philadelphia, the FBI starting using donated electronic “digital” billboards to help find fugitives. The FBI calls these high-tech signs “force multipliers.” Tips generated by digital billboards have resolved 53 FBI cases.

State and local police also rely on billboards to communicate with the public. After two inmates escaped prison in upstate New York in early June, New York State Police activated 50 digital billboards in four states.

Near St. Louis, a motorist opened fire on an Illinois State trooper during a traffic stop on June 23. The trooper was not injured, but the shooter fled. In southern Illinois, the District 11 State Police office is located near Mid America Outdoor Advertising in Collinsville, IL. Shortly after police asked Mid America for help, the suspect's photo appeared on a digital billboard along a high-traffic interstate en route to St. Louis. The suspect was arrested by the end of the week.

In Elyria, OH, the sheriff says 12 fugitives have been arrested thanks to tips prompted by digital billboards. Lorain County Sheriff Phil R. Stammitti describes these long-sought individuals as “very hard to locate.”

Neil Mahan, the retired police chief from Janesville, WI, says billboards help police apprehend suspected criminals and deliver other information to the public. “For example,” he wrote in *The Police Chief* magazine, “an elderly

female suffering from Alzheimer's disease wandered away from family at a local shopping mall and was found by a citizen using the digital billboard information. When spring floods along the Rock River posed significant danger to the public, billboards were used to post warnings about the danger.”

In conclusion, we know that public safety is enhanced when citizens are empowered to help law enforcement. I commend the Kansas City Crime Commission and Greater Kansas City Crime Stoppers for their contributions in advancing a new communications tool that aides the cause of safety.●

RECOGNIZING THE JOHN R. ELLIOTT HERO CAMPAIGN FOR DESIGNATED DRIVERS

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers on the occasion of their 15th anniversary.

The John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers was created in 2000 following the tragic death of Navy ENS John R. Elliott in a drunk-driving related crash.

The campaign's mission is to prevent drunk driving-related crashes and deaths through the use of designated drivers. That mission has been a significant success across New Jersey, with many drivers citing the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign as a reason why they choose to serve as designated drivers.

Over the last 15 years, the organization has grown from a small group from Southern New Jersey, to an organization nationally recognized by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and the National Commission Against Drunk Driving for its efforts.

The effects of the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign have gone beyond the Southern New Jersey region. Seven States across our Nation have adopted the HERO Campaign as their designated driver model in an effort to decrease drunk driving fatalities. The HERO Campaign has also partnered with the New York Giants, the Philadelphia Phillies, and other professional sports franchises in their mission to promote the use of designated drivers. These partnerships do not include the thousands of individuals across our Nation who have also registered as designated drivers at concerts and sporting events as a pledge to the HERO campaign.

The John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers was instrumental in the passage of John's Law, enacted in 2005, which gave States \$145 million in highway grant incentives for establishing car impoundment laws for drivers suspected of drunk driving.

The tragic circumstances surrounding Navy ENS John R. Elliott's

crash have turned into a long history of meaningful accomplishments across not only New Jersey, but across our Nation. It is my hope that the legacy of John R. Elliott will live on and expand across our country.

I applaud the efforts of the John R. Elliott HERO Campaign for Designated Drivers and thank them for their efforts in making our roads safer across our country by promoting the use of designated drivers.●

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF L. MASON CAPITANI

● Mr. PETERS. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 50th Anniversary of L. Mason Capitani CORFAC International. It is a pleasure to commemorate this wonderful milestone in the history of a family-owned Michigan business.

Founded by L. Mason Capitani in 1965, L. Mason Capitani was a one-man operation until his son, Mason E. Capitani, joined the company. Mason displayed an affinity for industry, which helped the company blossom into the full-service brokerage and property management firm it is today. Mason E. still serves as the company's chairman, but a third generation of the Capitani family—Jason Capitani and Mason L. Capitani—are now managing most of the day-to-day operations of L. Mason Capitani.

Mason E. Capitani credits tenacity and careful planning as two of the keys to L. Mason Capitani's success over the past five decades. From its modest beginning, the company has grown into a global organization, with a reach that extends far beyond the State of Michigan. The company has followed a careful path of natural growth, where an honest understanding of its strengths and weaknesses, as well as the dynamics of a global market, have allowed L. Mason Capitani to thrive in a volatile industry.

The success of L. Mason Capitani is rooted in more than diligent planning. It is a reflection of the company's dedication to customer service, as well as its commitment to supporting a knowledgeable and talented workforce. The brokers, agents, and support staff at L. Mason Capitani are encouraged to provide high-quality customer service without jeopardizing their ethics, integrity, or dignity. An emphasis on integrity has allowed L. Mason Capitani to build relationships based on trust and experience. As a family business, its employees understand the company's success and the family's reputation are inseparable.

I applaud the employees of L. Mason Capitani for demonstrating the hard work and dedication to service required for 50 years of success. Family businesses like L. Mason Capitani are the main drivers of the economy in Michigan and across the United States. L.

Mason Capitani is well aware of its role in supporting economic opportunity and quality of life in communities across the State of Michigan, including Detroit, where the company embraces the opportunity for it to grow while contributing to efforts to rebuild one of America's great cities.

Again, I congratulate L. Mason Capitani CORFAC International on the occasion of its 50th Anniversary. I appreciate its contributions to quality of life and economic vitality throughout the State of Michigan and wish it and its employees many more decades of success.●

REMEMBERING JOSEPH SCANLON

● Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Rhode Island recently lost a good man and dedicated public servant. Joseph Scanlon, from Tiverton, passed away on August 24 with his family at his side. For all of us who knew him, this was very sad news.

Joe wore many hats during the course of his life. He served in the U.S. Army in the Korean war. He represented his hometown of Tiverton in the Rhode Island General Assembly. He worked for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Rhode Island for 10 years and was a member of the board of directors of Home Loan Investment Bank. He was active in local civic and charitable organizations, like the Fogarty Foundation, the Catholic Charity Fund, the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation, and the Rhode Island Heart Association, just to name a few. These items alone make for quite an impressive résumé.

But Joe will always be remembered for his service as administrative aide to the late U.S. Congressman Fernand St. Germain. For nearly three decades, Joe ran the Congressman's office in Rhode Island. During that time, Joe created an office which focused on helping constituents in their dealings with the Federal Government. Joe's work was and remains the gold standard for congressional offices and reflects Joe's deep-seated commitment to the people of Rhode Island.

In this time of partisanship and rancor, it is good to honor Joe's dedication to a simple goal: helping people. Joe seemed to like everyone he met, and he went out of his way to steer power of government to helping people, one by one, as he learned of their difficulties. He was a master of his craft.

Although it might not get as much attention as other aspects of the job, helping constituents navigate through their government is one of the most important roles we play as Members of Congress. Federal bureaucracy can be difficult, overwhelming, and frustrating. We can't seek special treatment, but we can ask questions and demand accountability, helping to cut the redtape that often stands in a constituent's way.

Joe knew the questions to ask and the people to call. He worked tirelessly with his staff. He returned calls and wrote letters promptly and exhausted every option available to the constituent. Joe truly cared about Rhode Island and its people. And he got results.

Joe was very helpful to me in my run for Senate in 2006. After my election, I sought Joe's advice as I set up my office in Rhode Island. He gave generously of his time and expertise, and many, if not all, of his words of wisdom are in use in my office today. I will always be grateful to him for that.

I will also be grateful for his friendship through the years, and I will miss him dearly.

I send my condolences to Joe's beloved wife, Jeannine; his children, Deborah, Stephen, and Susan; and the entire Scanlon family. Rhode Island was fortunate to have had such a committed, energetic, and selfless citizen.

Godspeed, my friend.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

In executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on August 6, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 212. An act to amend the Safe Water Drinking Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1531. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston,

South Carolina, as the “J. Waties Waring Judicial Center”.

H.R. 2559. An act to designate the “PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway” in the State of Texas.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the enrolled bills were signed on August 6, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2533. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-074); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2534. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-028); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2535. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-039); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2536. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-034); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2537. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-044); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2538. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Suspension of Community Eligibility” ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2539. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; Correction” (FRL No. 9931-19-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2540. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Definitions of Low Pressure Gas Well and Storage Vessel” (FRL No. 9931-76-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office

of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2541. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS” (FRL No. 9932-05-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2542. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS” (FRL No. 9932-04-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2543. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead (Pb) and the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS)” (FRL No. 9926-72-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2544. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Atlanta; Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard” (FRL No. 9932-20-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2545. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Miscellaneous Changes” (FRL No. 9932-25-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2546. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina; Certain Visibility Requirements for the 2008 Ozone Standards” (FRL No. 9932-30-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2547. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington” (FRL No. 9932-21-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of

the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2548. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference” (FRL No. 9926-85-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 7, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2549. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0086)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2550. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0679)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2551. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0748)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2552. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0011)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2553. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; ATR-GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1986)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2554. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0926)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2555. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal

2014-1123)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2578. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Przedsiebiorstwo Doswiadczalno-Produkcyjne Szybownictwa 'PZL-Bielsko' Sailplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0951)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2579. A communication from the Paralegal Specialist, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Category Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2962)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2014; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2580. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2581. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turbohaft Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0164)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2582. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class B Airspace; New Orleans, LA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2219)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2583. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dyersburg, TN" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0968)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2584. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Campbellsville, KY" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0458)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2585. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, SC" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0044)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2586. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Headland, AL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0046)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2587. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revocation of Class D and Class E Airspace; Independence, KS" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0565)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2588. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bremerton, WA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1067)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2589. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0045)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2590. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Revocation of Class E Airspace; Salem, OR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-1069)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2591. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Restricted Areas R-4501A, R-4501B, R-4501C, R-4501D, R-4501F, and R-4501H; Fort Leonard Wood, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0640)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2592. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of

Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (23); Amdt. No. 3650" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2593. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Part 95 Instrument Flight Rules; Miscellaneous Amendment No. 521" ((RIN2120-AA63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2594. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (22); Amdt. No. 3647" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2595. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (54); Amdt. No. 3648" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2596. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (6); Amdt. No. 3649" ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2597. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska" ((RIN0648-XE064) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2598. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery by Non-Rockfish Program Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western and Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska" ((RIN0648-XE064) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2599. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Squids in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XE072) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2600. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries" (RIN0648-BD64) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2601. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimeter Total Allowable Catch area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XE073) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2602. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications" (RIN0648-XD742) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2603. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels" (RIN0648-XE084) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2604. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XD079) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2605. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery" (RIN0648-XE005) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2606. A communication from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries" (RIN0648-XE007)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2607. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean" (RIN0648-XD972) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2608. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2015" (RIN0648-BF19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2609. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Regional Framework Amendment" (RIN0648-BE40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2610. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Recreational Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna" (RIN0648-BE78) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2611. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Acetic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930-20-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2612. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930-06-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2613. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9931-30-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to

the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2614. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, et al.; Revising Determination of Sales History" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0091; FV15-929-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2615. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Asian Longhorned Beetle Quarantine Areas in Massachusetts and New York" (Docket No. APHIS-2015-0016) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2616. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fruit, Vegetable, and Specialty Crops—Import Regulations; Changes to Reporting Requirements to Add Electronic Form Filing Option" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0093; FV15-944/980/999-1 FR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2617. A communication from the Associate Administrator of the Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments" (Docket No. AMS-FV-14-0042) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2618. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents; Final Rule" (RIN0790-AJ10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2619. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contracts or Delivery Orders Issued by a Non-DoD Agency" ((RIN0750-AI63) (DFARS Case 2014-D014)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2620. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Personnel Supporting U.S. Armed Forces Deployed Outside

the United States" ((RIN0750-AI45) (DFARS Case 2014-D023)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2621. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds" ((RIN0750-AI52) (DFARS Case 2014-D006)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2622. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisition of the American Flag" ((RIN0750-AI51) (DFARS Case 2014-D005)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2623. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Network Penetration Reporting and Contracting for Cloud Services" ((RIN0750-AI61) (DFARS Case 2013-D018)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2624. A communication from the Director of Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Item Unique Identification Prescription Correction" ((RIN0750-AI65) (DFARS Case 2014-D021)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2625. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2626. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David R. Hogg, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2627. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of major general or brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2628. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of an officer authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2629. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Methane Sulfonic Acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9931-07-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2630. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Lavanduly Senecioate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9930-16-OCSPP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2631. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9930-18-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2632. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2633. A communication from the Director of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" (RIN3064-AE27) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 4, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2634. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to operation of the Exchange Stabilization Fund (ESF) for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2635. A communication from the Chair of the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program"; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2636. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the continuation of a national emergency declared in Executive Order 13222 with respect to the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2637. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the continuation of the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13396 on February 7, 2006, with respect to Cote d'Ivoire; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2638. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Registration Process for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants" (RIN3235-AL05) re-

ceived during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2639. A communication from the Secretary, Division of Corporate Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pay Ratio Disclosure" (RIN3235-AL47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2640. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards; Final Rule" (RIN3133-AE40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2641. A communication from the General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chartering and Field of Membership Manual" (RIN3133-AE31) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2642. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Updating Regulations Governing HUD Fees and the Financing of the Purchase and Installation of Fire Safety Equipment in FHA-Insured Healthcare Facilities" (RIN2502-AJ27) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2643. A communication from the Deputy General Counsel of the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Derivatives" (RIN3133-AD90) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2644. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Russian Sanctions Addition to the Entity List to Prevent Violations of Russian Industry Sector Sanctions" (RIN0694-AG66) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2645. A communication from the General Counsel of the Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2015-2017 Enterprise Housing Goals" (RIN2590-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2646. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revision of Freedom of Information Act Regulation" (RIN2501-AD57)

received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2647. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2648. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a final report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012, with respect to Russia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2649. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions" (RIN0694-AG13) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2650. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the export to the People's Republic of China of items not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2651. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Clothes Washers" (RIN1904-AC97) (Docket No. EERE-2013-BT-TP-0009) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2652. A communication from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2653. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Definitions and Standards for Grid-Enabled Water Heaters" (RIN1904-AD55) (Docket No. EERE-2015-BT-STD-0017) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2654. A communication from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations" (RIN1902-0128) (Docket No. RM12-11-003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2655. A communication from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Privacy Act Regulations; Exemption for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board" (RIN1090-AB10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2656. A communication from the Deputy Chief of the National Forest System, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the final map and boundary for the Grande Ronde Wild and Scenic River in Oregon, added to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2657. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for External Power Supplies" (RIN1904-AD36) (Docket No. EERE-2014-BT-TP-0043) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2658. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016"; to the Special Committee on Aging; Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry; Appropriations; Armed Services; Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs; the Budget; Commerce, Science, and Transportation; Energy and Natural Resources; Environment and Public Works; Select Committee on Ethics; Finance; Foreign Relations; Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions; Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs; Indian Affairs; Select Committee on Intelligence; the Judiciary; Rules and Administration; Small Business and Entrepreneurship; and Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 5, 2015, the following reports of committees were submitted on August 28, 2015:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, without amendment.

S. 1251. A bill to implement the Amendment to the Convention on Future Multilateral Cooperation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, as adopted at Lisbon, Portugal on September 28, 2007 (Rept. No. 114-120).

S. 1315. A bill to protect the right of law-abiding citizens to transport knives interstate, notwithstanding a patchwork of local and State prohibitions (Rept. No. 114-121).

By Mr. ISAKSON, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1493. A bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-122).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Report to accompany H.R. 1531, A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-123).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1137. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, and the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act to make improvements and technical corrections, and for other purposes.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 36

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 36, a bill to address the continued threat posed by dangerous synthetic drugs by amending the Controlled Substances Act relating to controlled substance analogues.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 417

At the request of Ms. KLOBUCHAR, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 417, a bill to encourage spectrum licensees to make unused spectrum available for use by rural and smaller carriers in order to expand wireless coverage.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act.

S. 559

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 559, a bill to prohibit the Secretary of Education from engaging in regulatory overreach with regard to institutional eligibility under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and for other purposes.

S. 626

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 626, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to cover physician services delivered by podiatric physicians to ensure access by Medicaid beneficiaries to appropriate quality foot and ankle care, to amend title XVIII of such Act to modify the requirements for diabetic shoes to be included under Medicare, and for other purposes.

S. 741

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 741, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to establish a program of awarding grants to owners or operators of water systems to increase the resiliency or adaptability of the systems to any ongoing or forecasted changes to the hydrologic conditions of a region of the United States.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 843

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 843, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to count a period of receipt of outpatient observation services in a hospital toward satisfying the 3-day inpatient hospital requirement for coverage of skilled nursing facility services under Medicare.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the names of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 993

At the request of Mr. FRANKEN, the names of the Senator from Massachu-

setts (Mr. MARKEY) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) were added as cosponsors of S. 993, a bill to increase public safety by facilitating collaboration among the criminal justice, juvenile justice, veterans treatment services, mental health treatment, and substance abuse systems.

S. 1126

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1126, a bill to modify and extend the National Guard State Partnership Program.

S. 1135

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1135, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for fairness in hospital payments under the Medicare program.

S. 1150

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1150, a bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1333

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1333, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to exclude cannabidiol and cannabidiol-rich plants from the definition of marijuana, and for other purposes.

S. 1375

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1375, a bill to designate as wilderness certain Federal portions of the red rock canyons of the Colorado Plateau and the Great Basin Deserts in the State of Utah for the benefit of present and future generations of people in the United States.

S. 1504

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1504, a bill to prohibit employers from requiring low-wage employees to enter into covenants not to compete, to require employers to notify potential employees of any requirement to enter into a covenant not to compete, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor

of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1608

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1608, a bill to protect the safety of the national airspace system from the hazardous operation of consumer drones, and for other purposes.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1812

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1812, a bill to protect public safety by incentivizing State and local law enforcement to cooperate with Federal immigration law enforcement to prevent the release of criminal aliens into communities.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1832

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1832, a bill to provide for increases in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1836

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1836, a bill to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

S. 1842

At the request of Mr. SESSIONS, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1842, a bill to ensure State and local compliance with all Federal immigration detainers on aliens in custody and for other purposes.

S. 1844

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1844, a bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to provide for voluntary country of origin labeling for beef, pork, and chicken.

S. 1852

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1852, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to ensure health insurance coverage continuity for former foster youth.

S. 1856

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1856, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, and for other purposes.

S. 1878

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1878, a bill to extend the pediatric priority review voucher program.

S. 1886

At the request of Mr. WICKER, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1886, a bill to reauthorize the Integrated Coastal and Ocean Observation System Act of 2009 and for other purposes.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1919, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1932

At the request of Mr. BENNET, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1932, a bill to provide States with flexibility to use Federal IV-E funding for State child welfare programs to improve safety, permanency, and well-being outcomes for all children who need child welfare services.

S. 1944

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1944, a bill to require each agency to repeal or amend 1 or more rules before issuing or amending a rule.

S. 1955

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1955, a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for equitable allotment of land to Alaska Native veterans.

S. 1957

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1957, a bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery.

S. 1981

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1981, a bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to

allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. RES. 108

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 108, a resolution commemorating the discovery of the polio vaccine and supporting efforts to eradicate the disease.

S. RES. 237

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 237, a resolution condemning Joseph Kony and the Lord's Resistance Army for continuing to perpetrate crimes against humanity, war crimes, and mass atrocities, and supporting ongoing efforts by the United States Government, the African Union, and governments and regional organizations in central Africa to remove Joseph Kony and Lord's Resistance Army commanders from the battlefield and promote protection and recovery of affected communities.

S. RES. 242

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN), the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 242, a resolution celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, a resolution designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2642. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2641 proposed

by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2643. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2644. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2640. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike line three and all that follows and insert:

That Congress does not favor the agreement transmitted by the President to Congress on July 19, 2015, under subsection (a) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e) for purposes of prohibiting the taking of any action involving any measure of statutory sanctions relief by the United States pursuant to such agreement under subsection (c)(2)(B) of such section.

SA 2641. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2642. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2641 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”.

SA 2643. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2644. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2643 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”.

SA 2645. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2646. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

SA 2647. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2646 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2645 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “6” and insert “7”.

CELEBRATING THE 35TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT CENTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Small Business Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 243.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 243) celebrating the 35th anniversary of the Small Business Development Centers of the United States.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 243) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 5, 2015, under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

APPOINTMENTS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand appointments were made during the adjournment of the Senate, and I ask they be stated for the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 106-286, appoints the following Member to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China: the Honorable BEN SASSE of Nebraska.

The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to Public Law 96-114, as amended, appoints the following individual to the Congressional Award Board: David Schiappa of Maryland.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 9; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time

until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that the time from 2:15 p.m. until 7 p.m. also be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees and that the time from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. be controlled by the Democrats and the time from 6 p.m. to 7 p.m. be controlled by the majority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:25 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

CLARE E. CONNORS, OF HAWAII, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF HAWAII, VICE SUSAN OKI MOLLWAY, RETIRING.

STEPHANIE A. GALLAGHER, OF MARYLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, VICE WILLIAM D. QUARLES, JR., RETIRING.

MARY S. MCELROY, OF RHODE ISLAND, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, VICE MARY M. LISI, RETIRING.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

EDWARD L. GILMORE, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS, VICE DARRYL KEITH MCPHERSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. MICHAEL E. FLANAGAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. DAVID W. SILVA II

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. PHILIP R. SHERIDAN

THE FOLLOWING AIR NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12212:

To be brigadier general

COL. TIMOTHY J. LABARGE

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. KRISTAN L. K. HERICKS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be major general

BRIG. GEN. JODY J. DANIELS

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KYLE J. WELD

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW P. TARIJICK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

JONATHAN S. ACKISS
CORNELIUS L. ALLEN, JR.

JONATHAN E. ALLEN

REGAN J. ALLEN

JACQUELINE E. BAIRD

CHRISTOPHER W. BAKER

KAREN A. BAKER

PATRICK J. BAKER

JACKSON L. BALL

THERON P. BALLARD

JEROME K. BARNARD

CHRISTOPHER P. BARTOS

RICHARD T. BASYE

PAUL B. BEDNAR

JASON A. BERDOU

DANIEL J. BIDEETI

WALTER M. BIELECKI

BOYD R. BINGHAM

CHAD J. BLACKETER

RON L. BLANCH

BRYAN A. BLITCH

DANGELO A. BLOUNT

JAMES E. BLUMAN

THOMAS R. BOLAND

FREEMAN T. BONNETTE

ALFRED S. BOONE

JOSEPH M. BOROVICKA

PETER C. BOYER

HENRY C. BROWN

MIRYAM D. C. BRUNSON

PAUL F. BUSHEY

PETER A. CAGGIANO II

SHAWN M. CALVERT

JOSIEL CARRASQUILLOMORALES

JEFFREY P. CHAMBERLAIN

MARTIN J. CHEMAN

MICHAEL C. CHERRY

JASON C. CHRISTENSON

STEPHEN L. CHRISTIAN

ERIC P. CHRISTIANSEN, JR.

HEATHER J. CLANCY

JAMES G. CLARK

WILLIAM J. CLARK

ERIC S. CLARKE

JOHN D. CLEMONS

JARED L. CLINGER

ANDY R. CLINKSCALES

FRANKIE C. COCHIAOSUE

KIM M. COHEN

ADAM J. COLLINS

JAMES D. COOK

ARMANDO V. CORRAL

CHRISTOPHER COURTLAND

BRIAN M. COZINE

DANA E. CROW

STEPHEN M. CROW

LANCE J. CULVER

SHERMOAN L. DAIYAAN

KENNETH R. DARNALL

PAUL R. DAVIS

LARRY R. DEAN

VICTOR M. DIAZ III

MICHAEL D. DOLGE

BRIAN T. DONAHUE

JOHN C. DOSS

AMY E. DOWNING

GERALD J. D. DUENAS

THERESA L. ELLISON

PATRICK C. EVANS

BRYAN J. FENCL

GREGORY A. FEND

KIMBERLY A. FERGUSON

DAWN M. FICK

ALAIN G. FISHER

MARC J. FLEURANT

CASSANDRA N. FORRESTER

MISTI L. FRODYMA

ALEXANDER GARCIA

OMAR GARCIA

VINCENTE GARCIA

CHAE GAYLES

JAMES J. GEISHAKER

MATTHEW M. GOMEZ

ERIC M. GOULDTHORPE

JOSEPH A. GRANDE, JR.

JESSIE K. GRIFFITH III

ADAM M. GRIM

STEVEN D. GUTIERREZ

THOMAS W. HAAS

TODD C. HANKS

SCOTT E. HELMORE

BROOK E. HESS

LUCAS S. HIGHTOWER

CHRISTOPHER M. HILL

ROBERT T. HOFFMAN

DAVID L. HOSLER

JOHN A. HOTEK

JAMES E. HOWELL III

CHRISTOPHER S. HOWSER

MICAH R. HUTCHINS

ANGELA B. HYSON

JEFFREY J. IGNATOWSKI

SEAN P. IMBS

JEFFREY J. JABLONSKI

FENICIA L. JACKSON

CHARLES V. JAQUILLARD

SEANA M. JARDIN

BRIAN L. JETER

CHRISTOPHER D. JOHNSON

LARRY P. JOHNSON

DAVID W. JONES

RONALD M. JONES

VERNON L. JONES, JR.

MICHAEL T. JORDAN

JENNIFER S. KARIM

MICHAEL T. KIM

BRIAN M. KNIERIEM

STEPHEN T. KOEHLER

CODY W. KOERWITZ

ANDREW T. KOSCHNIK

WILLIAM R. KOST

THOMAS D. KRUPP

MATTHEW L. KUHN

WESLEY J. KWASNEY

WILLIAM E. LAASE

HEATHER D. LABRECQUE

JUAN C. LAGO

BARRCARY J. LANE

TYRONNE G. LASTRAPES

JOEL K. LEFLORE

CLAIRE LINDLEY

CARLOS A. LOCK

JAMES T. LOCKLEAR

CHRISTOPHER S. LOWERY

JEFFREY L. LUCOWITZ

THOMAS R. LUTZ

BRIAN W. MACK

CARMELO T. MADERA

STEPHEN MAGNER

MICHAEL R. MAI

PATRICK M. MAJOR

ANTHONY P. MARANTE

JESSE R. MARSALES

RICHARD J. MARSDEN

KATIE E. MATTHEW

ROLAND L. MATTHEWS

JULIE A. MAXWELL

RAMIRO MAYA, JR.

ASUERO N. MAYO, JR.

MARLON MCBRIDE

SHANNON T. MCCROY

CHRISTOPHER S. MCLEAN

DANIELLE R. MEDAGLIA

JONATHAN W. MEISEL

MICHAEL K. MEUMANN

ANDREW J. MEYERS

JASON L. MILES

MARVIN B. MILLAR

SAMUEL R. MILLER

ZACHARY T. MILLER

JEFF R. MILNE

DAVID A. MITCHELL

KEITH C. MIXON

FAMARLON L. MOBLEY

LATASHA L. MOODYLOVE

CHRISTOPHER L. MOORE

RICHARD B. MOORE

SHANE A. MORRIS

JOHN A. MOTT

JESSICA L. MURNOCK

DEREK S. NEAL

RANDALL W. NEWMAN

MICHELLE D. NHAMBURE

SHAWN M. OBRIEN

ROSENDO PAGAN

PHILBERT J. PALMORE

MATTHEW C. PAUL

ANTHONY J. PETE

KEVIN D. PIERCE

MARTIN P. PLYS, JR.

KEVIN A. POOLE

EUGENE T. PORTER

PHILLIP B. POTEET

STEVEN POWER

MATTHEW A. PRICE

RHEA M. PRITCHETT

ANDRES R. RAMIREZ III

ELDRED K. RAMTAHAL

LUKE RICHARDS

SEAN R. RICHARDSON

MICHAEL K. RILEY

JAMES R. RITCH

DOMINGOS S. ROBINSON

LEON L. ROGERS

ORLANDO R. ROJASBANREY

GEORGE W. ROLLINSON

GILBERTO C. ROLON

ANGEL R. ROSADOPADILLA

JOSEPH L. ROSEN

CHRISTOPHER M. ROZHON

DINA D. RUCK

THOMAS H. RUTH III

JESSICA M. SALGADO
 SHAWN D. SANBORN
 MICHAEL A. SANSONE
 DONALD C. SANTILLO
 NATHAN R. SAWYER
 JOHN M. SCHMITT
 DENNIS L. SHELDEN
 ERIC L. SHEPHERD
 JASON L. SHICK
 JESSICA A. SHUEY
 SAMSON T. SIDER
 STEPHANIE R. M. SIMMONS
 BRUCE A. SKRABANEK
 ALLEN M. SLITER
 JOHN K. SNYDER
 PIERRE A. SPRATT
 SHANNON V. STAMBERSKY
 RONALD H. STEWART, JR.
 JOHN B. STRINGER, JR.
 DOMINIC J. TANGLAO
 DAVID L. TAYLOR, JR.
 FRANYATE D. TAYLOR
 MICHAEL J. THIESFELD
 DAVID L. THOMPSON
 STEPHEN A. THORPE
 JOHN S. THYNG
 MIGUEL A. TORRES
 ANDRE L. TOUSSAINT
 ANITA R. TREPANIER
 TIMOTHY S. TROYER
 THOMAS J. TROYN
 DENNIS J. UTT
 BERNARD D. VANBROCKLIN
 CHRISTOPHER K. VENTERS
 WILLIAM H. VICK, JR.
 CLAUDE E. WALKER
 DAMON K. WALKER
 BARRY L. WALSH, JR.
 JEREMY H. WESTRAND
 DONNA L. I. WELCH
 MATTHEW R. WESTERN
 ANTHONY K. WHITFIELD
 CARL D. WHITMAN, JR.
 DENNIS F. WILLIAMS
 TERRENCE A. WILLIAMS
 ANTHONY L. WILSON
 GORDON L. WILSON
 MELVIN E. WRIGHTSIL
 MICHAEL D. WROBLEWSKI
 JENNIFER R. ZAIS
 D011349
 D011462
 D011538
 D011859
 D012121
 D012472
 D012659

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MICHAEL H. ADORJAN
 JOHN M. AGUILAR, JR.
 MATTHEW J. ALDEN
 JOSEPH E. ANDERSON
 JAKUB H. ANDREWS
 OKERA G. ANYABWILE
 LANCE D. AWBREY
 CHARLES R. AYERS
 MARK A. G. AYSON
 THOMAS A. BABBITT
 MICHAEL J. BANCROFT
 REBEKAH L. BARNES
 PALOMA C. BEAUSOLEIL
 CRAIG R. BENDER
 WAYNE L. BLAS
 THOMAS J. BLOOMFIELD
 TODD A. BOOK
 CRYSTAL X. BORING
 DAVID M. BORN
 BRETT J. BOSTON
 ANASTASIA BRESLOWKYNASTON
 ROBERT E. BREWER
 JAMES B. BRINDLE
 MICHAEL A. BROCK
 BYRON J. BROWN
 JEANETTE P. A. BROWN
 JOSEPH G. BRUHL
 THOMAS E. BURNEY, JR.
 JASON E. BURNS
 MALCOLM S. BUSH
 STEVEN R. CALDER
 SILAS J. CALHOUN
 CHARLES H. CANON
 KEVIN K. CARLILE
 WILLIAM E. CARRUTH
 EDWARD M. CERER, SR.
 PETER C. J. CHARBONNEAU
 SCOTT T. CHILDERS
 MELVIN A. CHISOLM
 JOSEPH C. CHRETIEN
 ROBERT H. CHUNG
 HEATHER A. CLEVINGER
 CHRISTOPHER L. CLINE
 MARK A. COBOS
 JASON R. CODY
 CRAIG C. COLUCCI
 JENNIFER J. COLVIN
 CLAYTON L. COMBS
 JOSHUA J. CONNER
 STEPHEN F. CORTEZ

RUSSELL M. CORWIN
 JAMES A. COVINGTON, JR.
 GEORGE W. COWLES III
 GEOFFREY B. CRAFTS
 THERESA K. E. CROSS
 MICHAEL E. CUSHWA
 JOHN H. DABOLT IV
 RICHARD J. DANGELO
 BRIAN L. DAVID
 RICHARD A. DAVILA, JR.
 BRIAN R. DAVIS
 ROBERT A. DEES
 RAYMOND G. DELUCIO
 ANDREW C. DERMANOSKI
 BRENDON K. DEVER
 TYPHANIE Y. DIAL
 RICHARD M. DIXON, JR.
 INDIRA R. DONEGAN
 JULIA M. DONLEY
 MICHAEL B. DORSCHNER
 GABRIEL R. DOWNEY II
 JONATHAN T. DRAKE
 BRIAN P. DUNN
 DAMON J. M. DURALL
 DENTON L. DYE
 CHRISTOPHER I. EASTBURG
 HEINZ EDER
 JAMES T. EDWARDS, JR.
 ELIAS L. EL ORM
 ADAM W. ENNIS
 JAMES R. ENOS
 DARIUS D. ERVIN
 DEVIN H. ESELIUS
 CRAIG L. EVANS
 LEE A. EVANS
 REGINALD K. EVANS
 NEIL C. EVERINGHAM
 BENJAMIN J. FERNANDES
 CHANTAL A. FIELDMAN
 JASON C. FINCH
 JEREMY J. FINN
 JAMES C. FINOCCHIARO
 DANIEL R. FITCH
 GREGORY B. FITCH
 STANLEY FLORKOWSKI
 NORA L. FLOTT
 ERIC S. FOWLER
 BRIAN D. FRULAND
 CHAD W. FURNE
 SUSAN M. GALICH
 KEVIN W. GARFIELD
 BENJAMIN T. GATZKE
 HEATH A. GIESECKE
 KEITH M. GIESECKE
 EVANS L. GILLIARD
 MATTHEW D. GIOVANNI
 STACY H. GODSHALL
 GARY J. GOLUBSKI
 JASON A. GONZALES
 MIGUEL A. GONZALEZQUINONES
 NATHAN K. GOODALL
 BENNETT GREEN
 CASON S. GREEN
 DANIEL S. GREEN
 MATTHEW R. GREGORY
 JOHN C. GRISWOLD
 JOSIAH T. GROVER
 PATRICK B. GROW
 DOUGLAS B. GUARD
 ERIC H. HAAS
 JASON B. HAIGHT
 DAVID L. HALL
 TODD J. HAMEL
 ALISON M. HAMILTON
 SCOTT P. HANDLER
 DAVID B. HANSEN
 JENNIFER H. HARLAN
 JEREMY D. HARTUNG
 BRIAN P. HAYES
 DAVID C. HAZELTON
 ELIZABETH J. HELLAND
 JAMES R. HENRY
 ALEXCIE A. HERBERT
 JANET L. HERRICK
 DOUGLAS C. HESS
 DUSTIN G. HEUMPHREUS
 CAROL M. HICKEY
 ULEKEYA S. HILL
 CHRISTOPHER S. HOBGOOD
 JAMES M. HOFFMAN II
 JARED A. HOFFMAN
 CHARLES D. HOOD
 TIMOTHY A. HUNT
 RICHARD A. HUNTER
 PATRICK J. O. HUSTED
 DANIEL P. HUYNH
 TIMOTHY A. HYDE
 ZACHARY P. HYLEMAN
 ZACHARY T. IRVINE
 CHRISTOPHER J. IWAN
 MATTHEW R. JENSEN
 CHRISTOPHER L. JOHNSON
 CRAIG W. JOHNSON
 LONNIE D. JOHNSTON
 PAUL D. JOHNSTON
 BRYAN G. JUNTUNEN
 JEFFREY M. KALDAHL
 BRANT E. KANANEN
 CRISTIAN A. KEELS
 CURTIS J. KELLOGG
 JULIE A. KELLUM
 ROY D. KEMPF

JOEL P. KLEEHAMMER
 MATTHEW E. KOPP
 ADAM M. KORDISH
 ANDREW M. KOVANEN
 CHRISTINA J. KRETCHMAN
 JUSTINE S. KRUMM
 JOSEPH R. KRUPA
 KRISTOFER H. KVAM
 STEVEN J. LACY
 VINCENT C. LAI
 JEFFREY J. LAKNER
 KYLE W. LANDS
 JAMES F. LAWSON
 PATRICK Y. K. LEE
 MICHAEL D. LOVE
 CHRISTOPHER J. LOWRANCE
 QUAN H. T. LU
 JOSE A. LUGOPEREZ
 BRIAN P. LUTI
 POLARIS X. LUU
 THANG V. LY
 CAMILLE L. MACK
 JAVIER MADRIGAL
 NATHAN M. MANN
 PHILLIP G. MANN
 KYLE B. MARCRUM
 ERIC J. MARION
 NATHAN D. MARTIN
 ANGELICA R. MARTINEZ
 MICHAEL C. MAYS
 BRIAN A. MCCALL
 CHRISTOPHER S. MCCLURE
 KEVIN J. MCCULLAGH
 MICHAEL E. MCNERNEY
 SHAWN P. MCMAHON
 PATRICK B. MCNEACE
 TIMOTHY T. MEASNER
 THOMAS H. MELTON II
 MARC T. MEYLE
 ROBERT Y. MIHARA
 JANIS C. MIKITS
 CHRISTOPHER J. MILLER
 ERIC W. MILLER
 ANGEL I. MIRANDA
 BOUNYASITH MITTHIVONG
 WILLIAM C. MOODY
 LOUIS A. MORRIS
 TIMOTHY J. MORROW
 GREGORY W. NAPOLI
 MICHAEL P. NEEDHAM
 SCOTT J. NELSON
 DAVID L. NEWELL
 HAC D. NGUYEN
 JACOB P. NINAS
 RYAN C. NOMURA
 MARGARET A. NOWICKI
 ROBERT A. NOWICKI
 DAVID P. OAKLEY
 TIMOTHY S. OBRVANT
 SHERRY K. OEHLER
 BRIAN W. OERTEL
 JOSEPH E. OHANLON III
 IRVIN W. OLIVER, JR.
 ELLIOT H. OLMSTEAD
 EDWARD ORTIZVAZQUEZ
 JAMON B. OSBORNE
 RAMON J. OSORIO
 STERLING J. PACKER
 ROMEL C. PAJIMULA
 RAFAL PANASIUK
 PETER A. PATTERSON
 GREGORY J. PAVLICHKO
 CARLOS PENA, JR.
 ROBERT C. PERRY, JR.
 FOLDEN L. PETERSON, JR.
 ERNEST S. PETROWSKY
 MICHAEL A. POE
 JOHN F. POPIAK
 KARLA J. PORCH
 PHILLIP D. PORTER
 JEREMIAH K. PRAY
 DAVID J. PRICE
 JEFFREY A. PROKOPOWICZ
 MANUEL F. PULIDO
 GABRIEL J. RAMIREZ
 ANGELA E. REBER
 JOHN M. REEDER
 THOMAS R. RENNER
 BLANCA E. REYES
 ISMAEL REYES
 KRISTINA L. RICHARDSON
 KEVIN T. RILEY
 MELISSA A. RINGHISEN
 BART C. RITCHY
 ANDRE G. RIVIER
 KILLLAURIN O. ROBERTS
 DANIEL H. ROBINSON
 THEODORE M. RODILL, JR.
 SHANE A. ROPPOLI
 MATTHEW R. RUCKMAN
 BRADLEY S. RUDDER
 ANDREW M. RUIZ
 TIMOTHY D. RUSTAD
 MICHAEL S. RYAN
 JIMMY C. SALAZAR
 JESSE L. SANDEFER
 BENJAMIN F. SANGSTER
 HERIBERTO SANTIAGOACEVEDO
 MICHAEL A. SAPP
 RACHEL E. SARLES
 TIMOTHY M. SAWYER
 KENNETH A. SCERBO

TINA M. SCHOENBERGER
PATRICK M. SCHOOF
LLOYD D. SCOTT
MICHAEL B. SHATTAN
RYAN L. SHAW
PAUL E. SHERMAN
JOHN W. SHERMER
JOSEPH J. SHIMERDLA
RYAN C. SHIPLEY
ELDRIDGE R. SINGLETON
DENNIS B. SLATON
DAVID J. SMITH
MATTHEW B. SMITH
SCOTT A. SMITSON
HOWARD M. SMYTH
MELISSA A. SOLSBURY
ISAAC M. SOUTH
JAYSON R. SPANGLER
ROBERT J. SPIVEY
JULIAN P. STAMPS
DANIEL R. STANTON III
ROTUNDA K. STOKES
MICHAEL A. STONE
CECIL A. STRICKLAND
TISSA L. STROUSE
JORDON E. SWAIN
JOHN SYERS
WILLIAM C. TAYLOR
MICHAEL J. TEMKO
JOSHUA W. THIBEAULT
CHRISTOPHER J. THOENDEL
LESLIE W. THOMPSON
ALAN W. THROOP
STANLEY O. THURSTON
ANTHONY L. TINGLE
STEVEN L. TINGLEY
THOMAS E. TOLMAN
CATARINA J. TRAN
PAUL E. TROY
WILLIAM E. TURNER
AUGUSTUS O. TUTU, JR.
JEFFREY B. VANSICKLE
KEITH S. VANYO
ALEXANDER S. VINDMAN
RYAN K. WAINWRIGHT
KEITH W. WALTHALL
MARK E. WARDER
ALAN R. WARMBIER
DENNIS D. WATTERS, JR.
JAMES R. WEARE
KEITH B. WEIDNER
JAMES W. WELCH
BRIAN S. WESTERFIELD
SHAWN E. WHITMORE
JARROD P. WICKLINE
CHRISTOPHER M. WILKINSON
FREDRICK O. WILLIAMS
PAUL M. WILLIAMS
NORMAN L. WILSON II
LISA L. WINEGAR
CLIFFORD M. WOODBURN
WILLIAM C. WRIGHT
JUN Y. YI
MATTHEW C. YIENGST
WILLIAM T. YOUNG
DOUGLAS W. ZIMMERMAN
D002999
D011942
D012030
D012034
D012047
D012183
D012283
D012292
D012622
G001139
G001378
G010029
G010052
G010108
G010299
G010301
G010310

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MATTHEW T. ADAMCZYK
DEVON F. ADKINSON, JR.
MATTHEW J. ALBERTUS
GREGORY K. ALEXANDER
NATHAN G. ALLARD
KELLY T. ALLEN
TERRENCE J. ALVAREZ
JUSTIN C. AMBURGEY
RUSSELL J. AMES
BENJAMIN L. ANDERSON
JASON G. ANDERSON
SPENCER M. ANDERSON
JAMES E. ARMSTRONG III
JOHN M. AUTEN III
VICTOR M. BAEZAN III
ANDREW J. BAKER
JOHN L. BAKER, JR.
MICHAEL L. BANDY
JEROME A. BARBOUR
AARON D. BARREDA
JEFFREY J. BARTA
MARK A. BARTON
MARK E. BATTJES
SHAWN M. BAULT

RICHARD E. BAYLIE
DANIEL K. BENSON
MICHAEL R. BERRIMAN
ANTHONY J. BIANCHI
JOHN D. BISHOP
RHETT A. BLACKMON
SCOTT R. BLANCHARD
CHARLES D. BOVEY III
MARTIN J. BOWLING
KEVIN B. BOWMAN
DONALD T. BRAMAN
JESSIE J. BREWSTER
AARON D. BRIGHT
NICOLE A. BROOKS
MATTHEW M. BROWN
JAMES L. BROWNING
MARK A. BRZozowski
TROY C. BUCHER
NICHOLAS T. BUGAJSKI
WILLIAM BURDEN
REED A. BURGGRAVE
JEFFERY T. BURROUGHS
CRAIG W. BUTERA
KARL R. BUTLER
CHAD W. CALDWELL
PEDRO A. CAMACHO III
CHRISTOPHER D. CARPENTIER
BARRY S. CARTER
KEITH L. CARTER
JOHANNES E. CASTRO
LARRY D. CASWELL, JR.
DONALD L. CHERRY, JR.
MATTHEW B. CHITTY
LAURENCE J. CHRISTIAN
STEPHEN L. CLOWER
CHRISTOPHER H. CLYDE
CLINTON R. CODY
DAVID S. COLLINS
XAVIER COLON
MICHAEL R. CONDON
KATE M. H. CONKEY
DAVID M. CONNER
JOSEPH F. CONNOLLY III
CHRISTINA N. COOK
JAMES P. COOK
WILLIAM F. CORYELL
THOMAS B. CRAIG
JARED A. CRAIN
MARK J. CROW
AUSTIN S. CRUZ
BRENDAN J. CULLINAN
AARON J. CULP
JOE D. CURTIS
KRISTEN N. DAHLE
TODD M. DANIELS
DAVID P.T. DAVID
HENRY B. DAVIS IV
JOHN B. DAVIS III
VICTOR D. DEESE
CHRISTOPHER J. DEMURE
KIRBY R. DENNIS
ETHAN P. DIAL
JEFFREY P. DIMARZIO
ETHAN J. DIVEN
AARON B. DIXON
STEPHEN G. DOBBINS
THOMAS P. DONATELLE
WILLIAM J. DOUGHERTY
KENNETH M. DWYER
JONATHAN G. ELIAS
AARON C. ELLIOTT
ROBERT L. ELLIOTT
CHRISTOPHER M. ELLIS
JOSEPH E. ELSNER
DANIEL C. ENSLEN
CHARLES E. ERGENBRIGHT
FRANK J. FAIR
DENNIS W. FAULKNER
WHITNEY O. FEES
BRIAN A. FERGUSON
TIMOTHY J. FERGUSON
JOHN V. FERRY
MICHAEL C. FIRMIN
JUDDSON C. FLORIS
MICHAEL J. FOOTE
CHARLES A. FORD
MICHAEL J. FORTENBERRY
THOMAS J. FOURNIER
GREGORY R. FOXX
DAVID C. FREEMAN
REID E. FURMAN
ANTERRIO C. GAINWELL
JOHN D. GARCIA
SEAMUS P. GARRETT
DANIEL A. GATES
TIMOTHY D. GATLIN
ROGER A. GAVRILUK
CASEY T. GEIST
MICHAEL J. GEORGE
JOHN G. GIBSON
ERIC J. GILGE
ANTHONY F. GIORDANO
COREY A. GIVENS
THOMAS A. GOETTKE
JONATHAN P. GRAEBENER
DAVID J. GRAHAM
PAUL M. GRANT
PETER M. GRAY
CHARLES A. GREEN
BRANDON S. GRIFFIN
TERRY D. HAHN
DANIEL S. HALL

LARRY C. HALSEY
BRET M. HAMILTON
JOSEPH R. HAMMOND
CHRISTOPHER C. HAMMONDS
ALAN M. HAMMONS
JODY D. HANSEN
WILLIAM G. HANSEN
RYAN M. HANSON
ELLIOTT R. HARRIS
JAMES J. HART
JONATHAN P. HARVEY
JAMES P. HARWELL
JIMMY L. HATHAWAY
BEAU A. HENDRICKS
JAMES H. HITE IV
MATTHEW B. HOLMES
BRIAN A. HOOKS
MATTHEW D. HOPPER
JOHN P. HORNING
KRISTOPHER H. HOWELL
WILBUR W. HSU
NATHAN M. HUBBARD
TIMOTHY P. HUDSON
DON P. HURSEY
BRANDON J. IKER
BRIAN A. JACOBS
TIMOTHY R. JAEGER
COREY M. JAMES
ERIC M. JANKOWSKI
MATTHEW J. JEMMOTT
EDGAR A. JIMENEZ
CAYTON L. JOHNSON
ERIC B. JOHNSON
RICHARD B. JOHNSON
TRACY D. JOHNSON
BRYAN C. JONES
CULLEN A. JONES
HUGH W. A. JONES
KENNETH R. JONES
KIRK J. JUNKER
JOSEPH A. KATZ
JAMES B. KAVANAUGH
DANIEL P. KEARNEY
COLLIN K. KEENAN
JIM D. KEIRSEY
MATTHEW F. KELLY
RYAN C. KENDALL
DANIEL R. KENT
ADAM R. KEOWN
JEFFREY J. KERSEY
KEVIN J. KEY
BRYAN R. KILBRIDE
NGAN M. KIM
ADISA T. KING
CHRISTOPHER J. KIRKPATRICK
ERIK A. KJONNEROD
CHRISTOPHER D. KLEIN
SAMUEL W. KLINE
JONATHAN S. KLUCK
ANDREW J. KNIGHT
RYAN T. KRANC
ERIC V. KREITZ
JAMES L. KRUEGER
KWENTON K. KUHLMAN
SCOTT A. KUTSCHER
JASON J. LAGEMAN
MATTHEW A. LANDRUM
CONNIE M. LANE
SHOSHANNAH B. LANE
JARRED M. LANG
NEAL J. LAPE
EDWARD B. LAROSA
EDUARDO J. LARUMBE
IAN J. LAUER
JASON C. LAUER
HARRIS T. LAWRENCE III
JOSEPH E. LEACH
ALEXANDER R. LEE
MARK D. LEHENBAUER
ANDREW J. LENNOX
NATHAN L. LEWIS
CHRISTOPHER D. LHEUREUX
STEWART C. LINDSAY
CHARLES M. LINGENFELTER
DENNIS O. LOCKHART
MICHAEL T. LOFTUS
JOHN F. LORY
BRADLEY S. LOUDON
HARVEY R. LOWELL
SEAN P. LUCAS
KENT M. MACGREGOR
SIMON A. MACIOCH
AMANDA L. MACWHIRTER
TOD T. MARCHAND
ERIC W. MARHOVER
CHRISTIAN M. MARIANI
WILLIAM J. MARM
BRYAN M. MARTIN
LINDSAY R. C. MATTHEWS
RYAN G. MAYFIELD
SEAN M. MCBRIDE
MARGARET L. MCGUNEGLE
STEVEN B. MCGUNEGLE
GEORGE C. MCINGVALE III
MATTHEW P. MCQUILTON
GLENN C. MCQUOWN III
DAVID O. MCRAE
BRIAN H. MEHAN
NICHOLAS O. MELIN
ERIC G. MELLOH
ANN M. MEREDITH
CHRISTOPHER J. MIDBERRY

STEPHEN P. MIDKIFF
 WILLIAM J. MILLER
 TRAVIS W. MILLS
 TROY A. MILLS
 MICHAEL L. MINCE
 DANIEL D. MITCHELL
 GEORGE A. MITROKA III
 JEFFREY D. MIX
 CASEY M. MOES
 BRYAN M. MOFFATT
 NATHAN A. MOLICA
 HECTOR A. MONTEMAYOR
 TOMAS I. MOORE
 BENJAMIN L. MORALES
 DAVID W. MORGAN
 KENNETH S. MORLEY
 JOHN A. MORRIS III
 SHELTON A. MORRIS
 JAMES M. MOSS
 KYLE T. MOULTON
 KEVIN J. MOYER
 CHRISTOPHER MUGAVERO
 JAMES E. MULLIN III
 ZACHARY J. MUNDELL
 NEIL J. MYRES
 BRADLEY S. NELSON
 KURT L. NELSON
 PATRICK R. NELSON
 JOHN T. NEWMAN
 PATRIC A. NICHOLS
 CECIL C. NIX IV
 TOM M. NOBLE
 CHRISTOPHER S. NUNN
 BRIAN A. OBERG
 THERESE L. OBIDINSKI
 JOHN H. OBRIEN IV
 DAVID J. OHEARN
 JEFFREY S. PALAZZINI
 ANDY J. PANNIER
 KENT W. PARK
 JEROME A. PARKER
 KEVIN M. PAYNE
 JAMES H. B. PEAY IV
 MICHAEL M. PECINA
 JASON E. PELLETTIER
 TIMOTHY N. PETERMAN
 JASON A. PIERI
 NORMAN L. POLLOCK
 MICHAEL A. PORCELLI
 AARON M. POULIN
 KEVIN R. PUGH
 GREGORY G. RALLS
 CHAD M. RAMSKUGLER
 MATTHEW S. RASMUSSEN
 ARIC J. RAUS
 TRAVIS J. RAYFIELD
 JOHN A. REDFORD
 CHRISTOPHER E. REICH
 STEPHEN A. RESCH
 LISA T. REYES
 JOSHUA R. RICHARDSON
 RANDY R. RIKER
 TYWANA D. ROBINSON
 KENNETH P. ROCKWELL
 STACY E. RODGERS
 EDUARDO D. RODRIGUEZ
 TIMMY L. ROSE
 DAVID B. ROWLAND
 AARON J. SADUSKY
 GREGORY SAKIMURA
 KEVIN A. SALGE
 JASON V. SAMA
 DAVID R. SANDOVAL
 BRIAN R. SAUL
 BRIAN D. SAWSER
 ADAM M. SAWYER
 MICHAEL A. SCHAAD
 VICTOR H. SCHARSTEIN
 NICHOLAS C. SCHENCK
 DEREK I. SCHMECK
 RYAN L. SCHROCK
 DAMON T. SCHWAN
 KIRSTEN T. SCHWENN
 JAMES H. SCOTT III
 SEANEGAN P. SCULLEY
 JUAN C. C. SEGURA
 AARON C. SESSOMS
 JUSTIN J. SHAFFER
 DEVAN J. SHANNON
 SHERRI L. SHARPE
 ROBERT M. SHAW
 COURTNEY A. SHORT
 DAVID E. SHORT
 SCOTT F. SIEGFRIED
 DAVID N. SIMMS
 SCOTT C. SINCLAIR
 ANDREW M. SLACK
 ADAM P. SMITH
 DEREK A. SMITH
 RONALD C. SMITH
 SCOTT C. SMITH
 WILLIAM H. SNOOK
 HYOKOOK SONG
 MATTHEW C. STANLEY
 ROBERT C. STANTON, JR.
 ANDREW C. STEADMAN
 PERRY O. STIEMKE
 JOHN C. STROH III
 GREGORY M. STROUD
 RACHEL D. V. SULLIVAN
 SHAWN D. SUMTER
 BRIAN E. SUPKO

JOHNNY R. SUTTON III
 JEREM G. SWENDDAL
 SCOTT F. SWILLEY
 NATHAN E. SWINDLER
 GABRIEL A. SZODY
 JONATHAN P. TACKABERRY
 BENJAMIN A. TAYLOR
 KEVIN R. TAYLOR
 RICHARD P. TAYLOR
 FRANK TEDESCHI
 JOSHUA P. THIEL
 ISRAEL A. THOMPSON
 MASON D. THOMPSON
 ERIC L. TISLAND
 JASON M. TODD
 WILLIAM J. TOLBERT
 JASON C. TOOLE
 VICTOR J. TORRESFERNANDEZ
 ERIC A. TRESCHL
 GREGORY E. TURNER
 ROBERT E. UNDERWOOD III
 JAMES W. UPTGRAFT II
 JULIAN T. URQUIDEZ
 ALBERT A. VIGILANTE, JR.
 ANDREW K. VISSER
 ROGER P. WALESKI, JR.
 STEPHEN C. WALKER
 RUFUS D. WATSON
 CHRISTOPHER J. WEHRI
 SCOTT D. WENCE
 JOSEPH E. WESTERMAN
 MARCUS C. WHITE
 SONJA L. WHITEHEAD
 BRETT A. WIERSMA
 ANDREW J. WIKER
 JOHN M. R. WILCOX
 JAMES M. WILES
 CHARLES M. WILLIAMS
 ARLIN R. WILSHER III
 CHAD J. WITHERELL
 MARTIN A. WOHLGEMUTH
 BRYAN T. WOODY
 MATTHEW T. WORK
 FREDRICK J. WRIGHT, JR.
 CHRISTOPHER T. YOUNG
 BRION D. YOUTZ
 JAMES A. ZANELLA
 JONATHAN S. ZIMMER
 JAMES E. ZOIZACK
 D003114
 D004286
 D010085
 D010375
 D010646
 D011051
 D012327
 D012380
 D012386
 D012387
 D012593

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be major

GREGORY I. KELTS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be colonel

STEPHEN H. COOPER
 DAVID L. JOHNSON
 JOHN P. MAIER
 DOUGLAS P. MARTIN
 JENNIFER R. MITCHELL
 MICHAELLE M. MUNGER
 RYAN T. PACE
 DAVID G. WORTMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

LESLEY A. WATTS

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

ENRIQUE R. ASUNCION
 VERNON D. BIBY
 ROBERT C. CARR
 CAROL Y. CHEEK
 LOWELL C. CORPUZ
 CLINTON FORD
 TIMOTHY J. SAXON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTIAN J. AUGER
 MICHAEL T. AUGUSTYN
 JOHN F. CASILLO

JONATHON K. CHARFAUROS
 BRIAN W. CHRISTNER
 PETER J. A. DANCEL
 DANE C. ELLES
 EDWARD A. FOSSON
 DANIEL J. B. GUTIERREZ
 KATHRYN A. GUTIERREZ
 THOMAS D. HALLAM
 CARL A. HANSEN
 HEATHER M. HESS
 MICHAEL R. HIGHTOWER
 WESLEY J. HOWARD
 JOSEPH L. IACOVONE
 MATTHEW J. LENZER
 KIMBERLY I. MAZUR
 SETH T. MCGUIRE
 JAMES B. MCKELVIE
 RONNIE A. MOJZIS
 RACHAEL M. MUSSER
 ROSS A. PENROD
 AUSTIN A. RASBACH
 JASON R. RAY
 CHRISTOPHER A. SANDMEL
 TYLER R. SCHARAR
 JASON A. SCHECHTER
 JAMES O. SHAMBLEY
 RAFAEL E. SUAZO
 ROBERT M. SYRE
 SHAWN E. TALLEY
 RYAN W. THRUN
 RUSSELL B. TORGESEN
 TERRENCE G. WHITE
 BRYAN K. WILSON
 BILLY D. WOODWARD
 CHESTER J. WYCKOFF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CARA M. ADDISON
 EMILEE K. BALDINI
 KRISTI H. BAO
 BRYAN C. BARLETTTO
 RONISHA T. BEASLEY
 TIMOTHY D. BERGSTROM
 NATASHA T. BODE
 JESSICA J. BURRELL
 CHRISTINA R. CAETANO
 THERESA J. CHAMP
 ANDREW S. CLAYTON
 ROSS S. ERICSON
 KYLE FRALICK
 NICOLAUS C. GRUESSEN
 PAUL T. HOCHMUTH, JR.
 LATHAM T. HUDSON
 TODD E. HUTCHINS
 PATRICK O. JACKSON
 MICHAEL E. JONES
 NICHOLAS J. KADLEC
 DANIEL B. LEARY
 JENNIFER L. MYERS
 AUDREY M. NICHOLS
 LEAH A. OBRIEN
 JASON A. PFEIL
 ZACHARY W. PRAGER
 MATTHEW T. RECTOR
 CHRISTOPHER M. REINTJES
 MARK W. RICHARDSON
 BRIAN F. ROACH
 JASPREET K. SAINI
 JULIE SHERMANDUMAIS
 URSULA M. C. SMITH
 JEREMY L. SNELLEN
 MALACHY J. SOLLER
 MATTHEW R. SONN
 BENITA E. STENTIFORD
 LEA E. SUAREZ
 PAUL H. THOMPSON
 AARON D. WALDO
 KEVIN M. WALKER
 ALEXANDER H. WANN
 DAVID W. WARNING
 JOEL A. WHITE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

OLUWAFADEKEMI N. ADEWETAN
 RICHARD D. BARTOL III
 JARED C. BECK
 ERIC L. BISCHOFF
 STEPHEN R. BLACK
 ROBERT J. BLOCK
 MICHAEL A. BOHMAN
 JOSEPH G. R. BOICE
 BRANDON K. CALLAWAY
 KARL M. CHANDLER
 ALAN H. S. CHEN
 ANTHONY Y. S. CHIA
 JAMES C. COMINSKY
 THOMAS G. COOPER
 PRESTON M. CRIDDLE
 TRACY A. DANTONIO
 CAITLIN D. DARCEY
 ROHIT K. DAVE
 HAI A. M. DOAN
 KRISTEN M. ESTRADA
 BRIAN D. EVANS
 KENNETH K. H. FAN

AMANDA A. FIX
STUART C. FRY
WILLIAM H. GALLAGHER
JOHN M. GREEN III
KARSTEN J. HAIN
JAMES M. HAWKINS
TAWFIQ N. HAZBOUN
BRENT M. HIEBERT
ANDREW J. HOPPE
PATRICK A. HUNTER
STEPHEN B. HUTTON
SHIN J. KIM
JIMMY H. KU
YALE A. LEE
ERIK J. LIGAS
JAMES C. M. LISH
LONDON E. LUDWICK
CHRISTOPHER P. MALY
RICHARD A. MCKINNEY, JR.
KRISTINA B. MENDOZA
EVAN P. MOODY
ALEXANDER D. PAUL
DAVID G. QUINTERO
MONICA L. RANCOURT
NICOLE M. REDDOUT
JENNA M. REDGATE
OSCAR A. RODRIGUEZRAMOS
NICHOLAS K. RORICK
BLAKE M. ROSACKER
GRANT R. RUTHERFORD
JAMES A. SHAUL
KELLY B. SLICHTER
VINCENT J. SLOVAN
JEFFREY T. SMITH
DOUGLAS D. STEFFY
WALTER D. THAMES
JUSTIN I. WATSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

FREDERIC ALBESA
CHRISTOPHER L. ALLEN
ALEX F. G. AMPER
IAN E. BARR
JENNIFER M. BIBY
HEATHER M. BOWMAN
CHRISTOPHER M. BUCHANAN
JASON P. BUONVINO
REYNALDO R. CABANA III
DON C. CADE
LUPEI CHOU
MICHAEL J. COLLINS
SHELLEY CONYERS
VAUGHN B. COOPER
MARK A. COWANS, JR.
SHANNON M. DANIELS
HEIDI M. DAVIS
JAMES A. DAVIS
CHARLES M. DEIBLER
JUSTIN T. DEVOE
RYAN P. DIPALO
MICHAEL B. DIPROSPERO
REBECCA R. DREMAN
CRAIG T. DZIEWIATKOWSKI
DAVID C. EGGERS
MALCOLM L. ELLIOTT
MELISSA S. FLYNN
JARON Z. GOLDSTEIN
MELISSA A. GONZALES
JEREMY A. GRENNAN
DEEANN K. GUNNELLS
MARK A. GUNTER
ADAM L. HAMILTON
BRIAN H. HAYS
NATHAN T. HAYWARD
EDWARD W. HERBERT IV
LUKE J. HODGES
ALEJANDRA HOLCH
STEVEN A. HOLLAND
RYAN Z. HUGHES
MICHAEL D. KEY
JONATHAN M. KRENZ
MICHAEL D. LABBE
RAYMOND J. LANCIOS III
QUENTIN E. LEASE
SOHNHWA LEE
JEFFREY D. LEGG
JASON P. MARKS
CATHERINE L. MCCLURE
ANDREW S. MIKESELL
HOWARD A. MILLIGAN
JOSHUA M. MILLNER
STEPHANIE C. MONTANO
JASON A. MONTS
BENJAMIN G. MUNIZ III
BRENT E. NIVEN
RAYMOND D. OBRIEN
JOHN A. OLABODE
ROEL K. OROZCO
ISAAC J. ORTMAN
STEAVE W. PHANN
MATTHEW C. POSS
RENAE J. RENKEN
JOHN J. RENQUIST
LEANNE R. RILEY
PETER J. RIVERA
WILLIAM D. M. ROMPS
MANUEL ROSAS
FADI J. SACRE
CHRISTOPHER M. SANDS

NARCISO M. SANGLE III
MATTHEW J. SCHAEFER
JAN D. SCHOTMAN
JOHN R. SECRIST
SARAH S. SIRKIN
GINA M. SLABY
CINDY SUAREZVILLAFANE
JOHN R. SUMNER
PURIPHAT SURARUJIOJ
SEAN M. TETER
MICHAEL B. VALLE
TROY R. WEIDENMILLER
KURT A. WELDAY, JR.
JACOB T. WHITELEY
JAMES R. WHITWORTH, JR.
DANTE E. WILLIAMSON
EDWARD P. WINDAS
TIMOTHY J. WINN
FRANZ J. YU

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MARICAR S. ABERIN
CHERIE T. AYALA
JOHN B. AYLSWORTH
KENNETH D. BARBER
KATHLEEN K. BAUTISTA
SHERI M. BENJAMIN
CARLTON W. BENNETT III
NICHOLE D. BENSON
TOMMIE R. BIRGE
ANGELINA D. BRANNON
ELYSE M. BRAXTON
TRACEY L. BURNEY
JASON R. CARMICHAEL
SARAH K. CERTANO
RAQUEL CHAMBERS
JOHN P. CHIONG
ESTHER M. COLBERT
TANYA M. COPPA
GRACIANA E. CRAWFORD
ANNISSA L. CROMER
NICOLE CUTHBERTSON
ANGELA R. DAVENPORT
KAREN E. DOWNER
ANTHONY P. DURAN, JR.
SARA R. EDMONDSON
JESSICA R. FAHL
MICHELLE L. FINLEY
ROBERT D. GIBSON
APRIL A. GILBRECH
DANIELLE M. GRADY
KEVIN T. GUTIERREZ
SAMUEL I. HARRIS
EMILY S. HESS
NARDA P. HEYWOOD
CHRISTINE D. HIGGINS
JAMES P. HINES
ANTONY N. HOPSON
MIRANDA R. HORNE
KAYLA R. HORTON
SARAH C. HULEY
DOUGLAS T. JOHNSON
SONDRA L. JOLLY
THOMAS J. KANNON
ERIN L. KERR
MEGAN L. KING
CANDICE N. KLINE
KATHLEEN E. KOSTKA
AMY D. KRAMER
LANI A. KUHLLOW
SHANE I. LATIMER
NATHAN J. LEE
TAIKO LESTER
ANDY G. LUM
JENNIFER R. LYND
CHRISTOPHER A. LYNN
KONSTANCE C. MACKIE
CHARLIE O. MANALANSAN
CAMERON F. MATHIE
RICKY R. MCCALLISTER
SHELLY K. MCCARTER
DAVID R. MCDONALD
MATTHEW M. MOORE
RACHEL M. NADOLSKY
DEREK L. OWENS
JENNY L. K. PAUL
JESSIE N. PERALTA
SHEILA PHILLIPS
DESIRAE N. PIERCE
JACKIE L. PONCE
JACQUELINE E. PRICE
CHASTITY Y. REID
JASON A. REID
AUTUMN J. RIDDELL
REBECA S. RODRIGUEZ
LUIS A. RODRIGUEZFONSECA
FRANCISCO J. RODRIGUEZSOSA
MELISSA J. ROSLONIEC
SHEREE A. SCOTT
BETSY M. SEITZ
DOMENIQUE K. SELBY
KRISTEN M. SKINNER
SASHA Y. SMITH
CHRISTOPHER E. STEADMAN
REBECCA L. STRONG
LAUREN T. SUSZAN
RIE H. TAMAYO
LAURA A. TATE
BEVERLY J. TORRES

SCHADAQ TORRES
WILLIAM C. WESTBROOK
MALINDA V. WILFORD
CARDIA M. WILSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMES P. ADWELL
MOLLY A. AVERY
TANYA N. BATES
JEREMY O. BIEHN
HENRY L. BIRD
GREGORY W. BOGGS
MICHAEL P. BOWERS
CLIFTON D. BUTLER
KIRSTEN M. CARLSON
MARY E. CAVA
STEPHANIE C. CLAPPER
ASHLEY N. CLARK
DOUGLAS E. COLE, JR.
WALTER J. COLVIN, JR.
RACHEL W. P. CONDON
TRAVIS W. COOK
BRENNAN D. COX
TARA J. DARIANO
RICHARD J. DELINSKY
SONJA M. DIAZSEVILLA
RYAN K. DIPARISI
PATRICK J. DOUGHERTY
STEPHEN M. EGGAN
MATTHEW R. ENGLISH
MICHAEL L. FISHER
JASON S. GALKA
LINDA C. GALLUS
GREGORY D. GENTRY
MARISSA L. GREENE
KAYREEN K. GUCCIARDO
MARC D. HAINES
FRANCIS J. HARAN III
LINDA D. HAVENS
HEATHER C. HENDRIXHOLMES
MACEDONIO M. HERRERA
CHRISTINE HOBBS
DEREK B. HOFFMAN
DARCI E. HOOK
MEGAN I. HORVATH
BRIAN A. HOWARD
ALAN D. HUBER
BRITTANY J. JANSEN
AMANDA L. JIMENEZ
JOSHUA I. KEIL
BRENNAN S. KELLY
MICHAEL R. KIMBRELL
CHRISTOPHER R. KUNTZ
CARLOS A. LINOMONTES
ERIC S. LITZENBERG
STEPHANIE M. LONG
WILLIAM P. MARTIN, JR.
BETH M. MATTESON
AMY E. MCARTHUR
JENNIFER J. MCLAUGHLIN
GREG F. R. MENDOZA
CASSANDRA G. MONTALVO
SHAWN M. MORRIS
ADELEKE O. MOWOBI
FRANKLIN E. J. MUHAMMAD
ANNE R. MURRAY
KEITH D. NEMEROFF
HEATHER M. NEUMEYER
ROBERT P. B. NEVINS
DAVID NORIEGA
JACOB N. J. NORRIS
DONALD T. ORDINARIO
MICHAEL D. OWEN
JOHN D. PAVLICA, JR.
KATHERINE E. PIERCE
BRIAN L. PIKE
BRETTSON W. PLATTE
ERICA L. POOLE
LUKE P. QUEBEDEAUX
DAVID W. QUEEN
CHRISTOPHER T. RAGSDALE
ROXANNE M. RAU
HEATHER A. REDDING
KAIA T. ROBINSON
STEPHEN E. ROGERS
KATHLEEN C. ROONEY
GARY M. ROSONET
ANDREW C. RUTLEDGE
JILL M. SALLIS
NICHOLAS C. SCHAAL
SCOTTIE E. SMITH
KWAJA G. SNAER
KRISTIN L. SOMAR
MICHAEL W. TERRENZI
DAWN M. TORRUSIO
CHRISTOPHER J. UDELL
JOEL A. VALDEZ
DAVID P. VARNEY
WILLIAM J. WALTERS
ROBERT C. WARD
THOMAS G. WARNER, JR.
DAVID L. WHEELER, JR.
KEVIN R. WHITMYER
JANNIFER L. WICK
JESSICA N. WOODY
JASON E. WRIGHT
MARTIN R. WRIGHT
HAO XIE
ADAM L. ZEILER

MARESA C. J. ZENNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RICHARD R. ABITRIA
CHANTAL N. AFUHLEFLORE
HAYDAR M. ALEID
DANIEL B. ALBERT
LESLEY P. ALBERT
WILLIAM C. ANDERSON
CODY C. ARMSTRONG
KESTUTIS A. AUKSTUOLIS
DAVID F. AURIGEMMA
KRISTEN D. AURIGEMMA
MARY M. BAILEY
NEAL J. BAKER
ANGELO B. BAQUIR
MATTHEW P. P. BAUER
TERRENCE D. BAYLY
JEREMY E. BENJAMINSON
DANIELA J. BERMUDEZ
MICHELLE C. BILBAO
BENJAMIN D. BONI
JEREMY T. BOUCHER
ELISE C. BRANDON
MARIE E. BROCK
TAYLOR A. BROWN
TIMOTHY P. BRUCE
KERRY L. BUCKLEY
RYAN T. BUCKLEY
SARAH B. BUCKLEY
SUSAN A. BULLARD
PATRICK J. BURBANODELARA
MATTHEW D. BURGESS
NATHAN H. BUTLER
WILLIAM J. BUTLER
AMELIA H. BUTTOLPH
WILLIAM E. BYLUND
KRISTOPHER E. CARTER
KRISTI L. CASSLEMAN
ALLEN D. CHANG
BENJAMIN B. CHI
GRANT K. COCHRAN
GEOFFREY J. COLE
RICHELE L. CORRADO
PAUL CRIPE
CHRIS A. CRUZ
NICHOLAS A. DARLING
CHRISTOPHER A. DAVIS
DANIEL J. DEAN, JR.
DEREK L. DEBOER
JOHN B. DEGEUS
ANDREA F. DELACRUZ
VICTORIA M. DEREVIANKO
NICHOLAS W. DIGEORGE
BRIGHAM L. DOUGLAS
STEVEN ELEK IV
JENNIFER K. ENKGULAWY
JOHN K. EVANS II
SARA K. FAUGHT
KAYCEE R. FIASEU
RADU FILIPESCU
LYNN M. FLOWERS
STEPHANIE M. FOFI
SAMUEL D. FRASIER
MICHELE M. GAGE
KAREN G. GANACIAS
ALEJANDRO J. GARCIASALAS
BETHANY K. GAYLORD
JUDITH C. GENEROSO
JOHN W. GILLESPIE
LUKE A. GILMAN
JONATHAN R. GOWER
JENNIFER N. GRAHAM
TATIANA M. GREENE
ALEX A. GUTWEILER
SEAN P. HAIGHT
KENT M. HALL
ERIN R. S. HAMERSLEY
TODD G. HASTINGS
HEATHER N. HAUCK
NIELS M. HAUFF
MAE W. HEALY
NATHAN J. HEMERLY
ANDREW D. HENEBRY
SADIE M. HENRY
EVAN M. HODELL
MARSHALL M. HOFFMAN
PATRICIA E. HOGAN
KEVIN T. HOLLEMAN
JAMON A. HOLZHOUSER
ANKUSH K. JAIN
MICHELLE D. JARDONAITES
JENNIFER L. JASKIEWICZ
LING JING
MICHAEL W. JOHNS
BIANCA C. KARRIS
DI KHOO
IULIANA KILMENTMIHAILEANU
DANIEL P. KUCKEL
SCOTT A. KUNKEL
CASEY E. LAFFERTY
JOSEPH E. LAGREW II
ERIC C. LARSEN
SCOTT M. LAWSON
JOSEPH A. LE
TUVIEN LE
BLAIR C. LEE
BENJAMIN J. LEHMANN
WILLIAM A. LEWIS

KATHRYN A. LIPSCOMB
MATTHEW C. LOMELI
LANCE A. LOPEZ
JOSEPH O. LOPREIATO
CHRISTOPHER S. LOVE
HEATHER K. MAK
PAUL G. MALIAKEL
ANDREW E. MANCUSIUNGARO
RODOLFO E. MANOSALVA
JOSEPH P. MARQUARDT
MICHAEL T. MARSHALL
MARY B. MARUSZAK
MANOJ MATHEW
JEAN G. MATHURIN
JOHN C. MATTINGLY
ROBERT I. MCCLURE
JEREMY D. MCCULLOUGH
JOHN C. MCDONNELL IV
LESLEY A. MCEPEAK
JONATHAN M. MELZER
NICOLE J. MEUNIER
ERIC B. MICHEL
SHANNON S. MICHEL
MICHAEL J. E. MONSON
BEAU J. MUNOZ
DAVID E. MYLES
JESSICA L. NAFF
CARLOS A. NAVARRO
MIKAL J. NELSON
MARIA L. NIEVES
BRENDAN S. OBRIEN
OLAMIDE J. OLADIPO
ERIK J. OLSON
TODD G. OSBORNE
JAMIE K. OVERBEY
STEFFANIE M. OWENS
AARON G. PANNIER
CHRISTOPHER R. PARTOVI
PHILLIP R. PERRINEZ
ALEXANDRA V. PERRY
BRANDON R. PETERSON
MICHAEL F. POWERS
MICHAEL A. PROKOP
WILLIAM J. REYNDERS
NOLEN F. ROBERSON
CHRISTOPHER D. RODEN
WARREN L. ROSS
MATTHEW C. RUSSELL
TODD M. RUTTENBERG
GABRIEL F. SANTIAGO
JONATHAN M. SARDINA
SCOTT J. SASOVETZ
JESSE T. SCHONAU
STEPHENIE A. SCULLY
DANIEL B. SEEGER
ERIK E. SHANAHAN
JOSEPH F. SIEBENALER
JOSEPH A. SIEGEL
BRETT P. SIMMONS
JACOB E. SINGER
CHRISTOPHER D. SKEEHAN
JENNIFER L. SMITH
RYAN W. SNOW
ANA L. SOLIS
PETER L. SONE
ADAM G. SONGER
MATTHEW V. SPEICHER
GREGORY R. STAHELI
CHRISTOPHER J. STANGE
VLAD V. STANILA
ROBERT E. STAPLETON
LEITH J. STATES
HELEN M. STEELE
LORETTA L. STEIN
KRISTI K. STONEGARZA
MICHAEL S. STRATTON
INES H. STROMBERG
PAUL C. TALISE
JACOB M. TAYLOR
BRIAN TOUPIN
RUTH A. TREVINO
IAN C. UBER
JASON M. VALADAO
KARI L. WAGNER
SCOTT C. WAGNER
KENNETH B. WAITE, JR.
JAMES D. WALLACE
JOHN C. WALSH
ADAM T. WATERMAN
JAMES W. WESTBROOK
ANN V. WHEELAN
JONATHAN D. WILDI
JESSICA A. WILSON
KEVIN F. WILSON
MICHAEL E. WOLF
BRYAN E. WOOLDRIDGE, JR.
DAVID J. ZELINSKAS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be captain

MICHELLE D. CARTER

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

KRESHNIK ALIKAJ, OF CALIFORNIA

MICHELLE ANGULO, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KATIE WILTROUT APPLIGATE, OF VIRGINIA
ALICIA M. ARENDT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIEGO A. ARIAS, OF NEW JERSEY
CHRISTOPHER N. ASHCRAFT, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ZACHARY SAMUEL AUERBACH, OF VIRGINIA
MADELEINE THERESA BEARD, OF VIRGINIA
ELIZABETH MARY ANN BENNING, OF UTAH
JULIA ANNE BENSON, OF WISCONSIN
CLARETHA BILLINGSLEA, OF VIRGINIA
XAVIER JONATHAN BILLINGSLEY, OF TEXAS
ROBERT R. BLAKELY III, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN A. BLEAKNEY, OF DELAWARE
JASON Z. BRAINER, OF MICHIGAN
JEREMY K. BRANSON, OF VIRGINIA
CASEY M. BRASWELL, OF VIRGINIA
DIANA G. BRAUN, OF NEW YORK
RYAN MARIE CALDWELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DANIEL MICHAEL CAPONE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
KATHRYN R. CARNEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JESSICA NICOLE CARRILLO, OF TEXAS
MORGAN E. CASSELL, OF WASHINGTON
CHRISTOPHER JONATHAN CHENG, OF VIRGINIA
JOEL WILLIAM CHRISTENSEN, OF UTAH
CARLY L. COHEN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
OSVALDO VIDALY COLON-TORRES, OF VIRGINIA
KHATIJAH SUZANNA COREY, OF CALIFORNIA
JULIE ANN CURRY, OF VIRGINIA
SHARON MICHELLE CYR, OF ILLINOIS
KEITH THOMAS DEVEREAUX, OF VIRGINIA
KELLY MARIE RAIN DODGE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JAMES HARRIS FINDLEY, OF ILLINOIS
LINNETTE D. FRANCO, OF GEORGIA
MICHELE L. GAMMARELLO, OF VIRGINIA
MELINDA GATTO, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL TEKA GETAHUN, OF MINNESOTA
RAJANI MARY GHOSH, OF MARYLAND
JUDITH DIANE GLASS, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DANIEL ALLAN GRIFFITHS, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN JOHN GROB-FITZGIBBON, OF VIRGINIA
HERMES RAFAEL GRULLON, OF NEW YORK
JUSTIN RANDALL HALPERN, OF NEW JERSEY
ADAM R. HENNINGS, OF MINNESOTA
DONNA MELYZA HERNANDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
BENJAMIN P. HINES, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN ISAAC HOUSTON, OF NEW JERSEY
AARON AKIRA ISAKI, OF HAWAII
KENYA JORDANA JAMES, OF NEW YORK
BRITTNEY NICOLLE JOHNSON, OF MARYLAND
SAMANTHA A. JORDAN, OF VIRGINIA
SARAH E. KAHTN, OF TEXAS
TARYN NOHEA KAILI, OF HAWAII
BRIAN C. KELLY, OF CALIFORNIA
MADELINE LOUISE KOCH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHRISTINE LAHENS, OF MASSACHUSETTS
CANDICE MELINDA LAPLANTE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY HOWARD LARSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
SARAH A. LEIGHTON-BRADLEY, OF VIRGINIA
ROBYN NICOLE LUFFMAN, OF MISSOURI
ETHAN DONOVAN LYNCH, OF KENTUCKY
MARCOS A. MADRID, OF VIRGINIA
JENNIFER MAITNER, OF VIRGINIA
BENJAMIN C. MALLETT, OF VIRGINIA
CRISTIAN NOEMI MARTINEZ-LUSANE, OF CALIFORNIA
NOLAN PATRICK MASTERSON, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT WILLIAM MCGHEE, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL JOSEPH MCGUIRE, OF VIRGINIA
WILLIAM L. MCILWAIN IV, OF OHIO
MICHAEL JOHN MCMULLAN, OF VIRGINIA
MEGAN ELIZABETH MCPHEE, OF MASSACHUSETTS
DAVID ALEJANDRO MENDEZ, OF CALIFORNIA
NATHAN MARK MILLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
NAAKOSHIE A. MILLS, OF NEW YORK
JAKE THOMAS MINER, OF CONNECTICUT
MENAL GAURISHANKER MODHA, OF VIRGINIA
JACQUELINE MAE MOORE, OF TEXAS
SARAH KYLER MOORE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
UMAR MOULTA-ALI, OF MARYLAND
AMAURY MUNOZ, OF NEW YORK
DARLENE M. NOBLE-ZINZER, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN MOODY O'GRADY, OF OREGON
JAMES ROBERT O'LEARY, OF VIRGINIA
AUTUMN KELLY PATTERSON, OF PENNSYLVANIA
PATRICK J. PATTERSON, OF VIRGINIA
SAMUEL PAYAN, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH ALAN PEARCE, OF VIRGINIA
STEPHANIE R. PATTERSON PEREZ, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK J. PRATT, OF TENNESSEE
EVAN ROBERTS PRICE, OF VIRGINIA
CHRISTOPHER D. PRITCHETT, OF GEORGIA
JESSE N. RAMIREZ, OF VIRGINIA
STEFAN H. REISINGER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MAI VAY RETTENMAYER, OF CALIFORNIA
CYRUS FARROKH REVAND, OF VIRGINIA
AMANDA MARISSE ROACH, OF NEW JERSEY
ASHTON E. ROBISON, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM D. ROWE, OF VIRGINIA
MELISSA M. SANDOVAL, OF NEW YORK
THOMAS HAMILTON SANTORO, OF NEW YORK
MONICA LORRAINE SAWYER, OF COLORADO
DANIEL R. SINGER, OF VIRGINIA
JESSICA A. SPERLANGANO, OF VIRGINIA
TODD E. STRUMKE, OF VIRGINIA
EDWARD B. SWANN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
LARA R. TALVERDIAN, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER F. TATUM, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MEGAN SIMONE TAYLOR, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MIMI WIN THEIN, OF VIRGINIA
CLAIRE GRONEMEYER THOMAS, OF CALIFORNIA
JONATHAN NIKOLAS TSCHETTER, OF VIRGINIA
DMITRIY UPART, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN JAMES VACCARO, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN RICHARD VELASCO, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
GREGORY JAMES VIOLA, OF NEW YORK
JAMES A. WATERMAN, OF WISCONSIN
TRAE R. WATSON, OF NORTH CAROLINA

DAVID MCKAY WEILER, OF OREGON
DEBORAH ARIN WHANG, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
DIANA MARIE WICK-PALDANO, OF VIRGINIA
JACOB ANDREW WILLIAMS, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL LEE WILSON, OF FLORIDA
EMA DIANE WOODWARD, OF MASSACHUSETTS
ONEJIN WU, OF CALIFORNIA
MARK D. WYDRA, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA YANG, OF VIRGINIA
BRETT DAVID ZISKIE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by
the Senate September 8, 2015:

THE JUDICIARY

ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, OF MISSOURI, TO BE UNITED
STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT
OF MISSOURI.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 8, 2015

The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 8, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable STEVE WOMACK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:
Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

As the Members of this people's House return from a lengthy time in their home districts, in the wake of a great American holiday, we ask Your special blessing upon American workers, those fortunate to have jobs during these difficult economic times and those desiring work. May they know and be confident of the nobility and sacredness of their labor.

Lord, the task facing the Nation's Congress is a difficult one which will call upon each Member to consider what is best for American workers first. It is the challenge facing all Americans.

Give the Members wisdom in their work that our economy might continue to rebound and our countrymen and -women throughout these United States be able to provide for their families and to build lives we have all come to expect for our citizens.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. BURGESS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 5, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 5, 2015 at 9:18 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1138.

That the Senate passed S. 1297.

That the Senate passed S. 267.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT, THE HONORABLE JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Timothy H. Reitz, legislative assistant, the Honorable JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Member of Congress:

WASHINGTON, DC, AUGUST 5, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you formally, pursuant to rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have received a grand jury subpoena, issued by the United States District Court for the Middle District of Georgia, for testimony and documents.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel regarding the subpoena, I will make the determinations required under rule VIII.

Sincerely,

TIMOTHY H. REITZ,
Legislative Assistant/Congressman Jody Hice.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 6, 2015 at 9:06 a.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 212.

That the Senate passed H. Con. Res. 72.

That the Senate passed S. 1523.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 6, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 6, 2015 at 9:28 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 720.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2559.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 2131.

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1531.

That the Senate passed S. 1707.

That the Senate passed S. 1826.

That the Senate passed S. 1596.

That the Senate passed S. 1362.

That the Senate passed S. 1576.

That the Senate passed S. 1347.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, August 7, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in clause 2(h) of rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on August 7, 2015 at 10:59 a.m.:

Appointments:
Commission on Care.
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. REEVES,
Deputy Clerk.

DEPUTY SHERIFF DARREN GOFORTH—TEXAS LAWMAN

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Friday, in the blistering heat of Houston, Texas, 11,000 people, including the Governor, attended the event; many more stood outside. The ceremony was broadcast live on all four local TV stations. Helicopters flew overhead. Peace officers from the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom were there. The city and State gave their final tribute and respect for one of its fallen—Harris County Deputy Sheriff Darren Goforth.

Darren left behind a widow, Kathleen, and children: Ava, 12, and Ryan, 5.

Darren was assassinated the week before while he was putting gasoline in his patrol car, apparently targeted because he was a peace officer. He was shot in the back of the head 15 times. An individual was quickly captured, and he is charged with capital murder.

Darren Goforth was a happy guy. He loved his family. He loved his second career as a lawman and loved working on old cars.

Everyone liked Darren. Even a local thief posted on social media that Goforth was his favorite police officer.

Darren loved his kids and recently bought his son and himself Captain America t-shirts. Ryan, his son, wore his t-shirt at the funeral. Deputy Goforth was buried in his Captain America t-shirt underneath his uniform.

Peace officers like Goforth are a rare breed. They rush to emergencies and dangers while most flee from them. Their life is dedicated to serving and protecting others. They are willing to sacrifice everything for the rest of us. Darren Goforth was that type of peace officer.

Mr. Speaker, when the funeral was over and the bagpipers had played "Amazing Grace" and the buglers had played "Taps," it started to rain, as if the angels above were shedding tears for a remarkable guy, Deputy Sheriff Darren Goforth.

And that is just the way it is.

AMERICA'S 122ND LABOR DAY

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, Monday marked the 122nd year that we have honored and celebrated the hard-working men and women of America on Labor Day.

It is also an occasion to reflect on the tremendous progress that the labor movement has made in improving the lives of working families.

From strengthening pay and working conditions to fighting for fair health care and retirement benefits, unions have and will always play a critical role in growing the American middle class.

However, we still have a long way to go. That is why I support raising the minimum wage, expanding the earned income tax credit, and fighting for fair trade agreements so that we can lift up the millions of working families in America still struggling to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, it is simple. Those willing to work should be able to find good jobs. Through their hard work, they should be able to improve their family's quality of life. That is the core of the American Dream.

This Labor Day, let's recommit ourselves to building a nation and an economy where that dream is within reach for every American.

GOLD KING MINE

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, early last month the negligence of the Environmental Protection Agency caused the release of over 3 million gallons of wastewater at the Gold King Mine near Silverton, Colorado, causing arguably the biggest environmental disaster of this year.

While over the congressional August work period, I was able to visit the spill site and, with elected officials, was able to view it for myself. As you can see, there is still considerable effluent coming out of the mouth of that mine as of 2 weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I will just ask: Has anyone been fired? Has anyone been held accountable at the Environmental Protection Agency for this disaster? No, they have not.

What would have happened had a private company been responsible for a disaster of this order of magnitude? I shudder to think where those people in charge of that company would be today.

The EPA did not follow its own procedures. It did not have proper communications equipment at the site of the disaster. They had no satellite phone. They had no radio.

As a consequence, they did not notify local officials until a day later of what had occurred at the mine. They have also refused to answer questions about

the potential health risks in the polluted water to humans and animals downriver.

The long-term effects of the EPA's neglect will be unknown, but I submit they will be significant for years to come.

FRANCIS BELLAMY

(Mr. COLLINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Francis Bellamy, one of the most influential individuals from Mount Morris, New York. Francis Bellamy is the author of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Today marks the 123rd anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance, which was first published in a magazine called "The Youth Companion" on September 8, 1892. The Pledge was initially written as part of a campaign to put American flags in every school in the country.

In its original form, it read: "I pledge allegiance to my Flag and the Republic for which it stands, one Nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In 1923, the words, "the Flag of the United States of America" were added. In 1954, Congress added the words "under God," creating the 31-word pledge we say every day.

Bellamy's words are recited millions of times every day and are ingrained in our society as an expression of national pride and patriotism.

CONGRESSIONAL LAND CONSERVATION CAUCUS

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the summer months provided us with an excellent opportunity to get outside and take advantage of the natural resources, great parks, and public lands in our communities.

In southeastern Pennsylvania, we are fortunate that we do not have to go much further than our own backyard to enjoy a wide variety of landscapes and public lands.

In an effort to prioritize the conservation of our public lands, waterways, natural resources, and public policies related to the same, I recently established the bipartisan Congressional Land Conservation Caucus with Representatives JOE PITTS, EARL BLUMENAUER, and MIKE THOMPSON of California. I appreciate their willingness to support this effort, and I urge my colleagues to join our caucus.

It is my hope this group of Members will focus on issues related to land conservation, the protection of natural resources, and the preservation of open space across the country.

I also want to thank Michael Rellahan and the Daily Local News for their in-depth observations on the past, present, and future of the Chester County government-led efforts to protect open space. It has been a remarkably successful program over the past 30 years.

And, indeed, another county in my district, Montgomery County, has followed in their lead, as have many other counties in Pennsylvania and across the country.

□ 1415

OPPOSE THE IRAN DEAL

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this much we know about the Iran deal.

It permits Iran to develop nuclear weapons in the future. It means \$150 billion to Iran, some of which will be used to export terrorism, as President Obama has admitted. It allows Iran to buy weapons, such as intercontinental ballistic missiles. It gives Iran weeks, if not months, of advance notice of any weapons site inspections.

It includes secret side agreements; one prohibits other countries from inspecting a possible nuclear weapons development site.

It is being implemented even though a majority in the House and the Senate oppose it.

The Iran deal destabilizes the Middle East, jeopardizes America's security, and endangers the world.

NOTICE OF INTENTION TO OFFER RESOLUTION RAISING A QUESTION OF THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 2(a)(1) of rule IX, I rise to give notice of my intention to raise a question of the privileges of the House.

The form of the resolution is as follows:

Whereas Rule IX of the Rules of the House of Representatives states that a question of the privileges of the House "shall be, first, those affecting the rights of the House collectively, its safety, dignity, and the integrity of its proceedings; and second, those affecting the rights, reputation, and conduct of Members, Delegates, or the Resident Commissioner, individually, in their representative capacity only";

Whereas the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (in this preamble referred to as the "Review Act") was passed by the Senate on May 7, 2015, by a vote of 98-1;

Whereas the House of Representatives passed the Review Act on May 14, 2015, by a vote of 400-25;

Whereas the Review Act was signed by President Barack Obama on May 22, 2015, becoming Public Law No. 114-17;

Whereas section 135(a)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) states, "Not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership—(A) the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes";

Whereas section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) states, "The term 'agreement' means an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future";

Whereas on July 14, 2015, the Director General of the International Atomic Energy Agency (in this preamble referred to as the "IAEA") and the President of the Atomic Energy Organization of Iran signed the "Roadmap for the Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran's Nuclear Program", which refers to two "separate arrangements" between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas the first of these separate arrangements seeks to clarify and resolve longstanding questions about the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program, including those identified in the IAEA Director General's report to the Board of Governors, designated "GOV/2011/65";

Whereas section G(38) of that report states, "Since 2002, the [IAEA] has become increasingly concerned about the possible existence in Iran of undisclosed nuclear related activities involving military related organizations, including activities related to the development of a nuclear payload for a missile, about which the [IAEA] has regularly received new information";

Whereas the Roadmap describes the second of these separate arrangements as an effort to resolve outstanding issues regarding the military facility at Parchin;

Whereas in his November 29, 2012, report to the Board of Governors, the Di-

rector General of the IAEA stated, "As you will recall, the [IAEA] has information indicating that Iran constructed a large explosives containment vessel at the Parchin site in which to conduct hydrodynamic experiments. Despite repeated requests, Iran has still not granted the [IAEA] access to the Parchin site. Satellite imagery shows that extensive activities, including the removal and replacement of considerable quantities of earth, have taken place at this location. I am concerned that these activities will have seriously undermined the [IAEA's] ability to undertake effective verification. I reiterate my request that Iran, without further delay, provide access to that location and substantive answers to the [IAEA's] detailed questions regarding the Parchin site";

Whereas an August 20, 2015, report by the Associated Press includes draft text of the Parchin separate agreement, which details a process by which Iran will provide photographs, videos, soil samples, and other materials in lieu of giving the IAEA access to the Parchin site;

Whereas Dr. Olli Heinonen, a 27-year veteran of the IAEA and its former Deputy Director General and chief inspector, stated, "Much of the current concerns arise from the reported arrangements worked out between the IAEA and Iran in the side documents to address PMD [possible military dimension] issues. If the reporting is accurate, these procedures appear to be risky, departing significantly from well-established and proven safeguards practices. At a broader level, if verification standards have been diluted for Parchin (or elsewhere) and limits imposed, the ramification is significant as it will affect the IAEA's ability to draw definitive conclusions with the requisite level of assurances and without undue hampering of the verification process";

Whereas the self inspection and verification by Iran of its own nuclear weapons-related activities performed at the Parchin military facility are inadequate and incapable of demonstrating Iran's compliance with safeguards against nuclear weapons development, as established by the IAEA or the international nuclear agreement with Iran;

Whereas on July 14, 2015, the P5+1 (the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the People's Republic of China, the Russian Federation, and Germany) and Iran announced that the parties had agreed to a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action;

Whereas section C(13) of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action requires Iran's parliament and president to implement the Additional Protocol to Iran's Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA;

Whereas section C(14) of the agreed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action requires Iran to fully implement the

“Roadmap for Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran’s Nuclear Program”, which was agreed to with the IAEA;

Whereas the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is necessarily predicated on and interdependent with the two side agreements between the IAEA and Iran, all of which are mutually reinforcing and indivisible;

Whereas State Department spokesman John Kirby issued a public statement on July 19, 2015, stating that “today the State Department transmitted to Congress the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, its annexes, and related materials. These documents include the Unclassified Verification Assessment Report on the JCPOA and the Intelligence Community’s Classified Annex to the Verification Assessment Report, as required under the law. Therefore, Day One of the 60-day review period begins tomorrow, Monday, July 20”;

Whereas section 135(c)(1)(E) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) states, “it is critically important that Congress have the opportunity, in an orderly and deliberative manner, to consider and, as appropriate, take action affecting the statutory sanctions regime imposed by Congress”, thereby providing the right to the House collectively, and the Members of the House individually in their representative capacities, to review the Iran nuclear agreement, as defined in section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, in order to determine what action, if any, to take;

Whereas section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) specifically requires the President to provide Congress with the text of “side agreements” and “related agreements”, including those agreements “between Iran and any other parties”;

Whereas the State Department’s transmission to Congress did not include the text or materials relating to the two side agreements between the IAEA and Iran and was therefore incomplete as a matter of law;

Whereas on July 21, 2015, Senate Foreign Relations Committee Chairman BOB CORKER and Ranking Member BEN CARDIN sent a bipartisan letter to the State Department requesting the actual text of the two separate agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas on July 22, 2015, Congressman MIKE POMPEO and Senator TOM COTTON, along with the Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, sent a letter to the President requesting the text of the two separate agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas on August 4, 2015, Congressman POMPEO sent a further letter to the President, co-signed by the House Majority Leader and 92 other Members

of the House, requesting the President to provide the text of the two separate agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas contrary to the law and these requests, the President did not provide the text of the separate agreements to Congress or any of its Members;

Whereas on July 22, 2015, State Department spokesman John Kirby stated, “There’s no side deals. There’s no secret deals between Iran and the IAEA that the P5+1 has not been briefed on in detail”;

Whereas in an August 5, 2015, letter to Members of Congress, Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs Julia Frifield contradicted this claim, saying, “The Roadmap refers to two ‘separate agreements’ between the IAEA and Iran. Within the IAEA system, such arrangements related to safeguards procedures and inspection activities are confidential and are not released to other member states”;

Whereas on July 28, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry told the House Foreign Affairs Committee, in responding to the statement that National Security Advisor Susan Rice has seen the actual text of the two side agreements, “I don’t believe Susan Rice, National Security Advisor, has seen it”;

Whereas responding further to whether he has seen the actual text, Secretary Kerry said, “No, I haven’t seen it, I’ve been briefed on it”;

Whereas on July 29, 2015, Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz stated, “I, personally, have not seen those documents”;

Whereas on July 31, 2015, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest stated, “Our negotiators were briefed on the contents of that agreement” (a reference to the side agreements);

Whereas being briefed second- or third-hand, including by Obama Administration officials who themselves have not read the actual text of the side agreements, is akin to a game of telephone and is not the same thing as allowing Members of Congress to read the actual text of the agreements;

Whereas the congressional review period prescribed in section 135(b) of Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) to review the Iran nuclear agreement begins only “if an agreement, including all materials required to be transmitted to Congress pursuant to subsection (a)(1)” is transmitted by the President to the Congress for review;

Whereas on July 14, 2015, President Obama stated, “This deal is not built on trust. It is built on verification”;

Whereas it is impossible for the President, Congress, and the American people to consider and determine whether to support or oppose an Iran nuclear agreement without reviewing key inspection and verification details contained in the text of the two side

agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas the determination by the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives, acting as an Officer of the House, that the President has transmitted to Congress the agreement and related materials as required by law, and therefore to begin counting the elapsing of the congressional review period beginning on July 20, 2015, deprives the House collectively and the Members of the House individually in their representative capacities, of the right to the review the Iran nuclear agreement;

Whereas the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the legislative day of July 27, 2015, is incorrect, listing under the heading “Executive Communications” the following entry: “A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter and attachments satisfying all requirements of Sec. 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Pub. L. 114-17), as received July 19, 2015; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means”;

Whereas the House of Representatives is scheduled to vote on a resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear agreement as soon as September 9, 2015, a procedure provided for under section 135(e)(4) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act);

Whereas such a vote is injurious to the integrity of the proceedings of the House as it violates the process provided under section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act), which is contingent upon both the President’s transmittal of the Iran nuclear agreement and all related documents, including side agreements, and the observance of the congressional review period provided in such section 135;

Whereas in her August 5, 2015, letter to Members of Congress, Assistant Secretary of State Frifield inaccurately stated, “The United States does not have a right to demand these [side agreement] documents from the IAEA”;

Whereas Dr. Heinonen, the former Deputy Director General and chief inspector of the IAEA stated, “According to the IAEA rules and practices, such documents could be made available to the members of the IAEA Board”;

Whereas Dr. Heinonen further stated, “The issue of confidentiality is an important matter for the IAEA. However, it should not be used as a blanket to stop legitimate questions, particularly regarding verification methods at Parchin. Historically, the IAEA has not viewed such issues as confidential. The IAEA and its member states have disclosed much more detailed facility-

specific approaches at regular safeguards symposia. Additionally, in 2007 the IAEA Iran Work Plan addressing outstanding issues, accumulated over several years, was made available to all IAEA member states, and the Board also received a 2012 document from Iran related to very specific PMD [possible military dimensions] questions, which happened while the IAEA was negotiating with Iran for greater clarity and access”;

Whereas part I, section 5 of IAEA Information Circular 153 provides that “specific information relating to such implementation [of measures to safeguard nuclear materials] in the State may be given to the Board of Governors and to such Agency staff members as require such knowledge”;

Whereas Article VI of the Statute of the IAEA authorizes the Board of Governors of the IAEA to direct the work of the IAEA, including in safeguarding nuclear materials and ensuring the peaceful ends of a participating member state's nuclear program;

Whereas Rule 18 of the Rules of the Board of Governors of the IAEA, entitled “Circulation of Documents of Particular Importance”, establishes procedures by which member states of the IAEA Board of Governors may access relevant documents related to their duties;

Whereas the United States serves on the Board of Governors of the IAEA and has both the need and the authority to access the actual text of the two side agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

Whereas on July 30, 2015, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest, speaking on behalf of the President of the United States, stated, “I will acknowledge that I don't know exactly what the requirements are of the Iran Review Act, so I'm not sure exactly what that means [Congress is] asking for”;

Whereas on April 6, 2015, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest stated, “[W]e do believe that Congress should play their rightful role in terms of ultimately deciding whether or not the sanctions that Congress passed into law should be removed”;

Whereas on April 7, 2015, White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest further stated, “[M]embers of Congress should consider the agreement and decide whether or not the President has achieved his stated objective of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, shutting down every pathway they have and making them cooperate with the most intrusive set of inspections that have ever been imposed on a country's nuclear program”;

Whereas the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, which was negotiated and agreed to by the Obama Administration, fails to accomplish those objectives;

Whereas any recognition by the House of Representatives of the trans-

mittal by the President of an Iran nuclear agreement that does not include all of the materials required by law, including the text of the 2 side agreements agreed to between the IAEA and Iran, violates the rights of the Members of the House individually in their representative capacity, impeding their ability to make a fully informed decision on how to vote on behalf of their constituents, as conceived and provided for in the enactment of the Review Act;

Whereas Director of National Intelligence James Clapper has labeled Iran the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism;

Whereas the Web site WhiteHouse.gov states that Iran currently has a 2-3 month breakout time to build a nuclear bomb;

Whereas legislative action on an Iran nuclear agreement is one of the most important issues that will ever come before the House, as it directly affects the safety and security of the Members of the House and their constituents;

Whereas the taking of legislative action without reasonable consideration and knowledge damages the reputation and credibility of the House collectively and its Members individually in their representative capacities; and

Whereas the President's failure to follow a law that he signed is an affront to the dignity of the House and cannot be ignored: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) reaffirms its legal right to obtain all materials, including the full text of all side agreements, comprising the Iran nuclear agreement, as defined in section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as enacted by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (in this section referred to as the “Review Act”), which was signed into law by President Obama;

(2) directs the Parliamentarian of the House of Representatives not to recognize, for purposes of determining the dates of the congressional review period prescribed in section 135(b) of Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act), any agreement and related documents submitted by the President that do not include the actual text of the two side agreements between the IAEA and Iran;

(3) directs the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Officers of the House to correct Executive Communication numbered 2207, appearing on page 5522 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the legislative day of July 27, 2015, to state the following: “A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter and attachments which does not satisfy all requirements of Sec. 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Pub. L.

114-17), as received July 19, 2015; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means”;

(4) instructs the Speaker of the House of Representatives to dispatch without delay a notification to the President, on behalf of the whole House, entitled “Failure to Follow the Law” and stating that—

(A) the President's transmittal of that agreement to the House is incomplete as a matter of law;

(B) consequently, the congressional review period provided in section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as enacted by section 2 of the Review Act) has not begun; and

(C) pursuant to section 135(b)(3) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (as so enacted), until the end of the congressional review period, “the President may not waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of statutory sanctions with respect to Iran under any provision of law or refrain from applying any such sanctions pursuant to an agreement described in subsection (a)”;

(5) instructs the Speaker of the House of Representatives, on behalf of the whole House, to return the agreement and related materials provided in the President's transmission of July 19, 2015, in order that the President may provide a full and complete transmission of all materials required by law, including the text of side agreements; and

(6) instructs the Speaker to take such actions as may be necessary to provide an appropriate remedy to ensure that the integrity of the legislative process is protected and to report his actions and recommendations to the House.

□ 1438

And, Mr. Speaker, if you didn't catch it, I am happy to repeat it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under rule IX, a resolution offered from the floor by a Member other than the majority leader or the minority leader as a question of the privileges of the House has immediate precedence only at a time designated by the Chair within 2 legislative days after the resolution is properly noticed.

Pending that designation, the form of the resolution noticed by the gentleman from Illinois will appear in the RECORD at this point.

The Chair will not at this point determine whether the resolution constitutes a question of privilege. That determination will be made at the time designated for consideration of the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the following

enrolled bills were signed by Speaker pro tempore HARRIS on Thursday, August 6, 2015:

H.R. 212, to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1138, to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1531, to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2131, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the “J. Waties Waring Judicial Center”;

H.R. 2559, to designate the “PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway” in the State of Texas.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) at 4 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

EARLY HEARING DETECTION AND INTERVENTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1344) to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1344

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may cited as the “Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds as follows:

(1) Deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, and young children require access to specialized early intervention providers and programs in order to help them meet their linguistic and cognitive potential.

(2) Families of deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, and young children benefit from comprehensive early intervention programs that assist them in supporting their child's development in all domains.

(3) Best practices principles for early intervention for deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, and young children have been identified in a range of areas including listening and spoken language and visual and signed language acquisition, family-to-family support, support from individuals who are deaf or hard-of-hearing, progress monitoring, and others.

(4) Effective hearing screening and early intervention programs must be in place to identify hearing levels in deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, and young children so that they may access appropriate early intervention programs in a timely manner.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF PROGRAM FOR EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.

Section 399M of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g–1) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 399M. EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND TREATMENT REGARDING DEAF AND HARD-OF-HEARING NEWBORNS, INFANTS, AND YOUNG CHILDREN.

“(a) HEALTH RESOURCES AND SERVICES ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary, acting through the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to develop statewide newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, diagnosis, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems, and to assist in the recruitment, retention, education, and training of qualified personnel and health care providers for the following purposes:

“(1) To develop and monitor the efficacy of statewide programs and systems for hearing screening of newborns, infants, and young children, prompt evaluation and diagnosis of children referred from screening programs, and appropriate educational, audiological, and medical interventions for children confirmed to be deaf or hard-of-hearing, consistent with the following:

“(A) Early intervention includes referral to and delivery of information and services by organizations such as schools and agencies (including community, consumer, and parent-based agencies), pediatric medical homes, and other programs mandated by part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, which offer programs specifically designed to meet the unique language and communication needs of deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

“(B) Information provided to parents must be accurate, comprehensive, and, where appropriate, evidence-based, allowing families to make important decisions for their child in a timely way, including decisions relating to all possible assistive hearing technologies (such as hearing aids, cochlear implants, and osseointegrated devices) and communication options (such as visual and sign language, listening and spoken language, or both).

“(C) Programs and systems under this paragraph shall offer mechanisms that foster family-to-family and deaf and hard-of-hearing consumer-to-family supports.

“(2) To develop efficient models (both educational and medical) to ensure that newborns, infants, and young children who are identified through hearing screening receive followup by qualified early intervention providers, qualified health care providers, or pediatric medical homes (including by encouraging State agencies to adopt such models).

“(3) To provide for a technical resource center in conjunction with the Maternal and Child Health Bureau of the Health Resources and Services Administration—

“(A) to provide technical support and education for States; and

“(B) to continue development and enhancement of State early hearing detection and intervention programs.

“(b) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH.—

“(1) CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—The Secretary, acting through the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, shall make awards of grants or cooperative agreements to State agencies or their designated entities for development, maintenance, and improvement of data tracking and surveillance systems on newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screenings, audiologic evaluations, medical evaluations, and intervention services; to conduct applied research related to services and outcomes, and provide technical assistance related to newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs, and information systems; to ensure high-quality monitoring of hearing screening, evaluation, and intervention programs and systems for newborns, infants, and young children; and to coordinate developing standardized procedures for data management and assessing program and cost effectiveness. The awards under the preceding sentence may be used—

“(A) to provide technical assistance on data collection and management;

“(B) to study and report on the costs and effectiveness of newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, intervention programs, and systems;

“(C) to collect data and report on newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems that can be used—

“(i) for applied research, program evaluation, and policy development; and

“(ii) to answer issues of importance to State and national policymakers;

“(D) to identify the causes and risk factors for congenital hearing loss;

“(E) to study the effectiveness of newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, audiologic evaluations, medical evaluations, and intervention programs and systems by assessing the health, intellectual and social developmental, cognitive, and hearing status of these children at school age; and

“(F) to promote the integration, linkage, and interoperability of data regarding early hearing loss and multiple sources to increase information exchanges between clinical care and public health including the ability of States and territories to exchange and share data.

“(2) NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.—The Director of the National Institutes of Health, acting through the Director of the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders, shall, for purposes of this section, continue a program of research and development related to early hearing detection and intervention, including development of technologies and clinical studies of screening methods, efficacy of interventions, and related research.

“(c) COORDINATION AND COLLABORATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out programs under this section, the Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall collaborate and consult with—

“(A) other Federal agencies;

“(B) State and local agencies, including those responsible for early intervention services pursuant to title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.) (Medicaid Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnosis and Treatment Program); title XXI of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1397aa et seq.) (State Children’s Health Insurance Program); title V of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) (Maternal and Child Health Block Grant Program); and part C of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.);

“(C) consumer groups of and that serve individuals who are deaf and hard-of-hearing and their families;

“(D) appropriate national medical and other health and education specialty organizations;

“(E) persons who are deaf and hard-of-hearing and their families;

“(F) other qualified professional personnel who are proficient in deaf or hard-of-hearing children’s language and who possess the specialized knowledge, skills, and attributes needed to serve deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, toddlers, children, and their families;

“(G) third-party payers and managed-care organizations; and

“(H) related commercial industries.

“(2) POLICY DEVELOPMENT.—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration, the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall coordinate and collaborate on recommendations for policy development at the Federal and State levels and with the private sector, including consumer, medical, and other health and education professional-based organizations, with respect to newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems.

“(3) STATE EARLY DETECTION, DIAGNOSIS, AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SYSTEMS; DATA COLLECTION.—The Administrator of the Health Resources and Services Administration and the Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall coordinate and collaborate in assisting States—

“(A) to establish newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening, evaluation, diagnosis, and intervention programs and systems under subsection (a); and

“(B) to develop a data collection system under subsection (b).

“(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION; RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to preempt or prohibit any State law, including State laws which do not require the screening for hearing loss of newborns, infants, or young children of parents who object to the screening on the grounds that such screening conflicts with the parents’ religious beliefs.

“(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

“(1) The term ‘audiologic’, when used in connection with evaluation, refers to procedures—

“(A) to assess the status of the auditory system;

“(B) to establish the site of the auditory disorder, the type and degree of hearing loss, and the potential effects of hearing loss on communication; and

“(C) to identify appropriate treatment and referral options, including—

“(i) linkage to State coordinating agencies under part C of the Individuals with Disabilities

Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1431 et seq.) or other appropriate agencies;

“(ii) medical evaluation;

“(iii) hearing aid/sensory aid assessment;

“(iv) audiologic rehabilitation treatment; and

“(v) referral to national and local consumer, self-help, parent, and education organizations, and other family-centered services.

“(2) The term ‘early intervention’ refers to—

“(A) providing appropriate services for the child who is deaf or hard of hearing, including nonmedical services; and

“(B) ensuring the family of the child is—

“(i) provided comprehensive, consumer-oriented information about the full range of family support, training, information services, and language and communication options; and

“(ii) given the opportunity to consider and obtain the full range of such appropriate services, educational and program placements, and other options for their child from highly qualified providers.

“(3) The term ‘medical evaluation’ refers to key components performed by a physician, including history, examination, and medical decisionmaking focused on symptomatic and related body systems for the purpose of diagnosing the etiology of hearing loss and related physical conditions, and for identifying appropriate treatment and referral options.

“(4) The term ‘medical intervention’ refers to the process by which a physician provides medical diagnosis and direction for medical or surgical treatment options for hearing loss or related medical disorders.

“(5) The term ‘newborn, infant, and young childhood hearing screening’ refers to objective physiologic procedures to detect possible hearing loss and to identify newborns, infants, and young children who require further audiologic evaluations and medical evaluations.

“(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

“(1) STATEWIDE NEWBORN, INFANT, AND YOUNG CHILDHOOD HEARING SCREENING, EVALUATION AND INTERVENTION PROGRAMS AND SYSTEMS.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Health Resources and Services Administration \$17,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(2) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH; CENTERS FOR DISEASE CONTROL AND PREVENTION.—For the purpose of carrying out subsection (b)(1), there is authorized to be appropriated to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention \$10,800,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020.

“(3) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, DATA MANAGEMENT, AND APPLIED RESEARCH; NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DEAFNESS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION DISORDERS.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of carrying out subsection (b)(2). Such subsection shall be carried out using funds which are otherwise authorized (under section 402A or other provisions of law) to be appropriated for such purpose.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased that, today, the House is considering H.R. 1344, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2015. This bipartisan bill sets a strong precedent for working together on the many big issues before Congress this month.

This bill, which I introduced along with Congresswoman LOIS CAPPs, reauthorizes the program for the early detection, diagnosis, and treatment of deaf and hard of hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

H.R. 1344 encourages hearing tests and intervention for newborn babies. Through early detection, these children and their families can be made aware of a child’s hearing loss and given access to specialized early intervention providers and programs in order to help children meet their potential. This reauthorization increases the focus on loss to followup. So those children whose hearing loss is identified don’t just stop with identification; they may go on to receive intervention, treatment, or an introduction to deaf services.

This program has proven success. In 2000, only 40 percent of newborns were screened for hearing loss. That number rose to just over 86 percent in 2011, and, today, the CDC reports that, roughly, 97 percent of all infant children are screened for hearing loss.

In closing, I want to thank my colleague, Congresswoman CAPPs, for her leadership over the years on this important bipartisan issue. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1344 so we can continue these vital services for newborn babies and young children.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1344, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act. This important legislation is led by Representatives LOIS CAPPs and BRETT GUTHRIE, both members of our committee.

Beginning in 2000, Congress took steps to facilitate the development of newborn and infant screening and intervention programs. This bill reauthorizes and makes further improvements to the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program, which supports detection and treatment for hearing-impaired newborns and young children.

The early identification of a child’s hearing loss increases the likelihood that intervention and treatment services can successfully prevent or limit developmental delays. Research shows that it can significantly improve quality of life and education outcomes for children with hearing impairments. The vast majority of deaf children are

born to parents who do not have impaired hearing and who, therefore, may not be able to identify their children's conditions early on. The outreach services provided for by the program reauthorized in this bill may help ensure that children and their parents receive appropriate screenings and followup.

I want to thank Representatives CAPPS and GUTHRIE for their leadership on this issue. I thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member PALLONE, and Chairman PITTS for their work to advance this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1344, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), my colleague and a cosponsor of the bill.

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1344, the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act, which I was so pleased to coauthor with my colleague from Kentucky, Congressman BRETT GUTHRIE.

Hearing loss in newborns is considered an invisible disability. Almost 3 out of every 1,000 children in the United States are born deaf or hard of hearing, and even more children lose their hearing later on during childhood. When hearing loss is left undetected, it can impede speech, language, and cognitive development; but we know that, when hearing loss is caught early, children have much better outcomes. In fact, early intervention can help children overcome hearing issues and get them ready to learn on par with their peers.

That is exactly what the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act does, pronounced "Eddie." As it is commonly called, EHDI has helped families in all 50 States and the District of Columbia identify children in need of care early when interventions are most effective.

By all accounts, this program has worked. Since the implementation of the EHDI program 15 years ago, we have seen a tremendous increase in the number of newborns who are being screened for hearing loss. Back in 2000, when we first set up the EHDI program, only 44 percent of newborns in the country were being screened for hearing loss. Now we are screening newborns at a rate of over 96 percent. This is a remarkable achievement, but our work is not done.

While it is important that all babies are screened for hearing loss, it is just as important that those babies who do not pass this screening receive a diagnostic evaluation and be connected to

early intervention programs. Unfortunately, according to the Centers for Disease Control, 36 percent of newborns who fail their initial hearing screenings are not receiving appropriate followup care. This reauthorization effort will focus on those children, helping to bridge the gap between screening and intervention.

My background is as a school nurse for over 20 years, and I have worked with so many students who were lagging behind their classmates due to undiagnosed or untreated hearing loss.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. CAPPS. These children did not need to suffer. We can and must help them succeed through stronger investments in followup and interventions, such as sign language training, hearing aids, and speech-language development. Early identification and intervention are both keys to a child's well-being.

Our legislation would ensure that these programs are there for the children who need them. A vote for this bill is a vote to keep this program strong. I urge my colleagues to support our bipartisan bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I urge the support of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I thank my friend from California (Mrs. CAPPS) so much for our working together to move this bipartisan bill forward. I thank our subcommittee ranking member, Mr. GREEN, and our chairman, Chairman PITTS.

I was involved in this effort in Kentucky when I was in the State Senate. I have seen the difference that it makes, and I am glad to be involved in this on a national level. Knowing that 97 percent of our babies are screened so they can get intervention and treatment very early in their lives makes a big difference. I am proud to be a part of this, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1344.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1344, the "Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Act of 2015" introduced by my colleagues Representatives CAPPS and GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1344, would reauthorize the Early Hearing Detection and Intervention Program. Prior to the creation of this program, less than 50 percent of all newborns were regularly screened for hearing loss. I'm proud to say that thanks to this program about 97 percent of newborns now receive a hearing screening. Through this program, children gain early access to interventions and treatments that are critical in minimizing a hearing-impaired child's risk of developmental delays, especially communication, social skills and cognition. H.R. 1344 would ensure that we continue to support this valuable public health program that has a proven track record of success.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1344, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL ALL SCHEDULES PRESCRIPTION ELECTRONIC REPORTING REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1725) to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Reauthorization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT TO PURPOSE.

Paragraph (1) of section 2 of the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Act of 2005 (Public Law 109-60) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) foster the establishment of State-administered controlled substance monitoring systems in order to ensure that—

"(A) health care providers have access to the accurate, timely prescription history information that they may use as a tool for the early identification of patients at risk for addiction in order to initiate appropriate medical interventions and avert the tragic personal, family, and community consequences of untreated addiction; and

"(B) appropriate law enforcement, regulatory, and State professional licensing authorities have access to prescription history information for the purposes of investigating drug diversion and prescribing and dispensing practices of errant prescribers or pharmacists; and"

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE MONITORING PROGRAM.

Section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280g-3) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking "or";

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) to maintain and operate an existing State-controlled substance monitoring program."; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by inserting "by the Secretary" after "Grants awarded";

(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) MINIMUM REQUIREMENTS.—The Secretary shall maintain and, as appropriate, supplement or revise (after publishing proposed additions and revisions in the Federal Register and receiving public comments

thereon) minimum requirements for criteria to be used by States for purposes of clauses (ii), (v), (vi), and (vii) of subsection (c)(1)(A).";

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B)—

(i) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking "(a)(1)(B)" and inserting "(a)(1)(B) or (a)(1)(C)";

(ii) in clause (i), by striking "program to be improved" and inserting "program to be improved or maintained";

(iii) by redesignating clauses (iii) and (iv) as clauses (iv) and (v), respectively;

(iv) by inserting after clause (ii) the following:

"(iii) a plan to apply the latest advances in health information technology in order to incorporate prescription drug monitoring program data directly into the workflow of prescribers and dispensers to ensure timely access to patients' controlled prescription drug history;";

(v) in clause (iv), as redesignated, by inserting before the semicolon at the end "and at least one health information technology system such as an electronic health records system, a health information exchange, or an e-prescribing system"; and

(vi) in clause (v), as redesignated, by striking "public health" and inserting "public health or public safety";

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking "If a State that submits" and inserting the following:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—If a State that submits";

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting "and include timelines for full implementation of such interoperability. The State shall also describe the manner in which it will achieve interoperability between its monitoring program and health information technology systems, as allowable under State law, and include timelines for implementation of such interoperability."; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) MONITORING OF EFFORTS.—The Secretary shall monitor State efforts to achieve interoperability, as described in subparagraph (A)."; and

(C) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "implement or improve" and inserting "establish, improve, or maintain"; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following: "The Secretary shall redistribute any funds that are so returned among the remaining grantees under this section in accordance with the formula described in subsection (a)(2)(B).";

(4) in subsection (d)—

(A) in the matter preceding paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking "In implementing or improving" and all that follows through "(a)(1)(B)" and inserting "In establishing, improving, or maintaining a controlled substance monitoring program under this section, a State shall comply, or with respect to a State that applies for a grant under subparagraph (B) or (C) of subsection (a)(1)"; and

(ii) by striking "public health" and inserting "public health or public safety"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) The State shall report to the Secretary on—

"(A) as appropriate, interoperability with the controlled substance monitoring programs of Federal departments and agencies;

"(B) as appropriate, interoperability with health information technology systems such as electronic health records systems, health

information exchanges, and e-prescribing systems; and

"(C) whether or not the State provides automatic, real-time or daily information about a patient when a practitioner (or the designee of a practitioner, where permitted) requests information about such patient.";

(5) in subsections (e), (f)(1), and (g), by striking "implementing or improving" each place it appears and inserting "establishing, improving, or maintaining";

(6) in subsection (f)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) in subparagraph (B), by striking "misuse of a schedule II, III, or IV substance" and inserting "misuse of a controlled substance included in schedule II, III, or IV of section 202(c) of the Controlled Substance Act"; and

(ii) in subparagraph (D), by inserting "a State substance abuse agency," after "a State health department,"; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

"(3) EVALUATION AND REPORTING.—Subject to subsection (g), a State receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall provide the Secretary with aggregate data and other information determined by the Secretary to be necessary to enable the Secretary—

"(A) to evaluate the success of the State's program in achieving its purposes; or

"(B) to prepare and submit the report to Congress required by subsection (1)(2).

"(4) RESEARCH BY OTHER ENTITIES.—A department, program, or administration receiving nonidentifiable information under paragraph (1)(D) may make such information available to other entities for research purposes.";

(7) by redesignating subsections (h) through (n) as subsections (j) through (p), respectively;

(8) in subsections (c)(1)(A)(iv) and (d)(4), by striking "subsection (h)" each place it appears and inserting "subsection (j)";

(9) by inserting after subsection (g) the following:

"(h) EDUCATION AND ACCESS TO THE MONITORING SYSTEM.—A State receiving a grant under subsection (a) shall take steps to—

"(1) facilitate prescriber and dispenser use of the State's controlled substance monitoring system;

"(2) educate prescribers and dispensers on the benefits of the system both to them and society; and

"(3) facilitate linkage to the State substance abuse agency and substance abuse disorder services.

"(i) CONSULTATION WITH ATTORNEY GENERAL.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall consult with the Attorney General of the United States and other relevant Federal officials to—

"(1) ensure maximum coordination of controlled substance monitoring programs and related activities; and

"(2) minimize duplicative efforts and funding.";

(10) in subsection (1)(2)(A), as redesignated by paragraph (7)—

(A) in clause (ii), by inserting "; established or strengthened initiatives to ensure linkages to substance use disorder services;" before "or affected patient access"; and

(B) in clause (iii), by inserting "and between controlled substance monitoring programs and health information technology systems" before "including an assessment";

(11) by striking subsection (m) (relating to preference), as redesignated by paragraph (7);

(12) by redesignating subsections (n) through (p), as redesignated by paragraph (7), as subsections (m) through (o), respectively;

(13) in subsection (m)(1), as redesignated by paragraph (12), by striking "establishment, implementation, or improvement" and inserting "establishment, improvement, or maintenance";

(14) in subsection (n), as redesignated by paragraph (12)—

(A) in paragraph (5)—

(i) by striking "means the ability" and inserting the following: "means—

"(A) the ability";

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; or"; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) sharing of State controlled substance monitoring program information with a health information technology system such as an electronic health records system, a health information exchange, or an e-prescribing system.";

(B) in paragraph (7), by striking "pharmacy" and inserting "pharmacist"; and

(C) in paragraph (8), by striking "and the District of Columbia" and inserting "; the District of Columbia, and any commonwealth or territory of the United States"; and

(15) by amending subsection (o), as redesignated by paragraph (12), to read as follows:

"(o) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—To carry out this section, there is authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for each of fiscal years from 2016 through 2020."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1725, the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Reauthorization Act of 2015, introduced by my colleagues Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. PALLONE.

Prescription drug abuse is an epidemic in this country, and, sadly, Kentucky is impacted by high rates of prescription drug abuse. Every year, there are 15,000 overdose deaths from prescription pain relievers. For every overdose death, there are an estimated 10 addiction treatment admissions and 32 emergency department visits. One important tool we have as a nation to combat this epidemic is Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs. They prevent doctor shopping and help physicians make more informed clinical decisions.

Reauthorizing NASPER would provide grant support to States to establish Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs. Healthcare providers can access

a patient's prescription history through the PDMP to help them identify patients at risk for addiction or those who are abusing prescription drugs. NASPER also helps identify best practices for new PDMPs and ways to improve existing monitoring programs.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1725, the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Reauthorization Act. This important legislation is sponsored by Ranking Member PALLONE, Representatives JOE KENNEDY and ED WHITFIELD, and Congressman LARRY BUCSHON.

The reauthorization of NASPER is urgently needed to ensure that physicians have patient-specific information through Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs, PDMPs, at the point of care. As its name suggests, PDMPs help physicians and other providers make appropriate prescribing decisions while ensuring that patients with legitimate pain management needs have access to necessary care. We are in the middle of an epidemic of prescription drug opioid misuse and overdose. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in 2013, more than 16,000 Americans died from an opioid-related overdose.

PDMPs are an integral part of our Nation's effort to combat the ongoing opioid and prescription drug epidemic. They allow for the early identification of at-risk patients and timely intervention to prevent prescription drug abuse. States have recognized that PDMPs are a vital tool to address this public health crisis as demonstrated by their universal adoption amongst the States.

H.R. 1725 reauthorizes grants to States to enhance their PDMPs, and it makes further improvements to the programs. Funding for PDMPs is needed to help States utilize this effective tool, to incentivize information sharing across State lines, and to further the implementation of best practices.

I want to thank Ranking Member PALLONE and Representatives KENNEDY, WHITFIELD, and BUCSHON for their leadership. I also want to thank my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their commitment to addressing our Nation's opioid epidemic. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1725.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1615

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. WHITFIELD), who has worked tirelessly on these issues in the Energy and Commerce Committee and back home to try to address the prescription drug problem in our State.

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 1725, the National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting Reauthorization Act, as we call it, NASPER.

I introduced this legislation earlier this year with my colleagues, Congressman LARRY BUCSHON of Indiana, FRANK PALLONE of New Jersey, and JOE KENNEDY of Massachusetts.

I want to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member PALLONE, as well as Subcommittee Chair PITTS, Ranking Member GREEN, and Congressman GUTHRIE for helping move this bill through the committee and subcommittee.

It has already been stated, the importance of this legislation to reauthorize NASPER. Prescription drug overdose death is reaching an epidemic proportion. Tragically, it has increased in America by fivefold since 1980, and drug overdose now kills more Americans than automobile accidents.

In my home State of Kentucky, more than 1,000 individuals die each year from prescription drug overdose, which is the third highest rate in the country.

Ten years ago NASPER was signed into law to assist States in combating prescription drug abuse through the creation and improvement of prescription drug-monitoring programs, which experts agree are one of the most promising clinical tools to address this epidemic.

So today we come to the floor to reauthorize this important legislation, and I hope that we can continue our efforts to obtain adequate funding from the Appropriations Committee for NASPER.

While there is no silver bullet to solve the problem, we do have an opportunity to make a difference by advancing this reauthorization act. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting that effort.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a colleague, friend, neighbor—our districts are joined on the Ohio River—who is a physician who understands these issues.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original coauthor of this legislation, H.R. 1725. The reauthorization of NASPER would allow SAMHSA to provide grants to States for the establishment, implementation, and improvement of prescription drug-monitoring programs, or PDMPs, offering timely access to accurate prescription information for healthcare providers.

As a physician, I understand this is critical to a provider's ability to screen and treat patients at risk for addiction.

The NASPER program also promotes greater information sharing among States by requiring grantees to facilitate these monitoring programs with

at least one bordering State while simultaneously protecting against unauthorized access to patient records.

This reauthorization language would also encourage States to explore ways to incorporate access to their PDMPs into provider workflow systems, such as electronic health records and e-prescribing. Given the growing problem of prescription drug abuse, this is a commonsense measure to protect the public.

I want to thank Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. KENNEDY, and Ranking Member PALLONE for their work on this legislation.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I appreciate Mr. WHITFIELD, Dr. BUCSHON, certainly Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. PALLONE for bringing this forward. It is important. It is important to my State, and it is important to our neighboring States and citizens throughout this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1725.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 1725, the "National All Schedules Prescription Electronic Reporting (NASPER) Reauthorization Act," which helps States establish and maintain prescription drug monitoring programs in order to combat prescription drug abuse, a public health crisis affecting communities across the country. I have been a long-time champion of this bill with my colleague Representative WHITFIELD and I am pleased that Representatives KENNEDY and BUCSHON joined our efforts this Congress to reauthorize the NASPER program.

Prescription drug monitoring programs help prescribers, pharmacists, and law enforcement track and prevent the misuse of prescription drugs. Forty nine states currently have laws authorizing these programs and they are playing a critical role in our efforts to combat the opioid crisis. This bill, however, once passed into law, will need funding and investment by appropriators in order to be effective. I urge Members to ensure that investment is met.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1725, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROTECTING OUR INFANTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1462) to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.
The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1462

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) Opioid prescription rates have risen dramatically over the past several years. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, in some States, there are as many as 96 to 143 prescriptions for opioids per 100 adults per year.

(2) In recent years, there has been a steady rise in the number of overdose deaths involving heroin. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the death rate for heroin overdose doubled from 2010 to 2012.

(3) At the same time, there has been an increase in cases of neonatal abstinence syndrome (referred to in this section as “NAS”). In the United States, the incidence of NAS has risen from 1.20 per 1,000 hospital births in 2000 to 3.39 per 1,000 hospital births in 2009.

(4) NAS refers to medical issues associated with drug withdrawal in newborns due to exposure to opioids or other drugs in utero.

(5) The average cost of treatment in a hospital for NAS increased from \$39,400 in 2000 to \$53,400 in 2009. Most of these costs are born by the Medicaid program.

(6) Preventing opioid abuse among pregnant women and women of childbearing age is crucial.

(7) Medically appropriate opioid use in pregnancy is not uncommon, and opioids are often the safest and most appropriate treatment for moderate to severe pain for pregnant women.

(8) Addressing NAS effectively requires a focus on women of childbearing age, pregnant women, and infants from preconception through early childhood.

(9) NAS can result from the use of prescription drugs as prescribed for medical reasons, from the abuse of prescription drugs, or from the use of illegal opioids like heroin.

(10) For pregnant women who are abusing opioids, it is most appropriate to treat and manage maternal substance use in a non-punitive manner.

(11) According to a report of the Government Accountability Office (referred to in this section as the “GAO report”), more research is needed to optimize the identification and treatment of babies with NAS and to better understand long-term impacts on children.

(12) According to the GAO report, the Department of Health and Human Services does not have a focal point to lead planning and coordinating efforts to address prenatal opioid use and NAS across the department.

(13) According to the GAO report, “given the increasing use of heroin and abuse of opioids prescribed for pain management, as well as the increased rate of NAS in the United States, it is important to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of planning and coordination of Federal efforts on prenatal opioid use and NAS”.

SEC. 3. DEVELOPING RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PREVENTING AND TREATING PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”), acting through the Director of the Agency for Healthcare Research

and Quality (referred to in this section as the “Director”), shall conduct a study and develop recommendations for preventing and treating prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome, soliciting input from nongovernmental entities, including organizations representing patients, health care providers, hospitals, other treatment facilities, and other entities, as appropriate.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director shall publish on the Internet Web site of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality a report on the study and recommendations under subsection (a). Such report shall address each of the issues described in paragraphs (1) through (3) of subsection (c).

(c) CONTENTS.—The study described in subsection (a) and the report under subsection (b) shall include—

(1) a comprehensive assessment of existing research with respect to the prevention, identification, treatment, and long-term outcomes of neonatal abstinence syndrome, including the identification and treatment of pregnant women or women who may become pregnant who use opioids or other drugs;

(2) an evaluation of—

(A) the causes of and risk factors for opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women;

(B) the barriers to identifying and treating opioid use disorders among women of reproductive age, including pregnant and postpartum women and women with young children;

(C) current practices in the health care system to respond to and treat pregnant women with opioid use disorders and infants born with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(D) medically indicated use of opioids during pregnancy;

(E) access to treatment for opioid use disorders in pregnant and postpartum women; and

(F) access to treatment for infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(3) recommendations on—

(A) preventing, identifying, and treating neonatal abstinence syndrome in infants;

(B) treating pregnant women who are dependent on opioids; and

(C) preventing opioid dependence among women of reproductive age, including pregnant women, who may be at risk of developing opioid dependence.

SEC. 4. IMPROVING PREVENTION AND TREATMENT FOR PRENATAL OPIOID ABUSE AND NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) REVIEW OF PROGRAMS.—The Secretary shall lead a review of planning and coordination within the Department of Health and Human Services related to prenatal opioid use and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(b) STRATEGY TO CLOSE GAPS IN RESEARCH AND PROGRAMMING.—In carrying out subsection (a), the Secretary shall develop a strategy to address research and program gaps, including such gaps identified in findings made by reports of the Government Accountability Office. Such strategy shall address—

(1) gaps in research, including with respect to—

(A) the most appropriate treatment of pregnant women with opioid use disorders;

(B) the most appropriate treatment and management of infants with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(C) the long-term effects of prenatal opioid exposure on children; and

(2) gaps in programs, including—

(A) the availability of treatment programs for pregnant and postpartum women and for newborns with neonatal abstinence syndrome; and

(B) guidance and coordination in Federal efforts to address prenatal opioid use or neonatal abstinence syndrome.

(c) REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives a report on the findings of the review described in subsection (a) and the strategy developed under subsection (b).

SEC. 5. IMPROVING DATA ON AND PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE TO NEONATAL ABSTINENCE SYNDROME.

(a) DATA AND SURVEILLANCE.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall, as appropriate—

(1) provide technical assistance to States to improve the availability and quality of data collection and surveillance activities regarding neonatal abstinence syndrome, including—

(A) the incidence and prevalence of neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(B) the identification of causes for neonatal abstinence syndrome, including new and emerging trends; and

(C) the demographics and other relevant information associated with neonatal abstinence syndrome;

(2) collect available surveillance data described in paragraph (1) from States, as applicable; and

(3) make surveillance data collected pursuant to paragraph (2) publicly available on an appropriate Internet Web site.

(b) PUBLIC HEALTH RESPONSE.—The Director of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention shall encourage increased utilization of effective public health measures to reduce neonatal abstinence syndrome.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 1462, the Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015, introduced by my colleagues, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts and Mr. STIVERS.

Over the past several years, opioid addiction has risen dramatically in the United States, reaching epidemic proportions. The death rate for heroin overdose doubled in just 2 years, from 2010 to 2012.

One of the issues that has arisen as a result of this epidemic is neonatal abstinence syndrome, known as NAS.

These are infants born addicted to opioids and suffer medical issues associated with drug withdrawal. Symptoms can last for weeks, keeping otherwise healthy infants confined to the hospital at the start of their lives.

NAS can result from the use of prescription drugs or from the use of illegal opioids. Sadly, over the past 15 years, a prevalence of NAS has tripled in the United States. This is a rapidly growing problem that needs to be addressed for the safety of our mothers and children.

H.R. 1462 would address the increasing problem of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome. Preventing opioid abuse among pregnant women and women of childbearing age is crucial in addressing NAS.

The Government Accountability Office has identified that more research is needed in this area to help treat babies born with NAS and mothers addicted to opioids.

This legislation would help fill this research gap by studying issues and developing recommendations for preventing and treating prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1462, the Protecting Our Infants Act, led by Representatives KATHERINE CLARK and STEVE STIVERS.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention has found drug overdose to be the leading cause of injury death in the United States.

According to a recent study by the New England Journal of Medicine, from 2004 to 2013, the incidence rate of neonatal abstinence syndrome, NAS, has quadrupled.

NAS refers to medical complications in newborns associated with drug withdrawal due to exposure to opioids and other drugs during pregnancy.

Babies born with NAS often require weeks of hospitalization and can suffer from seizures and other severe complications.

There is an urgent need for further research to facilitate the identification and treatment of infants with NAS and determine long-term health impacts.

The GAO and other experts identified specific research gaps related to best practices for treating pregnant women with opioid use disorders, the long-term effects of prenatal drug exposure, and best practices in the screening, diagnosis, and treatment of NAS.

The Protecting Our Infants Act takes proactive steps to help reduce the number of newborns born exposed to opioids and other drugs and to improve their care if they are exposed.

It will facilitate the development of recommendations for treatment and

coordinate a national strategy to close the known gaps in research and coordination. It will also help States improve data collection and surveillance activities.

I want to thank Representatives CLARK of Massachusetts and STIVERS for their leadership. I also want to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman PITTS, and my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for advancing this important legislation.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1462. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, every day in hospitals across the Third Congressional District of West Virginia and the country babies begin their lives going through drug withdrawal because they were exposed during pregnancy. As you have heard, it is the diagnosis known as neonatal abstinence syndrome, or NAS.

No baby—no baby—deserves to start his or her life in withdrawal from heroin or other opioids. But, sadly, the rate of babies born with NAS, again, as you have heard, has skyrocketed nationally.

Doctors, nurses, and caregivers are providing innovative care for newborns with NAS, but there are still gaps in research and our understanding of how best to care for our most vulnerable.

The Protecting Our Infants Act makes significant strides in addressing this nationwide gap and developing these strategies, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

West Virginia has been at the forefront of this epidemic, with NAS rates much higher than the national average.

Our nurses and doctors are tirelessly working to care for newborns with NAS, and having additional resources and research will only further their efforts in providing the best possible care.

I have met with caregivers throughout my district to discuss their approaches to treating NAS, and I know this legislation will help in their efforts to treat these babies.

While we must continue to guarantee that newborns receive the absolute best care, we must also address the issue of addiction in pregnant and postnatal women.

This legislation will help identify and develop treatment methods for expectant mothers with opioid addictions, leading to healthier outcomes for mother and baby alike.

NAS is a nationwide crisis, one that impacts urban, rural, and suburban areas. Nearly every district in America has been touched by heroin and opioid addiction. We must address the impact this addiction has on our most vulnerable in society, our newborn babies.

I commend Congresswoman CLARK for her efforts on this important legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK), the cosponsor of the bill.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Our Nation is experiencing a deadly opiate epidemic, an epidemic that knows no boundaries and destroys lives, families, and communities.

Today 58 babies—one baby every 25 minutes—will be born suffering from the same pain adults describe as the worst pain of their lives. It is the pain of drug withdrawal.

Neonatal abstinence syndrome, or NAS for short, occurs when babies are born dependent on opioids, and it is one of the chief causes of the significant surge of newborns in neonatal intensive care units across the Nation.

Over the last decade, the number of infants born dependent on powerful drugs has grown nearly fivefold. In States like Massachusetts, NAS is occurring at a rate three times the national average.

NAS births are five times more costly than healthy ones. Costs have risen to more than \$1.5 billion a year, 80 percent of which are paid for by Medicaid.

Because of this skyrocketing rise of NAS cases and costs, doctors are desperately trying to find the most effective method of diagnosis and treatment.

□ 1630

There is little coordination of data and best practices and protocols among States, healthcare systems, and practitioners; and no medications have been approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration for treating these babies.

The Protecting Our Infants Act is the first Federal bill to take proactive steps in addressing the rise of NAS. With broad bipartisan support in both Chambers, this is an opportunity for Congress to make a difference for babies suffering from opioid exposure and the families struggling with addiction.

This bill directs the Department of Health and Human Services to develop the protocols for treating and preventing NAS. The Protecting Our Infants Act helps babies suffering from opioid withdrawal by making sure they get the best care available.

This act will ensure that every hospital has access to the best practices and that States have the public health data they need to address this crisis. This is good for families, good for our healthcare providers, and good for our Nation's bottom line.

I want to thank my colleagues in the House and, in particular, Congressman

STEVE STIVERS for his partnership in this bill. I am grateful for his deep commitment to addressing this problem and crafting a solution. I am also grateful to Senators MCCONNELL and CASEY for sponsoring this legislation in the Senate.

Today, we have a chance to help the youngest of those suffering from the opioid crisis.

I urge my colleagues to pass the bipartisan Protecting Our Infants Act.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STIVERS), my friend.

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support a bill that my colleague from Massachusetts, Representative KATHERINE CLARK, and I introduced, H.R. 1462, the Protect Our Infants Act. I want to thank Representative CLARK for her leadership, her hard work, and her commitment to protecting America's children.

This bill has the support of 95 bipartisan cosponsors. It is a targeted effort to address a national epidemic of babies being born addicted to drugs.

Recent data has shown that this issue, called neonatal abstinence syndrome, is sadly on the rise throughout the country. A baby is born with neonatal abstinence syndrome every 25 minutes, and symptoms can last for months and lead to weeks of hospitalization and have a lifelong impact.

A report by the Journal of the American Medical Association showed that the number of newborns diagnosed with NAS tripled from 2000 to 2009. In my home State of Ohio, the rate of neonatal abstinence syndrome grew over 600 percent between 2004 and 2011.

It has taken a heavy toll on Ohio's healthcare system and Ohio's families. Treating newborns with NAS was associated with over \$70 million in charges and approximately 19,000 hospital stays, and that was back in 2011. It has been on the rise ever since.

This issue is especially devastating to our families and especially devastating to the youngest among us, the babies who are born addicted to drugs. I recently heard from a grandmother to three babies who were born with NAS. She was pleading for help for her innocent grandchildren, and she wanted to make sure we did something about this terrible disease.

I am proud to say that the response in my district has been strong to our bill. There is a healthcare system called Adena Regional Medical Center in Chillicothe, Ohio, and they actually have an incredible program which was piloted with a bunch of OB/GYNs, and they started with just 15 pregnant women who were addicted to drugs, and they have served those women. Now, they are on their second class to try to get those women off of drugs before they deliver.

I am happy to report that, because of the support of the Adena Health System, none of the women in that group delivered a baby with NAS. Due to the success of the pilot, there is a permanent program that is starting now, and it already has a wait list, so I am really excited to say that there are people out there showing real leadership.

Last week, I hosted my fourth annual opiate roundtable in my district to bring together a lot of issues, and we talked about this bill and how important it was, so I am so proud that it is on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support the Protecting Our Infants Act, H.R. 1462, to help our Nation's most innocent citizens. Again, I want to thank KATHERINE CLARK for her incredible leadership on this bill and her commitment.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers, and in closing, I encourage our colleagues to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, during the hearing in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, one of the physicians testifying, a neonatologist, turned out to practice with my first cousin, so I got to do research further into what is moving forward in this bill.

I learned even more from personal stories about how important it is and how critical this is and how sad it is for children to be born addicted and how the opportunity is for us to help.

I certainly appreciate my friend from Massachusetts, Ms. CLARK, and my friend from Ohio, Mr. STIVERS. I would encourage all my colleagues to vote for H.R. 1462, Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 1462 the "Protecting Our Infants Act of 2015." This legislation would address the urgent need for a comprehensive strategy for one of the harmful outcome of our nation's opioid epidemic. Neonatal abstinence syndrome, or NAS, occurs in newborns who were exposed to opioids, including pain killers, while in their mother's womb. NAS is associated with negative health outcomes like preterm births and low birthweight.

I'm saddened to say that the opioid epidemic has resulted in a steep increase in the occurrence of NAS over the past decade. H.R. 1462 would require HHS to develop recommendations for the treatment and prevention of prenatal opiate abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome. It would also require the collection of data to better monitor the problem.

I want to thank Representative KATHERINE CLARK for her leadership on this issue and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this necessary legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1462.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEM CELL THERAPEUTIC AND RESEARCH REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2820) to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2820

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO THE STEM CELL THERAPEUTIC AND RESEARCH ACT OF 2005.

(a) CORD BLOOD INVENTORY.—Section 2 of the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 274k note) is amended in subsection (h)—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "\$23,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2014 and"; and

(B) by inserting before the period at the end the following: "and \$23,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2020"; and

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "2011 through 2015" and inserting "2015 through 2020".

(b) NATIONAL PROGRAM.—Section 379B of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 274m) is amended by striking "2011 through 2014" and inserting "2016 through 2020".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2820, the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act of 2015, introduced by my colleagues CHRIS SMITH and DORIS MATSUI.

Bone marrow transplantation has been used for more than 50 years to treat blood-related diseases, such as leukemia, different anemias, and lymphoma. It is a rich source of blood stem cells. In more recent years,

breakthroughs have been made using blood stem cells from umbilical cord blood in the treatment of those various blood-related diseases and conditions.

It can be very difficult to find a bone marrow transplant match, and in some cases, cord blood can be used instead. Bone marrow and cord blood donation are critical to ensure those in need of transplant can find a match. The need for this lifesaving transplantation has risen 25 percent since 2005.

H.R. 2820 reauthorizes the National Marrow Donor Program and creates a national network of public cord blood banks. The legislation also provides healthcare professionals the ability to search for bone marrow and umbilical cord blood units for transplantation.

H.R. 2820 also bolsters patient and advocacy services; provides for public and professional education; and collects, analyzes, and reports data on transplant outcomes.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2820, the Stem Cell Therapeutic Research Reauthorization Act. This important legislation is championed by Representatives DORIS MATSUI and CHRIS SMITH.

According to the Health Resources and Services Administration, nearly 20,000 patients in the United States need a bone marrow or cord blood transplant each year. Stem cells from both cord blood and bone marrow are used to treat nearly 80 lifesaving diseases, including cancers, blood diseases, and immune disorders.

H.R. 2820 provides Federal support for cord blood donation, the continuation of the national bone marrow registry, and critical medical research. This legislation reauthorizes the C. W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program, which includes the National Marrow Donor Program.

The program helps patients in need of lifesaving transplants find matching bone marrow donors or cord blood units. It also includes a stem cell therapeutic outcomes database, which facilitates research to better understand the matching process. This legislation will give hope of access to patients and their families in need of a curative transplant.

I want to thank Representatives MATSUI and SMITH for their leadership on this issue. I also want to thank Chairman UPTON, Ranking Member PALLONE, Chairman PITTS, and my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce for advancing this important legislation. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2820.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), my good friend.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank my good friend Mr. GUTHRIE for yielding and for his support on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, Maalik was diagnosed with Hurler syndrome at 15 months old, a rare and life-threatening metabolic disorder. He had a curved spine, and he could not walk.

After receiving an umbilical cord blood transplant facilitated through the Carolinas Cord Blood Bank, Maalik is running around and is expected to have a normal lifespan. His mother, Krystal, said: "My son is extremely happy now. He is energetic and more independent. The transplant saved his life."

In like manner, bone marrow donations provide lifesaving transplants for a myriad of diseases. Clara was only 4 months old when she was diagnosed with acute myeloid leukemia. John had registered with the National Marrow Donor Program Be The Match as a bone marrow donor when Clara was only 17 days old. It turned out it was a perfect match for Clara. John's donation saved Clara's life. She is now thriving at 2 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, not only has God in His wisdom and goodness created a placenta and an umbilical cord to nurture and protect the precious life of an unborn child, but now, we find He has left a great gift behind. Immediately after birth, something very special is left behind, cord blood that is teeming with lifesaving stem cells.

Breathtaking scientific breakthroughs have turned medical waste—postbirth placentas and umbilical cord blood—into medical miracles, treating more than 80 diseases, including leukemia, lymphoma, and sickle cell anemia.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Joanne Kurtzberg of Duke University and president of the Cord Blood Association told Chairman PITTS' subcommittee on June 25 that sickle cell anemia can be cured with cord blood transplantation and that it has become one of the most optimal donor sources for patients with sickle cell disease.

H.R. 2820, under consideration by the House today, reauthorizes through 2020 the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, a law I sponsored a decade ago, joined by Artur Davis of Alabama, legislation that cleared the Senate with the incomparable help of Senator ORRIN HATCH.

That law built upon the excellent work of our distinguished late colleague Bill Young of Florida to facilitate bone marrow transplants and created a brand-new national umbilical cord blood donation and transplantation program.

Special thanks, Mr. Speaker, to both Chairmen UPTON and PITTS for their outstanding leadership and help on this bill, as well as the strong support by Ranking Members PALLONE and my good friend and colleague Mr. GREEN.

I am deeply grateful to our original sponsors, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOLLY, and Mr. FATTAH, for their contributions and special thanks to Adrianna Simonelli, Katie Novaria, and Megan McCrum.

Today, Mr. Speaker, under the National Cord Blood Inventory program, contracts are awarded to cord blood banks to collect cord blood units donated after their mothers give birth. These units are then made available through the C. W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program, also called the Be The Match Registry.

The program provides a single point of access, enabling those in need of lifesaving transplants to search for a match via an integrated nationwide network of bone marrow and cord blood stem cells.

Americans willing to volunteer are at the heart of the success of this program. In reauthorizing it, we are grateful for the adult donors willing to donate bone marrow or peripheral blood stem cells, as well as mothers who donate their baby's cord blood to public cord blood banks.

There are 13 public banks contracted through the NCBI, including the New Jersey Cord Blood Bank in my home State, which collects cord blood from five participating hospitals.

□ 1645

Mr. Speaker, it ought to be noted as well that, in addition to treating more than 80 diseases, cord blood units from the NCBI banks are also available for research on future therapies.

Indeed, Dr. Kurtzberg pointed out that, "in addition to use in patients with malignant and genetic diseases, cord blood is showing enormous potential for use in cellular therapies and other regenerative medicine. Cord blood derived vaccines against viruses and certain types of cancers are currently under development and in early phase clinical trials. Cells, manufactured from cord blood units are being developed to boost recovery of the immune system. Cells regulating autoimmunity are also in clinical trials. These approaches, which often utilize cord blood banked in family banks, may help patients with type 1 diabetes, as well as other diseases," she testified just a few months ago.

She also pointed out that "over the past 6 years, we have initiated trials of the patient's own cord blood in babies with birth asphyxia, cerebral palsy, hearing loss"; and she is doing some incredible work on an issue that I have worked on for over 20 years, and that is the issue and the disability known as autism.

Dr. Kurtzberg finally said, "We've learned that when a donor cells are infused into one's body, they go to the brain and help heal the brain. When a child has a brain injury around birth, we can use their own cord blood cells

to correct the damage that's occurred."

Dr. Jeffrey Chell, of Be the Match—he is the CEO for it—noted that for many diseases, including blood cancers and sickle cell disease, cellular therapy is the best hope for a cure.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I visited Celgene Corporation of Summit, New Jersey, to learn of their extraordinary efforts to use cord blood to heal diabetic foot ulcers, and they now have turned amniotic membrane, an old placenta, into wound management that has now advanced—it is on the market—past stage 3 clinical trials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. H.R. 2820 authorizes \$265 million over 5 years and will ensure that thousands of present-day and future patients benefit from this exciting field of regenerative medicine.

We have only just begun. This legislation furthers that work. And again, I thank my colleagues for this bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, Maalik was diagnosed with Hurler Syndrome at 15 months old—a rare and life-threatening metabolic disorder. He had a curved spine and could not walk. After receiving an umbilical cord blood transplant facilitated through the Carolina Blood Bank, Maalik is running around and expected to have a normal lifespan. His mother Krystal told the Herald Sun newspaper in North Carolina, "My son is extremely happy now . . . He's energetic, and more independent. The transplant saved his life."

In like manner, bone marrow donations provide lifesaving transplants to treat diseases like blood cancer or inherited metabolic or immune system disorders. Clara was only 4 months old when she was diagnosed with acute myeloid leukemia. John had registered with the National Marrow Donor Program (NMDP) Be the Match as a bone marrow donor when Clara was only 17 days old. It turned out he was a perfect match for Clara. John's donation saved Clara's life, she is now a thriving 2-year-old.

Valentina was 10 months old and only 13 pounds—and diagnosed with severe combined immunodeficiency (SCID). Her doctor treated her with chemotherapy followed by a cord blood transplant. 5 months after the transplant Valentina weighed 21 pounds and doctors credited her strengthened immune system from the stem cells in cord blood.

Jennifer, 45, was suffering from acute myeloid leukemia but unable to find a matched bone-marrow transplant. Because of the high rate of tissue type diversity among racial and ethnic minorities it can be difficult to find a matched bone marrow transplant, but umbilical cord blood can be successfully used for treatment with a less perfect match of tissue type. After undergoing chemotherapy and radiation she received a cord blood transplant, and is now living cancer free.

Not only has God in His wisdom and goodness created a placenta and umbilical cord to

nurture and protect the precious life of an unborn child, but now we know that another gift awaits us immediately after birth. Something very special is left behind—cord blood that is teeming with lifesaving stem cells.

Breathtaking scientific breakthroughs have turned medical waste—post birth placentas and umbilical cord blood—into medical miracles treating more than 80 diseases including leukemia, lymphoma and sickle cell anemia.

As a matter of fact, Dr. Joanne Kurtzberg of Duke University and President of the Cord Blood Association told Chairman PITTS' Health Subcommittee on June 25 that sickle cell anemia can be "cured" with cord blood transplantation and that "it has become one of the optimal donor sources for patients with sickle cell disease" because it doesn't have to be perfectly matched.

H.R. 2820 under consideration by the House today reauthorizes through 2020 the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005 a law that I sponsored a decade ago joined by Artur Davis of Alabama; legislation that cleared the Senate with the incomparable help of Senator ORRIN HATCH. That law built upon the excellent work of our distinguished late colleague Bill Young of Florida to facilitate bone marrow transplants and created a brand new national umbilical cord blood donation and transplantation program.

Special thanks to both Chairmen UPTON and PITTS for their outstanding leadership and help on this bill, as well as the strong support by Ranking Members PALLONE and GREEN. I am deeply grateful to original cosponsors Ms. MATSUI, Mr. JOLLY and Mr. FATTAH for their important contributions. And special thanks to Katie Novaria, Adrianna Simonelli, and Megan McCrum.

Today, Mr. Speaker, under the National Cord Blood Inventory Program (NCBI), contracts are awarded to cord blood banks to collect cord blood units donated after mothers give birth. These units are then made available through the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program also called the Be the Match Registry. The Program provides a single point of access, enabling those in need of lifesaving transplants to search for a match via an integrated nationwide network of bone marrow donors and cord blood stem cells. The Program's Bone Marrow and Cord Blood Coordinating Centers makes information about bone marrow and cord blood transplant available to donors and patients, and the Office of Patient Advocacy helps support patients and families dealing with a life-threatening diagnosis. And the Stem Cell Therapeutic Outcomes Database tracks results.

Americans willing to volunteer are the heart of the success of this program. In reauthorizing it we are grateful for the adult donors willing to donate bone marrow or peripheral blood stem cells, as well as mothers who donate their babies' cord blood through public cord blood banks.

There are 13 public banks contracted through NCBI, including the New Jersey Cord Blood Bank in my home state, which collects cord blood from 5 participating hospitals.

According to the Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), every year 18,000 people in the U.S. are diagnosed with illnesses for which blood stem cell transplan-

tation from a matched donor is their best treatment option. Of this number, only about 30% have a sibling who can be the ideal matched donor, so about 12,600 people annually depend on the programs made available by this law to find an unrelated adult marrow donor or cord blood unit for treatment.

Cord blood transplants have accounted for about one half of the growth in stem cell transplants since NCBI was established in 2005. More NCBI units have been released for transplantation with each successive year since the program's inception.

In addition to currently treating more than 80 diseases, cord blood units from NCBI banks are also made available for research on future therapies. In groundbreaking research, Dr. Kurtzberg of Duke University also testified last June that "in addition to use in patients with malignant and genetic diseases, cord blood is showing enormous potential for use in cellular therapies and regenerative medicine. Cord blood derived vaccines against viruses and certain types of cancers are currently under development and in early phase clinical trials. Cells manufactured from cord blood units are being developed to boost recovery of the immune system. Cells regulating autoimmunity (Regulatory T cells) are also in clinical trials. These approaches, which often utilize cord blood banked in family banks, may help patients with Type 1 Diabetes, as well as other diseases."

Dr. Kurtzberg further testified that she and others are developing uses for cord blood to treat acquired brain disorders. "Over the past six years" she said "we have initiated trials of autologous (the patient's own) cord blood in babies with birth asphyxia, cerebral palsy, hearing loss and autism . . ."

Dr. Kurtzberg has also said "We've learned that when donor cells are infused into one's body, they go to the brain and help heal the brain. When a child has a brain injury around birth, we can use their own cord blood cells to correct the damage that's occurred."

Dr. Jeffrey W. Chell, CEO of NMDP/Be the Match noted that for many diseases including blood cancers and sickle cell disease, cellular therapy is the best hope for a cure. He told Chairman PITTS' subcommittee that the patient population "rising the most quickly is the elderly population . . . growing by double digits every year, and the reason for that is the medical conditions for which transplant is often the only cure tend to occur in older populations for diseases like acute myeloid leukemia, myelodysplastic syndrome, myelofibrosis and others."

Last year, Mr. Speaker, I visited Celgene Corporation of Summit, New Jersey to learn of their extraordinary efforts to use cord blood to heal diabetic foot ulcers and how they've turned amniotic membrane—an old placenta—into wound management that has now advanced past stage 3 clinical trials to the approval and regulatory filings stage.

H.R. 2820 authorizes \$265 million over five years and will ensure that thousands of present-day and future patients benefit from the exciting field of regenerative medicine.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close with a quick story.

There is a good friend of mine. His name is Philip Schardein, and I am great friends with his family. He went off to play golf in college—great athlete. All of a sudden, he came down with leukemia, and I remember that there were some issues at first about his sister being able to donate bone marrow.

So my town, Bowling Green, Kentucky, organized a bone marrow drive to see if anybody could match Philip Schardein. I have probably never been more proud to call myself a resident of the hometown of Bowling Green than that day. I remember going three times, and it was so overwhelmed with volunteers trying to have their bone marrow, the blood type, to see if they matched, that it just overwhelmed the system.

I remember finally getting through late in the afternoon, and people waited all day to see if they could match and help Philip Schardein. And God bless, for whatever reason his sister couldn't donate, it turned out that she could donate, and he is a healthy person now with family and children, and everything is going well.

But just about a year after that, I was in Holiday World with my family. I was having a day with them. My cell phone rang, and it turned out I had matched, because of going to get my bone marrow tested, or my blood tested, that I matched someone. The lady got on the phone, and she told me what it takes to be a donor and, Will you be willing to move forward? I said, Of course.

I remember the reason I said I was at Holiday World was because I remember standing there going, here I am with my family having fun, laughing and having a great afternoon, and there is some family somewhere that is anonymous, not having the same experience, probably trying to figure out if their loved one is going to live or survive or what is going to be the prognosis.

So I went through the process, and I remember going through, having my blood taken and several of the steps. Just getting close to the actual time to do the bone marrow transplant, for whatever reason, we got notified that it wasn't going forward. It could do that for many reasons. One, hopefully, is the anonymous person was cured or the prognosis was better, or maybe a sibling or something matched like it did for Philip Schardein.

But I've often wondered about the life on the other end, because they don't tell you for reason of anonymity, and it is just something that has always weighed on my mind. Even sitting here and getting ready to close, I was thinking about who was on the other end, and I hope that they have a good story, as well as Philip Schardein.

But what I want to stress is how important it is that families in need and worry and wondering what is going to

happen with their loved ones, and the loved ones themselves, and this is something we can do. It was a little thing that I was able to do, that we all were able to do in my community, and people across this country can do to try to help people live long and fruitful lives.

Our prayers were answered with Philip Schardein, and this is an opportunity for us to come together, in a bipartisan way, as all the bills were.

I want to close with this. We have been through four bills in the last hour, and they are dealing with touching families, and every one of them has been bipartisan. We have been able to come together and find where we agree and work together, that we can work for infants, for families suffering with leukemia and other blood disorders, for infants with opioid addiction, for parents who have children with early hearing detection, and that is where we have been able to come together and work together.

I appreciate the effort of Ranking Member GREEN in bringing us all together, and our subcommittee chairman, Mr. PITTS.

I look forward to voting for this bill, and I urge my colleagues to vote for H.R. 2820. I appreciate my friend, Mr. SMITH, for bringing it forward.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 820, the "Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Reauthorization Act," would continue critical federal support for the C.W. Bill Young Cell Transplantation Program. This program includes the Be the Match registry for bone marrow and umbilical cord blood transplantation which continues to provide hope to people in need of a lifesaving transplants.

Each year thousands of patients in need of life saving transplants are unable to find a match within their family and therefore require a nonrelative donor. That is why the Be the Match registry and its nearly 12.5 million registered bone marrow donors and collection of more than 209,000 cord blood units is so important. The Program also supports the collection and use of transplantation data to advance medical research.

I'd like to thank Representative DORIS MATSUI for her leadership in this area and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2820 to ensure that the lifesaving Be the Match registry continues.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2820.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

E-WARRANTY ACT OF 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(S. 1359) to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 1359

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "E-Warranty Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Many manufacturers and consumers prefer to have the option to provide or receive warranty information online.

(2) Modernizing warranty notification rules is necessary to allow the United States to continue to compete globally in manufacturing, trade, and the development of consumer products connected to the Internet.

(3) Allowing an electronic warranty option would expand consumer access to relevant consumer information in an environmentally friendly way, and would provide additional flexibility to manufacturers to meet their labeling and warranty requirements.

SEC. 3. ELECTRONIC DISPLAY OF TERMS OF WRITTEN WARRANTY FOR CONSUMER PRODUCTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 102(b) of the Magnuson-Moss Warranty—Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act (15 U.S.C. 2302(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(4)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the rules prescribed under this subsection shall allow for the satisfaction of all requirements concerning the availability of terms of a written warranty on a consumer product under this subsection by—

"(i) making available such terms in an accessible digital format on the Internet website of the manufacturer of the consumer product in a clear and conspicuous manner; and

"(ii) providing to the consumer (or prospective consumer) information with respect to how to obtain and review such terms by indicating on the product or product packaging or in the product manual—

"(I) the Internet website of the manufacturer where such terms can be obtained and reviewed; and

"(II) the phone number of the manufacturer, the postal mailing address of the manufacturer, or another reasonable non-Internet based means of contacting the manufacturer to obtain and review such terms.

"(B) With respect to any requirement that the terms of any written warranty for a consumer product be made available to the consumer (or prospective consumer) prior to sale of the product, in a case in which a consumer product is offered for sale in a retail location, by catalog, or through door-to-door sales, subparagraph (A) shall only apply if the seller makes available, through electronic or other means, at the location of the sale to the consumer purchasing the consumer product the terms of the warranty for the consumer product before the purchase."

(b) REVISION OF RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Trade Commission shall revise the rules prescribed under such section to comply with the requirements of paragraph (4) of

such section, as added by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) **AUTHORITY TO WAIVE REQUIREMENT FOR ORAL PRESENTATION.**—In revising rules under paragraph (1), the Federal Trade Commission may waive the requirement of section 109(a) of such Act (15 U.S.C. 2309(a)) to give interested persons an opportunity for oral presentation if the Commission determines that giving interested persons such opportunity would interfere with the ability of the Commission to revise rules under paragraph (1) in a timely manner.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LOEBSACK) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous materials into the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the E-Warranty Act of 2015 modernizes current warranty requirements by allowing manufacturers to post product warranty information online.

I certainly want to thank Senator FISCHER and Congressman MULLIN for crafting bipartisan legislation opening a path for manufacturers to conduct their business more efficiently in the digital age.

This legislation will give consumers better access to warranty information, while retaining flexibility for sellers and reducing costs for manufacturers. The Energy and Commerce Committee unanimously forwarded the companion bill, H.R. 3154, to the House floor in July after consideration by the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade.

The subcommittee has been studying how the use of the Internet and other advanced technologies is generating great advances for consumers and creating jobs. Simple things like this will create savings across multiple industries.

We will continue to look for ways to roll back outdated regulations that slow down our e-commerce, economy and hurt jobs. This legislation does just that by bringing warranty regulations into the 21st century. I urge my colleagues to vote for S. 1359.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 1359, the E-Warranty Act of 2015. I am pleased the House is considering this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. S. 1359 is identical to H.R. 3154, the E-

Warranty Act of 2015, which I was very, very happy to introduce with my good friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN).

This commonsense legislation will bring product warranties into the 21st century by allowing warranty information to be posted online. This solution makes sense for both manufacturers and consumers, as many of which prefer the option of providing or receiving warranty information in electronic rather than paper form.

Not only will this bill reduce waste, it will make it easier for consumers to find warranty information quickly and easily, without worrying that it will be lost or discarded.

I thank the committee for bringing this bill forward, and I urge support for this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the author of the House-sponsored legislation.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate Chairman BURGESS and the committee for allowing this bill to come to the floor. This is one of those commonsense bills that brings a regulation that was put in place nearly 40 years ago and brings it to today's technology.

This bill has passed the Senate by unanimous consent and is identical to H.R. 3154 that Congressman LOEBSACK and I introduced and which passed the committee by voice vote. This bipartisan E-Warranty Act of 2015 gives manufacturers the option of fulfilling their warranty notice requirements by posting the information on the Web site.

Our current Federal regulation, as I stated earlier, was developed nearly 40 years ago. The world has changed since then, and, like many regulations, this has become outdated. Warranty requirements ensure consumers get important information when they purchase a product, and we need to make sure the methods for delivering this information keep pace with innovation.

I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this commonsense bill.

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, it appears that I have no further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I would just simply add that I encourage all Members to vote in favor of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1359, the E-Warranty Act. And I want to thank Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. MULLIN for their contributions to the bill.

The bill directs the Federal Trade Commission to amend its current rules on warranty notice to allow the pre-sale notice requirements to be fulfilled by making warranty information available online. While I support this commonsense proposal, I would like to highlight one point that the bill rightly acknowl-

edges—there are many consumers and small business owners without Internet access.

This bill requires that contact information of the product manufacturers be made available so consumers may obtain warranty information by non-electronic means. To ensure that consumers and small business owners without Internet access are not disadvantaged, this Committee expects the FTC to require that consumers be provided with a toll-free phone number and warrantors respond to non-Internet requests for free and in a timely manner.

Moreover, I am confident that when the FTC changes its rules pursuant to this bill, it will maintain the protections that currently exist for consumers and small business owners who do not have Internet access, including requiring manufacturers to ensure sellers can fulfill their obligations under the bill and the rules.

This bill will help modernize the rules regarding pre-sale warranty notice by allowing warranty information to be made available online. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1359.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1832

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. WALORSKI) at 6 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.

E-WARRANTY ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on the motion to suspend the rules previously postponed.

The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 1359), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 2, not voting 43, as follows:

[Roll No. 490]
YEAS—388

Abraham Dold King (IA)
Adams Donovan King (NY)
Aderholt Doyle, Michael Kinzinger (IL)
Allen F. Knight
Amash Duffy Kuster
Amodei Duncan (SC) Labrador
Ashford Duncan (TN) LaMalfa
Babin Edwards Lamborn
Barletta Ellison Lance
Barr Ellmers (NC) Langevin
Barton Emmer (MN) Larsen (WA)
Bass Engel Larson (CT)
Beatty Eshoo Latta
Becerra Esty Lawrence
Bera Farenthold Lee
Beyer Farr Levin
Bilirakis Fattah Lewis
Bishop (GA) Fincher
Bishop (MI) Fitzpatrick
Bishop (UT) Fleischmann
Black Fleming LoBiondo
Blackburn Flores Loebsack
Boustany Fortenberry Lofgren
Boyle, Brendan Foster Long
F. Foxx Love
Brady (TX) Frankel (FL) Lowenthal
Brat Franks (AZ) Lowey
Bridenstine Frelinghuysen Lucas
Brooks (AL) Fudge Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN) Gabbard Lujan Grisham
Brown (FL) Gallego (NM)
Brownley (CA) Garamendi Luján, Ben Ray
Buchanan Garrett (NM)
Buck Gibbs Lynch
Bucshon Gibson MacArthur
Burgess Gohmert Maloney,
Bustos Goodlatte Carolyn
Butterfield Gosar Marchant
Byrne Gowdy Massie
Calvert Graham Matsui
Capps Granger McCarthy
Capuano Graves (GA) McCaul
Cárdenas Graves (LA) McClintock
Carney Graves (MO) McDermott
Carson (IN) Grayson McGovern
Carter (GA) Green, Al McHenry
Cartwright Green, Gene McKinley
Castor (FL) Griffith McMorris
Castro (TX) Grothman Rodgers
Chabot Guinta McNeerney
Chaffetz Guthrie MSally
Chu, Judy Hahn Meadows
Cicilline Hardy Meehan
Clark (MA) Harper Meeks
Clawson (FL) Hartzler Meng
Clay Hastings Messer
Cleverer Heck (NV) Mica
Clyburn Heck (WA) Miller (FL)
Coffman Hensarling Miller (MI)
Cohen Hice, Jody B. Moolenaar
Cole Hill Mooney (WV)
Collins (GA) Himes Moore
Collins (NY) Hinojosa Moulton
Comstock Holding Mullin
Conaway Honda Murphy (FL)
Connolly Hoyer Murphy (PA)
Conyers Hudson Nadler
Cook Huelskamp Napolitano
Cooper Huizenga (MI) Neal
Costa Hunter Neugebauer
Costello (PA) Hurd (TX) Newhouse
Courtney Hurt (VA) Noem
Crawford Israel Nolan
Crenshaw Issa Norcross
Crowley Jackson Lee Nugent
Cuellar Jeffries Nunes
Culberson Jenkins (KS) O'Rourke
Cummings Jenkins (WV) Olson
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) Palazzo
Davis (CA) Johnson (OH) Pallone
Davis, Danny Palmer
Davis, Rodney Johnson, E. B. Pascrell
DeGette Jolly Paulsen
Delaney Jordan Payne
DeLauro Joyce Pearce
DelBene Kaptur Pelosi
Denham Katko Perlmutter
Dent Keating Perry
DeSaulnier Kelly (MS) Peters
DesJarlais Kelly (PA) Peterson
Deutch Kennedy Pingree
Diaz-Balart Kilmer Pittenger
Doggett Kind Pitts

Pocan
Poe (TX) Scalise
Polis Schakowsky
Pompeo Schiff
Posey Schrader
Price (NC) Schweikert
Price, Tom Scott (VA)
Ratcliffe Scott, Austin
Reed Scott, David
Reichert Sensenbrenner
Renacci Serrano
Ribble Sessions
Rice (NY) Sewell (AL)
Rice (SC) Sherman
Richmond Shuster
Rigell Simpson
Robby Sinema
Roe (TN) Sires
Rogers (AL) Slaughter
Rogers (KY) Smith (MO)
Rokita Smith (NE)
Rooney (FL) Smith (NJ)
Ros-Lehtinen Smith (TX)
Roskam Smith (WA)
Ross Speier
Rothfus Stefanik
Rouzer Stewart
Royce Stivers
Ruiz Stutzman
Ruppersberger Swallow (CA)
Russell Takai
Ryan (OH) Takano
Ryan (WI) Thompson (CA)
Salmon Thompson (MS)
Sánchez, Linda Thompson (PA)
T. Thornberry
Sanchez, Loretta Titus
Sanford Tonko
Sarbanes Trott

Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—2

Benishek Jones
NOT VOTING—43

Aguilar Gutiérrez
Blum Hanna Mulvaney
Blumenauer Harris Poliquin
Bonamici Herrera Beutler Quigley
Bost Higgins Rangel
Brady (PA) Huffman Rohrabacher
Carter (TX) Hultgren Roybal-Allard
Clarke (NY) Kelly (IL) Rush
Cramer Kildee Shimkus
DeFazio Kirkpatrick Tiberi
DeSantis Loudermilk Torres
Dingell Lummis Velázquez
Duckworth Maloney, Sean Walberg
Forbes Marino Watson Coleman
Grijalva McCollum

□ 1857

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Tuesday, September 8, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall vote 490 in support of the E-Warranty Act of 2015.

Mr. TIBERI. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 490 (On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass S. 1359), I was unavoidably detained and did not cast my vote. Had I been present, I would have voted, “yea” on this vote.

Mr. HULTGREN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 490, I was unavoidably detained (delayed flight—weather). Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 490, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 70, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. ROSELEHTINEN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 70

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN.

On October 16, 2015, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 30th annual District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the “event”) may be run through the Capitol Grounds to carry the Special Olympics torch to honor local Special Olympics athletes.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1900

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE 2ND ANNUAL FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS CONGRESSIONAL FLAG PRESENTATION CEREMONY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 73, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 73

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS CONGRESSIONAL FLAG PRESENTATION CEREMONY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Congressional Fire Services Institute and the National Fallen Firefighters Foundation (in this resolution referred to jointly as the “sponsor”) shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 2nd Annual Fallen Firefighters Congressional Flag Presentation Ceremony (in this resolution referred to as the “event”), on the Capitol Grounds in order to honor the firefighters who died in the line of duty in 2014.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on September 30, 2015, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), the Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

(b) USE OF FIRE EQUIPMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Capitol Police Board may allow the sponsor, as part of the event, to use traditional, hand-held fire equipment, such as axes and Pulaski tools, and any other fire equipment that the Board determines can be used in a safe manner and will not cause damage to the Capitol Grounds or harm to any individual.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR AN EVENT TO COMMEMORATE THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MILLION MAN MARCH

Mr. CRAWFORD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 74, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 74

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR EVENT TO COMMEMORATE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF MILLION MAN MARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Million Man March, Inc. 2015 (in this resolution referred to as the “sponsor”) shall be permitted to sponsor a public event on the Capitol Grounds to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Million Man March (in this resolution referred to as the “event”).

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on October 10, 2015, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions in section 5104(c) of title 40, United States Code, concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3412

Mr. VEASEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor from H.R. 3412.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER FOR ALISON PARKER AND ADAM WARD

(Mr. GRIFFITH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I would ask that members of the Virginia congregation join me here in the well.

Madam Speaker, colleagues, along with my fellow members of the delegation from the Commonwealth of Virginia, I rise today with a heavy heart.

On the morning of August 26, we were shaken by a tragic incident during which WDBJ7 journalists Alison Parker and Adam Ward were killed in an act of senseless, heartbreaking violence. Vicki Gardner, head of the Smith Mountain Lake Regional Chamber of Commerce, was seriously injured in the shooting. She has recently been discharged from the hospital and continues her recovery.

Alison Parker was 24 years old. She graduated from Martinsville High School, attended Patrick Henry Community College, and went on to James Madison University's School of Media Arts and Design. After she graduated, Alison joined the news team at WCTI 12 in North Carolina before, last year, landing a job reporting for the Mornin' Show at WDBJ in Roanoke, where she worked on the news team with Adam. It is a TV station that broadcasts into her hometown and into Adam's hometown.

Adam Ward was 27. He grew up in Botetourt, but was described as “truly a Salem Spartan, born and bred.” He started attending school at Andrew Lewis Middle School in the seventh grade, later playing football for Salem High. Adam fulfilled another dream by attending Virginia Tech and becoming a proud member of the Hokie Nation.

Alison and Adam were cheerful, hard-working, exuberant, and much-loved members of the WDBJ family who are and will continue to be missed.

Our community is grieving and coping. We are asking for comfort and healing. We are reflecting on Alison's and Adam's lives while also praying for Vicki's ongoing recovery.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me, my colleagues from the Commonwealth, and our community in a moment of silent prayer.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN HONOR OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS STOKES

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise this evening to pay tribute to an historic, distinguished former Member of this Chamber—Louis Stokes of Cleveland, Ohio.

Congressman Stokes passed away on August 18, at the age of 90, with his loving wife of 55 years, Jeanette, by his side.

On behalf of the people of Ohio and the Ohio delegation, I would like to express our deep sadness and enduring gratitude for the life of Louis Stokes.

Growing up in Cleveland in public housing, with his brother, Carl, and their widowed mother, life was hard, but Lou triumphed over hardship to become a passionate voice for the less fortunate. He gave his life to public service, serving 3 years in the Army before using the benefits he earned under the GI Bill to attend college and law school; and, I might say, he served in a segregated Army. He worked closely with the NAACP and argued the landmark stop and frisk case, *Terry v. Ohio*, before the U.S. Supreme Court.

In his 15 terms in Congress, he served as an ever-present voice for people of color and vulnerable communities across this country, playing a role to help found the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971. He was a foundational figure. His leadership was also historic, as he was the first African American Member of Congress ever elected to represent Ohio. Lou's resume in the House included stints as chairman of the select committee that investigated the assassinations of John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King, Jr., from 1976 to 1978; as chairman of the House Ethics Committee; as a member of the House select committee that investigated the Iran-Contra affair; and as the first Black person to chair the Intelligence Committee and serve on the influential House Appropriations Committee and chair its Subcommittee on Veterans, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.

A month before his passing, Lou gave an interview to the Cleveland Plain Dealer. He said: "I was a very blessed guy . . . I've been blessed with the opportunity to participate in history, to rise to opportunities I never envisioned . . . and to provide for people opportunities that, in many cases, they would have never had."

We stand here today in the footsteps of this historic champion. It is we who are blessed to have worked alongside Congressman Stokes; and our thoughts and prayers are with his wife, Jeanette; his beautiful daughters Angela, Shelley, and Lori; son, Chuck; and seven grandchildren. Our thoughts and prayers are with all of them during this difficult time of loss.

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the Ohio delegation, I ask that the House observe a moment of silence in memory of the legendary, transformative life of former Congressman Louis Stokes, and I thank you all.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, this week, we will debate and vote on one of the most consequential national security and foreign policy issues that we have faced in quite some time—the Iran nuclear agreement.

This deal allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium and to keep in place nearly every key aspect of its nuclear program. It also provides an economic lifeline to the Iranian regime, with billions of dollars in sanctions relief, which will fund Iran's support for terror and its other acts of belligerence in the region.

This deal also lifts the arms embargo on Iran, lifts sanctions on its ballistic missile program, and lifts certain sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its leader, like Qasem Soleimani.

This is not a partisan or a political statement—this is the grim reality of the situation. This deal, as it has been presented to Congress and to the American people, will not prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. As such, it is incumbent upon us to reject this weak and dangerous Iran nuclear agreement this week.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE LOU STOKES

(Mr. RYAN of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just take a minute to join with Congresswoman KAPTUR, with Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE, and with Congresswoman JOYCE BEATTY in honoring the life of Louis Stokes.

We attended his funeral a few weeks back, and I just want to say there were so many great stories that came about through his passing—from his family and from his grandkids, who gave beautiful eulogies, stories of their grandfather.

This is just to say, when I first got to the United States Congress as a young Congressman of 29 years old, it was Congressman Stokes who sat in my office, who gave me counsel, who was always there and was always in a good mood, who was always joking and playing around and having a good time; but he took his job very seriously and took being a Member of Congress very seriously.

The striking and remarkable thing about him was, no matter how high up the ladder he moved, he always had time. Whether it was for a young boy or girl in Cleveland or a new Congressman from Youngstown, he had time. He shared his advice, and he shared his counsel. He was such a remarkable man.

When you think of the word "gentleman," that was Congressman Lou Stokes. He was a gentle man and, I think, embodied the kind of character we want our young men in Ohio to look up to and aspire to be.

I wanted to take a minute here on the House floor to thank him for all he did for me and all he did for Ohio and all he did for this country. He was a great man, and he will be missed. Our hearts and our prayers go out to him and his family.

VOTE FOR NEW AMERICAN LEADERSHIP AND WORLD PEACE

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this week, the House will vote against the nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

The House will vote against Mr. Putin's getting new missiles for Iran to hit Europe—even America—with a nuclear bomb.

The House will vote against giving Iran \$50 billion to hand to ISIS, Hamas, Hezbollah, and al Qaeda.

The House will vote for American Christians held in jails in Iran. The House will vote for the survival of our greatest ally, Israel.

World peace needs American leadership. The world has had 7 years of America's leading from behind.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting for new American leadership and world peace. Vote to disapprove of President Obama's deal with Iran.

ALL LIVES MATTER

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the past year, our Nation has witnessed an unspeakable tragedy—a rivalry of law enforcement officers and the communities they work so hard to protect.

From riots in Ferguson and Baltimore to, most recently, the individual targeting and murdering of police officers, our Nation is at a crossroads.

We find ourselves asking:

When will the rule of law and those who enforce that law, once again, be respected?

How many more violent protests and threatening chants will those who bravely wear the badge have to put up with?

How much more taunting under the guise of a misleading slogan be tolerated before community organizers, prominent African American leaders, and Democrats at the city, State, and national levels say enough is enough?

When will we hear in unison: "It is not okay to kill police officers"?

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are here this evening to honor those in uniform who have fallen, but we are also here to call for an end to this violence. We are here to call for the restoration of law and order. We are here to call for the protection of the men and women who put their lives on the line every single day—the ones who chose a profession to help make their neighborhoods safer.

These are not just police officers. They are mothers; they are fathers; they are husbands and wives; they are sons and daughters. Mr. Speaker, their lives matter, too, and all lives matter. In God we trust.

□ 1915

IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a poll of my constituents in Pennsylvania's Eighth District, one of the true swing districts in this House, shows that they disapprove of the administration's nuclear deal with Iran by a 2 to 1 margin.

These returns are in line with recent national polls showing Americans, as a whole, overwhelmingly disapprove of the agreement by a similar count, and they have every right to.

What we have learned about this deal is that it does not go far enough to achieve its ultimate goal, to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. In fact, it would allow just that when it sunsets.

In the meantime, "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iranian nuclear sites were neutralized to provide up to 24 days' notice prior to any inspection.

In addition, this deal precipitates a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, a reality we are already seeing, as nations like Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have already begun building up their nuclear infrastructure in response.

The hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief provided by this deal will no doubt be used to further fund Tehran's state sponsorship of terror.

A nation that has a nine-figure line item in the budget to support terrorism, like attacks that devastated our Nation on September 11, 2001, is hard to trust.

Unfortunately, what we have is a bad deal, one that makes an already volatile, unstable Middle East less safe, clears the way for a nuclear Iran, and gravely endangers allies like Israel.

I urge my colleagues to disapprove it.

ANTI-TRAFFICKING LAWS MAKE A DIFFERENCE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Madam Speaker, one of the issues that I have been most passionate about is stopping the horrific crime of sex trafficking and protecting young victims.

Earlier this year Congress took action and passed a package of bipartisan bills, including one that I authored aimed at combatting this crime. I said at the time that this legislation would save lives.

Madam Speaker, in the short time since these laws have gone into effect, we are already seeing results. Recently, a provision in the legislation that allowed local law enforcement to coordinate their efforts with the U.S. Marshals Service was used to help find a kidnapped Tennessee teenager. The 14-year-old girl was rescued in Virginia, and her abductor, a known sex offender, was taken into custody.

Madam Speaker, ending human trafficking requires vigilance and a bipartisan commitment to ensure that children are safe from those wishing to exploit them. The actions we have taken to combat this awful crime are making a difference and saving lives.

HONORING ERNIE PELLOW

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise tonight to honor the accomplishments of Ernie Pellow, a man who dedicated his life and career to his community of Franklin and to its region's housing industry.

Mr. Pellow was recently awarded the Pennsylvania Builders Association's Distinguished Achievement Award, which has only been given to a handful of that organization's members over the past two decades.

Madam Speaker, Ernie's accomplishments are extensive. He is the founder of Builder Services, Incorporated, and the creator of the Home Builders Show in Venango County.

He has also received numerous awards, including Builder of the Year in 1996 and the Executive Office Service Award from the Pennsylvania State Senate.

Perhaps more importantly than all of this, Madam Speaker, Ernie Pellow served his Nation bravely and, since then, has participated in more than 1,000 Honor Guard events.

Now, I am one of the many elected officials who have relied on Ernie's advice and support in the area of home

construction. I congratulate him on this award and his continued service to his community.

HONORING FIRST RESPONDERS

(Mrs. BLACKBURN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, as you know so well, one of the top issues that people in our districts are discussing is national security. The reason for that is because they are seeing the issues of national security, domestic security, played out on their streets.

I want to stand with my colleagues who are going to do a Special Order in just a few minutes to honor the work that our first responders, that our men and women in uniform, are doing every single day to keep our community safe.

A police officer is tasked with not just enforcing the law, which they do, they are also tasked with protecting the community.

Often they find themselves with the duty to protect the community from itself, whether that is to stop the motorist who is driving recklessly in a school zone or having to thrust themselves into the middle of a domestic dispute and to restore order.

I will tell you, so many times, as I talked to first responders as I was in my district in the month of August, they said there is no such thing as a routine stop any longer. They know they face danger. We thank them.

CELEBRATING H. CANYON'S SUCCESS

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, this August, the H. Canyon facility at the U.S. Department of Energy's Savannah River Site near Aiken, South Carolina, celebrated 60 years of service.

H. Canyon is America's only hardened nuclear chemical separations plant still operating, and its dedicated staff play a vital role in our Nation's history and in the future.

During the cold war, H. Canyon was vital for victory, promoting national defense by peace through strength. Today it continues to process nuclear materials safely and securely and delivers fuels to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

H. Canyon is also a pioneer for the future, developing plutonium-powered batteries for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for deep space exploration. We saw the results of this incredible technology this summer with the historic, close-range photographs of the most remote planet, Pluto.

I am grateful to the Savannah River Nuclear Solutions and the 800 employees for operating this remarkable facility. I am also grateful for SRNS President and CEO Carol Johnson, site manager Jack Craig, and the support of the partnering contractors: Fluor, Newport News Nuclear, and Honeywell.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, one of the most important votes we will maybe ever do in this House will happen probably later this week. I am talking about the Iran deal.

Indeed, the original premise of the Iran nuclear deal was that Iran would be a nuclear-free, nonmilitary nuclear zone. That has already been conceded to in the deal we will be voting on here soon in the House and, I guess, over in the Senate as well.

This is going to greatly affect the security of our allies like our good, solid ally, Israel, as well as others we do trading with in the Middle East.

And if you don't think it affects U.S. homeland, then why does the deal include provisions not only after 5 years for being able to trade arms on the open market for Iran, but for them to have intercontinental ballistic missiles within 8 years? What do you do with ICBMs? I will guarantee it isn't delivering forget-me-not bouquets to the United States.

Our security is on the line in this deal. Seventy-three percent of Americans don't even believe that we can strike a deal with Iran and have them keep their word.

The Associated Press—and this is the real kicker—reported here recently that Iran would be self-inspecting, self-reporting on the deal. We can put no faith that they will uphold this deal and that they will adhere to any of the provisions in it.

We need to vote “no” on this.

HONORING FALLEN POLICE OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. MCSALLY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extra-

neous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, last Friday, August 28, 2015, a deputy sheriff that protects my neighborhood in Houston, Texas, Harris County Deputy Sheriff Darren Goforth, was ambushed and brutally murdered at a gas station that my family and I use regularly and that I drive past every day.

I knew this good man. He was well known to my neighbors and me as a model citizen and as a model officer.

You could not ask for a kinder, gentler, better law enforcement officer than Darren Goforth. He was murdered in cold blood, assassinated by someone whose motives are not completely clear yet.

In this atmosphere and this movement of extremist people calling on individuals to attack law enforcement, I wanted to call this Special Order. I want to thank my good friend, Judge TED POE, for organizing this Special Order today.

We reserved this hour so that the Members of the House can come down here today and express our love and admiration and appreciation for every man and woman who wears the blue and defends our peace, our liberty, our property, and our safety on the streets of America.

Deputy Goforth was a 10-year veteran of the Harris County Sheriffs Department. He was a loving husband and a father of two precious children, ages 5 and 12. He was murdered for one reason: Because he wore the uniform. Because he wore the blue to protect us all, to preserve our liberty, to protect our homes and our property, he was murdered in cold blood.

I went to many of the prayer vigils in the neighborhood. I went to a prayer vigil at the gas station where he was murdered, and I went to a service last Friday. Our minister, Dr. Ed Young of Second Baptist Church, conducted the service. It was overwhelming emotionally.

It was overwhelming and, also, encouraging to see the tremendous outpouring of support from the people of Houston, from the people of Texas, from people all over America, who showed up to express their love and admiration and support for the men and women in law enforcement who protect us every single day. It was an outpouring of support like I don't think the people of Houston have seen for a long, long time.

Dr. Young's service was particularly compelling as he pointed out that the only prayer that Jesus taught us in the brief time he was here with us on Earth was the Lord's Prayer.

Dr. Young pointed out that the Lord's Prayer concludes, as we all

know, with “deliver us from evil.” In that “deliver us from evil,” as Dr. Young pointed out, the word “deliver” actually means “shield” in Greek.

Dr. Young pointed out that the temple priests in Christ's time all wore blue as a symbol of the protection that they afforded to the temple-goers from evil and that Christ's robe was blue and it was appropriate that the men and women who protect us every day wear blue and we need to remember that they are there to shield us from evil.

There is no other job in America that you can go to work and might not come home because of the threat that you face when you are willing to step in front of a bullet or take that risk on yourself in defense of your neighbors and your friends.

As Dr. Young pointed out in that service, the good thing to come from this is that the people of Texas, the people of Houston, really, the people of America—and that is demonstrated by my colleagues being here with us today on the floor—have all stepped forward to let the law enforcement community know that we are there for them, we love them, we are praying for them, and that we have got their back.

In fact, one of the members of Second Baptist told Dr. Young and his staff that, shortly after this terrible murder of Deputy Goforth, he spotted a law enforcement officer filling his gas tank at a neighborhood gas station. As the officer was looking over his shoulder nervously, the member of Second Baptist walked up to the officer and said, “Don't worry, Officer. I have got your back.”

□ 1930

A concealed carry permit holder—and as so many of our constituents and neighbors in Texas are concealed carry permit holders—law enforcement knows that a concealed carry permit holder is their best friend.

The message that I want to make sure that every law enforcement officer in the country hears tonight from myself and my colleagues and from the people of Texas and America, for every law enforcement officer out there: We love you. We are proud of you. We are praying for you and your family, and most of all, we got your back.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP), my good friend and colleague.

HONORING MICHAEL BYRON TABB, SR.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman and all of my colleagues for coming tonight in support of law enforcement.

The Good Book tells us that greater love hath no man but that he lay down his life for his friends. That is what our law enforcement, our first responders, our public safety personnel do for us each and every day, 24/7, all across this country. For that, we are so grateful.

They are Black; they are White; they are young; they are seasoned; they are male, and they are female. In my community in Columbus, Georgia, we have had all of them to give their last full measure of devotion in defense of our communities, to keep us safe at night, so I commend my colleagues for that.

I thank my colleague so much for allowing me to invade this Special Order to give a special tribute to one of my constituents who passed away during our break.

It is with a heavy heart, Madam Speaker, and in solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a respected community leader, an outstanding citizen, Michael Byron Tabb, Sr.

Sadly, Mike passed away on Monday, August 17, 2015, and funeral services were held Saturday, August 22, at 11 a.m. at the Milford Baptist Church in Leary, Georgia.

Mike Tabb was born in Albany, Georgia, and graduated from Baker County High School. He earned a bachelor's degree in secondary education and minored in biology at Valdosta State College, now Valdosta State University.

He was a teacher and a coach from 1967 until 1974 and a farmer from 1974 to 1986. He then served as the managing editor for the Camilla Enterprise from 1987 until 1993 and wrote the column "Plantation Pete."

From 1993 to 2012, Mike worked at the Camilla Housing Authority as grant and public relations coordinator and program coordinator. Following his retirement, he continued to work part time with Community Ventures, a nonprofit corporation that serves the community in various ways, including building homes.

He was instrumental in obtaining grants totaling nearly \$15 million and contracts with the department of human resources to match welfare clients with employment opportunities. He helped organize youth development activities in 20 counties and acquired funding to construct housing for low-to-moderate-income citizens.

He was widely known by everybody as a driving force in the community. He served as chairman of the Baker Commission, chairman of the Mitchell County Children and Youth Collaborative, chairman of the board of directors of the Mitchell-Baker Association for Retarded Citizens, chairman of the Baker County Historical Society, and chairman of the Advisory Committee for South Georgia Judicial Circuit Indigent Defense Program.

He was also a member of the Mitchell County Children and Youth Family Connection Corporate Board, Baker County Family Connection, Mitchell County Hospital Authority, and the Southwest Georgia Workforce Investment Board.

He was instrumental in forming the first volunteer Baker County EMS and

was an avid historian, playing a critical role in the publishing of the Baker County history book and cemetery book.

He was a resolute steward of Christ's message, and he taught Sunday school for over 35 years at Milford Baptist Church. His faith and spirituality always reminded those around him of the power of love and fellowship through Christ and the church.

Mike has accomplished much in his life, but none of it would have been possible without the love and support of his wife, Karin; his children; grandchildren; and great-grandchildren.

Madam Speaker, my wife, Vivian, and I, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District, salute Mike Byron Tabb for his dedicated service to his community.

I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Mike's family, friends, and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks, and months ahead.

I thank my colleague for yielding to me. It was very special. I, again, commend him for standing up and expressing our appreciation for America's law enforcement, the men and women who protect us day in and day out.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, SANFORD. I know the State of Georgia loves and admires law enforcement as much as we do.

I am privileged to yield to my neighbor and colleague from Texas, Judge TED POE.

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, peace officers are really the last strand of wire in defense between the fox and the chickens. They are the ones that stand between the lawful and the lawless. They protect us from outlaws. Sometimes, they do so without much appreciation from the public.

Friday, about 11,000 people or more gathered for the funeral of Deputy Darren Goforth at the Second Baptist Church in Houston, Texas. Many hundreds of others couldn't get in to any of the service. It was televised live on all four networks. Helicopters flew over during the service. It was hot, and people stood and gave appreciation to this man.

He was married to Kathleen. They had two children, Ava and Ryan. Ava is 5, and Ryan is 12. He had been a Harris County deputy sheriff for 10 years. I guess every member of the sheriff's department was at that funeral.

There were police officers from all over the United States there. There were some from Canada and the United Kingdom. I talked to a police officer from Connecticut who was in Houston for this funeral. He was stunned in a way of appreciation for the people and other peace officers that came for this man's funeral.

It affected the whole community and still does to a great degree for a lot of reasons. In my other life, I was a prosecutor and a judge at the criminal courts building in Houston. I prosecuted people who killed peace officers, and I tried cases where peace officers had been killed when I was a judge. It is a grim thing that happens when a peace officer is murdered in the line of duty.

As my colleague, Mr. CULBERSON, pointed out, Darren Goforth was getting gasoline at a local gas station he stopped at regularly and was filling up his patrol car 2 weeks ago. An assassin came up from behind him and shot him in the back of the head.

He kept shooting. He finally emptied his clip, and 15 times, Deputy Goforth was shot in the back of the head. The assassin fled but was later captured, and a man is charged with capital murder.

There seems to be an environment in America that police officers are being targeted. We will leave that for a different discussion. These are real people. They do what most of us would never do. They go out and protect and serve us. Police officers have been referred to as the thin blue line.

As mentioned earlier, blue is a traditional color that peace officers wear. They also wear a badge or a star, a star in Texas for deputy sheriffs and Texas Rangers, a badge for local police officers. They place that over their heart, symbolic of the shield that protects us from the lawless.

They do that all over the country. That is why the badge or the star is placed in that location. The badge, the star, it really represents everything that is good and right about law and order and America.

When a person, a peace officer is murdered, it affects all of us. It was encouraging to me and I think other peace officers to see the community support for Darren Goforth; his wife, Kathleen; Ava; and Ryan.

A lot of stories were told about this wonderful person. Being a police officer was his second career. He loved working on cars. He wanted to make them run, old cars—muscle cars, as we called them in my day.

He had recently bought his son, Ryan, a Captain America T-shirt, and he bought himself one. They didn't have time to wear it, but at the funeral, Ryan, his son, under his suit, wore his Captain America T-shirt. Deputy Goforth was buried in his, underneath his uniform. He was a marvelous individual, a brave and good guy.

The community not only attended the funeral and watched it on TV. As the procession left the church, led by I don't know how many police officers on motorcycles and then you had the Patriot Guard motorcycle riders and other motorcycle groups at the end of the parade going through the Houston

area to the cemetery, people stood on the side of the road, put their hand over their heart.

A lot of money has been raised for Darren Goforth's family. At the location where he was murdered, a Chevron station, people are still putting up flowers and tributes.

As my colleague said, apparently, on more than one occasion, peace officers have been filling up their patrol cars—and in Houston, patrol officers, Houston officers and county officers, travel alone; there is not two in a car—but while they have been filling up their patrol cars, apparently, on more than one occasion, some citizen has stopped, come up to the officer, and said, "I got your back," and that was really the message.

In our area, in the Houston area, we are saddened by what happened to this individual, but I think it is true that the community, like that Connecticut officer said, like no other place, is very supportive of peace officers, their families, and what they do and that we do have their back. The community supports them.

We mourn with the family; we mourn with all peace officers who have lost a brother peace officer, but we are also resolved and resilient that, in the future, we are going to have their back because respecting and upholding the rule of law is what these men and women do, and we should support them in that effort.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. CULBERSON. Dr. Young looked at that young family and said: I want you to know that your father, your husband, did not die in vain because he has steeled the resolve of this Nation to stand behind every man and woman in uniform that defends our liberty and our safety on the streets of America.

I am proud to yield to my colleague from Texas, Dr. BABIN.

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas not only for yielding, but for getting this Special Order together on such a special issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Harris County Deputy Sheriff Darren Goforth and all of America's law enforcement officers. On Friday, August 28, Deputy Goforth was ambushed and murdered while refueling his patrol car in Houston, Texas.

I am proud to represent a portion of the city. Deputy Goforth was a committed 10-year veteran of the police force, a proud husband, and the father of two.

Tragically, his life was cut short for one simple reason: his uniform. It is hard to express my outrage and my contempt for those who have incited this war of hatred and violence toward our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Police officers take an oath to protect and to serve, and it is time they receive the same level of commitment and protection in return.

□ 1945

In August alone, we have lost five other police officers. In 2015, we have seen 24 law enforcement officers gunned down. These brave men and women put their lives on the line every single day for our communities and for the safety of our families. They deserve our support and our respect, and it is a travesty that this situation has gotten to this point.

This is not an issue of whose life matters most. This is a matter of right and of wrong. And what we have seen in recent weeks is absolutely wrong, and it must end now.

Our community and elected leaders, starting with the President of the United States, must stand up for what is right and denounce the hatred being directed at our law enforcement personnel in this country.

I, personally, could not be more thankful and proud of the men and women who police our communities. Last week, I was honored to join in a community celebration of the men and women in blue of Tyler County, Texas, my home—and all over America, as a matter of fact.

We also gathered together in Jasper County, Texas, on Saturday to honor and rally support for America's first responders; and this week, much of my staff, while I am up here serving in Congress, will be attending an event recognizing the law enforcement personnel of Hardin County, Texas.

Our law enforcement officers have a very difficult job, and it is a shame that the violent rhetoric of a very few are putting their lives at greater risk.

During this difficult time, I, along with an overwhelming majority of Americans, stand in strong solidarity with our law enforcement officers and offer them and their families our unwavering commitment, attention, and support.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Dr. BABIN.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my colleague from California (Mr. VALADAO) to speak on behalf of his constituents and the people of California of their love and respect for our law enforcement officers.

Mr. VALADAO. I thank my colleague from Texas for hosting this and allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Madam Speaker, my background is, as many of you know and I spoke of many times, I am a farmer from California. One of the things that I have had the opportunity of—and sometimes not always the best opportunity, but I have had a lot of opportunities—is to deal with law enforcement; metal thieves, different folks breaking into houses and doing different types of things.

I remember one specific night where we had a person trespassing, and I showed up and it was dark, 10, 11 at night. I drove up in the middle of the

field, had no idea if there was someone behind me, someone coming up behind me or on the side of me. It was just a really scary feeling to think that I just drove up on this situation. How many people are out here? What are their intentions?

Now, obviously, I called 911, and when the police showed up, they run into these situations on a daily basis.

But the fear that I felt, knowing that there were people out there close to me who could have been there for a really, really bad reason, looking to do someone harm, is something that I just couldn't imagine doing on a daily basis.

My wife and I are friends with some law enforcement folks in my district, people I grew up with, as my wife did as well. When you look back—and we have had dinners with these folks—and you talk to their spouse or you talk to their kids, you know that their husbands, their wives go into these situations on a daily basis. They have to run out there, jump into a situation where they know there is someone out there that could have a gun, could have a weapon, could look to do these people harm. They are the ones that we always call for backup. They are the ones that we always call when there is a desperate situation. And these people are the ones that are being threatened now, today.

There are so many people out there that put so much into their work. But when you look at what our law enforcement does for us, every time we dial 911, every time we call for help, every time that we have got a situation that is out of our control, they are the people that step in, without any fear for their own lives, and step up and do what we need them to do.

To see what has happened, especially now in Texas and other parts of the country, where these people are being ambushed, where our protectors, those who keep our families safe, are being attacked from behind, is just something that is unimaginable.

The fact that we have got a group of Members here today, and I know so many more, stepping up and supporting those who do so much for us is something I am thrilled to be a part of, and it is an honor.

So, again, I want to thank all of those who put on the badge and step up to protect us, each and every one of us all throughout the country. So again, thank you for what you do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me this opportunity.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, DAVID.

I think it is so important for each and every one of us, if we get an opportunity, we run across a law enforcement officer, just walk up and tell them how much we love them and appreciate them and that we have got their back.

I am delighted to yield to my colleague from northeastern Louisiana

(Mr. ABRAHAM) to express the feeling of his constituents about law enforcement.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Thank you, Congressman, for having this Special Order on such a somber occasion.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer my support and utmost respect for law enforcement officers who put their lives on the line to protect our communities, as well as to applaud these men and women who take part in their selfless actions every day.

We sleep safely at night because we know the men and women who wear the badges are on the streets looking out for us. They look out for our families. They look out for our communities, for our country, and words cannot convey how grateful we are to them.

This year, there have been too many reminders that too many of our officers are paying the ultimate sacrifice in the name of service. They risk everything to protect us, and they deserve our utmost respect.

Unfortunately, my State of Louisiana has lost nine officers in the line of duty this year, one of the most in the Nation, according to the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. This is a statistic I am not proud of, and I will continue to do all in my power to ensure that all officers in the Nation are safe.

I want to thank those men and women who have sacrificed for Louisiana and for the Nation.

We must always remember that the vast majority of law enforcement officers serve because they want to make their community and their country better places, and for that we are very grateful.

We must always remember that these officers step out each day in the face of uncertainty. They never know what situation they will encounter and when a routine traffic stop could turn very tragic.

Thank you, officers, for putting your lives on the line for our safety. Thank you for answering the call to serve and to protect Louisiana and the country.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege to yield to a colleague from northeast Texas, Congressman JOHN RATCLIFFE.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. I thank my friend and colleague from Texas for holding this Special Order and for yielding.

Madam Speaker, "to protect and serve," those words are much more than just a slogan on the side of police cars across this country. It is a promise, a promise that our men and women in blue fulfill on a daily basis while they serve to uphold the pillars of law and order that our society depends on. Without their work, without their sacrifice, our communities would be lawless, and our families, our friends, our neighbors, our loved ones would all be in constant jeopardy.

Thousands of police officers go to work each day knowing the danger, knowing that they may have to pay the ultimate sacrifice to provide us with security. Officers like Deputy Goforth of Texas have been targeted for execution and have paid the ultimate price simply because they choose to protect our communities.

The recent wave of violence against our peace officers simply because they wear a uniform is outrageous. It is appalling, and it must end.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to stand with our law enforcement, and I want to personally thank the men and women in law enforcement in the Fourth Congressional District of Texas that I am privileged to represent.

I want to thank those Texas peace officers who have reached out to me personally to express their concerns on this issue, like Mike Sullivan in Farmersville, Otis Henry in Sherman, Terry Garrett in Heath, Harold Eavenson in Rockwall, Jay Burch in Denison, and Daniel Shiner in Texarkana.

Thanks to you all. Thanks to all the men and women who serve in law enforcement and serve our communities. You are appreciated. We are grateful.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, JOHN.

Madam Speaker, we are here from every corner of the United States to tell our men and women in uniform who risk their lives every day to protect us and the safety of our families and our homes how much we appreciate them and love them and we are praying for them and we have got their back.

It is a privilege to yield to my good friend and colleague from Minnesota, Congressman TOM EMMER.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and having this Special Order tonight. It is important that we allow time to acknowledge the brave men and women who serve as police officers throughout our country.

During the August district work period, I had the opportunity to participate in an event to memorialize and honor a fallen officer from Minnesota, Officer Tommy Decker. Tommy was an amazing individual who dedicated his life to serving the Cold Spring community in central Minnesota.

On Thursday, November 29, 2012, while conducting a welfare check, Tommy was ambushed and taken from this world far too soon. At the young age of 31, Tommy had already given 10 years of his life to serve his community.

My predecessor, Michele Bachmann, worked tirelessly to ensure that Tommy received the recognition he so greatly deserved, and 2 weeks ago we dedicated the Cold Spring Post Office in the name of Officer Tommy Decker, a man who gave his life to the Cold Spring community.

I was privileged to participate in the ceremony on behalf of Minnesota's

Sixth Congressional District and to continue the great work that Michele began. We now have this lasting reminder of Tommy, his service, and his great heroism to his community.

We try to thank our military veterans and the servicemen and -women in uniform as much as possible for their work and sacrifice to protect our freedoms and keep us safe. We should do the same for our men and women in police uniforms.

Police are courageous and selfless servants in our communities. They patrol our streets to keep us safe. Perhaps now more than ever, they not only deserve but need our acknowledgement, support, and encouragement.

Every day, police officers across this country go to work not knowing what they are going to encounter, all the while knowing that, regardless, it is their duty to, quite literally, serve and protect.

Tommy and all of the men and women who proudly wear their police uniforms are looked up to by many, and we all owe them so much.

Thank you to all of our police officers across the United States. We pray for your safe return home tonight and every night.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, it is important that the law enforcement community know that, while we are waiting to hear from the President of the United States, the Members of Congress are stepping forward tonight from every corner of the country to express our love and support for our law enforcement community.

I am privileged at this time to yield to my colleague from California's 25th District, Congressman STEVE KNIGHT.

Mr. KNIGHT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate Mr. CULBERSON putting this together and allowing us time to talk about our heroes on the street.

During your shift as a police officer or as a sheriff's deputy, you go into roll call or you go into briefing and start your day with info or assignments. You check out your equipment. You go over and you get in your car. You go to the gas pumps and you fill up the gas. And you might talk to some of the other officers or the other deputies about what is happening on the street or what happened the night before, and you start your day.

Your day might start off with talking to your partner and trying to find out a little bit more about them if you don't know them, because that happens on a day-to-day basis—new officers are put in with officers every day—just trying to find out what your thoughts are, what your tactics are, what your training is, and how you feel like you are going to feel out these situations. This is the start of a police officer's day.

For 18 years I was a Los Angeles police officer, and I served on the front

lines in a police car for 17 of those 18 years. So, as they say, I was out pushing the sled around for 12 hours a day, snooping and pooping, looking for bad guys, and protecting and serving. On the side of my car, that is exactly what it said, "to protect and to serve." That is what a police officer does.

It is not like the shows that you see on TV. Some of it is boring time, some of it is high adrenalin, but all of it is service to the community. Every second, every minute of your shift is service to the community.

So if we are out there enforcing the law, making a traffic stop, making an arrest, or just, as 1-Adam-12 used to do, go and respond to a "see the man," "see the woman," and help and just serve, that is a day-to-day.

I didn't know Deputy Goforth, but I feel like he was a brother in arms because he was. He was someone who went out and served his community, served them with honor, served them with integrity. And I am sure that the community is better for his years of service.

□ 2000

I am sure over the next decade or generations that they won't forget Deputy Goforth's commitment to the community. There will be a memorial. There will be a yearly service. People will talk about what he meant to the community.

I was in the 990 class in LAPD. The very first female officer who died in the line of duty for LAPD was in the 590 class. Our class was taken out of its normal duty of going and learning how to be a professional law enforcement officer, and we went to the service for that officer.

Tina Kerbrat was the very first female officer who died in LAPD, and it was very similar to Deputy Goforth. It was basically a shooting, an assassination.

This will always stay with you when you go to a law enforcement officer's funeral. You will never forget it. You will see the thousands of people.

Just like many of the Members said today, the thousands of people that came from other departments all over the country, all over the world, come to pay their respects to the law enforcement professional who did everything that they could to protect their community.

My squadron leader in my academy class died in Afghanistan. He was a law enforcement officer with LAPD who was a SWAT officer. He did his duty, went to Afghanistan to fight for our ideals and for our morals with the United States Marine Corps. He died in Afghanistan doing the same thing that he would do on a 24-hour-a-day basis, protecting what we believe here in America.

I am honored to be able to stand and talk about our heroes on the street,

talk about the people who protect our community on a day-to-day basis, put their lives on the line so that we can live the life that we choose.

Mr. CULBERSON. STEVE, thank you for your service to the people of Los Angeles and California.

I think, as Congressman KNIGHT said, it is so important to remember that these young men and women are serving their community. They do it out of the goodness of their heart and the love for their neighbors, to help their fellow man to try to make their communities a better place.

God bless you. Thank you for your service.

I am proud to have with us tonight the congressman from the Ninth District of North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER) to express the feelings of the people of North Carolina that he represents about law enforcement.

Mr. PITTENGER. Thank you. I am so grateful that the gentleman from Texas took the leadership in honoring and paying tribute to those who defend and protect us in our own communities.

Madam Speaker, tonight I can think of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Officers Harlan Proctor, Ashley Brown, and Scott Evett who, in the aftermath of a horrific domestic violence homicide and arson earlier this year, used their own time and their own money to purchase clothes and toys for the children left behind. They never expected to get any type of recognition.

Madam Speaker, I think of my friend Detective Shane Page, who volunteered for the Violent Criminal Apprehension Team, who was shot and seriously wounded while attempting to arrest a dangerous suspect who was hiding out in a quiet neighborhood.

Earlier this year I met Cornelius Police Lieutenant James Quattlebaum at Carolinas Medical Center. He had just been shot earlier that day while responding to a domestic disturbance.

And Charlotte-Mecklenburg Police Lieutenant Nate King was conducting routine police business last year when a frantic mother drove up and placed a lifeless baby in his arms. The 6-month-old baby was choking to death. But thanks to Lieutenant King's lifesaving efforts, the little girl made a full recovery.

Every day thousands of brave superheroes go to work to serve and protect our children, our homes, and our communities. The pay is low. The hours are long. They are often screamed at. They are hit. They are spit upon and even bitten. Yet, they show back up for work each and every day. Would we?

Madam Speaker, we should encourage greater dialogue between our local police departments and the community, and we should encourage the best possible training. We should demand accountability because no one is above the law.

However, we should also teach our children to have a healthy respect for law enforcement and work hard to recognize the bravery and everyday good deeds of America's law enforcement. We expect them to be at their best when we are at our worst.

Thank you to America's law enforcement, who are truly committed to both serve and to protect.

Mr. CULBERSON. ROBERT, thank you very much.

We are still waiting, Mr. President, for you to step up and tell America how proud you are of our law enforcement men and women and to hear you condemn, Mr. President, this violent, dangerous rhetoric that is encouraging mentally unbalanced people to attack our law enforcement officers, as Deputy Sheriff Goforth was murdered in Houston, Texas.

We are still waiting, Mr. President. But while we wait, Members of Congress are standing here on the floor tonight to tell America how proud we are of our men and women in uniform.

I am proud to yield to my colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. OLSON).

Mr. OLSON. I thank my fellow Texan from the Seventh Congressional District of Texas, Mr. CULBERSON.

My friends, America has a problem. I have lived here for 52 years and I have never heard the word "assassination" in the same sentence as "police officer" or "sheriff's deputy" as I have in the past 6 months.

Harris County Deputy Sheriff Darren Goforth was assassinated a few weeks ago doing his job. As my colleagues mentioned, he was in uniform, pumping gas at a service station in his sheriff's cruiser in a very nice neighborhood in Houston, Texas, and gunned down in cold blood, assassinated.

The shooter shot and shot and shot and shot and shot and shot and shot and shot until Deputy Goforth dropped dead protecting us.

He left behind a wife, Kathleen, and two young kids who won't have a father walk them down the aisle when they get married.

I want to go up there to the site of the assassination and pray with fellow Texans. I took this picture yesterday at the Chevron gas station.

As you can see, there are flowers everywhere and notes and stuffed animals, little stuffed teddy bears. This was replayed over and over and over. That was just one day.

And right on the sidewalk are all sorts of colored chalk with messages for Deputy Sheriff Goforth. "Darren Goforth, we love you," "Thank you," "Rest in peace."

I felt rejuvenated about America at that moment, but it got better.

I am coming home to Sugar Land, Texas. That is my neighborhood. It is at Alcorn Oaks Drive and Oakland Drive in my hometown.

These are six amazing young Texans with a lemonade stand for police. It

says “Blue lives matter.” These kids get it. They get it. They get it. We should love and praise our officers and thank them, thank them, thank them for their sacrifice.

I have to mention, too, my friend, I bought a glass of lemonade there, the most expensive one I have ever purchased, close to \$20.

In closing, these men and women protect us every single day from people who want to hurt us and hurt our families. They deserve our love, support, and admiration, and to know that we always have their backs.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, PETE.

It is a privilege to yield to my colleague representing the people of central Indiana, the Congresswoman from the Fifth District, Congresswoman SUSAN BROOKS.

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for holding this very important Special Order tonight because now, more than ever, it is more important than ever that we recognize and thank our Nation's law enforcement officers. These are the loyal and selfless men and women all across America who wake up each and every day and serve our community.

Madam Speaker, police officers are an integral part of our communities and our neighborhoods, working every day and at all hours to keep us safe. From downtown city blocks to small town squares, from country roads to busy highways, our Nation's law enforcement officers are always there, always ready to serve.

As we have heard, they are fathers and brothers, mothers and sisters, husbands, wives, sons, and daughters. Some are friends. Some are neighbors. Some are the strangers that we see every day.

But we often don't even see them. They are on our morning commutes. They are on our trips to the grocery store. They are all around us.

They are fellow citizens who have answered the call to serve and protect and, in some cases, pay the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and welfare of those in their communities. They protect their families and loved ones, and they protect the lives of complete strangers day in and day out.

You may not know, but throughout U.S. history, over 20,000 law enforcement officers have made the ultimate sacrifice. Last year four Hoosiers lost their lives while upholding their vow to serve and protect.

And, unfortunately, as we have seen, this has been an incredibly deadly August. Violence against police officers has skyrocketed recently, with six officers being mercilessly gunned down by individuals who neither respect law and order nor the value of human life. These officers' sacrifices as well as that of their families do not go unnoticed or unappreciated.

In fact, this August the family of Jake Laird, an officer who was gunned down in August of 2004—and we have to think about the families—held another golf outing in order to raise money for more protective vests for law enforcement and more personal safety equipment for firefighters.

These families—and I have seen them. I have witnessed them firsthand. They are remarkable families. They display courage in the face of adversity, compassion in the face of hardship, and an undying commitment to serve the communities in which they live. We must thank them, the families and the officers.

So today I salute the men and women in uniform who every day head out to the streets. They cover their beats. They patrol their precincts. They take up again without fail the call to serve and protect.

We must be thankful for their service and send our thoughts and prayers to their loved ones because, without hesitation, we must renew our appreciation for and our steadfast commitment to the heroic men and women who are part of that thin blue line. Please thank a police officer.

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. At this time, it is my privilege to yield to my colleague and good friend representing the people of North Carolina, Ms. FOXX.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON) for organizing and conducting this Special Order tonight to honor our law enforcement personnel.

I do my best every time I see someone in law enforcement to say thank you. I go out of my way to say thank you.

I point out to them, whether they are local, State, or national people in law enforcement, that we owe to them and to our military people the ability that we have to move around this country and do the things that we do every day because of their willingness to serve and to put their lives on the line every single day of their lives.

We have seen, unfortunately, in the past few weeks a spate of senseless killings of our wonderful law enforcement people. And I think it is wonderful, again, that my colleagues are here tonight to say thank you.

I want to encourage them, also—and I know many do—to say thank you to our law enforcement people every day as they go about protecting us, our families. I want to thank their families, also, for the sacrifices they make.

Thank you, Congressman CULBERSON, for your efforts.

□ 2015

Mr. CULBERSON. Madam Speaker, it is my privilege now to yield to the gen-

tleman from northern California (Mr. LAMALFA), representing the First District.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you to my colleague, Mr. CULBERSON. It is really, really good and proper that you are having this time here tonight, and I am glad to be able to join you with that.

Madam Speaker, it is amazing to me that we even have to have this conversation. It is always a good conversation to have to honor our officers that put their lives on the line in so many aspects of our lives, whether it is highway patrol or sheriff or city police, park rangers, fish and game. All of them out there have some level of risk in order to maintain what it is we want in a free society for our security.

What is so tragic about what is happening lately is it is coming down to a racial issue, so much that the sides are becoming much sharper and sharper as to what America is or what Americans are about. We need to get together on this. The enforcement of the law, the upholding of the law, the protection of families, of homes, this cuts across all lines.

Indeed, I just saw a bit on the news a few minutes ago here where a gentleman in Florida—his name is George Cooper, as I recall; he happens to be Black. He came to the defense of an officer who happens to be White who was being beaten in some type of an altercation there where he was trying to do his job.

There are examples where, as the gentleman said in the interview, it isn't a race thing, it doesn't matter who is White or who is Black in this thing, it is about upholding the law and about having safe neighborhoods for all of us for Americans to be able to thrive.

It is tragic that so much is going on trying to pit Americans against each other. Yes, we have problems; we have issues that need to be resolved within how some may enforce the law, but we have protocols for that. We need to make sure that they are followed and they are prosecuted, but it doesn't make the whole aura of law enforcement somehow wrong.

Indeed, the effects we are seeing with cities now where cops are backing off, crime rates are going up, murders are going up in some of these cities here dramatically—I heard in one of the cities that it is 96 percent.

This is not what we want. It is not good for the families, for the moms that have to watch their kids go out the door and wonder if they are going to come back because there isn't that law enforcement.

I want to share with you a piece, though, that I think really encapsulates this, by a great American, Paul Harvey, from some years ago: What are Policemen Made Of?

A policeman is a composite of what all men are, mingling of a saint and sinner, dust and deity.

Gulled statistics wave the fan over the stinkers, underscore instances of dishonesty and brutality because they are “new.” What they really mean is that they are exceptional, unusual, not commonplace.

Buried under the frost is the fact: Less than one-half of one percent of policemen misfit the uniform. That’s a better average than you’d find among clergy.

What is a policeman made of? He, among all men, is once the most needed and the most unwanted. He’s a strangely nameless creature who is “sir” to his face and “pig” or “fuzz” to his back.

He must be such a diplomat that he can settle differences between individuals so that each will think he won.

But . . . if the policeman is neat, he’s conceited; if he’s careless, he’s a bum. If he’s pleasant, he’s flirting; if not, he’s a grouch. He must make an instant decision which would require months for a lawyer to make.

But . . . if he hurries, he’s careless; if he’s deliberate, he’s lazy. He must be first to an accident and infallible with his diagnosis. He must be able to start breathing, stop bleeding, tie splints, and, above all, be sure the victim goes home without a limp. Or expect to be sued.

The police officer must know every gun, draw on the run, and hit where it doesn’t hurt. He must be able to whip two men twice his size and half his age without damaging his uniform and without being “brutal.” If you hit him, he’s a coward. If he hits you, he’s a bully.

A policeman must know everything—and not tell. He must know where all the sin is and not partake.

A policeman must, from a single strand of hair, be able to describe the crime, the weapon and the criminal—and tell you where the criminal is hiding.

But . . . if he catches the criminal, he’s lucky; if he doesn’t, he’s a dunce. If he gets promoted, he has political pull; if he doesn’t, he’s a dullard. The policeman must chase a bum lead to a dead-end, stake out 10 nights to tag one witness who saw it happen—but refused to remember.

The policeman must be a minister, a social worker, a diplomat, a tough guy, and a gentleman.

And, of course, he’d have to be genius . . . for he will have to feed his family on a policeman’s salary.

This is just a sample of what officers go through across this country where they, giving of themselves in service many times, especially in this present environment, feel like they are somehow made wrong for having done so.

We are here to uphold that tonight and tell them: You are doing it right. We support you and appreciate the thin blue line.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think that Congressman LAMALFA expressed it very well. Police officers are expected to do their job perfectly every time and in so many ways that we cannot even imagine the work that they do to help keep us safe, the work that they do to improve our communities, the sacrifices that they make on a personal level.

They are counselors; they are mentors; they are enforcers, and above all, they are preservers and protectors of our liberty because, without law enforcement, there is no liberty. That responsibility is vested in one person in our Constitution. Only the President of the United States is charged by our Founders in the Constitution with faithfully taking care that the law be faithfully executed.

We are still waiting, Mr. President. We are still waiting for you to step up, as we are here tonight, to say how proud you are of our men and women in blue, who protect us every night and every day and must do their job perfectly, as DOUG LAMALFA just told us, every man and woman who wears the uniform, who would step in front of a bullet for each and every one of us.

We are still waiting, Mr. President, for you to condemn the vital rhetoric that tell the men and women across this Nation, who defend us every day on the streets of America, how proud you are, Mr. President. We need you to step up and tell them, tell us all, how proud you are of their sacrifice, of their service, of their dedication, to tell all the widows and the children of Darren Goforth and all the other officers who have lost their lives that their father’s loss, their mother’s loss, their sacrifice was not in vain.

As Dr. Ed Young told us all last Friday at 11 a.m., the sacrifice that Darren Goforth made galvanized the people of Houston, the people of Texas. We see it across the Nation from California to Missouri to Indiana, to the East Coast. The people of America stand behind our law enforcement officers.

We are proud of you. We love you. We respect you. We recognize what a sacrifice you have made for not enough money to protect us. We know all that you do. We understand the burden that you and your family carry.

As Kathleen Goforth said in her statement of her late husband:

There are no words for this. Darren was an incredibly intricate blend of toughness and gentility. He was always loyal, fiercely so. Darren was ethical. The right thing to do is what guided his internal compass.

She said:

Darren was good. If people want to know what kind of man he was, this is it. Darren was who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor. However, it was I who was blessed so richly, that I had the privilege of calling him my husband and my best friend.

We are immensely proud of every man and woman who wears the uniform, and we will not forget the sacrifice of Darren Goforth or all the other men and women who preserve our liberty and protect our lives and put their lives on the line for us every day. We are immensely proud of you.

If the President of the United States won’t say it, we will here in this House, that we stand behind you, we are proud

of you, we pray for you every day, and we have got your back.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to a perceived viewing audience.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 64, DISAPPROVAL OF AGREEMENT RELATING TO NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX (during the special order of Mr. CULBERSON) from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-256) on the resolution (H. Res. 408) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 64) disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our Republican colleagues for reminding us that this Nation is dependent upon those men and women that serve as police officers, as deputy sheriffs, and in other positions.

Certainly, the deaths that we have seen and the murders that we have seen in recent days are a tragedy, and they cannot go without our notice. I appreciate it.

I don’t, however, think it is the President’s fault, so let us move on here.

I want to talk about something that is coming up here in the next couple of days, an extremely important issue for all of us. While violence in America and violence against police officers are important issues, this issue is also extremely important.

The Congress of the United States is going to take up the issue of the Iran deal, the nuclear deal between the P5+1—China, Russia, Germany, France, United Kingdom, and the United States—negotiated over the course of 2-plus years an agreement with Iran that would block Iran’s ability to create a nuclear weapon.

Prior to this agreement, the Iranian Government, in secret, was rapidly moving towards the development of a nuclear weapon. They had created an infrastructure that included the various centrifuges to concentrate the uranium into low-enriched uranium and then on into highly enriched uranium, which is the uranium that is necessary for a nuclear weapon.

They are also in the process of building a heavy water reactor that would be capable of producing plutonium, the other route to a nuclear weapon. This was done in secret over many years, dating back probably 15, maybe even 20 years.

For the last 10 years, the United States has placed sanctions on Iran to try to convince them that they should not be developing a nuclear weapon, that there would be significant economic sanctions and other sanctions imposed on the country.

Those sanctions did not go successfully. The Congress of the United States added sanctions. I, together with many of my colleagues here, I think almost unanimously on the floor of the House voted to impose those ever harsher sanctions, but it didn't work until the P5+1 got together.

Secretary Clinton at that time, 3 years ago, 4 years ago, worked with those countries, persuading them to sit down at the table together with the United States to see if it was possible to negotiate an agreement with Iran that would prevent Iran from ever having a nuclear weapon. This spring, the agreements began to come together, and in June, July, the agreements were culminated.

I want to talk tonight about those agreements and what they mean to the United States, to the Middle East, and to the world. The very short way of saying this is that this agreement is the most recent and the most significant nonnuclear proliferation agreement in the last decade, maybe even longer.

Iran was very, very close to a nuclear weapon, so much so that it was believed that they could have a nuclear weapon very soon. Perhaps in 3 to 5 months, they could have material for perhaps nine weapons and be able to perfect those weapons into a bomb that could be delivered through their missile systems or through some mechanism.

Where are we today? We are going to vote. As I understand, I think there is a rule that just came across the desk a few moments ago that would put us in line to vote up or down on the Iranian agreement, and I understand that that vote will be taking place on Friday of this week—a very, very significant moment in the history of nuclear proliferation or nonproliferation.

Let's take a look at where we are. First, the agreement came about as a result of six nations, the largest economies in the world, sitting down and negotiating with Iran.

What did those countries think about the deal that they signed onto?

□ 2030

This isn't just the United States. This deal was signed onto by the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, China, and the United States.

So, if the United States Congress—the House and the Senate—were to trash this agreement, what do those countries think?

We don't have to guess what they think. They actually have said, categorically, their position on the deal, and their position is clear. We signed onto it, they said. We agreed to this deal, and here is what we think if the United States Congress negates this deal.

Let's start with the French. Frederic Dore, the French Embassy Deputy Chief of Mission, said this in meetings with the United States Senate—and I understand that we will be meeting with the representatives of these countries later this week.

The position of the French is: World powers have secured the best deal possible with Iran.

The best deal possible.

All right. How about Germany?

The German Government's position is—as stated by Philipp Ackermann, the Acting German Ambassador to the United States, before the U.S. Senate and, again, in the Foreign Policy magazine, on August 6, 2015—the prospect of the rejection of a deal makes us nervous. It would be a nightmare for every European country if this deal is rejected.

Then there is the United Kingdom, again, in the Foreign Policy magazine, on August 6, in words similar to this, or, perhaps, these exact words were said to the U.S. Senate a couple of weeks ago:

If Congress rejects this good deal and the U.S. is forced to walk away, Iran will be left with an unconstrained nuclear program with far weaker monitoring arrangements than the current international consensus on sanctions, and the current international consensus on sanctions would unravel, and international unity and pressure on Iran would be seriously undermined.

The P5+1 all signed onto the agreement, and all but the United States has said categorically: Therefore, the agreement. They are not looking to renegotiate, only the United States. So it is up to us, the Members of Congress, to decide whether to stay with the agreement that was negotiated by the United States Government and five other countries and confirmed by the European Union and the United Nations.

So where do we go?

Let's assume for a moment that the Senate and the House reject the deal. Will these countries come back to the negotiating table?

The information we have from the meeting with the United States Senators—and all of these countries were there—was, no, they are not going to go back to the negotiating table. I think I said “all of these countries.” I don't think China and Russia were at that meeting. Yet the word is that they

are not going to go back to the negotiating table, so we would have to negotiate by ourselves. Keep in mind that we attempted to do that for many, many years without any success. It was only when all of these countries got together that the sanctions really hit Iran in such a way that they decided to come to the table and to make the agreement which is now before the Congress.

Let's go about that deal. What is it? This is basically what it is here.

The deal blocks for at least 15 years—and, quite possibly, indefinitely into the future—Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon.

I am going to come back to this timeline, but I want to go here first.

So no deal. Without a deal. If the United States Congress this week and next week vote to do away with the deal, then where are we?

Iran has sufficient low enriched uranium and the ability to further enrich that uranium to highly enriched uranium—in other words, weapons grade uranium—for approximately nine nuclear bombs. The number of centrifuges that they presently have are some 19,000 centrifuges, and that would be used to complete the enrichment process. Then the time to produce a bomb's worth of material—highly enriched uranium—is a couple of months, 2 or 3 months.

Presumably, under the present situation, with no deal, Iran would be able to move forward, as they have been in the past, for the full development of nuclear weapons within a matter of months. That is not a good situation.

However, with a deal, where are we?

Iran's low enriched uranium and what amount of highly enriched uranium they have would be significantly reduced to an amount that would be insufficient to make even one nuclear weapon, and there would be verification procedures to assure that they would not be able to make any additional nuclear weapons. The number of centrifuges that they would be able to have are old, antiquated, and would be some 6,000-plus, and all four pathways to a nuclear bomb are blocked. That is the choice we have. That is the choice we have.

Now, what does this mean over time?

Over time, for a long time—25 years or more—the implementation of additional protocols, commitments to reprocess plutonium, and the nonproliferation treaty obligations remain in place indefinitely into the future—way beyond 25 years. So, as for the nonproliferation treaty, they have upped it once more. They have agreed to it again. Now, granted, they weren't paying attention to it in the past, but now we have verification procedures.

Secondly, there would be continuous surveillance of uranium mines and mills so that we know what they are doing. Are they mining uranium? What

are they doing with it? What are their mills doing? That would continue for 25 years.

There would be continued surveillance of centrifuge production for 20 years. Now, you don't make highly enriched uranium in procedures other than centrifuges unless you go to some very, very advanced procedures, which we do not believe Iran can do, and those procedures that are currently available to Iran and would be into the future are monitored for 20 years.

The low enriched stockpile, which is several thousand kilograms, would be reduced and capped at 300 kilograms, and there would be no further enrichment for new highly enriched uranium beyond a very, very small amount for research purposes; and the heavy water reactor that could produce plutonium within a matter of a couple of years would be, basically, decommissioned and be unable to produce plutonium, and that would go for the next 15 years. In the short period of time, 10 years to 15 years, these other procedures that prevent the operation of the centrifuges would be in place.

This is how you block the path to nuclear weapons. All of these procedures are in place. Scientists, physicists, generals, and others have all looked at this and have all come to the conclusion that, hey, this works. This will block Iran from developing a nuclear weapon for a minimum of 15 years, probably 20 years, and assuming that we are able to hold them to the agreement, 25 years and beyond. That is the nonproliferation treaty.

Now, all of this, of course, is dependent upon verification. We don't trust Iran. We don't need to trust Iran. In fact, we should go into this not trusting Iran. Therefore, do we have sufficient verification procedures in place to hold Iran to the deal?

The answer is yes.

The International Atomic Energy Agency, the IAEA, is and has been for decades the United Nations' watchdog for the nonproliferation treaty. They have been in Iran in the past. They have observed cheating. They have observed obfuscation. However, under the new agreement, the doors are open to all of the facilities that are known to be involved in the nuclear production and the nuclear bomb activities. There is an additional procedure that, within 24 days, should there be an indication of a site that is not now known to be involved in nuclear activity, the IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency, would be able to observe what is going on at that site. As for the other sites—the secret sites of the past—we would have the IAEA observing, monitoring, and verifying that the agreement is being held to its standard.

We also have other methods of knowing what is going on in Iran. Nuclear material leaves a radiation signature. We have the capability of reading those

signatures and understanding in detail what is going on at any particular site—past, present, and into the future.

The verifications that are in this treaty are built upon the fact that we do not trust Iran, and, therefore, these verification procedures are the most robust, comprehensive, and extensive in any proliferation treaty with Russia or anybody else. So that is in place.

Now, what if they do cheat?

If they do cheat and if they do not honor the agreement, we will know. That is what the verification is all about. It is agreed by the P5+1—that is the United Kingdom, which is Britain; France; Germany; Russia; China; the U.N.; and the European Union—that should there be a breach of the procedures in this deal that the sanctions—the toughest of them—would automatically snap back into place and would continue to apply the kind of economic-social pressure on Iran that brought them to the negotiating table in the first place.

Can we trust these countries to snap back?

I believe we can. It is an agreement that they have made not just with the United States but with each other.

Now, if they don't, we still have our own sanctions, which are tough, which provide us with an ability to put a lot of pressure on Iran, even though not as much as the other countries together with us could do; but, nonetheless, those sanctions are always available to us now and on into the future should Iran renege in any way on this deal.

There are a couple of other things about this that we need to consider.

There is a lot of talk that this deal would free a vast amount of money that Iran has had sequestered—having been known to get their hands on a vast amount of money. The numbers bandied about are \$150 billion. It has been said by the Treasury Department and by the Secretary of State that the amount is actually closer to \$100 billion. That is a lot of money. There is great fear—and, I think, appropriately—that Iran would use that money to advance, enhance, and increase its support of terrorism around the world—specifically in the Middle East—and against Israel.

□ 2045

I suppose that is a possibility. But when an analysis is done of that money, about \$40 billion of that \$100 billion is owed to other countries and other entities outside of Iran.

So as soon as that sanction is removed and that money is available, then \$40 billion of the \$100 billion is not available to Iran. It is in some other country's hand.

The remaining money presumably could be used for support of terrorist activities. However, we should keep in mind that Iran has been heavily hit by the existing sanctions, so much so that their economy is in terrible condition.

Their infrastructure, specifically in the oil arena, is woefully old, inadequate, and not capable of significant production. So they are going to need to invest a lot of money in that and in other infrastructure.

How much money would be available for terrorism? Far more than we would want. And, therefore, we need to be certain that our support for those countries that are fighting the terrorist activity in the Middle East and beyond have the full support of the United States Government, people, and our Treasury.

It is going to cost us some money, but this is something we are going to have to do. We must make certain that Israel has whatever it needs to counter whatever terrorist threats there may be and whatever threats there may be in the more conventional military sense.

Already we are preparing to ship to Israel our most advanced fighters, the F-35, which is just now coming off our production lines, and there will be a lot of other equipment made available.

Certainly, with regard to intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, we will continue to work with Israel very closely as we have for many, many years, in fact, decades. All of that is there.

We also need to be aware that the other Gulf state countries and other countries in the area that have been subject to Iranian attacks and trouble need our support.

We should also be willing, as we have in the past and as we are committed to now, to provide them with the support that they need to push back not only on terrorism, but on overt Iranian military activity.

So here we are. Deal? No deal? No deal. Is there a better deal? Highly unlikely that the P5+1 will ever come back together again to negotiate a better deal.

So we would probably almost certainly have to do it by ourselves. We have already proved in the past, before the P5+1 went into existence, that we were not successful alone negotiating a deal with Iran.

The sanctions by our country alone were insufficient. But, as a global community, we were sufficient. And that is where the P5+1 comes in. Listen carefully to what those countries are saying about a renegotiation, "not likely."

So where are we? I believe we have to support this deal that was put together by these six major countries, supported by the European Union and the United Nations. This is the path that would block all paths to a nuclear weapon that Iran might be able to pursue for at least the next 15 years and beyond.

I ask my colleagues to look hard at this. Unfortunately, a lot of the newspapers are portraying this as a partisan fight. I don't believe it is. I know that

many of my colleagues on the Democratic side and certainly what appears to be most Republicans, if not all, are opposed to the deal. I am certain many of them have their own reasons for that opposition.

But I think, when you take a comprehensive look at this deal, when you look at all of the elements, that is, what happens if there is no deal and Iran can immediately restart its nuclear weapons program, you go, "Whoa. That is not a good thing."

On the other hand, if this deal holds, then Iran will be prevented from having a nuclear weapon for at least 15 years, quite probably 20 years.

Should they continue to honor the nonproliferation treaty, then it would go on indefinitely. That is a good thing. And, therefore, I support this negotiated deal and I ask my colleagues to do the same.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have completed my time on the floor.

I notice that two of my colleagues are here to speak to the passing of one of our Members of this House who served here for many, many years.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS STOKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend deepest thanks to Congressman GARAMENDI for sharing his time with us and, also, to Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, who has been waiting almost an hour to share her memories of a very great American.

We are here this evening, Mr. Speaker, and we rise to honor the illustrious career of a dear friend and stellar colleague, the late Congressman Louis Stokes from Cleveland, Ohio.

Our hearts are heavy, but immensely grateful for his path-breaking life and legendary generous service. As the first African American Member of Congress elected to serve from Ohio, he wrote new history for America, for Ohio, every day of his life.

Rising from the public housing projects of Cleveland, he and his brother Carl became revered as they built a more inclusive and representative America. What courage and passion that required.

A proud, personable, and gracious man whose fashion and manner exuded dignity, it was actually never his aspiration to be a politician. He opted instead to serve the local neighborhoods of Cleveland, where he grew up, after returning from 3 years of service in the U.S. Army during World War II.

After using his GI benefits to go to college, Lou served in the Veterans Ad-

ministration and the Treasury Department before attending law school. He loved the law. He loved being a lawyer, and he loved writing laws here.

His enlightened leadership moved America forward socially, economically, and legally. In Congress, his gentlemanly demeanor and sharp intellect allowed him to chair, again, as the first African American, the Appropriations subcommittee on Veterans, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies.

As a much newer, younger Member of Congress, I had the great privilege of serving under him as he chaired that important committee.

He also chaired the House Select Committee on Assassinations and served on the House Select Committee to investigate covert arms transactions with Iran. His agile legal mind was evident in the investigations he conducted.

The people of Cleveland and Ohio have been blessed throughout his life and hold abiding gratitude for his extraordinary accomplishments and generous spirit. I can still hear his laugh.

I am privileged, actually, to have served with Congressman Stokes for almost a quarter century and hold lasting memories of his deep love for his wife, for his mother, for his brother, for his children, and his grandchildren.

He had indefatigable and inspired efforts to gain respect and equal justice in the law for all of our citizens. And he saw progress, great progress, in his lifetime that we have so far to go.

I witnessed his perseverance in building America's communities forward and his dedication to meeting our Nation's obligations to veterans, to advance space science, and to catapult Cleveland's health and human services to the top rung of national assets.

I have so many memories of Congressman Stokes. I can remember one time in a subcommittee he had the head of Arlington Cemetery come up, and he had these big volumes that he brought with him of who were the veterans who were interred there.

And Congressman Stokes pointed out to the entire committee, "Go down and read the roster." And the roster said, "No name," "No name," "No name," "No name." And Congressman Stokes informed us that, in fact, those were Africa Americans who had died in service to our country, but they were buried with no name at Arlington. And he made sure that that area was especially recognized, and he was writing history for America for the first time.

I thought, wow, this isn't 1870. This was in the 1980s and 1990s. He was a great teacher.

I shall sorely miss his dogged determination, easy smile, keen and measured counsel, and persevering nature.

The last time we were together was at a Fair Housing meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, just a few months ago.

Looking back on his generous attendance at age 90 and looking in really great shape, I think it was his way—he hadn't told anyone yet what was ailing him, but I think it was his way of saying good-bye.

What a gracious gentleman he was. What a gifted leader has lived among us.

I am going to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a special story that was in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled, "Lou Stokes—The Congressman, Leading Lawyer, and Towering Political Presence Has Died," written by Brent Larkin, Tom Diemer, and Sabrina Eaton of the Northeast Ohio Media Group.

Though I won't read the entire article into the record tonight, let me just read a few sentences:

"We have been blessed as a family with a legacy we can always be proud of," Lou Stokes said. "Together with Carl"—his brother—"we made a name that stood for something. What greater honor could have come to two brothers who grew up in poverty here in Cleveland?"

And he tells a story about his mother. He would always get tears in his eyes when he would talk of his mother. She had become ill at one point, and he went to visit her.

And he said, "I took her hands to give her some comfort and, when I felt those hard, cold hands from scrubbing floors in order to give me an education, I began to understand what her life was about, what her life meant." And that piercing memory Lou carried with him every day of his life.

"Beginning in junior high school, Stokes took jobs delivering the Cleveland News, shining shoes, and working in a small factory that made canned whipped cream."

When he was 16, a man named Isadore Apisdorf hired him to perform odd jobs at his Army-Navy surplus store on lower Prospect Avenue. Seeing something in the youngster, Apisdorf ignored the risk to his business in those days and hired Stokes as a salesman.

When speaking of his early years, Stokes always remembered to mention the kindness demonstrated to him by a man "who sort of acted like a father to me," Congressman Stokes said.

Stokes graduated from Central High School in 1943. And with World War II raging, he joined the Army and was assigned to a segregated unit that remained Stateside, mainly in the south.

Stokes recalled a layover his unit once had in Memphis where a group of German prisoners of war in a train station restaurant were treated better than the Black soldiers.

Louis Stokes embodied so many memories and so much progress that he helped not just Cleveland, not just Ohio, but our country and people everywhere to persevere, no matter what the odds.

I shall miss him. What a gifted leader has lived among us. I know all of the people of Ohio join me, as do our colleagues, in saying: May the angels carry him to a deserved, peaceful rest close to the heart of God.

There are other Members that wish to speak this evening. I just feel very honored to be here. I can still see Lou in the cloakroom in the back with his good friend, Bill Clay, and some of the guys. We weren't included, as women, in those conversations, but we respected them.

And he was always cordial. He always sort of stood halfway turned so he could say hello to those Members going by. He had a special gracious manner about him.

[From Cleveland.com, Aug. 19, 2015]

LOU STOKES—THE CONGRESSMAN, LEADING LAWYER AND TOWERING POLITICAL PRESENCE HAS DIED

(By Brent Larkin)

CLEVELAND, OH.—Louis Stokes, whose iconic career in public life assures him a place as one of the most revered, respected and powerful figures in Cleveland history, died Tuesday night.

He was 90.

The older brother of former Mayor Carl B. Stokes had an aggressive form of cancer, diagnosed in late June.

A proud, personable and gracious man whose dress and manner exuded dignity, Stokes never wanted to be a politician, aspiring instead to become Cleveland's leading black lawyer.

But the reluctant officeholder who came to Congress in 1969 left it 30 years later as a towering political figure both in Washington and at home.

Mayor Frank Jackson was one of dozens to publicly mourn the death of his longtime friend.

"Congressman Louis Stokes' long career in public life was a model of how to serve with dignity, integrity and honor," Jackson said. "His service paved the way for many who would follow in both public and private careers. I know full well that, but for him, I would have never had the opportunity to become mayor."

For more than three decades, Stokes, his brother, former Council President George Forbes, and former Cleveland School Board President Arnold Pinkney dominated every aspect of black political life in the city.

Now, only Forbes survives.

"The four of us had parallel careers in public life," Forbes said. "It was not unusual for some of the things we did or said to be questioned. But not Lou Stokes. If he said it, or did it, it was like a pronouncement from Sinai. It was the gospel. It was the last word. No one disagreed with him."

Stokes' resume in the House included stints as chairman of the select committee that from 1976 to 1978 investigated the assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King Jr., chairman of the House Ethics Committee, a member of the House select committee that investigated the Iran-Contra affair, and the first black to chair the Intelligence Committee and serve on the influential House Appropriations Committee.

In Cleveland, Stokes' political muscle was the 21st Congressional District Caucus, a political organization founded by his late brother that became so powerful, its ability

to influence election outcomes sometimes surpassed that of the Cuyahoga County Democratic Party.

When Stokes and the caucus urged Democrats in his district to vote against a sitting Democratic president in the Ohio presidential primary in 1980, they did just that, supporting Massachusetts Sen. Edward Kennedy over President Jimmy Carter by a margin of nearly 2-1.

Stokes never lost an election. Nor did he forget where he came from.

And he never strayed from his commitment to expand political and economic opportunities for minorities.

In an interview at his home just a month before his death and days after he learned of his terminal illness, Stokes emotionally reminisced on his storybook life.

"I was a very blessed guy," he began. "I've been blessed with the opportunity to participate in history, to rise to opportunities I never envisioned . . . and to provide for people opportunities that, in many cases, they would have never had."

"We have been blessed as a family with a legacy we can always be proud of. Together with Carl, we made a name that stood for something."

"What greater honor could have come to two brothers who grew up in poverty here in Cleveland?"

HUMBLE BEGINNINGS

Lou Stokes was born Feb. 23, 1925, the first of two children born to Charles and Louise Stokes. Carl was born a little more than two years later.

Their father died when Lou was three, and Louise Stokes took an \$8-a-day job as a domestic worker at homes in the eastern suburbs. To help raise the young boys in their small apartment on East 69th Street, Louise's mother moved to Cleveland from Georgia.

Stokes spoke often and with great emotion of his mother, and her repeated lectures on the importance of an education.

"One night, she was lying in bed ill and I went into her room and sat with her," Stokes recalled during an interview last year at the Maltz Museum of Jewish Heritage.

"I took her hands to give her some comfort. And when I felt those hard, cold hands from scrubbing floors in order to give me an education, I began to understand what she meant."

Beginning in junior high, Stokes took jobs delivering the Cleveland News, shining shoes and working in a small factory that made canned whip cream.

When Stokes was 16, Isadore Apisdorf hired him to perform odd jobs at his Army-Navy surplus store on lower Prospect Avenue. Seeing something in the youngster, Apisdorf ignored the risks to his business and hired Stokes as a salesman.

When speaking of his early years, Stokes always remembered to mention the kindness demonstrated to him by a man "who sort of acted like a father to me."

Stokes graduated from Central High School in 1943. With World War II raging, he joined the Army and was assigned to a segregated unit that remained stateside, mainly in the South. Stokes recalled a layover his unit once had in Memphis where a group of German prisoners of war in a train station restaurant were treated better than the black soldiers.

After the war, Stokes attended Western Reserve University on the G.I. Bill. He worked for a time for the Veterans Administration and Treasury Department before graduating from Cleveland State Univer-

sity's Cleveland Marshall College of Law in 1953.

Stokes opened up a small law office on St. Clair Avenue, and was later joined by his brother. Carl also became a lawyer and, in 1962, became the first black Democrat elected to the Ohio House.

Around this time, Stokes drew the attention of Norman Minor, considered one of the greatest lawyers in Ohio history and the greatest black lawyer Cleveland ever produced.

"I tried to be like Norman Minor in every way I could," Stokes recalled in 2014. "Carl loved politics. I didn't have that love. I loved being a lawyer."

MAKING HISTORY

On the night of Nov. 7, 1967, Stokes sat with Martin Luther King Jr. in the Rockefeller Building just west of Public Square, and experienced what he described as "a pioneering political event for America"—Carl Stokes' election as the nation's first black, big-city mayor.

In 1965 and again two years later, King had made numerous trips to Cleveland aimed at registering blacks to vote. Carl Stokes lost the 1965 mayoral primary by about 1,700 votes. Two years later, he beat Republican Seth Taft by about 2,500 votes.

Lou Stokes said King was "tremendously helpful" to his brother in both those elections.

Less than a month after his brother's winning election, Stokes enjoyed his own first moment of fame, arguing a case before the U.S. Supreme Court.

The case involved John Terry, a Cleveland man suspected of preparing to rob a Euclid Avenue store downtown in 1963. Terry and two others were stopped on the sidewalk by a Cleveland policeman, who frisked Terry and found a gun.

The landmark case of Terry v. Ohio upheld the arrest, but allowed police to stop and frisk suspects only when the officer has a "reasonable suspicion" the suspect is about to commit a crime, and may be armed and dangerous.

That same year, another landmark Supreme Court ruling known as "one man, one vote" led to Carl Stokes and Gov. James Rhodes collaborating in the creation of a new, majority-minority congressional district comprised of Cleveland's East Side and some eastern suburbs.

At his brother's urging, a reluctant Lou Stokes put his law career on hold and became a candidate. In the Democratic primary, Stokes beat 13 opponents, including George Forbes, Leo Jackson and George White.

In January 1969, Stokes entered Congress along with Shirley Chisholm of New York and William "Bill" Clay of Missouri. Their elections brought to nine the number of blacks in Congress.

Stokes immediately began to make his mark, becoming a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus a little more than a year after taking office.

Always served well by his personality, Stokes was a tall, hard-working man with a loud, infectious laugh. His gentle nature masked a steely commitment—and, at times, he was viewed as a bit too thin-skinned. Nevertheless, among his colleagues, Stokes was always considered one of the body's most popular members.

When Tip O'Neill became speaker of the U.S. House in 1977, Stokes' career took off. O'Neill's respect for Stokes earned him prestigious and powerful committee assignments, which often translated into federal spending on projects important to Cleveland.

"We had a very special relationship," Stokes said of O'Neill during his July 14 interview. "He used to call me 'Louie, my pal.' He gave me some very tough assignments."

In 1987, Stokes had a memorable back-and-forth with Oliver North during the Iran-Contra hearings, telling the Marine Corps lieutenant colonel, "While I admire your love for America, I just hope you will never forget that others, too, love America just as much as you do—and . . . will die for America just as quickly as you will."

THE POWER BROKER

Back in Cleveland, the 1971 decision by Carl Stokes to leave town for a television career in New York instead of seeking a third term as mayor created a significant power vacuum within the black political establishment.

Stokes moved decisively to fill that vacuum, and Democratic leaders awarded him a co-chairmanship of the county party. But Forbes and Arnold Pinkney were becoming powerful black political figures in their own right.

For the next 10 to 15 years, the inevitable tensions that arise with power-sharing led to public disagreements and some angry private moments—with Call and Post founder and publisher W.O. Walker often serving as a mediator.

Over time, those strains disappeared. And while Forbes would eventually cement a legacy as the most powerful City Council president in Cleveland history and Pinkney twice waged competitive campaigns for mayor and became a nationally recognized political consultant, there was never any doubt who owned the magic political name.

That name at times moved Stokes and the 21st Congressional District Caucus to part ways with the Democratic Party. And Stokes was not above using the caucus as a weapon to punish and defeat candidates he believed did not deserve black votes.

The caucus' influence was often most pronounced in down-the-ballot races for judge and other offices. But in the 1977 election for mayor, one of the most competitive and dramatic in the city's history, support from the Stokes brothers probably made the difference in Dennis Kucinich's victory over Democratic Party-backed Edward Feighan.

Tim Hagan served as Feighan's de facto campaign manager. Several months after the election, he would become chairman of the county's Democratic Party.

"If Congressman Stokes was with you, it gave you unquestioned credibility with the people he represented," said Hagan. "It made the difference between winning or losing an election. Lou's endorsement was the most important endorsement a candidate sought."

There were a few stumbles, but none major. And they did little or nothing to tarnish Stokes' relationship with his constituents. [In 1983, following a late-night session of Congress, he was convicted on a minor charge of driving under the influence and also of running a red light; Stokes said he was overly tired but sober, but decided not to appeal the jury verdict.] In the early 1990s, he had 551 overdrafts at the House Bank, most for small amounts.

In 1993, Stokes reached the height of his power in Congress, joining the prestigious "College of Cardinals" when he became chair of the Appropriations subcommittee for the Veterans Administration and Housing and Urban Development. It was a position that gave Stokes enormous say in how and where tens of billions in federal dollars were spent. The Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Cen-

ter on East 105th Street is one of several Cleveland buildings named in his honor.

But his enthusiasm for the job would soon wane. In 1994, Republicans took control of the House. Two years later, at age 71, Stokes had open heart surgery at the Cleveland Clinic and a tumor removed from his vocal cords.

When, in April 1996, Carl Stokes died of cancer, Stokes lost his best friend.

THE DENOUEMENT

By 1998, after 30 years in office, Stokes decided not to seek re-election.

On the day he announced his retirement, Plain Dealer columnist Elizabeth Auster wrote, "Stokes brought more than money home from Washington. He also brought laughter and inspiration and pride. And sometimes those are harder to come by."

Then-Cleveland Mayor Michael White said of Stokes, "Someone will fill his seat, but I don't think anyone will ever fill his shoes."

It was always a foregone conclusion Stokes' job would pass to Stephanie Tubbs Jones, county prosecutor at the time. When Tubbs Jones died unexpectedly in 2008, Marcia Fudge became only the third person to hold the seat.

In retirement, Stokes became senior counsel at the Cleveland-based law firm of what was then Squire Sanders & Dempsey. He served on several corporate boards, including Forest City Enterprises.

When asked in the July interview about the lack of civility in Washington today, Stokes said he was sometimes embarrassed to be a former member of Congress.

"I have members of Congress whom I see, on both sides of the aisle, and they tell me, 'Louie, you wouldn't want to be here now.' It's a waste of your time and intellect to be involved there now and see how difficult it is to concentrate on doing what's best for people—considering you were sent there to help people. That's gone now."

Stokes retired from the law firm in 2012, and resigned from the Forest City board last year. In recent months, he spent time assisting his daughter, Cleveland Municipal Court Judge Angela Stokes, who is contesting disciplinary charges filed against her by the Ohio Supreme Court's Disciplinary Counsel.

Besides Angela, he is survived by his wife of 55 years, Jeanette (Jay); daughter Shelley Stokes-Hammond, retired public affairs director at Howard University; daughter Lori, a television news anchor in New York City; son Chuck, editorial and public affairs director at a Detroit television station; and seven grandchildren.

Funeral arrangements are pending.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I yield to EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, who I know was a very, very dear friend of Congressman Stokes. I thank her so much for joining us this evening.

□ 2100

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join Congresswoman KAPTUR in sharing some sentiments.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in recognition of the late Congressman Louis Stokes, a dear friend and a tremendous patriot, who dedicated his life to serving our great Nation. He was dedicated to expanding political and economic opportunities for all Americans, and he was determined to transcend the culture of discrimination and injustice.

Louis Stokes rose from humble beginnings in the local housing projects of Cleveland, Ohio, to serve 30 years in the U.S. House of Representatives. He was first elected in 1968. Reluctant to enter the political arena, Stokes was persuaded to run for office by his younger brother, Carl B. Stokes, the first African American mayor of a major American city, elected in 1967.

Prior to serving in Congress, Mr. Stokes served as a civil rights lawyer. He was the first African American to represent the State of Ohio in Congress and was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus. Throughout his tenure in the House, he chaired several congressional committees and was the first African American to win a seat on the House Committee on Appropriations.

During his long tenure in Congress, he headed and participated in several major House investigations. In March of 1977, he was appointed to lead the Select Committee on Assassinations, formed to conduct an investigation of the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

He also served as the chairman of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and became the first African American Member of Congress to head this committee.

He was the dean of the Ohio congressional delegation. His work in the area of health led to his appointment as a member of the Pepper Commission of comprehensive health care, and he was the founder and chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus Health Braintrust. In 1981, he chaired the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct.

When Louis Stokes retired in 1998, he became the first African American in the history of the U.S. Congress to retire after 30 years of service. Following his service in Congress, he became a senior counsel at Squire, Sanders & Dempsey, LLP, a global law firm, and distinguished visiting professor at the Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University.

He also served as a vice chairman of the Pew Environmental Health Commission at the Johns Hopkins School of Public Health and was appointed by the former Health and Human Services Secretary, Donna Shalala, as chairman of the Advisory Committee on Minority Health.

As a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, he engineered a vehicle that would foster collaboration and strategic alliances for generations. Because of his visionary leadership, we all benefit from an organization powerful enough to engage, empower, and excite generations of African American leaders who influence the political landscape, impact the outcome of elections, and serve as strong

voices for those weakened by poverty, discrimination, and lack of opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to have had the privilege of serving with this Congressman. I was inspired by his intelligence, preparation, dignity, generosity, and forward thinking. He leaves behind a legacy that inspires not only those who served with him, but a generation of future leaders.

I am grateful for this vision that he had, his integrity, his grace, his friendship, and his mentorship.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you, Congresswoman EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, a long way from Cleveland, for your great service and for sharing your memories of our beloved friend, Congressman Louis Stokes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. KAPTUR. I know others want to enter material in the RECORD in memory of Congressman Stokes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I also wanted to mention that Congressman Stokes' beautiful wife, Jeanette, who was at his side through all his years of service; his daughters, Angela, Shelley, Lori; his son, Chuck; and seven grandchildren.

What an amazing family—the Stokes family has made many contributions to Ohio and to our country, but I think Jeanette and Congressman Stokes are proudest of the children and grandchildren that they have raised. They have represented the family well during this most difficult time.

HONORING SPEAKER JIM WRIGHT

Ms. KAPTUR. I would like to turn to a different subject, if I might, in the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, there was a Special Order that was given on Speaker Jim Wright, and I was unable, because of duties in Ohio, to join my remarks to those of his friends and colleagues here in the Congress. I rise tonight to honor him for the leader and master of the legislative process that Speaker Jim Wright of Fort Worth, Texas, was.

He approached life with an eager and courageous mission and a true democratic heart. He loved this House. He just loved it. He just basked in its glory and its power, and he had the keenness of intellect, the balance of knowledge, the intuition, the direction, and the wisdom that comes from the long years of experience that he had at the level of Fort Worth and then the State of Texas and then, obviously, federally.

He was a veteran of World War II and had been a pilot and received the Distinguished Flying Cross. He was truly—truly—a courageous hero for our country and chose to serve then in elected life.

What I will forever remember of him was his dignity and his strength. His personal ability to also forgive those who sought to harm him and move on was an amazing trait, and I think it revealed some of what he was able to bring as a negotiator and a statesman to the work here.

He was a passionate fighter for the people of our country, especially those of ordinary means who might not have their voices heard, and when he got into a topic that he loved, he was absolutely unstoppable.

He was a gifted orator. He spoke with all of his heart, and he elevated this House and the people who served in it. He loved Congress. He referred to it as a heady place to be, where Members of both political parties should cooperate to make America a world leader and to build and support a strong middle class.

His early life growing up during the Great Depression had a permanent imprint on him, and he never forgot the common person. His service in the Army during World War II instilled in him a life of service and a dedication to help those less fortunate, but also a passion for liberty.

His legislative achievements were legion. He helped create the Clean Water Act and the Interstate Highway System, and he helped guarantee benefits for returning veterans. I remember what a master he was. I believe he chaired the House Public Works Committee and rose from there.

I can still see him making the case, right at this podium here in the House, for a modern transportation bill, clinking dimes in a large glass bowl to say that we have to pay our way forward here. He understood what it took to build and maintain a great nation's prosperity. He was a terrific, terrific orator.

In foreign affairs, Speaker Wright had a contribution that one could describe as profound. He was a peacemaker. He visited the Middle East and facilitated the meeting that led to the accord between Israel and Egypt in 1977.

More than a decade later, he led a successful push for a compromise that would end the war between the Sandinista government and the Contras in Nicaragua. Over time, his approach would lead to the end of U.S. military financing and the start of democratically held elections there. How many Americans can say they have ever been involved in something of that magnitude?

In his farewell speech before Congress, Speaker Wright said: "When vengeance becomes more desirable

than vindication, harsh personal attacks on one another's motives, one another's character, drown out the quiet logic of serious debate on important issues, things that we ought to be involved ourselves in, surely that is unworthy of our institution, unworthy of our American political process. All of us in both parties must resolve to bring this period of mindless cannibalism to an end. There has been enough of it."

Speaker Wright returned to Fort Worth where he donated his official papers to Texas Christian University's library and taught a TCU course called Congress and the Presidents for more than 20 years. His intention to keep the class small was simply impossible, as his enrollment grew at an increasing rate every year.

Speaker Wright always treated me graciously. Here I was from Ohio, a completely different part of the country, but I appreciate the fact that he assisted my efforts to seek a seat on the Committee on Appropriations—it took me over a decade to arrive there—since no one from our part of Ohio had ever served on it.

He saw the exclusion, and he helped me. I am so grateful to him forever for that and what I have been able to do to help the country in that position.

He and I shared many experiences and pursuits during our shared years in Congress, but one of my favorite memories is something we had in common, and that was a love of gardening and roses. He was especially fond of a gray-purplish variety of rose that he had raised to perfection. He just loved life.

Speaker Wright would often quote Horace Greeley in saying: "Fame is a vapor; popularity an accident; riches take wings; those who cheer today may curse tomorrow; only one thing endures—character."

Speaker Wright was certainly a man of great character and great talent and ability and great accomplishment.

We shall miss him greatly. May the hearts of his loved ones, his beloved wife, Betty; his four children; 15 grandchildren; 24 great-grandchildren; and his sister Betty Lee Wright be warmed by the light of his memory and the legacy of liberty he bestowed upon us all and the great affection we shall always have for him in our hearts.

May God bless the Wright family.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes rose from the local housing projects to serve 30 years in the U.S. House, becoming a potent symbol for his Cleveland-based majority-black district. Reluctant to enter the political arena, Stokes was persuaded to run for office by his prominent brother and by community members he had served for decades as a civil rights lawyer.

His accomplishments were substantive and of historic proportions. The first Black to represent Ohio, Stokes chaired several congressional committees (including the Permanent

Select Intelligence Committee) and was the first African American to win a seat on the powerful House Appropriations Committee.

He used his success to try to increase opportunities for millions of African Americans, saying, "I'm going to keep on denouncing the inequities of this system, but I'm going to work within it. To go outside the system would be to deny myself—to deny my own existence. I've beaten the system. I've proved it can be done—so have a lot of others." Stokes continued, "But the problem is that a black man has to be extra special to win in this system. Why should you have to be a super black to get someplace? That's what's wrong in the society. The ordinary black man doesn't have the same chance as the ordinary white man does."

Louis Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to Charles and Louise Cinthy (Stone) Stokes. His father worked in a laundromat and died when Louis was young. Stokes and his younger brother, Carl, were raised by their widowed mother, whose salary as a domestic was supplemented by welfare payments. Louis Stokes supplemented the family income by shining shoes around the Cleveland projects and clerking at an Army/Navy store. He attended Cleveland's public schools and served as a personnel specialist in the U.S. Army from 1943 to 1946. He returned home with an honorable discharge, taking jobs in the Veterans Administration and Treasury Department offices in Cleveland while attending college at night with the help of the GI Bill. He attended the Cleveland College of Western Reserve University from 1946 to 1948. Stokes eventually earned a J.D. from the Cleveland Marshall School of Law in 1953 and, with his brother, opened the law firm Stokes and Stokes. On August 21, 1960, Louis Stokes married Jeanette (Jay) Francis, and they raised four children: Shelly, Louis C., Angela, and Lorene.

He devoted himself to his law practice, where he became involved in a number of civil rights—related cases—often working pro bono on behalf of poor clients and activists. He was an active participant in civic affairs. Working on behalf of the Cleveland NAACP, Stokes helped challenge the Ohio legislature's redistricting in 1965 that followed the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" decision.

The state legislature had fragmented the congressional districts that overlay Cleveland, diluting black voting strength. Stokes joined forces with Charles Lucas, a black Republican, to challenge that action. They lost their case in U.S. District Court, but based on Stokes's written appeal, the U.S. Supreme Court agreed with the brief in 1967. From that decision followed the creation of Ohio's first majority-black district. Later that year, in December 1967, Stokes made an oral argument before the U.S. Supreme Court in *Terry v. Ohio*, a precedent-setting case that defined the legality of police search and seizure procedures.

At his brother Carl's behest Louis Stokes made his first run for elective office in 1968. He sought to win the seat in the newly created congressional district that encompassed much of the east side of Cleveland. Stokes was hardly a typical newcomer to the political campaign. First, his brother, Mayor Stokes, put the

services of his political network at Louis's disposal. Stokes won by a landslide. He won his subsequent 14 general elections by lopsided margins in the heavily Democratic district taking as much as 88 percent of the vote.

As a freshman Representative, Stokes received assignments on the Education and Labor Committee and the Internal Security Committee (formerly the House Un-American Activities Committee). He enthusiastically accepted the former assignment, believing Education and Labor would be a prime platform from which he could push the agenda for his urban district: job training, economic opportunity, and educational interests. But Stokes was less pleased with the Internal Security panel, which had lapsed into an increasingly irrelevant entity since its heyday investigating communists in the 1940s and 1950s. (House leaders disbanded it entirely in the mid-1970s.)

During his second term in the House, Stokes earned a seat on the Appropriations Committee. During more than two decades on the committee, Stokes steered hundreds of millions of federal dollars into projects in his home state. He eventually became an Appropriations subcommittee chair, or "cardinal," for Veterans, HUD, and Independent Agencies. Stokes was the second African-American "cardinal" ever (the first, Julian Dixon of California, chaired the DC Subcommittee). Years later, Stokes said of the Appropriations Committee, "It's the only committee to be on. All the rest is window dressing." In addition to chairing an Appropriations subcommittee, Stokes is one of fewer than two dozen African Americans ever to chair a House committee and one of just a handful to wield the gavel on multiple panels: the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence (100th Congress), the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (97th–98th Congresses, 102nd Congress), and the Select Committee on Assassinations (95th Congress).

The growing ranks of black Members sought to create a power base, realizing—in the words of Representative William (Bill) Clay, Sr. of Missouri they "had to parlay massive voting potential into concrete economic results." As freshman House Members, Stokes and Clay quickly developed an enduring friendship and became strong supporters of the formation of the Congressional Black Caucus (CBC), to promote economic, educational, and social issues that were important to African Americans. This strategy dovetailed with Stokes's perception of his role as an advocate for the "black community" in his district. Stokes served as chairman of the CBC for two consecutive terms beginning in 1972, after Chairman Charles Diggs, Jr., of Michigan resigned from the post. A centrist, Stokes was widely credited with shepherding the group away from the polarizing politics of various black factions toward a more stable and organized policy agenda.

Using his position as CBC chairman and his increasing influence on the Appropriations Committee, Representative Stokes pushed a legislative agenda that mirrored the needs of his majority-black district. He earned a reputation as a congenial but determined activist for minority issues, consistently scoring as one of the most liberal Members of the House in the

Americans for Democratic Action and the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations vote tallies. He advocated more funding for education (particularly for minority colleges), affirmative action programs to employ more blacks, housing and urban development projects, and initiatives to improve access to health care for working-class Americans. In the 1980s, Stokes vocalized black concerns that the Ronald W. Reagan administration was intent on rolling back minority gains made in the 1960s and 1970s. He described conservative efforts to scale back school desegregation efforts and affirmative action programs—as well as massive spending on military programs—as a "full scale attack" on the priorities of the black community. He also was an early advocate of federal government intervention in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

From his seat on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Stokes was a particularly forceful critic of the Reagan administration's foreign policy. He gained national prominence as a member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran when he grilled Lieutenant Colonel Oliver North in 1987 about his role in funding anticommunist Nicaraguan Contras through weapons sales to Tehran. At one juncture he reminded North, "I wore [the uniform] as proudly as you do, even when our government required black and white soldiers in the same Army to live, sleep, eat and travel separate and apart, while fighting and dying for our country."

House leaders repeatedly sought to capitalize on Stokes's image as a stable, trustworthy, and competent adjudicator—turning to him to lead high-profile committees and handle controversial national issues, as well as the occasional ethics scandals in the House. When Representative Henry Gonzalez of Texas resigned as chairman of the Select Committee on Assassinations, Speaker Thomas P. (Tip) O'Neill of Massachusetts tapped Stokes to lead the panel, which was investigating the circumstances surrounding the deaths of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. In 1978, Stokes's committee filed 27 volumes of hearings and a final report that recommended administrative and legislative reforms. While the panel found that the King and the Kennedy murders may have involved multiple assassins (James Earl Ray and Lee Harvey Oswald have traditionally been described as lone killers), it concluded there was no evidence to support assertions of a broad conspiracy involving domestic groups or foreign governments—an assessment that has been upheld for the past three decades. The committee did suggest that Oswald may have had an accomplice on Dealey Plaza, where Kennedy was killed in November 1963.

Stokes's chairmanship of the Select Committee on Assassinations led to his appointment by Speaker O'Neill in 1981 as chairman of the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct (often called the Ethics Committee). Stokes steered the panel through a turbulent period that included investigations of Members implicated in the Federal Bureau of Investigation's ABSCAM sting and a sex scandal that involved two House Members and current and former House Pages.

During the 1990s, Stokes's seniority made him an influential voice on the Appropriations Committee. In 1993, at the start of the 103rd Congress, he assumed the chairman's gavel of the Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, which controlled one of the largest chunks of discretionary spending in the federal budget. Stokes prodded federal agencies to hire and serve more minorities. Republicans praised him for his nonpartisan leadership of the subcommittee, but when the GOP won control of the House in the 1994 elections, and Stokes became the Ranking Member of the panel, he often found himself fighting Republican efforts to trim federal spending that involved cutting welfare programs, including public housing.

In January 1998, Stokes announced his retirement from the House, noting that he wanted to leave "without ever losing an election." Moreover, a new generation of rising black politicians Cleveland was displacing those of Stokes's generation. Among his proudest accomplishments as a Representative, Stokes cited his ability to bring Appropriations Committee money to his district to address needs in housing and urban development and the opportunities that allowed him to set "historic precedents" as an African American in the House. "When I started this journey, I realized that I was the first black American ever to hold this position in this state," Stokes told a newspaper reporter. "I had to write the book . . . I was going to set a standard of excellence that would give any successor something to shoot for." After his congressional career, Louis Stokes resumed his work as a lawyer. He was a great American Hero—to be admired and remembered by us all.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of a truly remarkable man—former Congressman Louis B. Stokes, who passed away last month at the age of 90.

It was my honor to meet with Congressman Stokes when I was a staffer in the office of Congressman Ron Dellums. I later had the honor to serve with him as a member of the House of Representatives as we worked to secure funding for homeless shelters in my district.

Congressman Stokes was a trailblazer.

Born in Cleveland in 1925, he loved his home city and his home state of Ohio. And he was determined to improve the lives of everyone in his community. After serving in the military, he returned home to become a civil rights attorney and work on behalf of the poor and disenfranchised.

Raised in poverty along with his brother Carl, he dreamed of a more just and equal world. He refused to allow prejudice or adversity to slow him down.

Through his life, Lou showed an unwavering commitment to the people of Cleveland, and particularly the vulnerable and voiceless.

As the first African American member of Congress from Ohio—and an original co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus and founding chair of the CBC's Health Brain Trust—Congressman Stokes was a proud voice for civil rights and equality.

And as the first African American to serve on the House Appropriations committee—the committee on which I now serve—Congressman Stokes worked tirelessly to bring re-

sources and opportunities to folks struggling across the country.

In many ways, Congressman Stokes was ahead of his time. He was one of the earliest and most vocal supporters of addressing the burgeoning HIV/AIDS crisis.

As a veteran, he fought to ensure every veteran had the highest possible quality services and care upon returning home. And as the chairman of the Appropriations subcommittee on Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, he worked to ensure agency services reached communities of color.

His work to combat discrimination in every form—housing, education, health care access, economic opportunity and more—continues to inspire me.

While Congressman Stokes will be greatly missed, his legacy and work lives on.

By opening doors of opportunity, and inspiring generations of leaders in Cleveland, Ohio and beyond, Congressman Lou Stokes has made our nation a more just and equal place. He was a great man and a good friend who will be greatly missed. My thoughts and prayers are with his family and my deepest gratitude for sharing this great human being with us.

IRAN'S PAST BEHAVIOR IS AN INDICATOR OF ITS FUTURE BEHAVIOR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is a psychological fact of life that, when it comes to human beings, the best predictor of future behavior is past behavior, period, end of story.

Psychologists who study human behavior agree that past behavior is a useful marker for future behavior, but only under certain specific conditions. For example, high-frequency, habitual behaviors are more predictive than infrequent behaviors. Predictions work best if done over short periods of time, based upon these behaviors. The anticipated situation must be essentially the same as the past situation that activated the behavior in the first place. Also, the behavior did not change by corrective or negative action or feedback. The person must remain essentially unchanged in their consistent behavior. The person must be fairly consistent in his or her behaviors over time.

Forensic psychologists that observe such behavior often use metaphor to warn of serious danger by referring to such individuals as "a ticking time bomb" or as one "carrying a hand grenade, and it is just a matter of when the pin is pulled."

What happens if we apply these same criteria to Iran's behavior? The result is the same. Psychologically, there is no reason to expect future behavioral change, given Iran's 36 years of bad behavior.

The record of history since 1979 is clear with regard to Iran's actions with the West and, in particular, the United States. For 30 of those 36 years, the United States has declared Iran as the most active state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

For 36 years, Iran has brutally murdered more Americans than any other terror group or state sponsor of terror. Their clerics have declared fatwas on the United States; their leaders have dubbed us the Great Satan and have called Israel a one-bomb state, with pledges to eliminate their existence.

□ 2115

That brutal behavior earned them treatment, and rightfully so, as a pariah, shunned by global economy, diplomacy, and withholding international goodwill.

So what a fantastic time to accommodate a terrorist state and make a deal.

Some, such as Secretary of State John Kerry, dismiss all of Iran's reticence as posturing rhetoric. How in God's name can we be so naive at the highest levels of our Republic to believe it?

How in God's name can we judge Iran's actions worthy of fair treatment and goodwill?

Perhaps we should take the teachings of Christ as a guide when he stated:

Every good tree bears good fruit. A good tree cannot bear bad fruit, but a bad tree bears bad fruit. Therefore, by their fruits, you will know them.

Christ's words, of course, are true. Iranian deeds speak louder than words. The problem is both word and deed are reprehensible, which should cause us even more alarm.

Don't believe me? Here are the facts of Iranian actions under this regime.

1979, hostage crisis. From the moment this regime came into being, the first act was to overrun the United States Embassy in Tehran, terrorizing 66 American hostages for 444 days, most of them, and forcing abandonment of our U.S. Embassy and consulates.

1982–1992, Lieutenant Colonel William Buckley, the CIA Station Chief and Vietnam warrior, decorated for valor, is tortured and brutally murdered.

David Anderson, a reporter of great renown, was captured and held for 7 years.

American University President David Dodge was captured and held for a year.

1983, April 18, the U.S. Embassy in Beirut is bombed, murdering 63, 17 of them Americans. The entire CIA Middle East contingent is reportedly murdered. The entire operation was directed by Hezbollah and financed by Iran.

October 23, the United States Marine barracks in Beirut was destroyed by

the largest nonnuclear explosion detonated on Earth by the hand of an Iranian terrorist; 241 United States Marines are slaughtered, and 100 are wounded.

During the same attack, the French barracks are destroyed by another Iranian terrorist bomb that murders 58 French paratroopers.

December 12, 1983, the U.S. Embassy in Kuwait was bombed by Iranian terrorists from Iranian-backed Hezbollah and Dawa, murdering 5 and wounding 86. Seventeen members of the Dawa are captured and arrested in connection. Iranian-sponsored terrorist acts then are perpetrated for years to come to try to negotiate their release.

1984, September 20, United States Embassy annex in Beirut is destroyed by Iranian-backed Hezbollah terrorists, murdering 22 civilians and 2 U.S. soldiers.

1985, June 14, Trans World Airlines Flight 847 hijacked with 160 hostages. Robert Dean Stetham, a United States Navy diver, is forced to kneel in front of an open aircraft door, shot in the back of the head, and dumped onto the tarmac. The remaining hostages are released, following terrorist releases from prisons in Israel and Lebanon.

1989, July 13, Dr. Abdul Rahman Ghassemlou, the Secretary General of the Kurdish Democratic Party of Iran, was assassinated by Iranian operatives, along with two associates in Vienna, where he was secretly meeting with envoys sent by then-Iranian President Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani.

1991, August 8, the assassination of Shapour Bakhtiar, who was the last Iranian Prime Minister prior to the Islamic Revolution by Iranian operatives. In a botched attempt on Bakhtiar's life in a Paris suburb before in 1980, his assailants murdered a French policeman and a female neighbor.

1992, March 17, the Israeli Embassy bombing in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Iran's terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, perpetrated the suicide bomb attack on the Israeli Embassy in Argentina, which murdered 29 people and wounded 242 others, the great majority of which were civilian bystanders in the vicinity of the embassy.

On the 17th of September 1992, Kurdish leader Dr. Mohammad Sadegh Saeid Sharafkandi and three other Iranian Kurds were assassinated at the Mykonos Cafe in Berlin. German courts linked the Iranian Government and Minister of Intelligence, Ali Fallahian, to the assassination.

1994, July 18, Iran was directly responsible for the Argentinian-Israeli Mutual Association Jewish community center bombing in Buenos Aires, Argentina, which murdered 85 and wounded 300. The AMIA attack remains the deadliest terrorist attack in Argentina's history.

In 2006, an Argentine court "declared former Iranian President Hashemi

Rafsanjani and eight others fugitives from justice in Argentina" for their role in the AMIA bombing.

1996, June 25, 14 members of the Iranian-backed Saudi branch of Hezbollah detonated a massive bomb in front of the Khobar Towers, a U.S. military housing complex in Saudi Arabia. The terrorist attack murdered 19 Americans and wounded 372 of our service men and women.

The attackers detonated a parked truck laden with the equivalent of somewhere between 3,000 and 8,000 pounds of explosive in the Khobar Towers parking lot. The resulting explosion "sheared the face off an eight-story structure which housed U.S. Air Force personnel."

2003–2011, following the 2003 U.S. invasion of Iraq, Iran undermined U.S. operations by "consistently supplying weapons, its own advisers, and Iranian proxy Hezbollah advisers from Lebanon to multiple residence groups, both Sunni and Shia," which targeted Coalition Forces.

For the U.S., "concern revolved around Iran's role in arming and assisting the Shiite militias." In Iraq, "the top killer of U.S. troops" were IEDs, or improvised explosive devices, which were primarily supplied by Iran. In total, Iran's support for Iraqi insurgents led to the death of thousands of U.S. soldiers and others in Iraq.

In 2010, United States Ambassador to Iraq James Jeffrey stated, "Up to a quarter, or 1,200 of the American casualties, and some of the more horrific incidents in which Americans were kidnapped can be traced without doubt to these Iranian groups."

I should also personally note that many were my friends, and all were my brothers and sisters as fellow warriors.

2006–2015, Iranian support for the Taliban against United States troops in Afghanistan has been ongoing since at least 2006. According to a RAND report, "although Iran has traditionally backed Tajik and Shia groups opposed to the Taliban, its enmity with the United States and tensions over the nuclear program led it to provide measured support to the Taliban."

According to the Treasury Department, "since at least 2006, Iran has arranged frequent shipments of small arms and associated ammunition, rocket-propelled grenades, mortar rounds, 107 mm rockets, plastic explosives, and probably man-portable defense systems to the Taliban."

A member of my own staff left limbs in Afghanistan by these devices.

Through "Qods force materials support," the report states, "we believe Iran is seeking to inflict casualties on U.S. and NATO forces." In 2010, multiple media sources reported Iran as "paying Taliban fighters \$1,000 for each U.S. soldier they kill in Afghanistan." This is currently.

Over a 6-month period in 2010, one "Taliban treasurer" claimed to have

collected more than \$77,000 from an Iranian firm in Kabul as payment for killing Americans.

2011, October, U.S. authorities thwarted a terrorist plot in this town, Washington, D.C., which included "the assassination of Saudi Arabian Ambassador to the United States and subsequent bomb attacks on Saudi and Israeli Embassies."

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder stated that the plot was "directed and approved by elements of the Iranian Government and, specifically, senior members of the Quds Force"—in this town. The two individuals charged were "Manssor Arbabsiar, a 56-year-old naturalized U.S. citizen holding both Iranian and U.S. passports, and Gholam Shakuri, an Iran-based member of Iran's Quds Force."

U.S. authorities arrested Arbabsiar on September 29, 2011, with Shakuri remaining at large.

2012, in March, Azerbaijan, United States and Israeli officials were among those targeted for assassination by a group of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps from Iran-linked terrorists. They were arrested in Baku, Azerbaijan.

According to The Washington Post, "United States and Middle Eastern officials now see the attempts as part of a broader campaign by Iran-linked operatives to kill foreign diplomats in at least seven countries over a span of 13 months."

How right they were.

13–14 February, New Delhi, India, the wife of Israeli Defense attache and her driver were wounded after a device attached to their car exploded. The Delhi police concluded that the suspects were members of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps.

A similar device was defused in Tbilisi, Georgia, after being discovered on the underside of an Israeli diplomat's car.

The following day, three Iranian men accidentally detonated a cache of explosives—darn—in Bangkok, Thailand. The explosives were intended to be used to assassinate Israeli diplomats. A multinational investigation has produced "the clearest evidence yet that Iran was involved" in all three plots.

18 July, a suicide bomber destroyed an Israeli tour bus in Burgas, Bulgaria, murdering the bus driver and five Israelis, and wounding more than 30 others. In an investigation in 2012, the Bulgarian Government found Iran and its proxy, Hezbollah, responsible for the attack.

Behavior, behavior, 36 consistent years. But now President Obama wants to negotiate with terrorists to prevent war.

Mr. Speaker, we are not the attackers here. Threat of war only comes from the United States when we are bullied, cajoled, attacked, or threatened. The President and Secretaries Kerry, Lew, and Moniz want us to show goodwill for bad behavior.

The American people are against it, as evidenced by the strong opposition from the majority of Americans who rightly deduce the deal would allow nuclear capacity for Iran and makes a legal path to possess weapons of mass destruction.

The President often makes political speeches demanding we keep dangerous firearms out of the hands of those with psychological problems, yet, under identical behavioral criteria, he would give nuclear capacity to Iran.

While public multiple-victim shootings are horrific, imagine an Iran with a nuclear capacity. Given Iran's prolific use of every form of weaponry and export of terror, are our leaders so naive to think Iran's behavior would be any better than putting a weapon in the hands of a psychologically consistent and dangerous individual?

Past behavior is the best predictor of future behavior. Any psychologist or criminologist will tell you this, yet the President is selling us on the deluded hope that this is somehow the right and only path to take. Nonsense.

No alternative you say? How can that be?

Our own administration does not even realize that Iran's interpretation of this very deal and ours are separated by a fairly problematic gulf.

In the last month, even the last few days, Iran's President Rouhani and his foreign ministry have made public statements that declare the following regarding this good deal. According to Iran and its statements from its leaders, here is what they think they have agreed to:

Iran can pursue the development of missiles without any restriction.

They can violate the U.N. resolutions without violating the agreement. Iran says it is not a treaty but binding.

Iran can violate the U.N. Security Council Resolution without violating the JCPOA, or the agreement.

Iran intends to violate the United Nations Security Council Resolution restrictions on weapons sales and imports. In fact, they are already negotiating with Russia for the sale of SS-300 and -400 missiles.

□ 2130

And Iran also has not agreed to inspect Parchin itself, but it will refuse to let anyone else inspect it.

These are from their own statements in recent days. Iran's public statements declare, Mr. Speaker, that all sanctions will be lifted.

Under Iran's interpretation and even in the stated language of the agreement, this includes those, such as the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps—they are in the agreement; they are listed—and the Quds Force, the same organization that we just itemized all of these terrorist acts, both of these groups. Two of the most reprehensible terrorist organizations in the world are

in this agreement for sanctions to be lifted. Read them. Annex II sanctions list. I have.

This flies in the face of our President's own statements and reassurances. Under Secretary of Treasury Szubin assures us that sanctions on these organizations will be maintained.

Secretary of Treasury Lew even goes further and has stated recently that, "We will not be providing any sanctions relief to any of these lines of activity and will not be delisting from sanctions the Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps, the Quds Force, or any of their subsidiaries or senior officials."

Then, why are they in the deal? According to the agreement and even Iran's recent public statements, they believe that they will be lifted.

Terrorists Soleimani, A.Q. Khan, numerous organizations that I have had to fight on battlefields, now we will reward their bad behavior with goodwill.

The Islamic Revolutionary Guards Corps and the Quds Force are both listed in this agreement and have sanctions against them lifted, according to interpretations of its terms. What a great deal. There is none better. This is the best we can do.

President Hassan Rouhani declared last month, "After the agreement is implemented, the economic sanctions will be immediately removed, meaning, financial, banking, insurance, transportation, petrochemical sanctions. All economic sanctions will be removed."

Congratulations, Mr. President, on that good deal and that goodwill.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation is in grave danger. We are trusting a psychologically fanatical and terrorist State with 36 consistent years of bad behavior to now behave well.

Perhaps the only thing missing to shore up the President and Secretary Kerry's reassurances is perhaps an airplane on the tarmac with an open door with our United States leader waving a document in his hand, declaring, "Peace in our time."

The power of this Nation only rests with the consent of the people. That is where the Congress, both parties, this august body, comes in.

But now our President even wants to find a political way to strip the American people from a vote by their duly elected representatives to avoid the optics of an opposition.

I guess he and President Hassan Rouhani of Iran do have something very much in common after all: not allowing a vote in their respective legislative bodies. One would expect that from a fanatical, unstable, religious dictatorship, but not in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, the President is outside his constitutional authority. No other President in the history of our Nation has ever cobbled together sanctions provisions meant to prevent nuclear

capacity, to provide a de facto treaty with a foreign rogue State and give them what the sanctions were intended to deny.

The President has acted without the consent of the people. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the people, through their duly elected Representatives, will now act without the consent of the President.

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution, a document I have defended since I was 18, states that the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations rests in the Congress of these United States.

Article II, Section 2, states that the President can only make a binding treaty with a foreign nation upon two-thirds consent with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, the President states that this is not a treaty. We agree. And, therefore, constitutionally, we are not bound to abide by it. Neither are the States.

The Supremacy Clause does not apply here. It is not a treaty. Not having the effect of treaty law, the States are free to act. And today they are and will. And we will.

I call upon my colleagues, people that have taken an oath to support and defend this republic, to stand with me.

We will declare the lifting of sanctions of terrorists as laid out in the agreement as null and void. It is illegal under past U.S. sanctions law.

We will uphold United States sanctions law against executive fiat action. We will make explicit the sense of Congress in upcoming State actions both legally and economically.

We will prevent the lifting of sanctions on scores of those listed in the agreement, thereby violating section 37 of Annex II of the Iran deal.

We will send a strong message to Iran that the power of this republic does not rest with its President. It rests by the consent of the people. We are bound to uphold that trust as our constitutional duty.

Mr. Speaker, I also call upon Americans to stand with me. Pound the White House with calls and emails. Support State legislative actions and sanctions. Support your representatives, both State and assembly, and your U.S. Representatives in this fight.

We ask the people to support us in this fight, not shoot us in the back, regardless of political party with anger and cynicism, leveling blame on those who oppose this deal rather than on the one who has created it.

Then, if we do this, what will the future look like? It will look like an Iran contained, not an Iran accommodated. It will look like a Nation that led rather than cowered.

It will have a United States that stands firm when Iran, a signatory to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, does—if they ever do—decide to go rogue, will be like North Korea, when a previous administration assured us

that, if we reached out to them with the IAEA and lifting of sanctions and easing, that they would come around.

They abandoned it. We should have known it. Their bad behavior was consistent. That future was predictable. They have nuclear weapons, and we knew it. We said we could trust them in a similar agreement.

But our country will stand for free people and free economies on this globe. It is what we do. And if we fail in that task, who will take our place?

How we fight today determines how we shape tomorrow. Accommodating terrorists and nations with 36 consistent years of bad behavior is not the best deal we have. If Iran, like Libya, displays good behavior first, then we will have a basis for discussion and follow-on goodwill, which we saw in that case.

Until then, the power of the republic rests with its people, not with its executive. Let us never waiver from that position. As long as we treasure this republic and its Constitution, this will defend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

REMEMBERING FORMER CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) until 10 p.m.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise regretting that I was unable to be here when MARCY KAPTUR, the gentlewoman from Ohio, was talking about Representative Louis Stokes.

Congressman Stokes and I were very good friends. I had the opportunity to serve with him for many years. And I wanted to take this time, Mr. Speaker, to thank Ms. KAPTUR for leading the special order.

On August 18, we learned of the passing of our friend, former Representative Lou Stokes.

He was a reluctant candidate, Mr. Speaker, who went on to serve his constituents for three decades. I have had the honor of serving here for 34 years.

But when I first came here, of course, I thought Lou Stokes had been here forever. I don't really think I have been here forever.

But he was a friend to all, respected by his colleagues on both sides of the aisle and beloved by his constituents. For three decades, he served here and left a lasting imprint on a State, our Nation, and, indeed, the world.

Lou Stokes was the first African American to represent Ohio and the first to chair the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. He was chairman as well of the Black Caucus and a tireless campaigner for civil rights and equality.

Moreover, he was also the first African American to serve on the Appropria-

tions Committee, where he and I were colleagues. I sat just two chairs from him for almost a decade along with Ms. KAPTUR for a number of years.

He chaired the Appropriations Subcommittee for Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development. That chairmanship reflected Representative Stokes' longstanding mission to address the unmet needs of millions of Americans living in inner city neighborhoods, like many of those in Cleveland who sent him to Congress.

Having been raised in a housing project himself along with his brother, former Cleveland Mayor Carl Stokes, he made it his mission to ensure that Congress was paying attention to the important issues of affordable housing, access to jobs, healthcare delivery, and crime prevention.

As a veteran, Representative Stokes never wavered from his determination to make certain that Congress was meeting its responsibility to those who had served our Nation in uniform.

I was saddened to learn of his passing. In his 90 years, Representative Stokes lived a very rich and full life. He was full of life and a deep and abiding love for his family, this House, the State, and Nation that he served so ably.

Lou Stokes was a gentleman and a gentle man. He was a giant in integrity and in intellect, committed to common sense, courage, and seeking the right answers for his people, for his State, and for his country.

It is a testament to him that his four children all followed him into careers that helped better their communities and our country.

One is an administrator at Howard University. Another is a well-respected journalist and news anchor in New York. The third is a Cleveland municipal court judge. And the fourth is an editor and public affairs director for a television station in Detroit.

He was extraordinarily proud of his children and of his grandchildren. They, like all of us in this House who served with him, Mr. Speaker, were and are extraordinarily proud of Congressman Louis Stokes.

I join in extending my condolences to them, to their mother, Representative Stokes' wife of 55 years, Angela, and to the seven grandchildren that Representative Stokes so cherished.

The House of Representatives was made a better body by having Lou Stokes serve in this hall. A grateful Nation thanks him and his family for sharing his life with all of us who had the honor and privilege and joy of serving by his side in this revered House of the people that he loved and who loved him.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. MCCOLLUM (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of funeral in district.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 267. An act to authorize the transfer of certain items under the control of the Omar Bradley Foundation to the descendants of General Omar Bradley; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1362. An act to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to clarify waiver authority regarding programs of all-inclusive care for the elderly (PACE programs); to the Committee on Ways and Means; in addition, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1576. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to prevent fraud by representative payees; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1596. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2082 Stringtown Road in Grove City, Ohio, as the "Specialist Joseph W. Riley Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

S. 1826. An act to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the Lieutenant Colonel James "Maggie" Megellas Post Office; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. HARRIS, on Thursday, August 6, 2015.

H.R. 212. An act to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. An act to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1531. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2131. An act to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the "J. Waties Waring Judicial Center".

H.R. 2559. An act to designate the "PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway" in the State of Texas.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE
PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 31, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 3236. To provide an extension of Federal-aid highway, highway safety, motor carrier safety, transit, and other programs funded out of the Highway Trust Fund, to provide resource flexibility to the Department of Veterans Affairs for health care services, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on August 6, 2015, she presented to the President of the

United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 2559. To designate the “PFC Milton A. Lee Medal of Honor Memorial Highway” in the State of Texas.

H.R. 1531. To amend title 5, United States Code, to provide a pathway for temporary seasonal employees in Federal land management agencies to compete for vacant permanent positions under internal merit promotion procedures, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2131. To designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 83 Meeting Street in Charleston, South Carolina, as the “J. Waties Waring Judicial Center”.

H.R. 212. To amend the Safe Drinking Water Act to provide for the assessment and management of the risk of algal toxins in drinking water, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1138. To establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the second and third quarters of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JANICE ROBINSON, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 17 AND JULY 21, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Janice Robinson	7/17	7/21	France		1,840.00		1,734.00				3,574.00
Committee total					1,840.00		1,734.00				3,574.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JANICE C. ROBINSON, July 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO UKRAINE, GEORGIA, AND IRELAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 28 AND JULY 6, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Peter Roskam	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.97		(³)				1,106.97
Hon. David Price	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.97		(³)				1,106.97
Hon. Tom Rice	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.97		(³)				1,106.97
Hon. Rob Woodall	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.98		(³)				1,106.98
Hon. Dina Titus	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.98		(³)				1,106.98
Hon. Lois Capps	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.98		(³)				1,106.98
Justin Wein	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.98		(³)				1,106.98
Michael Shapiro	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		1,106.98		(³)				1,106.98
Hon. Peter Roskam	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. David Price	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. Tom Rice	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. Rob Woodall	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. Dina Titus	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. Lois Capps	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Justin Wein	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Michael Shapiro	7/2	7/5	Georgia		915.00		(³)				915.00
Hon. Peter Roskam	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Hon. David Price	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Hon. Tom Rice	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Hon. Rob Woodall	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Hon. Dina Titus	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Hon. Lois Capps	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Justin Wein	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Michael Shapiro	7/5	7/6	Ireland		236.93		(³)				236.93
Committee total					18,071.20						18,071.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. PETER J. ROSKAM, July 28, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LITHUANIA, FINLAND, POLAND, AND IRELAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 5, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Boehner	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00
Hon. Greg Walden	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00
Hon. John Shimkus	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(³)					824.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO LITHUANIA, FINLAND, POLAND, AND IRELAND, EXPENDED BETWEEN JUNE 26 AND JULY 5, 2015—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Susan Brooks	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Hon. Ann Wagner	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Mike Sommers	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
David Stewart	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Michael Ricci	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Ann Loupone	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Tom Andrews	6/27	6/29	Lithuania		824.00	(3)					824.00
Hon. John Boehner	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Greg Walden	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. John Shimkus	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Susan Brooks	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. Ann Wagner	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Mike Sommers	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
David Stewart	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Michael Ricci	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Amy Loupone	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Tom Andrews	6/29	7/1	Finland		584.00	(3)					584.00
Hon. John Boehner	7/1	7/2	Poland		303.00	(3)					303.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. Greg Walden	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. John Shimkus	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. Susan Brooks	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. Ann Wagner	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Mike Sommers	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
David Stewart	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Michael Ricci	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Amy Loupone	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Tom Andrews	7/1	7/2	Poland		237.00	(3)					237.00
Hon. John Boehner	7/2	7/5	Ireland		1,040.00	(3)					1,040.00
Hon. Dan Lipinski	7/2	7/5	Ireland		341.00	(3)	1,595.00				1,936.00
Hon. Greg Walden	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Hon. John Shimkus	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Hon. Mike Simpson	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Hon. Mike Kelly	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Hon. Susan Brooks	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Hon. Ann Wagner	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Mike Sommers	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
David Stewart	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Michael Ricci	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Amy Loupone	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Tom Andrews	7/2	7/5	Ireland		934.00	(3)					934.00
Committee total					33,106.00		1,595.00				34,701.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Aug. 5, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Ann Kirkpatrick	4/1	4/2	Ethiopia		398.04		55.22		141.03		594.29
	4/2	4/3	Tanzania		573.00		538.10				1,111.10
	4/3	4/3	Burundi				64.05				64.05
	4/3	4/4	Spain		95.00						95.00
Hon. Jim Costa	5/5	5/7	Germany		715.00		162.08		328.86		1,205.94
Hon. K. Michael Conaway	5/25	5/26	Germany		343.16						343.16
	5/26	5/27	Estonia		249.40		236.49		66.16		552.05
	5/27	5/28	Czech Republic		372.38		88.47				460.85
	5/28	5/29	Romania		257.00						257.00
	5/29	5/29	Italy		24.00						24.00
	5/29	5/30	Spain		160.12						160.12
Jackie Barber	5/25	5/26	Germany		331.97						331.97
	5/26	5/27	Estonia		226.87		236.49		66.16		529.52
	5/27	5/28	Czech Republic		372.37		88.47				460.84
	5/28	5/29	Italy		12.00						12.00
	5/29	5/30	Spain		97.70						97.70
Committee total					4,228.01		1,469.37		602.21		6,299.59

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Sam Farr	4/9	4/12	Panama		949.00		1,948.33		0.00		2,897.33
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/9	4/12	Panama		949.00		2,487.60		222.09		3,658.69
Hon. David Joyce	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.31				214.63		550.94
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—
Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Valadao	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
	5/7	5/9	Europe		357.50				490.95		848.45
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Commercial airfare							6,493.30				6,493.30
Hon. Betty McCollum	5/2	5/3	Qatar		114.00				62.00		176.00
	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		112.00				12.00		124.00
Commercial airfare	5/5	5/6	Kuwait		105.00				52.00		157.00
							9,332.55				8,332.55
Committee total					5,287.31		20,377.66		2,288.14		27,953.11

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. HAROLD ROGERS, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Visit to Ukraine, Romania, Poland, Lithuania— March 26–April 2, 2015:											
Hon. Mac Thornberry	3/27	3/29	Romania		651.51						651.51
	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		745.23						745.23
	3/31	4/1	Poland		275.00						275.00
	4/1	4/3	Lithuania		324.57						324.57
Hon. Mike Rogers	3/27	3/29	Romania		651.51						651.51
	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		745.23						745.23
	3/31	4/1	Poland		275.00						275.00
	4/1	4/3	Lithuania		324.57						324.57
Tim Morrison	3/27	3/29	Romania		572.93						572.93
	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		745.22						745.22
	3/31	4/1	Poland		275.00						275.00
	4/1	4/3	Lithuania		324.56						324.56
John P. MacNaughton	3/27	3/29	Romania		572.93						572.93
	3/29	3/31	Ukraine		745.22						745.22
	3/31	4/1	Poland		275.00						275.00
	4/1	4/3	Lithuania		324.56						324.56
Delegation expenses			Ukraine				3,694.00		3,648.63		7,342.63
			Romania						1,926.44		1,926.44
Visit to Romania, Israel—March 29–April 4, 2015:											
Hon. Michael Turner	3/29	3/31	Romania		510.00						510.00
	3/31	4/4	Italy		1,650.00						1,650.00
Commercial airfare							10,063.16				10,063.16
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	3/29	3/31	Romania		510.00						510.00
	3/31	4/4	Italy		1,650.00						1,650.00
Commercial airfare							10,063.16				10,063.16
Hon. Paul Cook	3/29	3/31	Romania		510.00						510.00
	3/31	4/4	Italy		1,650.00						1,650.00
Commercial airfare							9,657.46				9,657.46
Jesse Tolleson	3/29	3/31	Romania		510.00						510.00
	3/31	4/4	Italy		1,650.00						1,650.00
Commercial airfare							9,709.96				9,709.96
Douglas Bush	3/29	3/31	Romania		510.00						510.00
	3/31	4/4	Italy		1,650.00						1,650.00
Commercial airfare							10,579.96				10,579.96
Visit to Philippines, Vietnam, Thailand, Malaysia—March 27–April 3, 2015:											
Hon. Rob Wittman	3/29	3/29	Korea								
	3/29	3/31	Vietnam		277.73						277.73
	3/31	4/2	Malaysia		275.00						275.00
	4/2	4/3	Thailand		235.12						235.12
Commercial airfare							6,696.60				6,696.60
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	3/29	3/29	Korea								
	3/29	3/31	Vietnam		277.73						277.73
	3/31	4/2	Malaysia		275.00						275.00
	4/2	4/3	Thailand		235.12						235.12
Commercial airfare							16,803.40				16,803.40
Ryan Crumpler	3/29	3/29	Korea								
	3/29	3/31	Vietnam		277.73						277.73
	3/31	4/2	Malaysia		275.00						275.00
	4/2	4/3	Thailand		235.12						235.12
Commercial airfare							16,803.40				16,803.40
Brian Garrett	3/29	3/29	Korea								
	3/29	3/31	Vietnam		277.73						277.73
	3/31	4/2	Malaysia		275.00						275.00
	4/2	4/3	Thailand		235.12						235.12
Commercial airfare							16,803.40				16,803.40
Delegation expenses			Vietnam						400.33		400.33
			Malaysia						832.87		832.87
			Thailand						405.60		405.60
Visit to Tunisia, Nigeria, Djibouti, Kenya, Senegal—April 6–13, 2015 with CODEL Gilibrand:											
Hon. Susan Davis	4/7	4/8	Tunisia		212.03						212.03
	4/8	4/9	Nigeria		287.67						287.67
	4/9	4/9	Djibouti								
	4/9	4/12	Kenya		740.00						740.00
	4/12	4/13	Senegal		260.00						260.00
Visit to Panama—April 9–11, 2015 with CODEL Duncan:											
Hon. Bradley Byrne	4/9	4/11	Panama		786.00						786.00
Visit to Afghanistan, Qatar, Kuwait—May 1–6, 2015:											
Hon. Martha McSally	5/2	5/3	Qatar		114.00						114.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Susan Davis	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
	5/5	5/6	Kuwait								
	5/2	5/3	Qatar		114.00						114.00
	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Jaime Cheshire	5/5	5/6	Kuwait								
	5/2	5/3	Qatar		114.00						114.00
	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Craig Greene	5/5	5/6	Kuwait								
	5/2	5/3	Qatar		114.00						114.00
	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		28.00						28.00
Visit to Germany, Austria, Egypt, Portugal, Tunisia—May 1–10, 2015 with CODEL Nunes:	5/5	5/6	Kuwait								
	5/2	5/3	Tunisia								
	5/3	5/5	Egypt		1,060.00						604.00
Hon. Paul Cook	5/5	5/7	Austria		1,073.50						1,073.50
	5/7	5/9	Germany		715.00						715.00
	5/9	5/10	Portugal		138.00						138.00
Visit to the Czech Republic, Ukraine, Romania, Bulgaria, Turkey, Georgia—May 2–9, 2015:	5/2	5/4	The Czech Republic		136.00						136.00
	5/4	5/5	Romania		191.00						191.00
	5/5	5/6	Ukraine		377.20						377.20
	5/6	5/7	Turkey		430.00						430.00
	5/7	5/8	Georgia		610.00						610.00
	5/8	5/9	Bulgaria		237.60						237.60
	5/2	5/4	The Czech Republic		136.00						136.00
	5/4	5/5	Romania		191.00						191.00
	5/5	5/6	Ukraine		377.20						377.20
	5/6	5/7	Turkey		430.00						430.00
Delegation expenses	5/7	5/8	Georgia		610.00						610.00
	5/8	5/9	Bulgaria		237.60						237.60
			Romania						824.00		824.00
			Bulgaria						3,839.06		3,839.06
			Ukraine						928.65		928.65
Visit to Honduras, Guatemala—May 3–7, 2015:			Georgia						1,572.06		1,572.06
			The Czech Republic				76.50		1,293.48		1,369.98
	5/3	5/4	Honduras		238.00						238.00
	5/4	5/7	Guatemala		430.00						430.00
			Commercial airfare						896.95		896.95
Hon. Marc Veasey	5/3	5/4	Honduras		238.00						238.00
	5/4	5/7	Guatemala		430.00						430.00
Commercial airfare									896.95		896.95
	5/3	5/4	Honduras		238.00						238.00
Hon. Catherine Sendak	5/4	5/7	Guatemala		628.00						628.00
			Commercial airfare						896.95		896.95
Michael Amato	5/4	5/7	Guatemala		628.00						628.00
			Commercial airfare						896.95		896.95
Delegation expenses			Honduras						880.00		880.00
			Guatemala						2,294.00		2,294.00
Visit to United Kingdom, Germany, Spain, Djibouti—May 21–28, 2015:	5/22	5/23	United Kingdom		612.15						612.15
	5/23	5/24	Germany								
	5/24	5/26	Djibouti								
	5/26	5/27	Spain								
			Commercial airfare								
Mark Morehouse	5/22	5/23	United Kingdom		612.15						612.15
	5/23	5/24	Germany								
	5/24	5/26	Djibouti								
	5/25	5/27	Spain								
Delegation expenses			United Kingdom								
							1,248.80				1,248.80
Visit to Japan, Republic of South Korea—May 21–31, 2015:											
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. Mike Rogers	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. Jim Cooper	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. Mo Brooks	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. John Fleming	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. Doug Lamborn	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Hon. Rick Larsen	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Timothy Morrison	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Leonor Tomero	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
	5/25	5/27	Japan		658.00						658.00
Delegation expenses	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00						706.00
			South Korea						4,078.90		4,078.90
Visit to Kuwait, Iraq—June 26–30, 2015:			Japan						9,241.37		9,241.37
	6/27	6/29	Iraq		22.00						22.00
Hon. Rob Wittman	6/29	6/30	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare								6,794.60			6,794.60
	6/27	6/29	Iraq		22.00						22.00
Hon. Madeleine Bordallo	6/29	6/30	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
								10,931.10			10,931.10
Ryan Crumpler	6/27	6/29	Iraq		22.00						22.00
	6/29	6/30	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare								10,930.80			10,930.80
	6/27	6/29	Iraq		22.00						22.00
Brian Garrett	6/29	6/30	Kuwait		105.00						105.00
								10,930.80			10,930.80
Commercial airfare								10,930.80			10,930.80
Committee total					46,601.54		151,786.90		35,753.19		234,141.63

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. MAC THORNBERRY, Chairman, Aug. 3, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. John Kline	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		474.46		(3)				474.46
Hon. Suzanne Bonamici	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Hon. Virginia Fox	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		474.46		(3)				474.46
Hon. Tim Walberg	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		474.46		(3)				474.46
Hon. Rick Allen	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		474.46		(3)				474.46
Juliane Sullivan	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Brian Newell	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Janelle Belland	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Jean Hinz	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Elizabeth Podgorski	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(3)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(3)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(3)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		440.90		(3)				440.90
Committee total					25,550.94						25,550.94

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

³ Military air transportation.

HON. JOHN KLINE, Chairman, July 29, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Joe Barton	3/27	3/28	Germany		333.76		(3)				333.76
	3/29	3/29	Bahrain		394.98		(3)		185.00		579.98
	3/30	3/30	Saudi Arabia		459.33		(3)		269.70		729.03
	3/31	3/31	Ethiopia		398.04		(3)		196.25		594.29
	4/1	4/2	Tanzania		480.00		(3)				480.00
	4/3	4/4	Spain		334.28		(3)				334.28
Hon. Yvette Clarke	4/10	4/12	Panama		524.00		3,414.63		1,000.00		4,943.63
Hon. Fred Upton	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)		5,085.00		5,436.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)		4,864.74		5,478.01
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)		4,064.55		4,812.94
Hon. Frank Pallone	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Joe Pitts	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Greg Walden	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Bob Latta	5/4	5/5	Portugal		263.74		(3)				263.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		351.27		(3)				351.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		486.39		(3)				486.39
Hon. Cathy McMorris Rodgers	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Mike Pompeo	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Bill Johnson	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Hon. Jerry McNeerney	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Alexa Marrero	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(3)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(3)				748.39
Tom Hassenboehler	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(3)				351.74

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Joan Hillebrands	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(³)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(³)				748.39
	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(³)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(³)				613.27
Theresa Gambo	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(³)				748.39
	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(³)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(³)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(³)				748.39
Jeff Carroll	5/4	5/5	Portugal		351.74		(³)				351.74
	5/5	5/7	Belgium		613.27		(³)				613.27
	5/7	5/9	Ukraine		748.39		(³)				748.39
	5/25	5/26	Japan		658.00		(³)				658.00
Hon. Gregg Harper	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00		(³)				706.00
	5/25	5/26	Japan		658.00		10,728.80				11,386.80
	5/27	5/29	South Korea		706.00		(³)				706.00
	6/23	6/25	Argentina		682.44		11,316.53				11,998.97
David Goldman	6/23	6/23	Argentina		682.44		12,066.53				12,748.97
Hon. Bill Flores	6/27	6/30	Kuwait		105.00		12,438.90				12,543.90
	6/27	6/29	Iraq		22.00						22.00
Committee total					30,519.87		49,965.39		15,670.24		96,155.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. FRED UPTON, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. David Schweikert	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		865.10				1,651.10
Hon. Robert Pittenger	5/5	5/5	France		330.00		7,640.50		827.00		8,797.50
	5/5	5/7	Austria		667.20		551.44		1,320.00		2,538.64
	5/7	5/9	Germany		775.56		(³)		1,088.89		1,844.45
	5/9	5/10	Portugal		137.50		(³)				137.50
Hon. Juan Vargas	5/6	5/8	Mexico		786.00		561.00				1,329.00
Hon. Randy Hultgren	5/22	5/24	Norway		784.54		(³)				784.54
	5/24	5/26	Sweden		744.23		(³)				744.23
	5/26	5/28	Finland		572.00		(³)				572.00
	5/28	5/30	Estonia		474.46		(³)				474.46
Committee total					6,019.49		9,618.04		3,235.89		18,873.42

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. JEB HENSARLING, Chairman, July 31, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Eric Jacobstein	5/25	5/26	Honduras		185.99		1,059.30				1,245.29
	5/26	5/28	El Salvador		417.41						417.41
	5/28	5/30	Guatemala		400.29						400.29
Jennifer Hendrixson White	3/29	4/1	Korea		985.00		10,423.20				11,408.20
	4/1	4/2	Hong Kong		514.73						514.73
	4/2	4/4	Japan		649.26						649.26
Eddy Acevedo	6/4	6/7	Haiti		673.00		900.40				1,573.40
Mark Walker	6/4	6/7	Haiti		678.00		900.40				1,578.40
Sadaf Khan	6/4	6/7	Haiti		683.00		900.40				1,583.40
Rebecca Ulrich	5/25	5/27	Guatemala		380.20		1,049.30				1,429.50
	5/27	5/29	El Salvador		421.40						421.40
	5/29	5/31	Honduras		420.00						420.00
Sadaf Khan	5/25	5/27	Guatemala		390.20		1,049.30				1,439.50
	5/27	5/29	El Salvador		417.40						417.40
	5/29	5/31	Honduras		440.00						440.00
Hon. Darrell Issa	5/6	5/7	Mexico		768.00		742.39				1,510.39
Scott Cullinane	3/29	4/3	Moldova		910.00		3,353.60				4,263.60
	4/3	4/4	Ukraine		361.00						361.00
	3/29	4/3	Moldova		900.00		3,377.60				4,277.60
Naz Durakoglu	4/3	4/4	Ukraine		351.00						351.00
	5/6	5/8	Switzerland		741.00		13,258.40				13,999.40
	5/8	5/9	Serbia		276.00				41,643.00		1,919.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	5/9	5/11	Bosnia		194.00						194.00
	5/10	5/11	Montenegro		178.00						178.00
	5/11	5/12	Kosovo		164.00						164.00
Paul Behrends	5/6	5/8	Switzerland		741.00		13,258.40				13,999.40
	5/8	5/9	Serbia		276.00						276.00
	5/9	5/11	Bosnia		194.00						194.00
Thomas Alexander	5/10	5/11	Montenegro		178.00						178.00
	5/11	5/12	Kosovo		164.00						164.00
	4/23	4/24	Mexico		362.00		1,255.95				1,617.95
Leah Campos	4/7	4/9	Uruguay		504.00		1,636.50				2,140.50
Kristen Marquardt	5/2	5/5	Turkey		995.17		4,196.80				5,191.97
	5/5	5/8	Jordan		1,009.01						1,009.01
Mira Resnick	5/4	5/5	Turkey		190.98		4,594.59				4,785.57
	5/5	5/8	Jordan		794.89						794.89

September 8, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

13795

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—

Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Reid Ribble	5/2	5/4	Czech Republic		760.37		11,571.20				12,331.57
	5/4	5/5	Romania		201.58						201.58
	5/5	5/6	Ukraine		392.49						392.49
	5/6	5/8	Georgia		610.62						610.62
	5/8	5/9	Bulgaria		226.95						226.95
Hon. Jeff Duncan	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		1,348.60				2,134.60
Hon. Eliot Engel	4/9	4/12	Panama		761.00		2,164.50				2,925.50
Hon. Gregory Meeks	4/9	4/12	Panama		262.00		1,989.10				2,251.10
Hon. David Cicilline	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		2,163.60				2,949.60
Hon. Juan Castro	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		859.10				1,645.10
Mark Walker	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		984.10				1,770.10
Rebecca Ulrich	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		1,019.10				1,805.19
Eric Jacobstein	4/9	4/12	Panama		761.00		1,019.10				1,780.10
Doug Campbell	4/9	4/12	Panama		766.00		1,019.10				1,785.10
Hon. Matt Salmon	5/3	5/7	Vietnam		1,149.12		15,309.70		*1A5,018.68		21,477.50
	5/7	5/10	Hong Kong		1,306.35				*1A8,298.38		9,604.73
Hon. Alan Lowenthal	5/3	5/7	Vietnam		971.34		16,087.80				17,059.14
	5/7	5/10	Hong Kong		935.04						935.04
Hon. Tom Emmer	5/3	5/7	Vietnam		915.76		12,578.70				13,494.46
	5/7	5/10	Hong Kong		1,072.99						1,072.99
Amy Chang	5/3	5/7	Vietnam		941.14		15,221.90				16,163.04
	5/7	5/10	Hong Kong		989.10						989.10
Joseph Brady Howell	5/3	5/7	Vietnam		859.01		15,309.90				16,168.91
	5/7	5/10	Hong Kong		960.43						960.43
Hon. Gregory Meeks	5/23	5/25	Peru		706.00		(³)				706.00
	5/25	5/28	Colombia		1,041.00		(³)				1,041.00
	5/28	5/28	El Salvador				(³)				
	5/28	5/30	Panama		544.00		(³)				544.00
Thomas Hill	5/2	5/5	Egypt		797.52		6,100.60		*1A184.00		7,082.12
	5/5	5/8	Tunisia		663.00				*1A116.54		779.54
	5/8	5/9	Malta		231.35						231.35
Joan Condon	5/2	5/5	Egypt		801.00		6,585.10				7,386.10
	5/5	5/8	Tunisia		663.00						663.00
	5/8	5/9	Malta		238.23						238.23
Jessica Kelch	5/2	5/5	Egypt		797.52		4,197.60				4,995.12
	5/5	5/8	Tunisia		663.00						663.00
Committee total					43,825.84		177,485.33		15,260.60		236,571.77

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.⁴ Indicates delegation costs

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
STAFFDEL Rebecca Ulrich:											
Hon. Jeff Miller	5/25	5/27	Guatemala		370.00		* 1,049.30				1,419.30
	5/27	5/29	El Salvador		422.40						422.40
	5/29	5/31	Honduras		460.00						460.00
Alex Carnes	5/25	5/27	Guatemala		397.00		* 1,049.30				1,446.30
	5/27	5/29	El Salvador		403.40						403.40
	5/29	5/31	Honduras		430.00						430.00
CODEL Kirsten Gillibrand:											
Hon. Kathleen Rice	4/7	4/8	Tunisia		215.42		(³)				215.42
	4/8	4/9	Chad		286.37		(³)				286.37
	4/9	4/10	Kenya		728.67		(³)				728.67
	4/11	4/12	Senegal		242.98		(³)				242.98
Per Diem Returned:					(247.49)						247.49
CODEL Martha McCally:											
Hon. Norma Torres	5/2	5/3	Qatar		62.00		** 12,581.05				12,643.05
	5/3	5/5	Afghanistan		12.00						12.00
	5/5	5/6	Kuwait		355.00						355.00
CODEL Mike Rogers:											
Hon. Mark Walker	5/25	5/27	Japan		665.00		(³)				665.00
	5/28	5/29	South Korea		706.00		(³)				706.00
STAFFDEL Mandy Bowers:											
Mandy Bowers	4/3	4/3	Turkey								0.00
	4/4	4/7	Malaysia		546.00		*** 14,160.80				14,706.80
	4/8	4/12	Australia		1,233.00						1,233.00
Alan Carroll	4/3	4/3	Turkey								0.00
	4/4	4/7	Malaysia		819.00		*** 10,689.70				11,508.70
	4/8	4/12	Australia		1,233.00						1,233.00
Lewis Burke	4/3	4/3	Turkey								0.00
	4/4	4/7	Malaysia		546.00		*** 8,799.90				9,345.90
	4/8	4/12	Australia		1,233.00						1,233.00
Nicole Tisdale	4/3	4/3	Turkey								0.00
	4/4	4/7	Malaysia		546.00		*** 14,160.80				14,706.80
	4/8	4/12	Australia		1,233.00						1,233.00
C. Hayes	4/3	4/3	Turkey								0.00
	4/4	4/7	Malaysia		546.00		*** 14,660.80				15,206.80
	4/8	4/12	Australia		1,233.00						1,233.00
Additional expenses:											
Local Staff Overtime	4/4	4/7	Malaysia						302.34		302.34
Transportation	4/8	4/12	Australia						2,034.00		2,034.00
CODEL Michael McCaul:											
Hon. Michael McCaul	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. William Keating	5/7	5/8	Belgium		408.41		(³)				408.41
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
Hon. John Katko	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		408.41		(³)				408.41
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
Hon. Will Hurd	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.96	**** 1,606.10					1,982.06
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
Hon. Barry Loudermilk	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00	***** 5,303.90					5,687.90
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.22		(³)				718.22
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
Hon. Kathleen Rice	5/7	5/8	Belgium		408.41		(³)				408.41
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
Brendan Shields	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.96		(³)				375.96
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
Laura Fullerton	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.97		(³)				375.97
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
Miles Taylor	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.97		(³)				375.97
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
Susan Phalen	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.97		(³)				375.97
Lanier Avant	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.96		(³)				375.96
Nicole Tisdale	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.97		(³)				375.97
Additional expenses:	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq		1,150.00		(³)				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
Transportation, OT, etc.	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.96		(³)				375.96
Vehicle rental, etc.	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
Bus rental, OT, etc.	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
Rental van, OT, etc.	5/5	5/6	Turkey		718.21		(³)				718.21
Trans, OT, Equip rental	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
Gifts for official visit	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.97		(³)				375.97
	5/8	5/11	France		1,960.00		(³)				1,960.00
Committee total					78,126.22		87,112.25		62,800.49		228,038.96

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

* For STAFFDEL Ulrich, airfare all inclusive.

** For CODEL McSally, airfare inclusive of multiple legs of trip.

*** For STAFFDEL Bowers, airfares inclusive of multiple legs of trip.

**** Flight from Brussels to US.

***** Flight from Germany to US.

HON. MICHAEL T. McCAUL, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEES											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.☒											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER, Chairman, July 15, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Bob Goodlatte	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Hon. Tom Marino	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Hon. Mike Bishop	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Hon. Pedro Pierluis	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
John Manning	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Danielle Brown	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Branden Ritchie	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Robert Parmiter	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Anthony Grossi	5/21	5/30	Peru		614.00		(³)		1,677.00		2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
			Panama								
Committee total					5,526.00				15,093.00		20,619.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. BOB GOODLATTE, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Tim Walberg	3/28	3/29	Germany		315.00						315.00
	3/29	3/30	Bahrain		396.00						396.00
	3/30	3/31	Saudi Arabia		485.00						485.00
	3/31	4/1	Ethiopia		400.00						400.00
	4/1	4/3	Tanzania		480.00						480.00
	4/3	4/4	Spain		236.00						236.00
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	4/23	4/24	Mexico		300.00		777.00				1,077.00
Hon. Stacey Plaskett	4/23	4/24	Mexico		362.00		1,052.00				1,414.00
Cordell Hull	4/22	4/24	Mexico		724.00		688.00				1,412.00
Hon. Jason Chaffetz	5/2	5/5	Saudi Arabia		946.00		12,361.00				13,307.00
Andrew Dockham	5/2	5/5	Saudi Arabia		946.00		12,691.00				13,637.00
Delegation expenses									2,978.00		2,978.00
Committee total					5,590.00		27,569.00		2,978.00		36,137.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JASON CHAFFETZ, Chairman, Aug. 7, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON RULES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Pete Sessions	4/30	5/5	Israel/Turkey		551.00		429.57		1,142.88		2,123.45
	5/6	5/7	Germany		231.00		41.79		324.28		597.07
	5/8	5/10	Bel/France		429.00		172.53		538.95		1,140.48
Lackey Miles	5/22	5/24	El Salvador		519.90		1,841.23				2,361.13
Hon. James McGovern	5/22	5/24	El Salvador		519.90		1,841.23				2,361.13
Committee total					2,250.80		4,326.35		2,006.11		8,583.26

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PETE SESSIONS, Chairman, July 29, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Barbara Comstock	5/21	5/30	Peru		2,291.00						2,291.00
			Colombia								
			El Salvador								
Hon. John Mica	6/19	6/23	Panama		2,074.00		4,560.90		84.00		6,718.90
			France								
Committee total					4,365.00		4,560.90		84.00		9,009.90

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. BILL SHUSTER, Chairman, July 31, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JEFF MILLER, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Charles Rangel	4/9	4/12	Panama		786.00		3,094.15				3,880.15
Hon. Vern Buchanan	5/2	5/5	Israel		1,500.00		(³)				1,500.00
	5/3	5/3	Iraq				1,150.00				1,150.00
	5/5	5/6	Turkey		654.00		(³)				654.00
	5/6	5/7	Germany		384.00		(³)				384.00
	5/7	5/8	Belgium		375.96		(³)				375.96
	5/8	5/11	France		1,947.00		(³)				1,947.00
Hon. George Holding	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		1,897.90				2,612.90
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00		(³)				138.00
Hon. John Larson	5/23	5/28	Cuba		1,455.00		(³)				1,455.00
Hon. Vern Buchanan	3/28	3/29	Germany		334.28		(³)				334.28
	3/29	3/29	Romania				(³)				
	3/29	3/30	Bahrain		395.01		(³)				395.01
	3/30	3/31	Saudi Arabia		486.00		(³)				486.00
	3/31	4/1	Ethiopia		398.04		(³)				398.04
	4/1	4/3	Tanzania		573.00		(³)				573.00
	4/3	4/3	Burundi				(³)				
	4/3	4/4	Spain		104.12		(³)				104.12
Committee total					10,245.41		6,142.05				16,387.46

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, July 31, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Pompeo	4/5	4/8	Middle East		97.00						97.00
	4/8	4/9	Middle East		339.82						339.82
	4/10	4/11	Middle East		414.20				39.93		454.13
	4/11	4/12	Middle East						54.92		54.92
Commercial airfare							15,208.00				15,208.00
Hon. Eric Swalwell	4/5	4/8	Middle East		87.00						87.00
	4/10	4/11	Middle East		414.20				39.93		
	4/11	4/12	Middle East						54.92		
Commercial airfare							14,339.60				14,339.60
Timothy Bergreen	4/5	4/8	Middle East		97.00						97.00
	4/8	4/9	Middle East		339.82						339.82
	4/10	4/11	Middle East		414.20				39.93		454.13
	4/11	4/12	Middle East						54.92		54.92
Commercial airfare							15,536.00				15,536.00
Chelsey Campbell			Middle East		97.00						97.00
	4/8	4/9	Middle East		339.82						339.82
	4/10	4/11	Middle East		414.20				39.93		454.13
	4/11	4/12	Middle East						54.92		54.92
Commercial airfare							15,536.00				15,536.00
Hon. Lynn Westmoreland	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Hon. James Himes	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77

September 8, 2015

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

13799

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Hon. Jackie Speier	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Andrew House	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61		184.10		854.71
Shannon Stuart	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Robert Minehart	4/7	4/9	Central America		361.63				257.14		618.77
Commercial airfare							670.61				670.61
Hon. Jeff Miller	4/10	4/12	Europe		834.37						834.37
Commercial airfare							3,365.40				3,365.40
Hon. Michael Turner	4/10	4/12	Europe		834.37						834.37
Commercial airfare							3,365.40				3,365.40
Jacob Crisp	4/10	4/12	Europe		834.37						834.37
Commercial airfare							3,365.40				3,365.40
Hon. Chris Stewart	5/4	5/6	Africa		935.37						935.37
	5/7	5/8	Africa		555.00						555.00
	5/8	5/9	Europe		385.00				633.32		1,018.32
Commercial airfare							13,294.02				13,294.02
Chelsey Campbell	5/4	5/6	Africa		935.37						935.37
	5/7	5/8	Africa		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							10,926.02				10,926.02
Hon. Devin Nunes	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Hon. Adam Schiff	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
Commercial airfare							848.00				848.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Hon. Terri Sewell	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		357.50		115.88		490.95		964.33
Commercial airfare							4,834.30				4,834.30
Damon Nelson	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Timothy Bergreen	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Kristin Jopson	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Robert Minehart	5/2	5/3	Africa		336.32				241.63		577.95
	5/3	5/5	Africa		604.00				131.40		735.40
	5/5	5/7	Europe		769.50				209.62		979.12
	5/7	5/9	Europe		715.00		115.88		490.95		1,321.83
	5/9	5/10	Europe		138.00				201.25		339.25
Diane Rinaldo	5/25	5/27	Asia		841.38						841.38
	5/27	5/29	Europe		426.00				473.51		899.51
Commercial airfare							9,087.66				9,087.66
Amanda Rogers-Thorpe	5/25	5/27	Asia		841.38						841.38
	5/27	5/29	Europe		426.00				473.50		899.50
Commercial airfare							9,087.66				9,087.66
Committee total					33,143.34		124,298.89		13,249.16		170,691.39

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

* In accordance with title 22, United States Code, Section 1754(b)(2), information as would identify the foreign countries in which Committee Members and staff have traveled is omitted.

HON. DEVIN NUNES, Chairman, July 30, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
HOUSE COMMITTEE											
Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. <input type="checkbox"/>											

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. PAUL RYAN, Chairman, July 1, 2015

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE EVENTS SURROUNDING THE 2012 TERRORIST ATTACK IN BENGHAZI, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEE

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return. ☐

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. TREY GOWDY, Chairman, July 15, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Erika Schlager	4/13	4/18	Austria	Euro	1,870.00		1,771.10				3,641.10
	5/20	5/23	Czech Republic	Koruna	832.00		2,696.30				3,528.30
Alex Johnson	4/23	4/28	France	Euro	2,531.78		2,133.70				4,665.48
	6/3	6/10	Denmark	Krone							
			Turkey	Lira	2,574.00		2,817.50				5,391.50
			Greece	Euro							
Robert Hand	4/23	4/28	Denmark	Krone	513.00		1,541.00				2,054.00
Shelly Han	5/26	6/3	South Korea	Won	2,544.00		2,818.00				5,362.00
			China	Renminbi							
Janice Helwig	4/13	6/30	Austria	Euro	26,286.00		4,667.85				30,953.85
Committee total					37,150.78		18,445.35				55,596.13

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, Chairman, July 31, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2423. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Clarification of United States Antitrust Laws, Immunity, and Liability Under Marketing Order Programs [Docket No.: AMS-FV-14-0072; FV14-900-2 FR] received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2424. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cranberries Grown in States of Massachusetts, et al.; Revising Determination of Sales History [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0091; FV15-929-1 FR] received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2425. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Fruit, Vegetable, and Specialty Crops — Import Regulations; Changes to Reporting Requirements To Add Electronic Form Filing Option [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0093; FV15-944/980/999-1 FR] received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2426. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Olives Grown in California; Increased Assessment Rate [Doc. No.: AMS-FV-14-0105; FV15-932-1 FR] received Au-

gust 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2427. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Amendment of Asian Longhorned Beetle Quarantine Areas in Massachusetts and New York [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0016] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2428. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Cotton and Tobacco Program, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Cotton Research and Promotion Program: Procedures for Conduct of Sign-up Period [AMS-CN-12-0059] received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2429. A letter from the Board Chairman and CEO, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 3052-AC93) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2430. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts, including Coast Guard personnel accounts, from any discretionary cap sequestration in FY 2016, if a sequestration is necessary, pursuant to Sec. 255(f) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2431. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the OMB Sequestration Update Report to the President and Congress for Fiscal Year 2016, pursuant to

Sec. 254 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2432. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General John D. Johnson, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2433. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contracts or Delivery Orders Issued by a Non-DoD Agency (DFARS Case 2015-D014) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0039] (RIN: 0750-AI63) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2434. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contractor Personnel Supporting U.S. Armed Forces Deployed Outside the United States (DFARS Case 2014-D023) (Docket No.: 2015-0010) (RIN: 0750-AI45) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2435. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of Military Construction Funds (DFARS Case 2015-D006) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0019] (RIN: 0750-AI52) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2436. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Acquisition of the American Flag (DFARS Case 2015-D005) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0014] (RIN: 0750-AI51) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2437. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Item Unique Identification Prescription Correction (DFARS Case 2014-D021) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0041] (RIN: 0750-AI65) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2438. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement and Acquisition Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Network Penetration Reporting and Contracting for Cloud Services (DFARS Case 2013-D018) [Docket No.: DARS-2015-0039] (RIN: 0750-AI61) received August 26, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2439. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-AJ10) received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2440. A letter from the Chair, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the "Annual Report to the Congress on the Presidential \$1 Coin Program", pursuant to Sec. 104 of the Presidential \$1 Coin Act of 2005, Pub. L. 109-145; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2441. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility, Sullivan County, NY, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B391] received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2442. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; Delaware County, PA, et al. [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-B393] received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2443. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund's Fiscal Years 2014 and 2013 Financial Statements", pursuant to Sec. 10 of the Gold Reserve Act of 1934, as amended, 31 U.S.C. 5302; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2444. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Corporation Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Pay Ratio Dis-

closure [Release Nos.: 33-9877; 34-75610; File No.: S7-07-13] (RIN: 3235-AL47) received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2445. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Trading and Markets, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Registration Process for Security-Based Swap Dealers and Major Security-Based Swap Participants [Release No.: 34-75611; File No.: S7-40-11] (RIN: 3235-AL05) received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2446. A letter from the Managing Associate General Counsel, Government Accountability Office, transmitting the Office's Major rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 1557-AD84, 7100 AE-22; 3064-AE27; 3052-AC93; 3133-AE40) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2447. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Legal, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 3064-AE27) received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2448. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards (RIN: 3133-AE40) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2449. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority — Technical Assistance Center for Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Program Evaluation and Quality Assurance [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0048] [CFDA No.: 84.263B.] received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2450. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority — Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center — Youth with Disabilities [CFDA No.: 84.264H.] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2451. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and definitions — Demonstration and Training Program: Career Pathways for Individuals with Disabilities [CFDA Number: 84.235N.] [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0061] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2452. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority —

Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center [CFDA Number: 84.264G.] [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0069] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2453. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and definitions — Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center — Targeted Communities [CFDA Number: 84.264F.] [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0070] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2454. A letter from the Acting Director, MSHA, Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Department of Labor, transmitting The Department's final rule — Fees for Testing, Evaluation, and Approval of Mining Products [Docket No.: MSHA-2014-0016] (RIN: 1219-AB82) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2455. A letter from the Program Manager, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators; Extension of Transition Period [Docket No.: CDC-2015-0004; NIOSH-280] (RIN: 0920-AA60) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2456. A letter from the Chair, Community Preventive Services Task Force, transmitting the Community Preventive Services Task Force's 2014-2015 Annual Report to Congress, pursuant to the Public Health Service Act, Sec. 399U(b)(6); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2457. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Substantial Product Hazard List: Seasonal and Decorative Lighting Products [CPSC Docket No.: CPSC-2014-0024] received August 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2458. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Regulatory Affairs, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Substantial Product Hazard List: Extension Cords [CPSC Docket No.: CPSC-2015-0003] received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2459. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting a report entitled "The Availability and Price of Petroleum and Petroleum Products Produced in Countries Other Than Iran", the twenty-second in a series of reports required by Sec. 1245(d)(4)(a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2012; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2460. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel, Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's Major

final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for External Power Supplies [Docket No.: EERE-2014-BT-TP-0043] (RIN: 1904-AD36) received August 25, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2461. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program: Pandemic Influenza Countermeasures Injury Table (RIN: 0906-AA79) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2462. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Health, United States, 2014", pursuant to Sec. 308 of the Public Health Service Act, Pub. L. 78-410; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2463. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Iowa; Update to Materials Incorporated by Reference [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0103; FRL-9926-85-Region 7] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2464. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Washington [EPA-R10-OAR-2007-0112; FRL-9932-21-Region 10] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2465. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Alabama, Mississippi, and South Carolina; Certain Visibility Requirements for the 2008 Ozone Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0177 FRL-9932-30-Region 4] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2466. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida; Miscellaneous Changes [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0336; FRL-9932-25-Region 4] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2467. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Atlanta; Requirements for the 2008 8-Hour Ozone Standard [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0248; FRL-9932-20-Region 4] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2468. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead

(Pb) and the 2008 8-Hour Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0258; FRL-9926-72-Region 9] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2469. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0346; FRL-9932-04-Region 8] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2470. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; State of Wyoming; Interstate Transport of Pollution for the 2006 24-Hour PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0351; FRL-9932-05-Region 8] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2471. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Definitions of Low Pressure Gas Well and Storage Vessel [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0505; FRL-9931-76-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS49) received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2472. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Butte County Air Quality Management District, Feather River Air Quality Management District, and San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0246; FRL-9931-19-Region 9] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2473. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Acetic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0793; FRL-9930-20] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2474. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana and Ohio; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 NO₂ and SO₂ NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0991; EPA-R05-OAR-2013-0435; FRL-9932-15-Region 5] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2475. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Movement of the Northern Virginia Area from Virginia's Nonattain-

ment Area List to its Maintenance Area List [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0454; FRL-9932-35-Region 3] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2476. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fludioxonil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0496; FRL-9931-06] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2477. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Hexythiazox; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0804; FRL-9931-30] received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2478. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Lavandulyl Senecioate; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0017; FRL-9930-16] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2479. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Data Requirements Rule for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Primary National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0711; FRL-9928-18-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR19) received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2480. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Controlling Emissions During Episodes of High Air Pollution Potential [EPA-R07-OAR-2014-0602; FRL-9932-39-Region 7] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2481. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Klamath Falls, Oregon Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory and SIP Strengthening Measures [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0005; FRL-9932-40-Region 10] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2482. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island; Rhode Island Low Emission Vehicle Program [EPA-R01-OAR-2009-0541; A-1-FRL-9932-46-Region 1] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2483. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation

Plans; District of Columbia; Interstate Pollution Transport Requirements for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard [EPA-R03-OAR-2015-0537; FRL-9932-55-Region 3] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2484. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Alcoa BART [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0660; FRL-9932-18-Region 5] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2485. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Nebraska; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0565; FRL-9932-84-Region 7] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2486. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan and Wisconsin; 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS PSD and Visibility Infrastructure SIP Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; FRL-9932-65-Region 5] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2487. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting for Greenhouse Gases: Removal of Certain Vacated Elements [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0414; FRL-9932-11-OAR] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2488. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Idaho: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program; Revision [EPA-R10-RCRA-2015-0307; FRL-9932-87-Region 10] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2489. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; IL; MN; Determinations of Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard for Chicago and Eagan [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0408; EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0409; FRL-9932-63-Region 5] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2490. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); State of Nebraska; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0270; FRL-9932-78-Region 7] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2491. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0564; FRL-9932-83-Region 7] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2492. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — NORTH CAROLINA: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R04-RCRA-2015-0294; FRL-9932-93-Region 4] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2493. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Klamath Falls, Oregon Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory and SIP Strengthening Measures [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0005; FRL-9932-40-Region 10] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2494. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0512; FRL-9932-81-Region 7] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2495. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0556; FRL-9932-95-Region 7] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2496. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana; Correction [EPA-R08-OAR-2010-0304; FRL-9932-53-Region 8] received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2497. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval of North Carolina's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Mecklenburg and Gaston Counties [EPA-HQ-OAR-2015-0208; FRL-9931-94-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AS64) received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2498. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Promulgation of State Im-

plementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2008 Lead, and 2010 NO₂ National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Colorado [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0972; FRL-9932-52-Region 8] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2499. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Methane sulfonic acid; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0633; FRL-9931-07] received August 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2500. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0470; FRL-9929-61] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2501. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Illinois; Disapproval of State Board Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2006 PM_{2.5} and 2008 Ozone NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2009-0805; EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0969; FRL-9932-97-Region 5] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2502. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Albuquerque-Bernalillo County; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permitting [EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0616; FRL-9931-35-Region 6] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2503. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Michigan; Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R05-RCRA-2014-0689; FRL-9933-29-Region 5] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2504. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Michigan State Board Requirements [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0657; FRL-9933-11-Region 5] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2505. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri; 2013 Missouri State Implementation Plan for the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0223; FRL-9933-09-Region 7] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2506. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0531; FRL-9932-26] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2507. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0544; FRL-9932-44-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ40) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2508. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nebraska; Revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the Revocation of the PM10 Annual Standard and Adoption of the 24hr PM2.5 Standard [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0269; FRL-9933-04-Region 7] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2509. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions; Channel Sharing by Full Power and Class A Stations Outside the Broadcast Television Spectrum Incentive Auction Context [GN Docket No.: 12-268] [MB Docket No.: 15-137] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2510. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revisions to Auxiliary Installations, Replacement Facilities, and Siting and Maintenance Regulations [Docket No.: RM12-11-003; Order No.: 790-B] received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2511. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final revised interpretations — Final Action Concerning Review of Interpretations of Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act; Rule Governing Disclosure of Written Consumer Product Warranty Terms and Conditions; Rule Governing Pre-Sale Availability of Written Warranty Terms; Rule Governing Informal Dispute Settlement Procedures; and Guides for the Advertising of Warranties and Guarantees (RIN: 3084-AB24; 3084-AB25; 3084-AB26) received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2512. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica-Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date [Docket Nos.: FDA-2014-C-1616 and FDA-2015-C-0245] received

August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2513. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institutes of Health Undergraduate Scholarship Program Regarding Professions Needed by National Research Institutes [Docket No.: NIH-2007-0930] (RIN: 0925-AA10) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2514. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Administration, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Miscellaneous Corrections [NRC-2015-0105] (RIN: 3150-AJ60) received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2515. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program for Consumer Products: Definitions and Standards for Grid-Enabled Water Heaters [Docket No.: EERE-2015-BT-STD-0017] (RIN: 1904-AD55) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2516. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedures for Clothes Washers [Docket No.: EERE-2013-BT-TP-0009] (RIN: 1904-AC97) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2517. A letter from the Chair of the Incentive Auctions Task Force, Office of Strategic Planning and Policy Analysis, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2518. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report by the Department on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period of April 1 through May 31, 2015, pursuant to Sec. 620C(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and in accordance with Sec. 1(a)(6) of Executive Order 13313; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2519. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List; and Removal of Certain Persons from the Entity List Based on Removal Requests [Docket No.: 150427401-5401-01] (RIN: 0694-AG61) received August 7, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2520. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report

certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009 delegation of authority [74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2521. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed item to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to Sec. 1512 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-261), as amended by Sec. 146 of the Omnibus Consolidated and Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act for FY 1999 (Pub. L. 105-277), and the President's September 29, 2009 delegation of authority [74 Fed. Reg. 50,913 (Oct. 2, 2009)]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2522. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination consistent with the provisions of 22 U.S.C. Sec. 2291-4, as amended, a copy of Presidential Determination No. 2015-10 determining that Colombia meets the statutory requirements relating to the interdiction of aircraft reasonably suspected to be engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2523. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting agreements prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements, other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2524. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report prepared by the Department concerning international agreements, other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2525. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-065; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2526. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-043; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2527. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-035; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2528. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-044; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2529. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to

Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-074; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2530. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-034; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2531. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-028; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2532. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-025; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2533. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of proposed issuance of an export license, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-039; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2534. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Secretary's determinations, certifications, and notifications, pursuant to the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012, Secs. 1244(c)(1), 1246(a)(1), and 1247(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2535. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Cote d'Ivoire that was declared in Executive Order 13396 of February 7, 2006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2536. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a final report on the national emergency with respect to the risk of nuclear proliferation created by the accumulation of a large volume of weapons-usable fissile material in the territory of the Russian Federation that was declared in Executive Order 13617 of June 25, 2012; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2537. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism that was declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2538. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting as required by Sec. 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), notification that the national emergency declared, with respect to Export Control Regulations, in Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 is to continue in effect beyond August 17, 2015; (H. Doc. No. 114—55); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2539. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting

D.C. Act 21-141, "Title IX Athletic Equity Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2540. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-142, "Naval Lodge Building, Inc. Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2541. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-140, "Ruby Whitfield Way Designation Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2542. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-143, "Margaret Peters and Roumania Peters Walker Tennis Courts Designation Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2543. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-144, "Closing of Public Streets adjacent to Squares 603S, 605, 607, 661, 661N, and 665, and in U.S. Reservations 243 and 244, S.O. 13-14605, Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2544. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-146, "Sale of Synthetic Drugs Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2545. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-147, "Ward 5 Paint Spray Booth Moratorium Temporary Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2546. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-145, "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2547. A letter from the Associate General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2548. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2549. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2550. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2551. A letter from the Executive Analyst, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting two reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2552. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998 (Pub. L. 105-270), the Department's FY 2012 and FY 2013 report on inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2553. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2554. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2555. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting The Corporation's 2015 Annual Performance Plan, pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (as amended) and the GPRA Modernization Act of 2010; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2556. A letter from the General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2557. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's Federal Activities Inventory Reform Inventory for FY 2012 and 2013, pursuant to the Federal Activities Inventory Reform (FAIR) Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-270; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2558. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2014 annual report, pursuant to Sec. 203(a) of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2559. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's annual report prepared in accordance with Sec. 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2560. A letter from the HR Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2561. A letter from the Special Counsel, U.S. Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Report to Congress for FY 2014; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2562. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations; Areas of the National Park System, Cuyahoga Valley National Park, Bicycling [NPS-CUVA-18292; PPMWCUVAR0, PPMRSNR1Z.Y00000] (RIN: 1024-AE18) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2563. A letter from the Departmental Privacy Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Privacy Act Regulations; Exemption for the Indian Arts and Crafts Board [156D0102DM/DS10700000-DMSN00000.000000/DX.10701.CEN00000] (RIN: 1090-AB10) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2564. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; North Atlantic Swordfish Fishery [Docket No.: 120627194-3657-02] (RIN: 0648-XE005) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2565. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE064) received August 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Pub. L. 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2566. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's 2012 Annual Report for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, pursuant to the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2567. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Surfclam and Ocean Quahog Fisheries [Docket No.: 130822745-5611-02] (RIN: 0648-BD64) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2568. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's Thirty-Seventh Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report, pursuant to Sec. 7A of the Clayton Act and the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2569. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the notice of adoption of Recommendation 2015-1, Promoting Accuracy and Transparency in the Unified Agenda [80 Fed. Reg. 36757 (June 26, 2015)]; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2570. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting the report of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts on applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during FY 2014, as required by 18 U.S.C. 3103a(d); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2571. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers who were employed at Westinghouse Electric Corp. in Bloomfield, New Jersey, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to

the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act of 2000 and 42 C.F.R. pt. 83; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2572. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting the Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States for the March 2015 session, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 331; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2573. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's annual report of the Review Panel on Prison Rape, pursuant to Sec. 4(c)(1)(A) of the Prison Rape Elimination Act of 2003, 42 U.S.C. 15603(c)(1)(A), also including a status report from the Department's Bureau of Justice Statistics entitled "PREA Data Collection Activities, 2015"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2574. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's report entitled, "Solutions for Safer Communities: FY 2013 Annual Report to Congress", in accordance with Secs. 522, 810, and 1406 of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3711 et. seq.), as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2575. A letter from the Chief Justice, Supreme Court, transmitting notification that the Supreme Court will open the October 2015 term on Monday, October 5, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. and will continue until all matters before the Court ready for argument have been disposed of or decided; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2576. A letter from the Chair, United States Sentencing Commission, transmitting the Commission's Report to Congress: Impact of the Fair Sentencing Act of 2010 (as directed by Sec. 10 of Pub. L. 111-220), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994-995, and its specific authority under 28 U.S.C. 995(a)(20); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2577. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting the biennial report on the status of the Missouri River Bank Stabilization and Navigation Fish and Wildlife Mitigation Project, Kansas, Missouri, Iowa, and Nebraska, pursuant to Sec. 4003(e) of the Water Resources Reform and Development Act of 2014; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2578. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revision of Freedom of Information Act Regulation [Docket No.: FR-5624-F-02] (RIN: 2501-AD57) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2579. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment and Amendment of Class E Airspace; Bremerton, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1067; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ANM-15] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2580. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Restricted Areas R-4501A, R-4501B, R-4501C, R-

4501D, R-4501F, and R-4501H; Fort Leonard Wood, MO [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0640; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2581. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revocation of Class D and E Airspace; Independence, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0565; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ACE-7] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2582. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Headland, AL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0046; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-23] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2583. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenville, SC [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0044; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-3] received August 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2584. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Campbellsville, KY [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0458; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ASO-2] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2585. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Dyersburg, TN [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0968; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-17] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2586. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0921; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-073-AD; Amendment 39-18193; AD 2015-13-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2587. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc. [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2906; Directorate Identifier 2014-SW-068-AD; Amendment 39-18213; AD 2015-15-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2588. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited

Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2957; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-089-AD; Amendment 39-18218; AD 2015-15-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2589. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2463; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-086-AD; Amendment 39-18216; AD 2015-15-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2590. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class B Airspace; New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2219; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWA-5] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2591. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1127; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-16-AD; Amendment 39-18203; AD 2015-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2592. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31030; Amdt. No.: 521] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2593. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International, Inc. Turbo-prop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2006-23706; Directorate Identifier 2006-NE-03-AD; Amendment 39-18177; AD 2015-12-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2594. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Defuniak Springs, FL [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0045; Airspace Docket No.: 14-ASO-22] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2595. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31025; Amdt. No.: 3650] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2596. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0926; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-085-AD; Amendment 39-18204; AD 2015-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2597. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31024; Amdt. 3649] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2598. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0428; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-067-AD; Amendment 39-18205; AD 2015-14-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2599. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31023; Amdt. No. 3648] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2600. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0086; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-191-AD; Amendment 39-18206; AD 2015-14-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2601. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0570; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-094-AD; Amendment 39-18201; AD 2015-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2602. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31022; Amdt. No.: 3647] received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2603. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; GA 8 Airvan (Pty) Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1123; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-037-AD; Amendment 39-18209; AD 2015-16-02 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2604. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0778; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-095-AD; Amendment 39-18220; AD 2015-15-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2605. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Various Transport Category Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2962; Directorate Identifier 2015-NM-071-AD; Amendment 39-18221; AD 2012-11-09 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2606. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS AIRCRAFT LTD. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1177; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-009-AD; Amendment 39-18208; AD 2015-14-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2607. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0011; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-046-AD; Amendment 39-18194; AD 2015-12-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2608. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Turbomeca S.A. Turboshift Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0164; Directorate Identifier 2014-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-18191; AD 2015-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2609. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-1052; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-18210; AD 2015-15-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2610. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-

2015-0679; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-182-AD; Amendment 39-18211; AD 2015-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2611. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0572; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-027-AD; Amendment 39-18214; AD 2015-15-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2612. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0088; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-179-AD; Amendment 39-18217; AD 2015-15-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2613. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0748; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-013-AD; Amendment 39-18219; AD 2015-15-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2614. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0165; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-02-AD; Amendment 39-18212; AD 2015-15-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2615. A letter from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Securement of Unattended Equipment [Docket No.: FRA-2014-0032; Notice No.: 2] (RIN: 2130-AC47) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2616. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0348; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-033-AD; Amendment 39-18225; AD 2015-15-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2617. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0095; Directorate Identifier 2015-NE-01-AD; Amendment 39-18228; AD 2015-16-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2618. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0652; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-076-AD; Amendment 39-18223; AD 2015-15-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2619. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3139; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-139-AD; Amendment 39-18224; AD 2015-15-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2620. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0834; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-045-AD; Amendment 39-18227; AD 2015-16-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2621. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0487; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-026-AD; Amendment 39-18226; AD 2015-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2622. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Kidde Gravier [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0751; Directorate Identifier 2013-NM-188-AD; Amendment 39-18229; AD 2015-16-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2623. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0826; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-221-AD; Amendment 39-18222; AD 2015-15-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2624. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31027; Amdt. No.: 3652] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2625. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of

Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31026; Amdt. No.: 3651] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2626. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31029; Amdt. No.: 3654] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2627. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31028; Amdt. No.: 3653] received August 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2628. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Water Quality Standards Regulatory Revisions [EPA-HQ-OW-2010-0606; FRL-9921-21-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF16) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2629. A letter from the Chairman, Office of Proceedings and the Office of Economics, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services — 2015 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 23)] received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2630. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty: Adjustable Rate Mortgage Notification Requirements and Look-Back Period (RIN: 2900-AP25) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2631. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Additional Compensation on Account of Children Adopted Out of Veteran's Family (RIN: 2900-AP18) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2632. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Vet Centers

(RIN: 2900-AP21) received August 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2633. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of the Squaw Valley-Miramonte Viticultural Area [Docket No.: TTB-2015-0002; T.D. TTB-129; Ref. Notice No.: 146] (RIN: 1513-AC12) received August 19, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2634. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "2012 Regional Partnership Grants to Increase the Well-Being of and to Improve the Permanency Outcomes for Children Affected by Substance Abuse: Second Annual Report to Congress", as required by the Child and Family Services Improvement Act, Pub. L. 112-34; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2635. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury providing additional information regarding the Treasury's ability to continue to finance the government and the extraordinary measures taken to avoid default; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2636. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Determination of Distributive Share When Partner's Interest Changes [TD 9728] (RIN: 1545-BD71) received August 5, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2637. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Extension of Time to File Certain Information Returns [TD 9730] (RIN: 1545-BM50) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2638. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Basis in Interests in Tax-Exempt Trusts [TD 9729] (RIN: 1545-BJ42) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2639. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Updated Static Mortality Tables for Defined Benefit Pension Plans for 2016 [Notice 2015-53] received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2640. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Advance Pricing Agreements (Rev. Proc. 2015-41) received August 13, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2641. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Requesting Competent Authority Assistance under Tax Treaties (Rev. Proc. 2015-40) received August 13, 2015,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2642. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Applicable Federal Rates — September 2015 (Rev. Rule. 2015-19) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2643. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Transfers of Property to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners and Controlled Transactions Involving Partnerships [Notice 2015-54] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2644. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates [Notice 2015-55] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2645. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Section 49801 — Excise Tax on High Cost Employer-Sponsored Health Coverage [Notice 2015-52] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2646. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule — Income tax treatment of 2014 fuel credits allowable under section 6426(c) and section 6426(d) [Notice 2015-56] received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2647. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Federal Tax Treatment of Identity Protection Services Provided to Data Breach Victims (Announcement 2015-22) received August 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2648. A letter from the Lead Regulations Writer, Office of Regulations and Reports Clearance, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Social Security Number Card Applications [Docket No.: SSA-2014-0042] (RIN: 0960-AH68) received August 20, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2649. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Office of Compliance, transmitting the Office's report on the Occupational Safety and Health Inspections conducted during the 112th and 113th Congresses, as provided in Sec. 215(e)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act, 2 U.S.C. 1341(e)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

2650. A letter from the Acting Director, Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Liberalization

of Certain Documentary Evidence Required as Proof of Exportation on Drawback Claims [CBP Dec. 15-11] (RIN: 1515-AE02) received August 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; jointly to the Committees on Homeland Security and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1344. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children; with an amendment (Rept. 114-241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 2820. A bill to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 3154. A bill to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1462. A bill to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome (Rept. 114-244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. UPTON: Committee on Energy and Commerce. H.R. 1725. A bill to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 758. A bill to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2954. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 617 Walnut Street in Helena, Arkansas, as the "Jacob Trieber Federal Building, United States Post Office, and United States Court House" (Rept. 114-247). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. S. 261. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 200 NW 4th Street in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, as the William J. Holloway, Jr. United States Courthouse (Rept. 114-248). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3114. A bill to provide funds to the Army Corps of Engineers to hire veterans and members of the Armed Forces to assist the Corps with curation and historic preservation activities, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 487. A bill to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands (Rept. 114-250). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 959. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-251). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1949. A bill to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia (Rept. 114-252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1937. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture to more efficiently develop domestic sources of the minerals and mineral materials of strategic and critical importance to United States economic and national security and manufacturing competitiveness (Rept. 114-253, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2791. A bill to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon; and for other purposes (Rept. 114-254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico; and for other purposes (Rept. 114-255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 408. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 64) disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; and for other purposes (Rept. 114-256). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration. H.R. 1937 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3442. A bill to provide further means of accountability of the United States debt and promote fiscal responsibility; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 3443. A bill to prohibit the provision of funds under title X of the Public Health Service Act to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or its affiliates, subsidiaries, successors, or clinics during a period of review by the Government Accountability Office and the Congress; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PITTS (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3444. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to reduce Medicaid and CHIP fraud in the territories of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. PITTS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 3445. A bill to prohibit the sale of arms to Bahrain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DOGGETT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. POCAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILMER, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3446. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require the Secretary to provide for the use of data from the second preceding tax year to carry out the simplification of applications for the estimation and determination of financial aid eligibility, to increase the income threshold to qualify for zero expected family contribution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. FOX:

H.R. 3447. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3448. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to prohibit the taking of any endangered species or threatened species of fish or wildlife in the United States as a trophy and the importation of any such trophy into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3449. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to extend honorary citizenship to otherwise qualified noncitizens who enlisted in the Philippines and died while serving on active duty with the United States Armed Forces during certain periods of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3450. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prohibit private educational lenders from requiring accelerated repayment of private education loans upon the death or disability of a cosigner of the loan; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3451. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to make student loans dischargeable; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3452. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income any amount awarded under a Federal Pell Grant and any portion of a scholarship used by a full-time student for room and board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia (for himself and Mr. LUCAS):

H.R. 3453. A bill to clarify the regulatory treatment of Federal Home Loan Bank products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3454. A bill to require the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy to conduct a fuel system requirements harmonization study, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.J. Res. 65. A joint resolution to authorize the use of the United States Armed Forces to

achieve the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. REICHERT):

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 2nd Annual Fallen Firefighters Congressional Flag Presentation Ceremony; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for an event to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Million Man March; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 409. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to exclude certain organizations from the definition of earmark; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOHMERT (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. BABIN, Mr. YOHIO, and Mr. BRAT):

H. Res. 410. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran and submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, because the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a treaty and, pursuant to Article II of the U.S. Constitution, the Senate must give its advice and consent to ratification if the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is to be effective and binding upon the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

108. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 37, urging the United States Congress to direct the Department of Defense to relocate the United States Africa Command to Ellington Field Joint Reserve Base in Houston; to the Committee on Armed Services.

109. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the enactment of the Older Americans Act of 1965, and the successful implementation of that act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

110. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to House Joint Memorial 16, urging Congress to work with Turkish diplomats, European Union, and NATO allies to stop mass arrests and detainment of journalists in Turkey; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

111. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 167, urging the United States Congress and the Louisiana Congressional Delegation to take such actions as are necessary to rectify the revenue sharing inequities between coastal and interior energy producing states; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

112. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 228, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to reestablish a right-of-way through the Lake Ophelia National

Wildlife Refuge in order to provide access to property owned by the Avoyelles Parish School Board; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

113. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 15, calling upon the President and administration officials to support the increased importation of oil from Canadian oil sands and to approve the newly routed TransCanada Keystone XL pipeline; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

114. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 80, urging the Congress of the United States to provide federal funding for necessary repairs to the Battleship Texas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

115. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 207, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to regulate airline baggage fees and processes for consumers as it relates to transportation of passenger luggage and passenger delays resulting from lost, damaged, or delayed luggage; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

116. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Missouri, relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 29, urging the President of the United States and the Congress of the United States to repeal the excise tax on medical devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

117. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, designating the year of 2015 as "State of California Year of Commemoration of the Centennial Anniversary of the Armenian Genocide of 1915-1923"; jointly to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Education and the Workforce.

118. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 225, urging the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to work to adopt policies that will help with the stability and the viability of the domestic shrimp industry, including support for the Imported Seafood Safety Standards Act; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and Energy and Commerce.

119. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, relative to Senate Joint Memorial 12, urging the Congress of the United States of America to support developing a solution to the financial issues that arise from the operation of the marijuana industry; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Financial Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 3442.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 2: The Congress shall have Power . . . To borrow Money on the credit of the United States.

Article I, section 8, clause 18: The Congress shall have Power . . . To make all Laws

which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina:

H.R. 3443.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article 1, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PITTS:

H.R. 3444.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 3445.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18

By Mr. DOGGETT:

H.R. 3446.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. FOXX:

H.R. 3447.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18, Congress may enact laws necessary and proper to the execution of its enumerated powers. As this legislation solely amends the amount of time available for execution of previously granted authority, it is merely technical in nature and an appropriate exercise of Congress' authority to amend its previous actions through necessary and proper statutes.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3448.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 3 and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3449.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, the reported bill is authorized by Congress's power to: "To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization. . . ."

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3450.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following: Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3451.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3452.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 3453.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 ("The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States")

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with Indian Tribes.)

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3454.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8, Cl. 3

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.J. Res. 65.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §8, cl. 11

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 20: Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. ESHOO, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 110: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 169: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 188: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 209: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 217: Mr. LOUDERMILK and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 244: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.

H.R. 249: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 267: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 292: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MEEHAN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 499: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 511: Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 546: Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 556: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 581: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 584: Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 592: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. JONES, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 653: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 662: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 671: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 682: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 700: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 702: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, and Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 716: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 721: Mr. STEWART, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 731: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 763: Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 766: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 822: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 829: Mr. HECK of Washington and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 838: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 842: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. ISSA, Mr. ROSS, and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 845: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 879: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 885: Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 902: Mr. SARBANES and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 920: Mr. PETERS and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 921: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. GRAHAM, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 927: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 932: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. KEATING.

H.R. 953: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 973: Mr. CULBERSON.

H.R. 980: Mr. HARPER.

H.R. 985: Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MICA, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COOK, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1000: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1035: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 1054: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 1061: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1086: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1101: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1111: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1117: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1132: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.

H.R. 1148: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 1170: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1188: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. POLIS, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1196: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1197: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 1211: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1221: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. OLSON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1233: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. HARRIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1258: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. ESTY.

H.R. 1288: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. NEAL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. CLAWSON of Florida, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. JOYCE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1292: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1298: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1299: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 1301: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1303: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 1304: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 1309: Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1312: Ms. DELAURO, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. GABBARD, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1321: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1344: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1356: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1375: Mr. ISRAEL, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1384: Mr. HIMES, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1399: Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1401: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 1424: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1427: Mr. BILIRAKIS, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1434: Mr. PIERLUISI.

H.R. 1439: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1441: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1462: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1464: Ms. LEE, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1475: Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1496: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 1516: Mr. TAKANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1550: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1559: Mr. LANCE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. NUNES, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. BOST.

H.R. 1567: Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1568: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1571: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 1594: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1603: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 1608: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SHUSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. COOPER.

H.R. 1610: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. VARGAS.

H.R. 1624: Mr. BRAT, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MARINO, and Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 1644: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1655: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 1706: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1714: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1718: Mr. WESTMORELAND and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 1725: Ms. KUSTER and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1726: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 1739: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1749: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1752: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 1763: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1769: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. MENG, Mr. JONES, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 1786: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. NEAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1818: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1854: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1856: Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1859: Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 1887: Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1901: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 1902: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1908: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1934: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 1942: Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1943: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 1988: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 1989: Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 1996: Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 2009: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 2016: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 2017: Mr. HARPER and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2027: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2037: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 2044: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 2050: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 2061: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 2076: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2083: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2096: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. HURT of Virginia, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2102: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2114: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2147: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2148: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

H.R. 2150: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 2173: Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 2191: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2210: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 2216: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2229: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 2257: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2266: Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2287: Mr. ASHFORD and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 2303: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2311: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 2315: Mr. GALLEG0.

H.R. 2327: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 2368: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 2369: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 2391: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2407: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 2449: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 2460: Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NEAL, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2461: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2494: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. HONDA, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. LEE.

H.R. 2513: Mr. HILL and Mr. BARTON.

H.R. 2524: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 2540: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2568: Mr. WESTMORELAND, and Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 2595: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2602: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 2609: Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2643: Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. WAGNER, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 2652: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2658: Mr. COLLINS of New York.

H.R. 2660: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. CRAMER and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
 H.R. 2713: Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2730: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2737: Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2749: Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2753: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 2759: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, and Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 2766: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
 H.R. 2769: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 2802: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 2808: Mr. DOGGETT.
 H.R. 2815: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2846: Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 2847: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 2849: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2853: Mr. STEWART.
 H.R. 2855: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2858: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TONKO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 2867: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 2894: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 2900: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. POSEY, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.
 H.R. 2912: Mr. RUSSELL.
 H.R. 2913: Mr. SANFORD.
 H.R. 2920: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. COURTNEY, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 2923: Mr. RICHMOND.
 H.R. 2938: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
 H.R. 2940: Ms. HAHN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2948: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. MARCHANT.
 H.R. 2972: Mr. HASTINGS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. AGUILAR.
 H.R. 2994: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2998: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. LANCE and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3013: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.R. 3025: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 3035: Mr. DUFFY.
 H.R. 3037: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 3040: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3048: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3052: Mr. BARLETTA.
 H.R. 3067: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SABLON, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 3071: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 3072: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
 H.R. 3092: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 3093: Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 3099: Mr. PASCARELL.
 H.R. 3110: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
 H.R. 3118: Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 3123: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 3126: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. WOODALL.
 H.R. 3136: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 3137: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3138: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. LOUDERMILK.
 H.R. 3139: Mr. ZELDIN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BARR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. GIBSON.
 H.R. 3150: Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. Pierluisi.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 3155: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3156: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3158: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3164: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. ENGEL, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.
 H.R. 3171: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 3177: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3180: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 3184: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3193: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 3197: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3199: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. JOYCE, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3237: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3243: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
 H.R. 3248: Mr. COURTNEY.
 H.R. 3251: Mr. HUELSKAMP and Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 3278: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 3285: Ms. KELLY of Illinois.
 H.R. 3287: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 3290: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. PAYNE and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3296: Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 3308: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
 H.R. 3309: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 3326: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PALLONE.
 H.R. 3337: Ms. FUDGE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3338: Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HANNA, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. HENSARLING, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. ROSS, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. ROKITA.
 H.R. 3339: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3340: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3341: Mr. HONDA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3364: Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 3365: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3366: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 3378: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGGO, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3393: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 3403: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 3406: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3411: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.
 H.R. 3441: Mrs. BLACKBURN.
 H.J. Res. 1: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.J. Res. 2: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. BILIRAKIS.
 H.J. Res. 14: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.J. Res. 51: Ms. GRAHAM.
 H.J. Res. 52: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr.

KIND, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. SIREs, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VELA, and Mr. REED.
 H.J. Res. 58: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.J. Res. 64: Mr. COOK, Mr. MCCAUL, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. FOX, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DENT, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. NUNES.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BOST and Ms. SINEMA.
 H. Con. Res. 33: Mr. DELANEY.
 H. Con. Res. 49: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GALLEGGO, and Mr. DOGGETT.
 H. Con. Res. 69: Mr. CHABOT.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. DESAULNIER and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H. Res. 130: Ms. BASS and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H. Res. 145: Mr. FARR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Res. 177: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.
 H. Res. 210: Mr. HONDA.
 H. Res. 211: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H. Res. 214: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. PLASKETT, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MOULTON, and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H. Res. 220: Mr. FARR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. POSEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. COURTNEY.
 H. Res. 230: Ms. ESTY, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Ms. FUDGE, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H. Res. 286: Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H. Res. 289: Mr. LYNCH and Miss RICE of New York.
 H. Res. 290: Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H. Res. 294: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H. Res. 343: Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. WALZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H. Res. 346: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H. Res. 367: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Mr. DENT.
 H. Res. 374: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H. Res. 402: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.J. Res. 64, Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Judiciary in H.J. Res.

64 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.J. Res. 64 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions of H.J. Res. 64 (Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran) that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.J. Res. 64, "Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3412: Mr. VEASEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

19. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Commission of the City of Lauderhill, FL, relative to Resolution No. 15R-07-161, condemning the Dominican Republic's impending mass deportation of Haitian immigrants; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

20. Also, a petition of the Oakland County Board of Commissioners, Oakland County, MI, relative to Miscellaneous Resolution No. 15154, objecting to the development of a nuclear waste repository in close proximity to the Great Lakes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

21. Also, a petition of City Council of Anaheim, CA, relative to Resolution No. 2015-222, urging the 114th United States Congress to adopt H.R. 2140 — The Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2015, that would attach human rights conditions to trade and security agreements with Vietnam to promote free-

dom, human rights, and the rule of law as part of United States-Vietnam relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

22. Also, a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to propose, for ratification by special conventions held within the individual states, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would require that at least one of the two houses of Congress approve, by majority vote of all members elected and serving in that body, a reprieve or pardon granted by the President of the United States to a person earlier having been properly found guilty of committing an offense against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

23. Also, a petition of the New Orleans City Council, Louisiana, relative to Resolution No.: R-15-337, recognizing August 6, 2015, as the 50th Anniversary of the signing of the Voting Rights Act of 1965; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

24. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 270-15, commemorating the 71st Anniversary of the Port Chicago disaster and urging the President of the United States and the U.S. Congress to exonerate the 50 sailors convicted of mutiny in the incident with the designation of Honorable Discharge; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNITION OF EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICERS AND THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES WITH 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE HOUSE AND RECIPIENTS OF THE HOUSE EMPLOYEE EXCELLENCE AWARD AND TEAM PLAYER AWARD

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Ranking Member ROBERT BRADY and I rise today to congratulate and recognize the outstanding employees of the Officers (Clerk of the House, Sergeant at Arms, and Chief Administrative Officer) and the Inspector General of the U.S. House of Representatives who have reached the milestone of 25 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives, as well as the recipients of the House Employee Excellence Award and Team Player Award.

The House's most important asset is its dedicated and exceptional employees, whose work, which is often behind the scenes, is vital in keeping the operations and services of the House running smoothly and efficiently. The employees we recognize today are acknowledged and commended for their hard work, dedication, professionalism, teamwork, support of House Members and their staffs and constituents, and for their contributions day-in and day-out to the overall operations of the House. These employees have a wide range of responsibilities and skills that support the legislative process, ensure the security of the institution, maintain our technology and service infrastructure, and contribute to a more effective and efficiently operating House support structure. They have accomplished many great things in a wide range of activities, and the House of Representatives and its Members, staff, and the American public is better served because of them.

We recognize and honor the individuals named below for 25 years of dedicated service to the House. Collectively, this group has provided 350 years of service to the U.S. House of Representatives:

Keith S. Brown, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Pamela L. Brown, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mona S. Burnett, Office of the Sergeant at Arms.

Ed Cassidy, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Mark Dobbins, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Daniel S. Hall, Office of the Clerk.

Patrick A. Hirsch, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Araceli Jennings, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Tara A. Kelley, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Timothy Magruder, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Charles E. Powell, Jr., Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Robin Richter, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

Randy Rogerson, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

David Tonizzo, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

We also recognize and congratulate the House employees receiving the Employee Excellence Award. This is a merit-based award, given to an employee from each House Officer organization, and the Office of Inspector General. Selected employees exhibited outstanding overall job performance and displayed a willingness to go above and beyond the call of duty for their organization throughout the last year. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this prestigious award.

Melissa K. Franger and John F. Looney, III, Office of the Sergeant at Arms.

Kevin Hanrahan, Office of the Clerk.

Michael A. Howard, Office of Inspector General.

David E. McKittrick, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

And finally, we recognize and congratulate several House employees being presented the Team Player Award. This award recognizes the value the House Officers and Inspector General place on working collaboratively across House organizations to strengthen and protect the U.S. House of Representatives. These awardees have demonstrated a collaborative attitude, commitment to achieving team objectives, respect and support of their teammates, and dedication to the betterment of House operations. We honor the individuals named below for receiving this notable award.

Alison M. Trulock, Office of the Clerk.

Kevin C. Cornell and Donna K. Wolfgang, Office of Inspector General.

James J. Kaelin, Office of the Sergeant at Arms.

Kevin N. Chambers, Office of the Chief Administrative Officer.

On behalf of the entire House community, I extend our congratulations and once again recognize and thank these employees for their professionalism and commitment to the U.S. House of Representatives as a whole, and in particular to their respective House Officers, the Inspector General, and collaboratively across these organizations. Their long hours, hard work, and team spirit are invaluable, and their years of unwavering service, dedication, and commitment to the House set an example for their colleagues and other employees who will follow in their footsteps. I celebrate our honorees, and I am proud to stand before you

and the nation on their behalf to recognize the importance of their public service.

15TH ANNIVERSARY OF WRITING ON AMERICA

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, last month we celebrated Viet Bao Daily News' 15th Anniversary of the Writing on America Essay Contest and its subsequent annual Awards program. Viet Bao Daily News established the Writing on America Essay Contest in 2000 with the simple mission of creating an opportunity for members of the Vietnamese community to share their individual experiences.

Since its creation, the competition has become an annual grand award celebration and a uniting chronicle sharing inspirational stories from members of the Vietnamese community. The initial objective of the competition was to preserve the Vietnamese language and cultural values. However, the impact exceeded Viet Bao's initial expectation. The tens of thousands of entries over the years have become more than just an anthology of shared, collective philosophical values—but a historical record helping to preserve the Vietnamese community's history across a broad spectrum ranging from tragedy to triumph.

I would like to congratulate all of the participants in the essay competition for sharing their varied stories of life and legacy, as well as congratulate all of the winners past and present. They have all contributed a multitude of inspirational stories that document and share with the whole community their experiences and journey to assimilate in American society.

I also want to congratulate and applaud Viet Bao Daily News for the success of their writing competition, not just for the community service the program brings to the Vietnamese community, but for what it contributes to the rich tapestry of our nation.

RECOGNIZING THE TOWN OF KOUTS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound admiration that I recognize the town of Kouts, Indiana, as it marks its 150th anniversary. In celebration of this special occasion, festivities were held in Kouts on August 22, 2015, which included a parade and commemoration ceremony coinciding with the

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

town's annual Porkfest and the historic Aukiki Festival.

An idyllic sanctuary for rural life, Kouts has become the thriving community it is today due to one noble trait: perseverance. In 1865, when surveyors of the nearby Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and Saint Louis railroad sought lodging, they were denied at the first home they came to and wandered onward to be accepted with hospitality at the second, where the Kouts family lived. Henceforth, the family name was given to the area as it expanded from the Kouts train station and was built into a prospering community by the surveyors. The village applied for incorporation three times, failing twice before Kouts' patience was rewarded in 1921, the same year electricity spread to the area.

Kouts has always been a town of industry, not in the sense of material production, but in the sense that the people of Kouts have always toiled with conviction and tenacity to create the lives they envision for themselves and to lift up their community as a civil microcosm worthy of respect.

It is a testament to the quality of the people of Kouts and their interest in supporting each member of the community that Blake Benson, an eighth grader at Kouts Middle School, has assumed the role of President of the town's Sesquicentennial Committee, performing the duties of his office with pride. In collaboration with his Committee, Blake has organized the joyous commemoration of this special day in Kouts history. For their devotion to their town's history and prosperity, I would like to acknowledge Mr. Benson, the Kouts Sesquicentennial Committee, and Kouts Clerk-Treasurer Laurie Tribble.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in honoring the 150th anniversary of the town of Kouts. The town's long history of harmonious cohabitations is inspiring and is worthy of our admiration.

HONORING ROBERT FISHER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Robert Fisher, who passed away on July 17 in Fairfax, California, at the age of 68. A nearly-lifelong Marin resident and community leader, he will be remembered for his unyielding efforts to better lives in Marin City and beyond.

From an early age, Mr. Fisher cared deeply about others. He moved to Marin City a year after his birth, and attended high school and college in the North Bay. He first ran for office at the age of 23, serving on the Sausalito-Marín City School District board and later, for the Marin City Community Services District board. He also worked as a student counselor at his alma mater, the College of Marin, and became an engineer by profession.

Mr. Fisher's efforts will continue to impact lives long after his passing. He was involved with the Marin City Health and Wellness Center, Bayside Martin Luther King Jr. School,

and the recently-opened Rocky Graham Park. A new community center for Marin City—one of his dreams—has begun the planning process.

Robert Fisher's lifetime dedication to public service exemplifies an inspirational spirit of generosity and a model for others to follow. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to him today and express our deepest condolences to his wife, Agnes, his sister, Lue Ann, and his children.

EDITH GATES BRADY—100TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

HON. ERIC A. "RICK" CRAWFORD

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, Edith's parents were William Earl and Marsha Susan Gates. She has one younger brother, Billy Duane, who resides in Texas.

Edith was born at 4:00 p.m. September 4, 1915, in the country outside of Peach Orchard, AR.

She moved from Peach Orchard, Arkansas, to Michigan in 1925 at age 10. She graduated as Salutatorian from John J. Pershing High School.

She was married to Loyd Elvin Brady in the midst of the Great Depression on October 28, 1934, at the Hazel Park Baptist Tabernacle, Hazel Park, MI in a wedding dress costing \$13. She had 6 children, Roger Bryan, Kay Linda, Loyd (Bud) Elvin II, Dan Gregory, Robert Franklin and Kirk Allyn.

As the wife of a city manager she resided, entertained and attended public/political functions in Hazel Park, MI, Trinidad, CO, The Dalles, OR, Monrovia, CA, and Santa Clara, CA, before her husband retired to raise cattle at the Sugarbush Ranch in Success, AR, in 1963.

She has 13 grandchildren, 13 great-grandchildren, and 5 great-great-grandchildren.

She was baptized into the Christian faith as a child and has been a member of the Success Baptist Church in Success, AR since 1963.

She became Deputy Treasurer of Western Clay County, Arkansas, in 1968, in which capacity she served for 16 years.

Edith has family traveling from California, Texas, Georgia, and Michigan for the centennial celebration.

She loves celebrating events with her family, recollecting amusing stories/life lessons, following political commentary, reading western novels, and cheering for the St. Louis Cardinals.

She plans to wear high heels to her 100th birthday celebration.

HONORING THE INTERAGENCY CO- OPERATION THAT SAVED A LIFE

HON. SUZAN K. DeIBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. DeIBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Whatcom County Fire District 5,

Whatcom County Sheriff's Department, Airlift Northwest, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) for working together to save the life of Hugh Graham, a Point Roberts visitor who went into cardiac arrest at the Port of Entry.

Early on June 7, Hugh and his friend Andy MacLean arrived in Point Roberts, having planned a bike ride. Immediately after passing through the Port of Entry on Tyee Drive, Hugh collapsed. Customs Agents began performing CPR, while a cardiac arrest call went out to the Whatcom County Sheriff's Department and Whatcom County Fire District 5.

The first responders worked on resuscitating Hugh using defibrillation and medication until he was stable. Hugh was then transported in an Airlift Northwest helicopter to PeaceHealth St. Joseph Medical Center in Bellingham. The strong relationship between the CBP, Airlift Northwest, Fire District 5 and the Sheriff's Department was essential in ensuring the best possible outcome for Hugh, who has since returned home to fully recover.

Many thanks go to:

Whatcom County Fire District 5 personnel:

Jerry Aguiar, Ben Boyko, Christian Craig, Jeff Finlay, Ryan Greene, Mark Puustelli, Fadi Samaha, John Shields, Kristy Steinberger, Christina Tersakian, Scott Van Den Boogaard, Kyle Whiteman

Whatcom County Sheriff Deputies:

Tom McCarthy, Jayson Loreen

Airlift Northwest members:

Bonita Haggith, Rose Goure, Rick Rathbun
U.S. Customs and Border Protection Agents:

Larry Tingley, Eddie Proctor, Timothy Johnson, Denton Glaser, Andrew Giles, Merritt Washburn, Christopher Barron, Robert Carter, Detlef Goellner

This situation is a great example of how our community benefits when agencies work together at all levels. I am thankful that these men and women are hard at work every single day to keep us safe and secure.

HONORING MOTHER VIRGINIA OLIVER

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep respect and profound admiration that I congratulate Mother Virginia Oliver, a longtime resident of East Chicago, Indiana, on a momentous milestone, her 100th birthday, which she celebrated on August 31, 2015. Virginia was honored by family and friends at a very special Celebration of 100 Years of Life, which featured a commemorative luncheon. The following day, she was recognized during a special reception at her church, Greater First Baptist Church in East Chicago.

Mother Virginia Oliver arrived in East Chicago nearly seventy years ago, when she and her loving husband, the late Robert Oliver, relocated to Northwest Indiana in the mid-1940's to build a life together. Upon their arrival in the city, the couple resided in an apartment above the JPL Furniture Store located in the section

of East Chicago known as the Harbor. It was during this time that Mr. and Mrs. Oliver welcomed two children, Robert and Sheryl, both proud graduates of East Chicago Roosevelt High School.

In 1953, Virginia and Robert purchased a home in the Calumet section of the city, where Virginia continues to reside. It was in this home that Mother Oliver raised her children. During this time, Virginia was fully involved in her children's educations and was an active member of the parent-teacher association.

While Mother Oliver was focused on raising her children, throughout her life she was also well known in the community as a skilled seamstress and beautician. After her children were grown, Virginia continued to serve her community as a crossing guard for the School City of East Chicago. A further testament to her patriotism and her commitment to her city, she also served as a poll worker on election days.

A woman of tremendous faith, Mother Virginia Oliver has dedicated herself to serving her church community, first as a member of First Baptist Church where she sang in the choir and served as a secretary, and later at Greater First Baptist Church. Friends and family recall Mother Oliver's pride that Greater First Baptist Church "began in her home" after founding-pastor, Reverend P.C. Harrison, came to her home and convinced her husband, Deacon Robert Oliver, to join him in forming a new church. Deacon Oliver would go on to become the first and longest serving chairman of the Deacon Board, a position he held for thirty four years. At the first church meeting, Virginia was named as the church's Financial Secretary, which she faithfully served as for twenty-seven years. Mother Oliver also has served her church as a deaconess, missionary, choir member, church decorator, and ultimately, church mother. She continues to serve as Greater First Baptist Church's oldest church mother.

Mr. Speaker, Mother Virginia Oliver has committed herself to her community and her church since she arrived in East Chicago, and has served as a mother and role model for many children throughout the years. She has taught every member of her family and her community the true meaning of service to others. I respectfully ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in wishing Mother Virginia Oliver a very happy 100th birthday.

RECOGNIZING ELIZABETH BURKO

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Elizabeth Burko, who was a true and committed leader in the California State Parks who lost her life on August 22, 2015.

Elizabeth Burko was born in Ohio and attended college at the University of Colorado where she graduated with a Bachelor of Science before moving out to California.

She began her career as a volunteer docent at Año Nuevo State Reserve in 1985 where

she was eventually hired on as a park aide. For 30 years, Burko dedicated her life and career to the mission and purpose of California State Parks. In 2007 she became the Superintendent of the Russian River District of California State Parks which includes parks in both Sonoma and Mendocino Counties.

Throughout her career Burko proved to be dedicated to the mission of the State Parks, but it was during the recession that she truly demonstrated the value of her leadership. Her management skills and creativity made it possible to avoid many park closures in the district and maintain the integrity of the State Parks mission. She was known for her willingness to collaborate with local non-profit groups in order to improve park access and management.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognition of Elizabeth Burko whose contributions to the Russian River District of California State Parks will be valued by park visitors and staff alike for years to come. She will be greatly missed.

PAXSON "PACKY" H. OFFFIELD, CATALINA ICON PASSES

HON. ALAN S. LOWENTHAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the community of Avalon, California was saddened to learn that Paxson "Packy" H. Offfield passed away on Sunday, June 14, due to complications from leukemia. He recently chose to return to his home in Michigan, and passed away there, with his wife and family by his side.

Mr. Offfield attended the Latin School of Chicago and the Catalina Island School for Boys, located in Toyon Bay. He graduated from the University of Denver in 1975 with a degree in Economics and then taught here at the Catalina Island School. In 1976, his family asked him to join the Santa Catalina Island Company, formed in 1894 and guided by the Wrigley and Offfield families since 1919. Beginning as property manager, Mr. Offfield gained experience in several departments, and served at various times as the company's chairman of the board, president, and CEO. He was a member of its Board of Directors from 1980 until his death.

Mr. Offfield was also chairman of the Benefactor Members of the Santa Catalina Island Conservancy, formed in 1972 by Philip K. Wrigley and Dorothy W. Offfield, and was the Conservancy's first chairman of the board.

A dedicated conservationist, Mr. Offfield was a director and chairman of The Billfish Foundation, a non-profit organization dedicated to the conservation and enhancement of billfish populations worldwide through scientific research, education and advocacy. He was a Board member and former chairman of The Peregrine Fund, a worldwide organization dedicated to preserving birds of prey. In 2006, Mr. Offfield received from the president of Panama the Commendador Award for work through the Peregrine Fund on the reintroduction of the Harpy Eagle, the national bird of Panama.

Mr. Offfield was also chairman of the Catalina Sea Bass Fund, dedicated to the restoration of sea bass and other fisheries in Southern California waters. He was active with the Conservation and Research for Endangered Species component of the San Diego Zoological Society. He was awarded the 2006 Conservation Medal from the Society for his work with the Peregrine Fund and satellite tagging of marlin. He also spearheaded a DNA sampling study with Rutgers University and The Billfish Foundation.

Mr. Offfield was very involved in developing satellite tags for tagging billfish in Pacific waters for over 20 years, to track migration and other data on billfish. He was the chairman of the Offfield Center for Billfish Studies and funded an archival tagging program for white sea bass in cooperation with the Pflieger Institute for Environmental Research. He was a founding member of the Marine Conservation Science Institute. Mr. Offfield was also a director of USC's Wrigley Institute for Environmental Studies and endowed the Paxson H. Offfield Professor of Population Ecology now held by Dennis Hedgecock at USC.

Mr. Offfield was president of the Offfield Family Foundation, which works predominantly on environmental issues around the world. He has worked with the Little Traverse Conservancy to protect the arboreal forests of Northern Michigan. He was a past president and board member of the Silver Creek Fishing Club in Northern Michigan.

Mr. Offfield was named to the International Game Fish Association Board of Trustees in 2007 and currently served as its chairman. He shared its belief in the conservation of game fish and the promotion of responsible, ethical angling practices through science, education, rule making and record keeping. He was inducted into the IGFA Hall of Fame in 2011.

In Avalon, Mr. Offfield was a past president and member of the Avalon Tuna Club, the world's oldest sportfishing club and was the current president of the Tuna Club Foundation. He had in the past served as Chairman of the Avalon Planning Commission and as president of the Catalina Island Chamber of Commerce. The Tuna Club had twice recognized him as Angler of the Year, and he had three Tuna Club record fish using three-thread linen and 8-pound Dacron. Mr. Offfield also participated in the International Masters Angling Invitational Tournament in Cancun.

Mr. Offfield is survived by his wife, Susan, his children, Chase (Lena), Calen (Amber) and Kelsey, his stepson, Rex, three grandchildren (Christian, Owen and Capri) and his brother, James Offfield. A celebration of life will be held in Avalon later in the summer.

HONORING CPL. TIMOTHY GRACE, 1ST INFANTRY DIVISION SOLDIER OF THE YEAR

HON. LOUIE GOHMERT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the First District of Texas has been blessed as the birthplace of many remarkable individuals who

have made notable contributions that have enriched lives well beyond the borders of Texas. It is a great pleasure to stand in honor of a man from Nacogdoches, Texas, who is young in terms of years but exceedingly senior when it comes to his patriotism, his caring, and his contribution to the ongoing of this country. His name is Corporal Timothy Grace and he has been named Soldier of the Year for the United States Army's 1st Infantry Division.

Cpl. Grace enlisted in the U.S. Army in 2013 at the age of 22, pursuing a dream born out of a family legacy of military service. Inspired by his grandfather Leo Acosta who served during World War II, Cpl. Grace knew as a young boy that the military would be his future. His heartfelt desire was to serve and protect the greatest country in the history of the world, precisely as his grandfather had done.

Cpl. Grace entered the military as a 19-Delta Cavalry Scout attached to the 1st Infantry Division in Fort Riley, Kansas. Regarding basic training, Cpl. Grace has remarked, ". . . I've always been mentally strong so they never really broke me down. I enjoyed every minute of it and learned a lot."

Cpl. Grace studied a variety of topics from weapons to Army history in preparation for the demanding process of facing the selection boards in anticipation of seeking advancement in his chosen endeavor. He first won the troop board, successfully navigated the squadron and brigade boards, ultimately culminating with his being named Soldier of the Year for the entire 1st Infantry Division.

As a result of his selection as Soldier of the Year, Cpl. Grace was chosen to provide personal security for the 1st Infantry Division Sgt. Maj. Michael A. Grinston in Iraq.

Based on his extraordinary history in the military thus far, there should be no doubt that Cpl. Grace will continue to distinguish himself as he pursues Airborne school and Ranger school. After his sterling career in the military is completed, Cpl. Grace aspires to yet again continue to serve his country and particularly the great state of Texas as a Department of Public Safety Highway Patrolman, but has not ruled out the possibility of serving as long as possible in his career within the United States Army.

It is a distinct privilege to honor this remarkable soldier, to pay tribute to him for his being named Soldier of the Year from the entire 1st Infantry Division, and to congratulate him for his upcoming promotion to sergeant. His accomplishments are now recorded in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which will endure as long as there is a United States of America.

HONORING THE CAREER OF LINDA CHIARENZA

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the distinguished career and legacy of service of Linda Chiarenza, who was honored for her professional excellence as the Executive Director of the West Side and Black

Rock-Riverside Neighborhood Housing Services at a Retirement Celebration on August 26, 2015.

In 1999, Linda was selected as the Executive Director of the West Side Neighborhood Housing Services (WSNHS) where she had worked as a Housing Specialist for 4 years. Linda immediately got to work rebuilding relationships with funding sources, expanding resources and engaging the WSNHS Board and staff to work collaboratively and creatively to lead this critically important non-profit agency to national recognition as part of the NeighborWorks network.

This year brought an Exemplary rating for WSNHS by NeighborWorks America, and it is deservedly proud of its designation as a NeighborWorks Green Organization.

From her first project on Shield Street to the revitalization of Connecticut Street to restoring a historic West Side property, Linda continually demonstrated dogged determination and an unshakeable commitment to neighborhood revitalization led by community stakeholders.

Linda's devotion of time, energy and resources to support the community was deservedly recognized by Business First with the 2009 Women of Influence Award and the 2007 and 2015 Woman of the Year Award by the West Side Business and Taxpayers Association. Her work with all levels of government earned her recognition as a New York State Woman of Distinction and the FBI Board of Directors Service Award.

During her time with West Side Neighborhood Housing Services, Linda accomplished significant milestones for the organization, including a merger with Black Rock-Riverside Neighborhood Housing Services, leading to a working partnership with West Side Neighborhood Housing Services sharing staff and services, and now serving as lead agency for housing rehab throughout the city of Buffalo. On June 10th of this year, West Side NHS and Black Rock NHS celebrated 35 years of service and another milestone of achievement was acknowledged on the recognition of its Executive Director who will leave a community better than when she arrived and clearly better prepared to continue to grow and thrive each and every day.

While Linda worked for the community, it is well known that her children and grandchildren are her world. We extend our best wishes and gratitude to her son John and daughter-in-law Maria, her daughter Nicole and son-in-law Jeff, and her seven grandchildren Vinny, Alexa, Johnny, Madeline, Jack, Jeff, and Addison. I am especially grateful for her friendship, invaluable guidance and leadership ability that led to remarkable growth in neighborhood reinvestment, expanded services and stronger partnerships.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor the career of Linda Chiarenza. I ask that my colleagues join me in expressing our congratulations on a well-earned retirement, and to celebrate the exemplary work she did to enrich the communities of Western New York.

RECOGNIZING THE GOKASHO, JAPAN "PEACE MEMORIAL MONUMENT COMMITTEE" AND A WWII ARMY AIR CORPS CREW THAT PERISHED NEAR TAKACHIHO, GOKASHO WHOSE LIVES THEY COMMEMORATE ANNUALLY

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the "Peace Memorial Monument Committee" of the Gokasho region of Japan which, since 1995, has honored the lives of a World War II U.S. Army Air Corps crew that perished near the local town of Takachiho.

On August 30th, 1945, an American B-29 Bomber with twelve Army Air Corps crew members on board clipped the peak of the Oyaji mountain in Takachiho. The bomber was on a mission to the Allied POW detention center at Kaitanko of Miyawaka, Fukuoka to air drop relief supplies. The ensuing crash left no survivors. The crew members' bodies were retrieved by the U.S. military with the help of the citizens of Takachiho.

The names of the flight crew members that perished are Alfred Eiken of Missouri, Henry Baker of Tennessee, Jack Riggs of Kansas, George Williamson of Pennsylvania, John Cornwell of Texas, Henry Frees of Illinois, Solomon Groner of New York, Walter Gustevson of Pennsylvania, Norman Henninger of Ohio, John Hodges, Jr. of Virginia, John Dangerfield of Utah, and Bob Miller of Utah.

In 1995, the "Peace Memorial Monument Committee," which is organized by the people of the Gokasho region of Japan, constructed the Peace Memorial Monument to honor this Army Air Corps crew as well as that of a Japanese Army Fighter jet "Hayabusa" which crashed in a nearby mountain town. A memorial ceremony has been held each year since 1995 to commemorate these two tragedies and pray for continued peace and friendship between the United States and Japan. The ceremony is held on the Saturday in August nearest to August 30th, the date of the American crash.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to have the privilege of recognizing these fallen warriors, as well as the act of commitment to peace and friendship by the people of the Gokasho region that has flourished from this tragedy.

In closing, I ask all my colleagues to join me in honoring the Gokasho "Peace Memorial Monument Committee," and the twelve American Air Corps crew members whose lives they have not forgotten.

HONORING LORRAINE "LORRIE" LEWIS

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of Lorrie Lewis, who passed away this

August in Novato, California, at the age of 72. A lifelong advocate for people with developmental disabilities, Mrs. Lewis was defined by her radiant warmth, focused passion, and unrelenting selfless actions.

Calling Mrs. Lewis an inspiration does not capture her complete dedication to helping others. After managing a group home in the North Bay with her husband, Jim, the couple co-founded the Institute for Abundant Living (IAL) in 1995. Since then, the Institute has provided educational opportunities to people living with developmental disabilities, pushing them to achieve more academically and equipping them with skills to succeed personally and professionally.

I can attest to the hard work and enthusiasm of both staff and students through my firsthand observations when visiting the Institute for Abundant Living over the years. The organization plays an important role in the North Bay and has touched innumerable lives in its two decades of operation. Marin County was truly lucky to count Mrs. Lewis as an activist and neighbor.

Mrs. Lewis was active in her faith community and loved nothing more than being with her family. She will be missed far beyond those circles, however, as her unyielding efforts will continue to impact our community for years to come. It is therefore appropriate that we pay tribute to her today and express our deepest condolences to Jim, her sons Andy and Kirt Lewis, and her grandchildren.

HONORING SANDRA WILLIAMS
BUSH AND RECOGNIZING HER
DEDICATION TO HELPING OTHERS

HON. BRIAN HIGGINS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today to recognize and honor Ms. Sandra Williams Bush for her outstanding commitment to service as well as the sharing of knowledge, culture, and community. Sandra Bush is the recipient of the Buffalo Association of Black Social Workers, Inc. Community Service Award; the Black Chamber of Commerce of WNY Beverly Gray Community Service Award, the GROUP Ministries, Inc. Community Achievement Award, the Harriet Tubman Community Service Award, the Afro-American Historical Association of the Niagara Frontier, Inc. William Wells Brown Community Service Award, and Community Service Recognition from the City of Buffalo Common Council Community.

Sandra Bush, the daughter of Willis and Evelyn Williams, was born in Buffalo and grew up attending schools within the Buffalo school system. She continued her education, earning a Human Services degree from Medaille College and a Masters of Library Science degree from the University of Buffalo School of Information and Library Science. Her well-rounded education only strengthened her passion to help others. In August of 1985, Sandra began her career with the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library as a clerk with the Department

of Extension Services. A few years later, she decided to pursue a degree in library science, and in 1991 she received her certification as a public librarian. Her career also included working with the RAM Van, Lookie Bookie, the Bookmobile and other several city branch libraries.

Sandra is retiring as the first Branch Manager of the Frank E. Merriweather, Jr. Library. There she oversaw the care of the largest resource center of African and African American history in central and western New York. Beyond maintaining the collection, she worked tirelessly to incorporate the community with quality library service, programming and outreach efforts.

She credits strong family support along with encouragement from the community for her achievements. Friends and family joined Sandra Bush for her retirement party on August 21, 2015, at the Frank Merriweather Library between 3:30 and 5:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing me a few moments to honor and recognize Ms. Sandra Williams Bush. I ask that my colleagues join me in congratulating Ms. Bush on an accomplished career and to commend her for her admirable work within the Buffalo library system and community.

CELEBRATING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF JAPANTOWN SAN JOSÉ (NIHONMACHI)

HON. MICHAEL M. HONDA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with Representatives ZOE LOFGREN and ANNA ESHOO to honor the 125th Anniversary of the establishment of Japantown San José (Nihonmachi) in Santa Clara Valley. Nihonmachi is a reflection of the values of the original Japanese immigrant community, the Issei (first generation), who settled in Santa Clara Valley in 1890. By the early 20th century, the community formally established residence in what is now Nihonmachi, which offered a uniquely Japanese source of employment, lodging, goods, services, and cultural support. Nihonmachi is one of only three remaining Japantowns in the United States today.

Soon after the founding of Nihonmachi, with the support of the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1907, an increased number of Japanese women began settling in Santa Clara Valley. This led to the growth of families and the birth of the Nisei (second generation) of Nihonmachi residents.

Nihonmachi witnessed its first national tragedy as the Great Depression enveloped the United States. However, despite national economic hardship, Nihonmachi experienced slow, yet steady economic growth. Nihonmachi further strengthened its presence in the region by welcoming other Asian communities, serving as a cultural refuge for Chinese and Filipino immigrants. This cultural diversity among the residents of Nihonmachi allowed the neighborhood to withstand the turmoil of World War II, as well as the forced internment of Japanese Americans in 1942.

After the post-war return of the Japanese American community to the West Coast and Santa Clara Valley, Nihonmachi became a haven for residents against the simmering anti-Japanese sentiment and national racial hysteria. Despite the open adversity faced by Nihonmachi, its population nearly doubled in size due to the addition of Sansei (third generation) by the end of the 1940s.

Through the late 1960s and into the 1970s the Nisei were caring not only for the aging Issei and growing Sansei, but were also determined to preserve Japanese culture and combat the widespread acculturation of their community into mainstream American culture. It was during the 1970s that the Sansei embarked on a path of political activism set on sparking a renewal of Nihonmachi through cultural awareness.

Since the 1980s, Nihonmachi has experienced a period of revitalization, including the building of new commercial and residential development, including projects on land that had once been a neighboring Chinatown. Furthermore, the installation of historical markers and plaques around the neighborhood commemorate the cultural history and achievements of Nihonmachi.

Currently, the Yonsei and Gosei (fourth and fifth generations) play a vital role in the international dialogue between Nihonmachi and Japan as well as the continued preservation of Japanese culture brought to Santa Clara Valley by the Issei 125 years ago. For instance, in 2013, the Japantown Business Association sponsored fundraising events to provide aid and support to victims of the Tohoku tsunami and earthquake in Japan.

Mr. Speaker, we commend Japantown San José for its 125 years of dedication to the preservation of Japanese culture in the increasingly diverse Santa Clara Valley. As one of only three remaining Japantowns in the United States, Nihonmachi's contributions to the cultural preservation of the Japanese American community and its commitment to cultural and economic development of the region serve as a national example of what can be accomplished by uniting communities and working toward positive change, diversity, and mutual respect.

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED JAMES C. "BUCK" SMITH

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and legacy of Northwest Florida's beloved James C. "Buck" Smith, who passed away peacefully in his home after a long battle with Alzheimer's on August 11, 2015. A longtime resident of Fort Walton Beach and former City Councilman, Buck had a deep love for his family and community, and his contributions, especially the impact on youth in the area, will be remembered.

Born on January 7, 1936, in Columbus, Georgia to Red and Myrtis Clements Smith,

Buck and his siblings moved to Florida's Gulf Coast following his mother's passing. Buck, who had a love for sports, which remained with him throughout his life, played football at Choctawhatchee High School, where he graduated Class of 1955, as well as played at Holmes Junior College in Mississippi.

Upon his return home to Fort Walton Beach, Buck became an active member of the community. As a small businessman, Buck started Smith's Plumbing, Randall's Nursery, and Bucran Corporation. As a leader in the civic arena, he was elected to serve the area he loved as Fort Walton Beach City Councilman from 1983 to 1991. Buck also was a member of the Shriners and was a Free Mason.

It was his passion for community and its youth, however, to whom he dedicated much of his life, by which many will remember Buck. He was instrumental in securing the Fort Walton Beach High School's field house and baseball field, as well as preparing the tennis courts for action at Bruner Middle School. He strongly advocated for the need of a vocational school in the area, helped found the Fellowship of Christian Athletes in Okaloosa County and the All Sports Association, which he was inducted into its Hall of Fame in 2004. Whether it was growing the love of softball in the area by starting a men's slow pitch softball team, which competed at National's in 1973; attending high school football games and cheering on players; or supporting Little League teams; Buck was inspired by the character and camaraderie built as a result of participating in organized sports. He believed in the youth and was dedicated to ensuring that they were afforded the opportunity to become involved.

Without question, Buck lived a life full of love and giving back to those around him. He was a friend and mentor to countless individuals and one of the area youth's biggest fans. To his family, however, he will most be remembered as a loving husband, father, and grandfather, a great man who they were blessed to have as their own and share with the Northwest Florida community.

On behalf of the United States Congress, I am privileged to recognize the life of James C. "Buck" Smith. My wife Vicki and I extend our heartfelt prayers and condolences to his wife of 44 years, Billie; daughter, Tina and her husband, Ryan; granddaughters Amber and Ryleigh; brother, Rocky; sisters, Connie, Debbie, Sonya, and Rita; and all of the Smith family.

IN HONOR OF THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE PRESCOTT AREA WILDLAND URBAN INTERFACE COMMISSION

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the silver anniversary and 25 years of dedicated service of the Prescott Area Wildland Urban Interface Commission (PAWUIC).

In 1989, Ed Hollenshead and Coy Jemmett of the Prescott National along with Prescott

Fire Department's Ron Prince and Darrell Willis originally conceived the idea of an organization where community leaders were involved in combating issues in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI). These conversations evolved into a task force known as the Interagency Fire and Emergency Management Group. A year later, The Prescott Area Wildland Urban Interface Commission was officially formed on September 7, 1990, when a memorandum of understanding was signed by PAWUIC, the City of Prescott, Yavapai County, Central Yavapai Fire District, Arizona State Land Department and the Prescott National Forest.

In 2001, Prescott was selected as one of seven communities in the United States to participate in the National Fire Protection Association's Firewise Communities program. This distinction resulted from Prescott having a strong, citizen-led commission on WUI issues.

Today, there are approximately 30 Firewise certified communities in and around Prescott protecting more than 12,000 properties and representing more than half of all Firewise communities in the State of Arizona.

I am proud to honor the Prescott Area Wildland Urban Interface Commission for their valuable contributions towards preventing dangerous wildfires and combating other wildland urban interface issues. At a time in our nation's history when catastrophic wildfires are devastating the West and have burned nearly 9 million acres this year alone, we must embrace commonsense and worthwhile efforts that encourage active forest management. As a native Arizonan, I am personally thankful for the hard work and dedication that this commission has set forth by empowering so many citizen volunteers.

HONORING COL. JAMES ISAAC WHEELER

HON. MARTHA MCSALLY

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life of Col. James Isaac Wheeler, who passed away on August 24, 2015 at the age of 93.

Col. Wheeler was an exceptional pilot who served his country with honor in three different conflicts—World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. Over his career in the Air Force, he piloted the P-47 "Thunderbolt," F-86, and C-47.

Upon his retirement, Col. Wheeler continued to serve his community and fellow airmen, holding numerous leadership positions in veterans organizations in Tucson. He was stoutly devoted to his fellow veterans and serving the Southern Arizona community he called home.

I met Col. Wheeler as a young captain after arriving at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in 1994. He became a great friend over the years and always encouraged me in my journey as a pilot, officer, and, most recently, Congresswoman. He was such a wonderful example of continued faithful service to the community, Air Force, and military members and family. He was a patriot and true servant leader, and I am so grateful for his example and friendship.

Few can say they answered the call to serve and defend our country as often, and during such critical times, as Col. Wheeler. It was my honor to have known and served with him, and I extend my sincere condolences to his family and friends.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND SELFLESS SACRIFICE OF TECHNICAL SERGEANT TIMOTHY A. OFFICER, JR.

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with both profound sadness and deep gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen decorated American hero. On Monday, August 3, 2015, Technical Sergeant Timothy A. Officer, Jr., of the 24th Special Operations Wing, located in Florida's First Congressional District, tragically lost his life during a military freefall training accident. TSgt Officer was 32 years old, but lived a lifetime marked by and full of service.

Timothy was born to Timothy and Linda Officer on August 8, 1982 in Huntington, West Virginia. After graduating high school, he followed in his family's footsteps of service and joined the Air Force in 2001. Upon becoming a Tactical Air Control Party Journeyman and ultimately a Joint Terminal Attack Controller, TSgt Officer earned his stripes as one of our Nation's most elite, both in training and in the ultimate crucible of combat. With multiple deployments around the globe and specifically in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM, TSgt Officer's leadership and devotion to duty served his fellow airmen and our Nation well over his prestigious fourteen-year career.

Among his many awards and accolades are two Bronze Stars, one with Valor Device, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, Army Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters, Air Force Achievement Medal, Army Achievement Medal, Meritorious Unit Award with one oak leaf cluster, Combat Readiness Medal, Air Force Good Conduct Medal with three oak leaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Iraq Campaign Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, among many others.

One fateful night in Iraq, on March 31, 2003, while serving as a Tactical Air Command and Control Journeyman in support of the 1st Armored Division, TSgt Officer and his unit were engaged by enemy mortar, artillery, and direct fire. After an artillery shell exploded near his vehicle, then Airman Officer engaged the enemy, killing two, while coordinating close air support. When his crew ran out of ammunition, the citation for his Bronze Star with Valor reads, "He voluntarily dismounted his vehicle, ran across the battlefield through a hail of small arms fire to another vehicle, and returned with enough ammunition for his entire crew." Then Airman Officer assisted in the delivery of air support, resulting in 55 enemy

killed. As the citation concludes, "His tremendous bravery under constant enemy fire undoubtedly saved his fellow crewmembers along with countless members of task force 2-70, and directly aided in the defeat of the enemy."

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of man we lost on August 3, 2015. Described as honest and loyal, he truly was a significant role model for those who knew him, not just by his words but by his actions. Adding more weight to our hearts, TSgt Officer is the second son and brother his family lays to rest upon the altar of freedom. His younger brother, Army Sergeant Justin Officer, tragically fell on the battlefield of Afghanistan while serving with the 101st Airborne on September 29, 2010. There are no words I, this body of Congress, or the Nation can say that might assuage the bereavement of the Officer family, as they endure the unendurable yet again. All I can say is on behalf of a humble and grateful Nation, we thank them for the love, counsel, guidance, and support given to Timothy and Justin, which helped make them the heroes they became. Their lives stand as a testament that freedom is not free, and their legacies will echo in time as examples of the ultimate sacrifice for all free people. My wife, Vicki, joins me in praying that God is with Timothy's parents, Timothy and Linda; his sister Kylea; and all of his family and friends during this time of great mourning, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO THE REMARKABLE
LIFE OF AMELIA PLATTS BOYNTON
ROBINSON

HON. TERRI A. SEWELL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the extraordinary life and legacy of an American treasure and one of my personal heroes, the courageous Mrs. Amelia Platts Boynton Robinson. Amelia passed away on August 26, 2015 at the age of 104. While we mourn the loss of this remarkable woman, I am comforted in knowing that her brave spirit will live through her impactful contributions to this nation.

Amelia was a key figure in the voting rights movement in Selma, Alabama, and she is often remembered for her historic role as one of the coordinators and marchers on "Bloody Sunday." On that solemn day on the Edmund Pettus Bridge, Amelia was savagely beaten and a photo of her taken shortly after she was attacked became a powerful symbol of the injustices suffered by those fighting on the frontlines of the movement.

Yet this fearless revolutionary continued her work as a leader on the frontlines of securing the right to vote for all Americans. She was undeterred by the perils of a racially unjust society that relegated blacks to second-class citizenship. Her story is a testament to her commitment to serving as a conduit for change and a reminder of why we in Alabama lovingly refer to her as the matriarch of the movement.

Amelia was born on August 18, 1911, in Savannah, Georgia. Her mother was an activist during the women's suffrage movement. After the passage of the 19th amendment, she and her mother distributed voter registration information to women from the family's horse and buggy in 1920. Her mother's tireless efforts to secure the right to vote for women would have a lasting impact on Amelia. It also paved the way for the young activist to claim her own place in American history.

Fueled by that same passion, Amelia began her own service to mankind when she and her husband Samuel Boynton fought for voting rights and property ownership for African-Americans in the poorest rural areas of Alabama. She was later named the only female lieutenant to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., during the civil rights movement. In this role, Amelia traveled alongside Dr. King and often appeared in his stead for various events and gatherings during the movement.

Amelia is also best known for her leadership that led to the passage of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Amelia was such an integral part of the process that the contents of the bill were drafted at her kitchen table in Selma.

On May 5, 1964, Amelia broke yet another barrier when she became the first woman in the state of Alabama to run for a congressional seat. She garnered 10.7 percent of the vote during a time when very few blacks were registered voters. Her historic run further solidified her impact on the movement for human rights in Alabama.

When this extraordinary woman wasn't contributing her time to the causes of her generation, she worked as an educator, a home demonstrations agent with the Department of Agriculture, an insurance agent, an income tax preparer, and a real estate agent. She attended Georgia State Industrial School, which was renamed Savannah State University and Tuskegee Normal, which is now known as Tuskegee University.

Without her courageous campaign for the 7th Congressional District, I know that my election to this seat in 2010 would not have been possible. Her sacrifices paved the way for me to walk the halls of Congress and I will carry my love and admiration for her in my heart each and every day. I will always cherish the time we spent together when she honored me as my special guest for the State of the Union on January 20, 2015. I am grateful for the memories of her greeting President Obama that night and I am so blessed to have called her a beloved mentor and friend.

As she reminded us in life, there is still much work to be done for this nation to live up to its ideals of equality and justice for all. Let us be inspired by the extraordinary life of Amelia to keep striving and working towards a more perfect union. May we honor her by continuing her life's work. I ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting Mrs. Platts Amelia Boynton Robinson, an Alabama gem and an American treasure. Thank you.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND SELFLESS SACRIFICE OF TECHNICAL SERGEANT MARTY B. BETTELYOUN

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with both profound sadness and deep gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen decorated American hero. On Monday, August 3, 2015, Technical Sergeant Marty B. Bettelyoun of the 24th Special Operations Wing, located in Florida's First Congressional District, tragically lost his life during a military freefall training accident. TSgt Bettelyoun was 35 years old, but lived a lifetime marked by and full of service.

Born to Sonny and Christina Bettelyoun on October 18, 1979, in Eugene, Oregon, TSgt Bettelyoun graduated from Oregon City High School. After graduation, he answered the call and joined the Air Force in 2000. Enduring one of the most challenging training pipelines the United States military has to offer, TSgt Bettelyoun earned his stripes as one of our Nation's most elite. As a lead instructor in Survival, Evasion, Resistance, and Escape, and later as a Combat Controller with multiple training and combat deployments around the globe, TSgt Bettelyoun's leadership and devotion to duty served thousands of airmen and our Nation well throughout his prestigious fifteen-year career.

Among his many awards and accolades are the Air Force Commendation Medal with one oak leaf cluster, Air Force Achievement Medal with two oak leaf clusters, Meritorious Unit Award with four oak leaf clusters, Air Force Good Conduct Medal with four oak leaf clusters, National Defense Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Global War on Terrorism Service Medal, Air Force Overseas Ribbon Long, Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border, Air Force Longevity Service Ribbon with two oak leaf clusters, USAF Noncommissioned Officer Professional Military Education Graduate Ribbon with one oak leaf cluster, and the Air Force Training Ribbon.

By all accounts, TSgt Bettelyoun was the consummate leader and selfless warrior in his professional life as well as his personal life. Described by close friends as being able to walk into a room of strangers and leave their friend, TSgt Bettelyoun surely lived a full, albeit too brief, life. A dedicated family man, it remains clear his family was the most important aspect in this young patriot's life. With five children to his beloved wife, Jennifer, TSgt Bettelyoun and Jennifer took in a young cousin as their own, after the cousin's parents tragically passed away.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of man we lost on August 3, 2015. There are no words I, this body of Congress, or the Nation can say that might assuage the bereavement of the Bettelyoun family and the six children Marty leaves behind. All I can say is on behalf of a humble and grateful Nation, we thank them for the love, counsel, guidance, and support given to Marty, which helped make him the hero he

became both in uniform and as a father. His life stands as a testament that freedom is not free, and his legacy will echo in time as an example of the ultimate sacrifice for all free people. My wife, Vicki, joins me in praying that God be with Marty's wife, Jennifer; his children Kalyn, Olivia, Benjamin, Isabella, and Mollie; his parents, Sonny and Christina; brothers Luke and Adam; stepmother Sharon and stepfather Jim; and all family and friends during this time of great mourning, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE HUMANE
SOCIETY OF FAIRFAX COUNTY'S
50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and congratulate the Humane Society of Fairfax County for reaching the grand old age of 50, and, perhaps more impressively, for spending those years caring for the animals of Virginia's 8th District.

The Humane Society of Fairfax County was established by concerned citizens in 1965 in order to pursue the three-fold mission of promoting humane education, preventing all forms of cruelty to animals—both domestic and wild—by every legitimate means available, and assisting the community with all matters pertaining to the welfare of animals.

In furtherance of this mission, the HSFC provides numerous different services for both the animals and people within its community. The HSFC accepts and cares for all animals in need—dogs and cats of course, but also birds, rabbits, gerbils, and more. They care for animals that have been given up by their families and for animals from overwhelmed and kill shelters. They help military families that have special needs in regard to caring for their animals and they provide emergency medical treatment for animals from families that wouldn't otherwise be able to afford such care. They provide spay and neuter services for community cats and run a pet food pantry to assist families during financial difficulties.

They do all of this, which would be impressive enough on its own, and yet the HSFC goes even further—they have made a conscious decision not to simply fix the problems that come their way, but to also seek out unaddressed problems and resolve them. They have been involved with legislative issues such as ensuring adequate shelter and veterinary care for animals and stopping the operation of rodeos and circuses. They employ investigators that, for over 40 years, have investigated thousands of cruelty and neglect cases. Finally, they have assisted with the Deer Spay Project for the past 2 years.

I hope I have made it as clear to you as it is to me that the Humane Society of Fairfax County is an outstanding, upstanding organization that has done more than can here be described for the animals and families in their community. I thank them for their valuable work and wish them many more happy anniversaries to come.

IN HONOR OF COLONEL CHARLES
EDWARD COOKE

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart and solemn remembrance that I rise today to pay tribute to a respected public servant and outstanding citizen, Colonel Charles Edward Cooke. Sadly, Colonel Cooke passed away on Sunday, August 2, 2015. Funeral services were held on Monday, August 10, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. at Andersonville National Cemetery in Andersonville, Georgia.

Colonel Cooke devoted nearly three decades of his life to protecting his country in the United States Marine Corps, an unwavering responsibility for which we are all greatly indebted. In his 31 years of duty, he was stationed in nine states and eleven countries. Though his responsibilities carried him across the globe, Colonel Cooke always enjoyed returning to his birthplace of Plains, Georgia, and hometown of Americus, Georgia.

Throughout his career, Colonel Cooke impacted the lives of thousands of young service men and women who served under him. For his outstanding leadership he was awarded the Legion of Merit, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Meritorious Service Medal, Joint Service Commendation Medal with Gold Star, and the Navy/Marine Corps Achievement Medal. Beyond these achievements and the respect held for him by Marines everywhere, he was an honorable human being who loved deeply and, in return, was deeply loved.

Following his retirement from the Marine Corps in 2004, Colonel Cooke worked for Northrup Grumman as an Information Assurance Specialist. His co-workers and fellow servicemen cherished the smile and booming laugh of a man with seasoned wisdom and a passion for reveling in the beauties of life. After 7 years, he retired to full-time community service with organizations such as the Semper Fi Community Task Force and Meals on Wheels.

Colonel Cooke was a resolute steward of Christ's message. His faith and spirituality always reminded those around him of the power of love and fellowship through Christ and his Church. He earned a Certificate of Biblical Studies from the Union Chapel Missionary Baptist Church Institute of Biblical Studies and served as deacon of First Mount Zion Baptist Church in Dumfries, Virginia for four years.

Colonel Cooke is survived by his wife of 44 years, Wilma; daughter, Mary; siblings Oscar, Josie, Lula May, Carrie, and Barbara; six grandchildren; and a host of other family members and friends.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 people of the Second Congressional District salute Colonel Charles Cooke for his dedicated service to our nation and to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Colonel Cooke's family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING MR. VU VAN LOC FOR
HIS SERVICE TO SANTA CLARA
COUNTY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a distinguished member of my community, Mr. Vu Van Loc. Mr. Vu has been a leader in Santa Clara County for nearly forty years. As the founder of the Immigrant Resettlement & Cultural Center, Mr. Vu provided essential resettlement services to Vietnamese refugees immediately after the Fall of Saigon and for decades following. He pioneered the historical preservation of the journey of the Vietnamese Boat People when he created the Viet Museum in San Jose, which displays their journey.

Mr. Vu was born in 1933 in Nam Dinh, North Vietnam. He became a Lieutenant upon graduation from the Dalat academy in 1954. During the Vietnam War, he held multiple leadership positions in the South Vietnam Army, including Colonel Director for the General Logistics Department.

After the Fall of Saigon on April 30, 1975, Vu Van Loc came to the United States and settled in San Jose, California. Shortly after his arrival, Mr. Vu began working with the Indochinese Resettlement & Cultural Center, or IRCC, to assist immigrants arriving from Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos who were beginning to settle in Northern California. The Social Planning Committee of Santa Clara County created the IRCC as a temporary office in 1976, but it was Mr. Vu who spearheaded IRCC's efforts and ensured the organization's mission was fulfilled in the decades that followed.

Over forty years, Mr. Vu built the IRCC as a community-based organization to serve Vietnamese immigrants in resettlement. Due to his efforts, IRCC, which changed its name to the Immigrant Resettlement & Cultural Center in the 1990s, has provided over 20,000 immigrants with access to resettlement services, such as ESL classes, job training programs, housing assistance, U.S. citizenship application assistance, and voter registration information.

Mr. Vu's work with the IRCC has also ensured that the history of the Vietnam War, and the sacrifice of many South Vietnamese soldiers, is not forgotten. In 1993, Mr. Vu gathered contributions to help restore the abandoned Bien Hoa Military Cemetery in Vietnam. With this support he helped ensure the Vietnamese government would not destroy the site as it had other military cemeteries.

Mr. Vu also had a vision for the creation of a museum that preserved the history of South Vietnam, the Vietnam War, and the diaspora of Vietnamese Boat People. In 2008, the Republic of Vietnam Boat People Museum opened at History Park in San Jose. Mr. Vu's efforts were critical in building community support to establish the museum. Today, the Viet Museum is a San Jose treasure that ensures the courageous stories from survivors of the Vietnamese Exodus are never forgotten, especially by young people.

Vu Van Loc has been a dedicated leader within the Vietnamese community in Santa Clara County. I had the pleasure of first meeting Mr. Vu when I served on the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors. He has been an important friend throughout my public service to Santa Clara County. I am grateful for his dedication, and through these remarks I hereby recognize and commend Mr. Vu for his service to Santa Clara County and our immigrant community.

HONORING CHANCELLOR JOSÉ
ORTIZ

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary career of Dr. José Ortiz, Chancellor of Peralta Community College District. The Peralta District spans six cities within the East Bay and serves over 60,000 students.

Dr. Ortiz has spent his career serving within institutions of higher education and in a variety of administrative positions. His career brought him to campuses in California, Maryland, and the University of Puerto Rico at Bayamon. His range of experience, both professionally and culturally, made him the ideal candidate to serve at Peralta, which is within my Congressional District; the most diverse Congressional District in the nation.

Prior to serving as Chancellor, Dr. Ortiz served as Vice President to Laney College, which falls under the umbrella of the Peralta Community College system. While there he was known for his deep understanding and commitment to the many challenges facing the extremely diverse student body.

Later, in 2005, Dr. Ortiz moved on to become President of Allan Hancock College in Santa Maria, California, where he served until 2012. Little did he know he would one day return home to Oakland and the Peralta system. Dr. Ortiz's appointment served as an opportunity for him to return home to foster his friendly relationships and spend more time with his family.

His appointment came in the years following the Great Recession, at a time when community college districts across the nation were facing a multitude of challenges; Dr. Ortiz called upon his exemplary leadership abilities and relationship building with his colleagues to help lead the district through some of its most trying time.

While serving as Chancellor, he emphasized delivering programs and services that enhanced the region's human, economic, environmental, and social development. Dr. Ortiz provided leadership and advocacy for the diverse students of the four colleges while promoting his mission of supporting student academic access and success. His demonstrated commitment to students serves as a fine example to others working toward providing high quality educational opportunities and services to the marginalized and underrepresented.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I salute Dr. José

M. Ortiz, for his outstanding service and passionate commitment to the Peralta Community College District. Dr. Ortiz has touched many lives throughout his career, and I wish him and his loved ones continued success and happiness.

IN RECOGNITION OF PATRICIA
PENNISI

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Patricia Pennisi as she retires after forty years of service to the Stanford Settlement Neighborhood Center. As her family, friends, and colleagues gather to celebrate her long list of accomplishments and years of service, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring this great individual who has served and contributed so much to the Sacramento region.

Since receiving her Master's Degree in Social Work in 1970 from the University of Kansas and shortly after her certification from the Academy of Certified Social Workers in 1972, Ms. Pennisi has been committed to the mission of social work. For the last forty years, Ms. Pennisi has been an integral part of the important programs that have made the Stanford Settlement Neighborhood Center an essential part of the North Sacramento community. As longtime Assistant Director of Stanford Settlement Neighborhood, she has been at the forefront of directing the center's children and youth services. With the leadership of Ms. Pennisi, both the Children's Program and the Teen Center Program have grown and flourished. In addition, to helping raise funds to support the center's many programs, she has been vital in ensuring its continued success.

Over her entire career, Ms. Pennisi has worked tirelessly to be a champion for children. She has been a remarkable influence on her colleagues, as well as the student interns that have had the privilege of working with her. Although she will be greatly missed for her vast contributions, she will be fondly remembered for her ability to make Sacramento a better place and for her contributions to the Stanford Settlement Neighborhood Center.

Mr. Speaker, as Patricia and her family, friends and colleagues gather to celebrate her retirement, I am pleased to honor and recognize her for her hard work to help the Sacramento community. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing her the best in retirement and thanking her for her service to the Sacramento region.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF
ROSELLEN KERSHAW

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Rosellen Kershaw who

recently passed away at the age of 87. She leaves behind her loving family, including her daughter Julie, and granddaughters, Taylor and Morgan Marsoobian. Fresno County is truly indebted to Rosellen's legacy of service, integrity and love.

Rosellen Kershaw was born on August 29, 1923, to Charles and Pinkie Kershaw in Fresno, California. She spent almost her entire life in the Central Valley, graduating from Fresno High School and Fresno State College. She received her Master's Degree from San Francisco State University.

Rosellen taught school at the elementary, high school and college levels. However, she consistently referred to herself as a "professional volunteer," having dedicated more than 50 years of her life to the causes and organizations in Fresno that she felt most passionate about. Ms. Kershaw was committed to improving her community one hour at a time.

The fruits of Rosellen's labors were reflected in her involvement with local organizations and clubs, such as the Ani Guild of the California Armenian Home, of which she was a founder and board member for over 40 years. She was also President of the League of Women Voters of Fresno, California State President of American Association of University Women, Chair of the Fresno Housing and Community Development Commission, Chair of the CSUF Arts and Humanities Advisory, board member of the Fresno Regional Foundation, Secretary of the Fresno County Grand Jury, board member of the California Journal, President of the Fresno Art Museum, and President of the Friends of Fresno County Library. In addition, she was a founder and first general manager of Valley Public Radio. Among her many achievements, Rosellen received the California Rotary Paul Harris Fellow accolade, and was awarded the CSU Fresno Top Dog Award for Service.

Rosellen Kershaw was an extraordinary woman with a commitment to family, friends and her community. Her service will forever be remembered by the lives she so graciously touched. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Rosellen Kershaw, a true pillar of our community who will never be forgotten.

HONORING SHARON SILVA

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Turlock Chamber of Commerce Chief Executive Officer Sharon Silva for her many years of profound service to Turlock. After fifteen years of dedicated work, she retired on August 31, 2015.

Born and raised in Phoenix, Arizona, Sharon moved to the small town of Turlock, California with her family. Sharon found the time to further her education at Modesto Junior College and California State University, Stanislaus where she received her Bachelor's degree in Organizational Communications. In addition, she graduated from the National

Trust for Historic Preservation in Washington, D.C. with a Main Street Certification Institute Certification in Historic Preservation and also from the US Chamber Institute in Chamber Management at the University of Arizona in 2004.

For eight and half years, Sharon served as the Executive Director of the Turlock Downtown Association, where she made enduring contributions to beautifying and restoring the historic downtown of Turlock. Among numerous activities that celebrated the culture of Turlock, she planned major community events such as the Festival of Lights Tree Lighting Ceremony and the Fourth of July parade. During Mrs. Silva's last three years with the Downtown Association, she was promoted to the position of Chief Executive Officer for the Turlock Chamber of Commerce and Convention and Visitor's Bureau, and diligently oversaw all three agencies. Sharon has been a beacon in the community and an integral part of the non-profit organization's success.

Volunteering is second nature to Sharon; she has been a part of several different boards and a vital member of many different clubs and organizations. Appointed by the Mayor of Turlock and confirmed by the City Council, Sharon was one of nine committee members to become a part of the Development Collaborative Advisory Committee, and provide advice and recommendations to the city for improving the business climate. Furthermore, Sharon was co-chair of the Turlock Centennial Celebration in 2008, sat on the Board of Directors for the Turlock Community Theatre, and is a longtime member of the Rotary Club of Turlock. Sharon is a past member of the Turlock Unified School District Board and sits on a number of CSU Stanislaus committees: the President's Advisory council, the College of Business Board, the Alumni Board, the CSUS Warrior Association, and lastly, and the Center for Public Policies Studies Advisory Board. She served on Stanislaus County's Economic Development Committee and on the Board of Directors for the Stanislaus County Alliance Workforce. She was also the chair of the county's Redistricting Committee in 2011. Mrs. Silva stands as a role model for community dedication. Being actively involved and connected within the community as Sharon Silva has been, it comes as no surprise that she has received numerous awards and recognitions. In 1995, she received the Turlock Citizen of the Year Award and Volunteer of the Year Award at the Best of Turlock Awards Dinner. While serving as the Executive Director for the Turlock Downtown Association, the organization received the Governor's Award for Excellence in Revitalization Achievement in Design. The Turlock Chamber of Commerce was one of ten chambers in the state of California to be a CalChamber's President Circle Recipient for six years in a row. In 2011, Sharon Silva was named the Western Chamber Executive of the Year by the Western Association of Chamber Executives. That same year, she was nominated by Assembly member Bill Berryhill for the Woman of the Year Award. She recently received the Woman of the Year Award from the Stanislaus County Women's Commission.

For the past 27 years, Sharon has been lovingly married to Manuel Silva. She has two

children: Tamra Spade and Douglas Holmes; five grandchildren: Richard Fortado, Kasondra Fortado, Kali Spade, Derek Holmes and Lexie Holmes; and one great-granddaughter; Madilynn Bettencourt.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing the indispensable contributions Sharon Silva has brought to the Turlock Chamber of Commerce and its community. Sharon Silva has lived a profound experience and left a valuable legacy that many chamber CEOs may aspire to.

RECOGNIZING THE CENTENNIAL OF ALLISON TRANSMISSION, INCORPORATED IN INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

HON. ANDRÉ CARSON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to recognize one of Indianapolis' and Indiana's most venerable employers, Allison Transmission Inc., as the company celebrates its Centennial this month. One hundred years ago, James A. Allison established the Speedway Team Company to support his Indianapolis 500 racing activities. On the first day of operation, with great significance, he hung a sign that read, "Whatever leaves this shop over my name must be of the finest work possible." A century later, this principle still guides the company that bears his name.

From the company's humble beginnings as a small machine shop, Allison Transmission has grown into the world's largest manufacturer of fully automatic transmissions for medium- and heavy-duty commercial vehicles and a leader in hybrid propulsion. Allison is a major supplier of transmissions for wheeled and tracked vehicles that keep our military strong and our soldiers safe, a lineage that can be traced back to 1917 and the advent of World War I.

With its headquarters and primary manufacturing facilities still in Indianapolis, Hoosiers are proud of Allison's 2,700 employees worldwide, its market presence in more than 80 countries, annual revenues exceeding \$2 billion, and a market capitalization of more than \$5 billion. Allison Transmission is poised to remain one of the United States' most enduring examples of technological innovation and manufacturing excellence that all Americans can be proud of as we compete globally to grow jobs at home. Under the leadership of its dynamic CEO Lawrence Dewey, and through a strong partnership with the United Auto Workers, Allison Transmission continues to employ Hoosiers at wages that support strong families and the civic life of our community.

It is a special source of pride to me, Mr. Speaker, that Allison Transmission played a key role in founding MEPI, the Minority Engineering Program Indianapolis, a non-profit organization that encourages and prepares underrepresented minority students to enter STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Math) related career fields. For 25 years, Allison Transmission has provided MEPI students with financial support, mentors, instructors and

access to its facilities for instructional purposes.

The United Negro College Fund (UNCF) is one of the nation's largest and most proactive organizations that provide minority students with educational opportunities at historically black colleges and universities. As a result of a partnership with Allison Transmission, the UNCF's Bowling for Scholars Bowl-A-Thon has become its second largest fundraising activity in the Midwest.

In November 2011, the Indiana Minority Supplier Dealer Council (IMSDC) awarded Allison Transmission its "Corporation of the Year" award. The award was in recognition of Allison's outreach efforts to increase the number of minority suppliers that do business with the company. Its employees have also served on the IMSDC board of directors, attended supplier fairs and sponsored local events that provide financial support to IMSDC.

In closing, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending our congratulations to Allison Transmission for 100 years of success which has provided economic security to tens of thousands of Hoosiers and their families and an enhanced quality of life for all of us who call Indianapolis home.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF JULIAN BOND, CIVIL RIGHTS CHAMPION, GEORGIA LEGISLATOR, AND ELOQUENT VOICE FOR JUSTICE, EQUALITY, AND HUMAN DIGNITY

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak in praise of Julian Bond, one of the leading lights of the Civil Rights Movement, who died on Saturday, August 15, 2015, at the age of 75.

While Julian lost his battle to the illness that claimed his life, it is the struggle for civil rights and human dignity he helped to win that he will be forever remembered and revered.

Horace Julian Bond was born January 14, 1940, in Nashville, Tennessee to Julia Agnes and Horace Mann Bond.

Julian's father was the first African-American President of Lincoln University of Pennsylvania, the same institution attended by Thurgood Marshall and Langston Hughes who would both go on to make substantial contributions to the Civil Rights Movement and the advancement of African-Americans.

Julian's father later became president of Atlanta University and Julian decided to attend Morehouse College, one of the leading black colleges in the nation.

Julian Bond, who came from a long line of educators, determined at an early age to put his journalistic and organizing talents in service of the cause of civil rights and racial equality.

While a student at Morehouse College, Julian helped found The Pegasus, a literary magazine, and led nonviolent student protests against segregation in Atlanta parks, restaurants, and movie theaters.

Mr. Speaker, today it is difficult to imagine there once was a time in our country when

blacks and whites could not eat together in public restaurants, use the same public restrooms, stay at the same hotels, or attend the same schools.

Julian Bond answered the call to action and put his studies on hold to devote all of his energies and efforts to ending segregation and racial discrimination.

Mr. Speaker, it is not unusual these days for us to think of a champion as someone who receives the highest accolades in sports.

Julian Bond was a champion of the people.

His success is measured not in the numbers of trophies, medals, ribbons, and championship banners, but in the number of doors and opportunities he helped to open for those who had been neglected, marginalized, and disenfranchised.

Julian Bond knew that to bring about non-violent social change it was necessary to organize so he co-founded the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC).

SNCC, which organized and mobilized the participation of students and young people in the Civil Rights Movement, conceived the Freedom Rides that challenged the practice of racial segregation in interstate transportation and the Mississippi Freedom Summer project that undertook the dangerous work of helping African Americans register to vote in the state most committed to maintaining White supremacy by any means necessary.

SNCC was not the first leadership role history and circumstance would call upon Julian Bond to assume; nor would it be the last.

In 1965, after passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Julian Bond was elected to represent the residents of the 32nd district in Georgia House of Representatives.

But on January 10, 1966, his white colleagues in the Georgia House voted 184–12 not to seat him because he had publicly expressed his opposition to the Vietnam War.

Julian Bond challenged the refusal of the Georgia House to seat him and took his case all the way to the United States Supreme Court, which ruled in the unanimous decision of *Bond v. Floyd*, 385 U.S. 116 (1966), that expressing opposition to the Vietnam War was speech protected by the First Amendment and directed that he be seated as a duly elected member of the state legislature.

Julian Bond would go on to serve three more terms in the Georgia House, where he co-founded the Georgia Legislative Black Caucus, and six terms in the Georgia State Senate.

In 1971, Julian Bond co-founded and served as president of the Southern Poverty Law Center that tracks the actions of hate groups to better inform and prepare communities about the dangers these groups pose.

Julian Bond consistently identified issues of civil inequality and provided solutions by gathering groups of community leaders, professionals, and educators to protect what the laws and policies would not, our basic civil rights.

In 1998, Julian Bond's commitment to justice and equality led him to answer the call to serve and accept the position of Chairman of the NAACP, a post he held until 2010.

Julian Bond was able to bring the earnest fight to achieve equality into the modern era

as he watched African-Americans achieve the highest awards in their professions and continued to break down barriers.

In November 2008, Julian Bond witnessed the election of the first African American President of the United States, a feat thought impossible just a decade earlier.

Mr. Speaker, because of trailblazers like Julian Bond millions of Americans gained access to opportunities previously denied to members of their communities.

Julian Bond spent 5 years with SNCC, 8 years as president of the Southern Poverty Law Center, 12 years as the president of NAACP, 20 years as a state representative, and 75 years an unwavering champion of civil rights for all people, including the LGBT community.

My thoughts and prayers are with Julian's beloved wife Pamela, his children and grandchildren; and the untold millions of persons whose lives were touched by one of America's greatest sons.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Julian Bond, a tireless and eloquent voice for justice, equality, and human dignity who did so much to close the gap between the promise of America's founding ideals and the reality of people's lives.

A TRIBUTE TO ELAINE FENNER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor Elaine Fenner of the Bluffs Arts Council for being a recipient of the Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. Elaine was granted this prestigious award as she has demonstrated her dedication to serving the Bluffs Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. Elaine's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud Elaine for her commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to serve civic minded Iowans like her in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating her for receiving this award and wish her nothing but continued success.

HONORING JUAN BAUTISTA MORA

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Juan Bautista Mora who turned 98 years old on May 3, 2015.

Mr. Mora was born in Chilili, New Mexico in 1917 as the youngest member of the family

that included nine children. His father was a logger assistant who traveled to the southern part of the territory and his mother was a homemaker who also took care of many chores on the family farm.

Juan was placed on a horse at age 6 and taught how to do some of the farming and ranching. In 1922, he became very ill and was cared for by one of his sisters until he recovered. Juan received most of his education from a home school teacher, since he had many responsibilities on the farm.

At age 17, he became a U.S. Census Taker in the Sandia Mountains and would travel from farm to farm, gathering the necessary information.

At age 18, he decided to take the test to enter the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC). At the time, he weighed less than 105 pounds and there was a weight requirement. Juan and his friends went to town and ate as many bananas as they could before being weighed for a second time. He made it into the Corps.

He was assigned to Camp #8 in LaVentana, New Mexico where he was assigned the work of building cabins and roads. He earned \$1.00 per day and would keep \$5.00 each month and send \$25.00 home to his family. The Corps was part of the New Deal by President Franklin D. Roosevelt and provided unskilled labor jobs related to the conservation and development of natural resources in rural lands owned by federal, local and state governments. Juan spent 18 months in the Corps.

In 1945, he married Petra Aragon, a teacher with a degree from Highland University. Juan worked for the Charles Ilfield Grocery store as a driver and he and his wife had five daughters before 1957. Petra went back to teaching at the San Ignacio Parochial School but became very ill and passed away in 1960.

From that point forward, Juan raised their five daughters on his own. He was employed by the City of Albuquerque from 1959 to 1978, first as a laborer, then a welder and eventually a supervisor, responsible for training new employees.

In 2007, Juan attended a reunion of the CCC boys and was able to reconnect with many of his friends and share memories from that time in his life.

He is still very involved with his daughters, M. Virginia Mora de Lazo, Margie Mora Brown, Deanna B. Mora, Lillian D. Stephens and Ruby Mora and their families. He has two grandchildren, Linda Lzao Sheroma and Andres F. Lazo. I would like to extend my thanks to Mr. Mora for his service as a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps during the Great Depression and for his service to the community as a City of Albuquerque employee.

RECOGNIZING REVEREND BERNIECE R. HICKS

HON. TODD C. YOUNG

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor and privilege to recognize Reverend Berniece R. Hicks on the occasion of her 97th birthday. Reverend Hicks founded Christ Gospel Churches International Inc. (CGCI) in

1957 which today has congregations across the United States, throughout South and Central America, and around the globe. The international headquarters in Jeffersonville, Indiana hosts Christ Gospel Bible Institute—founded by Reverend Hicks in the early 1970s—which provides an education curriculum to those with an interest in studying and learning from the Bible. Moreover, the headquarters in Jeffersonville is home to the church's publishing house and weekly radio broadcast, which reaches thousands of readers and listeners across the world.

The Reverend Hicks' spiritual journey began at a young age. As a young woman, she felt the desire to study and teach the Bible, from which she dedicated her life to Jesus Christ. Reverend Hicks has written and published extensively, having authored more than 110 books over the course of her tenure. The church holds a copyright license on these materials, and Reverend Hicks receives no royalties from them.

Reverend Berniece R. Hicks touches the lives of those in her ministry in Southern Indiana and through the network of churches in the United States and around the world. Although 97 years old, she still preaches two sermons most weeks at the Jeffersonville church. Today I honor the life and legacy of Reverend Berniece R. Hicks and wish her a very happy 97th birthday.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. STEVE
ALLEN

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Steve Allen on his retirement after 28 years of dedicated service to the Selma Fire Department.

Mr. Allen was born on April 18, 1961. He grew up in Fresno, California and attended local schools before going on to start his fire career as a volunteer firefighter for North Central Fire Department in May 1979. He completed his Emergency Medical Technician training and was hired by Jones Ambulance in 1981.

On November 6, 1986, after completing paramedic school, Mr. Allen joined Selma Fire Department as one of Selma's first Firefighter/Paramedics. He was promoted first to Fire Engineer in November 1993 and then to Captain in January 1996.

Throughout his career, Mr. Allen worked tirelessly to protect people's lives from devastating fires, such as those in Los Angeles and the Oakland Hills Fire. Additionally, he took a special interest in investigating the causes of fires and was a member of the City of Selma's Arson Team for many years.

After 28 years with the Selma Fire Department, Mr. Allen retired on May 27, 2015.

The Selma community has been extremely fortunate to have a dedicated firefighter such as Mr. Allen to ensure the wellbeing of their community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to

join me in commending Steve Allen for his 28 years of dedicated public service in Selma and congratulating him on his recent retirement.

IN HONOR OF MR. COMMODORE
CONYERS

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding public servant, champion of education, man of God, and loving husband, father, grandfather and friend, Mr. Commodore Conyers. Mr. Conyers departed this life on Monday, August 17, 2015. A funeral service was held on Saturday, August 22, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. at Mt. Zion Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia.

Commodore Conyers was born in Thomasville, Georgia and graduated from Douglas High School in 1949. He then continued his education at Savannah State College, now University, and graduated in 1958 with a bachelor degree in Industrial Education. His early passion for education motivated him to excel in his studies as he progressed to earn a master's degree from Valdosta State College, now University, and an L-6 degree in Administration and Supervision from Albany State College, also now University.

Yet, it was Mr. Conyers' services to his alma mater, Savannah State College, which remained near and dear to his heart for decades. He served as President of the Greater Albany Alumni Chapter of Savannah State and was selected as the Grand Marshal of the 2014 Homecoming Parade. He recently was chosen as the latest inductee into the Savannah State University Foundation Hall of Fame. This prestigious honor will allow his legacy to live on for years to come.

Mr. Conyers' scholastic repertoire, cultivated by his devotion to service and leadership, continued to flourish, as his achievements earned him numerous recognitions and commendations within the educational arena. In 1965, he was named by the State Director of Vocational Education to serve with vocational educators and students from five high schools across Georgia. In this role, he is credited with the major accomplishment of combining two of the state's youth organizations into one. After the successful merger, he was appointed State President of the Georgia American Vocational Association where he also helped merge the two state associations into one, before serving as Treasurer of the merged organization.

In 1983, Mr. Conyers was appointed by the late Georgia Governor George Busbee to serve on a Task Force to study the need for a third state board to oversee vocational education in Georgia. The Task Force indeed recommended a third board, which is in place today. Mr. Conyers also served numerous state and community boards and organizations, including the Board of Directors of the Georgia Teachers and Education Association, the Georgia Association of Educators, and the Georgia Retired Educators Association. He also served as Chairman and Board member of the Dougherty County Board of Elections

and on the Water, Gas, and Light Board of Directors, as well as the Board of Directors for the Albany Civil Rights Institute.

Mr. Speaker, one of the many things that I will always remember and respect about Commodore Conyers is his unwavering passion for education, which made him a trailblazer in his community. During his tenure as the first black Principal of Dougherty Comprehensive High School in Albany, Georgia, a position he held for eleven years, Mr. Conyers was named First Runner-up for State of Georgia Principal of the Year and was also named the State of Georgia Administrator of the Year by the Georgia Association of Educators. In 1997, he again broke barriers when he was named Director of Vocational and Technical Education for the Dougherty County School System, the first African American to serve in this role. Moreover, he started the first Boy Scout Troop for African-American youth in Vienna, Georgia and the first Cub Scout and Boy Scout Troops at Shiloh Baptist Church in Albany, Georgia.

In addition to the love and support of his late wife, Anne; their two children, Derrick, and Devetrice; and two grandchildren, Derrick and Ashley, Mr. Conyers relied on our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ to guide him throughout his life. A member of Shiloh Baptist Church since 1961, he served as Superintendent of the Sunday School, Deacon and a Trustee, Chairman of the Facilities Committee, and numerous other positions.

Mr. Speaker, my wife Vivian and I, along with the more than 730,000 people of Georgia's Second Congressional District salute Mr. Commodore Conyers for his leadership in education and service to his community. I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join us in extending our deepest sympathies to Mr. Conyers' family, friends and loved ones during this difficult time. We pray that they will be consoled and comforted by an abiding faith and the Holy Spirit in the days, weeks and months ahead.

HONORING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF SAINT MARY'S PARISH
IN THE CITY OF GILROY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague, Congressman SAM FARR, to pay tribute to Saint Mary's Parish of the City of Gilroy. On August 15, 2015, the Parish celebrated a true milestone: its 150th Anniversary. Together we commend the Parish for its century and a half of service, fellowship, and leadership to the Gilroy community.

From its founding, Saint Mary's Parish has been at the heart of its Gilroy community. Founding Pastor Thomas J. Hudson built Saint Mary of the Assumption in the young southernmost town of Santa Clara County, Gilroy, in 1865. As the town grew into a city of 50,000 residents, Saint Mary's Parish expanded, adding its third building on its 100th Anniversary in 1965. The Parish has served as a point of gathering for people with diverse backgrounds and experiences. It has also been a home to

hundreds of dedicated parishioners of Saint Mary's Parish who have served the residents of Gilroy.

Saint Mary's Parish has led and contributed to the spiritual and cultural life of Gilroy for many years through various cultural events, its local and international programs, and St. Mary School, staffed by the Sisters of the Presentation. The Parish's programs have included Saint Joseph Family Center, Lord's Table, Mexico Mission, various disaster and poverty relief collections, and person-by-person counseling.

Through the years, Saint Mary's Parish has maintained strong and active social justice outreach within the community. The Parish has contributed to the lives of many individuals and families by extending its support to young families, immigrants, families of farm workers, and persons living with physical and mental disabilities. The Parish has also offered solace to the bereaved.

In addition to being attentive to the spiritual, cultural, and social justice needs of Gilroy community members, Saint Mary's Parish has been an important source of unity to our residents. The Parish has continued to focus its efforts on the betterment of our society by providing a spiritual home for our youth and promoting social justice and diversity in the City of Gilroy.

As Saint Mary's Parish of the City of Gilroy celebrates 150 years of service to the Gilroy community, we join the many friends and families wishing well to the Parish. On this day of honor and celebration, we do hereby recognize and commend Saint Mary's Parish on this milestone.

HONORING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY
OF THE CITY OF SOUTH
TUCSON

HON. RAÚL M. GRIJALVA

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 75th Anniversary of the City of South Tucson, a community known for the resiliency, determination, and independence of its residents.

As a native of Tucson, Arizona, I am privileged to represent the City of South Tucson in the United States Congress. The support and loyalty I have received from the residents of South Tucson during my entire public life is a great honor for me personally.

Over 6,000 people and 300 businesses call the City of South Tucson home. This square mile city incorporated by its residents, rather than losing its identity to the City of Tucson, continues after 75 years to assert its independence and be the unique and proud community it has always been through its history.

South Tucson is about family and community, offering to the much larger metropolis of Tucson a view of our past and a dynamic view of what a community can do to retain its character while looking forward.

South Tucson boasts the best Mexican cuisine found anywhere; Las Artes, a model for integrating public art and education; and public

services from the state of the art Sam Lena library to excellent public schools Ochoa and Mission View. South Tucson has a sophisticated network of social service providers and City of South Tucson first responders who place the safety of their residents first.

The greatest asset that the City of South Tucson has is its people, a diverse group representing Native-Americans, African-Americans, and Anglos, and families that have contributed so much to the region.

From South Tucson have come generations of political leaders, tradesmen, educators, decorated war veterans, business leaders, civil leaders, and so many hardworking people whose dignity and determination better us all.

Like all small towns and cities in America, the City of South Tucson faces challenges, but the drive to meet those challenges and prosper for the next 75 years is without a doubt the city's future.

I wish to congratulate the Mayor and Council of the City of South Tucson and the residents of the city on its 75th anniversary. The commemoration ceremony on September 19, 2015 at the Music and Arts Festival will be a day in which we pause and acknowledge the history, achievements, and the future of the City of South Tucson. Congratulations to South Tucson.

IN MEMORY OF EDITH NORLE
MCMILLAN ROBERTS

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my good friend, Edith Norle McMillan Roberts, who passed away on Saturday, August 15, 2015, in Antelope, California at the age of 96. Edith was not only a good friend of mine, but she was a friend to Sacramento—someone who spent her life dedicated to her family, education and public service.

Edith Norle McMillan Roberts was the widow of the late Tuskegee Airman George "Spanky" Roberts, Colonel, USAF (Retired), a member of the first graduating class of the Tuskegee Airmen in 1942. She was born on March 18, 1919, in Gilliam, West Virginia. While attending West Virginia State University (formerly West Virginia State College), she met George. She graduated in 1941 with a Bachelor's degree in music and French. While at college, she joined the Delta Sigma Theta Sorority and the college choir. After graduation, she taught second through fifth grade, as well as the Boys' Glee Club, at Lakin Boys' Reformatory in Point Pleasant, West Virginia. Edith and George married on March 7, 1942, immediately following his graduation in the first class of Tuskegee Airmen.

Moving to Sacramento, California, in 1965, George worked at McClellan Air Force Base where Edith directed the Military Wives' Choral Group and sang in the chapel choir. The pair retired to civilian life in 1968. The family attended St. Stephen's Presbyterian Church, where Edith, once again, took up the post of choir director until 1997.

Edith graduated in 1972 with her Master's Degree in social work from the Graduate School of Social Work at California State University, Sacramento. She worked for the Sacramento City Unified School District as a School Social Worker from 1972–1985, and was the first African-American social worker for the school district.

Edith did extensive work for the George S. "Spanky" Roberts Chapter of the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. and founded the "Living History Team." She traveled the United States teaching adults and children about the legacy of the Tuskegee Airmen and the many hardships they were dealt in life, from Jim Crow laws and segregation to her struggles of being a military wife.

Edith was always a strong advocate of education. The George S. "Spanky" Roberts Chapter will honor her memory by creating the Edith Roberts Scholarship Award in her name. Similarly, the Tuskegee Airmen, Inc. national organization will create the George and Edith Roberts Scholarship award. These scholarships will help graduating seniors to follow their goals through higher education and beyond. Nothing made Edith happier than watching young people recognize and follow their dreams.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Edith Norle McMillan Roberts. She leaves a legacy that we should all aspire to follow. She is loved deeply and will be missed by many. I pray that her loving family, George Roberts, Jr., Lanelle Brent, Michalyn Green, and Leigh Roberts; six grandchildren, Richard Brent, Heather Mercer, Joshua Roberts, Margaret Green, Zachari Roberts, and Nathaniel Roberts; and three great-grandchildren, Kathryn Mercer, Grace Roberts, and Lauren Mercer will find comfort in the fact that Edith provided so much love and service to those of us who had the honor to share in her life.

A TRIBUTE TO DICK MILLER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dick Miller of the Bluffs Arts Council for receiving an Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. Dick was granted this prestigious award as he has demonstrated his dedication to serving the Bluffs Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. Dick's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud Dick for his commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to represent civic minded Iowans like him in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him for receiving this award and wish him nothing but continued success.

TRIBUTE TO DEPUTY DARREN GOFORTH OF THE HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE, LOVING HUSBAND, DEVOTED FATHER, AND DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but an abiding admiration that I rise today to acknowledge the life and service of Deputy Darren Goforth of Houston, Texas.

Deputy Darren Goforth, a ten-year veteran of the Harris County Sheriff's office, died on Friday, August 28, 2015, while refueling his patrol car.

He was shot fifteen times by a man who, by all accounts, never knew Darren Goforth and the light he brought into this world.

In a senseless act of violence, the love and care Darren Goforth gave to his wife, Kathleen and two young children, and the community he served, ended entirely too soon.

According to Kathleen Goforth her husband was an "intricate blend of toughness and gentility," a man who was fiercely loyal and always strived to do the right thing; a person "who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor."

May I add, Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth was what we want in an American.

Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth's life is a testament to the goodness in the American people, but his death is a reminder of many difficult and painful truths.

Foremost among these are the dangers the men and women of our nation's law enforcement departments face every time they walk their beats and patrol their communities.

Their families, the persons who know them best and love them most, deserve to welcome them home at the end of each shift, safe and sound.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront the reality that police departments and the communities they protect are all too often adversarial.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security for all persons.

The murder of Deputy Goforth also reminds us that we must do more to stem the tide of gun violence that tears through this country.

Neither our country nor our hearts can afford to lose people of such quality as Darren Goforth to gun violence in the staggering quantities that we do.

Mr. Speaker, over 32,000 Americans die from gun violence each year.

So, while Darren Goforth's death is most certainly a tragedy, death by gun violence happens all too often in our country.

This normalcy of gun violence is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the person who ended Deputy Goforth's wonderful life, struggled with mental illness for quite some time.

We absolutely have to do more to ensure that society's most dangerous weapons stay

out of the hands of the most mentally or emotionally unstable persons.

It is important that we do this because it is estimated that 61.5 million Americans experience mental illness in a given year.

This is why we must, as a nation, attach as much importance and provide the same level of resources for mental health as we do for physical health.

We can no longer afford to ignore the struggles of nearly 20 percent of the population and fail to provide adequate treatment and services that could alleviate some of that struggle and prevent horrific events like the one that claimed the life of Deputy Darren Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning the loss of Deputy Darren Goforth but I have hope.

I have hope that out of this tragedy we will be moved to act to make this country safer for the men and women who risk their lives to keep their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Darren Goforth, an extraordinary human being and a shining example of what is meant when we remember him and say: "He was one of Houston's finest."

BEULAH BAPTIST INSTITUTIONAL CHURCH

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Beulah Baptist Institutional Church in Tampa, Florida, in celebrating its 150th anniversary. Founded by freed slaves in 1865, the church holds a unique place in history. It has served many generations and the entire community with its mission of freedom of worship and dignity of the individual.

Established at the conclusion of the Civil War, Beulah became Tampa's first African-American Baptist Church. Over its 150 years, the Church has grown to be a symbol of social justice. Beulah has remained committed in focusing on education and civil rights. This diligent commitment has surely ensured a brighter future for its congregates and the community as a whole.

The lasting influence the church has had on Tampa is a testament to its congregants and, certainly, to its leaders. The late Reverend Dr. A. Leon Lowry, Sr. who served from 1956 to 1996, was a leader in the fight for civil rights in Tampa in the 1950s and 1960s as well as the State President of the NAACP. Reverend Lowry then went on to become the first African-American elected to office countywide—the Hillsborough County School Board. He was one of the Theology professors of Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The A. Leon Lowry, Sr. Elementary School in Tampa is named in his honor.

The current pastor, Reverend Dr. W. James Favorite, has continued the church's pivotal role in community advancement. With a strong philosophy that serving the church is more than just ministering on Sunday, Reverend Fa-

vorite serves on many community initiatives including Pastors on Patrol, the African American Family Support Initiative, Childcare Facilities Advisory Board, and the Tampa Urban League board. As the Chairman of the Black Leadership Commission on AIDS of Tampa Bay, Reverend Favorite has spearheaded the effort nationally to reduce the stigma associated with HIV and AIDS by calling on clergy all across the bay area and America to put AIDS and HIV awareness at the heart of their sermons.

With 150 years of service and stewardship, the church enters into its next 150 years with enthusiasm. The church is looking forward to its upcoming projects including Senior housing initiatives, job preparation and technology training, sponsorship of Jamaica Outreach ministry, Summer Instructional camp, and an after school e-Library facility.

On behalf of the Tampa Bay community that has greatly benefitted from the church's continuing presence and guidance, I am honored to congratulate the Beulah Baptist Institutional Church on their 150th anniversary.

A TRIBUTE TO DENISE PUTMAN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Denise Putman of the Bluff's Arts Council for receiving an Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. Denise was granted this prestigious award as she has demonstrated her dedication to serving the Bluff's Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. Denise's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud Denise for her commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to represent civic minded Iowans like her in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating her for receiving this award and wish her nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING JULIE LOUISE LOVIE, NAPA COUNTY TEACHER OF THE YEAR

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Julie Louise Lovie, who has been selected as the Napa County Teacher of the Year for 2016.

A native of Napa, California, Ms. Lovie began her teaching career in 1993 at the Napa Valley Adult School. In 1994, she began teaching math and science at Valley Oak Continuation High School in Napa, where she still

teaches today. Throughout her career, Ms. Lovie has been a beloved member of her school community. In 2010, she was named Teacher of the Year by the Napa Rotary Club, and in 2014 she was named a "Friend of the Napa Hispanic Network". Her professional affiliations have included The California Teach's Association, a partnership with the Napa County Resource Conservation Acorns to Oaks program, and the Water Shed Week "STRAW" program. Furthermore, Ms. Lovie has been a Community Club Leader for the 4 Leaf Clover 4H Club for over 15 years and has actively participated in Youth Ministry at St. Apollinaris Church for 10 years.

As an experienced continuation high school teacher, Ms. Lovie understands that traditional teaching strategies will not work for the students in her classes. Serving a population that is often considered at risk for drug and alcohol use, she serves as the Friday Night Live advisor, the California Highway Patrol "Every 15 Minutes" advisor, and as a member of the Catalyst Prevention Coalition.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Lovie makes it her mission as a teacher to change students' beliefs about themselves and take them on a journey of achievement. It is appropriate that we take this time to honor Ms. Lovie for her decades of service to our community and her commitment to making each of her students feel both supported and respected.

HONORING PROGRESSIVE
MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Progressive Missionary Baptist Church located in Berkeley, California, upon its 80th Anniversary as a strong religious pillar in the East Bay community.

Progressive Missionary Baptist Church was founded in 1935 by a group of 35 devout Christians. They sought to bring glory to God by engaging and empowering believers through fellowship, discipleship, worship and service. The church was built in the historic Lorin district of Berkeley. To accommodate its growing membership, the church was expanded in 1959 to include a library, nursery, and classrooms. The church added a new building in 1964 and named it the Stoval Center in honor of the late Pastor Edward Stoval.

Dr. Earl C. Stuckey Sr. was elected senior pastor of Progressive Missionary Baptist Church in September 1977. Pastor Stuckey is active in both the faith and local communities. He served as an advisor on the Billy Graham Crusade, and was an active member of the Baptist Ministers Union as well as numerous other Christian organizations, including serving as a planning board member of the Mount Hermon Christian Conference; Publicity Chairman of the Evangelism Committee; former board member of the Bay Cities Bible Institute; and Christian Nationals Evangelism Commission.

Through many outreach programs, Progressive Missionary Baptist Church has been able

to better the lives of people in their community. The church facilitates programs such as the Bay Area Rescue Mission, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs, Crown Ministries Financial Seminars, Project Go Ye, and Celebrate Recovery. All of these programs have had a truly remarkable effect on the residents of the Bay Area.

Progressive Missionary Baptist Church continues to host ministries for groups of all ages and areas of need. The Life Development Ministry provides young members a safe and caring atmosphere in which they can receive guidance and direction. The Home Builders Ministry works to strengthen the spiritual foundation for engaged and married couples; the Men's Fellowship Ministry challenges men to reach spiritual maturity and restore family connections; and, the Women's Fellowship Ministry seeks to enable each woman to discover and utilize her spiritual potential.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I extend my sincerest congratulations to Progressive Missionary Baptist Church on the special occasion of its 80th anniversary. I wish Progressive Missionary Baptist Church many more years of faithful and compassionate service.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE LAWRENCE
K. KARLTON

HON. DORIS O. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of retired U.S. District Court Judge Lawrence K. Karlton, who passed away last month. I ask my colleagues to take a moment and join me in tribute to Judge Karlton's truly distinguished life and service to the American people.

Judge Karlton was a steadfast believer that justice and equal protection under the law applied to all Americans, regardless of one's place in our nation and society. After graduating from New York University and Columbia School of Law, Judge Karlton served in the United States Army and was the lead Civilian Legal Officer at the Sacramento Army Depot. He would later serve in private practice and volunteer as a lawyer for the American Civil Liberties Union on a number of civil rights cases. Governor Jerry Brown, well aware of Judge Karlton's talents, appointed him to the Superior Court of California in 1976. Three years later, President Jimmy Carter appointed him to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California in 1979. He would serve honorably for a number of years and took senior status in 2000. After thirty-five years on the federal bench, Judge Karlton formally retired last September.

With his passing, Judge Karlton has left behind a clear legacy as a fair jurist, one who was always impartial to those who stood in front of him, and one who clearly valued the rights enshrined in the United States Constitution. He has left an unforgettable mark on the people of our nation who needed the federal courts to be strong in order to protect their rights. While on the federal bench, Judge

Karlton served on a number three judge panels that were charged with overseeing the State of California's overcrowded prison system. He oversaw a complex class action case filed on behalf of those who had immigrated to the United States in the 1980s, and waded into the complexities of federal protections for endangered species in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta in the 2000s.

Finally and perhaps most importantly, Judge Karlton leaves a legacy as a mentor to many talented lawyers, a number of whom have gone on to be appointed to federal and state judgeships. While the responsibilities of serving on federal bench were immense, he also was a wonderful husband to his wife, Sue, and father to his daughter, Emily Williams.

Mr. Speaker, as Judge Lawrence Karlton's family, friends and colleagues gather to honor his life and accomplishments, I ask that my colleagues join me in thanking him and recognizing him for his many years of service to our nation and the legacy that he leaves behind.

HONORING CARLOS P. YAMZON

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Stanislaus Council of Governments (StanCOG) Executive Director Carlos P. Yamzon on his retirement; and to personally thank him for his years of profound service to Stanislaus County.

Over 35 years ago, Mr. Yamzon's career began in the public service of transportation. Twenty-seven of those years were spent in technical and management positions with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), whose purpose is to provide a safe and reliable transportation system to benefit and enhance the state of California.

After working in the transportation sector, Mr. Yamzon was amply prepared to begin working for StanCOG, the federally-designated Metropolitan Planning Organization, and the state designated Regional Transportation Planning Agency for the region of Stanislaus County. He worked diligently for this public organization to ensure transportation plans that would enhance the economic vitality of all Stanislaus County cities. After five short years, Mr. Yamzon was promoted to Executive Director.

In this role, Mr. Yamzon was responsible for a variety of entities within the organization. He was charged with regional transportation planning, program administration, financial management and budget control where he handled all areas proficiently and with expertise. Mr. Yamzon was a key player in implementing StanCOG's 2011 and 2014 Regional Transportation Plans. These plans will continue to be utilized for future transportation improvements and investments.

During his time at StanCOG, Mr. Yamzon was also instrumental in improving State Route 132. This is a major route for central valley commuters, as well as commercial truck drivers. In addition to Mr. Yamzon's efforts to improve State Route 132, he was an advocate

for finding a suitable route in Stanislaus County to connect Interstate 5 and State Highway 99, 2 of California's best known routes.

Mr. Yamzon is a well-known leader in the community of Modesto and the region of Stanislaus County. In the StanCOG office located in downtown Modesto, he is loved and admired by his staff for his sense of humor, unique sock choices, his love for jelly donuts and his keen devotion to rock and roll.

Residing in Modesto, California for 29 years, Carlos and his wife Liz raised two children; daughter Aja Yamzon and son Marlon Yamzon.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the outstanding contributions made to the transportation systems in Stanislaus County by Executive Director Carlos Yamzon. We wish him continued success in his retirement.

HONORING MR. MARK RAYMOND
CHANDLER

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life of Mr. Mark Raymond Chandler. Known throughout the Bay Area as a tireless advocate for veterans, Mr. Chandler has left an undeniable mark on our community. With his passing on July 31, 2015, we look to honor the outstanding quality of his life's work.

Born in Erie, Pennsylvania, on July 25, 1934, Mark Raymond Chandler, formerly Raymond Joseph Buczynski, set out to explore the world at a young age. Mark spent much of his youth in New York City as a theatre actor. At the age of sixteen, he joined the United States Navy and later served in the Korean War. Mr. Chandler also aided in the evacuation of American civilian and "at risk" Vietnamese from Saigon in the fall of Saigon. He traveled extensively across the world, and met his beloved wife Indiah while working in Indonesia.

Later on in life, Mr. Chandler dedicated himself to serving as an advocate for disabled veterans, serving on the Veterans Affairs Commission, and working tirelessly to bring a VA Clinic to Alameda Point.

Mr. Chandler was a soldier, an actor, and a journalist, but above all else, he was a loving husband and father. He is survived by his wife Indiah, his siblings Marianne and Sonny, his children Kathy, Roger, Steven, and Brian, and his grandson Oliver.

Mark will forever be remembered as a hopeless romantic, a lover of roses, and a man who, despite all of his travels and experiences, cherished nothing more than sharing a coffee and a bun with his grandson, who he loved more than life itself.

Today, California's 13th Congressional District salutes the life of an outstanding individual and leader. Mr. Chandler's contributions have truly impacted countless lives throughout the Bay Area. I join all of Mr. Chandler's loved ones in celebrating his incredible accomplishments and offer my most sincere condolences.

A TRIBUTE TO CALLIE ECKMANN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Callie Eckmann from the Tri-Center Varsity Cheer team, as she has been honored with the status of All-American at the Tri-Center cheer camp.

To achieve this status, Callie had to try out in front of the entire camp, demonstrating her knowledge and skill in all areas of cheer. Callie has dedicated her time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend her for her hard work and determination.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Callie demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Callie on a job well done, and wish her nothing but continued success.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VOTING
RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker on this joyful day 50 years ago, President Lyndon Johnson signed into law the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and because of that law, I stand before you as Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE, the first African American woman Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today not just to commemorate the landmark achievement of 50 years ago but to inform our colleagues and the nation of the need to redouble and rededicate our efforts to the work that remains to be done to protect the right of all Americans to vote free from discrimination and the injustices that prevent them from exercising this most fundamental right of citizenship.

On August 6, 1965, in the Rotunda of the Capitol and in the presence of such luminaries as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Rev. Ralph Abernathy of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Roy Wilkins of the NAACP; Whitney Young of the National Urban League; James Foreman of the Congress of Racial Equality; A. Philip Randolph of the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters; John Lewis of the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee; Senators Robert Kennedy, Hubert Humphrey, and Everett Dirksen; President Johnson addressed the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act:

The vote is the most powerful instrument ever devised by man for breaking down injustice and destroying the terrible walls which imprison men because they are different from other men.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 was critical to preventing brazen voter discrimination violations that historically left millions of African Americans disenfranchised.

In 1940, for example, there were less than 30,000 African Americans registered to vote in Texas and only about 3% of African Americans living in the South were registered to vote.

Poll taxes, literacy tests, and threats of violence were the major causes of these racially discriminatory results.

After passage of the Voting Rights Act in 1965, which prohibited these discriminatory practices, registration and electoral participation steadily increased to the point that by 2012, more than 1.2 million African Americans living in Texas were registered to vote.

In 1964, the year before the Voting Rights Act became law, there were approximately 300 African Americans in public office, including just three in Congress.

Few, if any, African Americans held elective office anywhere in the South.

Because of the Voting Rights Act, today there are more than 9,100 black elected officials, including 46 members of Congress, the largest number ever.

The Voting Rights Act opened the political process for many of the approximately 6,000 Hispanic public officials that have been elected and appointed nationwide, including more than 275 at the state or federal level, 32 of whom serve in Congress.

Native Americans, Asians and others who have historically encountered harsh barriers to full political participation also have benefited greatly.

The crown jewel of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is Section 5, which requires that states and localities with a chronic record of discrimination in voting practices secure federal approval before making any changes to voting processes.

Section 5 protects minority voting rights where voter discrimination has historically been the worst.

Since 1982, Section 5 has stopped more than 1,000 discriminatory voting changes in their tracks, including 107 discriminatory changes right here in Texas.

And it is a source of eternal pride to all of us in Houston that in pursuit of extending the full measure of citizenship to all Americans, in 1975 Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, who also represented this historic 18th Congressional District of Texas, introduced, and the Congress adopted, what are now Sections 4(f)(3) and 4(f)(4) of the Voting Rights Act, which extended the protections of Section 4(a) and Section 5 to language minorities.

During the floor debate on the 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act, Congresswoman Jordan explained why this reform was needed:

There are Mexican-American people in the State of Texas who have been denied the right to vote; who have been impeded in their efforts to register and vote; who have not had encouragement from those election officials because they are brown people.

So, the state of Texas, if we approve this measure, would be brought within the coverage of this Act for the first time.

When it comes to extending and protecting the precious right to vote, the Lone Star

State—the home state of Lyndon Johnson and Barbara Jordan—can be the leading state in the Union, one that sets the example for the nation.

But to realize that future, we must turn from and not return to the dark days of the past.

We must remain ever vigilant and oppose all schemes that will abridge or dilute the precious right to vote.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today to remind the nation that the right to vote—that “powerful instrument that can break down the walls of injustice”—is facing grave threats.

The threat stems from the decision issued in June 2013 by the Supreme Court in *Shelby County v. Holder*, 570 U.S. 193 (2013), which invalidated Section 4(b) of the VRA, and paralyzed the application of the VRA’s Section 5 preclearance requirements.

According to the Supreme Court majority, the reason for striking down Section 4(b) was that “times change.”

Now, the Court was right; times have changed.

But what the Court did not fully appreciate is that the positive changes it cited are due almost entirely to the existence and vigorous enforcement of the Voting Rights Act.

And that is why the Voting Rights Act is still needed.

Let me put it this way: in the same way that the vaccine invented by Dr. Jonas Salk in 1953 eradicated the crippling effects but did not eliminate the cause of polio, the Voting Rights Act succeeded in stymieing the practices that resulted in the wholesale disenfranchisement of African Americans and language minorities but did eliminate them entirely.

The Voting Rights Act is needed as much today to prevent another epidemic of voting disenfranchisement as Dr. Salk’s vaccine is still needed to prevent another polio epidemic.

However, officials in some states, notably Texas and North Carolina, seemed to regard the *Shelby* decision as a green light and rushed to implement election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

My constituents remember very well the Voter ID law passed in Texas in 2011, which required every registered voter to present a valid government-issued photo ID on the day of polling in order to vote.

The Justice Department blocked the law in March of 2012, and it was Section 5 that prohibited it from going into effect.

At least it did until the *Shelby* decision, because on the very same day that *Shelby* was decided officials in Texas announced they would immediately implement the Photo ID law, and other election laws, policies, and practices that could never pass muster under the Section 5 preclearance regime.

The Texas Photo ID law was challenged in federal court and thankfully, just yesterday, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit upheld the decision of U.S. District Court Judge Nelva Gonzales Ramos that Texas’ strict voter identification law discriminated against blacks and Hispanics and violated Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

Mr. Speaker, protecting voting rights and combating voter suppression schemes are two of the critical challenges facing our great democracy.

Without safeguards to ensure that all citizens have equal access to the polls, more injustices are likely to occur and the voices of millions silenced.

Those of us who cherish the right to vote justifiably are skeptical of Voter ID laws because we understand how these laws, like poll taxes and literacy tests, can be used to impede or negate the ability of seniors, racial and language minorities, and young people to cast their votes.

Consider the demographic groups who lack a government issued ID:

1. African Americans: 25%
2. Asian Americans: 20%
3. Hispanic Americans: 19%
4. Young people, aged 18–24: 18%
5. Persons with incomes less than \$35,000: 15%

And there are other ways abridging or suppressing the right to vote, including:

1. Curtailing or eliminating early voting
2. Ending same-day registration
3. Not counting provisional ballots cast in the wrong precinct on Election Day will not count.
4. Eliminating adolescent pre-registration
5. Shortening poll hours
6. Lessening the standards governing voter challenges thus allowing self-proclaimed “ballot security vigilantes” like the King Street Patriots to cause trouble at the polls.

Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the landmark Voting Rights Act signed into law by President Lyndon Johnson on August 6, 1965, I called upon House Speaker BOEHNER to bring legislation intended to protect the right to vote of all Americans to the floor for debate and vote.

Specifically, I call for the passage of the bipartisan Voting Rights Amendments Act (H.R. 885), of which I am an original co-sponsor, which repairs the damage done to the Voting Rights Act by the Supreme Court’s *Shelby* decision.

This legislation replaces the old ‘static’ coverage formula with a new dynamic coverage formula, or ‘rolling trigger,’ which effectively gives the legislation nationwide reach because any state and any jurisdiction in any state potentially is subject to being covered if the requisite number of violations are found to have been committed.

Alternatively, I call upon the Speaker to let the House debate and vote on the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2015 (H.R. 2867), a bill that provides even greater federal oversight of jurisdictions which have a history of voter suppression and protects vulnerable communities from discriminatory voting practices.

Second, I call for the passage of H.R. 12, the Voter Empowerment Act of 2015, legislation I have co-sponsored that protects voters from suppression, deception, and other forms of disenfranchisement by modernizing voter registration, promoting access to voting for individuals with disabilities, and protecting the ability of individuals to exercise the right to vote in elections for federal office.

Mr. Speaker, before concluding there is one other point I would like to stress.

In his address to the nation before signing the Voting Rights Act of 1965, President Johnson said:

Presidents and Congresses, laws and lawsuits can open the doors to the polling places and open the doors to the wondrous rewards which await the wise use of the ballot.

But only the individual Negro, and all others who have been denied the right to vote, can really walk through those doors, and can use that right, and can transform the vote into an instrument of justice and fulfillment.

In other words, political power—and the justice, opportunity, inclusion, and fulfillment it provides—comes not from the right to vote but in the exercise of that right.

And that means it is the civic obligation of every citizen to both register and vote in every election, state and local as well as federal.

Because if we can register and vote, but fail to do so, we are guilty of voluntary voter suppression, the most effective method of disenfranchisement ever devised.

And in recent years, Americans have not been doing a very good job of exercising our civic responsibility to register, vote, and make their voices heard.

Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans, the right to vote protected by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is sacred treasure, earned by the sweat and toil and tears and blood of ordinary Americans who showed the world it was possible to accomplish extraordinary things.

So on this 50th anniversary of that landmark law, let us rededicate ourselves to honoring those who won for us this precious right by remaining vigilant and fighting against both the efforts of others to abridge or suppress the right to vote and our own apathy in exercising this sacred right.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN REVIER

HON. MICHAEL K. SIMPSON

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank John Revier for the nearly fifteen years of service he has given me as my Deputy Chief of Staff and Legislative Director. John’s last day with my office was yesterday, and today he is beginning a new phase in his career at the Idaho National Laboratory (INL) where he will serve in Boise as the Director for State and Regional Government Relations.

Not many staffers come along like John Revier. For those who know him, they know he has one of the sharpest legislative minds of any staffer I have ever seen. He can break down any legislative or administrative issue in an instant and begin charting the course of action and implementing it. Many times he does this before people understand what the problem actually is and how it is going to affect them. John has become an expert on so many different issues it’s hard to begin counting them.

As a Congressional staffer, John accomplished a rare feat. He served in both the Senate District office and Washington, D.C. office for the late Senator Rod Grams of Minnesota. He also served in both my Washington, D.C. office and Boise office. Not many Congressional staffers can say they touched all four bases in the House and Senate. This served to impress upon him how to work well with

State and D.C. offices in both the House and Senate.

John is very proud of his roots in Minnesota and moreover his hometown of Redwood Falls. However, we are fortunate that he is now an Idaho transplant and will continue to serve Idaho in a new capacity.

I want to thank John's wife Jani and their two wonderful children Kate and Sam. They have allowed John to give much of his time to me. Moreover, it's been a pleasure to watch the twins as they are growing up.

I wish John the best in his new position, and as I like to jokingly say—"good luck to the INL for taking him away from us".

RECOGNIZING MIGUEL TREVIÑO,
JR.

HON. HENRY CUELLAR

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. CUELLAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the retiring CEO of Gateway Community Health Center, Miguel Treviño, Jr. Born on April 14, 1944 in Laredo, Texas, Mr. Treviño started his career 48 years ago with the Laredo-Webb County Health Department working on the Migrant Health Program. This program later became the private, not-for-profit corporation Gateway Community Health Center, which has provided preventive health programs including: Family Planning, Breast and Cervical Cancer Services, and Immunizations.

As the former President of both the Texas Association of Community Health Centers and the Community Health Network of South Texas, Mr. Treviño was passionate about bringing health care needs to the forefront in his community.

A proud husband and father of three, Mr. Treviño is a man of values who has always extended a hand to those in need. His compassion and persistence were exemplified every day by his eagerness to greet everyone the moment he walked in the door and his willingness to pay for patients who couldn't afford services.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mr. Treviño. He never wavered and stood his ground; all to benefit the community and those in it who were most vulnerable. Thank you for this time.

A TRIBUTE TO EAGLE SCOUT
MARK T. ALBERS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mark Albers of Boy Scout Troop 182 in Waukee, Iowa for achieving the rank of Eagle Scout.

The Eagle Scout rank is the highest advancement rank in scouting. Only about five percent of Boy Scouts earn the Eagle Scout Award. The award is a performance-based

achievement with high standards that have been well-maintained for more than a century.

To earn the Eagle Scout rank, a Boy Scout is obligated to pass specific tests that are organized by requirements and merit badges, and must complete an Eagle Project to benefit the community. For his project, Mark planned, constructed and installed three professional grade benches at the Covenant Presbyterian Church playground in West Des Moines. This playground is frequently used by area families and the Head Start Program at the church. The work ethic Mark has shown in his Eagle Project and every other project leading up to his Eagle Scout rank speaks volumes of his commitment to serving a cause greater than himself and assisting his community.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by this young man and his supportive family demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication, and perseverance. I am honored to represent Mark and his family in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on reaching the rank of Eagle Scout, and I wish him continued success in his future education and career.

CELEBRATING THE SUCCESS OF
THE SPECIAL OLYMPICS WORLD
GAMES IN LOS ANGELES

HON. KAREN BASS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize and celebrate the success of the Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles, California. The Games began on Saturday, July 25, 2015 with spectacular Opening Ceremonies at the Los Angeles Memorial Coliseum that featured an address by First Lady Michelle Obama. The Games ended with festive Closing Ceremonies at the same venue on Sunday, August 2, 2015. I am proud to represent the area that includes not only the Coliseum, but also the University of Southern California which has hosted several events, including aquatics, basketball, track and field competitions.

Special Olympics World Games this year included over 6,000 athletes from 165 countries competing in 25 different sports. I am particularly happy to have the Games in Los Angeles after 16 years of being hosted outside of the United States.

Since its founding in 1968 by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, the Special Olympics have played a significant part in fostering greater acceptance and inclusion of people with intellectual disabilities in the U.S. and all over the world. The Games honor the talents, perseverance and achievements of people who are all too often overlooked or excluded from mainstream society. Every year, millions of athletes participate in Special Olympics activities in nearly every country of the world, with the support of as many as one million coaches and volunteers.

The Special Olympians here in Los Angeles have travelled far and overcome many obstacles in their quest for excellence. They also

know that their willingness to step into the spotlight and share their abilities and dreams with the world will offer inspiration to others with intellectual disabilities, and to their families, friends, villages, towns, cities and nations.

Thanks are also due to the families and friends back home who support their athletes and loved ones with intellectual disabilities, whether or not they will ever make it to the World Games.

I invite all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me and the entire bipartisan Los Angeles delegation in congratulating the organizers, coaches, volunteers, families, supporters and most of all the athletes on the success of the 2015 Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles.

INTRODUCING A JOINT RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE USE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES TO ACHIEVE THE GOAL OF PREVENTING IRAN FROM OBTAINING NUCLEAR WEAPONS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that will authorize the sitting President or his successors to use the armed forces of the United States to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

On July 14, 2015, a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) designed to ensure that Iran's nuclear program is used solely for peaceful purposes was finalized. With history as our guide, any agreement with the Iranian government must be met with skepticism, and therefore, backed up with muscularity—my legislation provides this muscularity.

Indeed, the importance of an international framework that actually prohibits Iran from ever becoming a nuclear weapons state cannot be overstated. As Ranking Democratic Member of the U.S. Helsinki Commission and the only American to have served as President of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe's (OSCE PA) Parliamentary Assembly, as well as a former member of both the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and Committee on Foreign Affairs, I am acutely aware of the challenges in dealing with Iran's nuclear program.

Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon at any time is a threat to the United States as well as our allies in the region, and its questionable sincerity in forgoing the procurement of such weapons has created legitimate cause for concern in the past and must, therefore, inform how we proceed today and in the future. It is my sincere hope that my legislation will provide the added hard power necessary to deter Iran from continued efforts to obtain nuclear weapons, including skirting compliance with the JCPOA, if implemented.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will send a clear message to the Iranian regime that the United States is willing to ensure that Iran never becomes a nuclear weapons state at any cost.

A TRIBUTE TO BOB FENNER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Bob Fenner of the Bluffs Arts Council for receiving an Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. Bob was granted this prestigious award as he has demonstrated his dedication to serving the Bluffs Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. Bob's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud Bob for his commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to represent civic minded Iowans like him in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him for receiving this award and wish him nothing but the best moving forward.

IN HONOR OF THE PROGRESSIVE
NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVEN-
TION'S ANNUAL SESSION FROM
AUGUST 2 THROUGH 7, 2015

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the instrumental work of the Progressive National Baptist Convention to protect the right to vote as they host their annual session from August 2 through 7, 2015, in Dallas, Texas. At its annual session, the Progressive National Baptist Convention calls on its current members to protect the right that its founding members fought to earn: the right to vote. Today, on the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, the right to the ballot box is once again challenged and the foot soldiers fighting to protect against the disenfranchisement of vulnerable populations are more necessary than ever.

Since its Civil Rights era founding in 1961, the Progressive National Baptist Convention has fought to improve the conditions of the African American community at large. The Progressive National Baptist Convention was the denominational home and platform for Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., as its founding leaders worked to unite Baptist faith communities across the country to further the socio-economic liberation of African Americans in the United States. The founding principles of fellowship, progress, service and peace continue to guide its membership as they now apply the cornerstones of their organization to advocate for full voter registration and participation.

In the last two years the Supreme Court weakened key components of the original Voting Rights Act of 1965, allowing state legislatures nationwide to actively create and imple-

ment voter ID laws meant to keep African Americans, Latinos and other traditionally disenfranchised communities away from the ballot box. On the heels of the 50th anniversary of the Voting Rights Act, the Progressive National Baptist Convention continues to be a vital Baptist denomination with an estimated membership of 2.5 million actively working to give full voice, leadership and active support to the black community, America, and ultimately the universal fight for human freedom. Today, the Progressive National Baptist Convention calls on its nationwide membership to fight in the name of voter empowerment and restoration of voting protections for all Americans.

In my home state of Texas, one of the battlegrounds for the modern struggle to protect the right to vote, the Progressive National Baptist Convention will galvanize member churches across the country to work to end voter intimidation, voting suppression, and suspicious practices. Additionally, the Progressive National Baptist Convention will embark upon a nationwide voter registration campaign with a special focus on the communities targeted by voting discrimination.

In honor of the great civil rights tradition that the Progressive National Baptist Convention continues, and in recognition of its status as an active advocate organization for the African American community and disenfranchised communities everywhere, this statement will be entered on Tuesday, September 8, 2015.

HONORING SHILOH CHURCH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Shiloh Church located in Oakland, California upon its 50th Anniversary as a strong religious pillar in the East Bay community.

Shiloh Church was founded in 1965 by Dr. Violet Kiteley and her son, Dr. David Kiteley, in the living room of an African-American family. They sought to bring glory to God by engaging and empowering believers through fellowship, discipleship, worship and service.

Since its founding, Shiloh Church has become a multi-ethnic congregation with members from over 40 nations. To accommodate its growing membership, the church underwent extensive remodeling of the facility to include a technology center and youth center. Shiloh Church also has affiliate ministries impacting hundreds of thousands of people in Canada, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Philippines, and Ethiopia throughout the world through its biblically-based training centers and church plants.

Dr. Violet Kiteley, now in her 90s, has served in fulltime ministry for over 70 years. She has served as the President of Shiloh Bible College for over 35 years and was personally instrumental in training hundreds of leaders who are now pastors, elders, missionaries, and licensed ministers in churches across the world. Dr. David Kiteley followed in his mother's footsteps alongside his wife, Pastor Marilyn, and they have faithfully served the church full-time since 1970 as co-pastors.

Dr. David has traveled extensively and held leadership conferences in over 45 countries. Dr. David's son, Pastor Patrick and his wife served as Senior Pastors from 2008 until 2015. Now, Dr. David's daughter, Pastor Melinda, and her husband, Pastor Javier Ramos, will serve as 4th senior leadership transition in the church's history that will carry on the spiritual heritage laid by the past generations.

Shiloh Church has been able to better the lives of East Bay residents through its various outreach programs such as the Robert Allen Mercy House, which provides groceries and other resources to the unemployed, underemployed, and homeless. Since 1982, this program has disbursed over \$1,000,000 of food each year to more than 15,000 families.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I extend my sincerest congratulations to Shiloh Church on the special occasion of its 50th anniversary. I wish Shiloh Church many more years of faithful and compassionate service.

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN RASMUSSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate John Rasmussen of the Bluffs Arts Council for receiving an Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. John was granted this prestigious award as he has demonstrated his dedication to serving the Bluffs Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. John's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud John for his commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to represent civic minded Iowans like him in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him for receiving this award and wish him nothing but the best moving forward.

GRAND OPENING OF VICTOR VAL-
LEY COLLEGE'S DR. PREM
REDDY HEALTH AND SCIENCES
BUILDING

HON. PAUL COOK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, over my time representing the citizens of California's Eighth Congressional District, I have been able to spend time with and learn from some of the best community leaders America has to offer. These are folks who regularly put the interest of others before their own. They show us their character and generosity by going above what

is required or expected of them, in order to improve the livelihood of the community as a whole. I come before you today to speak on Dr. Reddy's latest philanthropic endeavor—Victor Valley College's Dr. Prem Reddy Health and Sciences Building.

Opened on August 28, 2015, this 24,000 square foot facility will provide much needed new labs for the science programs, as well as nursing specific training labs, all integrated with indoor and outdoor student gathering and study spaces to create a collaborative and technology driven learning environment. The building will also feature expanded anatomy and chemistry labs, as well as a digital science lab capable of up to 40 workstations. The new nursing lab will feature 8 simulated medical beds and instruction space for up to 40 students. All of these lab and training facilities are supplied with high tech audio and visual equipment and a wireless network for student access. The building also operates under the most technologically advanced systems for energy efficiency and energy savings.

The students trained and educated in this state-of-the-art facility will enter the healthcare industry in a period of great turmoil. As the payment methods and organization of the industry rapidly evolve, no one can predict what the future may hold. However, the one thing we know for certain is that we will always need the most highly trained and educated students to provide the actual care, person to person. That process begins by having a learning environment to facilitate their education. I graciously thank Dr. Prem Reddy for his generosity on making this building a reality, and I congratulate Victor Valley College for its development and wish its future students years of success.

**RECOGNIZING CHRISTINA COONEY
FOR HER EXEMPLARY PERFORMANCE
AT THE SPECIAL OLYMPICS
WORLD GAMES IN LOS ANGELES**

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Christina Cooney for winning a Silver and Bronze medal in equestrian events at the Special Olympics World Games in Los Angeles, California this past July.

In order to qualify for the World Games, Christina had to win a gold medal in local, regional and state competitions, and be approved by Special Olympics Florida. Christina achieved all of these feats to become one of 7,000 competitors from over 170 countries around the world, and the only equestrian rider from Florida, out of ten riders from around the nation, to represent the United States at the World Games.

Christina is visually impaired, deaf, mentally challenged, and cannot speak; yet, she is able to communicate with the horses she rides and cares for in a way few individuals are able. Christina started riding at Vinceremos Therapeutic Riding Center in Loxahatchee, Florida, at age 12 and has ridden for over 20 years.

At Vinceremos, Christina trains and volunteers on a daily basis, doing whatever tasks are required to care for the animals and the facilities.

Christina developed a remarkable relationship with her coach, Kim Elie, who took it upon herself to learn sign language and created a buzzer system for communication purposes. When Christina learned she qualified for the World Games, she and her coaches and family faced one last challenge: funding the trip to compete in California. The Special Olympics only funds transportation for the competing athlete not for their family members and coaches. Thus, Coach Kim Elie's husband, Mark Elie, set up an online fundraising account that raised over \$8,000 to fund the travel costs of her family members and coaches. In a similar way, a local restaurant held an event in support of Christina that raised over \$7,000 in one night. This money has created a fund in Christina's name that pays for sign language instruction for her coaches.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of Christina for continuing to push the bounds for what is possible within her sport. Christina has overcome many obstacles to become the decorated Olympic medalist she is today. She may live with disabilities, but she competes with the heart of an Olympian. That is why I am so truly honored to recognize Christina Cooney as a Hastings Hero. It is inspiring individuals such as Christina, who give me great pride to represent in Congress.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I was absent on July 28 and July 29 on account of official business at the Trans-Pacific Partnership talks. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows:

On Roll Call 473, I would have voted No (Young amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 474, I would have voted No (Smith amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 475, I would have voted Aye (Johnson amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 476, I would have voted Aye (Capps amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 477, I would have voted Aye (Cicilline amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 478, I would have voted Aye (Cicilline/Jackson-Lee amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 479, I would have voted Aye (Nadler amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 480, I would have voted Aye (Pocan/Moore amendment to the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 481, I would have voted Aye (Motion to Recommit the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 482, I would have voted No (Final passage of the Regulations from the Executive in Need of Scrutiny Act).

On Roll Call 483, I would have voted No (Ordering the previous question on the Rule for H.R. 1994 and H.R. 3236).

On Roll Call 484, I would have voted No (Rule for H.R. 1994 and H.R. 3236).

On Roll Call 485, I would have voted Aye (Passage of the First Responder Anthrax Preparedness Act).

On Roll Call 486, I would have voted Aye (Passage of the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act).

On Roll Call 487, I would have voted Aye (Takano amendment to the VA Accountability Act of 2015).

On Roll Call 488, I would have voted Aye (Motion to recommit the VA Accountability Act of 2015).

On Roll Call 489, I would have voted No (Final passage of the VA Accountability Act of 2015).

**HONORING THE LIFE OF MARY
BROWN**

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Mary Brown, who recently passed away on August 28, 2015, at the age of 82. Mary was an extraordinary person, and she will always be remembered as a woman who lived her life with purpose and great dedication to her students, family, friends, and community.

Mary Brown was the pioneer of girls' basketball in the San Joaquin Valley. She left an indelible stamp in the record books and inspired young women to fulfill their potential in athletics and academics. In 18 seasons at San Joaquin Memorial High School, she directed the girls' basketball team to a 317–45 record, highlighted by 16 league titles and eight Central Section championships. Through her impeccable coaching, the Panthers won 13 consecutive league championships from 1971 to 1983, setting a state record, and the team had 97 straight league victories; the second longest streak in state history. In 1973 she was named the Girls State Coach of the year.

As a graduate of Fresno State, Mary was an exemplary community leader and gave back in ways that will not be forgotten. Her ability to motivate and inspire young women to reach their greatest potential was clearly visible in her coaching techniques. Mary has brought great pride to San Joaquin Memorial High School, and the community overall. Many of her former players consider Mary an icon and legend in sports.

Her commitment to the community of Fresno will not be forgotten. All of those who knew her or played for her are truly grateful for the lasting imprint she has made in their lives as an incomparable coach and leader.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect that I ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saying farewell to a

woman who embodies passion and inspiration, Ms. Mary Brown. Her genuine character and loving commitment to her friends and community will be greatly missed.

HONORING SERGEANT JOHN D.
TREANTOS

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the life of Sergeant John D. Treantos. The beloved father, grandfather, brother, and teacher passed away on Friday, July 31st, 2015 surrounded by his loving family.

During his youth, Sgt. Treantos grew up in California's State Capitol, Sacramento where he attended the local high school, Sacramento High. Following graduation in 1954, he enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps where he spent several years diligently serving our country. Sgt. Treantos' time in the Marine Corps was spent teaching his fellow marines to navigate exiting helicopters during the Korean War. In addition to always helping others, he was part of the unit to test helicopter tactics to be used with nuclear weapons. Before retiring from the Marine Corps, he achieved the rank of Sergeant.

Following his service in the Marine Corps, Sgt. Treantos moved back to his hometown of Sacramento and enrolled at Sacramento State College. He obtained his degree and began his career as an educator where his passion for teaching history would be utilized and instilled in his students. Dedicating 52 years between Sacramento High School, Tracy High School, and San Joaquin Delta College, Mr. Treantos loved teaching and once stated that he would work for free as long as he got to teach history. Mr. Treantos was a beloved teacher who would spend countless hours researching his lessons to ensure his students would not only learn what was being taught, but be able to envision the historic events that shaped the United States. His legacy will live on through the lessons he instilled in his students.

In his retirement, Sgt. Treantos became actively involved in the Tracy American Legion Post 172. From 2002–2012, he served as Commander where he assisted in honoring local heroes, organized events, and selected recipients to attend Boys State. He was also involved in the Bill King Detachment 019 of the Marine Corps League in Modesto where he served two terms as the detachment Commandant. Sgt. Treantos was the Judge Advocate and took part in funerals for Marines, color guards and parades. Furthermore, Sgt. Treantos was the proud president of the Tracy War Memorial where he participated in honoring veterans and fallen heroes. Marine Treantos was an inaugural and sitting member of my Veterans Advisory Committee before his passing.

Sgt. Treantos was deeply passionate about sports and unwaveringly loyal to the San Francisco Giants. Downtime for Sgt. Treantos was spent enjoying music, theatre, museums, mov-

ies and most of all, reading books. He was never without a book and shared his desire for the arts and learning with the various people in his life.

Sgt. Treantos is survived by his son John Treantos; daughters Jennifer, Melina and Imogene; five grandchildren Chris, John, Roger, Addy, and Cameron; three sisters Dena, Kathy, and Mary; and the mother of his children, Liz.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Sergeant John D. Treantos for his service and outstanding contributions to the community as well as our country.

A TRIBUTE TO JULIA DOLLEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Julia Dollen from the Tri-Center Varsity Cheer team, as she has been honored with the status of All-American at the Tri-Center cheer camp.

To achieve this status, Julia had to try out in front of the entire camp, demonstrating her knowledge and skill in all areas of cheer. Julia has dedicated her time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend her for her hard work and determination.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Julia demonstrates the rewards of hard work, dedication and perseverance. I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating Julia on a job well done, and wish her nothing but continued success.

RECOGNIZING MATTHEW WALZER
FOR THE EXTRAORDINARY CON-
TRIBUTIONS TO THE INTELLEC-
TUALLY AND DEVELOP-
MENTALLY DISABLED COMMU-
NITY

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Matthew Walzer for his extraordinary contributions to the lives of those with intellectual, developmental, and physical disabilities. It all began with a simple request to achieve a dream that most take for granted: 16-year-old Matthew needed an easier way to put on his shoes.

You see, Matthew has cerebral palsy, a condition which stiffens the muscles in the body making it difficult to walk and even speak. In an open letter to Nike's CEO Mark Parker, he explained that his condition makes it impossible to tie his shoes. Matthew, who at the time was preparing to leave high school and attend college, explained he simply wanted to go to the college of his choice and not worry about someone tying his shoes every day.

Originally, Nike planned to make just one pair of this revolutionary shoe for Matthew; however that was not enough for this inspiring young man. Matthew didn't want a special shoe just for him—he understood this was an opportunity to develop something that would benefit a diverse community of millions of people facing various physical challenges. As a longtime admirer of Nike shoes, he brought attention to the lack of a running or basketball shoe with a self-lacing system that could be used by everyone.

Matthew's discussions with Nike were the catalyst to change the world of shoe technology. Through his tireless work alongside Nike, his dream became a reality. Nike recently released the Zoom Lebron Soldier 8 FLYEASE, a shoe that features a wrap-around zipper system. Now a sophomore at Florida Gulf Coast University, Matthew is able to put his shoes on every day without assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of Matthew Walzer for refusing to back down from his goal and his actively seeking out a universal solution. He wanted to create a shoe not for one person, but for everyone. Even Lebron James wore them during a basketball game to prove that it was truly a shoe that everybody could wear.

I am so extremely proud to recognize Matthew Walzer as a Hastings Star Student. Matthew has overcome diagnosis after diagnosis from doctors across the nation, and has proven that no matter the obstacles, he would not settle for the status quo.

IN RECOGNITION OF ERIC NADEL

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Eric Nadel.

Mr. Nadel was the 2014 recipient of the Ford C. Frick Award, presented annually for excellence in broadcasting by the National Baseball Hall of Fame and Museum. Currently he is in his 21st year as the lead voice on the Texas Rangers radio broadcasts, which marks his 37th year broadcasting Rangers baseball, the longest tenure of any announcer in the history of the franchise.

Mr. Nadel is a seven-time recipient of the National Sportscasters and Sportswriters Association Texas Sportscaster of the Year Award, and two-time winner of the Associated Press award for best play-by-play in Texas. He was also inducted as the 15th member of the Texas Rangers Baseball Hall of Fame.

Mr. Nadel has spent several off seasons learning Spanish and has taken part in Spanish game broadcasts in numerous Latin American countries. He is the author of three books, including Texas Rangers: The Authorized History, published in 1997. He also is very active in the local music scene, annually presenting a Birthday Benefit Concert at the Kessler Theater.

A 1991 inductee in the Texas Baseball Hall of Fame, Eric and his wife, Jeannie, reside in Dallas with their dog, Kirby, a Yorkie mix. The city of Dallas is lucky to have him.

TRIBUTE TO THE LIFE OF PHILIP
HAGOPIAN

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Philip Hagopian of Madera, California who recently passed away on August 20, 2015 at the age of 64. Philip will be missed greatly by his family, friends, and community.

Mr. Hagopian was born in Fresno, California on November 12, 1950, to Edward and Margaret Hagopian. He spent his early years in Fresno, before moving with his family to Kerman, and eventually settling in Madera. Upon graduating from high school, Philip went on to earn his B.A. in History from the University of California, Davis. After trying his hand at various occupations, he came back home to Madera and joined the family business, farming with his father, when he was 32 years old.

In 1998, Philip married the love of his life, Ms. Carol Ann LeMarr. The following year, his dream of being a father came true when their son, Aram Alexander was born. He was a devoted husband and father, and he truly loved farming in the San Joaquin Valley. Philip had a nurturing heart, and he enjoyed nothing more than to walk out into the fields and appreciate the crops he sowed.

Mr. Hagopian was also dedicated to serving his community. For many years, he provided goods and services, and was active in his agricultural profession. For instance, Philip served on the Madera County Planning Commission, board member for the Raisin Bargaining Association, Trustee of the Board at Holy Trinity Armenian Apostolic Church, and he served his country in the United States Army.

Without question, Mr. Hagopian's integrity, honor and long-lasting involvement in the raisin industry made him a reputable man; he was well known, well-liked and shown enormous appreciation by fellow farmers in the Central Valley. Philip worked hard and expected nothing in return. This same generous spirit was evident in Philip's love for his family. I am honored to join his family in celebrating the life of Philip Hagopian. His presence will be dearly missed in our community for many years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in remembering a man of great service and dedication. His memory will live on through his family and be remembered by many in our community. We are all better for having known Mr. Philip Hagopian, a remarkable Californian and Central Valley native.

A TRIBUTE TO MARGARITE
GOODENOW

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Margarite

Goodenow of the Bluffs Arts Council for receiving an Iowa Governor's Volunteer Award.

Each year Iowa Governor Terry Branstad honors individuals who have exemplified exceptional commitment to their communities through various service related activities. Margarite was granted this prestigious award as she has demonstrated her dedication to serving the Bluffs Arts Council as both a board member and volunteer. Margarite's hard work and dedication to serving others truly embodies our Iowa values.

I applaud Margarite for her commitment to service and giving back to the community. It is an honor to represent civic minded Iowans like her in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating her for receiving this award and wish her nothing but continued success.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,154,955,297.86. We've added \$7,524,277,906,384.78 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF FRANK PUMILIA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life and legacy of Mr. Frank Pumilia of Margate, Florida, who sadly passed away on Sunday, August 30th at age 94. Frank was born in Brooklyn, New York and, at an early age, demonstrated a passion for politics and a fervent interest in community service. He attended high school for only half a year before dropping out to support his family. Eventually, Frank became an owner of his own grocery store and later worked as an insurance investor. He retired to Margate, Florida where he assumed a number of leadership positions within local organizations.

Frank served as president of both the Margate Democratic Club and the Margate Association of Condominiums. He also served as a chairman for the Margate Civil Service Board, member of the Broward County Democratic Executive Committee, member of the advisory council of the Alzheimer's Family Center. Frank was a highly regarded community leader. In 2010, he was selected by the Area Agency of Aging of Broward to receive the Broward County Senior Hall of Fame honor.

I offer my deepest condolences to Frank's family. He is survived by his daughter, Louise Ditto, by two sons, John Pumilia and Charles Pumilia, as well as five grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. Frank's presence will be profoundly missed throughout the Margate community.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay my respects to Frank Pumilia and his family. Frank was a great friend to me throughout the years. His spirit, loving memory, and legacy of outstanding leadership will always live on.

TRIBUTE: ALPHA DELTA KAPPA
INTERNATIONAL HONORARY OR-
GANIZATION FOR WOMEN EDU-
CATORS

HON. MO BROOKS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on its sixty-eight years of dedicated service and proclaim October 2015 as Alpha Delta Kappa Month. Established in 1947, Alpha Delta Kappa's goals have been to establish high standards of education, give recognition to outstanding educators, build a fraternal fellowship among educators, and to promote educational and charitable projects and activities enriching the lives of individuals everywhere.

With a membership of over 33,000 educators representing all fifty U.S. states, Puerto Rico, Canada, Mexico, Jamaica and Australia, Alpha Delta Kappa is committed to educational excellence, personal and professional growth and for collectively channeling their energies toward the good of their schools, communities, the teaching profession and the world.

Women in education constitute a great portion of the nation's working force and are constantly striving to serve their communities and nation in educational, cultural, and charitable programs leading to harmony, happiness, and peace among all people.

Over the last two years alone, the members of Alpha Delta Kappa have given altruistically to the communities they serve by raising nearly twelve million dollars and volunteering more than 2 million service hours. Alpha Delta Kappa members also biennially awards nearly two million dollars through its 11 scholarship programs.

I congratulate Alpha Delta Kappa International Honorary Organization for Women Educators on their many years of unparalleled success and wish them well as they continue to educate our children.

RECOGNIZING THE SERVICE OF
ANTONIO "TONY" CAMPOS

HON. JIM COSTA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the dedication and success of Central

Valley almond farmer, Antonio "Tony" Campos. Tony has demonstrated an unwavering dedication to his community and to California agriculture. It is because of his service to the Central Valley that Tony Campos is being honored at the 2015 California Ag One Community Salute.

Tony was born in Orondritz, Spain, a small village in the Pyrenees Mountains. As a teenager, Tony would hear of the opportunities offered in America and how one could establish a better life. When Tony was just 17 years old, he immigrated to the United States with his brothers, and settled in Caruthers, California. It was there where they first began to grow almonds and by 1981, Tony and his brothers had established their almond farm, Campos Brothers Farms Almond Huller. Today, Tony and his wife, Juliet, continue to operate Campos Brothers Farms with their three children Steven, Joseph, and Jeannine. Their commitment and enthusiasm for California agriculture and community values have not faltered.

The almond industry makes significant contributions to the overall success of California's economy. It is responsible for more than \$21 billion in California's economic output and adds about \$11 billion to California's gross state product. The almond industry makes for an active and healthy California economy. Tony Campos and Campos Brothers Farms have done a great deal to enrich California's agriculture and economy.

In addition to their dedication to California agriculture, the Campos family has also dedicated themselves to serving the community. Tony and his family support organizations such as Valley Children's Hospital, Catholic Charities Diocese of Fresno, Basque Cultural Center, and Caruthers High School. Additionally, all of the proceeds raised to honor Tony at the 2015 Ag One Community Salute, will go toward establishing the Ag One - Antonio "Tony" Campos endowment that will support both students and programs of the Jordan College at California State University, Fresno.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing my longtime friend Tony Campos in the celebration of his achievements as a Central Valley almond farmer and as the 2015 honoree at the Ag One Community Salute. It is with great pride that I thank Tony Campos for his service and lasting contributions to our community and to California agriculture.

WELCOME TO SCENIC MISSOURI
CITY, TEXAS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Missouri City, Texas for earning a Platinum Level Scenic City Certification! Missouri City residents know full well what a beautiful city they live in and are proud that everybody across Texas agrees.

Scenic Texas, a non-profit organization, awarded the Platinum Level Scenic City Certification to Missouri City for five years. Mis-

souri City is only one of eight cities to receive this top honor and the only city in the Houston area to earn Platinum status. The organization took note of Missouri City's beautiful landscapes, tree-lined streets, and dedication to cultural arts. This certification further demonstrates Missouri City's commitment to improving the quality of life for its residents. We are extremely proud of this growing city!

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Missouri City! Thank you for keeping our little piece of Texas beautiful.

A TRIBUTE TO THE IOWA FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION MAR-
KETING AND COMMUNICATIONS
DEPARTMENT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation Marketing and Communications Department for receiving five prestigious awards at the American Farm Bureau Federation's annual Strategic Policy, Advocacy, Resources and Communications Conference.

Each year the American Farm Bureau Federation gives out awards at their Strategic Policy, Advocacy, Resources and Communications Conference to recognize select Farm Bureau Federation teams that excel in their outreach and communication to the public. The conference is designed to incentivize strategic communication, aligning the organization's platforms around important subjects and initiatives that are aimed at creating better policy. The Iowa Farm Bureau Federation team received the following five awards: Best Newspaper, Best News or Feature Series, Best Blog, Best Social Media Campaign, and Best Promotional or Education Video.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by the Iowa Farm Bureau Federation Marketing and Communications Department demonstrates the rewards of hard work and dedication. Their efforts embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent this valued Iowa organization in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating this team on their achievements, and I wish them nothing but continued success.

IN MEMORY OF ANGELEAN
"ANGIE" CLARK GLASS OF HAL-
LANDE BEACH, FLORIDA

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an esteemed teacher, community leader, and personal friend, Mrs. Angelean "Angie" Clark Glass. Angie was born on January 3, 1937 in Hallandale Beach, Florida. She

grew up as the first of four children born into the glorious union of the late Robert "Willard" Clark and Hazel Mabel Taylor Clark.

Angie's early accomplishments included being the star basketball player at Lanier Elementary-Junior High School in Hallandale. She later went on to attend and graduate from Booker T. Washington High School in Miami, Florida in 1955. She received her Bachelor's of Arts degree in Elementary Education from Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University (FAMU) in Tallahassee, Florida in June, 1959. Angie pursued additional matriculation at Barry University in Miami, Florida.

After graduation, Angie began her remarkable career at Sheridan Hills Elementary School in Hollywood, Florida. For 44 years, she taught at Sheridan Hills Elementary School, shaping the lives of generations of children and remaining at the school as various principals came and went. Her dedication to the school came from her unwavering faith in her students, many of whom were inspired by her kindness and selflessness for her community.

As a devout Christian, Angie served as a member and was considered a pillar of both St. Anne's Episcopal Church in Hallandale, Florida and St. Andrews Episcopal Church in Hollywood, Florida. Aside from serving faithfully on the Vestry and Parish Council, she also coordinated all social activities and served as treasurer of the Church's True Fund.

Angie sponsored dinners for church members every third Sunday of the month and provided personal, financial assistance to aid the church's less fortunate members. She coordinated food and clothing drives and served as Episcopal Youth Counselor and Senior Warden. For over seventy years, she remained loyal to the church and worked tirelessly wherever she was needed. Four words encapsulate her life at the church and her life as a Christian: faith, devotion, generosity, and perseverance.

As an active member of her community, Angie served on committees in Hallandale Beach, ensuring many projects and activities were effectively executed. She was one of the founders of the Community Civic Association and was heavily involved with MLK Parade and Scholarship fundraising. In 2013, Angie's efforts did not go unnoticed. She was selected by the Human Services Advisory Board for the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Humanitarian Award.

Friends and family knew Angie as someone who was a wonderlust at heart. Although she did not get to fulfill her dream of seeing the Seven Wonders of the World, she visited London, Alaska, the Grand Canyon, the Canadian Rockies and the Bahamas, the birthplace of her parents. When Angie was not traveling, she was giving back. She relished in the beauty and changes of the City of Hallandale Beach. She proudly supported the act of giving her time, talents, and money to the cause of freedom, civil justice, and equality in the Hallandale Beach community. It was always her desire to make the community a better and more positive place to live.

Throughout her illness, she showed the same courage, dignity, concern for loved ones, and grace as shown throughout her life.

On July 26, 2015, Angelean, a dedicated parent, teacher and community leader left this world at 4:50 a.m. Precious memories remain with those she loved and touched.

Angie is survived by her husband Rudolph "Rudy" Glass, her beloved son Troy Andrews, her brother Leon Clark, a cherished granddaughter Toya MacDonald, a great grandson, Tomas Martin, a sister-in-law, Mrs. Rowena Willson, and devoted brother-in-law, Thomas Glass. Her nieces Rhonda Merritt, Sonya Davis, Tangela Culpepper, Kamalie Culpepper, Robbie Clark, Ashley Roach Gardiner, and grand nieces Audrey and Olivia Gardiner, Markita Loisy, Rose Herard, Jasmine Herard, and Brianna Hyman. Her nephews Dr. Dwight Wilson, Thomas Glass, Jr., Steve Fisher and Fernando Loisy.

Of her extended siblings, six step brothers, sisters, their mates and children: Dan Peoples, James Peoples, Deborah Ellis, Jacquelyn P. Riley, Gail Glass Alrich, Jacquelyn Glass, Linda Glass Bell, Alfred Glass Bell, Alfred Glass, Tracy Glass, Terry Glass, a goddaughter, Trina Stafford, the clergy members and family members and families of St. Ann's, St. Thomas, and St. James-in-the-Hills Episcopal Churches in Hallandale and Hollywood, Florida. Other extended family members—They Taylors, a devoted and compassionate friend and godmother of Troy Andrews, Maureen S. Bethel, other friends throughout the years—Mrs. Jacquelyn Singleton, Mrs. Joyce Langston, Mrs. Beverly Williams, Mrs. Ulee Major, Booker T. Washington High School Classmates of 1955, and several cousins, associates and business partners.

Mr. Speaker. I once again want to honor Mrs. Angelean "Angie" Clark Glass for her dedication and commitment to education, her community, and to her family. She was a kind human being whose legacy and memory will always live on. I was truly proud to call Angie my friend and will miss her dearly.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF LOUIS STOKES, CIVIL RIGHTS CHAMPION, WORLD WAR II VETERAN, ADVOCATE FOR THE DISADVANTAGED, OHIO'S FIRST AFRICAN AMERICAN CONGRESSMAN, EXCEPTIONAL LEGISLATOR, AND BELOVED MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise to speak in praise of Louis Stokes, one of the greatest and most respected Members ever to serve in this body, who died on Tuesday, August 18, 2015, at his home near Cleveland, Ohio at the age of 90.

It is not unusual in these days for commentators and politicians to talk of something called "American Exceptionalism."

But what is meant by the term?

Mr. Speaker, one way to understand the term: America is exceptional because it produces and finds persons like Louis Stokes and affords them the opportunity to utilize their tal-

ents to the fullest in the service of their community and their country.

Think about it: in what other nation does a little African American boy born in 1925 on the east side of Cleveland and raised in the Outhwaite Homes housing project by a mother who worked as a domestic go on to become a lawyer who argues and wins a landmark criminal justice reform case (*Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968)) in the United States Supreme Court; become the first African American elected to Congress; is selected to chair the powerful Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, the Select Committee on Assassinations, and an Appropriations Subcommittee responsible for more than \$90 billion annually in federal outlays?

Yes, America is an exceptional nation and Louis Stokes was an exceptional human being.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to Charles and Louise Cinthy (nee Stone) Stokes.

When he was three years old, his father, who worked in a laundromat, died leaving young Louis and his younger brother, Carl, to be raised by their mother, who worked as a domestic for affluent families in the wealthy Cleveland suburbs.

Louis Stokes' maternal grandmother played a critical role in his life because she took care of the Stokes boys while their mother was at work and instilled in them "the idea that work with your hands is the hard way of doing things" and encouraged them over and over "to learn to use their heads."

Louis Stokes took the advice to heart so after attending Cleveland's Central High School and serving in the U.S. Army during World War II, he returned home to attend what is now Case Western Reserve University on the G.I. Bill at night while working during the day for the Veterans Administration and the Department of the Treasury.

After graduating from college in two years where he excelled as a student, Louis Stokes was accepted for admission to Cleveland Marshall School of Law, from which he graduated in 1953; three years later, his brother Carl would also graduate from Cleveland Marshall School of Law and the two of them would go on to form the law firm of Stokes & Stokes specializing in the areas of civil rights and criminal law.

In 1964, the Supreme Court decided the landmark case of *Reynolds v. Sims*, 377 U.S. 533 (1964), which established the principle of "one person, one vote" governing the reapportionment of legislative boundaries.

The following year, working on behalf of the local branch of the NAACP, Louis Stokes led the legal challenge to the Ohio legislature's congressional redistricting, which had the effect of diluting African American voting strength in Cleveland.

The challenge was unsuccessful in the federal district court but undeterred, Louis Stokes, joined by Charles Lucas, an African American Republican, successfully appealed the decision to the U.S. Supreme Court, which in an order handed down in 1967 ruled the redistricting plan unconstitutional and ordered it redrawn, resulting in the creation of Ohio's first

majority-black district, the 21st Congressional District of Ohio.

Ironically, Louis Stokes would defeat his one-time ally Charles Lucas to win that seat in November 1968, capturing 75% of the vote, the closest of his 15 successful elections to the U.S. House of Representatives.

For the next 30 years, from 1969 to 1999, Congressman Stokes tirelessly fought for his constituents in Cleveland and for the best interests of the people of Ohio and the United States.

Louis Stokes, a founding member and Chair of the Congressional Black Caucus from 1972–74, was the epitome of a public servant.

In his second term in Congress, he won appointment to the powerful House Appropriations Committee, where he served for 28 years, later becoming the second African American "Cardinal" in history when he was selected to chair the VA, HUD, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Because of the esteem in which he was held by his colleagues and the leadership, Louis Stokes would also later be selected to chair the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and the Select Committee charged with investigating the assassinations of President Kennedy and the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

As Chairman of the House Ethics Committee and a person of unquestioned integrity, Louis Stokes oversaw the committee's investigation of the corruption scandal known as ABSCAM in 1979–80, which eventually led to convictions of a senator and six House members.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes perhaps is best known for the national attention he attracted in 1987 as a member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran ("Iran-Contra"), the scandal involving the illegal sale of military weapons to the Ayatollah Khomeini's Iran to generate money to fund the illegal contra war in Nicaragua.

In response to the claim by Colonel Oliver North that he acted out of patriotism in engineering the illegal weapons sales and diverting the proceeds to fund the contras, a stern Louis Stokes lectured the misguided Colonel North on the rule of law, the true meaning of patriotism, and, in the process American exceptionalism:

I suppose that what has been most disturbing to me about your testimony is the ugly part. In fact, it has been more than ugly. It has been chilling, and, in fact, frightening. I'm not just talking about your part in this, but the entire scenario, about government officials who plotted and conspired, who set up a straw man, a fall guy. Officials who lied, misrepresented and deceived. Officials who planned to superimpose upon our government a layer outside of our government, shrouded in secrecy and only accountable to the conspirators.

Colonel, as I sit here this morning looking at you in your uniform, I cannot help but remember that I wore the uniform of this country in World War II in a segregated Army. I wore it as proudly as you do, even though our government required black and white soldiers in the same Army to live, sleep, eat and travel separate and apart, while fighting and dying for our country. But because of the rule of law, today's servicemen in America suffer no such indignity.

My mother, a widow, raised two boys. She had an eighth-grade education. She was a domestic worker who scrubbed floors. One son became the first black mayor of a major American city. The other sits today as chairman of a House Intelligence Committee. Only in America, Col. North. Only in America. And while I admire your love for America, I hope that you will never forget that others too love America just as much as you do and that others will die for America, just as quick as you will.

Louis Stokes never wavered in his belief that America could fulfill the promise of its Founders or his dedication to the principles of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, stating:

I'm going to keep on denouncing the inequities of this system, but I'm going to work within it. To go outside the system would be to deny myself—to deny my own existence. I've beaten the system. I've proved it can be done—so have a lot of others.

But the problem is that a black man has to be extra special to win in this system. Why should you have to be a super black to get someplace? That's what's wrong in the society. The ordinary black man doesn't have the same chance as the ordinary white man does.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes' commitment to fairness and equal treatment started long before he was elected to Congress.

As a lawyer for the NAACP, he brought anti-discrimination lawsuits, represented demonstrators arrested in anti-discrimination marches and sit-ins, and took the cases of poor persons charged with crimes.

One of those criminal cases he took is known to every lawyer in America and appreciated by every person who cherishes the protections guaranteed by the 4th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

I am speaking of the famous case of *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968) won by Louis Stokes in which the Supreme Court held that a police officer could "stop and frisk" an individual only where he could articulate a reasonable basis that the person was, or was about to be, engaged in criminal activity.

As a result of *Terry v. Ohio*, a police officer has the right to stop, frisk, and question an individual he reasonably suspects to be engaged in criminal activity, but cannot seize items from that person if the pat down of the suspect's outer clothing does not reveal any weapons posing a threat to the officer's safety.

Because of Louis Stokes' exceptional advocacy in *Terry v. Ohio*, the right of every individual to secure from unreasonable searches and seizures was preserved while at the same not impeding the ability of law enforcement officers to perform their duties safely.

Mr. Speaker, every citizen benefits from this ruling and communities that have a history of being harassed by law enforcement protected by the Constitution from arbitrary and abusive treatment by law enforcement.

But the fight for a criminal justice system that respects the rights of all persons is not over.

That is why I am proud to be the Ranking Member of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations and a leader in the effort to reform the criminal justice system so that all persons receive fair and equal treatment regard-

less of their race, gender, religion, or national origin.

Louis Stokes fought tirelessly to fulfill the promise of the 14th Amendment that "no state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

It is a fight I am proud to continue today.

Mr. Speaker, Louis Stokes will be mourned by friends and colleagues on both sides of the aisle who had the privilege to serve alongside him.

He was a mentor to me and I will always remember his commanding presence and cherish the assistance he provided me and the example he set for new Members to follow.

My thoughts and prayers are with his Jay, Louis' beloved wife of 55 years; to his children, Shelly, Louis, Angela, and Lorene; his grandchildren; and the untold thousands of persons who touched and whose lives were touched by one of Cleveland's greatest sons.

Mr. Speaker I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in memory of Louis Stokes, an exceptional American, and the gentleman from Ohio who served in this chamber for three decades with honor, integrity, and distinction.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
FORMER WASHINGTON STATE
SENATOR BOB MORTON, A LIFE-
LONG ADVOCATE FOR NORTH-
EASTERN WASHINGTON

HON. CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, in August, Washington State lost one of our best, former Washington State Senator Bob Morton. Today, I rise to celebrate his life and the legacy he leaves behind in Northeastern Washington.

Before winning election to the Washington State House of Representatives, Bob was a farmer, flew as a bush pilot in Alaska and cloud seeder in Spokane, and was a logger in Northeastern Washington. Bob was also a minister and helped perform my wedding ceremony to my husband, Brian.

In 1990, Senator Morton was elected to the Washington State House of Representatives, where he served until his appointment to the Washington State Senate in 1994. In the Senate, Senator Morton was a tireless champion for the 7th legislative district in Northeastern Washington, focusing on issues closest to his constituents and serving as Chair of the Natural Resources, Energy & Water Committee and Chair of the Agriculture & Environment Committee. He believed in the people and the way of life we enjoy in Northeastern Washington. He was most comfortable in cowboy boots and a cowboy hat. He passionately fought for our priorities which on one occasion, led him to be graveled down by the President of the Senate for blowing a railroad

whistle on the Senate floor when he thought he was being railroaded by legislation.

Ahead of his time to promote forest health, Senator Morton championed the idea of thinning the trees in our forests in order that they may be less susceptible to catastrophic fire. He also spearheaded efforts to develop a statewide plan to preserve the health of forests across Washington State. Senator Morton also advocated to protect water rights for agriculture use and to defend livestock from wild animal predation.

In 2006, Senator Morton was instrumental in passing historical water legislation that sought out new water supplies through the construction of new storage facilities and conservation measures. During this time, he was also known for carrying around a seven foot tall pole that depicted the flow of the Columbia River. At the bill signing ceremony, Senator Morton presented this pole to Governor Gregoire as a gift.

Senator Morton was also passionate about compiling and distributing an annual salmon report. He was committed to protecting our way of life even if it meant proposing to split the state in two.

Senator Morton was extremely well liked and respected, not only by his constituents and staff, but by Senators on both sides of the aisle. A man of strong convictions, he epitomized a perfect gentleman, respectful of all viewpoints and always ready with just the right words to say.

On a personal note, Bob was my mentor, a role model, an inspiration, and constant encouragement. As Senator, he was a tremendous example both in his devotion to God and to his community. As a young college graduate, I had the distinct honor of working for Bob as his legislative aide while he served in the Washington State House of Representatives. Bob took a chance on me—he believed in me and I will forever be grateful for his support and encouragement.

I rise to thank Senator Bob Morton for his years of dedication and service to Northeastern Washington. Bob lived his life to demonstrate God's love. Whenever I see someone with a cowboy hat walking the halls of Congress, I will fondly remember State Senator Bob Morton, his love for God, and for people. My thoughts and prayers remain with his wife, Linda, his children, and other family members and friends. They don't come any better than Bob Morton.

BICENTENNIAL OF ALLEN
COUNTY, KENTUCKY

HON. ED WHITFIELD

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the bicentennial of Allen County, Kentucky, located in the First Congressional District. This momentous occasion not only celebrates the rich history of Allen County, but the many thousands of residents who over the years have made it a vibrant and thriving community.

Allen County was formed in 1815, the fifty-seventh county in the Commonwealth, and

named in honor of Colonel John Allen, a hero of the War of 1812. Soldiers made their way into the hilly terrain of Allen County during the Civil War, and Dumont Hill, which currently serves as a park, remains a link to this past.

The area's largest source of tourism came about in 1964 when the Port Oliver Dam on the Barren River was completed, creating the 2,187-acre Barren River Lake State Resort Park. Aside from Barren River Lake, Allen County offers tourists a wide range of activities throughout the year. From summer concert series to one of the area's largest Christmas parades, Allen County boasts many active people and organizations and is always eager to showcase its recently revitalized downtown. Jacksonian Days, held in the fall, is a weeklong street festival revolving around the old hotel, long rumored to have been a stop on President Andrew Jackson's commute to and from his home in Nashville to Washington, D.C.

This progressive community offers small-town hospitality with access to metropolitan amenities. It also has a thriving industrial base, including Halton Company and Sumitomo. Dollar General was founded in the area over 75 years ago and remains a leading employer today, along with the J.M. Smucker Company, whose plant produces in excess of one million sandwiches per day, making Allen County the largest peanut butter and jelly sandwich producer in the nation.

To commemorate the county's bicentennial, community leaders and residents of Allen County have planned several events to educate Kentuckians about the history of Allen County and celebrate its residents and culture. One such event was a one-act play entitled, "Allen County: A Work in Progress." The play featured familiar characters remembering the people, places, and events of Allen County's past. A free live concert was also held in July featuring Scottsville's own Sweetwater and starring country superstars Diamond Rio on the public square.

It is my privilege to represent Allen County in the U.S. House of Representatives and I hope my colleagues in Congress will join me in celebrating this community and its residents.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF JIM AND LEE VANOY

HON. MIKE ROGERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the House's attention today to recognize my friends, Jim and Lee Vanoy, on their 50th wedding anniversary.

Jim and Lee met on a blind date in July of 1965 and less than six weeks later eloped and were married on August 26, 1965. Because of the Vietnam War draft rules, many couples were married on that date.

Together Jim and Lee raised two boys, Van and Ben. They are the proud grandparents of four grandchildren, Courtney, Taylor, Blake, and Alex.

The Vanoy family made their home in Opelika, Alabama, for the last 45 years. Jim is retired from the Uniroyal Tire plant and Lee, after serving many years as a church secretary, currently serves as the county voter registrar.

They enjoy Bible studies, doing home repair for the elderly, and traveling.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in wishing this couple a very happy 50th wedding anniversary.

HONORING THE 24TH ANNIVERSARY OF MACEDONIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. CANDICE S. MILLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Macedonian-American community in honor of their homeland's Independence Day. The people of the Republic of Macedonia voted on September 8, 1991, to officially gain independence from the former Yugoslavia. By voting for independence, the people decided that it was time for their country to forge its own path and to begin a new era in their history. This 24th anniversary of their independence provides us all an opportunity to recognize the Macedonian-American community's significant contributions within the United States.

Since 2001, Macedonia has been one of the staunchest allies of the United States in the War on Terror. Macedonia was the fourth and fifth largest contributor of troops, per capita, in the mission in Afghanistan. Macedonian troops guarded American troops at the compound in Kabul. And, Macedonia welcomed 50,000 and 400,000 refugees during the wars in Bosnia and Kosovo, respectively. For a country of little over two million, Macedonia has done its fair share and deserves to be in NATO. On that note, I ask that you join me, and 34 colleagues, in cosponsoring H. Res. 56 in support of Macedonia's NATO accession at the Warsaw Summit in 2016.

This month will also mark the 20th year of full diplomatic relations between the United States and Macedonia. With American support, Macedonia has become a model of stability in a region known for ethnic strife and tension. Recently, Macedonia has been struck with the unprecedented refugee crisis facing Europe, as thousands of migrants and refugees have fled war-torn countries in the Middle East and North Africa. This year alone, an estimated 70,000 migrants have traveled through Macedonia, and the Macedonian government is attempting to organize an orderly response to the influx of people, including organizing daily trains to ferry migrants from the southern to the northern border. If the partnership between the United States and Macedonia is to remain strong, the country needs our continued support. I also use this opportunity to urge Macedonia's leaders to continue strengthening their institutions and reforming its democracy and rule of law.

As a way to recognize and strengthen this partnership, I started the first Congressional

Caucus on Macedonia and Macedonian-Americans. This Caucus is a bipartisan group of members of Congress dedicated to maintaining and strengthening a positive and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and the Republic of Macedonia, as well as advocating for the concerns and interests of the Macedonian community in the United States.

Michigan's 10th District has one of the largest populations of Macedonian-Americans in the Nation. Over Labor Day weekend, St. Mary Macedonian Orthodox Cathedral in Sterling Heights, Michigan hosted the 41st Annual American-Canadian Macedonian Orthodox Convention, bringing thousands of guests from throughout the U.S. and Canada to my District. I would like to acknowledge their contributions to our District and our State, and I look forward to continuing that relationship as we deal with the problems facing our great Nation.

Again, congratulations to all of Macedonian heritage for their achievements as we commemorate the anniversary of Macedonia's independence.

RECOGNIZING WAYNE WATTS

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Mr. Wayne Watts, General Counsel and Senior Executive Vice President of AT&T. Mr. Watts served a total of 32 years at AT&T, starting as a rookie lawyer in the litigation department of what was then Southwestern Bell Telephone Company. As he enters retirement, it is fitting that this body honors Mr. Watts and his significant career that was embodied by his commitment to improving the Dallas community and beyond.

Mr. Watts was born in Abilene and raised in the blue-collar Dallas neighborhood of Oak Cliff. He went on to receive an undergraduate degree from the University of Texas-Arlington, and a Juris Doctorate from the Dedman School of Law at Southern Methodist University. Throughout his career, his affection for Dallas and all of its people only grew.

In his role at AT&T, Mr. Watts was directly involved in negotiating dozens of mergers and acquisitions with a combined value of nearly \$250 billion. These negotiations saw Southwestern Bell transform from the smallest of the Baby Bell companies into AT&T, the world's largest communications business.

In addition to his professional successes, Mr. Watts was committed to enriching his community. He gained national fame for influencing law firms to hire and promote more women and minorities. He constantly pushed his legal staff of thousands of global lawyers to do more pro bono and public service work. In addition to being a member of the advisory boards of the SMU Dedman School of Law, the Salvation Army's Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex Command, and the Development Board at the University of Texas at Arlington, he serves on the board of Texas Access to

Justice, a non-profit which provides funding for poor and indigent people who need legal services.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Watts' leadership has brought the business community and the greater community of Dallas and the United States resounding success. I recognize Mr. Watts as a great businessman, but more importantly, as a great American who devoted his career to expanding opportunities for others.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN
LOUIS STOKES

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 8, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the life and service of a good friend, Congressman Louis Stokes. He was the voice of the people of Cleveland, Ohio in the House of

Representatives for 30 years and will be missed by every person he touched. Although I never had the privilege of serving with Lou, he was a dear friend to my husband and they did much good work together on many critical issues, including civil rights. I will always remember him for his thoughtfulness, graciousness, and integrity.

Born on February 23, 1925 in Cleveland, Congressman Stokes revealed the true nature of his character at an early age when he started shining shoes and clerking at an Army/Navy store to supplement the income of his widowed mother. A man dedicated to public service, he served our nation honorably in the U.S. Army and continued his service when he returned home through working at the VA and Treasury Department offices in Cleveland. He also made a name for himself as a civil rights lawyer while working for the Cleveland NAACP, and ran for Congress successfully in 1968.

In Congress, Lou was a strong voice for minorities and the disadvantaged. A founding

member of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman Stokes served as Chairman of the group for two consecutive terms beginning in 1972. Through his seat on the Appropriations Committee, Congressman Stokes advanced civil rights in this country by fighting against segregation and in support of affirmative action and fair housing. His legacy on these issues can still be felt today.

Congress would do good to follow the example that Congressman Stokes set for all of us—that what matters most in this body is that you put your head down, do what is right for your constituents, and vote your conscience. The thing I remember most about Lou is that he never forgot where he came from and always put the people of Cleveland first. My thoughts and prayers are with the Stokes family during this difficult time. It is my hope that all members of this Congress will be inspired by the great example that Congressman Louis Stokes set for all of us and by the contributions he made to this country.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 9, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CURBELO of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

September 9, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CARLOS CURBELO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our vote on the nuclear agreement with Iran will be the most important decision I have made in Congress since voting against the disastrous Iraq war.

I am under no illusions that the clerics and military that run Iran are friends of the United States. To the contrary, they are engaged in activities that are opposed to the United States interests and those of many of our friends and allies.

This agreement does not resolve all our differences, change Iranian behaviors, or provide greater freedom for its people. What it does do is give the world 15 years of security to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

It also demonstrates our ability to work with our international partners—France, Great Britain, Germany, especially Russia and China—to bring Iran to the negotiating table, to force them to make important concessions, and to retain the ability to re-impose crippling sanctions if they violate the agreement.

It has a strong mechanism for surveillance and snapping back sanctions to give us confidence that it is strongly in the Iranians' interest to comply.

Fifteen years is not forever. But taking the current nuclear breakout time of less than 15 weeks for Iran to a minimum of a year and having assurance for 15 years is a remarkable achievement.

The alternative is not “a better deal.” There is no evidence that there is something beyond this agreement that the Iranians would agree with or, most critically, that has the support of the other five countries that made this agreement possible in the first place.

The alternative is for the United States to lose the support of our allies so that Iran gets access to its money anyway, the partnership dissolves, and this important moment is lost.

The United States still retains the ability to walk away from the deal if it is rejected or violated by Iran. This puts us in a much stronger position to re-impose sanctions with more leverage going forward.

In the final analysis, the United States or Israel, for that matter, can always resort to military force. But it is far better, however, to make this agreement work, to monitor and enforce it, and build on this unique international partnership.

Our work will not be done in the Middle East with Iran, even if this agreement is adopted and Iran abides by it. We still must be prepared to confront Iran where they are involved with aggressive action against other countries, especially our allies.

We must be prepared to support our friends in the Middle East, like Israel and Saudi Arabia. We must be prepared to make the diplomatic efforts and demonstrate commitment and resolve wherever it is necessary.

Those who would resort to force in the first instance will always retain that option.

We risk little trying to make diplomacy with rigorous inspections work and to strengthen the partnership with countries that made this agreement possible, to redouble our ongoing efforts to stabilize this deeply troubled Middle East region.

The agreement doesn't solve our problems, but it simplifies one of the greatest threats to the Middle East, not just Iranian nuclear weapons, but a potential nuclear arms race with potentially catastrophic results.

I am comfortable being in agreement with some of the most distinguished

leaders of past American administrations, both Republican and Democratic, who have agreed, notwithstanding their reservations and cautions, that the acceptance of this agreement is the best path forward for the United States and world peace.

It is sad that, for the very first time, a critical American foreign policy decision has become so partisan in Congress. But the weight of evidence is for the agreement to be adopted, and we should do so.

APOLOGY TO THE VICTIMS OF THE “IRANIAN NUCLEAR ATTACK”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, because speeches made here on the House floor are preserved for history, I want to speak to the future, to present a plausible scenario and an apology, an apology to be heard by the survivors, an apology to every victim of what will forever be known as the Iranian nuclear attack.

I expect it will be after the year 2030 before anyone takes any real notice of this apology. Someone will find it while surfing what remains of the Internet, maybe in Israel, Western Europe, or here in the United States, someone surrounded by the smoking ruins of leveled buildings, the incinerated corpses of those lucky enough to have been killed in the first seconds of the blast, and the wails of anguish of those left to die and mourn.

It is especially ironic and heartbreaking to be speaking about this as today, in 2015, we prepare to remember those killed in the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

So to the people of 2030, on behalf of America, I am truly sorry. I am sorry we failed to stop President Obama from releasing \$150 billion to fuel the destructive fantasies of terrorist leaders in Iran that lit the fuse.

During my 26-year career in the United States Air Force, America's leaders believed in mutually assured destruction, the MAD theory.

We thought, if one nation such as the Soviet Union launched nuclear missiles, the other nation would do so as well and both would be destroyed. This potential of mutual destruction kept those missiles in their silos.

But that theory does not apply to dealing with the leaders of Iran, who are dangerous fanatics, motivated by evil, not self-preservation.

So the madness in Iran means the MAD theory doesn't apply in 2015. And that is why I am sorry that we who lead America in 2015 failed to stop President Obama from helping Iranian terrorists and Iranian tyrants build an intercontinental ballistic missile system.

I am also sad to say that the people hearing my message in 2030 will bear witness to the fact that Iranian missiles can, indeed, deliver nuclear holocaust to America's soil.

In the Air Force, I worked alongside other military strategists to ensure that missiles would never strike here. But, in 2015, America's President and his supporters discarded those concerns.

So to our countrymen of 2030 and to our friends in Israel whose land now lies fallow and wrecked, let me now say we were wrong. We struggle to imagine what you must be going through. The death and destruction that once haunted your nightmares now plays out before you.

Families and friends are either dead or lined up at makeshift morgues to claim the bodies of loved ones. Food and water are scarce or contaminated with radiation. Refugees from the blast area stagger down gridlocked highways where traffic stopped when the detonation occurred.

We thought we had seen the worst of humanity's hate on September 11, 2001, but that atrocity now pales in comparison. The similarities between the tragic missteps of Barack Obama and Neville Chamberlain, who foolishly trusted Nazi Germany, are obvious.

Mr. Obama says his deal with Iran will somehow lead to peace. Mr. Chamberlain made the same assertion, claiming that his pact with the Nazis would lead to "peace for our time."

In 2015, I spoke in opposition to the deal that led to the 2030 Iranian nuclear attack because I well remember the words of the theologian Bonhoeffer who eventually died in a Nazi torture chamber.

In confronting the murderous madmen of his time, he declared that "Silence in the face of evil is itself evil: God will not hold us guiltless. Not to speak is to speak. Not to act is to act."

In 2015, many of us spoke, many of us acted, but the powers of evil still won the day. And now the innocent dead of 2030 call out with just one question: How could the leaders of 2015 let this happen?

The answer is simple and sad: Because, despite our best efforts, we couldn't stop the deal that funded, armed, and unleashed nuclear hell from the madmen of Iran. We allowed the power and persistence of the foolish to deliver a corrupt contract with a nation of terror. And, in 2030, the day of reckoning arrived. And for that I am truly very, very sorry.

May God have mercy on us all.

IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, you know in the movies when someone has to make a choice and a little devil and a little angel appear on their shoulder to give good and bad advice? Well, that is what I feel America is going to feel like in a couple of weeks when His Holiness Pope Francisco comes to visit us, including an address in this very room.

On one shoulder, we have a billionaire out there saying Mexicans are murderers; immigrants come to this country to get on welfare; our best days are behind us; and just getting tough and insulting people will solve all of our problems and make us great again.

And almost everyone else in his party is scrambling to catch up so they don't miss out on the wave of populist anger he is tapping and feeding with a mix of untruths, half-truths, and good old-fashioned racism.

On the other shoulder is a man who is not afraid to touch the feet of the poor and recognizes their humanity even in their poverty. He is a man who sees actual human problems, like our environment, and tries to bring us together to do something about it. He is a man who, through deeds, declarations, and his own demeanor says in a clear voice: Welcome the stranger, and come onto me.

He does not blame a nation's problems on the strangers at the gate or says "get the hell out." In many ways, Pope Francis represents the Anti-Trump, the antidote to his venom.

I, like a lot of my Democratic colleagues and a lot of my Catholic colleagues and, frankly, the majority of American of all faiths and political stripes across the Nation, am very much looking forward to the Pope's visit and the Pope's words because our Nation needs a counterbalance, a counterweight, to what has become the ugliest, most xenophobic, and most anti-immigration campaign in anyone's memory.

You can also throw in large helpings of anti-woman, anti-environmental, and anti-poor attacks in there as well.

Shortly after The Donald announced with great fanfare and extreme insult and unvarnished racism that he would inflict his campaign for the White House on the Nation, I came to this well to address my colleagues on July 9.

I discussed a reasoned approach to dealing with the immigrant criminals who must be locked up and deported and distinguishing them from the vast majority of America's immigrants who live peacefully and helpfully among us.

They come here to work and to make a better life for themselves and their families, as my parents did when they

left Puerto Rico in the fifties to seek a better life, eventually landing in Chicago.

It is the strength and the advantage of our Nation that we come from everywhere, but we have put together the best Nation on Earth by working together. It is what defines us as a people.

Most of our ancestors came to this land of their own free will, and some did not. Most came here seeking a dream or running away from a nightmare or sometimes both.

Most of us came here legally, sometimes waiting in lines that lasted years. And some of us, when legality was not an option and there was no line to stand in, came anyway because work and freedom are so plentiful.

But in the United States, we came together from many nations and traditions and languages and religions and made the one Nation that stands above all others as the defender of liberty, the engine of the world economy, and the beacon of freedom recognized in every corner of the globe.

We are proud of our accomplishments, as we should be, despite our humble beginnings, when no one and no other nation thought we could survive to take our place among the nations of the world.

As the Pope joins us this month to deliver his message of peace and inclusion, I urge all of us to remember the many challenges we have faced as a Nation and the many obstacles we have overcome.

Just a few decades ago the thought of a Catholic President was outrageous and the thought of a Pope addressing a Joint Session of Congress was far-fetched, just about as far-fetched as a Black President of the United States, a woman President, or a Latino Pope from Latin America.

Over the decades, in fits and starts, marching forward, being pushed back, marching forward again arm in arm, we have spent more time listening to our better angels and their advice, taking us toward a brighter future as a Nation and less time listening to our darker influences who lament progress and seek to divide us from one another.

□ 1015

I think, in this Capitol Building, in this Chamber, when the Pope speaks to us, we will see two paths in very sharp relief. Build a wall or build a bridge? Help our brother or turn our backs? Belittle our sister or share her heavy load? Incite distrust and division or foster unity to face our challenges because we are stronger together?

For this Catholic American, for this man who has sometimes struggled with the church and is not always welcome because of my support for women's health, a woman's right to a legal abortion, LGBT, I am so looking forward to the Pope's visit because I feel my Nation needs him more than ever before.

CHINA'S AGGRESSIVE SOUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, there are five entities that have mischief and aggression on their minds—of course, ISIS, Iran, Russia, North Korea, and China.

Recently, while the President preached climate change in Alaska, three Chinese combat ships got closer to the Alaskan coast than ever before. Military experts say this was the first time Chinese ships were in that area, just the latest example of China expanding its military operation globally.

One expert said:

The Chinese Navy is taking on more and more of an expeditionary character . . . the Chinese Navy is going global.

He is correct. China has massively built up its military and uses it to project its power in Asia and other places. Like Russia's invasion of Ukraine, China is taking over territory while the United States just watches.

There has been a fivefold increase in China's military expenditures since 1997. It is stockpiling nuclear weapons. A recent Pentagon report revealed that China is upgrading its ballistic missile delivery systems with multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles, or MIRV, technology. What that means in layman's terms is they can send one missile with several nuclear warheads; one could hit New York, and one could hit Texas.

The Beijing Navy is taking control of disputed areas and intimidating other countries in the region who have rightful claims to the South China Sea. This is a poster, Mr. Speaker, of 1999—I know you can't see the background, but this is Beijing in the South China Sea area from Australia to almost Alaska and east and west Guam to Indonesia—1999 military might of the Chinese depicted here by planes, ships, and submarines and U.S. military might about the same in 1999.

What is it today? Let's look at the same map, superimposed with Chinese buildup since 1999. In 2015, you don't have to be real smart to understand the Chinese are building more airplanes, now aircraft carriers, more ships, and lots of nuclear submarines and conventional submarines. The United States, we are about the same with our military might in the area. That is today.

This ratio here is a missile that can be fired in this region.

Now, let's project just 5 years and see what the Chinese will have in 2020 in the same area, same region. United States, we are about the same—but, look, planes, nuclear carriers, now intercontinental ballistic missiles, more ships, more submarines, Chinese military might, 2020 and today or in 1999.

We should be concerned about Chinese aggressive tendencies. In December 2013, China also began a bold land-reclaiming project in the South China Sea in an effort to increase its influence. What does that mean? That means that the Chinese are going in the South China Sea and they are dredging areas and making islands in the South China Sea. On some of these islands, it intends to build runways. I wonder what for.

Not only does China claim these newly created lands, but it also claims exclusive maritime rights in vast surrounding areas in the South China Sea. This has rightfully rattled our allies in the region. Not only has China become an economic giant, but it is a military bully in the area.

China, of course, is a state-run communist country. There is no telling what China could do and what would happen to the global economy if China insists on controlling the sea lanes. Is China becoming like the Barbary pirates of old that used to control the Mediterranean? Is that what China is going to do in the South China Sea? Who knows.

Other countries in the area are looking for the United States to lead. They haven't forgotten what China did the last time China was an imperial power. For over 1,000 years, until the 20th century, China required other countries that wanted to trade in Asia to pay tribute to China. That meant kneeling down before the emperor and paying heavy taxes. It was an extortion plan.

Our friends in Asia don't want that to happen again. This is not a time to sit back and let the chips fall where they may in Asia. The United States should care about what China is doing because China's brazen move toward colonization of the South China Sea shows that Beijing is determined to expand its military and economic influence in the entire area.

What is the United States going to do? Are we going to do the same as we did with Russia and just watch? The region and the world both are looking for the United States to lead. We should lead because that is the responsibility of the world's most important democracy.

This should concern the entire world, not just the South China Sea area. Also, these lack of resources should concern Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, supporting healthy families and strong communities starts with access to healthy food, but for many families, it is a struggle just to put food on the

table. A growing body of research shows why we should all be concerned with hunger as a health issue.

For the 49 million Americans who struggle with food insecurity—or hunger—access to nutritious food and enough healthy food is a real challenge that can have serious negative health consequences far beyond just a growling stomach.

Hunger can exacerbate underlying medical conditions like diabetes, heart disease, and cancer and can result in life-threatening complications; not only that, hunger can result in more trips to the emergency room and more hospitalizations which only increases healthcare costs across the board.

A recent article in the Canadian Medical Association Journal found that households with low food security had 49 percent higher healthcare costs than those who didn't have to worry about where their next meal was coming from. Healthcare costs were an astonishing 121 percent higher for those with very low food security.

Similarly, a 2014 article in the journal Health Affairs reported that hospitals saw a 27 percent increase in hypoglycemia cases among low-income individuals at the end of the month as compared to the beginning of the month.

You might wonder why that is. The sad truth is that these cases of hypoglycemia—or low blood sugar—are likely more prevalent at the end of the month because this is when SNAP benefits run out for many individuals and their families.

When families don't have enough to eat, their health suffers. We hear time and time again that the current monthly SNAP benefit is inadequate. That families must scramble to cobble together enough to eat from food pantries and charities.

Seniors are especially vulnerable to hunger as a health issue. Many seniors live on fixed incomes and are often faced with the tough choice of paying for their medications or paying for their food. For seniors, taking medication on an empty stomach can be especially dangerous and may land them in the hospital.

It is astounding that some of America's most vulnerable families must face these challenges month after month, year after year; but the good news is that hunger can also be one of the most treatable health conditions. Hunger is solvable. We have the resources, but we need to muster the political will to end hunger now.

One organization that has for years been doing incredible work to reframe the paradigm of hunger as a health issue is Community Servings, a Massachusetts-based nonprofit that delivers free meals to homebound individuals and their families. Their meals are medically tailored to meet the specific dietary needs of the recipients.

The Community Servings model addresses two of the biggest barriers that low-income individuals who are dealing with extended illness face: shopping for food and preparing meals. Community Servings takes care of that so that patients can focus on getting better without worrying about where their next meal is coming from.

The Community Servings model shows great promise in not only fighting hunger but also in saving money in our healthcare system. A survey last year of doctors and nurses who care for Community Servings clients found that 96 percent said that the meals improved their clients' health and 65 percent said they believed the meals had resulted in fewer hospitalizations.

We also need to do a better job of connecting our hospitals and our community health centers and VA hospitals with farmers markets. Organizations like Wholesome Wave are effectively expanding their fruit and vegetable prescription program, where doctors can write a prescription for fruits and vegetables that individuals could then immediately fill at a farmers market that might be set up on the hospital grounds 1 or 2 days a week.

Boston Medical Center has addressed hunger as a health issue head on with its Preventive Food Pantry permanently located in the hospital itself. Here, low-income families can work with a dietitian to choose foods that meet their dietary needs with an emphasis on fresh fruits and vegetables.

Food banks and food pantries are finding innovative ways to partner with local farms to provide more fresh produce to low-income families. I am proud to represent one such forward-thinking partnership in my congressional district. Every year, the Community Harvest Project, run through a local farm in Grafton, Massachusetts, donates hundreds of thousands of pounds of fresh fruits and vegetables to the Worcester County Food Bank.

Finally, we ought to do a better job of educating doctors and nurses about what hunger looks like. I am always surprised when I talk to medical students, that they only take one or two, if any, classes in nutrition. That is why I am a cosponsor of my friend Congressman TIM RYAN's bill, the ENRICH Act, which would provide grants to improve nutrition education among healthcare professionals.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we talk a lot about finding ways to save money in our healthcare system. In that same conversation, we need to do a better job of understanding that food is medicine.

We can't just address hunger and health as two separate issues; they are two sides of the same coin. Hunger is a health issue, and it should be treated as such. We can and we should do more to end hunger now.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the House adjourned for the month of August for time to be in the districts with our constituents.

Before that, we saw the breaking story in mid-July of Planned Parenthood and the videos that came out of the barbaric practices that were happening in there on aborted babies. Indeed, America was horrified as each of the videos unfolded to see that these are the practices that our tax dollars are somehow helping to fund in that organization.

The House did not completely take time away from Washington. Indeed, several of our committees started immediately taking action in July and then during August with letters transmitted to Planned Parenthood and others to make this more well known to the public, letters to invite them to explain themselves to committees—Energy and Commerce Committee, Judiciary Committee, Oversight and Government Reform Committee—which upon each video, as they became available to the public, Americans were more and more horrified with what was going on.

The actions in the House were to ask the first person in the first video, Dr. Nucatola, to come and present her case of what that video was about and why it happened to the committee.

Planned Parenthood responded that they probably wouldn't make Dr. Nucatola available; but indeed, finally, a month later, on August 27, the committee was able—a month later—to interview Dr. Nucatola.

Today, the Judiciary Committee will resume these hearings this morning, almost as we speak now. Indeed, later on, Oversight and Government Reform later this week and Energy and Commerce Committee this week, will be doing more investigations, more hearings, on this, as is our prerogative in the House with Oversight and Government Reform because the American people, no matter how they feel about the question on abortion, post-abortion, when Planned Parenthood appears to most people to now be the equivalent of a chop shop for baby parts, they are outraged. They are going: Why are my tax dollars going to this organization?

This isn't about women's health. There are lots of options for the health issues that women do need that don't have to be funded by an organization that is doing these practices.

□ 1030

The House will continue its work on the investigations that are needed here, and we will continue on our work, seeing to it that tax dollars can be

pulled back from supporting such an organization with such barbaric practices and with such a callous attitude as they discuss them over a glass of wine, on camera, at lunch. Indeed, this is our time in Congress, through this investigative process, to stand up for life, for what is right, for what is moral, and we dare not shirk from that responsibility.

PILLOW FIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Ms. SPEIER) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, like slumber parties and sleepovers, a pillow fight doesn't sound like the type of activity that would leave 30 of our Nation's most promising future military leaders injured or call into question the management practices of the Army's top academy. Yet, that is exactly what happened.

We just learned that, on August 20, West Point freshman cadets got together for an annual pillow fight, and according to press accounts, they swung pillowcases packed with large, hard objects, thought to be helmets. This fight badly injured 30 cadets, 24 of them diagnosed with concussions. There were shoulders dislocated, one cadet diagnosed with a hairline fracture of the cheekbone, some with broken noses and split lips. Before the fight, upperclassmen commanders reportedly encouraged the freshmen by telling them, "If you don't come back with a bloody nose, you didn't try hard enough."

The American people deserve to know what happened here. West Point and the Army have provided conflicting explanations, saying in one instance, "Many members of the plebe class spontaneously participated in a pillow fight," while, in another, they suggested that a pillow fight is a halLOWed annual tradition, dating back to 1897. Well, which is it?

West Point, apparently, doesn't know how to run this pillow fight either. This rite of passage has a track record of similar injuries, followed by ineffective attempts to make this event safer. Two years ago, for example, the 2013 pillow fight was canceled after at least one cadet placed a lockbox as a weapon in a pillowcase. Now it is back, and according to reports, the helmets the cadets were using to give their teammates concussions had been mandated as protection after injuries in previous pillow fights.

May I remind everyone that this education is being paid for directly by the taxpayers of this country. The U.S. Government funds everything the Academy does to the tune of millions of dollars a year. It is utterly irresponsible to think that a violent pillow fight is a way to build camaraderie and create a professional military.

West Point has stated that all cadets are back on duty and that it is pursuing an investigation, but Congress needs to know what kind of investigation it is pursuing and when we will receive answers. As the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee's Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I am calling on the Army and the U.S. Military Academy to provide a clear explanation of the incident and its causes, as well as a full accounting of who was responsible and what measures are being taken to prevent something like this from happening again.

We will not create the world's most feared fighting force by hosting a concussion-filled slumber party. We must ensure that the august institution lives up to the exceptionally high standards that it represents and that our future military leaders live up to the great responsibility that rests on their shoulders. We can and we must do better.

HONORING THE LIFE OF TUSKEGEE AIRMAN JOHN WATSON, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of John Watson, Jr., of Beckley, a Tuskegee Airman who served our country honorably during World War II.

Mr. Watson passed away on August 31, and he will be buried with honors at Arlington National Cemetery.

I had the honor of meeting Mr. Watson in May when he was formally recognized as a Tuskegee Airman. Mr. Watson joined the military during World War II and served as an aircraft crew chief. These men were integral to the success of the Tuskegee Airmen but were never given their due until recently. I was pleased and honored to help present Mr. Watson with his Tuskegee red jacket and his Congressional Gold Medal when he visited the Capitol just this past May as part of an Honor Flight that was organized by Always Free Honor Flight of West Virginia. One of his granddaughters, Daphne Watson, was able to join him for the presentation, and there was not a dry eye in the room as Mr. Watson received his long past due, much-deserved recognition.

After serving in World War II, Mr. Watson continued his work as an employee of the VA Medical Center in Beckley, West Virginia. He truly believed in giving back to his Nation, and we are better off for his service to our country.

SACRAMENTO HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the extraordinary heroism of Airman 1st Class Spencer Stone, Army National Guardsman Alek Skarlatos, and college student Anthony Sadler.

These three courageous young Americans drew the attention of the world on August 21 when they bravely took action to prevent a terrorist attack that could have taken the lives of dozens, if not hundreds, of innocent people on a passenger train in France. By now, most of the country and the world have heard about the heroic actions of these young men.

Spencer, Alek, and Anthony were on a train from Amsterdam to Paris as part of a European vacation. A terrorist, intending to murder passengers, boarded their train. When the attacker, armed with at least two firearms, including an assault rifle with hundreds of rounds of ammunition, entered the train car, the three young Americans, without hesitation, responded.

Witnesses say that Alek prompted action by yelling, "Go get 'em." Spencer charged and tackled the gunman, with Alek and Anthony close behind. The three men, with the help of another passenger, tackled, subdued, and disarmed the attacker before anyone else was seriously injured. The attacker managed to wound Spencer with a box cutter during the struggle. Despite his injuries, Spencer used his Air Force medic training to treat the wound of another passenger, likely saving his life.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that all three of these heroes are from the Sacramento region. They met at a local middle school and have maintained a close friendship ever since. Their friendship and loyalty to each other is part of what makes Sacramento and this Nation great.

Spencer grew up in Carmichael, which is just outside of Sacramento—a suburb, in fact—and attended Del Campo High School. He currently serves as a U.S. Air Force medic.

Alek is also from Carmichael and had moved to Oregon. He serves in the Oregon National Guard and had just finished a 9-month deployment in Afghanistan.

Anthony is studying kinesiology at California State University, Sacramento. He grew up in Sacramento. His father is a pastor at Shiloh Baptist Church, a historical church in our community, and he has been a friend of the Matsui family for many, many years. As he related to me, he always told Anthony to always watch each other's back. That is what friends do.

Mr. Speaker, Spencer's, Alek's, and Anthony's actions were nothing short of extraordinary. These young men, who call themselves just regular guys, have given all Americans a reason to celebrate. They have been awarded the French Legion of Honour. My city of

Sacramento, which is also the State capital, will be throwing them a parade on Friday—significantly, on 9/11—and I am sure more accolades will follow.

However, more important than any accolade is that they have reminded us about the importance of service, sacrifice, and selflessness. All three men deserve commendation for the manner in which they have represented our Nation and have put themselves in harm's way to save the lives of others.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to join me in recognizing Spencer Stone, Alek Skarlatos, and Anthony Sadler as we honor their bravery.

A NUCLEAR-ARMED IRAN IS A THREAT TO EVERY COUNTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, there is no higher priority for this government than of guaranteeing the safety and security of the American people. Allowing Iran—the chief sponsor of global terror—to obtain nuclear capabilities, which Iran is guaranteed to have through this deal, means freedom everywhere is threatened. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to every country everywhere.

Mr. Speaker, any deal must be verifiable, enforceable, and accountable, and there is nothing verifiable about this deal.

The secret deals between Iran and the U.N. mean Iranians get to certify whether they are complying, and Iran actually provides the testing samples to the U.N. for testing. If the U.S. demands the right to inspect facilities, Iran can delay for more than 3 weeks. Our "anytime, anywhere" threshold demand has been watered down during negotiations to what Iran calls "managed access."

It is not an enforceable deal. Sanctions will have been lifted, and it is the sanctions that have forced them to the bargaining table in the first instance. Once lifted, Iran will have billions to complete their nuclear program and expand their funding of terror. Even if we can prove a violation, a slow bureaucratic process gives them time to delay, deceive, and deter effective enforcement. There are no snapback provisions here, Mr. Speaker, and it is not an accountable deal.

Iran is permitted to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges to enrich uranium. As for the \$150 billion in unfrozen assets, does anyone think that Iran is going to use that to build schools or hospitals or to teach tolerance of other faiths? Instead, how about using it to wipe Israel off the map? How about the chants of "death to America"? Why are we paving the path to weapons that can accomplish these atrocities?

Why should we trust Iran? What is it about their history of deceit, destruction, and killings that warrants our bestowing trust that they will be peaceful?

Here is a question for those who say this is a good deal: How many people can Iran kill with this money for this to remain a good deal? What is the under-over death toll threshold for this deal to no longer be a good deal?

I ask these questions because, very simply, this money is going to be used to kill people, and this deal provides the funding for it.

Millions of Americans, throughout the history of this country, have fought and died. Families have sacrificed in the name of freedom. Generations of Americans have brought about American strength and exceptionalism, and this has engendered a belief in our allies that we will have their backs, and it has kept many of our enemies in check given our military capability. This strength has always been at the very core of our leverage when dealing with other countries.

As for negotiating, the administration simply says we have negotiated the best deal we can, and we are supposed to, as Congress, accept that at face value with zero input.

Here is a little bit of recent history. We were assured by this administration that al Qaeda had been broken, but it hasn't. Our strategy in Yemen was called a model for combating terrorism, but, at this point, it looks very much like an Iran proxy state. ISIS was mocked as a JV team, and now they are murdering thousands. Our relationship with Russia was supposed to be reset, but I don't think anyone let Vladimir Putin know that as he invades sovereign countries and faces no consequences.

□ 1045

How about the bright red line in Syria that said we won't allow Assad to kill his own people with chemical weapons? This administration decided to ignore that, and we now have a Syrian refugee crisis.

This is the recent backdrop from which our leverage, our American strength and exceptionalism, earned through the blood, sweat, and tears of generations of Americans, has been brokered by this administration in this deal.

The U.N. voting on this deal before the United States Congress and the United States Senate, the minority of which is actually considering filibustering a vote on this deal, is an outrage, Mr. Speaker.

What does a good deal consist of? Real simple: A complete dismantling of their entire nuclear program. Once we have a demonstrated proof of that, then sanctions get lifted. No non-nuclear concessions.

Any other outcome is not acceptable. Let's use our leverage to the max-

imum. We fought for it. Let's be strong and let's be proud of our strength and let's use it to our advantage.

Diplomacy isn't compromising to the preferred position of a terrorist country. Diplomacy must always begin and end with protecting American security.

This is not about politics, and it is not just about America. A nuclear Iran is a global threat to everyone everywhere. All Iranian terror must be stopped. We need to reject this deal and go back to the negotiating table.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA FIELD HEARING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Congresswoman DELAURO and I held a Make It In America field hearing in Connecticut.

We heard from manufacturers from across the State, including leaders from Click Bond in Watertown, Connecticut, who are committed to growing their businesses right here in the United States. But they need our support.

Congress needs to be a more effective partner for American manufacturing. We must continue to foster an innovation economy that creates manufacturing careers, not jobs, but careers that are at the heart of the middle class.

We must reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, a critical financial tool for our companies to remain competitive in the global marketplace.

We must work together to create a predictable Tax Code that encourages companies to return to the United States and levels the playing field for our small businesses, particularly our family-owned companies.

We must inspire our students in science, technology, engineering, and math so that the United States remains the leader in global innovation for generations to come. By engaging our students in the STEM fields, we can prepare them to be the scientists, entrepreneurs, and innovators of the future.

These students could become NASA astronauts like Waterbury's own Rick Mastracchio, who circled the planet on the International Space Station, or machinists or Teamsters, who assemble the aircraft that our military flies proudly all around the world, or computer programmers, who make our world more accessible and connected. Many of my colleagues share my passion for STEM education and bolstering our skilled workforce.

With Minority Whip STENY HOYER's leadership, Congress has advanced the Make It In America agenda and passed important legislation to cut taxes, provide small business loans, train skilled workers, and support American manufacturing.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are dedicated to creating and growing American jobs.

By rising above partisan politics and focusing on commonsense practical policies, our bipartisan efforts can stimulate real economic growth. We should seize the opportunity to work together to support high-paying careers in American manufacturing.

WASHINGTON STATE WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row, my home State of Washington and my Fourth Congressional District are facing the worst wildfires in the State's recorded history.

One year ago the Carlton Complex fire broke out in Okanogan County. At the time, it was the most destructive in our State's history, burning over 250,000 acres, destroying hundreds of homes and businesses, and devastating the environment.

Now the people of Washington are once again enduring another catastrophic wildfire season, far surpassing the scale of the devastation experienced last year.

To put it in perspective, the amount of land burning in my home State is equivalent to the State of Rhode Island. Many of these fires continue to burn, even as Federal, State, and local agencies and officials work tirelessly to contain them.

Communities across my State are mourning the tragic loss of three firefighters who fell in the line of duty on August 19 while battling the Twisp fire in Okanogan County. We remember and mourn the loss of these brave young men: Andrew Zajac, Richard Wheeler, and Tom Beshevsky.

Our prayers are with their families and their loved ones. The current situation in Washington is dire, and the heartbreaking loss of life is a sober reminder of the dangerous conditions facing many residents.

Already roughly 1 million acres have burned, along with countless homes and businesses and agricultural operations, forcing thousands of residents to evacuate their homes as the threat continues.

While the Governor has declared a state of emergency and the President approved a Federal emergency declaration, the threat remains for residents of central and eastern Washington, and more resources are necessary.

For the first time in history, the Forest Service has spent more than half its budget on wildfire suppression and across the country over 8 million acres have already burned just this year.

The Forest Service reported last week that it has begun the practice

known as fire borrowing, which is transferring funds to supplement its diminishing firefighting budget.

This practice of fire borrowing leads into a vicious cycle where funding is not available for critical fire mitigation efforts, such as thinning dense forests, rehabilitating areas after wildfires, and ensuring communities are more resilient and prepared for future fires.

This leads the next fire season to be worse than the last, a trend that we are now experiencing in Washington, which is why it is more important than ever to pass legislation to fix this problem such as the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act.

To protect our communities and battle the wildfires, firefighters from across the U.S., as well as Australia and New Zealand, have joined the fight. We owe them our deepest gratitude and thanks.

Additionally, the thousands of first responders and volunteers and National Guard servicemembers who have worked around the clock at great personal risk to fight the blaze deserve recognition for their heroic and selfless efforts.

I have seen firsthand how our communities have pulled together to help one another during these trying times. Our communities in central and eastern Washington are resolute, resilient, and have come together to confront the many challenges facing them.

The outpouring of support and effort of volunteers from all over the State and country, who provide shelter to survivors, cook meals, and unload trucks of relief supplies, is a testament to the spirit and determination of Washingtonians and our neighbors.

However, help is needed still as the current fires have only worsened what was already a perilous situation, with more and more homes being destroyed, families being displaced, and severe economic hardship expected in the aftermath.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember the losses caused by catastrophic wildfires of the last 2 years, and Congress must continue to push to improve forest health and to ensure that this does not happen again.

AMERICAN HEROES OF FRENCH TRAIN ATTACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my neighbor and good friend from Sacramento in honoring three brave Americans who foiled an attempted attack on passengers in a train traveling from Amsterdam to Paris on August 22, 2015. Anthony Sadler, Spencer Stone, and Alek Skarlatos were the three brave Americans who stopped this attack.

Anthony Sadler is a native of Pittsburg, California, which, happily, is in my congressional district. These courageous men charged the attacker, who was armed with an AK-47 and dozens of rounds of ammunition, enough to kill everyone on that train.

Thanks to Anthony and his friends, no one was killed and injuries were minimized. Each were awarded France's highest civilian honor, the Legion d'Honneur.

As we reflect on 9/11, 14 years ago this week, the heroic efforts of these young men underscore our Nation's resolve to confront violent extremism. I am thankful they returned home to their families and to America.

A MUNICH-SIZED MISTAKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in 48 hours, the House will vote on a resolution to stop the Iran nuclear treaty.

Now, I know the President chooses not to call it a treaty, but it is a treaty in everything but name, with international ramifications as great as any treaty Congress has ever considered.

Because treaties have a profound implication to the life of this Nation, the Constitution requires they be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the Senate. Yet, in this post-constitutional era of Obama's America, it now require two-thirds of both Houses to reject them.

Every Republican in both Houses has taken a stand against this treaty. So rejection or ratification now rests solely on whether enough Democrats are willing to place country ahead of party on a matter of the gravest consequence to world peace.

I don't think anyone can dispute the immediate effects of this treaty: \$150 billion in frozen assets will be released to a regime whose leaders daily reiterate their intention to wage war on Israel and the United States. These funds will be available to finance Iran's military and terrorist activities and to fund its nuclear ambitions.

Although the agreement purports to halt production of fissile material, it gives Iran the legal right to continue its research and development of advanced centrifuges, the only purpose of which is to produce nuclear weapons.

It gives them legal access to traffic in conventional arms in just 5 years and ICBM technology in 8 years, something that Obama's own chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said should be done "under no circumstances" just a week before the treaty was announced.

Does anyone deny that the nation most immediately imperiled by a nuclear Iran—our ally, Israel—is united in its opposition to this treaty? Israeli political parties are among the most fractured and disputatious in the

world. Yet, they stand united on this issue.

Does anyone deny that the Iranian regime is notorious for not honoring its treaty obligations? Indeed, Iran signed a nuclear nonproliferation treaty and has violated it ever since, which is why we are now debating this treaty.

Verification therefore must be the central focus of any treaty with this regime. Yet, under its very terms, spot inspections can be delayed for weeks or even months if the regime objects.

More recently, we have learned that, under secret side agreements the administration had no intention of sharing, inspections of the most important nuclear sites are to be conducted by the Iranians themselves. This provision alone guarantees that history will ridicule this treaty as the pinnacle of naivety.

So I ask my Democratic colleagues, why? Why would anyone who values peace support this treaty? The answer I hear is that it reduces the chance of war in the next few years or, in Neville Chamberlain's words, it guarantees "peace in our time."

Does anyone really believe this? This treaty gives Israel the Hobson's choice of launching a preemptive strike or ramping up its own nuclear program.

The Saudis and Egyptians have already made clear this agreement gives them no alternative other than to initiate their own nuclear programs. It catastrophically undermines the Iranian democratic opposition at just the time the regime was faltering from within.

Ironically, Mr. Obama tacitly concedes the destabilizing effect of this treaty by following it up with pledges to vastly increase military aid to Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia. If he really believed this treaty stabilizes the region, why would it need a new infusion of arms?

□ 1100

I appeal to my Democratic colleagues to consider the ramifications of this vote. The constitutional concerns are huge. This sets a dangerous precedent that essentially rescinds the treaty clause of the Constitution, a precedent they might live to regret under Republican administrations.

A far more immediate danger is the chain of events this treaty would set off in the Middle East and quickly spread throughout the world. This treaty bolsters the Iranian regime from within. It infuses it with \$150 billion with which to finance its nuclear ambitions. It gives it the legal right and guaranteed timetable to pursue nuclear war and cannot be verified through inspections.

Iran has made crystal clear its intent to destroy Israel and the United States, a threat reiterated yesterday in no uncertain terms by its Supreme Leader.

Mr. Speaker, we are running out of time to avert a catastrophe.

SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY TRUST FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED) for 5 minutes.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of important issues before the House this week, but I wanted to take an opportunity to raise an issue that we have been working on in our office for quite some time.

We, as a body, Mr. Speaker, will be faced with an opportunity, hopefully, to resolve this issue here shortly in the next few months, and that is the issue of the Social Security disability insurance trust fund.

Not a lot of people are aware—and I just read the Social Security trustees report over the summer—that the disability trust fund goes insolvent in 2016. That means millions of Americans who rely on Social Security disability benefits are looking at a situation where their benefits are going to be cut 20 percent because of the insolvency of the Social Security trust fund—2016, Mr. Speaker, that is right around the corner.

When I raised this issue 2 years ago with the White House, with Jack Lew—our Treasury Secretary—in our Committee on Ways and Means hearing, I asked him 2 years ago: What is the plan? What is the solution to this problem?

What I was ultimately told was this is what we are going to do: we are just going to take money from the Social Security retirement fund and move it over to the disability trust fund and bail it out.

Well, in my private life in business, I knew a lot of businessowners, and what that essentially was, it is robbing Peter to pay Paul because the Social Security retirement fund is on a path to insolvency just a few short years down the road.

I said we could do better. That is why I was glad to join with my colleague, SAM JOHNSON, who chairs the Subcommittee on Social Security here in Washington, to change the rules to make sure that that solution would not be the one that we follow here in 2015 and 2016. We can do better.

You know why we can do better? It is because we care. We care about the people that are in the disability trust fund, and we need to listen to those people. This is what their experience is with the disability trust fund today. They are frustrated. It is a bureaucracy. It is a mess.

We have overpayments. We have fraudulent payments. We have a system that penalizes people returning to work, rather than trying to incentivize them and stand with them when they return to work.

We had an individual by the name of Mike Zelly come before the committee and testify to us, and he is in the disability trust fund. He was in a horrific automobile accident 36 years ago and has been in a wheelchair ever since.

These are the people we should listen to. These are the people that know the disability trust fund the best. What his testimony to us was, he says we should seize this opportunity to fix this problem, take care of the bureaucracy, make sure the overpayments don't occur because, when an overpayment occurs to a disability recipient, guess who has to pay it back? It is the disability recipient because of the Social Security Administration's incompetence. That is not right. That is not fair.

Most importantly, what he talked about in his 36 years in the disability trust fund is that, when he tried to return to work, he was faced with obstacle after obstacle of a bureaucracy that said, if you do that, you will lose your benefit. That is not right.

Mike Zelly offered ideas on how we can improve the system to streamline this bureaucracy. This is the process someone in the Social Security disability trust fund has to go through in order to try to go back to work. We need to simplify it, and we need to stand with the American work ethic for the people in the disability trust fund that want to return to work.

There was a recent Brookings Institution report that came across my desk that I read. There was 40 percent return on the beneficiaries in the disability trust fund that indicated they would like to return to work, but because of the bureaucracy, there was fear. There was a sense that, if they did that, they would lose their benefit, and they just couldn't risk it.

That is why we are offering common-sense reforms here out of our office, out of the Committee on Ways and Means, out of this House, hopefully, shortly, so that what we can do is make sure that those disability trust fund recipients don't look at a 20 percent cut in 2016.

We will hold them harmless, and we will make sure we do what is necessary in order to make sure that our obligations and promises under the disability trust fund are met to those individuals because that is the right thing to do.

We cannot lose this opportunity to modernize the Social Security disability trust fund to make sure that we stand with those that want to return to work and believe in the American work ethic like we do.

I ask my colleagues to join with us on a bipartisan basis, and there has been an indication of bipartisan work that we have been able to show here in the initial conversations.

Let's modernize the disability trust fund; let's cure the waste, fraud, and abuse, but most importantly, let's

stand with the individuals like Mike Zelly who want to return to work because it gives him dignity and it gives him a sense that he is contributing rather than being in any way a burden on the system.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Robert Michaels, Serve & Protect, Brentwood, Tennessee, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, we humbly come before You asking for wisdom, unity, and peace.

We are reminded that September 9, 1776, the Continental Congress declared the name of our new Nation to be the United States of America, no longer United Colonies. Our national unity was strong.

Lord, we also remember unity September 11, 2001, when terrorists attacked our Nation. Again, our Nation stood united, strong, and resolute.

Today, Lord, we pray for that same commitment to unity, that sense of all for one and one for all. We pray for our military and first responders, noble heroes all.

Please, Lord, help our leaders. Grant wisdom and vision; help them serve this great Nation, under God, "with liberty and justice for all." One Nation. One heart. One mind.

We sincerely pray this as one Nation under God, as Jesus taught us to pray, to our Father, who is in heaven.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. MCCOLLUM led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND ROBERT MICHAELS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, it is a distinct honor to introduce and honor guest chaplain Reverend Robert Michaels, from Brentwood, Tennessee.

As is the tradition of this governing body, we begin each day with a prayer. I am so pleased that Chaplain Michaels is offering that prayer today.

He is the CEO, founder, and national trauma care specialist for Serve & Protect, an international nonprofit organization dedicated to comprehensive and confidential trauma care and therapy for police officers, firefighters, rescue workers, dispatchers, and other emergency workers.

Chaplain Michaels served in law enforcement with the 229th Military Police Battalion of the Virginia Army National Guard, as well as with the Norfolk, Virginia, police department.

He serves as chaplain for the FBI Memphis division, Nashville R.A., State chaplain for Tennessee FOP, and is a chaplain and second vice president for Morris Heithcock FOP Lodge 41 in Williamson County, Tennessee, where he is an active member and leads a Bible study group for first responders.

He is a member of the American Academy of Experts in Trauma Stress, National Center for Crisis Management, the International Conference of Police Chaplains, and Federation of Fire Chaplains. He holds a BA from Columbia International University and an MA from Wheaton College.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in welcoming Chaplain Michaels today and expressing gratitude for the good work that he does for our law enforcement and emergency workers each and every day.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WENSTRUP). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONGRATULATING THE ROWAN LITTLE LEAGUE SOFTBALL TEAM

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize the members of Rowan Little League's 12-under softball team.

Kaylin Dowling, Allison Ennis, Kary Hales, Caylie Keller, Caitlin Mann,

Kali Morton, Taylor Sanborn, Megyn Spicer, Liza Simmerson, Jaden Vaughn, Taylor Walton, Ellie Wilhelm, and Ellen Yang played their hearts out during the Little League Softball World Series in Portland, Oregon, and emerged as world champions.

Coach Steve Yang, with assistance from Coaches Eric Dowling and Rob Hales, led the team, who went 5-1 in the tournament and outscored their opponents 43-6 during the winning campaign.

After scoring four runs in the first inning of the championship game versus East regional champs, Rhode Island, the team relied on exceptional pitching and outstanding defensive play to win the game.

I commend these young athletes and congratulate them on a job well done. North Carolina is incredibly proud of the teamwork, dedication, and perseverance they exhibited on the way to this extraordinary achievement.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF SHANE CLIFTON

(Ms. MCCOLLUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I attended a visitation for St. Paul firefighter and paramedic Shane Clifton. Mr. Clifton passed away while on duty at Fire Station 14 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

In addition to his duties as firefighter and paramedic, Shane served in Afghanistan and Iraq as a member of the United States Navy and participated in humanitarian missions in Haiti.

Shane and firefighters around Minnesota and our Nation sacrifice time away from their families, work long hours, and put their lives at risk to keep our communities safe. We owe all of our first responders an incredible debt of gratitude for ensuring our public safety.

Shane served the city of St. Paul bravely and his death is a tragedy. The city of St. Paul, Fire Station 14, and his family will all miss his presence dearly.

My thoughts and prayers are with his children, his family, and his brothers and sisters in the St. Paul Fire Department.

Rest in peace, Shane.

IRAN AND FAILED PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the President's failure to lead our Nation for a strategy of peace through strength has resulted in mass murders in the Middle East.

We have seen his failure to take action after Syria violated his declared "red line" and used chemical weapons against its citizens. We have seen his failure in recognizing ISIL-Daesh as a deadly threat to American families as the "JV" team. The President has been inaccurate in describing his dangerous nuclear deal.

Sadly, we read tragic stories of men, women, and children fleeing their homes in Syria. They are escaping a murderous government, the same government propped up by the Iranian regime. The President is establishing a failed dangerous legacy that has left the Middle East in wars and mayhem with refugees and migrants drowning at sea.

Ambassador John Bolton said it best when he remarked:

Obama's mistakes make it impossible to travel in time back to a theoretical world where sanctions might have derailed Iran's nuclear weapons program.

I believe the President has abandoned the young people of Iran seeking regime change.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING THE MEMORIES OF MORRIS AND BETH FAITELEWICZ AND YEHUDA BAYME

(Ms. VELÁZQUEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, three New Yorkers—Morris and Beth Faitelwicz, who celebrated their 33rd wedding anniversary in June, and Yehuda Bayme, fiancé to their only daughter—lost their lives in a Sullivan County car accident.

This tragedy is being felt deeply in the Lower East Side. Not only were they respected community members, but Morris and Beth had been involved in response and recovery efforts on 9/11.

Morris served as vice chair of Manhattan's Community Board 3, was city-wide coordinator and deputy inspector of NYPD's Auxiliary Volunteer Emergency Services Rescue Unit in the World Trade Center area, and was a dedicated Hatzolah member.

He was among the first to rush to the World Trade Center. For his efforts, he earned a Port Authority exceptional service award and a city council proclamation. Beth, an ER nurse, also served with distinction after the towers collapsed.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring their memories.

Rest in peace.

MAYERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL SUCCESS

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Mayers Memorial Hospital in my district, the First District of California, in Fall River Mills, eastern Shasta County, not only for their commitment to deliver exemplary healthcare services to the northeast area of rural California, but also in congratulations for, after years of planning and diligence on their part, Mayers was recently awarded a \$21 million USDA rural development grant to address the hospital and region's most urgent needs, including replacement facilities for emergency departments, acute care, and diagnostic services, while making the facility compliant with California's rigid earthquake mandates that will make the building in seismic code by 2020.

Access to healthcare services is already critical and a big challenge in rural areas of California, so ensuring our hospitals and doctors have the tools they need to continue offering primary care and emergency health services is very critical for our area.

I have no doubt this project—one that I was happy to help support—will have a positive impact on the community and the whole northeast region, generating jobs, and making sure the people of eastern Shasta County, as well as northeastern California, have the healthcare services and emergency services they need.

LET'S FOCUS MORE ON PRIORITIES OF HARD-WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican leadership's continued dysfunction and inability to govern is starting to have real effects on people back home.

Like most Members, I spent the last month back home listening to the people that I work for, and I heard one message loud and clear. They want us to get to work and get things done and set aside the hyperpartisanship and focus on the priorities of the American people; yet we are 10 days away from another government shutdown.

We are no further ahead today than we were 6 months ago in getting a budget that represents the interests and the priorities of the American people, 10 days away from another government shutdown—instead of focusing on the priorities of the American people, like rebuilding our crumbling roads and bridges that would help us be more efficient and make our businesses more productive, nothing.

Instead of focusing on the priorities of the American people to grow our economy, we have seen nothing come to this floor of the House. We can't even get a budget bill.

On this side, Democrats, we stand willing to work, and we stand willing to compromise. We will work with you to put together a spending plan. We cannot continue to allow the priorities of the American people to be set aside.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. GIBBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GIBBS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose the nuclear deal that the President and Secretary of State Kerry negotiated with Iran. Since the announcement of the deal on July 14, the world has learned piece by piece just how bad it is.

Earlier this year, I spoke on the House floor on the elements that would be needed in order to consider an agreement with Iran.

One such element was the requirement of anytime, anywhere inspections, which would give inspectors 24-hour access to any site inside Iran; yet, according to Hillel Fradkin, an expert at the Hudson Institute, Iran could get as many as 63 days—possibly more—before inspections. This gives Iran time to hide and destroy any potential evidence of nuclear weapons research.

Additionally, this deal lifts economic sanctions too quickly and gives Iran access to \$150 billion in sanctions relief. Iran is a top exporter and supporter of terrorism. We should not be making it easier for them to fund groups like Hezbollah and dictators like those in Syria, nor should we make it easier for Iran to procure conventional arms and missiles that have the capability of reaching American soil.

Despite our negotiators' assurances that the conventional arms embargo would not be lifted, this is precisely what will happen with the UN arms embargo ending in just 5 years. The President is rewarding Iran with money, access to weaponry, and a 10-year pause on their nuclear weapons research—and that is if the Iranians don't cheat.

Empowering Iran to fund terrorists and bully its neighbors is not what I call a good agreement for the United States or allies Israel and Saudi Arabia. Congress must end this deal and impose stronger sanctions.

□ 1215

LAS VEGAS NIGHT

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite all of my colleagues to join me tonight in the Cannon Caucus Room to celebrate Las Vegas Night.

We will have food and drinks and music and casino games, and it just

promises to be a good time. This is what is happening only in District One. It is my pleasure to welcome and thank the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce for hosting this event. It is going to be just a great evening, and I hope you will all join us.

Las Vegas is back. Our economy was hard hit by the recession, but now we are doing so much better. We had 315,000 tourists just over Labor Day weekend. We will welcome over 42 million tourists and business travelers this year, and that includes 8 million foreign visitors. That supports 366,000 jobs. I tip my hat to those workers in the tourism industry who have helped us make it through.

Please join me tonight, and remember that what happens on Vegas Night stays on Vegas Night.

PATIENTS DESERVE BETTER THAN NEW PROSTHETIC RULE

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, every day, cutting-edge medical innovation is making it possible for patients to live healthy, active lives. One of the best examples of this is lower limb prosthetics.

Losing a limb is a traumatic and life-altering experience, but the continued advancement and development of prosthetics has made it possible for many of these patients to continue to have significant amounts of functionality, along with ensuring they won't be confined to wheelchairs.

However, proposed changes to Medicare rules threaten access to important medical innovation and medical technology. Recently, a number of patients and advocacy groups came to Washington to share what the proposed rule changes would mean to them. One patient from Minnesota noted that the proposed rule would turn back the clock and force her to use a prosthetic that she claimed would be the car equivalent of a 1970s Vega.

Mr. Speaker, I share the apprehension that these patients have, and I encourage CMS, the agency in charge of administering Medicare, to chart a different course when it comes to administering lower limb prosthetics.

GOP ATTACKS AGAINST A NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. DOGGETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, Republican self-styled experts like Sarah Palin, Glenn Beck, and Donald Trump condemning an agreement to decrease the nuclear threat is hardly new.

One Republican Presidential candidate blasted a "nuclear Munich."

The National Review denounced a “suicide pact.”

The Conservative Caucus founder derided our President as a “useful idiot” and a “weak man.”

Old George Will lamented the “cult of arms control.”

Sharp words for a President who is negotiating a nuclear agreement with an untrustworthy, terrorist-promoting regime that is bent on destroying America.

Yet these shrill Republican attacks were not against President Obama, rather they were against President Ronald Reagan for agreeing with the Soviets to limit nuclear missiles. What the bomb-first, rejectionist crowd lacks in understanding and creativity they make up for here today in fatal consistency. Those who think the only good deal with Iran is a dead deal over nuclear weapons are only endangering our families.

This week, I believe that reason will prevail and the President will be sustained, and our families will be all the safer for it.

HAPPY ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, 37 years ago today, I received one of the highest honors of my life when I was married to the former Amy Coppage of Waycross, Georgia.

We met as chemistry lab partners at Young Harris College in the north Georgia mountains. I didn't really like her much then—she was a lot smarter than me—but that quickly changed, and I grew very fond of her.

We were married in Trinity United Methodist Church in Waycross, Georgia. We have been blessed with three wonderful sons, two daughters-in-law, two wonderful granddaughters, and we have a grandson on the way. Those fine young men are really the result of her efforts.

I want to wish her a happy anniversary. We have been very blessed, and I am blessed today to have her with me.

Happy anniversary.

WEAR RED WEDNESDAY

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today is Wear Red Wednesday to Bring Back Our Girls.

We have heard so many heart-breaking details of the death and destruction that Boko Haram has brought upon the people of Nigeria.

I traveled to Nigeria last month, and I am strongly encouraged by President Buhari's pledge to defeat Boko Haram by the end of December with the help of a multinational joint task force that

is made up of troops from Benin, Cameroon, Chad, Niger, and Nigeria—and also to free the girls.

I am also encouraged after meeting in my office yesterday with members of the Nigerian House of Representatives—people who I know share my concern about Boko Haram and the Chibok girls. These honorable men confirmed the news that Boko Haram is quickly deteriorating—fractured after losing its central command—and may be defeated even before President Buhari's December deadline.

Until Boko Haram is defeated and those precious girls are returned, we will continue to tweet, tweet, tweet #bringbackourgirls and tweet, tweet, tweet #joinrepwilson.

CONGRESS MUST REJECT DISASTROUS IRAN DEAL

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Iran nuclear deal.

Earlier this year, over 350 Members of Congress, myself included, wrote the President with objectives any deal must reach before we would consider lifting sanctions. The deal is before us, and now it has none of them.

There are no anytime, anywhere inspections. Iran gets to maintain key nuclear infrastructure. The most important restrictions begin to expire in as few as 10 years. On top of that, Iran will receive \$100 billion in sanctions relief almost immediately.

This agreement is a dangerous gamble for the United States and our allies, especially for Israel. Our security is on the line, and the deck is stacked in favor of a sworn adversary. I will be voting to reject this disastrous deal, and I call on my colleagues to do the same.

DEFEAT THE IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. WENSTRUP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, the details found within the nuclear Iran deal are stunning.

The original pledge of anywhere, anytime inspections gave way to a 24-day lead time for Iranians to hide their activities from inspectors.

We now know that Iran has entered into two secret deals with the IAEA and that the details are not available to the duly elected Members of this body.

We were told that no deal is better than a bad deal. Yet here we are with a very bad deal.

The alternative to this deal is not war, as this administration is fear-mongering, but through strengthened sanctions to continue international

pressure on the largest state sponsor of terrorism. Without war, we can pursue a nuclear-free Iran through diplomacy by engaging with our allies and with peace-loving nations and with the deterrent of military might and effective economic sanctions.

“Do I trust Iran?” I am asked. Based on the last four decades and on its recent behavior, I only trust them to cheat.

Congress and the American people must defeat this deal in the interest of regional stability and our own national security and for the prospect of peace for future generations of Americans and our allies.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF TWO INDIANA LEADERS

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in sadness over the loss of two northeast Indiana community leaders.

Jac Price, a lifetime LaGrange County native, passed away on Sunday, September 6, at the age of 76. Jac, a member of the United States Army, a LaGrange County commissioner and business leader, loved his country, State, and community very much. In a testament to this, last month, Jac was awarded the prestigious Sagamore of the Wabash award—our State's highest honor—by Governor Mike Pence. He will be missed by many, and I rise today to honor Jac's service to our State.

Indiana also lost Garrett Mayor Tonya Hoeffel on Sunday as well. Tonya passed away at the age of 52, living a life dedicated to DeKalb County and the city of Garrett, Indiana. Her heart for serving her community represented true Hoosier values and is an example for all of us to follow. Her contagious smile will be forever missed. I continue to keep her husband, children, and family in my prayers.

RIDGWAY RIFLE CLUB

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the Ridgway Rifle Club, which has been called the “Silhouette Capital of the United States.”

This type of target practice involves shooting at steel targets at varying distances. While silhouette shooting has been around for 100 years, the Ridgway Rifle Club has the distinction of being the first club east of the Mississippi River to open this type of a shooting range, in the 1970s.

The range has grown over the past 40 years to include silhouettes of all shapes and sizes. One of its most recent

creations, the Varmint Bench Rest Silhouette, includes small targets that are placed 1,000 yards from the shooter.

Mr. Speaker, the Ridgway Rifle Club's silhouette range is very popular, with more than 100 people attending matches each month. The range has even attracted national attention, and it was recently featured on the television program "Shooting USA."

I wish the club continued success in nurturing a love of target shooting, shooting sports, and its support of the Second Amendment in our communities and for future generations.

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA ST. PETERSBURG'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

(Mr. JOLLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an institution that for a half century has provided excellence in higher education to the people of Florida's 13th Congressional District, to the State of Florida, and, increasingly, to all corners of the world.

I rise to recognize and honor the University of South Florida St. Petersburg as it celebrates its 50th anniversary.

USF St. Petersburg was established in 1965 by the University of South Florida to meet a rising demand by students who sought to make their mark in the world. It grew through the eighties and nineties, and, by 2006, USF became its own accredited institution by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. Today, it boasts over 5,000 students and faculty who are Fulbright Scholars and Pulitzer Prize jurors; and it boasts partnerships with leading health institutions, like All Children's Hospital and Raymond James. In short, USF St. Petersburg has become part of the fabric of Pinellas County, enriching the lives of students, faculty, and all of our neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in recognizing USF St. Petersburg as it celebrates 50 magnificent years of higher education.

□ 1230

RECOGNIZING CHESTER COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on August 26th, an armed man, who we later learned posed a security threat when he jumped the fence at the White House earlier this year, charged past the metal detectors at the Chester County Courthouse in my dis-

trict and threatened those going about their daily schedules. The intruder used a knife to attack and wound a deputy sheriff before being shot dead.

Just a few years earlier I had served as a Chester County Commissioner and regularly went into that building.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank those security officers, especially those serving in the Chester County Sheriff's Department who put their lives on the line each day to protect our communities, for their hard work.

Unspoken and often unknown to many is the countless amount of time spent training and preparing for such an incident if it ever does come about.

We owe a special thanks to Sheriff Bunny Welsh and those in her department for the service they provide every single day.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of their heroic efforts that for those who enter the Chester County Courthouse day in and day out can feel safe.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2227

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 411, FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3461, APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3460, SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-259) on the resolution (H. Res. 412) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agree-

ment Review Act of 2015; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 64, Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

First, I would like to commend all of the individuals from the Obama administration and their counterparts across the globe for their tireless work in this agreement.

Since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, this is as close as our country and the international community have come to signing a peace agreement. That progress did not come without significant sacrifice of personal and professional time. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. While I commend all those involved and recognize the importance of a comprehensive nuclear agreement, I do not believe in what we are getting.

Over the past 30 years, the international community has been subjected to Iranian threats and bully behaviors. The international community has also had to tolerate Iran's constant threats to destroy our Nation and the State of Israel, our staunch ally. For too long, the community of nations has dealt with Iran's funding of terrorism throughout the Middle East and the world.

I am unable to support a deal that would allow the Iranian regime to continue to perpetrate these actions without repercussions. It is important to mention that these are not just my beliefs.

Since the announcement in July, my office has received hundreds of contacts from constituents opposing the Iran agreement.

In the month of August, I held town halls, hosted meetings and conducted constituent visits.

The majority of those interactions affirmed the people in our district do not trust Iran.

The State of Israel should not have to worry about more threats and potentially expanded attacks funded by Iranian petro-dollars.

The United States shouldn't have to provide relief to a regime that continues to call for our destruction and those of our allies.

I believe the delay and dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program is a laudable goal, perhaps one of the most important in the world.

I also believe that we should work to alleviate the pressures and foster the goals of the Iranian people.

The young people in Iran are being held accountable for the actions of an autocratic, religiously-motivated panel of leaders.

However, we cannot ignore 30 years of unrelenting threats and condemnable behavior for a decade or less of nuclear concessions.

In Texas, perception is often reality and if you are perceived as a bully, then you'll be treated as one.

We spent too many years bringing Iran to the table through sanctions and diplomatic pressures.

We cannot easily forget the history between the two countries but we can hopefully work toward a better situation.

As long as our friends and allies in the Middle East and around the world feel the threat of Iranian influence, our job as the United States is to hold the regime accountable in every way possible.

It is my hope we work together to block this deal and use its framework to get a better deal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 64 and I yield back.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 10, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2651. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services for 2016, pursuant to 37 U.S.C. 1009(e); (H. Doc. No. 114-56); to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

2652. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 21-148, "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Support Act of 2015", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2653. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an alternative plan for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems in January 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5303(b) and 5304a; (H. Doc. No. 114-57); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 1554. A bill to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-257). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 2223. A bill to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes (Rept. 114-258). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 412. A Resolution providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran (Rept. 114-259). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. DONOVAN, and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 3455. A bill to prevent gun trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 3456. A bill to improve the process for claims for losses under the National Flood Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MEEHAN (for himself, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. DUFFY):

H.R. 3457. A bill to prohibit the lifting of sanctions on Iran until the Government of Iran pays the judgments against it for acts of terrorism, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. BEYER, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3458. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Transportation for surface transportation research, development, and deployment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for con-

sideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WALBERG, Ms. FOXX, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. HARDY, and Mr. KNIGHT):

H.R. 3459. A bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 3460. A bill to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 3461. A bill to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 3462. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act with respect to sport fish restoration and recreational boating safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself and Ms. DEGETTE):

H.R. 3463. A bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to clarify the treatment of pediatric dental coverage in the individual and group markets outside of Exchanges established under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 3464. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide that the United States Postal Service may not close or consolidate any postal facility located in a ZIP code with a high rate of population growth, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3465. A bill to enhance the services of the Office of Contracts and Procurement at

the Department of Transportation to assist modal agencies, States, and grant recipients with certain design and procurement practices and contracts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Ms. SCHKOWSKY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 3466. A bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California):

H.R. 3467. A bill to establish a pilot program to train public housing residents as home health aides and in home-based health services to enable such residents to provide covered home-based health services to residents of public housing and residents of federally-assisted rental housing, who are elderly and disabled, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. HAHN, Mr. TAKAI, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3468. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 to establish a scale-up manufacturing investment company program; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. COOK):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution to authorize the use of the Armed Forces of the United States against Iran if the President determines and certifies to Congress that Iran is not able to demonstrate that it has not sought, developed, or acquired nuclear weapons in violation of its commitments or obligations under the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DENHAM, and Mr. VARGAS):

H. Con. Res. 75. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that those who commit or support atrocities against Christians and other ethnic and religious minorities, including Yezidis, Turkmen, Sabea-Mandeans, Kaka'e, and Kurds, and who target them specifically for ethnic or religious reasons, are committing, and are hereby declared to be committing, "war crimes", "crimes against humanity", and "genocide"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARRETT:

H. Con. Res. 76. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that Taiwan and its people deserve membership in the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POMPEO (for himself and Mr. ZELDIN):

H. Res. 411. A resolution finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Finan-

cial Services, the Judiciary, Oversight and Government Reform, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. HONDA):

H. Res. 413. A resolution honoring the victims of hate crimes of Islamophobia and anti-immigrant sentiment, in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, where individuals were targeted by violence and hatred, because they were Muslim or perceived to be Muslim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mrs. DAVIS of California introduced a bill (H.R. 3469) for the relief of Beloved Jefeti; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3455.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 3456.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. MEEHAN:

H.R. 3457.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3458.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3459.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 3460.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States (relating to the regulation of commerce with foreign nations).

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 3461.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States (relating to

the regulation of commerce with foreign nations).

By Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana:

H.R. 3462.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H.R. 3463.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3464.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3465.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 3466.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3467.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . ."

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3468.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 3469.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.J. Res. 66.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 11.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 69: Ms. FUDGE and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 114: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 140: Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 167: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 184: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 207: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 288: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 303: Mr. HIMES, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 333: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 347: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 353: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 379: Mr. BUTTERFIELD.
 H.R. 403: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 425: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 456: Ms. STEFANIK.
 H.R. 525: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 592: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 612: Mr. RIGELL.
 H.R. 662: Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 702: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
 H.R. 704: Mr. CARTER of Texas and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 707: Mr. HARPER.
 H.R. 757: Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 767: Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 836: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 842: Mr. NUGENT and Mr. GIBBS.
 H.R. 855: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 865: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 883: Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 915: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 920: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 939: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 953: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
 H.R. 963: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 985: Mr. STEWART and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 986: Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 997: Mr. SHUSTER and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 1019: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
 H.R. 1062: Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. TIPTON, and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 1086: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 1130: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. CHAFFETZ.
 H.R. 1141: Ms. GABBARD and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1142: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. MEEHAN.
 H.R. 1151: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
 H.R. 1174: Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 1175: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 1188: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1220: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. DOLD, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1258: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 1411: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 1422: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 1459: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 1464: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 1475: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. PITTINGER.
 H.R. 1516: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 1624: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1644: Mr. GRIFFITH.
 H.R. 1671: Mr. KNIGHT.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 1728: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 1733: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1737: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 1761: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 1769: Mr. COLE and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 1786: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. HAHN.
 H.R. 1814: Ms. SINEMA, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. LOEBACK.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.R. 1948: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
 H.R. 1966: Mr. PERLMUTTER and Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2013: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. LEE, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2071: Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 2072: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 2083: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2145: Mr. RIBBLE and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2156: Ms. GRAHAM, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. HULTGREN.
 H.R. 2217: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2248: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2293: Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H.R. 2306: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 2327: Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 2342: Mr. KIND, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. WELCH, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2430: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. LOWEY.
 H.R. 2449: Ms. PELOSI.
 H.R. 2463: Mr. DOLD.
 H.R. 2493: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 2494: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2513: Mr. MULLIN.
 H.R. 2539: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 2609: Mr. BRAT and Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 2622: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 2646: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2654: Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 2697: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2712: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 2715: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
 H.R. 2738: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2739: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
 H.R. 2747: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HONDA, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LEE.
 H.R. 2775: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. PIN-GREE.
 H.R. 2799: Mr. PAULSEN.
 H.R. 2811: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 2847: Mr. DENT, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
 H.R. 2858: Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. GRAYSON, and Ms. DUCKWORTH.
 H.R. 2901: Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. MULVANEY, and Mr. HILL.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 2915: Ms. LOFGREN and Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2922: Mr. BRAT.
 H.R. 2932: Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 2948: Mr. RIBBLE and Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 2957: Ms. MOORE, Ms. LEE, and Mr. LEVIN.
 H.R. 2989: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 2992: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 3025: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 3029: Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. COOK, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PIERLUISI, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. SIREN.
 H.R. 3041: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. NOLAN.
 H.R. 3121: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3136: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 3142: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. FLORES, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 3166: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. LANCE.
 H.R. 3187: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. DESJARLAIS.
 H.R. 3188: Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 3221: Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MOULTON, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 3225: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 3258: Mr. RUSH and Mr. FARR.
 H.R. 3268: Mrs. NOEM, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LEE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 3286: Ms. GRAHAM and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 3289: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3296: Mr. BRAT and Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 3338: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. LEWIS, and Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 3339: Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.R. 3364: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CARNEY.
 H.R. 3377: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3379: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3381: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. DELANEY.
 H.R. 3396: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. MACARTHUR.
 H.R. 3429: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. TIBERI, Mr. REED, Mr. FLORES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. RENACCI.
 H.R. 3443: Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Ms. MCSALLY.
 H.J. Res. 9: Mr. FLORES.
 H.J. Res. 64: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mr. BARR.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. DONOVAN.

H. Res. 12: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. CUELLAR,
and Mr. GALLEGO.

H. Res. 145: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 214: Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 261: Ms. DELBENE.

H. Res. 289: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H. Res. 318: Mr. GRAYSON and Mr. DONOVAN.

H. Res. 354: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms.
MENG, and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 410: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr.
HARRIS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, and Mr. POSEY.

SENATE—Wednesday, September 9, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, our Lord, how excellent is Your Name in all the Earth. Today, open the hearts of our lawmakers to what You have done, are doing, and will do for those who love You. As they remember how You led our Nation in the past, increase their optimism regarding what the future can bring. Help them to remember that even when wrong seems very strong, You continue to rule and that Your sovereignty will prevail.

Give us this day our daily bread, not only of physical renewal but of spiritual sustenance, lest our souls starve in the far country of neglect or indulgence.

We pray in Your great Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The majority leader is recognized.

SERIOUS DEBATE IN THE SENATE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, this afternoon the Senate will engage in a debate of immense importance to our country. I again ask every Senator to reflect upon its gravity.

At its heart, this is about more than just the short term prospects of one agreement or the long-term legacy of one President or the narrow interests of one political party. Wrapped within are larger questions about the prospects for stability in a region, the potential for safety in a nation, and the continued role for our country in a dangerous and uncertain world.

We can't escape these questions. Their answers carry the potential to touch every American and future generations.

The American people deserve our deliberate and considered responses. They deserve a Senate that can rise to the

moment. Tired talking points won't get us there. A filibuster won't do it, either. But here is what will: Respecting each other will get us there. Serious discussion will get us there. A debate worthy of the moment will get us there. So that is what I am calling for again today.

I ask every Senator to join me at their desks this afternoon so that we might listen to colleagues as well as debate colleagues. A serious debate and an open vote on this issue is the very least our country should expect. That is the least we should be able to give them.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

DEADLINES IN THE SENATE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, yesterday my friend, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER of Tennessee, said: "I recognize, and have all along, that it takes 60 Senators to advance legislation and get to a final vote on a bill or resolution." No equivocation, no dancing around the issue—the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee established what we have known all along: It takes 60 votes.

His counterpart, Senator CARDIN of Maryland, also agrees that 60 votes was always the intention. One Senator at the hearings voted no on the resolution because he didn't want it to be 60 votes. Everybody else voted for that. Forty-seven Republican Senators sent a letter to the Ayatollah, explaining to them how the Senate works. In that letter, all 47 Republican Senators acknowledged that it takes three-fifths votes to get things done here in the Senate.

So that is over and done with. The resolution before us will take 60 votes to pass. The direct quote from Senator CORKER that I read is in black and white. There aren't any words of mine; those are his words. That is a direct quote from the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

So that is what we have. Republicans have clearly conceded that it takes 60 votes to advance a resolution of disapproval.

Filibusters stop debate. We are willing to have all the debate the Republicans want—2 hours, 2 days, whatever they want. It has to be completed by next Thursday. That is the only deadline that I can see.

The good news is that Senate Democrats, of course, on this side of the

aisle, continue to propose that following ample debate, the Senate then proceed directly to a vote on final passage. Of course, it would have a 60-vote threshold, as the chairman of the committee said yesterday. There would be no need for any other procedural votes. We would just do that. There is no need for the Republican leader to continue wasting the Senate's time—and it is precious.

Look at what we have this week. There is basically one more legislative day this week. Next week, we have two days, Monday and Tuesday, which are long-time celebrations by the entire Congress of a Jewish holiday. We have the deadline of September 17 for this matter dealing with Iran to be completed, as far as Senate floor action. Staring us in the face at the end of the month is that government funding will be gone. We have to do something about that. And we know, as we have heard all the threats by Republican Senators, that we are not going to fund the government unless something is done with Planned Parenthood. Those things take time. We have to get to that. Every day we waste here on the floor, trying to figure out what the Republicans want to do, is time that we should be spending on how we are going to fund the government.

There is no question that the Republican leader now has a very real and important decision to make. We have a lot of work to do this month. We can't afford to waste time with unnecessary procedural votes.

We also have some things we have to be involved in here that are going to slow up what we do. We have the President of China coming toward the end of the month. We have the Pope coming. We expect as many as 500,000 people here on both sides of the Capitol during the short time the Pope is here on Capitol Hill.

We have so many things to do. We need to have a path forward, as I mentioned already, to keep the Federal Government from shutting down because of a lack of funding. We need to figure out a way to keep our highway trust fund solvent, which it is not now. We need to do something about cyber security, and we need to consider important tax extenders legislation, as well as how to avoid default on the debt limit. They are all going to converge at about the same time.

Senate Democrats and Senate Republicans have very real deadlines that we must meet. We can't meet them because of the procedure in the Senate unless the Republican leader allows us to have some time on the floor. What

we don't have is time to waste on Republican-contrived procedural fights that have no basis in fact or reality. It is time for Republicans to abandon their plans to slow down a vote on final passage of the Iran nuclear agreement resolution of disapproval and move on to other matters.

Mr. President, would the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2641 (to amend amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2642 (to amend amendment No. 2641), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2643 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2644 (to amend amendment No. 2643), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2645, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2646 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2645), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2647 (to amend amendment No. 2646), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that until 12:30 p.m. today, the time during quorum calls be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, if I might, through the Chair, if Senator CORKER would like to take his 5 minutes first, I am happy to allow that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for her tremendous courtesy, and I will actually take 1 minute.

This afternoon we are going to have a very sober and dignified debate about

a foreign policy issue of huge consequence to our Nation and certainly to the world. I wish to thank Senator MCCONNELL and Senator REID for setting up a format that reflects that. I know many of my friends on the other side of the aisle have been concerned about amendments that may call for this to be a different type of debate. I would like to point out that the leader yesterday filled the tree. I just want people to know that.

I wish to thank Senator CARDIN and Senator MENENDEZ before him for the way we have all been able to work through a lot of issues that have come up. What I hope doesn't happen today is that, somehow or another, we begin referring back to incidents and trying to turn this into some type of partisan debate. We worked through August. Things happened all along the way. We worked through those. We ended up with the ability as a Congress, on an executive agreement, which we all know was meant to be implemented without any congressional involvement whatsoever, going straight to the U.N. Security Council—we all worked together to figure out a way to have this debate and then vote on the substance of this legislation.

So I want to thank my friends on both sides of the aisle. It passed overwhelmingly—98 to 1. I think, actually, the Senator from California was absent on that day. I look forward to a very substantive debate taking place on this most important issue.

Later today, I will have longer and more formal comments to make about the substance of what was agreed to by the administration and other countries involved in the process.

I am looking forward to this. I want to say again to my friends on the other side of the aisle that I think we set this up in a manner to be a dignified, sober debate about one of the most important foreign policy issues that will come before us. Thankfully it is coming before us because we all forced it to come before us, to have this debate, and to be able to weigh in.

I yield the floor. I thank very much the Senator from California for her courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I wish to thank my chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, for his courtesies. We do not agree on this particular matter, but there are a lot of matters when it comes to foreign policy on which we do agree. I do agree this should be a very straightforward debate—either you are for this agreement or you are not.

I think the fact that Congress is voting on it is good. I did support that in the committee. That calls for regular order as far as the way we treat this very important vote.

I am very proud to stand here today as the longest serving member sitting

on the Foreign Relations Committee today. Out of all of the members, I have been there the longest. When I got there, I did not have these gray hairs. I am not blaming any of the topics that came before us for these gray hairs; however, we have had some tough debates, and this certainly is one of them. I know my friend has a lot to do. I just want to say I was pleased to yield to him because I think he has set the right tone.

Colleagues, this is a vote we are going to long remember, a vote on an arms control agreement that came about for only one reason. That reason is, our President and his team—former Senator John Kerry, now Secretary of State; Wendy Sherman, the chief negotiator—they were part of the team, and many others worked tirelessly against the most vitriolic opposition.

The President stood firm. I want to say to him today: Thank you, Mr. President. In that race for President that you ran, you were very clear that you were going to reach out your hand and see if we could avoid another war in the Middle East. I hope and pray this Senate will give us and the world this opportunity.

As the President has said, a military option is always on the table. It is in our Constitution that the President can respond to a threat. So nothing in this agreement takes a military response off the table. But it does say that diplomacy should have a chance to work. This diplomacy includes much of the world. That is why it is so remarkable.

I also want to give special thanks to two former Secretaries of State—Colin Powell, a Republican, and Hillary Clinton, a Democrat—for weighing in on the side of diplomacy. As Senators, we deal with thousands of issues in the course of our careers, but we will long remember those that actually change the course of history. Those kinds of votes are votes of conscience, and they are votes about which we must look deeply into our hearts and into our minds. We have to look at the facts. Facts are stubborn things. No matter what 30-second ad there is, no matter what newspaper ad there is, there are facts that are obvious. I want to go through those facts. I have them here on this chart.

One, this agreement cuts off the uranium pathway to a bomb. It does it by reducing Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent and severely restricting its ability to enrich uranium. That is No. 1.

Two, it cuts off the plutonium pathway to a bomb. They do that by dismantling Iran's Arak reactor's core and replacing it with a core that cannot produce weapons-grade plutonium. That is the second part of the agreement.

Three, it includes the most intrusive inspections regime ever negotiated.

Let me repeat that. The deal includes the most intrusive inspections regime ever negotiated. This means 24/7 monitoring of Iran's declared sites as well as inspections to the entire nuclear supply chain, from its uranium mines and mills, to its conversion facility, to its centrifuge manufacturing and storage facility. This is critical. It provides the International Atomic Energy Agency—you will hear it referred to as the IAEA—with the mechanism to require that Iran grant access to its suspicious sites. No other international agreement has ever done this before. So when you hear colleagues say, "Well, Iran has 24 days, you know, to hide things," all the experts will tell you that you can hide a computer, but you cannot hide nuclear material. It has a half-life of thousands of years. But no other international agreement, not even the agreements we have with the IAEA, say that the IAEA has a deadline where access has to be granted to suspicious sites.

Next, it requires the Iranians to disclose their past nuclear activities before they can receive any sanctions relief. Let me say that again. The Iranians have to disclose their past nuclear activities before they can receive any sanctions relief.

Lastly, if Iran cheats, the United States and our allies will be able to snap back multilateral sanctions. There is a process there that gives us a lot of power to do that.

Because of all of this, more than 100 nations support this deal, including many of our closest allies, such as the United Kingdom, Germany, Australia, France, Japan, and Canada—100 nations. That is why 29 of the Nation's top scientists, including 6 Nobel laureates, call the deal "innovative and stringent" and even say it can serve as a "guidepost for future agreements." One hundred nations, 29 of our Nation's top scientists. That is also why 60 bipartisan national security leaders support it, including leaders such as Madeleine Albright, Thomas Pickering, and Ryan Crocker. You know those names. You know those people. They have integrity. They have intelligence. They have experience. They were appointed by Republicans and Democrats alike. They point out that there are no viable alternatives to this agreement. They are right.

Anyone—you are going to hear this from my Republican friends—anyone who says we should go back to the bargaining table—and you are going to hear this over and over again: Oh, just go back to the bargaining table. Anyone who says that after 20 months of negotiations and huge support in the world is either engaging in fantasy or they truly want to sink this deal. So if you hear somebody say, "Oh, just go back to the table. Just forget the support of the 100 nations. Just go back and renegotiate this deal," let me tell

you, they are either engaging in fantasy or they want to sink this deal. There is a hard, cold truth here: If we walk away, there will be no agreement. Let's be clear. If that is your position, why don't you say it? But don't say "Go back to the negotiating table. No problem." If we walk away, there will be no agreement. America will be isolating itself and undermining its role as a global leader on arms control. That is why more than 100 former U.S. Ambassadors say that without this deal, "the risks to the security of the United States and our friends and allies would be far greater." Let me say that again. One hundred former U.S. Ambassadors from both parties say that "the risks to the security of the United States and our friends and allies would be far greater" than if we do the deal.

We know right now that Iran has enough nuclear material to build 10 nuclear weapons. So whom are you kidding when you say the world will be safer if this agreement falls and Iran is left to continue the dangerous course it began way back in 1984? We passed sanctions. We did it right here. I spoke on that. I said: We have to keep our eye on Iran. We don't trust them. So they came to the table.

Opposing this agreement means walking away—walking away from the very strategy we embraced when we placed sanctions on Iran. It means walking away from our best friends, our allies, and our trading partners.

When you probe the opponents of this deal and you say, "Well, if you go back to the table, you are going to lose 100 nations, many of them our best friends," do you know what they say? "Oh, we can just sanction those friends. We can just sanction those allies. We can just sanction those trading partners." Can you imagine going after our best friends? Is that a winning strategy? That is another example of the opponents dreaming or scheming—dreaming of a successful go-it-alone strategy or scheming for another war in the Middle East. Those options—go it alone or a war—are self-inflicted wounds we can ill afford.

Let's put up the statement by Philip Hammond, the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary. This is what he said. In a meeting with the various Ambassadors of the countries that cut this deal, the same thing was said, but let's say it the way he did. This is the United Kingdom Foreign Secretary:

If the United States were to walk away from this deal, international unity would disintegrate. The hardliners in Iran would be strengthened, and we would lose the most effective path to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

Philip Hammond, the UK Foreign Secretary.

So, again, look at what he is saying. He is saying that if we walk away, the hardliners in Iran would be strength-

ened. They would win. So I ask opponents of this deal: Why do you want to stand with the hardliners in Iran? Because you are standing with the hardliners in Iran who shout "Death to America," "Death to Israel." You are standing with them. They want to kill the deal.

I am under no illusion that this agreement solves all of our problems with Iran. I am under no illusions that this agreement will make Iran suddenly some positive player on the world stage that we can cozy up to. No. No. That is why this agreement is not based on trust. As Hillary Clinton said today, it is based on distrust and verification. She is right. This agreement is also based on the most stringent inspection regime ever negotiated. Iran is a bad and a dangerous actor. I do not think there is any disagreement on that. That is why its nonnuclear activities will remain subject to tough sanctions. But here is the ultimate question each of us must ask ourselves: Would we rather have a bad and dangerous actor with a nuclear bomb or a bad and dangerous actor without a nuclear bomb? My kids would say that is a no-brainer. The answer is obvious. We don't want Iran with a nuclear bomb. That is why we need this deal. If Iran cheats, it will be in front of the whole world. I will be among the first to consider any and all options.

I began by saying this is one of the most important votes we will ever cast in our lifetime. I am reminded of another one, my vote against the Iraq war. It was lonely then—only 23 of us—but you have to look at the situation. Some of the leading voices against this deal were the very same people who brought us the Iraq war.

Remember Paul Wolfowitz saying the Iraqis would "greet us as liberators"?

Remember Dick Cheney, who is out there now saying: Vote no on this deal. Oh, it is terrible.

Remember what he said as he drew us into Iraq? He said there was "no doubt that Saddam Hussein now has weapons of mass destruction." And remember when he said the whole war would be "weeks rather than months"? I remember that after 10 years of war.

Remember Bill Kristol saying we would "be vindicated when we discover the weapons of mass destruction"?

And, remember, some of our colleagues who are here today pushed hard for the Iraq war and said it would be great for America and great for Israel. Well, they were wrong then, and they are wrong now.

Look, it is no secret that the Prime Minister of our great ally, Israel, is on the other side of this argument, but we must also remember that Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu was a cheerleader for the Iraq war and said in 2002: "If you take out . . . Saddam's regime,

I guarantee you that it will have enormous positive reverberations on the region." Prime Minister Netanyahu argued for the Iraq war saying: "I guarantee you that it will have enormous positive reverberations on the region."

Positive reverberations? Instead, devastating consequences. More than 4,000 of our brave American men and women were killed and nearly 32,000 wounded. We know that a lot of the Baathists joined ISIS, and the Baathists were loyal to Saddam. Now they are guiding ISIS. No positive reverberations there, devastating consequences.

If we were completely honest and we really asked the question: Who won the war in Iraq? The answer comes back, Iran. Iran. They have never had more influence in modern times on Iraq than they have today. That is why, as a stalwart supporter of Israel and the Israeli-American relationship, I strongly support this deal.

I am the proud author of the last two United States-Israel security bills passed by Congress. They were called the United States-Israel Enhanced Security Cooperation Act of 2012 and the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2014. I believe, as the author of those two bills that President Obama signed, this deal makes the United States safer, it makes Israel safer, and it makes the entire world safer.

I said that Prime Minister Netanyahu is very clearly opposed, but let's look at some of the top military experts in Israel—experts who understand what is paramount to Israel's security.

Let's look at Ami Ayalon. He is a former head of Shin Bet, Israel's internal security service. He said: "When it comes to Iran's nuclear capability, this [deal] is the best option. . . ." Now this isn't just some citizen in the street; this is the former head of Shin Bet, Israel's internal security service, saying this.

Then there is Amram Mitzna, a retired major general in the Israel Defense Forces, the IDF, former member of the Knesset and former mayor of Haifa, who said: "For Israel's sake and all the people of the Middle East, we must not miss this opportunity."

Then there is Efraim Halevy, former director of the Mossad, who said: "Without an agreement, Iran will be free to act as it wishes. . . ."

Let me repeat that. This is the former director of the Mossad, who said: "Without an agreement, Iran will be free to act as it wishes. . . ."

These leaders from Israel whom I have quoted are some of the most knowledgeable in the world when it comes to Israel's security, and they believe this deal will make Israel safer. It doesn't change the fact that the Israeli Government opposes this. I agree with that; I understand that. But there is a split in Israel, and it is worth commenting on it.

With their expertise and their knowledge, these endorsements by these Israelis should be taken seriously. Also, the endorsements from our current and former colleagues in Congress should be taken seriously.

Eleven Jewish former Members have weighed in, saying: "We championed the U.S.-Israel alliance . . . and we all strongly support this agreement because it will enhance the security of the U.S., the State of Israel, and the entire world."

I thank them for weighing in. This is one of those debates that is very hard—regardless of your position—because it is emotional, it is difficult, and yet they weighed in, as did the Israeli security experts. Believe me, the pressure on them not to talk was enormous.

This deal also has the support of some of the most knowledgeable and respected foreign policy lawmakers who ever served in Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two opinion pieces, one written by Senators Carl Levin and John Warner and another by Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Aug. 13, 2015]

WHY HAWKS SHOULD ALSO BACK THE IRAN DEAL

(By Carl Levin and John Warner)

We both were elected to the Senate in 1978 and privileged to have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee for 30 years, during which we each held committee leadership positions of chairman or ranking minority member. We support the Iran Agreement negotiated by the United States and other leading world powers for many reasons, including its limitations on Iran's nuclear activities, its strong inspections regime, and the ability to quickly re-impose sanctions should Iran violate its provisions.

But we also see a compelling reason to support the agreement that has gotten little attention: Rejecting it would weaken the deterrent value of America's military option.

As former chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have always believed that the U.S. should keep a strong military option on the table. If Iran pursues a nuclear weapon, some believe that military action is inevitable if we're to prevent it from reaching its goal. We don't subscribe to that notion, but we are skeptical that, should Iran attempt to consider moving to a nuclear weapon, we could deter them from pursuing it through economic sanctions alone.

How does rejecting the agreement give America a weaker military hand to play? Let's imagine a world in which the United States rejects the nuclear accord that all other parties have embraced. The sanctions now in place would likely not be maintained and enforced by all the parties to the agreement, so those would lose their strong deterrent value. Iran would effectively argue to the world that it had been willing to negotiate an agreement, only to have that agreement rejected by a recalcitrant America.

In that world, should we find credible evidence that Iran is starting to move toward a

nuclear weapon, the United States would almost certainly consider use of the military option to stop that program. But it's highly unlikely that our traditional European allies, let alone China and Russia, would support the use of the military option since we had undermined the diplomatic path. Iran surely would know this, and so from the start, would have less fear of a military option than if it faced a unified coalition.

While the United States would certainly provide the greatest combat power in any military action, allies and other partners make valuable contributions—not just in direct participation, but also in access rights, logistics, intelligence, and other critical support. If we reject the agreement, we risk isolating ourselves and damaging our ability to assemble the strongest possible coalition to stop Iran.

In short, then, rejecting the Iran deal would erode the current deterrent value of the military option, making it more likely Iran might choose to pursue a nuclear weapon, and would then make it more costly for the U.S. to mount any subsequent military operation. It would tie the hands of any future president trying to build international participation and support for military force against Iran should that be necessary.

Those who think the use of force against Iran is almost inevitable should want the military option to be as credible and effective as possible, both as a deterrent to Iran's nuclear ambitions and in destroying Iran's nuclear weapons program should that become necessary. For that to be the case, the United States needs to be a party to the agreement rather than being the cause of its collapse.

In our many years on the Armed Services Committee, we saw time and again how America is stronger when we fight alongside allies. Iran must constantly be kept aware that a collective framework of deterrence stands resolute, and that if credible evidence evolves that Iran is taking steps towards a nuclear arsenal, it would face the real possibility of military action by a unified coalition of nations to stop their efforts.

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

[Aug. 30, 2015]

THERE ARE NO PERFECT NUCLEAR DEALS

(By Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar)

During the Cold War both Republican and Democratic presidents accepted less-than-perfect arms pacts with the Soviets. We need to do the same with Iran.

At the height of the Cold War, the Soviet Union had thousands of nuclear warheads aimed at American cities, and the Soviets were subject to numerous arms controls agreements. But progress was hard-fought and incremental at best. In an ideal world, the Soviet Union would have agreed to more severe constraints than those agreed by Presidents Kennedy, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan and Bush, for example. It would have dismantled all of its nuclear weapons, stopped its human rights abuses and halted its meddling around the world.

But, as all of these presidents—Democratic and Republican—understood, holding out for the impossible is a recipe for no progress at

all. Congress should take the same approach today to the Iran nuclear deal.

We know something about the long history of such agreements. During our combined 60 years in the U.S. Senate, we participated in countless meetings, hearings and trips around the globe focused on reducing the threats posed by weapons of mass destruction. The centerpiece of our efforts was the Nunn-Lugar Act, passed in 1991, which was the basis for two decades of hard work that resulted in the safeguarding and deactivation of more than 7,000 nuclear warheads, hundreds of missiles and bombers, and numerous other elements of the former Soviet Union's WMD programs.

These experiences underscored for us that arms control agreements are rarely finished absolutes. Inevitably, their success depends on many factors that play out after the agreement is signed, including alliance cohesion, congressional funding for implementation and the political will of the parties to ensure verification and enforcement.

Over the next several weeks, every member of Congress will have the opportunity to weigh the terms of the nuclear agreement against all viable alternatives. In our view, the key questions regarding this agreement are: Will it stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon? What are the risks of going forward with this agreement? And what are the risks if Congress rejects the agreement?

The plus-sides of this deal are clear. It includes severe restrictions on uranium enrichment and plutonium production, required transparency into Iranian activities and inspection provisions to assure the international community that Iran's nuclear program is, and remains, peaceful. Reports that Iran will simply inspect itself to address unresolved allegations about its nuclear behavior have been refuted by the head of the International Atomic Energy Agency, who has stated that the arrangements are technically sound, consistent with the IAEA's long-established practices and do not compromise IAEA safeguards standards in any way. Importantly, the agreement taken as a whole will help deter Iranian cheating and provide the means to detect violations in time to take strong action if required.

Could we conceive a stronger deal? Of course—that has been true of every arms control negotiation. We have heard critics suggest that Iran would have agreed to entirely dismantle its nuclear enrichment facilities and stop all activities related to its civil nuclear program if only the U.S. had been tougher in negotiations. But had the U.S. taken such an approach in the early 1990s, we would not have encouraged and helped Russia, Ukraine, Kazakhstan and Belarus safely accelerate the destruction of their weapons and materials of mass destruction, and the risk of accidents or catastrophic terrorism would have been far higher over the past 20 years.

Although there are no absolute guarantees, nor can there be in diplomatic accords, our bottom line is that this agreement makes it far less likely that the Iranians will acquire a nuclear weapon over the next 15 years.

As to risks in going forward with the agreement, Congress must listen carefully to both our intelligence community and the IAEA's views on any possible weaknesses in the verification regime, and then work with these entities to mitigate any vulnerabilities, both now and in the years ahead.

As with other agreements, Congress must recognize that there is no such thing as "perfect" verification. What is crucial, however, is whether "effective" verification can be

achieved. Can cheating be detected in time to take action before Iran could achieve a militarily significant advance? We believe the answer to that question is yes. The monitoring and verification provisions of this agreement are unprecedented in the history of arms control in their comprehensiveness and intrusiveness, and together with our intelligence capabilities should give us powerful tools to achieve effective verification.

Opponents of this agreement have offered criticism that sanctions relief would provide Iran with additional resources that would enable it to intensify its destabilizing behavior in the region. This is a risk, but the argument that this risk can be avoided or reduced by the defeat of this agreement rests on a patently false assumption. Anyone believing that the present effective economic sanctions will be continued by Russia, China, India and other nations if Congress rejects this agreement is in a dream world. This agreement and the alliance that brought Iran to the negotiating table through sanctions has focused on Iran's nuclear activities, not its regional behavior, though both are serious dangers. This alliance could never have been brought or held together to pursue a broad, nuclear and regional agenda on which alliance partners themselves strongly disagree.

With or without this agreement, the U.S. must continue and intensify our efforts with other partners to challenge and counter Iran's destabilizing regional activities and strengthen our cooperation with Israel and the Gulf States. If this agreement is rejected, both of these objectives become more difficult.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, members of Congress must think long and hard about the consequences if this agreement is turned down. There is no escaping the conclusion that there will inevitably be grave implications for U.S. security and for U.S. international leadership in the decades ahead. Sanctions allies will go their own way, reducing the effectiveness of our financial tools and leaving Iran in a stronger position across the board. Any future effort by this president or the next to assemble a "sanctions coalition" relating to Iran or other security challenges will be weakened. U.S. leadership, diplomacy and credibility, including efforts to achieve support for possible military action against Iran, will all be severely damaged.

If, however, the Iran agreement is upheld by Congress, the hard work of monitoring and enforcement is just beginning. This Congress and future Congresses, as well as future presidents, have a large and continuing role to play in the decades ahead if "stopping the Iranian bomb" is to become a reality. Congress must insist that Iran be held to its commitments while not obstructing the agreement. The U.S. must make clear our commitment to the security of our allies and friends in the Middle East, through security assistance and a clear policy that Iranian meddling in the region will be firmly resisted. It must be clear which congressional committees are responsible for oversight and monitoring of implementation and compliance. There should also be clear requirements for the president to report to Congress on intelligence associated with Iran. In addition, Congress must provide funding to the IAEA for its activities in monitoring Iranian compliance with this agreement as well as other nuclear proliferation activities in the Gulf region.

These crucial September votes will require members to search their own consciences.

Whether they vote "yea" or "nay," they must first look in the mirror and ask whether they are putting our nation's interest first.

Our own conviction is that this agreement represents our best chance to stop an Iranian bomb without another war in the Middle East.

Mrs. BOXER. These are two Democrats, two Republicans, leaders all—respected, effective. These former colleagues understand the risks of military action, and they are right. They know this deal doesn't rule out the use of military force. The United States can strike if we need to, but we must first try diplomacy. Since when are we afraid of that?

We can try diplomacy because we are the most powerful Nation on Earth. We should try diplomacy, and if it fails, we always have all options on the table—as our President has said, as I have said, as everyone has said.

It is striking to me that we don't have one Republican for this. I am kind of amazed. All of the focus was on the Democrats, really. A few are opposing and a vast majority are for it.

I am surprised that a Richard Lugar couldn't sway anybody, that a Colin Powell couldn't sway anybody, that a John Warner couldn't sway anybody, and, also, the religious communities across the United States apparently aren't swaying anybody. It is telling that 340 U.S. rabbis fear that if the United States rejects the deal: "... the outcome will be the collapse of the international sanctions regime, an Iranian race for nuclear weapons ... [and] isolation of Israel and the United States from international partners."

There is also support from more than 53 Christian leaders and the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, who referred to Pope Francis's hope for a deal that he says is a "definitive step toward a more secure and fraternal world."

I don't know why we haven't been able to really see bipartisan support in the Senate. I am puzzled by it. I am saddened by it. It appears to me this is political. President Obama wants it. He worked hard for it. They don't like it. This is what I think.

I may be wrong, but it is hard for me to imagine, with all of these solid Republicans in favor of this deal outside of the Senate and the House, we cannot seem to have bipartisanship. These faith leaders are speaking on behalf of their synagogues, on behalf their congregations, and their faithful. They are speaking for so many Americans, so many Americans who have prayed on this issue and have come to the conclusion that it is best for our Nation.

Believe me, it is easier to say no. You can always say: Well, I don't like page 4, line 2.

A deal by its very nature is not perfect. It is not. That is why it is a deal. Otherwise it would be a fiat. Oh, I want this. OK. We make deals. We do it here

all the time, but somehow this deal—because it isn't perfect and everyone agrees it isn't perfect—somehow we cannot seem to get bipartisanship. It breaks my heart, frankly.

Colleagues, this is really a major moment for us, as individuals and for our Nation. We will be judged on this vote, and we should be judged on this vote. We should be judged on votes that could lead to another war in the Middle East. At least one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle admitted his truthful position. I respect that. He said we can "set Iran's nuclear facilities back to day zero" using military force.

He is voting no on this agreement, and anyone else who joins him should know this: to walk away means Iran could continue its nuclear program at will. This is not acceptable, and it means a path to war.

Let us not tiptoe around this. This option, the option of no agreement, isn't going back to the bargaining table because everyone has said—very clearly, all our allies—they are not going back to the bargaining table.

So we have no agreement, and to walk away means the international sanctions collapse. If we think that we, ourselves, can now turn to our best friends and allies, such as the United Kingdom, and say: Well, if you don't go along with us, we are not trading with you anymore—that is not going to happen.

To walk away means Iran continues its nuclear program because there won't be a deal. To walk away means we will find ourselves isolated from some of our best allies in the world. Remember, 100 nations support this deal, including the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Australia, Japan, and Canada. To walk away—I believe—means war, and the other side would say: Oh, that is just a scare tactic.

It is not a scare tactic. If you cannot go back to the negotiating table because nobody is going back there with you—you can go back. You will be there by yourself. Iran walks away. They continue with their program, and we are not going to stand for that. We have all said that.

So to walk away, in my view, means war. Because when we walk away, there is no deal. Iran keeps its nuclear program, and that cannot be allowed to happen.

Another one of our colleagues whom we serve with—and I have a lot of respect for and a good friendship with—one said: Bomb, bomb, bomb, bomb Iran.

You remember that. He is going to vote no on this deal, and that is going to move us more toward his reality.

Wars are easy to start, and they are hard to end. Wars are a stain on the human race, and we should do everything in our power to avoid war. Now, avoiding war does not mean giving up

strength because, again, a military response to Iran is always on the table. And if Iran violates the deal, the whole world will know it. It will be right out there, and the whole world will stand with us in taking action.

Diplomacy is the first resort; war is the last resort. I have voted for war, OK. I said: Let's go after bin Laden. I voted for that war. It is easy to start, hard to end.

So, my colleagues, I will say it again. This is our chance, and this is our choice. History will judge us.

With this one vote, we have the chance to seize a historic opportunity to once again make America a shining example of leadership. With this vote, we have a chance, a real chance, to make this world safer right now for our children and our grandchildren.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from California for her service on the Foreign Relations Committee and her passionate comments. Obviously, I am in a very different place policywise than she is.

I do want to point out there is bipartisanship here. There is bipartisan disapproval. While I know the Senator from California knows a great deal about foreign policy, as she is the longest serving member on the committee, the two who have spent more time than anyone understanding the nature of this deal, the impact it is going to have on the region—more time because there has been more meetings with them—are the two Democrats, the ranking member today and the former ranking member, who both oppose this. So there is bipartisanship.

I don't view this as political at all. I think we have been able to establish a strong bipartisan bill to vote on this. We have strong bipartisanship in both bodies, I might say, in the House and the Senate, in opposing this.

I hope what we will be able to do is not cast aspersions about people's motives but really debate this on the substance.

If I could, and then I will be glad to take my colleague's question.

Without objection, I would like to yield the remainder of Republican time as in morning business in this manner: 20 minutes to Senator CRUZ, who I think will be here momentarily; 20 minutes to Senator MCCAIN; 15 minutes to Senator VITTER; and 5 minutes to Senator KIRK.

I don't want to burn up a lot of our time, but if there is no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. I will be glad to take my colleague's question briefly, but I don't want to burn up a lot of our time.

Mrs. BOXER. Briefly, this is not a lot.

What I wanted to point out is exactly that; that you do have a few Democrats, I think four Democrats, who have come down "no," but we don't have one Republican on the other side. That was the only point I was making.

So my colleague is right. You have bipartisanship, but I am asking where are the Republicans supporting this? It just seems odd to me. And to me it does feel political from your side because when you have Colin Powell, who is for the agreement, and you have John Warner and other Republicans—former ambassadors and military people—it just seems odd. I was making that point.

But my colleague is right. You do have bipartisan support on your side, and I am lamenting the fact that we don't have it on ours because it doesn't feel right to me, having gone through these debates in the past.

Mr. CORKER. I think in closing—I will leave the floor, so I am not burning up any more of our time—but I think there are very legitimate concerns about the fact we began this to dismantle Iran's nuclear program, to end their program, per the President, and by approval of this deal we actually are approving the industrialization of Iran's nuclear program—the greatest state sponsor of terror in the world. Obviously, that creates a lot of issues and concerns. That is why, I believe, we see so many people disapproving of this agreement.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, let's start out with a little simple math: 58 to 42 is not a victory for the side with 42. Even in the case of ObamaCare—a truly disastrous piece of legislation which was forced through the Congress on purely partisan lines—that legislation received a majority. This isn't even close. Because not only has the Republican caucus held firm and unanimously rejected this catastrophic deal, we have also been joined by colleagues from across the aisle who are not blinded by partisan politics and understand the threat that is posed by President Obama's proposed nuclear deal with Iran.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge them, as they are among those who know best how bad this deal is. First, Senator CHUCK SCHUMER of New York, who has been a long-time advocate for the State of Israel. It is no secret Senator SCHUMER and I have had our disagreements on a great many

issues, but I have been proud to stand with him for Israel and against this Iranian nuclear deal, and I was proud to stand with Senator SCHUMER when Congress voted unanimously on the legislation I introduced to ban a known terrorist—Hamid Aboutalebi, who participated in the 1979 Iranian hostage-taking—from becoming Iran's Ambassador to the United Nations.

Senator BOB MENENDEZ of New Jersey, the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, has likewise come out against this catastrophic deal. Senator MENENDEZ and I have worked together on a wide range of issues, including legislation to provide a Rewards for Justice reward last summer of \$5 million for the capture or kill of the Hamas terrorist who murdered Israeli American teenager Naftali Fraenkel and his two teenage friends.

Senator BEN CARDIN of Maryland, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, whose name is on the legislation on which we are scheduled to vote this week. Certainly Senator CARDIN knows as much about this deal as anyone, and his opposition should make all Senators, particularly Democratic Senators, take note.

Senator JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia, my colleague on the Senate Committee on Armed Services, who understands the threats to national security posed by this Iranian nuclear deal, I was honored to work with him and have his support for the resolution I introduced condemning Hamas's use of human shields during Israel's action in Gaza last summer—a disgusting terrorist tactic that was aided and abetted by Hamas's Iranian sponsors.

Democrats should take note that the ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, the former ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Democrat scheduled to be the next Democratic leader have all come out and valued national security above partisan loyalty. That ought to be reason to cause every other Democratic Member of this body to take a second assessment of their own decisions.

I also want to mention Senator CHRIS COONS of Delaware, who even though he plans, unfortunately, to vote in favor of this deal, maintains it should go to a vote and not go into effect by default because the minority can block cloture through a filibuster. In these dark times, it is at least encouraging to know there are still a handful of Democrats who, in the tradition of Scoop Jackson, JFK, and Joe Lieberman, are willing to put country in front of party, are willing to defend national security. That used to be a robust tradition on the Democratic side of the aisle. I would that there were more Scoop Jackson Democrats in the United States Senate. I would that there were more JFK Democrats in the

United States Senate. I would that there were more Joe Lieberman Democrats in the United States Senate.

It is also telling that not a single Republican was persuaded by the President and Secretary of State when they told us this is the only option; that it is this deal, this catastrophic deal, or war and that this is the very best deal we could have gotten. If that is so, we shouldn't have been negotiating in the first place.

Indeed, as Israel's Prime Minister Netanyahu noted, the one person telling the truth about this deal is Iran's President Ruhani, who observed that Iran has gotten everything they wanted from this deal because this deal is, as Prime Minister Netanyahu predicted, a very bad deal and a historic mistake.

First and foremost, this terrible deal will not stop a virulently anti-American and anti-Israeli regime from getting a nuclear bomb. The so-called Supreme Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, declared that Israel—which he calls the Little Satan—would be nothing in 25 years and that those 25 years would be made miserable because of the heroic attacks of radical Islamic jihadists. America, he said, was the Great Satan. He didn't say this in 1979. He tweeted it yesterday.

This is the Ayatollah Khamenei, the person with whom the administration is making a deal that facilitates his having nuclear weapons. He is being candid. He is telling us he intends to do everything possible to murder as many Israelis as possible and to murder as many Americans as possible.

President Obama's deal, if it goes through, will allow Khamenei and his fellow mullahs to retain their centrifuges. They have established their "right to enrich" uranium. They have rejected attempts to inspect their sites with possible military dimensions related to their nuclear program. Indeed, this deal is without any credible inspection mechanism.

Not long ago, the administration was promising the American people so-called "anytime, anywhere inspections." Those inspections quickly morphed into inspections with 24 days' advance notice—plenty of time to ensure that the inspections will never uncover the cheating.

But even more laughable, even more farcical, this deal doesn't rely on American inspectors; it doesn't rely on international inspectors. This deal trusts the Iranians to inspect themselves. It is not much of an exaggeration to say the inspection regime envisioned in this deal is simply picking up the phone, calling the Ayatollah Khamenei, and asking: Are you developing nuclear weapons? No. Very good; thank you.

That is a regime designed to facilitate cheating, to facilitate surreptitious development of nuclear weapons

with \$150 billion to fuel and fund that development.

Beyond that, the deal actually obligates signatories to assist Iran in developing their program, which, remarkably, the Secretary of State suggests will be used to try to cure cancer, and, even more remarkably, obligates signatories to assist Iran in defending against efforts by the nation of Israel to stop a nuclear weapons regime. That is a remarkable commitment Senate Democrats have signed on to.

In addition, this terrible deal makes concessions to Iran completely unrelated to the nuclear program. For example, it provides sanctions relief for designated terrorists such as General Suleimani, the head of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard's elite Quds Force, who should have no association with the Iranian nuclear program whatsoever. Iran and the Iranian regime maintain that the nuclear program is not a military program. Then why is a military general covered in this agreement—this man, General Suleimani, who has blood on his hands from the IEDs that he funneled into Iraq that murdered and maimed hundreds of American service men and women?

And even while Iranians such as Suleimani get relief, four Americans were cruelly excluded from this deal: Pastor Saeed Abedini, an American citizen imprisoned for 8 years in an Iranian prison for the crime of preaching the Gospel; former marine Amir Hekmati; Washington Post reporter Jason Rezaian; and Bob Levinson. It is a disgrace on our Nation that we agreed to any deal with Tehran before they were liberated.

Finally, this terrible deal provides Iran with some \$150 billion in economic relief, which will inevitably be used to finance the violent terrorist mayhem that has been a signature of the Islamic Republic since the 1979 revolution. It will, in effect, make the U.S. Government the leading international financier of terrorism. We haven't even voted yet on this deal, and we are already seeing the consequences play out in real time. Senior Iranian officials, including Suleimani, who is technically still under a U.N. travel ban, have traveled to Moscow to make arms deals with Vladimir Putin—arms that will flow to Iran's terrorist proxies, from Yemen to Gaza to Lebanon to Syria. Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad has gotten an economic lifeline in the form of a \$1 billion line of credit. Senior Iranian officials have announced to the media they will redouble their support for Hamas because they "reject the existence of any Israeli on this earth."

If we want to understand who we are dealing with, that clarifies exactly what their intent is. In other words, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, Iran, just got a \$150 billion windfall courtesy of the U.S. Government.

The grim consequences of this activity can be seen on our TV screens as we witness hundreds of thousands of panicked refugees fleeing out of places where Iran's proxies are active. Of course, ISIS and its affiliates bear significant responsibility for this crisis. But make no mistake about it; Tehran's bloody fingerprints are all over it as well. From the Houthis to Hamas to Hezbollah, they are enabling and financing the radical Islamic terrorists who are making life, from North Africa to the Middle East, utterly untenable. They are murdering Christians and Jews and other Muslims who do not embrace their radical jihadist dream.

This isn't complicated. The American people know this is a terrible deal. That is why President Obama has only been able to persuade a minority of their duly elected representatives to support it. It is why, as Secretary Kerry frankly admitted, they didn't even try to submit their deal to the Senate as a treaty, as they should have done. They prefer to jam it through by default or by Presidential veto—anything to get what they believe will be a domestic political legacy. How typical it is of the Washington cartel that one-third of one House of Congress is trying to force this catastrophic deal on our country.

Yet even in the face of 42 Democrats making a decision to value partisan loyalty over the national security of our country, over standing with our friend and ally the nation of Israel, and over protecting the lives of millions of Americans—even in the face of that—there are still serious steps we can take right now. There are two individuals in Washington, DC, who have the capacity still to stop this deal. Their names are Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL and Speaker of the House JOHN BOEHNER. Corker-Cardin was, unfortunately, a very weak piece of review legislation, but it did have one small bit of teeth in it that ought to be used. Under Corker-Cardin, the review period does not start until the administration submits the entirety of the deal to Congress. That entirety is defined under Corker-Cardin to include any and all side deals.

This deal has at least two side deals with the IAEA concerning inspections. It is the laughable inspection regime that trusts the Iranians to inspect themselves. Those side deals have not been submitted to Congress. Under the terms of Corker-Cardin, the review period has not started and does not start until the entire deal is submitted to Congress, and the President cannot lift these sanctions until the review period expires.

So therefore, I call upon the leadership of my party—Leader MCCONNELL, Speaker BOEHNER—simply to enforce the terms of Corker-Cardin. The administration has not submitted the

deal. Accordingly, we should not be voting on a resolution of disapproval because the Corker-Cardin clock never began to start, and under Corker-Cardin, until the clock starts, the sanctions can't be lifted.

Republicans in this body should not be facilitating this President's yet again disregarding the law and doing so in contravention of the national security interests of this country.

Two final observations: If and when we vote on this deal, for every Member of this body, I agree with my former colleague, former Senator Joe Lieberman, who said this may well be the most important vote any Senator casts in his or her career. I implore every Democrat who has come out in support of this deal, search your conscience. You can make a choice other than standing with your own party. You can stand up to your own party. Trust me; I have done it myself. It is not the end of the world.

I implore every Democrat: Go home and pray. Go home and ask yourself how you will look in the eyes of the mother or father whose son was blown to bits by an Iranian IED that came directly from General Suleimani, on whom we are now lifting sanctions; how you will explain your vote that "your son or daughter's life didn't matter enough to me, that I was willing to reward their murderer." I can tell you that is not a conversation I would ever like to have. I ask every Democrat who has said they support this deal to ask yourself that question.

I ask you to ask the question how you will look in the eyes of the mothers and fathers and sons and daughters of those who will be murdered by Hamas, by Hezbollah, by the Houthis, by radical Islamic terrorists across the globe with the over \$100 billion that this deal gives them.

Osama bin Laden murdered nearly 3,000 people on September 11, 2001. Bin Laden never had \$100 billion at his disposal. This deal gives people every bit as evil, every bit as consumed with bilious hatred resources, billions of dollars. And, if this deal goes through, we know to an absolute certainty that Americans will be murdered, Israelis will be murdered, and Europeans will be murdered. I ask every Democratic Member of this body to think before you cast a vote: How will you look in the eyes of the children of those who are murdered by terrorists who use the billions that this deal gives them to kill them? That is blood you can't wash your hands of. When you knowingly and willingly send billions of dollars to jihadists who have declared their intention to murder us, there is no excuse you can hide behind when they carry through on the intention using the billions of dollars you have given.

And, if—God forbid—Iran ever acquires a nuclear weapon, the odds are

unacceptably high they would, No. 1, use that nuclear weapon above our friend and ally the nation of Israel. For every Democrat who maintains he or she is a friend of Israel, you need to be prepared to explain how you facilitated a day that could see a nuclear warhead detonating over Tel-Aviv, murdering millions.

When Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke to a joint session of Congress, I participated in a panel discussion that my office organized with Elie Wiesel, a Nobel laureate who survived the Holocaust, and when Elie Wiesel says "never again," it means never again. The one threat that could kill 6 million Jews again is a nuclear Iran. Listen to Elie Wiesel.

The single-most dangerous thing Iran could do with a nuclear weapon is launch it from a ship in the Atlantic into the atmosphere and set off an electromagnetic pulse, or an EMP, that would take down the electrical grid and could kill tens of millions of Americans. To every Democrat, listen to those voices.

Finally, if the Democrats refuse to put our national security interests first, then it will be incumbent on the next President to undo the damage. Any competent Commander in Chief should be prepared on the first day—on January 20, 2017—to rip to shreds this catastrophic Iranian deal and to make clear to the Ayatollah Khamenei and to every other jihadist that under no circumstances will the nation of Iran, led by a theocratic Ayatollah who chants "Death to America," be allowed to acquire nuclear weapons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, what time is remaining on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-six minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. How much on the other side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-one minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to respond very briefly—very briefly—before yielding to Senator NELSON of Florida.

I would say to the junior Senator from Texas that I hope he listened carefully last Sunday when General Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—a man who risked his life in battle for America, a man who served as Secretary of State under Republican President George W. Bush—came forward and endorsed this agreement that has been proposed before the Senate. So to suggest that General Powell and so many others are not aware of the security aspects of this agreement I don't believe is a fair characterization. General Powell and others understand better than I can, better than the Senator from Texas can what it means to face these security issues. I would like to quote what

he said. He said that “with respect to the Iranians, don’t trust, never trust, and always verify.” So he comes to his conclusion supporting this agreement with the same degree of skepticism that many of us do.

I would not discount for a minute some of the activities that have been cataloged by the junior Senator from Texas when it comes to Iran, but if you think those were terrible—and they were—imagine Iran with a nuclear weapon. That is what is at stake in this debate. Currently Iran has the capacity to build 10 nuclear weapons—10. We want to stop them from doing that, put inspectors in place. So when you list the litany of horrors coming out of Iran’s terrorist activities, imagine those activities with a nuclear weapon. Our goal is to stop the development of a nuclear weapon in Iran.

I yield the floor to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I will vote for the joint agreement. I want the Senate and my colleagues from Florida to understand. I gave a lengthy speech as to why I would support this some 5 weeks ago, in the early part of August before we adjourned. Indeed, I, like most every other Senator here, feel this is one of the most important votes we will cast. I bring to the table the attempted insight given the fact of 6 years being a member of the Intelligence Committee and now having the privilege of being a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

The question is, Does this agreement prevent Iran from having a nuclear bomb? That is the essential question. Does this agreement do that? This is not an agreement to stop the bad behavior of Iran, which, of course, I wish we could. This is not a question of whether we are going to get Iran to suddenly change its attitude about Israel, which I wish we could. This is a question of preventing Iran from building and producing a nuclear bomb. I believe this agreement does it, and I believe it does it at both the declared sites and a future cheating at a covert site. Now, there are three declared sites. Those are going to be completely dismantled. The whole program is going to be dismantled.

This is misunderstood when you talk about their centrifuges, of which they have the generation of centrifuge that is very modernized. All of those are going to be cut in a third, from approximately 19,000, and they are all going to be first-generation, which is not the modernized centrifuges. That is one thing. But also they have 12,000 kilograms of enriched uranium. Do you know how much that is? That is over 13 tons, to put it in the lingo Americans understand. That is going to be reduced under this agreement by 98 percent to 300 kilograms—in other words, less

than one-fifth to make a bomb. And by the way, that enriched uranium is going to be cut down not to 90 percent to build a bomb but 3.67 percent enriched uranium.

Also, going forward, we are going to have the inspection from cradle to grave, from the very uranium mines where they dig up the uranium rocks, to the processing, which is crushing it into the yellowcake—we are going to have constant surveillance of all of this—taking the yellowcake, making it into a gas, putting that gas into centrifuges, and spinning it so that the uranium comes out of the gas in more concentrated forms, and in the cascade of these centrifuges, then bringing it down to the enriched uranium in order to make a bomb.

The same thing with plutonium. What about plutonium? In the one declared site, Arak, they are going to fill it up with concrete, and all of the existing plutonium is going to be shipped out of the country. I hope we are going to have lots of pictures of that as they do this.

Oh, by the way, as they shut down this program—talking about this money which is held in the banks of five foreign countries, which is the Iranian oil money they will eventually get—you hear all these figures: 150, 100. When you subtract the Iranian obligations, the net amount is still a lot of money—\$56 billion—but they don’t get that until they do all of this. And when is that going to be? It will probably be a year from now before they ever get the money that is held in the banks of Japan, South Korea, China, India, and Taiwan, banks that are in countries that need oil, that want Iranian oil, especially if in the future Iran sells them oil at discounted prices. Do you think those banks, those countries are going to keep that money if we walk away from this deal? No. The sanctions are going to dissipate. The money is going to flow.

Thank goodness, because of the joint agreement, that money is not going to flow—probably a year from now—until they have done all of these things that are required in the agreement of dismantling their program.

What this agreement does is it vastly reduces their ability to produce a bomb unless they cheat. Let’s talk about that. Now, I said from the very beginning—and this was part of my speech 5, 6 weeks ago. President Reagan said “trust, but verify” in dealing with the Soviet Union. I say don’t trust, but verify. So the whole point is that if we think they are going to cheat—and I can tell you that this Senator thinks they are going to try to cheat, although I think they clearly are going to comply with this. And I think the outset—the preamble of the agreement says that it is understood that Iran will never have a nuclear weapon. Never ever. But are some elements of

their society, their government, going to try to cheat? This Senator thinks they will. Can we catch them? Well, I think we clearly will.

First of all, we are going to have a lot more insight into their attempted nuclear program than we do now. And by the way, we have a vast intelligence network out there, along with our allies, that will penetrate. But on top of that, other than the three declared sites of Iraq, Natanz, and Fordow, which will all be dismantled in the reductions that I just mentioned—we will have immediate access to those sites. Any other site that we suspect, that we say we want to inspect, the max that they can rope-a-dope us is 24 days.

So if they are trying to cheat, could they do a nuclear detonator? Probably. But can they build a bomb? The answer is no. Why is it no without us knowing? Because when that site is suspected and we go in and have the inspection, you cannot hide energized, enriched uranium or plutonium. The half-life of this stuff is thousands of years. You can’t paint over it. You can’t asphalt over it. We will find it because the radioactivity will be there.

If they cheat, what happens? The fact that we have caused them to reduce all of these things that I have mentioned means we have a year in advance to deal with it, whether it is a military strike, whether it is the sanctions going back into place.

By the way, this is structured so that the United Nations sanctions go right back into place. You say: How in the world can you do that? The U.N. Security Council—any one of those other countries, such as China or Russia, can object.

No, that is not how this deal is structured. With the United States saying the sanctions go back—by ourselves—if they have cheated, the economic sanctions of the P5+1—the UK, France, Germany, China, Russia, and the United States—go back into place.

So we are going to have a year advance if they are cheating. Compare that, please, to if we walk away from the deal today. They can have a nuclear bomb within a few months, and the sanctions of our allies will dissipate because they have all told us they will dissipate if we walk away from the deal.

I will conclude with this: If this Senator knows that we are in a situation where if we reject the deal, Iran is going to have a nuclear bomb in a few months as opposed to any prospect in the future of them having a nuclear bomb with us having a year’s advance notice but the likelihood that it is 10, 15, 20, 25 years—this Senator feels that the world is going to be a very different place in 15 to 20 years and that for the protection of the interests of the United States and our allies right now, including our strong ally Israel, it is important that Iran not have a nuclear

weapon, that we are dealing with an Iran that does not have a nuclear weapon in the immediate future and instead that we penetrate their society with a much better understanding with them not having the capability of a nuclear weapon until years and years in the future.

For all of those reasons—and you can tell this is coming right out of my heart and is not some written, read speech—it is in the interest of the United States that this Senator will vote to support the deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, in response to the Senator from Florida's—I am sure heartfelt—remarks, only 21 percent of the American people agree with his stated position there, and I am sure he will hear from his constituents, as he should.

I did not come to the floor this morning to talk about the agreement. I will save my remarks, which I have been asked to make, for this afternoon.

REFUGEE CRISIS AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I call attention to the urgent refugee crisis that is happening in our midst. Men, women, and children are fleeing by the thousands from the violence and destruction that has engulfed the Middle East and North Africa. This crisis didn't come out of nowhere like an earthquake or a tornado. Instead, it is the predictable result of this administration's policies of leading from behind as conflicts metastasized in the vacuum created through years of inaction by President Obama and a total lack of American leadership. This did not happen by accident. It happened because of leading from behind. It happened because this President has refused to lead. When a vacuum is created, this is the predictable result which many of us predicted.

As we know, the vast majority of these refugees are from Syria, a country which has known little but death and destruction for 4 years as a murderous dictatorship and a homicidal cult have fought a war against a common enemy, the Syrian people. As Assad and ISIL fight to rule, cruelty and atrocity reign.

According to the United Nations Refugee Agency, about 63 percent of European asylum seekers in the past 2 years are Syrians, but the truth is, the refugee crisis is much bigger than what we are seeing today in Europe. Since 2011, well over 200,000 Syrians have been killed, 1 million injured, 8 million displaced, 4 million forced to seek refuge abroad in countries such as Tur-

key, Jordan, Lebanon, and Egypt where the situation is not much better. The United Nations has described this crisis as "the greatest humanitarian crisis tragedy of our times."

As conditions at refugee camps in the region continue to deteriorate with overcrowding, disease, violence, and exploitation, those who can are attempting to escape further west to safer places in Europe. The United Nations estimates that at least 850,000 people will seek refuge in Europe between 2015 and 2016. About a quarter of them will be children. These children are increasingly leaving their families and homes to make dangerous journeys by sea and land. While they are risking their lives to escape the threat of abduction, sexual abuse, torture and murder, they face an entirely new set of threats on this desperate journey for asylum. Many are on traversing unsafe routes, suffering from starvation, facing the threat of human trafficking, enduring debilitating psychological trauma, and, of course, many are dying.

The U.N. Refugee Agency has stated that about 2,600 people have died while attempting to cross the Mediterranean this year alone, including 3-year-old Aylan Kurdi. Aylan grew up in the Syrian city of Kobani, a city situated on the border of Turkey, which in recent years has been under siege by ISIL militants and the Assad regime. Facing increasing turmoil and unrest, Aylan's father, Abdullah, and mother, Rehen, did what any parent would do for their children. They attempted to move Aylan and his 4-year-old brother Galip to a safer home. Abdullah arranged for his family to board a boat bound for Sweden by way of Greece, a trip that many of his fellow Syrians have attempted over the years. But when the Kurdi family met their smugglers in Turkey, they were surprised how crowded the small, flimsy fiberglass boat was. Despite repeated questions about the safety of the voyage, the smugglers assured Abdullah they would be OK.

Shortly into the trip, the waters became increasingly rough, crashing into the boat and rocking it back and forth until it capsized, launching the passengers—including Aylan, his mother, and 4-year-old brother—into the rough waters. Despite Abdullah's strongest attempts, he was unable to save his family.

This photo, which was taken shortly after Aylan's dead body was washed ashore, has opened the world's eyes to this devastating crisis. Within hours of this photo being posted, people across the world began to share it on social media using a hashtag in Arabic that translates to "humanity washed ashore." This image has haunted the world, but what should haunt us even more than the horror unfolding before our eyes is the thought that the United

States will continue to do nothing meaningful about it.

The conflicts in Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Yemen, and elsewhere in the Middle East and North Africa that have taken the lives of Aylan and countless other desperate refugees are not only a threat to our security, but a crisis of conscience. They challenge the moral fabric of our Nation and the foundation of global leadership. Let's be clear. The current crisis before us is not a migrant issue. They are not migrants. Migrants leave for economic reasons. It is a mass exodus of refugees who are fleeing conflicts that this administration has refused to address for years. As the U.N. High Commissioner stated last week: "This is a primarily refugee crisis, not only a migration phenomenon. The vast majority of those arriving in Greece come from conflict zones like Syria, Iraq or Afghanistan and are simply running for their lives."

I say to the media: Stop calling them migrants. They are not migrants. They are refugees who are attempting to escape from torture, murder, killing, and genocide. Statements and images like these should not just be a source of heartbreak and sympathy; they should be a call to action. The following quote is from the Wall Street Journal editorial this morning.

Another Syria Failure

It's hard to believe, but the debacle that is the Obama Administration's Syria policy could get worse. U.S. sources have been leaking that Russia may be preparing for a major military deployment to keep Bashar Assad in power in Damascus. By some reports quoting Western diplomats, a Russian expeditionary force is already in Syria preparing for the arrival of jets and attack helicopters to carry out strikes against Islamic State . . . Mr. Assad is a Russian ally, and Vladimir Putin isn't about to let the Syrian government fall without a bigger fight. Like so much else in the Middle East, President Obama has created an opening for this Russian intervention by minimizing U.S. interests in the outcome of Syria's civil war. He has refused to offer more than token help to pro-Western Syrians, thus ceding the battleground to radical Islamists or the Assad-Russia-Iran-Hezbollah axis. Don't expect a decline in the flow of refugees anytime soon.

Just a few months after the revolution in Syria began in 2011, President Obama issued his Presidential Study Directive stating: "Preventing mass atrocities and genocide is a core national security interest and a core moral responsibility of the United States."

He went on to say: "Our security is affected when masses of civilians are slaughtered, refugees flow across borders, and murderers wreak havoc on regional stability and livelihoods."

In 2013, President Obama, speaking at the U.S. Holocaust Museum, said: "Too often, the world has failed to prevent the killing of innocents on a massive scale. And we are haunted by the atrocities that we did not stop and the lives we did not save."

In a 2013 address to the U.N. General Assembly, President Obama said:

[T]he principle of sovereignty is at the center of our international order. But sovereignty cannot be a shield for tyrants to commit wanton murder, or an excuse for the international community to turn a blind eye. While we need to be modest in our belief that we can remedy every evil, while we need to be mindful that the world is full of unintended consequences, should we really accept the notion that the world is powerless in the face of a Rwanda, or Srebrenica? If that's the world that people want to live in, they should say so, and reckon with the cold logic of mass graves.

I strongly suggest, given the fact that there is no policy, no strategy, and no effective way of stemming this horror, that the President of the United States should say so and reckon with the cold logic of mass graves. That was our President. By the way, I agree with every word he said, but how can the American people reconcile these words with pictures of dead children and desperate refugees literally running for their lives? How can President Obama say it is our moral obligation to do what we can to prevent the worst atrocities in our world but refuse to do anything to stop the atrocities that are occurring every single day in Syria and across the Middle East?

Where is that President Obama today? Where is the President Obama who has spoken so movingly of the moral responsibilities that great power confers?

Unfortunately, the administration is still "considering a range of options"—I am not making this up—to respond to this issue, a National Security Council spokesman stated this week. In the meantime, the President and his cabinet officials continue to push through an agreement that legitimizes Iran, which is not only the leading state sponsor of terror in the world, but the patron of the Assad regime responsible for the deaths of hundreds of thousands of innocent Syrians. After this deal, Iran's power in the region will only be enhanced, and it is safe to assume that it will use the billions of dollars in sanctions relief to boost arms supplies to Iran's terrorist proxies, to sow chaos and instability across the region, and to prop up Assad right when he needs it most.

As the administration stands by, Russia is capitalizing on America's inaction to provide additional support for the Assad regime. According to numerous press reports, Russia is establishing a base at an airfield near an Assad stronghold in western Syria. Russia could soon deploy 1,000 or more military personnel into Syria to conduct air operations in support of Assad's forces.

Our government is doing what it has sadly done too often in the past, receding our strength and averting our eyes. We try to comfort our guilty consciences by telling ourselves that we

are not doing nothing, but it is a claim made in bad faith, for everyone concedes that nothing we are doing is equal to the horrors we face. We are telling ourselves: We're too tired or weary to get more involved, that this is not our problem, that helping to resolve this crisis is not our responsibility, and that there are no options to end the conflicts around the world today. The truth is there was plenty that could have been done to avoid the devastation unfolding before our eyes in 2011, in 2012, in 2013, in 2014. And there is still more we can do today to respond to this growing crisis.

My friends, my colleagues, my fellow Americans, I fear the longer this violence goes on, the more difficult it will be to bring it to an end. Failing to do so will leave a dangerous vacuum that enables extremism and instability to grow and provides terrorists the space, resources, and recruits they need to wreak havoc on the region and threaten the United States of America.

It is not too late. We must not avert our eyes from Aylan and the millions of other refugees running for their lives. We must commit to a strategy to defeat the malign forces in the region that are sowing chaos and mass destruction. Failing to act now leaves us with even fewer options to rectify this terrible chapter in our history.

Speaking of history, I am a student of history. I don't believe there are exact parallels in American history, but there are certain areas where a failure to lead leads to catastrophic consequences. In 1938, on October 5, a man named Winston Churchill—who was shunned by his colleagues and ridiculed in the House of Commons for his constant speaking and warning—in one of my favorites of the appearances he made in the House of Commons before his fellow citizens, he said:

And do not suppose this is the end. This is only the beginning of the reckoning. This is only the first sip, the first foretaste of a bitter cup which will be proffered to us year by year unless by a supreme recovery of moral health and martial vigour, we arise again and take our stand for freedom as in olden time.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I come to the floor to speak to the nuclear agreement with Iran. First, having just come back from the region after having spent Sunday morning in one of the biggest refugee camps inside Syria—where 80,000, more than half of them children under the age of 18, with more than 250 every day leaving the camp because they have lost hope and they are, frankly, more willing to live inside a dangerous Syria with their lives in danger than to continue to live inside of this camp—let me associate myself with the imperative that Senator MCCAIN laid before us, that we can do more. I don't agree with his diagnosis

of how we got here, nor will I likely agree with his solution in terms of prescriptions to solve the problem, but I certainly agree that this body and the administration should be standing up and bearing our share of the burden when it comes to this humanitarian crisis, having seen it now firsthand for myself.

Peace is a messy business. As Yitzhak Rabin said upon the recognition of the PLO—a really hard thing for the Israelis to do—he said, "You don't make peace with your friends, you make it with very unsavory enemies." It makes sense, right? The definition of peace is the settlement of old disputes or even just one big dispute with someone with whom one has a long history of disagreement or conflict. And unless peace comes from unconditional surrender—and that frankly doesn't happen very much in the postnuclear age—then peace by nature is going to be a compromise. It doesn't come from one side getting everything it wants. Thus, by definition, it is going to feel fairly unsatisfactory.

I say this because viewing the Iran deal through that prism allows me to understand why so many people are voting no, and it allows me to understand why many of those who are voting yes took a long time to get there, but what I have trouble understanding is all of the revisionist history that is crowding this Chamber right now. I don't think there is a single Member of the Senate who didn't in principle support the idea of negotiating an end to Iran's nuclear weapons program. And I don't remember anyone who didn't understand that the sanctions we layered upon Iran were directed at their nuclear program, not their support for Hezbollah or their detainment of hostages or any other malevolent behavior in the region. Why? Because we had a whole different set of sanctions on that activity.

But now there is all sorts of Sturm und Drang in Congress over the idea that this deal represents a give-and-take between the United States and Iran. Why didn't we get everything, a lot of people are asking; and the failure of this agreement to settle all our disputes with Iran at once—but they still do bad stuff, people say. I view these protests largely as cover for a "no" vote that is likely about something else because we always knew this was going to be a negotiation. We can complain about the end balance, but we can't engage in a straight-faced argument about the outrageousness of Iran getting to keep a few centrifuges. And we can all rage about Iran's support for terrorism or their dangerous talk about our sacred ally, Israel, but we all passed sanctions bills knowing they were about their nuclear program, not all of these other activities. Thus, it must stand to reason that these sanctions would be removed if Iran came to

the table and satisfied our concerns about their nuclear program, not our concerns about everything else they do that is terrible.

Peace is never perfect. Diplomacy is, frankly, mostly ugly, but it matters. Because why on Earth do we spend \$500 billion every year on the world's biggest, baddest, most capable military force if we aren't willing to use it? I don't mean use it in the way that Senator GRAHAM or Senator COTTON may mean "use it," I mean use it by entering into peaceful agreements that are held in place by the threat of overwhelming U.S. military force. Our planes and our bombs and our brigades, these are the muscle that ensures that agreements are lived up to, not the muscle that substitutes for a diplomatic agreement. America, more than any other country in the world, can afford to take a diplomatic risk because we can clean it up fast if it goes wrong. Now, I don't think this agreement is going to go wrong, but I sure like knowing that a bunker-busting bomb is waiting in the wings if it does. And I will sleep better at night knowing that by agreeing to this deal, we are keeping together an unprecedented international coalition that will stand with us if we need to drop that bomb—something they would not do if we dropped it without this agreement.

This body often seems to forget that American power is not simply exercised through the blunt force of military power. And President Obama, frankly, is not the first President to be pressed by hawks in Congress, and outside of Congress, to forsake diplomacy in favor of war.

In the first meeting with legislative leaders after the announcement of Russian missiles inside Cuba, the bipartisan congressional leadership, meeting with President Kennedy, was unanimous in its support for an attack and ultimately the possible invasion of Cuba. All of them thought that talking to Russia about a negotiated solution equaled weakness. President Kennedy didn't listen, and over 13 days he worked out a peaceful solution to the Cuban Missile Crisis that history looks very kindly upon.

President Reagan, upon signing the IMF treaty with Russia, leaned over to Gorbachev as they announced the deal and said: "The hardliners in both our countries are bleeding when we shake hands today." Hawks in Congress didn't want an agreement with our sworn enemy, Russia. They didn't understand why we signed a nuclear agreement with a country that was still out for American blood on so many other fronts. But history tells us that the IMF treaty was an important piece of our strategy to weaken hardliners inside Russia and open that country to reform.

I hear this analogy to 1938 and Munich almost every day, and it doesn't

just come with respect to this agreement. Almost every time we sit across the table from someone we have a disagreement with, the claim is that it is Munich all over again, but Munich is the exception, not the rule. There are plenty more diplomatic agreements to avert war that went right rather than those that went wrong. It doesn't mean we don't use 1938 as a caution, but it doesn't mean it is an automatic parallel to every single time we are trying to settle our disputes with an adversary at the negotiating table rather than through the means of arms.

Our partners in the Middle East largely get this. I just returned from this trip, as I mentioned, to the region—Qatar, UAE, Iraq, Kuwait, and Jordan—with Senator PETERS. In every country we visited, we heard about Iran's dangerous activity in the region, including support for the Houthis in Yemen, funding Shiite militias in Iraq, propping up the murderous Bashar al Assad in Syria, pumping money into Hezbollah and Hamas to threaten Israel, but despite these provocations, every Arab political leader whom we met with—every single one—supports this agreement. They give two basic reasons, and I want to share them because they mirror the reasons for my support as well.

First, they know that no matter how dangerous Iran is today, they shudder to think how much more dangerous Iran would be if they possessed a nuclear weapon. They believe, as I do, that this agreement is the best way to keep Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and they support it, to a country, first and foremost for that reason.

Before this deal, Iran had 19,000 centrifuges spinning. After it, they are going to have just a few thousand. Before this deal, Iran was enriching up to 20 percent and was only a few months from being able to enrich to a level in which they could get on a pathway to a bomb. After this deal, enrichment will be down to 3.7 percent. Before this deal, Iran had an enormous stockpile of enriched uranium, and after this deal that stockpile is, for all intents and purposes, eliminated—reduced by 97 percent. Before this deal, the only way we knew what was going on in the nuclear program was through covert surveillance. After the deal, we are going to have a network of inspectors crawling over every inch of their nuclear program to make sure they aren't cheating.

Second, our Arab partners whom we visited within the region know that all of the problems in the region can't be solved without Iran at the table, and while they aren't sure this agreement by itself will draw Iran into peaceful negotiations over Syria or Yemen or Iraq—and I think none of us can be sure that is how this will play out—they are certain that a rejection of the agreement by the United States Con-

gress will virtually guarantee that Iran will not come to the table. They talk openly about fearing a newly isolated Iran, the rejection of this agreement empowering the hardliners, punishing the moderates, and pushing Iran away from any constructive dialogue in the region. Our Arab partners don't love the terms of this agreement any more than the U.S. Senate does, but they know the alternative—a retrenched Iran with a green light to start back up their nuclear program—is the most dangerous outcome of all.

Our partners understand what supporters of the deal understand; that this idea that if Congress were to reject the agreement, we could come back to the table and get a better one is pure fiction. It is pure political fiction made up by people who don't want to sound like they don't have an alternative plan, when they really don't. No one with any credible diplomatic experience in the Middle East believes that Iran will come back to the table if Congress rejects this deal, and our international partners have told us to our face that they will not come back to the table if we reject this deal. A better deal is fantasy, plain and simple.

Here is what happens. Here is what really happens if Congress rejects this deal that is supported by all of our negotiating partners—Britain, France, Germany, China, Russia—the entirety of the Security Council and all of our Arab partners in the region. What happens is that Iran starts back up their nuclear program, centrifuges climb to 25,000, 30,000, enrichment gets closer to the level necessary for a bomb, the inspectors get kicked out—our eyes on a nuclear program disappear—and sanctions fray at first and likely fall apart over time and Iran gets everything it wants. It gets its nuclear program and it gets sanctions relief. What a catastrophic outcome that would be.

But as bad as that reality would be, it actually gets worse. We know the hardliners have been marginalized as a result of this deal, and the moderates, which I admit is, frankly, a relative term inside Iran, are gaining power. Rejection of this deal would just be a gift to hardliners and would likely lead to Ruhani being replaced by a Revolutionary Guard proxy who would lead Iran down a path that is even more dangerous—hard to believe—than the path they are on today.

Lastly, the United States would just become an international pariah. With all of our partners at the negotiating table, almost every nation around the world supporting this agreement, what would it say if the U.S. Congress walked away? Our power as a nation would be irreparably damaged.

Now, I heard Senator CRUZ on the floor earlier today chastising Democrats, yelling at us, about how could we live with ourselves doing a deal with our mortal enemy Iran. So let me

ask him and others who oppose this agreement, with the rhetoric that he uses, a question in return: How could opponents of this deal live with themselves if a rejection of this deal would result in, No. 1, Iran restarting its nuclear program; No. 2, sanctions dramatically weakening; No. 3, inspections ending; and, No. 4, hard-liners being in power inside Iran?

The fact is that many Republicans opposed this agreement before they read it. Senator CRUZ opposed it within an hour of its announcement. So I don't know how some opponents of this deal can live with themselves having made a political decision to oppose the most important diplomatic agreement that most of us will vote on during our time here.

This is not a perfect deal, but no diplomatic agreement ever is. Peace, as the great Israeli leader Yitzhak Rabin told us, is never easy. History almost always judges that it is worthwhile.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. VITTER. Madam President, I rise to urge all of our colleagues, Republicans and Democrats, to strongly oppose the proposed nuclear deal with Iran and to effectively block it for the sake of the country and our national security by supporting the motion of disapproval on the Senate floor.

I have served in the Senate and the House for about 15 years. It has been an enormous honor and a serious responsibility. I have taken it very seriously. When I think through all of that service, all of the votes we have cast, all of the debates we have had, I cannot think of any more serious than the issue we are debating and voting on here, the Iran nuclear deal. Maybe there are a few that rank in a similar way—after 9/11, starting that effort to root out terrorists and to oppose those who inflicted massive death in our country—but there is none that is more important and more significant because this deal, this issue goes to the fundamental security of America, our future. Are we going to be free from the threat of attack with nuclear weapons by a wildly radical and unstable regime? It does not get more basic, more serious than that.

The first point I want to make is that this is a dead-serious issue because the consequences do involve life or death, massive numbers of lives or deaths. So if there is any debate, any vote that should be completely devoid of partisan political considerations, it is this one. I urge all of our colleagues on both

sides of the aisle to leave the partisanship at the door. This is way more important than that. I would hope that would be obvious.

With that in mind, it is troubling that President Obama has tried to make this a partisan debate. He has actively, obviously sought to inflict partisanship into it, I think simply because that is the way he thinks he can hold enough Democratic votes on his side. I think that is really a shame. I hope everyone proves him wrong in terms of the nature of the debate and vote we have in this important body.

When you look at the agreement, at the specifics of the agreement—I will not go into all of the weeds and all of the issues. I could spend days alone on that. But I do want to focus on two key considerations that are absolutely top in my mind.

The first is the very premise and outcome of the agreement because we have gone from a negotiation that was supposed to be about preventing Iran from ever developing nuclear weapons to a discussion of when they are going to do it. We have gone from if to when. This agreement ensures that they will have the ability to get there even if they live under the full terms of the agreement, and obviously there is a concern, which I will get to in my second point, that they won't. This puts our nuclear nonproliferation policy, including the nonproliferation treaty, which has been the cornerstone of our policy regarding the proliferation of nuclear weapons and particularly in the Middle East for 45 years—this throws it out the window. This puts it on its head.

With this agreement, the United States has agreed that at the end of a timeline, Iran has full authority to enrich uranium, will be completely within its rights to do so with no fear of economic or political repercussions by the major powers, full authority for them to go against 45 years of standing nonproliferation policy. So what started as strong action, including meaningful sanctions that were having an impact to make sure Iran never got nuclear weapons, now concedes that they will get there; it is simply a debate about when. That is at the core of this agreement. That is at the core of the reason we all must say no and pass the motion of disapproval.

If there is any region of the world where we need to maintain this tough nonproliferation policy, it is the Middle East. This agreement obliterates that. Iran won't be the only new nuclear power over time. There will be a race among Middle Eastern countries to develop nuclear weapons because Iran is going to get one. That is inevitable, in my mind.

The second major point I want to make—the second major issue is verification, our ability under the agreement to see that Iran lives by it. First,

as I said, even under the agreement, we are conceding their ability to develop nuclear weapons. That is absolutely wrong. But then within the agreement, we also have nothing near the tools and the assurances we need with regard to verification every step of the way.

Iran has proved over and over that they will violate these sorts of agreements, that they will lie. International agencies have caught them in those lies, including the IAEA. That agency and others have noted the difficulty of verification in dealing with Iran. Then we get to this agreement, which makes that difficulty move from significant to monumental.

There are lots of details we could look at, but the single most telling is the detail that is in a side agreement between Iran and the IAEA that we are not allowed to read. We are having this debate. We have to vote on this motion of disapproval. Yet we are not allowed to read this critical side agreement which goes to the heart of the ability of the world to verify compliance.

I brought up this fairly basic issue a few weeks ago when Wendy Sherman, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, testified before our committee on banking and urban affairs. I asked her point-blank: This side agreement between the IAEA and Iran, have you read it?

She answered: Yes.

I will be honest with you, I am not certain if that is true, but she answered yes.

Then I asked her: Am I, as a representative of the people of Louisiana, allowed to read that agreement?

She answered through nonresponses: No.

I asked her: Do you have to vote on this agreement in your responsibility?

No.

But I do; correct, Ms. Sherman?

Yes.

But I don't get to read this critical side agreement with regard to verification that goes to the heart of our ability to make sure Iran is even following these rules, as lax as they are?

Again, through her nonanswer, the answer was clear: No, I don't get to read it. The Presiding Officer does not get to read it. Nobody in the Senate who is voting on this gets to read it. Nobody in the House of Representatives who is voting on this gets to read it. Forget about any slight on the Presiding Officer and me and others personally. It is not about that. We are here to represent the people. I am here to represent the people of Louisiana. I cannot read what we are voting on? That is absolutely ridiculous.

Then, to add insult to injury, come press reports about what we are not allowed to read. Of course, the most significant were the press reports from several weeks ago from the AP saying that this side agreement had an extremely unusual provision with regard

to inspections at at least one of Iran's most sensitive military facilities—the biggest concern we have probably in all of Iran. In at least that most sensitive military facility and perhaps others, Iran gets to collect the samples. Iran gets to choose and control those who do. The IAEA, the international community, and America do not and are not allowed on site. That just does not pass, I would say, the laugh test. But it is a very serious matter. That is like someone like Alex Rodriguez collecting his own urine and mailing it in. That does not work at a basic level. Yet that, according to very credible reports, is in this side agreement that, oh, by the way, we are not allowed to read.

For all of these reasons, for our security, for our kids' future, for freedom around the world, for Israel's security, for nonproliferation in the Middle East so that we do not have an explosive Middle Eastern nuclear arms race, we must pass this motion of disapproval.

Again, this goes way beyond politics. This is about our physical security, our kids' and grandkids' future. We must all come together, look at the substance of this, and do the right thing. That certainly involves invoking cloture on this motion so we go to a final vote. I believe that clearly involves passing this motion of disapproval. I urge all of our colleagues to do exactly that.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Madam President, as do virtually all of the Members of this body, I believe we must prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Because of that, I support the international agreement that the Senate is debating this week because I am convinced it is the best way to achieve that objective.

We can stop Iran's nuclear weapons program in one of two ways, either diplomatically or militarily. Powerful international sanctions, which I have strongly supported, have brought Iran to the negotiating table. And on July 14, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, and the European Union—the so-called P5+1 powers—concluded an agreement with Iran that, if it is implemented as it was agreed to, promises a peaceful, diplomatic solution. Thanks to the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, Congress has had ample time to review the agreement.

I have spent hours and hours studying the text of the agreement and scrutinizing our intelligence agencies' clas-

sified assessment of their ability to verify Iran's compliance.

As a member of both the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, I attended more than a dozen hearings and briefings with administration officials and outside experts—both for and against the agreement. In the end, I have concluded that this agreement effectively blocks Iran's pathways to develop a nuclear weapon for well over a decade.

Right now, what we heard from testimony from both those people who support and oppose the agreement is that Iran can acquire enough fissile nuclear material to make a bomb in less than 3 months. The agreement extends this breakout time to at least 1 year by slashing Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent and banning enrichment above 3.67 percent, which is far below weapons grade, for 15 years.

The agreement also reduces Iran's number of centrifuges by more than two-thirds for a decade, and it maintains inspectors' access to Iran's uranium mines and mills—so the whole life cycle of uranium—for a quarter of a century. These are just some of the many restrictions the agreement imposes on Iran.

In addition, Iran is bound by the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and other agreements to a permanent commitment not to pursue nuclear weapons and, as part of that agreement, to permit access by inspectors to any suspected sites. Of critical importance, the Iran agreement is not based on trust—none of us trust Iran—but it is based on an inspections regime that is more rigorous and more intrusive than any previous negotiated agreement. Nuclear experts are confident that we will be able to detect violations by Iran. Thanks to language in the agreement that allows the United States to respond unilaterally to a violation by reimposing U.S. and U.N. sanctions, Iran knows that it faces crippling consequences if it violates the agreement.

If Congress rejects the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the Iran agreement, all of these advantages go away. The risk of an Iranian nuclear breakout and a regional nuclear arms race will increase dramatically. We will be left with no credible, non-military option for stopping Iran's nuclear program.

Now, I certainly respect the views of my colleagues who oppose this agreement, and I have listened carefully to their arguments. Some of them assert that Iran will find a way to cheat and, therefore, no diplomatic resolution is possible. However, most opponents are careful to avoid talk of military conflict and argue that we can reject this deal, that we can rally the world to impose harsher sanctions, and that Iran will eventually capitulate.

But sadly, that premise is at odds with the facts as they currently exist.

Our negotiating partners in this deal—Britain, France, Russia, China, and the European Union—have concluded that this is a fair agreement. In a briefing for Senators last month, the Ambassadors from these nations told us in no uncertain terms that there will be no going back to the bargaining table if Congress rejects this agreement. If the deal is rejected, the most likely outcome is that the international sanctions regime against Iran would unravel. The United States would be isolated, and we would lose credibility as a reliable negotiating partner. So, yes, we would retain the ability to act unilaterally, but unilateral sanctions have their limits, as we have heard in this body. Our military commanders counsel us that even a robust military option would delay, but it would not prevent, Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon because they already have the nuclear know-how.

This agreement is not about becoming friends with Iran or turning a blind eye to its efforts to destabilize the Middle East. In fact, we must redouble our efforts to help our allies counter Iran's malign influence in the region.

In particular, our commitment to the defense of Israel should remain unshakeable. In addition, we must maintain vigorous sanctions against Iran for its support for terrorism and for its violations of human rights.

Now, while there are risks to whatever course we take with respect to Iran, I believe that the choice is clear. Either we recognize that this agreement is the best available option or we chase some fantasy agreement on our own as international sanctions collapse and Iran's nuclear program continues unchecked and our options for stopping it are narrowed.

I am convinced that the agreement negotiated by the United States and our allies is the least risky approach, and it is the approach that is most likely to succeed. As I said last month in New Hampshire, I intend to vote to support this deal.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, I ask unanimous that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. KIRK. Madam President, as I rise, many who fear the pending Iran vote feel that it could deliver a mortal blow to the Senate's historic support for the safety of the families of Israel. Have no fear. No matter what, we will always have a capable majority of Americans who support the free and democratic tolerant society of Israel. No matter what the Iranians do, America's commitment will remain to that

shining city on Jerusalem's hills, to a nation that has proved that democracy and tolerance can thrive in a place even as hostile as the Middle East and will remain strong.

I represent many people who have survived the Holocaust. Their spirit is within the State of Illinois. They prevailed over the worst evil that has ever disgraced our time. That spirit unites the free and tolerant people of the United States and Israel that we will prevail no matter what.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:28 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015— Continued

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, in anticipation of the majority leader and minority leader coming to the floor in a moment, I will begin the debate, a debate on the most consequential vote I will ever take as an elected official. Certainly, in my 41 years of public service, I have never had a decision to make as serious, as complex, and as meaningful as the decision we will make on the Iran nuclear deal negotiated by the administration and the President.

I rise in opposition to that agreement and to explain why I will vote against it, but before I do, I want to compliment three or four members in particular on the Foreign Relations Committee: former Chairman MENENDEZ from New Jersey, Ranking Member CARDIN from Maryland, and Chairman CORKER from Tennessee. Throughout the entire debate on the Iran nuclear deal, they have been forthright in being sure everybody got every question they wanted answered, that every issue was exposed, and that everybody had the time to participate to the fullest degree possible. Great leadership on the part of Senator CORKER, great leadership on the part of Senator CARDIN, and great assistance on the part of Senator MENENDEZ.

In the end, in committee, I voted for the resolution of disapproval to vote against the nuclear arrangement with the Iranians, and I want to talk about why. First of all, the President said a vote against the deal is a vote for war. I argue with that conclusion. In fact, I think a vote against the deal is a vote of strength. A vote for the deal is an appeasement to the Iranian people, to the Iranian ayatollahs, and to a group of people who have not been trust-

worthy in negotiations with our country for the past 60 years.

Second, I think it is a vote against strength and for appeasement, when in fact there has never been a time more important to the United States of America to be stronger than today.

Think about this. The bodies of young Syrian children are washing up on the shore of the Mediterranean. The Russians have established a beachhead in the Crimea, the Ukraine, and now in the Arctic. Last week, our President went to Alaska and the Chinese sent five ships off the coast just to wave the Chinese flag in the face of our President.

Our diplomacy around the world is faltering and failing because we are not resolved. We are not as strong as we used to be. Diplomatically we are not respected and militarily we are not feared. It is time we made sure the vote we cast on this Iranian nuclear deal is not a vote that sends another signal of weakness but instead a signal of strength.

Why am I voting against the Iranian nuclear deal? There are five principal reasons. No. 1 is the basis upon which I voted for the New START treaty 5 years ago. When I voted for that treaty, I was on the Foreign Relations Committee as well, and the questions I asked at that time are the same questions I am asking now about what is not a treaty—what I think is a treaty but what the President calls an agreement: No. 1, is it enforceable; No. 2, do we have inspections; No. 3, do we have credibility; No. 4, have I seen all the documents; and, No. 5, is it best for my children and grandchildren and the future of my country?

First, I haven't seen all the documents, and we now find out we will never see all of them because the addendums to the IAEA will not be available to us as Members of the Senate. That is No. 1. No. 2, can we have inspections? Well, yes, you can have inspections, kind of or sort of. Yes, you get 24 hours' notice and then 24 days to approve and then the Iranians have a say over who gets to inspect and we don't have a part. That is not a fair deal.

When I voted for the New START treaty, the principal reason I finally did was this: Russians were allowed in the United States to inspect our nuclear warheads; we were allowed in Russia to inspect theirs. We had absolute credibility in the inspection regime. We knew what we were getting, and it was an enforceable treaty. This is not that. This is one that can be cheated on too easily and far too easily for the American people and the security of my children and grandchildren.

And what about my children and grandchildren—why are they of interest to me in this vote? They are because they are our future. The future of all mankind is the young people

today who will run these countries in the years ahead, unless there is a rogue nation with nuclear weapons that could disrupt the world's balance of power, and that is just what the Iranians are capable of doing. So I want to make sure I don't do anything that would facilitate the Iranian use of nuclear weapons in the future. I don't think this deal protects us from that, and that is why I am going to vote against it.

Lastly, I want to comment about the issue of a cloture vote. I understand there will be a vote to filibuster the final vote on the resolution of disapproval rather than having a resolution of disapproval. I think that is wrong. I think the American people deserve to know where each of us stand, and the people of Georgia deserve to know where JOHNNY ISAKSON stands—what I am going to do and why I am going to do it.

A vote against cloture is to protract having a final vote on the resolution of disapproval and leaves open the whole issue. It is not fair to the American people, it is not right for the American people, and it is avoiding our responsibility. So I will vote for cloture so we can go to a final vote on the resolution of disapproval, and I hope every Member of the Senate will do the same. To do anything less is wrong for America, wrong for our heritage, and wrong for our future.

So I end where I began. I thank Senator CORKER, Senator MENENDEZ, and Senator CARDIN for their forthright leadership. I have studied hard, I have worked hard to try to find the best parts of this deal and the worst parts of this deal. I find it fails in those five tests I have given it and I will vote no. I will vote for the resolution of disapproval and vote against the treaty with Iran on the Iran nuclear deal.

With that said, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Colleagues, before the Senate is a resolution that would disapprove of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action agreed to by the United States, China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, the European Union, and the Islamic Republic of Iran.

I have long said the Senate should assess this deal by employing a simple standard: Will it further or will it harm the national security interests of the United States and her allies? By that measure, I believe Senators must vote to disapprove of the deal.

I truly wish that wasn't the case, but it is a predictable outcome when one considers the mindset with which the administration appeared to approach these negotiations. The President's overall foreign policy has long been guided by policies and desires to withdraw forward-deployed conventional military power from operational theaters, to reduce America's commitments and capabilities, and to rely upon international organizations to uphold international order.

That is the type of mindset that guided the administration's negotiators on this deal, and it has resulted in a flawed deal that a majority of Congress and a broad swath of the American people now seem poised to reject—and that is a bipartisan majority.

The American people were led to believe that negotiations with Iran would be about ending its nuclear program, but that is not what the deal before us would do. Instead, the President's deal would bestow international recognition upon Iran's nuclear program by the most powerful nations on Earth. There is no question that Iran's nuclear program is designed to develop a nuclear weapon—no question. This is not about peaceful nuclear energy.

Yet the President's deal would leave Iran as a nuclear threshold state forever on the edge of developing a nuclear weapon. It would allow Iran to maintain thousands of centrifuges—1,044 IR-1 centrifuges in Fordow and 5,060 centrifuges at Natanz—as well as advanced research and development programs.

The President's deal with Iran will also give the regime access to literally billions of dollars. The President himself has acknowledged that at least some of that cash windfall is likely to be used to support terrorism.

It is already clear that Iran is meddling in Bahrain, in Yemen, in Lebanon, and in Afghanistan, and the President's deal will only strengthen terrorist proxies such as Hezbollah, the Houthis insurgents in Yemen, and the Assad regime in Syria.

Iran is working to prop up and protect Assad's regime in Damascus, and it is working with Shia militias in Iraq to expand its influence even further—just as Iran once supplied Iraq's Shia militias with the weapons to maim and kill our soldiers and marines.

Iran has a long history of employing terrorism as a tool for defending the regime—not just against its neighbors, not just against Israel, but also against America.

On September 20, 1984, with support and direction from Iran, the Shia militants of Hezbollah carried out a suicide car bombing against the American embassy in Beirut, 31 years ago. Two dozen people died that day; among them, Chief Warrant Officer Kenneth Welch of the U.S. Army. His son, Brian, has lived with that loss ever since. I

want all of our colleagues to know he is sitting with us in this Gallery this afternoon. He is right here with us listening to this debate.

So I ask my colleagues: How could we support a deal that would not only strengthen terrorist groups like Hezbollah, but also would effectively subsidize the activities of the Revolutionary Guard Corps, a group that has been accused of helping Shiite militias attack and kill Americans in Iraq?

The \$100 billion Iran is expected to reap from this deal is also certain to be invested in Iran's war economy for defense of the regime and will undoubtedly strengthen the hand of the Revolutionary Guards.

The Council on Foreign Relations has referred to the group as the regime's "money machine" because of its varied business interests with Iran. As the Council noted in a 2013 backgrounder, the Guards were estimated to have ties to more than 100 companies controlling about \$12 billion in construction and engineering capital, and one of its fellows, Ray Takeyh, has linked the group to "university laboratories, weapons manufacturers, and companies connected to nuclear technology."

Now, the administration has attempted to make light of the benefits to Iran's economy, military, and terrorist arms from the lifting of sanctions. Secretary Kerry observed that \$100 billion is "nothing"—nothing—"compared to what gets spent" in the region.

"Iran's military budget is \$15 billion," he said, while "the Gulf states' military budget is \$130 billion."

But what is lost on Secretary Kerry is the fact that Iran and its proxies have pursued asymmetric capabilities against the United States, not to mention Israel and our moderate Sunni allies.

Iran has carefully studied the tactics and capabilities brought to bear by our forces in Desert Storm, Operation Enduring Freedom, Operation Iraqi Freedom, and other campaigns. And because it has, the regime has decided to invest in anti-access and area-denial capabilities, cyber warfare capabilities, espionage, and other means to avoid fighting directly against our strengths.

The Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs, in an assessment of the nuclear deal with Iran, expanded on that point. Here is what they had to say:

Iran has acquired and developed various capabilities to execute this asymmetric strategy, including anti access/area denial . . . it possesses the region's largest arsenal of short and medium ballistic missiles, as well as a growing arsenal of cruise missiles and unmanned aerial vehicles, to target military and energy installations throughout the Gulf, including U.S. ships. It also has a sizeable fleet of fast attack craft, submarines and large numbers of torpedoes and naval mines for choking off Hormuz and attacking aforementioned targets. The S-300

air defense systems could stymie U.S. air operations around the Gulf, in addition to complicating any strike on Iran's nuclear facilities.

That is from the Jewish Institute of National Security Affairs.

Now, there is another worrying aspect of the cash windfall from this deal as well. It will also serve to advance Tehran's efforts to divide the United States from the very allies who helped us bring Iran to the table in the first place. As Iranian trade expands with the other P5+1 countries, they will grow even more reluctant to hold Iran accountable for the inevitable violations of the deal.

We need not have ended up here. We didn't have to be in this place. The President had the opportunity to declare a firm policy to end Iran's nuclear program and to enact additional sanctions while Iran's war economy was ailing. But, no, that is not what he did.

Instead, the administration attempted to rely on the ambiguity of its military policy by claiming at every stage that it sought to keep "all options on the table." But that was never a policy. It was a talking point—a talking point was not going to deter Iran.

As I alluded in a speech delivered at AIPAC a few years ago, the only way the administration is going to be able to persuade Iran to cease its pursuit of a nuclear weapon and to dismantle its enrichment capability is if it was prepared to make the Supreme Leader of Iran believe—believe—that the survival of his regime was actually at stake.

In other words, the only way the Iranian regime could have been expected to negotiate to preserve its own survival—rather than simply delay as a means to pursue nuclear weapons—is if the administration had imposed the strictest sanctions while concurrently enforcing a firm declaratory policy that reflected a commitment to a potential use of force, if that became necessary. But, no. The administration chose to pursue negotiations and sanctions consecutively rather than simultaneously, as it also failed to articulate a clear consequence for the crossing of red lines.

Thus, while the President had an opportunity to exercise political leadership and work with the Congress to craft a stronger policy toward Iran that would have better served our national security, he chose the path of concessions instead. Indeed, the administration allowed for a series of concessions throughout these lengthy negotiations.

Rather than anytime, anywhere inspections, the deal creates a process within which Iran can delay inspections for at least up to 24 days.

Rather than dismantle Iran's enrichment capability, some centrifuges will be put in storage, enrichment will continue, and research and development

will go on—all legitimized by the President's deal. Now, at the end of the 10- and 15-year milestones, Iran's breakout time will be reduced to nearly zero.

Concessions were made on the conventional weapons ban and ballistic missile technology embargo too. Despite the fact that the International Atomic Energy Agency reported in 2011 that "Iran has carried out activities relevant to the development of a nuclear device," the administration made further concessions regarding the possible military dimensions of Iran's program.

Assessing this deal strategically, it can only be understood as part of a broader strategy to concede a larger sphere of influence to the Iranian regime while weakening our commitment to our moderate Sunni allies and Israel. Now, that is just fitting within the overall administration's view of reducing America's overseas commitments, its reliance upon international organizations, and its seeming determination to withdraw our forward deployed presence. But in terms of our traditional strategy, it makes no sense at all, as Iran's capability and power will be stronger in every single regard.

Writing in the *Wall Street Journal* in April, two former Secretaries of State noted that Iran's representatives remain committed to a revolutionary, anti-western concept of the international order. They observed that:

Absent any linkage between nuclear and political restraint, America's traditional allies will conclude that the U.S. has traded temporary nuclear cooperation for acquiescence to Iranian hegemony. They will increasingly look to create their own nuclear balances and, if necessary, call in other powers to sustain their integrity.

Does America still hope to arrest the region's trend towards sectarian upheaval, state collapse, and the disequilibrium of power tilting toward Tehran, or do we now accept this as an irremediable aspect of the regional balance?

Regrettably, it appears that the administration has traded the appearance of nuclear cooperation for acquiescence to Iranian hegemony.

The President famously suggested that if countries like Iran were willing to unclench their fist, they would find an extended hand. From that hand the Iranians took concession after concession after concession on enrichment, on U.N. Security Council resolutions, on centrifuges, on missiles, on the conventional arms embargo, and on sanctions—concessions on every one of those issues.

Under the President's deal with Iran, nearly every aspect of Iran's national power will be strengthened: economic power, diplomatic power, espionage power, conventional warfare power, and the power Iran derives from supporting proxies like Hamas, Hezbollah, the Houthis in Yemen, and the Assad regime.

So when supporters of this flawed deal ask "what is the alternative," there is a simple answer: political leadership. It is the next President and the next Congress that will have to deal with the consequences of this deal; and if we are united in ending Iran's nuclear program, we can make clear to the Iranians that their weapons program is simply unacceptable.

Remember: It was the sanctions enacted by Congress, over the objections of President Obama—many people have forgotten that he didn't want the sanctions they ended up getting—that caused sufficient concern within the regime to compel the Supreme Leader to allow the negotiations in the first place.

That is why, throughout the previous Congress and the beginning of this Congress, I attempted to pass additional sanctions and made a commitment to a strong declaratory policy against Iran—an idea some of our colleagues may now deem necessary to pursue through legislation given the terms of the nuclear deal with Iran.

But Congress alone cannot provide Presidential leadership. It can provide for the defense capabilities required to contain and combat threats like Iran. It can reassure regional allies, like Israel, that this Executive deal is not a treaty and can be revisited. And when Iran cheats on this deal, we can resolve to use the tools available to us to stop its nuclear weapons program. In short, Congress can lay the groundwork for the next President. But Congress needs real Presidential leadership, too.

Just this morning, we saw reports that Iran's Supreme Leader had ruled out any real rapprochement with the U.S. after this nuclear deal. We saw the Supreme Leader state his desire to see Israel cease to exist in the coming years. Against that backdrop, we now have the President's deal with Iran before us.

Any objective net assessment of this deal must conclude that it will strengthen the Supreme Leader's regime. No question about it. Any objective assessment must also conclude that America and her allies will be made less safe by the President's deal with Iran. Well, certainly that is the conclusion I have reached as well. This is the conclusion many Democrats have reached. This seems to be the conclusion the American people have reached as well.

I wish this was a deal I could support, but it isn't. I urge my colleagues to join me and many others in voting for the resolution of disapproval.

In fact, we know there is a bipartisan majority of the United States Senate in opposition to this deal. We know that already. We know there is a huge majority of Americans who oppose this deal. We know that every single Democrat who has come out for the deal has immediately started making excuses

about how we need to get tougher with Iran—every single one of them.

So that is what is before us, and it will be before us until next week.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, first of all, I wish to thank our leader and I wish to thank Senator REID for allowing us to come to this vote without a motion to proceed so we can begin this debate in a sober and responsible manner.

I thank the leader. I know many Members on the other side of the aisle were concerned about maybe nefarious amendments being a part of this debate on the front end. I thank you for the way you set up this procedure so that we are focused only on the resolution of disapproval. That is something I know the other side had wanted, and I appreciate your setting it up in that manner.

I also thank Senator CARDIN. I thank him for being such a tremendous partner on the committee. I thank him for his diligence in making what I know was a tough decision on the substance. I truly appreciate his ability and the way he worked with us to ensure that we have this debate and this opportunity to vote.

Let me step back and refresh people's memory. I know there has been a lot of discussion, and there are some who purposefully try to confuse what is happening here. But the fact is that the President decided long ago that he was not going to pursue a treaty. He instead was going to pursue what is called a nonbinding political commitment, and he was going to go directly to the U.N. Security Council for approval. As a matter of fact, he has already done that.

In the course of discussions, we realized, just as the leader mentioned, it was actually we who brought Iran to the table. We had four tranches of severe sanctions that, as was mentioned, in most cases were objected to by the administration, but it was those sanctions and then the international community agreeing with those sanctions that brought Iran to the table in the first place. We had discussions. We realized that we understand the President planned to do this with an Executive agreement.

By the way, I think everyone understands that when the President does that, it is only binding on his administration, it is not binding on future administrations, whereas a treaty, which goes through a whole different process, is binding on future Presidents.

Because we had played such a role, we ended up with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, and this agreement has now put us in place to debate this issue and to decide as a body whether we want to approve it or disapprove it. I thank Senator CARDIN for his efforts in making that happen.

I thank all the Senators in this body—98 of them; 1 was missing that day—who voted to put us in this place. As a matter of fact, I think all of us know that if it weren't for that, we would be having no discussion. This would have already been implemented. The President already went to the U.N. Security Council, and it is this pause that has allowed us to weigh in this way on behalf of the American people and to express whether we approve or disapprove of this agreement.

Let me say this: When the President began back in 2012 and he said that he was going to negotiate with the P5+1 on this Iranian nuclear deal to end their nuclear program, I thought, that is outstanding. As a matter of fact, if the President can do that and if he had done that, I am sure we would have had 100 votes in favor of that. As a matter of fact, in other instances, he mentioned that he wanted to dismantle their nuclear program. Again, as the leader has mentioned, had he achieved that, none of us would be debating this issue. We would be thrilled with that outcome. But it was very evident that was not the course of action which was being pursued when we had the first agreement, the JOPA.

We had another round. We had additional concessions. Finally, we got to the point where we all realized that what was happening—instead of a dismantling or instead of ending Iran's nuclear program, what this agreement does, if we were to approve it, it agrees to the industrialization of their nuclear program. We have a state sponsor of terror, and this agreement is approving the industrialization of their program.

I think everyone knows that one of the great fallacies in this deal is that not only, with our approval, are they industrializing their program, but in 9 months all of the leverage shifts. Their country has a \$409 billion economy. In the next 9 months, this country is going to get about \$100 billion. That has not been disputed. Think about it—25 percent of their economy is going to be given to them in 1 year. Think about an \$18 trillion country such as ours. If we were to get \$4 to \$5 trillion, think what we would be able to do with those resources. Over that 9-month period, regardless of what they do with PMD, regardless of what they do with other issues, the rest of the big economic sanctions are going to be relieved. Their economy is going to be growing. They are going to be cash-rich. They are going to be a much stronger country.

I think it is probably important to talk about whom we are dealing with. I know Senator COTTON has alluded to this before, as have many others, but when we went to Baghdad through the years, most of us sat down with General Odierno. On his coffee table, he would have in front of him all of the

devices Iran was using to kill and maim our soldiers. I think you will remember that there was actually a rush at one time to rush out humvees to try to protect our soldiers from having their limbs and body parts dismembered. Once we did that, the Iranians developed another device. It was made of copper. When it exploded, it would go through any type of metal. It was used to kill Americans. It was used to dismember them. As a matter of fact, when you see people in Tennessee, Wyoming, Kansas, or in other places walking up and down the street with prosthetics, that was Iran. Iran was responsible for the dismembering of so many Americans.

They are the same people, by the way, who are supporting Assad right now. An amazing thing—the IRGC, which is the arm that directly reports to the Supreme Leader, is the shock force in Syria right now that is keeping Assad afloat.

The ranking member and I recently went to see a display by the Holocaust Museum. A gentleman named Caesar had documented what Assad, with Iran's support, is doing to everyday Syrians in the country. As we sit here, what they are doing is torturing people. As a matter of fact, I wish you could see the pictures. They are actually amputating people's genitals. As we are sitting here in this comfortable setting, Iran is supporting Assad's ability to do that to his own people. We see on the TV screens what is happening. People are flooding out from Syria and flooding out from Iraq to get away from what is happening right now in the Middle East.

We know that Hezbollah—another arm of Iran—through one of its proxies right now, is destabilizing Lebanon.

We know that Hamas is being supplied rockets—sophisticated rockets, I might add—from Iran to shoot into Israel.

We know that in Bahrain, where we have thousands of troops to keep the Strait of Hormuz open, they are supplying terrorist organizations there to disrupt that government and cause harm to the people who are serving us.

So this is whom we are dealing with—the greatest state sponsor of terror that we know. We only named three, by the way. We named Syria, we named Sudan, and we named Iran.

Obviously, when we worked through the first agreements and in the interim agreement where we agreed to enrich, that was quite a shock to most of us. Then they went through the first big round to reach this comprehensive agreement, and that agreement addressed a number of the issues the leader just laid out. But prior to going to Geneva, there were still, in this final round, some issues that needed to be addressed.

I had one of those few calls with Secretary Kerry where I felt as though he

was listening. I talked to him at length. I told him: Secretary Kerry, a lot of people are going to have difficulty ever approving a deal that allows Iran to industrialize their program like this.

But how you finish these last pieces is going to say a lot qualitatively about how we really plan to implement this deal. At that time, of course, we still had the issues of previous military dimensions. Some people call it possible military dimensions. But we know they were developing a nuclear weapon. You certainly heard the presentation regarding how we are dealing with Parchin. It is really pretty amazing, after the AP report came out, how this has actually survived late-night comedy. We know that if the IAEA gives a report on Iran's previous military dimensions—I think you know Iran is supposed to be supplying the IAEA information and access to scientists regarding what they were doing. But regardless of what the quality of this is—if it is a D-minus report or an A-plus report—the fact is that they still get the sanctions relief they are seeking over the next 9 months.

In addition to that, the inspections process—we have all had concerns about the fact that we have to wait 24 days. By the way, there is a lot of misunderstanding about the 24 days. That is after the IAEA raises a concern. That is after Iran responds to that. Some people have written that it could take as many as 40 to 45 days for this to occur. But then there is a 24-day period.

Our leader referred to the IR-1. Iran has done a masterful job because they have gotten the P5+1 to focus on their IR-1 centrifuges. They have 19,000 of them. They are antiques. Truly, they are antiques. What they have going on right now is the development of IR-2s, IR-4s, IR-6s, IR-8s.

I would ask you to go down to the SCIF and let some of our intelligence people tell you the speed—the difference between the IR-8 and IR-1.

Let me say to you without giving any classified information that in a room the size of where I am standing to this back wall and actually much closer this way, in a small room like that, Iran can actually do the equivalent of 720 IR-1s. With a 24-day inspection process, our ability to detect in very small areas of Iran—a very large country—this type of thing is going to be very difficult.

So I talked to Secretary Kerry about those two things, and I am sorry, I feel as if we totally punted on those issues, and then for good measure, as has been mentioned many times, we threw in the lifting of the conventional arms embargo. I mean, where did that come from? What did that have to do with the nuclear power? We threw in the lifting of ballistic testing in 8 years. Again, what was that about? Then,

with some really special and peculiar language meant, I think, to confuse, we lifted immediately their ability to test ballistic weapons.

So let me say again that all of this we know is being done with a country that has no practical need for enrichment. They have one nuclear reactor—one. They can buy enriched uranium so much cheaper on the market. They have absolutely no need for 19,000 centrifuges. They have no need for an underground facility to protect from bombing. They have no need for the facility at Arak that produces plutonium.

Many people have said that Iran wants to have the ability to deal with medical isotopes. They want to show to the rest of the Middle East that they are sophisticated. Do you know how many centrifuges they would need to do that? Five hundred.

So what has all this been about? They have put their people through such grief, such economic depravity. They have been isolated from the world. They are a rogue community. And they have done all that to create a program that has, as we know, only one need, and that is so they can develop a nuclear weapon.

I am very disappointed with where we have come up, and I am disappointed to add this as another problem. We are doing all this without a strategy in the Middle East. I wrote an op-ed in the Washington Post—not that anybody reads them—to talk about my disapproval of this deal. When you think about it, one of the great tragedies—again, we are seeing it play out on television. JOHN MCCAIN has been so good at talking about this issue. But what we are seeing play out right now is no strategy in the Middle East. It is the greatest humanitarian disaster of my lifetime.

So what is going to happen without any strategy to push back against Iran, to push back against what they are doing in Syria, what they have been doing in Lebanon, what they are doing in Yemen, what they are doing in Bahrain, what they are doing certainly against Israel—Hamas—without a strategy, this is going to be the de facto strategy.

I will remind everyone again that in 9 months all the leverage goes away. Right now we have leverage over them. In 9 months, they have all their money and the sanctions have been relieved. Many of you have read statements that have been issued by the Supreme Leader and others that if we try to put sanctions on them for their terrorist activities, violations of human rights or other activities, you know what they are going to say. They are going to say: Hey, I am sorry. You are violating the agreement.

Remember, this President has tried to obligate not just us from putting additional sanctions in place, but he has

tried to keep State and local governments from putting sanctions in place. He is actually acting as a buffer against those people who in good conscience would want to push back against the terrible human rights activities that are taking place and the terrorism that is being exported.

Again, this is going to be our strategy. Think about it. In a year, before the next President takes office, let's say we want to put sanctions in place to push back because Iran is supplying additional arms to Assad, as it appears Russia is doing right now, what is Iran going to say? Well, we are just going to begin development of our nuclear program.

What if we say that we know they are in violation of the nuclear program, and therefore we are going to put sanctions in place, what are they going to say? Well, we are just going to resume the nuclear program.

So in 9 months, literally, the leverage shifts from us to them. We are going to be very reticent to challenge them on any violations of this agreement. Candidly, we are going to be reticent to push back against the things they are doing to destabilize the region.

I will close with this. I appreciate the leader setting up this debate. I appreciate Senator REID allowing us to do this. I appreciate that 98 Senators have said: Look, this is probably the biggest foreign policy issue we are going to deal with during our time here in the U.S. Senate. I hope what is going to happen over the course of the next several days is that we will continue to express our approval by some, our disapproval by others—a bipartisan majority—and the reasons as to why some approve this.

At the end of the day what I hope will happen is that—since all 98 Senators in this body said they wanted to debate this and wanted the opportunity to vote up or down on the substance of this deal—we will have enough colleagues in this Chamber who will agree that because it is the biggest foreign policy issue of our day and because 98 Senators stood up and said: No, Mr. President, you cannot implement this deal until we express whether we approve or disapprove this deal, we will have far more than 60 Senators who will agree to allow us to get to a final vote so everybody in this Senate can be accountable.

This is an important issue. I thank my colleagues for the time to be able to discuss it in this way.

With that, I will yield the floor. I thought Senator CARDIN was next, but it looks as if it will be Senator DURBIN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arizona, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, be recog-

nized and that I be recognized following his remarks.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator from Utah, the President pro tempore, advise the Senate if we are operating under a unanimous consent agreement as to time allocations?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. At this time, the time is equally divided.

Mr. DURBIN. Between which hours?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time until 5 p.m. today is equally divided.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, will the President pro tempore be kind enough to tell me how much time has been used by the Republican side since 2:15 p.m.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Approximately 45 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I do not object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I am really glad that the distinguished leader of the Armed Services Committee is going to speak next. The Senator from Arizona probably has more knowledge of the Middle East than almost anybody in this body, but it was my understanding that we were going to rotate back and forth.

We actually have people who have asked to speak. Senator REID had asked to speak, but he decided not to do so. Senator CARDIN was going to speak. We were going to rotate between Republicans and Democrats.

Senators had signed up for time to speak, and that was the procedure we were going to follow. It wasn't going to be just Republicans on the floor and then Democrats, but it appears the majority whip wishes to alter that status.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we have Senators on the Democratic side prepared to speak when the Republicans are ready to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Illinois that I will be more than happy to yield to any speaker on the other side. I was under the impression that we were going to be going back and forth, and I think that would contribute to the debate. If the Senator from Illinois or the Senator from Hawaii or anyone else wishes to speak, I will be glad to yield.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between both sides of the aisle and that following the recognition of a speaker on our side, an opportunity be given to a speaker on the Democratic side and that we alternate back and forth using the time that is allotted for the debate.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object. The Republican side has already used 45 minutes, so I hope the Senator from Texas is saying that between 2:15 p.m. and 5 p.m. the time will be equally divided, and we will rotate from one side to the other.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask consent to amend the request.

Mr. MCCAIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas has the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. I yield the floor.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, again, I say to the Senator from Illinois that the usual way I have seen around here for many years is one side will speak, and then the other side will make their argument. If the Senator from Illinois wants to stack up all of his time on that side so there is no back and forth, I don't think that is the intent of what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to my friend from Arizona, I have told you, we have Democratic Senators prepared to speak. So when my friends are ready to give up the floor, we will be glad to recognize our Democratic Senators.

Mr. MCCAIN. We have been in since 2:15 p.m.

Mr. DURBIN. We have been waiting patiently.

Mr. MCCAIN. I know their schedules are very crowded, but I would hope that maybe one of them could wander over and speak. This is a fairly important issue.

Mr. DURBIN. I say to my friend from Arizona, we have a Democratic Senator prepared to speak at this moment.

Is the Senator prepared to yield?

Mr. MCCAIN. Prepared to speak at this moment?

I yield to whichever Senator on the other side wishes to speak.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. SCHATZ. Thank you, Mr. President.

A President of the United States once said of his Nation's enemy that we cannot "wish away the differences between our two societies and our philosophies, but we should always remember that we do have common interests and the foremost among them is to avoid war." In pursuing that cause, he said:

We will be prepared to protect our interests and those of our friends and allies, but we want more than deterrents. We seek genuine cooperation. We seek progress for peace.

It was President Reagan who seized the opportunity during the Cold War and President George H. W. Bush who carried it forward. Together they achieved commitments from the United States and the Soviet Union, enemies through and through, to reduce their stockpiles of nuclear weap-

ons, bringing us ever closer to a world free of the threat of nuclear annihilation. It ingrained in us a tradition of pragmatism—the idea that even with countries we deeply distrust and whose behavior we abhor, we cannot ignore the opportunity to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

The Joint Comprehension Plan of Action that the United States negotiated with Iran and the other members of the P5+1 preserves that tradition, to "seek progress for peace."

This deal is not perfect, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee so ably explained. We had to make concessions, and that is because it was negotiated between sovereign countries pursuing diplomacy and not unconditional surrender.

I hear complaints about one provision or another, and some of those criticisms are valid, but we don't have the luxury of sending our negotiators back to Vienna. If we do that, things will fall apart. Every ambassador from the P5+1 has made clear that the multilateral sanctions that brought Iran to the table will be upended. We would be isolated diplomatically, Iran's nuclear program would be unconstrained, and Iran would get most of its money too.

Of course, we could levy harsh unilateral sanctions ourselves, and that would be emotionally satisfying to many, but they won't bite. They did not when Iran went from 300 centrifuges to more than 18,000, and they won't now.

The question in this debate is whether to approve the deal or dump it. There is no door No. 3, but we don't need to feel resigned because, as a deal, it is quite a good one. Experts in the nonproliferation space almost unanimously affirm that it is a strong deal. It blocks each one of Iran's pathways to the bomb and places its nuclear program under strict international supervision. There is no alternative to this agreement, and certainly no military option, that eliminates 98 percent of Iran's fissile material or two-thirds of its operating centrifuges.

Now, I will grant that critics make a few very persuasive arguments that have more to do with how we view Iran than how we view this deal. First they say that it places too much trust in Iran, but the opposite is true. This agreement is not based on trust or shared values, and we have no reason to assume that Iran will comply with its terms in good faith. That is why the agreement adopts a robust inspections and verification regime that will be in place for up to 25 years. We will be monitoring Iran's entire nuclear supply chain—from uranium mining, milling, and enrichment to the manufacturing and replacement of centrifuges—so we will know if Iran is diverting uranium or centrifuges to secret facilities.

If Iran does try to break out to acquire the bomb, all options remain on

the table to stop it, including the use of military force. And because the agreement provides us more information about Iran's nuclear program, our military options will be more effective and have the backing of the international community because we will have exhausted diplomacy first.

The other concern, and I think this is a valid one, is that this deal should not be overstated in terms of its impact on our priorities and alliances in the region. It is important on the nuclear issue, but in October we will have many of the same challenges in the Middle East that we have in September. Iran is still the world's leading state sponsor of terror and nothing in this deal will deter us from working to contain Iran's regional aspirations, including its support of Hamas and Hezbollah. But our efforts can now occur with a nuclear-armed Iran off the table.

I wish to personally offer some words to those Americans who love Israel with a personal passion and commitment that I share. Your skepticism is well earned and based in faith and history—based in familial relationships and culture. It is core of who we are.

My colleagues rightly want to know what happens next. What is the United States prepared to do to protect loved ones in a dangerous neighborhood? Whether one supports this deal or not, we can all agree that America's commitment to Israel remains unshakeable, and we will continue, Democrats and Republicans united, to stand with Israel. Even as we work to restrict Iran's nuclear ambitions, we will continue to thwart Hamas and Hezbollah. We are committed to cooperating with Israel on intelligence and security at the highest levels ever and continuing to ensure that Israel's qualitative military edge is protected. When this debate is over, we must find new ways to enhance our joint efforts to counter threats that endanger Israel every day.

We are debating what may be the most important foreign policy choice of the decade. Our decision will have consequences for the security and the stability of the new Middle East. If Congress chooses to oppose this agreement, we will witness an unraveling of the international sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table, with Iran moving ever faster toward the bomb and our country left with few choices besides another war in the Middle East.

We have shown as a country that we have the will to protect ourselves, our allies, and our interests—using military force when truly necessary. We will continue to stand with Israel despite whatever temporary disagreements our governments may have. We do not underestimate or understate the challenges we have and the role of our military in shaping events for the better, but in this instance, with eyes

wide open, we ought to pursue peace first.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky, for conducting the debate on this agreement with the seriousness and gravity it deserves. In doing so, he has acted in the best traditions of the Senate, and I thank him for it.

I wish to also thank my colleague, the Senator from Tennessee, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who I believe just gave a very eloquent presentation of the situation as we are debating today.

Today begins the culmination of a monumental debate that our Nation has conducted for the past 3 months. This debate is not about whether we support diplomatic solutions to international challenges or whether we are willing to negotiate with the Iranian regime or whether we should go to war with Iran. That is not what this debate is about, despite the President's sad, partisan attempts to make it so.

It is always preferable to solve international problems without resorting to military force, but the ultimate test of any diplomacy is not merely whether it avoids the use of force but whether it secures our national security interests. Put simply, I believe the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action fails this test and it fails by the very criteria the administration itself once laid out as a good deal.

Three years ago, President Obama said the goal of negotiations with Iran was to "get Iran to recognize it needs to give up its nuclear program and abide by U.N. resolutions that have been in place." This is what the President said:

The deal we'll accept is they end their nuclear program. It's very straightforward.

In reality, the deal doesn't require Iran to end its program; it simply suspends it for a period of years. As the President said in April, "Iran is not going to simply dismantle its program because we demand it to do so." Let's contemplate that. "Iran is not going to simply dismantle its program because we demand it to do so."

Unfortunately, the administration's concessions didn't stop there. On November 24, 2013, Secretary Kerry said:

There is no right to enrich. We do not recognize a right to enrich.

However, in the final deal, the administration not only conceded the right to enrich, it also allowed Iran to maintain an industrial-scale enrichment capability that will only grow in size and sophistication.

On the issue of Fordow, the once covert nuclear facility that was built deep into a mountain, President Obama said in December 2013 that Iran had no

need—no need—for such a facility if all it sought was peaceful nuclear energy. Yet the final deal allows Iran to maintain nearly 1,000 centrifuges at Fordow and conduct nuclear-related testing there during the entire life of the agreement.

On the issue of Iran's breakout capacity, President Obama said in December of 2013 that in the deal he envisioned, the Iranians "as a practical matter, do not have a breakout capacity." Here, too, the administration reversed itself, conceding to a breakout capacity in establishing the arbitrary standard of 1 year.

Similarly, on the so-called possible military dimensions, or PMD, of Iran's past nuclear activities, Secretary Kerry said this April:

They have to do it. It will be done. . . . It will be part of a final agreement. It has to be.

Just 2 months later—2 months later—Secretary Kerry reversed himself, saying:

We're not fixated on Iran specifically accounting for what they did at one point in time or another. We know what they did. We have no doubt. We have absolute knowledge.

My friends, this kind of hubris is astonishing. I know of no intelligence professional who would share that level of certainty. But perhaps Secretary Kerry's reversal is because the final deal does not require Iran to resolve the PMD issue prior to receiving sanctions relief.

Furthermore, the chief of Iran's atomic energy agency has said sanctions relief will proceed regardless of the resolution of the PMD issue. That was the chief of Iran's atomic energy agency.

The mechanism to resolve longstanding international concerns about the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program is contained in a side agreement between Iran and the IAEA which neither the administration nor the Congress has seen. Get this: There is an agreement on inspection and verification that this Congress, before we vote, will never have seen and the American people will never have seen. How in the world, on the most important aspect of any agreement—verification—the provisions for which are not known to the Members of this body. That alone is a reason to demand—to demand—what are those side agreements? Maybe they are nothing. Maybe they are something we would approve of. We don't even know what in the world they are.

The administration provided a classified briefing on what they know to be in the side agreement, and suffice it to say that I think most of us—even on both sides of the aisle—would agree that briefing is one of the more bizarre and disturbing aspects of this deal. They called it unconventional. That is generous.

What is more, inspections of Iran's facilities will be conducted by the

IAEA, the International Atomic Energy Agency. There will be no Americans allowed on the ground, and the details of how these monitoring activities will occur are contained in another side agreement between the IAEA and Iran.

Here is the problem: Verifying that Iran is not cheating on this deal requires a full accounting of the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program. To verify that Iran has ceased its nuclear weapons-related activities necessarily requires that we know the full extent of these past activities—the personnel, facilities, equipment, and materials used and over what time period. We do not have that information.

President Obama has said this deal is based on verification, not trust, but the means of verification are in many cases suspect. This presents a major problem. We will vote in the coming days on the Iran deal, but we cannot even read certain foundational documents pertaining to how that verification will occur, and our own government is not even a party to those agreements. I find that deeply troubling. It may account for, as more Americans know more about it, the overwhelming majority of Americans who do not approve of this deal.

Even more troubling, however, is that the administration also conceded its longstanding and repeated promises that its diplomacy was limited exclusively to the nuclear fight. For nearly a decade, the international arms embargo has significantly hurt Iran's ability to build up and modernize its aging military.

Not long before the deal was announced, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before our committee—General Dempsey—told the Committee on Armed Services that "under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Is there anything in this agreement that does that? In fact, it is the opposite.

In 5 years, the international arms embargo against Iran will be lifted, freeing up the regime to acquire advanced conventional military means capabilities such as fighter aircraft, air defense systems, and anti-ship missiles. With billions of dollars in sanctions relief, Iran is sure to find plenty of states that are eager to sell those weapons, especially Russia and China.

In 8 years, the agreement would legitimate and accelerate Iran's development of ballistic missiles, including ICBMs, whose only conceivable military purpose would be to deliver nuclear weapons. This concession was made even as the Director of National Intelligence concluded earlier this year that "Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering WMD"—that is weapons of mass destruction—

“and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East.”

In this way, the administration's Iran deal not only paves the Islamic Republic's path to a nuclear capability, it also furthers that regime's emergence as a dominant military power in the Middle East. This has direct and dangerous implications for the United States—especially our Armed Forces. After all, the ultimate guarantee that Iran will not get a nuclear weapon is not a 109-page document; it is the capability of the U.S. military to do what is necessary to prevent it if all else fails.

The administration says that the military option will remain on the table if Iran violates the agreement, and that is true. Yet the agreement itself would enable Iran to construct the very kind of advanced military arsenal that could raise the cost of employing our military option should it become necessary. In short, if this agreement fails and U.S. servicemembers are called upon to take military action in Iran, their lives clearly would be at greater risk because of the terms of this deal.

As we debate the technical details of this agreement, this is the bigger picture we must stay focused on: the strategic implications of this agreement on nuclear proliferation, regional security, and the balance of power in an increasingly chaotic Middle East. This has been the focus of our oversight on the Committee on Armed Services, and from this perspective, this bad Iran deal only looks that much worse.

Iran is not just an arms control challenge; it is a geopolitical challenge. For years, many of us have urged the administration to adopt a regional strategy to counter Iran's malign activities in the Middle East. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee pointed out what has been done by these IEDs that Qasem Soleimani sent into Iraq to kill and maim our men and women who are serving in the military. Unfortunately, if such a strategy exists, there is no evidence of it. Instead, we have watched with alarm as Iran's military and intelligence operatives have stepped up their destabilizing activities in Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Bahrain, Gaza, and elsewhere.

Iran did all of this under the full pressure of sanctions. Now Iran will receive tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief. To be sure, a good amount of that money will go to Iran's priorities, but much of it will also surely flow to Iran's Revolutionary Guards Corps and Quds Force—groups that, as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff also mentioned, were responsible for the deaths of several hundred U.S. servicemembers. This will have enormous consequences for stability in the Middle East and for America's credibility.

For decades, Republican and Democratic administrations have sought to contain the malign influence of the Islamic Republic of Iran and prevent it from acquiring nuclear weapons capability. Our allies and partners have entrusted much of their own security to the United States because they believed our commitments were credible. In this way, America's role in the region has been to suppress security competition between states with long histories of mistrust and to prevent that competition from breaking down into conflict.

I fear this agreement will further undermine our ability and willingness to play that vital stabilizing role. Our allies and partners in the Middle East have increasingly come to believe that America is withdrawing from the region and doing so at a time when Iran is aggressively seeking to advance its geopolitical ambitions. Now we have made a deal with Iran that will not only legitimize the Islamic Republic as a threshold nuclear state with an industrial enrichment capability but will also unshackle this regime in its long-held pursuit of conventional military power and may actually consolidate the Islamic Republic's control in Iran for years to come. The dangerous result is that our allies and partners will be increasingly likely to take matters into their own hands—and, indeed, we already see evidence of that.

These fateful decisions may well manifest themselves in a growing regional security competition, new arms races, nuclear proliferation, and possible conflict, all of which would demand more, not less, U.S. leadership and presence in the region.

Ultimately, this is what I find most troubling about the Iran deal. It embodies and will likely exacerbate the collapse of America's global influence that is occurring under this administration and indeed has so often been catalyzed by its policies.

Just consider—just consider, my colleagues, how much more dangerous our world has become. A malign form of Russian influence is expanding in Europe and Eurasia. Vladimir Putin is using 21st century weapons to further his 19th century ambitions of the Russian Empire—most dramatically in Ukraine where Putin seeks to annex the territory of a sovereign country.

Our President goes to Estonia and days later Russia abducts an Estonian agent on Estonian territory. What message does that send? China's leaders also appear to feel emboldened. Our President visits Asia, and the next week China escalates tensions with a U.S. partner in the South China Sea. Our President visits Alaska and five—for the first time five Chinese warships show up in the Aleutians, violating the 12-mile limit.

Meanwhile, China continues its military modernization while building and

militarizing land features in international waters. Again, there is no deterrence. Cyber attacks against our Nation are increasing in regularity and severity. In just the past year, we have been attacked by North Korea, Iran, China, and Russia. The administration does what? Nothing. There is no deterrence, so the attacks continue.

We have watched the hard-won gains of our men and women in uniform melt away in Iraq following the President's decision to withdraw all of our troops in 2011 over the objections of his military leaders and commanders on the ground. Of course, there is the conflict in Syria, which has claimed 220,000 lives and counting, spawned the largest and most threatening terrorist army in the world, involved the repeated use of weapons of mass destruction, destabilized the entire Middle East, and led to the largest refugee crisis in Europe since World War II.

There is no one who was not deeply moved by the picture of the 3-year-old baby on the beach. My friends, that is a direct result of Obama's foreign policy and have no doubt about it. Amidst all of these growing threats, for 4 years now the Budget Control Act and sequestration have cut our military by hundreds of billions of dollars for no strategic rationale whatsoever. Congress has, unfortunately, been complicit in this disaster, but if the President showed as much personal engagement and willingness to compromise with the Republicans as he did with the Iranians, we could repeal the Budget Control Act and sequestration and fund the government tomorrow.

Through it all, my colleagues, what have we heard from our President? We have been told that America's influence is limited, as if that is not always the case. We have been told there are no good options to the challenges we face, as if there ever are in the real world. We have been told we cannot solve every problem in the world, as if that absolves us from ever attempting to solve any problem. We have been told the administration's worst failures are always someone else's fault and that no policy of theirs, after 6 years in power, is ever to blame.

We have been told the only alternative to our current mess of a foreign policy is war and that anyone who disagrees with this President—Republicans and Democrats; they make no distinction—is a warmonger—is a warmonger. Again and again, where there should be leadership and statesmanship, there is only a parade of truisms and defeatist rhetoric and straw man arguments and partisan attacks.

This has tainted and cheapened our national discourse, as evidenced by the fact that unlike past landmark diplomatic agreements, this one will likely come into force on a party-line minority vote. Let me emphasize that. This Iranian deal will likely be rejected by a

bipartisan majority of both Houses of Congress. If there is a precedent in American history for such a thing, I cannot think of it.

Indeed, a recent Pew poll found that only 21 percent of Americans approve of the Iranian deal. This has also diminished our standing in the world. Our words ring hollow. Our reassurances fail to reassure. Our warnings are not heeded. Our redlines are crossed. Our moral influence is being discredited and tarnished. Americans sense this and so do our adversaries. They perceive it as weakness, and it is provocative.

We need leadership, a strategy, and policies to address this crisis in our foreign policy, especially the broader threat posed by Iran. This larger response should include, among other steps, increasing sanctions against Iran for its malign activities in the Middle East and its human rights abuses, new security assistance for our allies and partners in the region, and once and for all eliminating the specter of sequestration.

This Congress should take up this effort with new legislation. I look forward to working on it with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. That time will come. However, the question now before this body is whether to disapprove of the administration's deal with Iran. I will vote yes. I disapprove of this deal because it would not cut off Iran's path to a nuclear weapon, it would pave a new one. I disapprove of this deal because it would legitimize the Islamic Republic as a threshold nuclear state with an industrial enrichment capability that will grow unfettered after the key terms of the deal end.

I disapprove of this deal because it unshackles Tehran's pursuit of conventional military power. I disapprove of this deal because it rests on the assumption—the hope, really—that in a decade or so we may be dealing with a better Iranian regime. Yet the deal itself will likely strengthen the current Iranian regime. This deal is not in our national security interests. Congress and the American people should reject it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, as has been said, the time is equally divided. Obviously, Republicans have spent a great deal of time on the floor. The order, just for people on our side who are coming and going on our side—we know the next speaker is Senator FEINSTEIN, but it was a preagreed order of HATCH, CORNYN, BARRASSO, and GARDNER. It is my understanding that we may only have about 15 to 20 minutes of time left on our side until 5 o'clock. I just say that for the convenience of Members.

Will the Presiding Officer tell us exactly how much time we have on our side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have approximately 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CORKER. I say that for the convenience of people on our side who may come and go. That is the order. I know that obviously—how much time does the Democratic side have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have approximately 1 hour 15 minutes.

Mr. CORKER. So just based on the process put forward by the minority whip—obviously we will have one more speaker over here. I assume you will have Democrats to fill the time on your side until 5. I want to make that known to people. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of the nuclear agreement with Iran. I do so because I believe this diplomatic achievement provides the only option that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. I would like to take just a moment to say thank you to our negotiating team and commend them on a job that I believe was well done and to thank them for their concerted effort to explain the agreement to the Congress over the past 2 months.

I have been in this body for a long time. There have been many different agreements. I can never remember a time where the Senate has been briefed more assiduously than it has with this agreement. As the Presiding Officer knows, we sat this morning for 2 hours and listened to the top heads of our intelligence agencies discuss with us the particulars of this agreement.

American negotiators have worked with negotiators from the world's major powers—the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China, Russia, and the EU—and reached an agreement that will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon for at least the next 15 years and I believe longer.

I cannot emphasize this enough: the agreement represents the world coming together to put an end to Iran's nuclear program. By contrast, if the Senate disapproves of this agreement, we are on our own.

As of last night, 42 Senators have announced their support for the agreement. In practical terms, that means the Senate will not disapprove of this agreement. We have conducted a full review and the opponents of this deal have failed, but the opponents are still holding out the false hope that there can be a better deal.

Let me be clear: there is no better deal. No one, no state, no leader has proposed one. The only alternative to the agreement we now have is no agreement at all. Should the Congress reject this accord, the United States,

which led this effort, would be deserting our allies and negotiating partners. That is because this is not just an agreement between the United States and Iran. It is an agreement between the world's major powers, the largest most powerful Nations in the world, and Iran. It is one approved by the 15 members of the United Nations Security Council.

Brent Scowcroft, someone I know well, see annually, and the former National Security Advisor to President George H.W. Bush, recently wrote:

There is no credible alternative were Congress to prevent U.S. participation in the nuclear deal. If we walk away, we walk away alone.

I think it may be helpful to remind my colleagues and the American people how we got where we are today. First of all, preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon has been a long-standing and bipartisan national security objective. In 2003, Europe led the first effort to halt Iran's nuclear program. The next decade saw five separate major rounds of failed negotiations and an ever-advancing Iranian nuclear program. Iran went from having a few centrifuges spinning to being a threshold nuclear power.

Following the revelations that Iran was installing centrifuges at Natanz last decade and disclosure in 2012 by our government and allies that Iran was turning a mountain near Qom into a deeply buried centrifuge chamber, Iran has seen sanctions escalate and felt international isolation, but its nuclear enrichment continued and advanced.

The United States, with strong support from this Chamber, led an effort to install devastating multilateral sanctions with the goal of bringing Iran to the negotiating table. Those sanctions were effective because they were supported by the world's powers and importers of Iranian oil. In fact, the United States does not do much business with Iran. We do not import Iranian oil and U.S. banks don't process Iranian financial transactions. Unilateral U.S. sanctions are of little value by themselves, unless we are willing to sanction allies' banks.

Indeed, multiple U.N. resolutions, EU sanctions, and the cooperation of our partners and allies successfully pressured Iran over its nuclear activities. Over time, the international sanctions that we helped build and continually enforced reduced Iranian oil exports from 2.5 million barrels per day to less than 1 million, reduced the number of countries that import Iranian oil from 23 to 6, prohibited Iran from repatriating more than \$100 billion in foreign currency, reduced Iran's GDP by nearly 6 percent in 1 year, caused major inflation, and basically ended international investment in Iran's economy.

The sanctions worked. Iran elected a reform government with a new President to negotiate an end to the sanctions and revive its economy. And despite its doubts, Iran sent a negotiating team to meet with the governments of the P5+1 nations.

In November 2013 we signed the interim agreement that froze and even reversed Iran's nuclear program. According to the IAEA, and verified by U.S. intelligence, Iran has abided by the interim agreement for more than 1½ years. As we all know, in July 2015 the P5+1 signed the final agreement, officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The agreement is the result of years of careful diplomacy among the world's powers. It was only possible because other nations abided by our sanctions at their own economic sacrifice. They believe that these sanctions worked, have achieved their result, and now should be suspended as Iran dismantles much of its nuclear infrastructure. These countries, which were so critical to our ability to impose sanctions, have told us directly they won't go back to the table to negotiate a new deal.

To my colleagues who plan to vote in opposition to this agreement, I hope they have thought long and hard about what message this would send to the world. The consequences of rejecting this carefully negotiated deal would reach far beyond Iran. It would signal that the United States isn't willing or able to lead the world in confronting global challenges.

Since the agreement was reached, I have spoken with many diplomats and statesmen. They are scratching their heads, wondering why the U.S. Congress is lining up with Iranian hard-liners in opposition to this agreement, instead of siding with the UK, France, Germany, Russia, and China, along with all the other members of the U.N. Security Council.

Last week, Saudi Arabia announced its support for the agreement. Foreign Minister Adel Al-Jubeir, who is known to many in this body, concluded his country's support by saying this agreement "will contribute to security and stability in the region by preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear capability."

During the August recess, a former head of state from one of our closest allies sat with me and said: "You know, we are one of the nations you trust the most. We follow U.S. leadership and have agreed to the Iran deal, and now your Congress wants to back out. Why should we ever follow you again?"

Many diplomats I have spoken with have echoed the former Prime Minister's statement. If Congress rejects the agreement, the world will be unlikely to follow us on other important issues in the future and I believe the Executive foreign policy obligations

and responsibilities of a President of our country are diminished. Our ability to lead against global threats, to be the indispensable nation, I believe, ends.

I understand that many Members of the Senate don't support our President, but by disapproving of this agreement we also undermine the ability of any future President to speak for the United States and carry out his or her constitutional role in conducting foreign policy.

I have been involved in national security issues for many years, and I can't recall a time in recent memory when the world was united to this degree on such a complex issue. Even Russia and China are with us. We shouldn't squander the opportunity.

Many of my colleagues have already described the terms of the agreement and how it constrains and allows for intrusive monitoring of Iran's nuclear program. For me, the arguments of Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz are particularly persuasive. As we all know, he is a distinguished nuclear physicist from MIT, and he played a central role in the negotiations. He is a true expert of unimpeachable integrity, and he knows the nuclear world.

He has said over and over again—and I have heard it personally at least five times—that every pathway to a bomb—plutonium, uranium, and covert—is blocked by this deal. The deal blocks Iran's uranium pathway to a bomb at Natanz and Fordow by reducing Iran's installed centrifuges by two-thirds—from more than 19,000 to 6,000—for at least 10 years. It reduces Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium by more than 97 percent, to no more than 300 kilograms of 3.67 percent enriched uranium for 15 years, not enough nuclear material for a single weapon. It requires intrusive IAEA inspections of Iran's centrifuge production—their careful labeling—and storage facilities for 20 years. And it requires IAEA inspections for 25 years of Iran's entire nuclear supply chain.

The agreement blocks Iran's plutonium pathway to a bomb at Arak by modifying Iran's only heavy water reactor so that it cannot produce weapons-grade plutonium and requires all spent fuel capable of being reprocessed for plutonium to be shipped out of the country.

The agreement blocks Iran's covert plutonium pathway to a bomb nationwide by requiring 24/7 IAEA access to all of Iran's declared nuclear sites for 15 years and by empowering the IAEA to use its most advanced monitoring techniques and equipment to ensure Iran cannot tamper with its devices or evade nuclear monitoring, and it guarantees IAEA access to any suspected—suspected—nuclear site within 24 days, including military facilities, and providing access to all of Iran's nuclear sites under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty permanently.

Most notably, the agreement imposes a perpetual prohibition against Iran ever seeking, developing or acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The terms of this agreement are unparalleled. The IAEA has never had this kind of access in any country. As the vice chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I can say we have looked at this issue very carefully.

As the Presiding Officer knows, as late as this morning, I can say that if Iran doesn't comply with its obligations, we will know about it, and we will be able to snap-back the sanctions that are suspended under this agreement.

The administration has provided Congress with documents detailing the verification measures in this agreement. At an unclassified level, the executive branch has written: "The United States is confident that it will be able to verify that Iran is complying with its commitments under the JCPOA, including its commitment not to pursue a nuclear weapon."

The Senate has also received a classified annex to the assessment from the intelligence community, which I think some of my colleagues have reviewed, and I would hope everyone would. The Senate Intelligence Committee has met with the heads of the U.S. intelligence agencies—as I just said—as recently as this morning to receive testimony and ask questions on our ability to ensure that Iran is complying with the terms of the nuclear agreement. From the reports and those hearings, I am very comfortable saying that the covert path to a bomb is closed, period.

I recognize that this agreement doesn't address other problems the United States and the international community have with Iran. Iran continues to support terrorist groups, prop up Bashar al-Assad, and undermine stability across the Middle East. It is a serial abuser of human rights and is improperly detaining American citizens. These are, of course, reprehensible policies and, of course, we will continue to oppose them. But a nuclear-armed Iran would dramatically compound these problems.

In my view, this agreement presents us with an opportunity to begin a broader discussion with Iran. As Iran, hopefully, will become more integrated into the global community and give up some of its bad ways, we can test whether Iran will move toward rejoining the community of nations. Rejecting this agreement only strengthens the hard-liners who lead the chants of "Death to America."

Eighty-eight percent of Iranians are under the age of 54, and 41 percent are under the age of 25. They defied predictions and elected a moderate replacement to President Ahmadinejad in the hopes that Iran will chart a new course. Clearly, this agreement won't change Iran's behavior overnight, and

it would be unrealistic to expect Iran's cooperation on every issue, but it would also be foolish to throw the opportunity away and to give the hardliners another reason to turn their backs on reform.

More importantly, I am not willing to cede America's global leadership to reject this nuclear agreement or ignore the possibility of resolving the region's crises in favor of the myth of a better deal. There is no better deal.

For these reasons, I join the large numbers of diplomats, scientists, retired U.S. flag officers, rabbis, arms controls advocates, national security experts, and intelligence professionals in supporting this agreement with Iran.

I urge my colleagues, most sincerely, to oppose the resolution of disapproval and support this historic agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I listened carefully to the eloquent remarks of the distinguished Senator from California and all of the countries around the world that embrace this deal, and I didn't hear mentioned once the nation of Israel, our most significant and important ally in the Middle East. And it is because, in fact, they do not approve.

As we have heard from the Prime Minister several months ago, this paves the way to a nuclear weapon. It completely transforms American policy, which had been to deny Iran a nuclear weapon, and it paves the path to a nuclear weapon.

But as I was contemplating this debate, I decided it was important for me to visit with Rick Kupke of Arlington, TX. Rick was one of 53 Americans who were held hostage and held for 14 months in Iran at the time of the Iranian Revolution. In an interview with one of our newspapers in Fort Worth, when asked about this deal with Iran, he said:

This is probably the worst agreement of this kind I've seen in my lifetime.

This is an experienced, seasoned Foreign Service officer. He continued:

I don't know why they think the Iranians are going to abide by any agreement. They never have.

So I approach this agreement between President Obama and the regime in Tehran with a tremendous amount of skepticism.

But this debate shouldn't be a partisan one, and I worry that it is quickly becoming partisan, based on the stated intention of the minority leader, Senator REID, the Senator from Nevada, to actually filibuster and prevent an up-or-down vote on this resolution of disapproval. This is something that apparently is being actively encouraged by the President of the United States. Just a short time after the President himself signed the bill—a bi-

partisan bill with 98 votes in the Senate, which sets up the procedure by which this resolution will be voted on—the President, the minority leader, and, apparently, many Democrats are tempted to filibuster this most important national security issue that I have confronted and seen since I have been in the Senate—and many would say during their lifetime.

The President has really taken the low road, I am sorry to say. He has claimed that those chanting "Death to America" in Iran are "making common cause with the Republican caucus." That is the President of the United States. I would like to point out there are several influential leaders of the President's own party who are opposed to this deal and they include some of this Chamber's most expert and respected Members in the field of foreign affairs.

First of all, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CARDIN, to whom I personally express my admiration and respect for his courage—he pointed out in his remarks, when he announced he would vote for the resolution of disapproval, that the deal "legitimizes Iran's nuclear program." He also said: "Under this agreement, Iran is permitted to be able to enrich to a level that will take them extremely close to breakout, legally."

The junior Senator from Maryland has made clear he shares the concerns many of us have expressed; that this deal leaves far too much of Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact and indeed legitimizes their nuclear program—something our stated national policy just a short time ago was to oppose.

The senior Senator from New York, Mr. SCHUMER—perhaps one of the Members on that side of the aisle whose vote was most anticipated before he announced it—announced he is for the resolution of disapproval. He said: "I believe Iran will not change, and under this agreement it will be able to achieve its dual goals of eliminating sanctions while ultimately retaining its nuclear and non-nuclear power."

Senator SCHUMER makes the point that Iran has gotten everything it wants. It has a pathway to a nuclear weapon, it has retained its nuclear infrastructure, and it has gotten an elimination of sanctions.

The former chairman and ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator MENENDEZ, on August 18 announced his decision to oppose this bad deal. He said the deal "failed to achieve the one thing it set out to achieve—it failed to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state at a time of its choosing." In fact, he said it "authorizes and supports the very roadmap Iran will need to arrive at its target."

These are not members of the Republican caucus. These are respected members of the Democratic caucus.

There used to be a time—and I hope it returns quickly—where matters of this gravity and seriousness, threats to our national security, were treated with bipartisan cooperation and consensus building, but apparently the President didn't get that memo—encouraging folks on that side of the aisle to prevent even an up-or-down vote on the resolution of disapproval and presumably cutting short the debate and hoping people across America aren't really paying attention to exactly how bad this deal is and how much it makes the world more dangerous rather than safer.

I hope our colleagues, even if they will vote for this deal or will vote against the resolution of disapproval—I hope they will allow us to have the sort of fulsome debate this serious issue deserves. Then they will be held accountable, as we will, for their vote either for or against the resolution of disapproval.

I note that President Obama seems to want to arrogate to himself not even an authority that the Ayatollah Khamenei appears to have. Ayatollah Khamenei said the Iranian Parliament will vote on this deal, but apparently President Obama doesn't feel the United States Senate should have the same opportunity the Iranian Parliament is going to have—to vote on the merits or lack of merits on this deal.

I hope our colleagues across the aisle will rethink their partisan opposition to actually even having an up-or-down vote on the resolution of disapproval. This could well be, as many have said before me, one of the most consequential foreign policy issues to come before us in a long time, and we ought to treat it with that sort of seriousness.

The American people need to listen—and they are listening—and they will hold all of us accountable for our decisions.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I have been listening to my friend from Texas, and I couldn't agree with him more about the need for us to work in a bipartisan manner to strengthen America's foreign policy.

I believe in the independence of Congress, and I very much support, along with Senator CORKER, the review we are doing. I think this is critically important to the American people. We are having our debate, as we should. I do think, though, that while we are an independent branch, when this debate is over, we have to come together and work in the best interests of America, and I look forward to broad support in Congress to do everything in our power to make sure Iran does not become a nuclear weapons state. I think we can, in a positive way, as we move forward. I mentioned yesterday when I was on the floor about things we can do.

Yes, there is disagreement on whether to vote for or against the resolution of disapproval, but I hope there is no disagreement that we need to work together with a broad consensus of Congress to give this country its strongest possible position moving forward, whether this agreement is approved or not.

With that, Mr. President, I yield to one of the important members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the junior Senator from Delaware, who has spent a lot of time on this issue. He has been a very constructive member of our committee, very instrumental in the passage of the Iran review act. Senator COONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I rise to discuss one of the greatest threats we face today in America, a great threat to our vital ally Israel and to global security—the nuclear weapons ambitions of Iran and the options that remain before us for blocking those ambitions.

On July 14, after years of negotiations between the United States, our international partners, and Iran, the administration reached a comprehensive agreement to freeze and roll back aspects of Iran's nuclear program in exchange for relief from the sanctions that have crippled Iran's economy. Our key partners in imposing and enforcing the sanctions that drove Iran to the negotiating table—the UK, Germany, France, the EU, China, and Russia—also joined in negotiating and ultimately ratifying this deal.

Thanks to bipartisan legislation that passed this Chamber nearly unanimously, Congress is now fulfilling its duty to review this deal under the authority of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. As a public servant and Member of this body, I am grateful for the opportunity to join my colleagues to thoughtfully debate this vital and important issue. As a body, we owe that to the American people. As a Senator from Delaware, I owe that to Delawareans—to participate in a vigorous debate on an issue with profound and far-reaching consequences, not just for our Nation but for the whole global community.

In preparation for this vote, I have dedicated myself to studying and understanding the content and consequences of the deal, and I am grateful to the bipartisan leadership of Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN in convening more than a dozen hearings of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as classified briefings; to the dozens of experts who came before us, both against and in favor of the deal, to provide us with analysis and insight; and to the thousands of Delawareans who have reached out to me by phone, by email, by text, and in person to express their strongly held views both against and for this agreement.

As are many of my fellow Delawareans and Americans, I am deeply suspicious of Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. I am also deeply suspicious of Iran's intentions for its nuclear program, given its long record of cheating on past deals and of consistently expressing virulently anti-American, anti-Semitic, and anti-Israel views.

Iran is a dangerous regime that is today dangerously close to having enough fissile material to build a nuclear bomb. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a profound threat to our Nation's security and our interests around the world, as well as the security of our vital ally, Israel, and all of our partners in the Middle East.

In response to these undeniable realities, we have successfully built a global coalition over the past decade united in their determination to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. They, too, see clearly the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran. Bipartisan actions by Congress and the administration to enact and enforce sanctions have brought us to this point where our major European allies, as well as Russia and China—countries with which we often disagree—have all signed off on a comprehensive agreement to roll back and restrain Iran's nuclear program. The challenge we are discussing on the floor today is whether to move ahead with our partners in this deal or to turn aside from it and attempt to seek a stronger deal.

From the day it was announced, this agreement has been sharply criticized by many in Congress and by the leaders of our vital ally Israel. After a close reading of this lengthy and complex agreement, I, too, have deep and persistent concerns about this deal.

If Iran simply complies with the plain language of this deal, it will first gain tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief that it will likely use to strengthen its support for terrorism and its proxies and rogue regimes and that will make it more resilient to future sanctions. Most importantly, the deal leaves in place key nuclear facilities and programs that over 10 to 15 years or more will allow Iran to develop a large-scale uranium enrichment capability that could be used to quickly make material for nuclear weapons if it decides to violate this agreement and the nonproliferation treaty.

To look at those realities and not recognize them as significant challenges or flaws would be to miss the core content of this deal. On the other hand, the agreement achieves several critical goals that could not be easily achieved by any other means, that freeze or roll back Iran's nuclear ambitions. To get any sanctions relief, Iran must give up 97 percent of its existing stockpile of 12 tons of enriched uranium. It must disable two-thirds of

their 19,000 centrifuges and permanently restructure its heavy water reactor at Arak so it can no longer produce weapons-grade plutonium.

I have heard no questions or challenges to the technical aspects of these significant accomplishments in the deal.

Most importantly, in my mind, Iran has agreed to thorough, intrusive, around-the-clock inspections of all of its declared and known nuclear sites, its uranium mines, uranium mills, centrifuge production, and uranium enrichment facilities for 15 years and more. Iran pledges under this agreement to abandon all efforts to develop or acquire a nuclear weapon, and the U.N. has ratified a unique arrangement under which the United States alone is able to reimpose U.N. sanctions on Iran for cheating on this deal at any point.

Finally, our own military and intelligence community confirm that the option of military action against Iran remains available at all times and will only be strengthened by the significant additional intelligence we will likely gain through regular inspections of Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

While many Americans, including thousands in my home State, have expressed strong opinions about this agreement, and while I, too, agree with many criticisms of this deal, none of us knows with certainty what will happen if instead Congress rejects this agreement. Will the strength of the U.S. banking system and our unilateral sanctions genuinely be strong enough to force our key allies and Iran back to the negotiating table? Is it possible to negotiate a stronger deal than this or will the nations that have dedicated years, along with us, to these negotiations now abandon sanctions and proceed without us to implement the deal with Iran, simply isolating us rather than Iran?

Meetings and discussions I have held with ambassadors of our key partners, as well as with leaders in financial policy and foreign policy, have ultimately persuaded me we are unlikely to be able to reimpose effective multilateral sanctions and renegotiate our way to a better deal if we reject this one.

Don't just take my word for it. Former Secretary of the Treasury Henry Paulson and former Chairman of the Fed Board Paul Volcker have reached the same conclusion publicly and in a whole series of private conversations have reinforced my conclusion.

Last week I delivered an address at the University of Delaware in my home State to explain in more detail why I have ultimately decided to support this deal. Today I am here to speak to my colleagues in the Senate because I believe strongly this floor must be a place of vigorous, spirited, and honest debate. Though nearly every one of my colleagues—in fact, probably as of

today all of my colleagues—have made their arguments, announced their positions and decisions, and discussed their conclusions, as I have in my home State and as many others have with the media, I still believe we cannot ignore this floor as an important place for debate and discussion. I think it is particularly important on an issue that has always in the past garnered such strong and bipartisan support as our Nation's enduring support for Israel.

So let me be clear about my position and where I stand. I will support this agreement and vote against measures to disapprove it in this Congress. I will support this agreement because it puts us on a known path of limiting Iran's nuclear program for 15 years with the full support of the international community. The alternative, I fear, is a scenario of uncertainty and isolation.

Finally, I will support this agreement despite its significant flaws because it is the better strategy for the United States to lead a coalesced global community in containing the spread of nuclear weapons. I support this deal aware of its flaws, and I am committed to working tirelessly with my colleagues to overcome the limitations of the agreement, to ensure the security of Israel, and to contain and deter Iran's ambitions.

That is why I did not make my final decision to support this deal until I secured, to me, valuable additional commitments from the administration—including a letter from the President offering specific reassurances across seven different areas, including that our allies and other members of the P5+1 will stick by us in strictly enforcing this deal, even as their economic engagements with Iran grow, and that we will continue to aggressively and by all means necessary address Iran's support for terrorism and its proxies, and that our commitment to Israel's security will remain unshakeable.

Moving forward, I hope to work with colleagues to focus on strengthening Israel's conventional military deterrent against Iran, vigorously interdicting and countering Iranian support for terrorism and its proxies, strengthening the nonproliferation treaty, so that in 15 years Iran leaves one cage—the JCPOA—and enters another—the constraints of an appropriately strengthened and bolstered NPT, and developing a clear and thorough plan with our European allies for active enforcement to enact a policy of zero tolerance of Iranian cheating on the agreement.

There are few votes in the Senate that will have as much consequence to the security of our Nation and Israel's as this one. I am voting to support this agreement not because I think it is perfect or because I believe it is a perfect mechanism to end nuclear proliferation. I am voting for it because I believe it is our most credible oppor-

tunity in our current situation to lead a global community in containing a profound nuclear threat while preserving America's ability in the future to use economic power and military might to successfully dismantle Iran's nuclear program should diplomacy fail.

My support for this agreement also represents a statement about U.S. leadership of an international system based on institutions that we developed following the Second World War to help bring about a rules-based international system of mutual security.

The United Nations and the IAEA were established following the great conflict of the Second World War to help prevent the spread and threat of nuclear war. We, the United States, helped lead the establishment of these institutions just as we led the international community to reach this deal to limit Iran's nuclear program.

While neither our current international system nor this deal with Iran is perfect, they represent the collective will of our international partners and a vision for America's place in the world for which I will fight. While we reserve the right to use force, if necessary, to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, we should uphold the international system that we helped create, and to do so we should support this deal.

The legitimacy of this order is yet another reason we must ensure adequate oversight and verification of this nuclear deal because its failure will be a blow to the international system which gave it birth.

In closing, Scripture offers us many stories, from Genesis to Deuteronomy to Isaiah and the gospels, in which we are encouraged to pursue diplomacy before resorting to conflict. My support of this agreement in no small part is an attempt to heed that advice.

We cannot trust Iran. But this deal, based on distrust, verification, deterrence, and strong multilateral diplomacy, ultimately, I have concluded, offers us our best opportunity to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

I support this deal with my eyes wide open, aware of its flaws as well as its potential, and I will remain committed to work with my colleagues to minimize the negative consequences and ensure we reap the maximum benefits of this agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator COONS. I know he went through a very deliberative process in reaching his conclusions. I know of his commitment to preventing Iran from having a nuclear weapons capacity, his strong support for regional security in the State of Israel. I know the process he went through because we had many conversations during the August recess. I know his statement is heartfelt,

and I know he did what he thought was best. I just want to underscore that and thank him for his counsel and friendship.

I am going to yield to Senator Kaine. Before I do that, I think it is important to point out that we are here today in this review in a very open and transparent way in large measure because of Senator Kaine.

Senator CORKER filed a review statute—I guess it was now several months ago—and through conversations with Senator Kaine he was able to get a framework that ultimately led to the passage of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act by a 98-to-1 vote on the floor of the U.S. Senate. I was proud to be part of that effort, working with Senator CORKER, but it would not have been possible without Senator Kaine. He was the one who recognized that we needed to find a common path—a non-partisan path—for a transparent review that protected not just the role of the United States Congress, but the executive and legislative branch, and I applaud him for those efforts.

Senator Kaine is a very valuable member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, one of our most trusted members in so many areas of foreign policy, and I am proud to have him as my friend and colleague.

I yield the floor to Senator Kaine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I thank my ranking member and friend, the Senator from Maryland, for those kind words.

Mr. President, I rise to discuss the Iran deal currently being debated in the Senate. We have not had a national security issue during my time in the Senate that has received so much attention in committee and on the floor of this body as this, and that is appropriate. The debate has been, and will continue to be, thorough and vigorous. That is appropriate, and I respect the views of my colleagues regardless of how they will vote on this matter.

I wish to spend a few minutes recapping why I support the deal. I did speak on the floor early in August about this. Since that time, a number of leaders have come out in support of the deal: former Senators John Warner, Richard Lugar, Sam Nunn, and Carl Levin; General Brent Scowcroft, General Colin Powell; and today, former head of the IAEA Commission Uzi Eilam. After I briefly talk about my reasons for support, I want to address three final points: one, the Republican argument on the floor today that it is wrong to have a 60-vote threshold for the vote on a resolution of disapproval; two, the arguments that Vice President Cheney made against the deal yesterday; three, finally, the place of vigorous diplomacy as a tool of American strength.

So first, to quickly recap why I support the deal: I support it because it is

better than the status quo for 15 to 25 years. I don't compare it with a hypothetical alternative. We can create a hypothetical to justify a position. If we can, let's talk about the status quo.

Before diplomacy started, Iran had rocketed ahead to 19,000 centrifuges and 12,000 kilograms of enriched uranium, a plutonium reprocessing facility under construction, and we had very few inspections. The system was very opaque. That was the status quo.

The best description of the Iranian status quo was the description that Prime Minister Netanyahu made to the U.N. in September of 2012. That was a speech known because he drew a bomb dialogue, and that sort of cartoon was known. But if we go into the guts of his speech, he gave a description of where the Iranian program was, and then he concluded and he said this: I want to thank the international community because the sanctions you have imposed together have hurt the Iranian economy, but "we have to face the truth." The sanctions have not stopped the Iranian nuclear program. In fact, there is a pretty good argument that the sanctions accelerated the program.

So if we go back to the status quo, it is an accelerated program, with 19,000 centrifuges and enough enriched uranium for multiple weapons. What we get with this deal, for 15 years disabling two-thirds of the centrifuges, for 15 years rolling back enriched uranium to 300 kilograms—not even enough for one weapon—for permanently disabling the plutonium facility, for 25 years enhanced inspections—more than any nation has to comply with—we get in this deal much better than we would have with the status quo that existed before diplomacy, and that is why I support it.

The second point, the argument about the 60-vote threshold. I am surprised to hear arguments on the floor that it is somehow wrong to use a 60-vote threshold on this bill. When I was in my first 2 years in the Senate and in the majority, the 60-vote threshold was used on everything—immigration, minimum wage, turning off the sequester. Sometimes we exceeded the 60-vote threshold. Many times we exceeded 50 votes, but we couldn't get to 60 on minimum wage. We couldn't get to 60 on turning off the threshold, but there was an insistence: We need to get to 60 votes. I can't think of a single issue of importance in my first 2 years in the Senate where the 60-vote threshold wasn't invoked.

As my ranking member, Senator CARDIN, mentioned, I was one of the co-authors of the Review Act under which we are now proceeding. The act was clear, and it was understood by all that action in the Senate to pass either a motion of approval or a motion of disapproval, either one, would be by a 60-vote threshold. We talked about this explicitly in committee, we talked

about it before the vote on the floor, and we voted in favor of the act by a 98-to-1 margin. I think the current majority party understood that. As was indicated in the letter of 47 to the leadership of Iran, it was stated very plainly we would understand this would be a three-fifths, 60-vote threshold. That is what happens in the Senate, so we shouldn't change the rules now.

The debate has been full, vigorous, and fair. We have spent a lot of time on this and we are going to spend more, and that is appropriate. There is now a complete accountability because all 100 Senators have declared exactly where they are and their position. We should stick with the agreement we made a few months ago, and treat this Resolution of Disapproval under a 60-vote rule.

Point No. 3, the Vice President's arguments yesterday. I respond to them because I think Vice President Cheney basically made two arguments, and they are the two arguments that have been repeated in different ways on the floor. Let me address those two main arguments.

No. 1, we can't trust Iran. I agree. I think everyone on the Democratic side agrees, and there is nothing about this deal that involves trust. That is why we have insisted that Iran subject itself to intrusive inspections by the IAEA for 25 years, and then, following that, to the additional protocol inspections required of all NPT members. The IAEA inspections—130-plus inspectors in the country—will enable us to catch Iran cheating and give us the intel that will be incredibly helpful if we ever need to take military action against them. It is that inspections intel that caused our two former colleagues, Senators John Warner and Carl Levin—chairs of the Armed Services Committee—to write an article recently, "Why Hawks Should Also Back the Iran Deal." It is because inspections give us intel, which increases the credibility of our military threat.

Now, the Vice President's response to this, interestingly enough, is: Wait. We can't trust IAEA inspections. They are going to do it wrong. They have the wrong protocols, and we can't trust them.

Folks, that argument has been made in this body before by the Vice President and others. Vice President Cheney promoted that we go to war with Iraq, and he repeatedly made the case in 2002 and 2003 that we had to do that to stop Iraq's nuclear weapons program. Two weeks before the war began, in early March, the IAEA issued a report indicating, "we have to date found no evidence or plausible indication of the revival of a nuclear weapons program in Iraq." The Vice President then went to the airwaves with others and led a campaign to trash the credibility of the IAEA, to say that neither the integrity of their inspections nor their

accuracy could be trusted. After that, we entered into war against Iraq saying that the IAEA was wrong. And what did we find? What we found was the inspectors and investigators and engineers and scientists of the IAEA were right, and Vice President Cheney and others were wrong. We have been down the path before of trying to trash the IAEA and said they couldn't be trusted, and it was a horrible disservice to America and the world that we didn't give those inspections a chance. We shouldn't go down that path again.

The Vice President made a second argument yesterday—here is a different and better strategy for dealing with Iran—the same strategy that the previous administration followed: Heavy sanctions, threats of military force, but no diplomacy.

But the Cheney doctrine didn't work with Iran. Under that strategy, the Iranian nuclear program rocketed ahead, centrifuges, enriched uranium, growing by the day. The Prime Minister of Israel, Prime Minister Netanyahu, acknowledged this before the U.N. in September of 2012. And when the Vice President was confronted with this by Chris Wallace over the weekend on television, he had no answer for it. He couldn't answer for it because the advance of the Iranian program under the Cheney doctrine cannot be disputed.

I was interested in his speech yesterday when he tried to justify that the strategy had worked when they tried it. Again, he ignored it.

So if we go back to the preferred doctrine of no diplomacy, sanctions, and military threat, we are likely to get what we just got before, and that is an acceleration of the Iranian nuclear program. We should not go back down that path.

Let me conclude with a story about my favorite President, Harry Truman. Truman was a bold and courageous wartime President. He fought in World War I as a captain. He made tough decisions to use the atomic weapons in Japan. He came back to a war-weary Congress and said: Give military support to Greece against Soviet bloc expansion. He came to a war-weary Congress and said: We have to put troops into North Korea. Nobody would say Harry Truman was a softy. He had military bona fides. Truman also was the President who made sure that America was the first nation to recognize the State of Israel, and he always held that as one of his proudest accomplishments. It is one of the reasons that he is my favorite President.

In October 1945, 70 years ago next month, President Truman did something that seems minor but was really important. He called reporters into his office at the White House and said: I have something to show you.

He unveiled that he had redesigned the seal of the Presidency of the United States. The seal is the eagle. The seal

has the arrows of war in one claw and the olive branches of diplomacy in the other claw. Truman had redesigned the seal so that the eagle was now turned to face the olive branches of diplomacy before the arrows of war—this wartime President. He explained: Look, I am a wartime President and I will use military force, but American values are such that we should always prefer diplomacy before the military.

We have the strongest military in the world. As a Virginian, I am so proud of it. We use it when needed. I have voted twice in 2½ years in the Senate as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to use military force. When I cast that vote, it is a very personal one for my State, for me, and my family. These votes are the hardest votes we take. But Truman believed—and I believe—that it is fundamentally a part of our values that we prefer diplomacy first. Before we use military action, we have to be engaged in vigorous diplomacy with allies and adversaries if we can see a path to possibly create a more peaceful world. Other Presidents have reached the same conclusion, not only President Truman—President Kennedy, in negotiating the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty with the Soviet Union; President Nixon, in going to China when China was supporting the North Vietnamese against us; President Reagan, in negotiating against the evil empire, the Soviet Union, over their nuclear program; and now President Obama. Our great Presidents have realized that diplomacy isn't just for friends. Diplomacy is important, even and especially with adversaries if you can see a path—a possibility—to a more peaceful world.

Here is something that is fascinating. Just as a strong military enhances diplomacy, strong diplomacy enhances our military might. That is true in this case. If we do a deal, we get an Iranian pledge that they will never pursue, develop or acquire nuclear weapons, caps on their programs for 15 years, and inspections forever. These tools will increase our intelligence. They will increase our legal justification to take military action if they break the pledge that is in paragraph 1 of the agreement.

It will also increase the likelihood that America will have global support if military action is necessary. But what if we walk away from diplomacy now? We lose the military intelligence that inspections will give us. We give up a clear legal justification for military action if—God forbid—we should need it. We weaken the likelihood that other nations will support military action if it is necessary.

In this case, diplomacy strengthens—not weakens—the American credibility of our military threat. Trying diplomacy here will keep the world's attention on Iranian behavior. Walking away from diplomacy here will put the

world's attention on American negotiating tactics and why we decided that we would rather go it alone. I believe the article I branch should send the message that we value diplomacy as a first option, just as President Truman did 70 years ago.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I thank Senator Kaine for his leadership on the review act. I know the statements and his position are heartfelt and ones that he comes to with full passion. I thank the Senator very much for his contribution.

I am now pleased to yield to Senator SANDERS. The two of us came to the Senate together. We served in the House of Representatives. He is one of the most passionate voices in this country. It is an honor to have him here on this issue.

I yield to Senator SANDERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. I thank my friend from Maryland.

Mr. President, I rise to speak about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the agreement that the United States negotiated with China, France, Germany, Russia, the United Kingdom, and Iran. I support the agreement and will oppose the resolution of disapproval, as I believe this approach is the best way forward if we are to accomplish what all of us want to accomplish; that is, making certain that Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon, an occurrence which would destabilize the region, lead to a nuclear arms race in the area, and would endanger the existence of Israel.

It is my firm belief that the test of a great nation, with the most powerful military on Earth, is not how many wars we can engage in but how we can use our strength and our capabilities to resolve international conflicts in a peaceful way. Those who have spoken out against this agreement, including many in this Chamber, and those who have made every effort to thwart the diplomatic process are many of the same people who spoke out forcefully and irresponsibly about the need to go to war with Iraq—one of the worst foreign policy blunders in the modern history of our country. Sadly, people such as former Vice President Dick Cheney and many of the other neocons who pushed us into war in Iraq were not only tragically wrong then; they are wrong now. Unfortunately, these individuals have learned nothing from the results of that disastrous policy and how it destabilized that entire region. I fear that many of my Republican colleagues do not understand that war must be a last resort, not the first resort. It is easy to go to war. It is not so easy to fully comprehend the unintended consequences of that war.

As the former Chairman of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I have talked to veterans from World War II to Iraq, and I have learned a little bit about what the cost of war entails. In Iraq and Afghanistan, we lost over 6,700 brave men and women, and many others have come home without legs, without arms, and without eyesight. Let us not forget that 500,000 veterans of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan came back to their families with post-traumatic stress disorder and traumatic brain injury—500,000 brave Americans. The suicide rate of young veterans is appallingly high. The divorce rate of those who served is appallingly high, and the impact on their children is appallingly high. God knows how many families have been devastated by these wars.

We should also not forget that many hundreds of thousands of innocent Iraqi men, women, and children who died in that war, and those whose lives who have been completely destabilized, hundreds of thousands of people whose lives have been totally altered, including those who are fleeing that country today with only the clothes on their backs as refugees. The cost of war is real. It is easy to give great speeches about how tough we are, but let us not forget the cost of war on the men and women who serve in our military and people in other countries.

Yes, the military option should always be on the table, but it should be the last option. We have to do everything we can to reach an agreement to ensure that Iran does not get a nuclear weapon without having to go to war. I believe we have an obligation to pursue diplomatic solutions before resorting to military engagement—especially after nearly 14 years of ill-conceived and disastrous military engagements in that region.

The agreement before us calls for cutting off Iran's pathways to the fissile materials needed for a nuclear weapon by reducing its stockpile of uranium by 98 percent and restricting the level of enrichment of uranium to well below the level needed for weaponized uranium. The agreement requires Iran to decrease the number of installed centrifuges by two-thirds, dismantle the country's heavy water nuclear reactor so that it cannot produce any weapons-grade plutonium, and commit to rigorous monitoring, inspection, and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Only after Iran has demonstrated to the international community its compliance with the tenets of this agreement, the United States and European Union will lift the sanctions that helped bring Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. This agreement also contains a mechanism for the snapback of those sanctions if Iran does not comply with its obligations.

Does this agreement achieve everything I would like? No, it does not. But

to my mind, it is far better than the path we were on with Iran developing nuclear weapons capability and the potential for military intervention by the United States and Israel growing greater by the day.

Let us not forget that if Iran does not live up to this agreement, sanctions may be reimposed. If Iran moves toward a nuclear weapon, all available options remain on the table. I think it is incumbent upon us, however, to give the negotiated agreement a chance to succeed. It is for these reasons that I will support the agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 16½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I don't know that we have faced a debate of this historic importance for 12 years, because it was about 12 years ago that we voted on the floor of the Senate on whether to invade Iraq. Senators don't forget those debates. What is at stake is war. What is at stake is human lives—not only the enemy but the innocent and those who are friends.

I remember that debate very well. There were 23 of us who voted against the invasion of Iraq—one Republican, Lincoln Chafee, and 22 Democrats. At the time, we were told by Vice President Cheney, Secretary Rumsfeld, and others that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction and we had to stop them for fear that they would use those weapons against our allies and our friends and even against the United States. It turned out that there were no weapons of mass destruction—none. After the invasion, they scoured the country and could find no evidence of those weapons.

The cost of that war is incalculable. The numbers only tell part of the story. There were 4,844 Americans who lost their lives. Tens of thousands have come home with traumatic brain injury, post-traumatic stress disorder. The cost to our Treasury is in the trillions. That and the war in Afghanistan—incidentally, the longest war in our history—were efforts in the Middle East to try to bring some order to chaos. Only limited success emerged from those efforts after all of the costs were paid in human life and treasure.

Those who are quick to talk about a military option to deal with the Iranians should be reminded, as the Senator from Vermont just said, of the extraordinary cost of that alternative. I have always felt then and now that diplomacy should be the first effort to try to avoid military action, to try to avoid a war. That is what this is about.

This President, Barack Obama, decided to make the sanctions regime tougher than ever. To do it, he had to engage countries from around the

world that depended on Iranian oil and were prepared to stop importing Iranian oil to punish them until they would come to the negotiating table. He gets absolutely no credit for that from the other side of the aisle—none—but he should.

He then took our major leaders and allies in the world and brought together a P5+1 coalition. We met with the Ambassadors from these countries. It was hard, just as an amateur student of history, to sit across the table from the Ambassadors of China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France and imagine that coalition coming together for any purpose that would serve the United States in the cause of world peace, but they did. The P5+1 came together and entered into a serious negotiation in an effort to stop the Iranians from developing a nuclear weapon. That was the goal. That was the reason for the sanctions.

There are many aspects of Iranian foreign policy and conduct which are reprehensible to me even to this day that don't reach that level of nuclear weaponry, but we focused on nuclear weaponry because we knew that was critical. If Iran developed a nuclear weapon, it would threaten our greatest friend and ally in the Middle East, Israel, as well as other countries that have worked closely with the United States, and trigger an arms race on the Arabian Peninsula, which would have been devastating. So we set out to stop that from happening.

Something happened during the course of that negotiation which was unprecedented in the history of the United States. On March 9, 2015, 47 Republican Senators sent a signed a letter to the Ayatollah, the Supreme Leader in Iran. I have read the letter over and over again and still cannot believe it. On March 9, 2015, 47 Republican Senators sent an open letter to the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran which basically said: We know you are in negotiation with the United States over stopping the development of a nuclear weapon, but understand—this letter makes it clear—that this President does not have the last word.

That has never happened before. I have asked those who studied the history of this country if there was ever a time when the United States of America was involved in delicate international negotiations and a group of Senators or Congressmen wrote to the other side—to the Iranians—to tell them to think twice before negotiating with the United States of America. It has never happened. It is unprecedented.

So 47 Republican Senators who did not want to wait until the agreement was reached or written decided in advance to warn the Ayatollah in Iran not to negotiate with the United States or to assume that any agreement would be enforceable with Con-

gress or future Presidents. What a contrast that 47 Republicans would decide in the midst of negotiations to send that letter—what a contrast with the Democratic side of the aisle.

For the last 6 weeks, I have been in touch with my colleagues over here—they are probably tired of hearing from me—talking about this agreement and where they stood. I know, but for a few, what they went through. Many of them were trying to educate themselves on the terms of this agreement because it is complicated. They were talking to experts in the field. One Senator came back and spent 5 hours with the intelligence agencies here in Washington trying to understand the complexities of this agreement and how they worked.

After all of that time, after all of that reflection, and after all of that study, these Senators announced their positions. Forty-two supported the President's position, and four opposed the President's position. Instead of prejudging the agreement or assuming the agreement was bad, they took the time to read it and study it. They took the time to use their responsibilities as Senators to make sure they understood this historic document, and 42 came out in favor of it.

I will tell the Presiding Officer that at this point in history, we have a tough decision to make—whether we as a nation will pursue this agreement in an effort to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon or the alternative. I have yet to hear a critic of this agreement honestly present the alternative. The alternative is obvious.

Today Iran owns enough fissile material to make 10 nuclear weapons. The Prime Minister of Israel has warned the world that they are only months away from developing a nuclear weapon in Iran. Yet we hear from the other side of the aisle that we should walk away from any inspections or agreement to stop a nuclear weapon. What is going to happen the next day in Iran if that point of view prevails? What happens if this agreement we have entered into should founder and fail? The door is closed, no inspectors, no negotiations, and Iran is on its own. That is not the recipe for a safer world. That is not the recipe for a safer Israel, as far as I am concerned, and that is why I support this.

I am happy to be joined in my support with leaders such as GEN Colin Powell, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under a Republican President and former Secretary of State under a Republican President, who has endorsed this agreement. He has told us: Don't trust Iran. Mistrust Iran, if you will, and verify.

We are going to send in scores of inspectors to verify—inspectors who have access to everything in Iran—and if there is a dispute over access, it is one that can be resolved in a matter of days or weeks.

I might add that there are telltale pieces of evidence for the development of nuclear weapons that the Iranians could never destroy in that of period of time. We will know if they have breached this agreement, and in knowing that, we have created the authority within the United Nations for the United States alone to reimpose sanctions based on a breach of this agreement by Iran.

It is an extraordinary agreement. Could it be stronger? Of course. But when we look back throughout history at the skeptics who have attacked Presidents of both political parties who have tried to reach agreements to create a more peaceful world, this is no different. When President Ronald Reagan—literally a deity in the Republican Party—decided to sit down and negotiate with Mikhail Gorbachev over nuclear weapons, the conservative wing of the Republican Party said he was signing a suicide pact, wasting his time, and threatening the United States—Ronald Reagan—in negotiating with Gorbachev. The same held true when Richard Nixon decided to open negotiations with China. The critics on the right were quick to condemn him. Chinese were sponsoring North Vietnamese who were killing American soldiers. There were plenty of reasons not to do it. Richard Nixon did it with bipartisan support, and the world is a better place for the courage he showed.

At this point, as we bring this aspect of the debate to a close—and I see Senator REED is here and will be recognized soon—we listened carefully to those who are critical of this agreement. It turns out that not a single Republican Member of the House or Senate is supporting this agreement—not one. It is hard to think back in diplomatic history when there has been such a partisan division within Congress on an issue of this historic importance and magnitude, but that shouldn't deter us. We need to work with our allies so we can move forward with the inspections and the deadlines to make certain we do everything in our power to bring peace to the Middle East, short of war. Those who want military action should speak up and say so. I don't. I want to see this done through diplomatic means, and I believe this effort is a good-faith effort to achieve that.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the vote the Senate will soon take on a resolution to disapprove the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA, is both momentous and historic. I, along with my colleagues, have carefully and conscientiously reviewed this agreement. We have each applied our independent judgment as to whether or not it achieves the primary objectives the President set out in the negotia-

tions when they began in November 2013—to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Since the conclusion of the negotiations, I have reviewed the text of the agreement, attended and participated in hearings of the Armed Services Committee and Banking Committee with government witnesses and non-government witnesses, received a series of classified briefings, and reached out to Rhode Islanders for their views. These venues—all of them—provided a full range of views and opinions and were critical in my review and decision with respect to the JCPOA.

In my view, evaluating the JCPOA rests on three factors. The first is the sufficiency of the provisions to cut off all Iranian pathways to a nuclear weapon. The second is the ability to conscientiously and continuously monitor and verify adherence to these provisions. Finally, we have to evaluate whether this agreement will leave us in a better position than a rejection of the agreement.

This last point of whether the agreement leaves us in a better position than rejecting it touches on two alternatives suggested by opponents of this agreement. The first suggested alternative is that there is a better agreement awaiting us if we simply reject the JCPOA and impose even more stringent sanctions. The second suggested alternative is that, without the JCPOA and with the possibility that an enhanced sanctions regime cannot be reconstituted, we can exercise a military option which will be more effective and less costly than following through with the JCPOA.

For reasons I will discuss in detail in the course of my remarks today, the JCPOA, in my view, does provide adequate measures to interdict Iranian pathways to a nuclear weapon and an unprecedented monitoring and verification regime moving forward. In addition, our national intelligence means will provide further insights into Iranian activities. In this regard, we will be aided by many international partners whose intelligence activities are acutely focused on Iran.

As such, I believe the JCPOA, if scrupulously implemented, will accomplish our objective of preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and is a better option than the alternative suggested in lieu of the JCPOA. That is why I intend to support the agreement and will vote against the resolution of disapproval.

To begin this discussion, I think it is important to recognize where we were when President Obama began his efforts to cut off all Iranian pathways to a nuclear weapon. Perhaps the most revealing description comes from Uzi Arad, who in 2009 was the National Security Advisor to newly elected Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. Arad described Iran's nuclear capacity in an

interview with Ha'aretz, an Israeli newspaper. In his words, "The point of no-return was defined as the point at which Iran has the ability to complete the cycle of nuclear fuel production on its own; the point at which it has all the elements to produce fissionable material without dependency on the outsiders. Iran is now there." That was in 2009.

This was the situation that confronted the President and the world in 2009. To glibly suggest today, as some do, that the international community could negotiate Iran back, after they pass the "point of no return," to a position of "no enrichment" is to ignore the reality of Iranian efforts, particularly from the mid-2000s forward. For example, in 2006 the Iranians possessed fewer than 400 centrifuges in a research facility. By 2009 they had well over 8,000 centrifuges, together with the essential elements of a nuclear program, taking them beyond the "point of no return," as indicated by Uzi Arad.

Former Secretary of State and National Security Advisor to President George Herbert Walker Bush, GEN Colin Powell, recently made this point as well. He said that Iran has "been on a superhighway for the last ten years to create a nuclear weapon or a nuclear weapons program, with no speed limit."

In a similar vein, Amos Yadlin, former head of the Israeli Defense Forces Military Intelligence Directorate and now director of the Institute for National Security Studies, made the point that any analysis or possible options regarding the Iranian nuclear program must begin with the recognition that they have already passed the "point of no return." In his words, "[t]he starting point for comparing the various scenarios is not one in which Iran has zero nuclear capabilities, but one in which Iran has been—however illegitimately—a nuclear threshold state since the beginning of the current decade."

The Iranians advanced their nuclear program as the international community insisted on no enrichment but failed either through sanctions, negotiations, or other actions to significantly interrupt Iranian progress on its nuclear infrastructure or nuclear know-how. Instead, when the negotiations began under President Obama, Iran had already acquired approximately 19,000 centrifuges and other essential components of the nuclear program.

Indeed, the administration's diplomatic effort to build an international coalition to give effect to the sanctions, which ultimately forced the Iranians to negotiate, was done with the P5+1's recognition that a "no enrichment" approach would not lead to negotiations. This was not a realistic option.

With that prologue, let me now turn to the elements of the agreement that

were critical to my judgment. In the area of cutting off pathways to provide nuclear material for nuclear weapons and Iran's enrichment capacity, this agreement accomplishes a key objective. It constrains and, through the interrelated verification measures, eliminates Iran's ability to produce either plutonium or uranium for a nuclear weapon.

On the uranium pathway, the JCPOA requires Iran to cap its stockpile of low enriched uranium, LEU, to 300 kilograms over 15 years. Why is this significant? First, before November 2013 and the initiation of the interim agreement, Iran had more than 12,000 kilograms of LEU. If fully enriched, this is enough to make seven to eight nuclear weapons.

Second, with this cap Iran will not have sufficient LEU in country to enrich and achieve the quantity necessary to produce a single weapon, even with additional enrichment. In other words, it will have to break a term of the agreement—the 300 kilogram cap of LEU—to have enough feedstock to further enrich and to make the quantity needed for even a single weapon.

On the plutonium pathway, Iran has agreed to redesign and rebuild the heavy water research reactor in Arak. The redesigned and rebuilt reactor, the design of which must be approved by the P5+1, may only support non-military nuclear research in radioisotope production. Why is this significant? Arak has been one of the most concerning elements of Iran's suspected nuclear weapons infrastructure, and this fundamental change to the reactor ensures Iran's plutonium pathway for a nuclear weapon is shut off.

In an alternative scenario, if completed, the heavy water reactor at Arak could have been a proliferation risk of unmatched proportion within their program. It could have allowed Iran to take easily acquired natural uranium from the ground and, over a period of time and through a series of reprocessing steps, make weapons-grade plutonium without the need for centrifuges for enrichment. The elimination of this heavy water reactor, as the Iranians previously envisioned it, is enormously significant.

Further, under the agreement, Iran will be forced to use its first generation centrifuge technology, known as IR-1s. This is a significant check on the program because these are Iran's most inefficient centrifuges. While Iran will be able to install more advanced centrifuges in the future, it will be required to abide by the enrichment plan submitted to the IAEA and to be consistent with the limitation inherent in the Additional Protocol. Also, it is significant that the P5+1 will have 10 years of evaluating, measuring, and assessing Iran's intentions to determine whether its plans and programs are indeed exclusively peaceful, as stated by the preamble to the JCPOA.

More broadly, the agreement's research and development measures provide the international community with insight into Iran's nuclear program. This is a significant opportunity to gauge Iran's intentions and willingness to abide by and comply with its commitments. The JCPOA establishes limitations on advanced centrifuge research, development, testing and deployment in the first 10 years. After that period of time, the international community will continue to have a critical "distrust-and-verify" mechanism built into the program. Iran must abide by its enrichment and research and development plan and submit it to the IAEA. This plan is subject to all of the IAEA's inspection and monitoring tools.

Furthermore, the JCPOA includes a permanent prohibition on Iran conducting research and development activities that could contribute to design and development of a nuclear explosive device. This significant prohibition goes well beyond the limitations of the non-nuclear weapons statement in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Taken together, closing off the pathways to a weapon and the constraints on enrichment and R&D, Iran's breakout time for a single nuclear weapon will remain at least 1 year for each of the first 10 years of this agreement and, critically, Iran's breakout time will remain longer than the two to three months it was in November of 2013.

Before I move on to the next area of discussion, I acknowledge that legitimate concerns have been raised about Iranian activities after the first 10 years of the agreement, sometimes referred to as the "out years." During this time, Iran's breakout time could shrink substantially. However, the initial 10 years of the JCPOA will be critical for the international community to measure and assess Iran's intentions.

A recent analysis of the JCPOA by Robert Einhorn, a noted expert in non-proliferation and a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, is instructive in this area. In his words:

If Iranian leaders . . . believed their national interests were best served by having nuclear weapons, they would run major risks in going forward, with no guarantee of success. Even in the 'out years,' the JCPOA's rigorous monitoring arrangements will remain in force. The world will have gained intimate knowledge of Iran's nuclear program, which would give the United States prompt warning of any Iranian effort to make a dash for the bomb.

In any case, the P5+1 must begin now to communicate its insistence that Iran operate consistent with a peaceful nuclear program after the initial 10-year period. The international community must convey in stark terms to the Iranians that a rapid buildup of enrichment capacity after 10 years, beyond what they need for their existing nu-

clear fuel cycle, will be considered an abandonment of the principles embodied in JCPOA, and that the P5+1 will need to evaluate alternative options.

Now, if my colleagues will allow me to discuss the area of inspection, monitoring, and verification. For me, the agreement must be built on a principle of "distrust and verify." Former Secretary of State Colin Powell put it nicely. He said: "It's don't trust, never trust, and always verify." And the architecture our negotiators designed to verify compliance with this agreement took this approach and set new precedents in key areas: access, modern technological monitoring, and the requirement for affirmative approval for certain actions. Thus, this is a custom-built, rigorously "red teamed" verification regime that is more stringent than any other previously created.

Specifically, the JCPOA does the following: Inspectors from the IAEA will have regular access to all of Iran's nuclear-related facilities. This includes Iran's two primary sites at Natanz and Fordow.

Inspectors will have cradle-to-grave access to Iran's nuclear supply chain, including uranium mines, mills, and centrifuge production and storage facilities that support Iran's nuclear program for at least 10 years and in many cases longer.

The verification regime established by this agreement has the effect of making the entire Iranian nuclear program auditable. This is a powerful tool that will make it possible for IAEA inspectors to know whether Iran is diverting material to a possible covert program.

Iran has agreed to apply provisionally the IAEA's Additional Protocol. This Additional Protocol to the IAEA comprehensive safeguards agreement further augments the agency's ability to investigate suspected clandestine facilities and activities. Of great importance, this is an enduring requirement for Iran beyond the JCPOA's terms.

A dedicated and exclusive procurement channel for Iran's nuclear program will be established to manage all purchases of the nuclear supplier group's "trigger list" and dual-use items. This additional step provides an intrusive authorization and transparency mechanism through which the IAEA can control what is coming into the country and gauge whether the requirement is consistent with the needs of the program and Iran's intentions. Any such procurement outside that channel would be a violation of the JCPOA.

This agreement is often casually compared to the 1994 Agreed Framework with North Korea. Not only are there significant differences between the two, but provisions of the JCPOA were specifically written to provide more stringent verification based on

the lessons from the 1994 agreement. One of the most significant differences was pointed out again by Robert Einhorn. As he indicated, a key weakness of the 1994 Agreed Framework was that “it only provided for IAEA monitoring at the nuclear facility at Yongbyon. It did not provide for monitoring in the rest of the country because that was the only declared site.”

Under the JCPOA, Iran must implement and abide by the Additional Protocol to its Safeguards Agreement under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, an addendum that the IAEA designed to address the ability of a nation to covertly develop a nuclear weapons program, as Iraq did after the first Gulf War. The Additional Protocol applies to all facilities that take part in any element of the nuclear fuel cycle of a state. The JCPOA is significantly more stringent in this regard than the 1994 framework.

More specifically, the Additional Protocol will allow IAEA inspectors access to suspected undeclared nuclear sites anywhere in the country so as to prevent Iran from conducting clandestine nuclear activity. If Iran does not provide access, it is in violation of the agreement and sanctions will be reimposed.

Iran's compliance with the Additional Protocol in the years after the term of the JCPOA will continue to provide the IAEA with a powerful tool to conduct inspections of Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Again, the creation of the Additional Protocol was in direct response to previous efforts to circumvent the IAEA's monitoring efforts in Iraq and North Korea.

An additional element of the monitoring and compliance regime is the independent and unilateral role that the U.S. Intelligence Community and its intelligence liaison services will play in validating Iran's compliance or noncompliance. While we can never be certain that these intelligence efforts will provide a complete picture of all Iranian nuclear activities, they provide a critical assessment of Iran's compliance with the agreement, Iran's perceptions of the cost and benefits of compliance with the agreement, and key insights into the Iranian leadership's priorities for the program. As a member of both the Armed Services Committee and the Select Committee on Intelligence, these activities and insights will also serve as a critical tool for my colleagues and me to gauge the success or failure of this agreement.

Over the course of the Armed Services Committee hearings, there was detailed questioning on several topics but one in particular: the 24-day period of time that Iran has available to it under the agreement to potentially delay access for IAEA inspectors to a facility suspected of prohibited activity. Secretary Moniz offered a helpful insight into this area. He said:

The 24-day period is itself new in the sense there has never been any time limit in terms of access to undeclared sites. Again, to repeat, on nuclear materials we have very, very sensitive capabilities and historically those have been proved.

But Secretary Moniz went on to speak candidly as he said:

With regard to nonnuclear materials, it gets more difficult. However, when one has nuclear weapons specialized activity, such as explosively driven neutron initiators, we would not be without tools to detect activities in that kind of a time period. But clearly, as one gets farther and farther away into let's say, just conventional explosive testing, which is something militaries do normally, then it's a question of intelligence putting together the context for suspicious activities. But nuclear material, in the end, you need to do nuclear materials to get to the weapon and that's where we have extraordinary techniques.

Now, critics of the agreement have said that this 24-day period of time is too long and offers Iran too much time to cover up its activities. As Secretary Moniz stated clearly, this is a possibility as it relates to certain non-nuclear activities. However, if Iran introduces fissile materials into these activities, Iran's ability to cover its tracks in 24 days is extremely unlikely.

I also believe this part of the agreement is an area where Iran's intentions need to be subjected to constant questioning and evaluation. If Iran is challenging the IAEA inspectors at every turn, it should be interpreted as an indication of its intent with respect to the permanent commitment it made on the third page of the agreement: “Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire nuclear weapons.”

This is a strong restatement of its basic obligations as a non-nuclear weapons state under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. A pattern of frustrating IAEA inspectors should be seen as a clear warning of possible renegeing on this central commitment.

Let me at this juncture discuss the duration of the agreement. Critics have made a variety of comments in this area of duration. Some argue that Iran can begin enriching beyond the low-enriched limit of 3.67 percent fissile uranium at year 16. That is true, but Iran could do that tomorrow without this agreement. Nevertheless, some argue that this agreement simply suspends Iran's program in place for a decade. In my view, this is not an accurate characterization as many of the access and verification elements of the agreement go well past 10 years or 15 years. Indeed, some are permanent. Iran's commitment under the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty and its Additional Protocol remain in place, and their compliance with it will be a key metric for the P5+1. Further, the international community's ability to impose sanctions always remains available.

Now I want to address the area of possible military dimensions or PMD.

Iran has agreed to address all the past and present outstanding PMD issues in a comprehensive and time-limited manner. This requirement is laid out clearly in paragraph 66 of Annex I of the JCPOA. It is further articulated in more detail in the IAEA's July 14, 2015, “Road-map for the Clarification of Past & Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran's Nuclear Program.”

Resolving the issue of PMD is critical for a number of reasons. It is critical that the IAEA is able to complete its investigation of PMD and issue an independent assessment of any nuclear weapons-related work Iran has conducted in the past. The IAEA made clear in the Director General's November 2011 report on PMD that unanswered questions remain. The U.N. Security Council has endorsed and reinforced the requirement that Iran address these questions.

Under the agreement, if Iran complies, the IAEA will again gain access to Parchin, and the IAEA will be provided the additional accesses to people, places, and other items it has requested. However, Iran gets nothing in the way of sanctions relief if it does not address these unanswered questions to the satisfaction of the IAEA.

Some critics of the agreement have also suggested that IAEA has outsourced to Iran its inspection of Parchin, the most infamous of Iran's suspected facilities. I have been briefed extensively on this matter in a classified setting. Those briefings are consistent with the conclusion of IAEA Director General Yukiya Amano. He has stated the agreement with the Iranians is, in his words, “technically sound” and does not—again in his words—“compromise [the IAEA's] safeguards standards in any way.”

Secretary Moniz has further assured me of this fact. We know the Iranians have repeatedly attempted to eradicate any sign of their activities at the Parchin site. Thus, it is unlikely that any significant PMD-related activities have occurred there in the last 4 years. We do not know what signs of past activities will remain at the site. Importantly, the IAEA will be able to confirm whether there is any ongoing nuclear-related activity at that location.

Critics of the arrangement to inspect Parchin have also suggested that the IAEA has entered into a secret side deal with Iran. In fact, the United States and all the other NPT member countries—Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty countries—have confidential agreements with the IAEA which cannot be shared.

These agreements vary by country, but they are designed to protect the integrity of the IAEA inspection process and the sensitive technical and design information about peaceful national nuclear programs. The IAEA and the Obama administration have taken extraordinary steps to brief Congress on

this agreement in a classified setting. These briefings have been informative and helpful to understand more fully what we can expect in the months and years ahead.

Now, I would like to discuss at this point the topic of the arms embargo and missile sanctions, which is part of this arrangement. Like many of my colleagues, I remain concerned about the elements of this agreement that relate to these issues. The inclusion of these provisions in the JCPOA is directly related to the fact that the United States secured these measures in U.N. Security Council Resolution 1929 to pressure Iran to address the international community's concerns with respect to its nuclear program. Since these sanctions were deemed by the P5+1 to be related to the nuclear program through the U.N. Resolution, they were within the ambit of sanctions relief.

Nevertheless, moving forward, this is an area where the United States needs to leverage the available sanctions and additional tools under other U.N. Security Council resolutions to keep pressure on Iran. For example, other U.N. Security Council resolutions prohibit Iranian transfers of arms to groups such as the Houthis in Yemen, nonstate actors in Lebanon, which includes Hezbollah, the Taliban in Afghanistan, and Shi'a militias in Iraq, as well as North Korea, Libya, and several sub-Saharan states in Africa.

This will mean the Treasury Department, the State Department, and the Intelligence Community must double their efforts to identify prohibited activities and build the international architecture necessary to counter it and deter them.

It also means working with our partners on the Missile Technology Control Regime, or MTCR, to prevent the spread of critical missile technologies, and with our more than 100 partners under the Bush administration's Proliferation Security Initiative, or PSI, to help limit Iranian missile-related imports or exports.

It may also mean what former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nick Burns recently suggested to the Senate Armed Services Committee, which is that we will need to, in his words, "reconstitute a coalition of sanctions countries against Iran five years from now on conventional weapons, eight years from now on ballistic missiles." I believe the next 5 years will provide the international community a critical measuring stick for Iranian intentions, and we must be prepared to lead efforts to preclude Iran from obtaining enhanced military technologies.

Now, a bulk of the work that will be done and will be so central to our efforts will be done by the IAEA. The IAEA will be responsible for carrying on the ground the implementation of

this agreement on behalf of the P5+1. While critics of the agreement are quick to call into question the technical expertise and skills of the IAEA, it is comprised of individuals with extensive training and experience and a deep commitment to the importance of nonproliferation work.

A recent study by Tom Shea, a noted safeguards expert with experience at the IAEA and in the laboratory community, concludes:

The IAEA's capabilities have been extended, strengthened and refined over the years in response to real-world proliferation cases in Iraq and North Korea. Its current capacity reflects the international community's decades-long investment in the organization, and the continuing commitment of states around the world to its mission.

I would also note that upwards of 200 IAEA technical experts will be devoted to implementing this agreement. This number far exceeds any number of experts and inspectors devoted to any one country by the IAEA.

Allow me now to focus on the area of sanctions and our ability to reapply them. First, it is critical that we remember Iran will receive no new sanctions relief if it does not complete its nuclear commitments and the IAEA's inspectors verify those steps. Let me be specific here. Prior to granting any further sanctions relief, Iran must, as verified by the IAEA, demonstrate that it has implemented the necessary steps with respect to, No. 1, the Arak heavy water research reactor; No. 2, its overall enrichment capacity; No. 3, its centrifuge research and development; No. 4, the Fordow fuel enrichment plant; No. 5, its uranium stocks and fuel; No. 6, its centrifuge manufacturing; No. 7, completing the modalities and facilities-specific arrangements to allow the IAEA to implement all transparency measures and the Additional Protocol and Modified Code 3.1; No. 8, its centrifuge component manufacturing transparency; and, No. 9, addressing the past and present issues of concern relating to PMD.

This means that Iran must take significant steps to roll back and freeze its nuclear program before it gets anything in the way of sanctions relief. In testimony before the Senate banking committee, Adam Szubin, the acting Under Secretary of Treasury said:

We expect that [process] to take at least six to nine months. Until Iran completes those steps, we are simply extending the limited relief that has been in place the last year and a half under the Joint Plan of Action. There will not be a cent of new sanctions relief.

Moreover, while the President will waive the application of the nuclear-related sanctions under the terms of the JCPOA, the U.S. sanctions, which include the Central Bank and other financial sanctions, will remain available until Congress acts to terminate them. This will allow Congress to monitor an extended period of Iran's com-

pliance before taking any such action. This also gives the President a strong hand because the ability to quickly snap back nuclear-related sanctions means that we can again shut off, to a substantial degree, Iran's access to the international financial system, to international markets, and to international financing that relies on access to the U.S. banking system.

It is important to note that this agreement does not take away the tools available to the President to target sanctions against Iran's violation of human rights or to damage Iran's ability to finance terrorism. U.S. secondary sanctions remain in place.

As Richard Nephew, a fellow at the Center on Global Energy Policy at Columbia University, recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee, under the agreement:

[The] United States will still be able to pressure banks and companies into not doing business with the IRGC, the Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, and Iran's military and missile forces. This is both due to direct risk of U.S. secondary sanctions, which remain in place, and an improvement in international banking practices since 9/11.

These secondary sanctions are not insignificant tools, and our use of them in response to human rights violators and terrorism are not a violation of the agreement. As Under Secretary Szubin recently told the Senate Banking Committee on the matter of terrorism sanctions:

[O]ne of the most powerful [tools] . . . is that when we sanction Iranian terrorist supporters, our designation is amplified internationally. What I mean by that is, when we name a Hezbollah financier, a Hezbollah money launderer, any bank worldwide, not just American banks, any bank worldwide that facilitates transactions for that designated entity faces very severe sanctions from the U.S., sanctions that no bank wants to face.

Under Secretary Szubin has also indicated that the United States will do more in the area of terrorism-related sanctions. Should Iran decide to continue its destabilizing actions in the region, increasing the cost in this area will be critical, so it is important to note the administration's willingness to ramp up pressure in the face of such conduct by the Iranians.

Particular attention has rightly been paid to the amount of sanctions relief Iran will receive and Iran's likely use of that sanctions relief. This is an important issue. While we do not know what Iran will do with it, we do know a couple of things. First, the amount of sanction relief is not \$100 or \$150 billion as some critics of the deal have suggested. According to the Treasury Department, the number is between \$50 and \$60 billion. While this number is significant, it is one-third of what many critics have asserted.

Second, it is likely that Iran will invest a portion of this money into its economy to address the concerns of its

people and to begin to recover from the international sanctions regime, but it may also invest in its financing of terrorism across the region. General Dempsey has rightly suggested, “[t]he answer is probably a little bit of both.” What we will need to do is monitor closely, particularly via our Intelligence Community, where Iran is making its investments and actively counter those maligned activities.

Now, I believe the JCPOA is the best option available to us right now. Critics recommend rejecting the JCPOA and advocating a regime of new and increasingly crippling sanctions that are more effective to ensuring Iran does not acquire a nuclear weapon. It is my view that this alternative is not feasible at this time and may, indeed, be counterproductive.

Moreover, the options for enhanced sanctions and even military operations remain available to the United States and our P5+1 partners should Iran at any time fail to comply with the JCPOA. Indeed, noncompliance would be more likely to find an international commitment for aggressive action than a rejection of the JCPOA. Such a rejection could give the Iranians the opening to argue that it can resume all of its existing activities prior to the interim agreement and insist that international sanctions have been nullified by our rejection of the JCPOA.

If the United States were now to say “this deal is not good enough,” it would likely have the immediate effect of alienating us from our partners and, therefore, empowering Iran. Iran would seize this opening to drive a wedge between us and our European allies, as well as Russia and China. Such an action by the United States would play right into the hands of Iran, both in terms of the viability of the multilateral sanctions regime and in terms of the obligations it has already agreed to take under this agreement.

It is difficult to imagine a scenario in which the United States can break, at this juncture, with its most critical economic partners on the Iran nuclear program and then secure more stringent sanctions.

Another complicating factor in this scenario is the outcome for the hardliners in Iran. Undoubtedly, their narrative can gain additional traction in Tehran and they may be able to seize an even greater amount of power and influence. This makes the “more sanctions” approach more concerning because it could produce the unintended consequence of empowering the most strident elements in Iran.

The second most common option discussed by critics of this agreement is the military option. In this regard, it is critical that we understand some points up front. Unless we are prepared to invade and occupy Iran, executing a military option to destroy the nuclear infrastructure will only delay Iran’s

nuclear program. It will not bomb away Iran’s knowledge, and it will empower significantly the hardliners in Iran who are committed to developing a nuclear weapon. They will likely disperse and disguise their activities so that military strikes are increasingly ineffective and produce significant collateral damage, which will be exploited by the Iranians for propaganda purposes.

On this issue of delay, General Dempsey provided two important insights. First, in response to a question asking for his military assessment on what is more effective in delaying or stopping the Iranian nuclear program at this time or in the near future, a military strike or this P5+1 agreement, he said:

First . . . I would like to point out that the military options remain. Secondly, I think a negotiated settlement provides a more durable—and reduces near term risk, which buys time to work with regional partners to address the other malign activities.

He also said:

Our government’s policy has been they will not get a nuclear weapon and nothing we’re talking about here today should change that policy.

This agreement does not change that longstanding and clearly articulated U.S. policy.

I also agree with the assessment of former Senators John Warner and Carl Levin—both of whom served terms as the chairman of the Armed Services Committee—that a vote against this deal is a vote to undermine the deterrent value and credibility of our military option.

Closer examination of the military option raises the critical question of our objective if we were to use force—to delay the nuclear program or to overthrow the regime so as to eliminate the nuclear threat? In either case, a daunting scenario emerges. As previously discussed, if our focus is limited only to Iran’s nuclear program, the United States—likely alone or nearly alone—will need to conduct a similar option every few years, as the Iranians will undoubtedly make their nuclear program an operation that is conducted in smaller and more numerous locations in areas that are increasingly difficult to locate and deeper in the ground or masked by civilian activities in populated areas.

If we conduct such targeted strikes, analysts suggest that the Iranians will respond. Such responses could include attacks against U.S. forces in the gulf region and Afghanistan; attacks against Israel by Iran’s most capable proxy, Hezbollah; attacks against our partners in the GCC; attacks against the region’s energy infrastructure; or a combination of all of the above. Along with the significant economic consequences, the loss of personnel and resource drain on our Nation’s military could be severe. Ironically, an addi-

tional consequence would be a shift in resources away from the campaign against the Islamic State in the Levant—or ISIL—particularly in Iraq, and our ongoing efforts to consolidate the international community’s gains in Afghanistan.

On the other hand, if our military objective was regime change, I would first remind my colleagues of the Iraq war and all of the implications that exercising that military option had on the region.

In 2012, Michael O’Hanlon of the Brookings Institution wrote:

An occupation of Iran would require up to one million U.S. and other foreign troops over an extended time and, hence, would indeed be implausible. But an invasion, with the single goal of deposing the government, could be considered a possibility under extreme circumstances—if for example there were unmistakable evidence that Iran’s current government was preparing a major attack on Israel, or if it responded to any U.S. “surgical” air campaign with an all-out global terrorist response, using Hezbollah and various elements of its security apparatus.

Although Michael O’Hanlon makes a distinction between an “occupation” and an “invasion,” our experience in both Iraq and Afghanistan should demonstrate that the deployment of ground forces to effect regime change is unlikely to produce a quick exit, so we must be prepared for his “implausible”—an expensive occupation with a million military personnel on the ground.

Thus, as some observers continue to discuss the military option regardless of the scope and intent of it, I would urge them to ensure that their analysis goes beyond the first day, first month, or first 6 months of conflict and rather considers the first year, first 5 years, and first decade of conflict. Our Nation has seen the great cost of war over the past 15 years.

This agreement retains the military options for the Commander in Chief and at the same time establishes an arrangement with the Iranians that allows us to test vigorously and monitor invasively the intentions of the Iranian regime’s nuclear program. This is one major reason at this point that the JCPOA is the most compelling option.

A number of noted national security experts and a number of my colleagues and Americans have discussed the importance of ensuring Iran is not only constrained with respect to its nuclear program but also with respect to its regional hegemonic aspirations and its support directly and indirectly of terrorism. These negotiations did not cover other hostile, objectionable actions by Iran—namely, its support of terrorism, its destabilizing activities across the region, its abuse of its own people, and ongoing detention of American citizens. We cannot condone or ignore these critical issues, and they all must be addressed. But absent implementation of this agreement, the

threats posed by Iran would likely be amplified as it returns to deliberate and focused efforts to build a nuclear infrastructure.

The choice before us under the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is exclusively on the nuclear dimension. But without the JCPOA, I suspect the Iranian nuclear challenge will grow quickly, adding further menace to their regional aspirations and their support of terrorism. Critically, any of these other objectionable Iranian behaviors would be far more dangerous if Iran acquired nuclear weapons.

As I said earlier, I evaluate this agreement with great skepticism. Iran is a major sponsor of terrorism and a leader in other destabilizing activities across the Middle East. As I mentioned previously, though, the negotiations to secure this agreement were not focused on Iran's support of terrorism. This matter remains outstanding, and charting a pragmatic and implementable strategy to counter it is critical to U.S. national security interests.

More broadly, however, these negotiations are not without precedent. During the Cold War, we negotiated with the Soviets despite their persistent destabilizing activities in many parts of the world. In fact, President Nixon was still in negotiation with the Soviets even while they still supported the North Vietnamese.

Graham Allison, a noted non-proliferation expert at Harvard's Belfer Center, noted in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently that "claims that the U.S. cannot reach advantageous agreements to constrain nuclear arms with states we are seeking to contain, or subvert, or even overthrow . . . are . . . wrong. [The Reagan] administration's core national security strategy for competition with the Soviet Union . . . states that 'U.S. policy towards the Soviet Union will consist of three elements: external resistance to Soviet imperialism; internal pressure on the USSR to weaken the sources of Soviet imperialism;' and 'engaging the Soviet Union in negotiations to attempt to reach agreements which protect and enhance U.S. interests and which are consistent with the principle of strict reciprocity and mutual interest.'"

Even with the JCPOA, I do not suspect that the Iranian support for their proxies will automatically abate under this agreement, and I do not think this agreement is a forcing mechanism for modifying Iranian behavior in the region. I do, however, think this agreement takes the near-term scenario of a nuclear-armed Iran bent on supporting its proxies in the Middle East off the table. And I believe it is for the time being sensible for the United States and our partners to take stock of Iran's willingness to comply with this agreement; monitor its activities closely in the region to see if they increase, de-

crease, or remain the same; and, in parallel, work with our regional partners to counter Iran's asymmetric threats.

On the matter of our regional partners in the Middle East, I see two critical matters that must be addressed.

First, our partners in Israel rightly see Iran as a significant and ongoing threat to their national security. It is incumbent upon the United States to better understand the concerns of the Israelis with respect to their gaps in addressing the Iranian problem set and to identify areas of cooperation on military and intelligence matters that address these gaps and maintain their qualitative military edge at all times.

Second, it is also critical that our partners and allies know that the United States will not abandon the region in the wake of this agreement. This message is critical for all of our partners to hear and understand.

The May 2015 joint statement following the United States and Gulf Cooperation Council meeting at Camp David provided a roadmap for how the administration intends to proceed. The joint statement indicates that the United States will be increasing training and exercise engagements with GCC special operation forces elements so as to better enable our partners to confront Iran's asymmetric capabilities, as well as enhancing the ballistic missile defense capabilities of the GCC and improving their interoperability to increase collective defense in order to counter Iran's support of terrorist proxies. These are important and essential efforts that will consume significant time and effort in the Middle East, and it will be critical that we ensure that they are resourced appropriately. The added benefit of these activities is that they will provide the U.S. military with additional access and capabilities in the region to ensure that the military option remains credible to the Iranians and available to the President.

Mr. President, I approached this vote with deep suspicion regarding Iran, and I see the agreement for what it is—a combination of opportunities and risks. I believe these negotiations were necessarily focused on denying Iran a pathway to a nuclear weapon. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a formidable force in the Middle East and, as it has repeatedly demonstrated, not a force for peace and stability. Moreover, a nuclear-armed Iran would likely prompt a nuclear arms race in the region that through accident or design could lead to catastrophe. This agreement provides a framework to close off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon.

Rejecting the resolution of disapproval is vitally important, but effective, unrelenting implementation of the JCPOA will be the real test. As such, it is critical that both the President and the Congress exert every effort to ensure that there are unstinting

efforts to monitor and sustain the provisions of the agreement. This effort demands constant attention and ample—more than ample funding for the indefinite future.

As Gen. Brent Scowcroft, former National Security Advisor to President George Herbert Walker Bush, recently stated in a Washington Post op-ed supporting the agreement:

Implementation and verification will be the key to success, and Congress has an important role. It should ensure that the [IAEA], other relevant bodies and U.S. intelligence agencies have all the resources necessary to facilitate inspection and monitor compliance.

I believe General Scowcroft is correct. Iranian compliance and the implementation phase of this agreement is critical no matter how you vote on the resolution of disapproval.

It is also important that we ensure that the administration is able to follow through on the commitments they have made to our allies and partners in the Middle East, especially to the State of Israel. Again, General Scowcroft makes an excellent point. The United States must work, in his words, "closely with the GCC and other allies to moderate Iranian behavior in the region, countering it where necessary." Absent support and resourcing for the implementation phase of this agreement, these efforts may not happen and our efforts to reassure our partners in the region may fail.

Soon, this debate will be over. I believe sustaining the JCPOA will leave us in a strong position to counter potential Iranian proliferation. But regardless of the outcome of this debate, we must not relax our efforts in countering Iranian nuclear aspirations, regional aggression, and the sponsorship of terrorism. I believe the JCPOA will give us valuable tools to monitor and interdict their pathways to a nuclear weapon, but it will require day-to-day surveillance and, where necessary, intervention to increase our chances of success.

In many respects, we are at a moment that recalls the emotional words of Winston Churchill:

Now this is not the end. It is not even the beginning of the end. But it is, perhaps, the end of the beginning.

We have concluded an agreement that dramatically constrains Iran's nuclear ambitions. Now the hard work begins each day to ensure that our aspirations become real.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my friend and colleague from Rhode Island in his very eloquent and powerful remarks, and I wish to add my own on the same topic. The question of whether the Senate should accept the agreement between the P5+1 and Iran to end their illicit

and treacherous nuclear program is one of the most difficult and critical matters of national security that I have confronted since my election to the Senate.

I am deeply grateful to many in my State of Connecticut, here in Washington, DC, and around the country who have offered me their insight, interest, and involvement—most especially the people of Connecticut who have given me their thoughts in letters, in emails, phone calls, and in one-on-one conversations across our State in a vast variety of settings, whether at parades or fairs or in one-on-one meetings or meetings in groups. I have made my decision based on conscience and conviction. I will vote to accept the proposed agreement concerning Iran's nuclear program and against the resolution of disapproval before the Senate.

My two paramount goals have been consistently and constantly to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran and to do so by peaceful means. I believe this agreement, using diplomacy, not military force, is the most viable remaining path now available—now available—to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran.

This agreement is not the one I would have negotiated or accepted, but it is better than no deal. This agreement is an opportunity for us to push back and deter Iran, and it brings on us a special obligation of vigilance and vigorous enforcement. It can be made better. It can be improved and strengthened through unilateral action by the United States and through consultation and collaboration with our allies, not resuming or reopening the negotiations but acting in collaboration with our allies, as well as through actions we can take as a nation alone and working closely with our ally, our friend, our critical partner in the Middle East, the State of Israel.

The administration set forth a case that the current agreement immediately reduces Iran's nuclear program and places it under a series of overlapping safeguards. Together these measures push a threshold nuclear power back from the brink. The agreement imposes an intrusive inspection and surveillance regime relying on international certification and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency. Future U.S. Presidents have the authority immediately and through Executive order to reimpose our sanctions if Iranian actions are inconsistent with our national security.

Rejecting this agreement is fraught with unacceptable risk. Our formal negotiation partners and allies have signaled clearly they are simply not coming back to the table—a point confirmed in my direct conversations and meetings. There is no better deal available now. The present sanctions will soon become unenforceable, producing an economic windfall for Iran whether

or not the United States accepts this agreement. The United States, instead of Iran, would be isolated, and Iran's nuclear program would be unconstrained. Rejection would fracture our unified efforts with our allies and greatly weaken international pressure on Iran and undermine American leadership on this issue and others, especially if economic sanctions are needed in the event of a violation.

This agreement has shortcomings, no doubt, and they are serious. I have listened to my colleagues, including Chairman CORKER, whom I deeply respect, and others here today, enumerate a number of them. Yet I remain convinced the most constructive and clear-eyed role for Congress is to support specific steps to make implementation and enforcement of this agreement stronger and more effective. In fact, in my view, the day after this agreement is approved and accepted is as important as the agreement itself—the day after, the months after, and the years after because that is when this agreement must be enforced vigorously and strenuously and unyieldingly.

I have taken additional time to look beyond this agreement to create a blueprint for diplomatic steps to strengthen it. Specifically, I am working with the ranking member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator BEN CARDIN of Maryland, to craft new legislation. Congress must act to encourage and enable diplomacy with Iran, which is not only possible but critically important. Now we must begin the process of addressing those shortfalls and shortcomings, unwanted impacts and consequences revealed during congressional review of the agreement.

No. 1, countering Iranian terror with dollar-for-dollar sanctions. To counter Iran's role as a leading state sponsor of terrorism, Congress must sustain and expand existing sanctions that crack down on terror financing and demand their full enforcement by both the United States and the European Union.

I will continue—indeed, I will increase—pressing Secretary of State John Kerry to take long overdue, aggressive steps to interdict arms to Hezbollah, and I will work to block Hezbollah's financing and logistical support from Iran, applying tools and techniques available through our banking and financial system.

No. 2, empowering our allies to counter Iran and terror proxies. We must renew and reinvigorate our efforts to protect our allies, especially Israel—our major strategic partner in the Middle East—from the threat of Iran and its terror proxies. We need a new framework of defense cooperation that takes into account how this agreement will affect the changing threat from Iran.

Congress must work to expand Israel's qualitative military edge and

bolster intelligence cooperation. The Pentagon must establish new joint training exercises that involve strategic air assets and invite Israeli pilots to train flying long-range bombers. Now is the time to aid Israel with extra F-35 Joint Strike Fighter squadrons and the tankers they need to cut off any threat to Israel—well before it reaches their borders. No equipment should be precluded if needed for Israel's self-defense.

As a member of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I will work to establish such a parallel agreement with Israel to cover threats, both nuclear and conventional, along with an ongoing joint review forum, bringing together the United States, Israel, and NATO members to enhance our deterrent capabilities.

No. 3, preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. The United States must reaffirm unequivocally that Iran will never be allowed to obtain a nuclear weapon and that all available options will be used to stop it from ever accumulating enough highly enriched uranium or weapons-grade plutonium to produce one. Such a policy is consistent with this agreement.

Congress must articulate in statute that that policy is unchallengeable and that Iranian violations both during this agreement and afterward will be met with strong, unquestionable action. It must be clear we will defend our vital interests in the Persian Gulf region, and those vital interests include preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. It is a fundamental tenet of our foreign policy.

As a member of the agreement, the United States is in a stronger position to deter and remedy violations, whether through economic sanctions or military action as a last resort. If the agreement is rejected and economic sanctions or military actions are ever necessary, we would act alone. That is a simple fact about our rejection. If the agreement is accepted, we act with a coalition of allies and partners with the legitimacy and credibility of diplomacy having run its course and with the intelligence produced by inspections that will help to guide any military action necessary as a last resort. There will be popular support at home, which is absolutely necessary for such action. That support is essential because acting without it will make it difficult, if not impossible, for the President to in effect seek to enforce the very terms of an agreement this Nation has rejected, if that is the result.

Most importantly, this agreement cannot be based on hope or trust. History belies both in our experience with Iran. This deal is not an agreement I have long sought, it is not the agreement I would have preferred, but it makes the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran less imminent. It requires the

United States and the international community to sustain their commitment to verify and enforce its provisions over many years, and I am ready to join in the hard work of preventing a nuclear-armed Iran on this difficult diplomatic path.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I come to the floor to discuss what I believe is probably the most important foreign policy issue I have worked on in my time in the Senate. It is one of great consequence to our Nation and also to our allies.

I don't come to this decision lightly, but there are many reasons I would urge this body to disapprove the agreement that has been entered into between the Obama administration, the Iranian Government, and the P5+1 nations.

First of all, we need to understand the country we are dealing with. Just today the Iranian Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said: I am saying to Israel that they won't live to see the end of these 25 years. With Allah's help, there will be no such thing as a Zionist regime in 25 years.

Of course, this is not the first time we have heard this from the Supreme Leader or the leaders of Iran. We are in this position even after having entered this agreement and having had the President go to the U.N. to seek approval of this agreement prior to coming to the Congress. We know that while this agreement was being negotiated, the Iranian Foreign Minister was smiling for the cameras and negotiating the agreement, while the President of Iran was actually at rallies in Iran where they were shouting "Down with America" and "Death to Israel."

Iran itself has a history that is important for us to understand. That history is a history of noncompliance. Iran has time and time again failed to comply with U.N. resolutions and failed to meet its obligations. Iran has violated U.N. Security Council resolutions. Iran has violated the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in the past. Iran has consistently been unresponsive to the International Atomic Energy Agency in the past—the IAEA—and Iran has failed to answer questions about its past nuclear weapons activities. If there is no covert, undeclared nuclear facility in Iran today, Olli Heinonen, a former IAEA Deputy Director, has said it would be the first time in 20 years.

So one of the important issues, I believe, for any of us in reviewing this agreement is: What is the inspection regime that would be put in place to assure not only that we are doing a full inspection at the declared facilities of Iran but also the undeclared facilities? The reality is that under this agreement, the process for seeking inspec-

tion by the IAEA for undeclared facilities is a process that only a lawyer could love—and I happen to be one—because if we look at the language of the actual agreement, we will see in paragraph 75 that "if the IAEA has concerns regarding undeclared nuclear materials or activities, or activities inconsistent with the JCPOA, at locations that have not been declared under the comprehensive safeguards agreement" the IAEA first has to "provide Iran [with] the basis for such concerns and request clarification."

So that is the first step. Then, "if Iran's explanations do not resolve the IAEA's concerns, the Agency may request access to such locations for the sole reason to verify the absence of undeclared nuclear materials and activities" and the IAEA also has to "provide Iran the reasons for access in writing and will make available all relevant information."

Then, Iran may come back and "propose to the IAEA alternative means of resolving the IAEA's concerns that enable the IAEA to verify the absence of undeclared nuclear materials and activities"

So if those alternatives aren't accepted from Iran, then, "if the two sides are unable to reach satisfactory agreements to verify the absence of" an undeclared nuclear facility, then at that point there is a process that goes into place, and that process—which has been described on this Senate floor—can take up to 24 days.

But we need to understand there is a whole litigation process that occurs even before those days, and this can be a much longer process.

Then, how does this get resolved? This gets resolved essentially by a committee process. So then we have a committee resolve all of this. That is why I say this is a lawyer's dream in terms of an inspection regime here.

Then, if we look at paragraph 78 of the agreement, "The members of the Joint Commission, by consensus or by a vote of 5 or more of its 8 members, would advise on the necessary means to resolve the IAEA's concerns."

This process, if we add up all the days, is a lengthy process. Again, it certainly is so far away from the anytime, anywhere inspection regime. We have to understand that Iran has a history of using every means possible to delay inspections, especially to areas that are undeclared or they are trying to hide their nuclear facilities. That is why I describe it as an inspection regime that only a lawyer could love because this will allow Iran to litigate access to their undeclared sites, and we already know they have a history of doing that.

One of the issues I have taken a keen interest in since I have been in the Senate is Iran's missile program. We have heard all along from the administration that they were not going to ad-

dress Iran's support of terrorism, that they were going to keep that issue separate—that they were going to keep separate issues of Iran's support for terrorism around the world—we have heard about that in this debate today—their support for groups like Hezbollah, Hamas, their support for the Houthis in Yemen, their support for the Taliban in Afghanistan, their support for terrorism around the world. Yet at the last minute in this agreement, the administration conceded two incredibly important points: No. 1, allowing Iran to have the resolutions lifted on having arms sales and transactions within 5 years, and then, No. 2, within 8 years, lifting the U.N. resolutions on missiles or ICBMs.

As our own Secretary of Defense has described, the significance of course in ICBMs is the "I," which means intercontinental, meaning missiles that can hit the United States of America. Yet that was lifted at the last minute, and that was lifted over the objections, over the recommendations of our highest military officer, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Chairman Martin Dempsey.

This has been a focus of mine in the Senate because I have been concerned that we have heard in the Armed Services Committee from many of our top defense and intelligence officials that the preferred method for Iran to deliver a nuclear weapon to the United States of America would be an ICBM and that this certainly represents a threat to America and to our allies.

In fact, I was so concerned about this that last summer I wrote the President of the United States, and 26 Senators joined me in the letter that I wrote to the President. In that letter, I expressed the belief that the Iranian deal should address Iran's ICBM missile program. The reason I wrote and led this effort is because we had been hearing for years before the Senate Armed Services Committee from people such as the Director of National Intelligence, James Clapper, who testified before the committee in February of 2014, that "we judge that Iran would choose a ballistic missile as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons."

In 2013, we also heard from Director Clapper that the Iranians are developing two systems that could have intercontinental capability as early as 2015. Here we are in 2015. Some have estimated it may take a few more years. Regardless, according to public testimony from our intelligence community, Iran could have ICBM capability in the next few years, and here we have, in conjunction with this agreement, our blessing because we agreed that the U.N. resolution against their missile program that said, no, Iran, you cannot have ICBM capability, now it is OK. It will be legitimate for them to have ICBM capability.

Why do they need ICBM capability if they don't have any interest in delivering the most destructive weapons to the world—to countries on the other side of the world, including our own?

So as I said, this issue was against the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff's advice. When I heard public reports—there were reports bubbling up about the agreement before it was signed that Iran was pressuring, with support from other countries like Russia, to lift the arms embargo, to lift the missile embargo. I was so worried about it that a week before the agreement I asked Chairman Dempsey in the Armed Services Committee, on July 7, about the reports that these resolutions may be lifted on arms and missiles. He told me that under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capability and arms trafficking. Yet that is exactly what happens in this agreement.

The Chairman came back to our committee after the agreement was signed to testify about the agreement, and I asked him again about including this in the agreement. He told me it was against his military advice to lift the arms resolution and to lift the missile resolution.

So as I look at the grave concerns we should have for our national security, this is one of the top concerns—an insufficient inspection regime legitimizing their ability to have ICBM capability, allowing them in 5 years to legitimately have more arms. We already know they are supplying arms and cash around the world to their terrorist proxies. This agreement of course gives them, within a 9-month period, billions of dollars more cash to support terrorism.

One of the things I have heard on the floor today from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are supporting this agreement is that somehow this leaves on the table all of the tools we need to deal with Iran's support for terrorism—which, of course, destabilizes the region. Except the problem is that nobody has told the Iranians this point because they have a very different viewpoint on this agreement. Iran has taken the position that if any of the sanctions are reimposed, they can walk away from the agreement.

If we look at paragraph 26 of this agreement, I would argue the language in the agreement actually allows them to make that argument, unfortunately.

Tehran has specifically stated that it will treat the imposition of any sanctions that are similar to those that were in place before this deal as a reason to walk away.

So why is this important? It is important because we know they support terrorism around the world. My colleagues have said we have to deal with their support for terrorism, and we

still have the tools in our toolbox to issue tough sanctions to deal with their terrorism, even while being part of this agreement. The problem is that the language doesn't necessarily bear that out in the agreement.

In a July 20 letter, Iran told the U.N. Security Council that it would "reconsider its commitments under the JCPOA if the effects of the termination of the Security Council, European Union, or United States nuclear-related sanctions or restrictive measures are impaired by continued application or the imposition of new sanctions with a nature and scope identical or similar to those that were in place prior to the implementation date, irrespective of whether such new sanctions are introduced on nuclear-related or other grounds, unless the issues are remedied within a reasonably short time."

In other words, Iran is taking the viewpoint, under the language of this agreement, that if we reimpose any of the sanctions that are lifted as part of this agreement—which, by the way, these are the toughest sanctions, right? These are the tools in our toolbox—even if they commit acts of terrorism, they can walk away from this agreement.

So let's put this all together. Iran, within 9 months, gets more cash for this agreement. They get to keep their infrastructure for their nuclear program because they get to keep their centrifuges. They are now in a position where people are doing business with them—because we know that many countries around the world want to be able to do business with Iran, so an infusion of cash and relationships there. And then they are continuing to support terrorism. They commit through their proxies a major terrorist event that triggers something that we want to do here—we want to take tough sanctions against them because they have supported a terrorist attack against us or our allies. Yet they are going to take the position that we can't reimpose any of their sanctions no matter what they do because of the language of the agreement in paragraph 26. They are interpreting it that way.

So if you are Iran, right now, this is a pretty good deal for you. You can get the cash. You can get the legitimization. People are doing business with you again. You can continue to support terrorism, and our hands apparently, in their view, are tied on sanctions.

So when I hear from those supporting the agreement that somehow we still have all the tools in our toolbox to deal with terrorism, it seems to me that if we look at the language of this agreement and how the Iranians are supporting it, we have tied our hands, and we will be in a weaker position to deal with their support for terrorism around

the world no matter how egregious their behavior is.

This is a real issue when I think about our national security, when they have the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world and they will now have legitimate access to developing their ICBM program with the lifting of sanctions in the U.N. and the legitimate purchasing of arms. We know there are countries like Russia that are lining up to sell these arms to them, and then we are going to weaken our ability to impose terrorism-related sanctions in the future.

I heard many of my colleagues talking earlier about the 60-vote threshold in the United States Senate. When we voted on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, we voted on it, I believe, 98 to 1. We would think at that point we wouldn't be worried at all about actually getting to the debate on the actual bill. So I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when they voted for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, were serious about having a substantive vote, given that this was a vote of 98 to 1 on this agreement. I believe the American people deserve nothing less than a substantive vote on the merits of this agreement as provided for by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act.

I know that many of my colleagues are here to speak, but I want to raise one final issue that we have heard about on this floor; that is, actually being able to see the full text of this agreement. We all know that when you have an agreement, especially with a country that has a history of cheating, language matters. We know that because the Iranians are already taking all kinds of different positions on what the language means in this agreement to their benefit. Yet we have not been given access to the two-side agreements between the IAEA and Iran. By the way, that is in direct violation of the express language of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which says Congress should have access to side agreements. But what we do know about these side agreements that has been reported in the press is truly disturbing; that is, as to the side agreements themselves, information has been leaked that indicates Tehran could declare some areas as suspected nuclear sites, including the Parchin military complex, off-limits to inspectors and that Iran could even be permitted to self-inspect there.

Can you imagine allowing a country with a history of cheating the ability to self-inspect or collect their own samples in terms of how inspections would be done? Yet those who are supporting the agreement are saying this is a robust inspection method.

I would ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who are supporting this agreement, does it not trouble you that you have not been

given access to the language of these side agreements given that what has been leaked about them is that they pertain to the actual inspection process at important sites such as Parchin? I would hope that our constituents would expect us to review every word of the language of something so important to our national security. That, in and of itself, I would say, is a reason to be highly skeptical of this agreement, along with the other issues I have raised.

Finally, we have a long history in this body of debating important international agreements, including agreements that deal with very fundamental issues involving our foreign policy—issues that involve nuclear non-proliferation, issues that involve many sensitive treaty issues. We have a long history of actually debating these in a bipartisan manner and working in a bipartisan manner to approve agreements. Yet on this agreement, we are left in a position where a majority of the Senate on a bipartisan basis has said that we have serious reservations about this agreement and have declared that we are going to vote against this agreement. Yet the administration is continuing to push forward to get this done, to make sure that this agreement is fully implemented without reaching out in a bipartisan fashion to ensure that the strength of the Congress in a bipartisan fashion is behind something so important to our national security.

That should say something about the merits of this agreement. This agreement is deeply flawed. This is an agreement that I believe does not protect our national security. In fact, in the long run it will undermine our security in this country by giving Iran more cash, legitimizing their nuclear weapons program in terms of keeping their infrastructure for that program, legitimizing their ICBM program, and hurting our ability to impose further sanctions if they conduct acts of terrorism, which they certainly have a history of doing through their proxies.

I hope as we continue this debate, we will disapprove this agreement, which I do not believe protects our national security.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I intend to speak at much greater length on this issue perhaps tomorrow. I am pleased to have the opportunity to participate in this colloquy. I will be brief. I know my colleagues are waiting to speak also.

First, I want to commend Senator CORKER, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Together with his work with Senator CARDIN, we have a bipartisan agreement supported by some of the most knowledgeable foreign policy experts on the Democratic side and on the Re-

publican side before us. Had Senator CORKER not been able to make that arrangement, it would have been a done deal before the Congress even saw what was agreed to in this negotiation with Iran.

I think my colleagues here have been amazed at the difference between what we were told the agreement did and didn't do and what we actually learned it does and doesn't do as we pored over it, word by word, annex through annex, looking at every piece of information here that is relevant to our decision. I am thankful for the work of Senator CORKER, who has taken some heat for not doing more. He saved us and saved the American people from not having the ability for us to examine this in detail. That is what this debate here is all about. The American people deserve to know what is in this agreement. The consequences of this for the future of America, for the future of the world are significant and almost mind-boggling. We have to get it right. To get it right, we need to read every word.

Here I am, shortly after the delivery of the 157 pages, together with the annexes, over a weekend poring through each sentence, trying to understand exactly what we have here and what we are dealing with, and I am amazed at what I have come up with. Instead of going through the various items—I will talk about more about this tomorrow, and it has been well presented by my colleague from New Hampshire and others this afternoon, including the majority leader—I would like to discuss something that I don't think has been raised yet. That something is the ambiguity that exists throughout this agreement and particularly in the annexes to the agreement. We know that there are two secret agreements which we don't have access to. How anyone can go forward and support an arrangement when you have side secret agreements and you are not allowed to know what they are—that in and of itself should be reason not to support an agreement. But having said that, let me spend a little bit of time regarding these ambiguities and the vagueness of some of the language here that I think have major implications.

The annex uses familiar forms of mushy language. I am going to quote here: “as determined,” “where appropriate,” “among others,” “as mutually determined,” and “when beneficial.” What are the actual obligations that we are undertaking if we vote for this agreement that is full of words like that? This is not clear to me, nor would I think it is clear to anyone in the administration.

We questioned the administration on this issue. They have essentially said: Well, this is to be determined at a later date or if this issue comes up, we will try to get some consensus on how to go forward. My own conclusion is that this language is not a mistake. These

people who negotiated on our benefit have had a lifetime of negotiating engagement. I assume many of them were attorneys, lawyers that know and understand that a definition of a word or a phrase is everything. You have to understand exactly what it is or you are going to end up with confusion.

These ambiguous obligations, I think, were purposefully designed to placate the Iranians, offering them a vision of a robust military nuclear infrastructure, developed not only with the acquiescence of the West but with our material assistance. Further, if we examine the agreement text—let alone the annex text—this same pattern with misleading ambiguity holds. In many of the detailed commitments that are specified in the agreement and the annexes available to us, these conditional ambiguous terms dominate.

I couldn't help but notice that this wasn't an occasional occurrence. I asked my staff to go through and look at some of these ambiguous definitions and count the number of them. The phrase “as appropriate” or “where appropriate”—“achieving this as appropriate” or “obligated to this as appropriate” or “where appropriate”—was sprinkled throughout the text 34 times. “As mutually determined” or “by consensus to be concluded” occurred 28 times, implying that future agreements or conditional commitments are there as against current commitments. At the same time, the phrase “Iran intends to” occurs more frequently than it should in place of affirmative obligations.

To any lawyer representing a client, whether you are buying a house, leasing a car, leasing an apartment or entering into a business contract, you can go to that lawyer and basically say: Look, I want an out. Or if you are on the other end of the negotiating process, you can say: Put some ambiguous vague language in there—“to be determined,” “as appropriate,” “by consensus”—so that if something goes wrong here, I have an excuse to opt out.

I think that is exactly what Iran was trying to do. If we come up with what we think is a breach of the agreement, it is easy for Iran to say: That needs to be by consensus; and without consensus, we see that as saying such and such, and you see it wrong. If we press the case with Iran, that, of course, gives them the option of withdrawing from the agreement. At an important time, now having over \$100 billion in their hands, now having signed up contracts with many nations around the world—long-term contracts for delivery of oil, minerals or whatever—now having put themselves in a much different position with the sanctions lifted, they may use that exact language as a means of escaping. Or if you turn it on its head and turn it the other way around, Iran says: Well, wait a minute;

our intentions are such and such. You didn't understand what we were trying to say to you.

Then how are we going to respond? This puts us in a very tenuous position.

I can recall a number of times when I told my wife: I thought you were going to stop and pick up milk on the way home.

Well, I intended to do that, but I got a phone call.

Wait a minute. I thought you were going to clean the garage on Saturday.

I intended to do that, but Joe called and said: Let's go play golf.

I intended. It was a good intention. That is fine in any kind of a marital relationship or any other kind of relationship. Many of those are just meaningless things. But when you are talking about an agreement that binds the United States on the basis of how its negotiating adversary interprets and uses these words, it can put you in real trouble.

I don't think anybody has talked about that yet. I wanted to bring that up. As I said, I am going to be talking about my position and how I came to the decision not to support this tomorrow. This is a sloppily written agreement that can bind the United States to obligations that we are not even yet aware of and that can give Iran an out if it so chooses. It comes to that point in time when, with a 3-month or so breakout toward having nuclear weapon capability, they simply say: Sanctions are gone, we have our money, we have done the research, even some with assistance of U.S. scientists and the members of the negotiating team, we are in a great position to go forward, and we are just going to do it. We can use this language to opt-out of the agreement. That is just one more reason why each of us should carefully try to understand what is and what isn't in this agreement and weigh this as we try to make a judgment in terms of whether we should go forward or whether we have signed on to a very bad deal here and should vote against it.

With that, I yield to my colleagues who have been patiently waiting to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment and recap the day and some of the issues I heard on the floor. I have been on the floor quite a bit today and heard a lot of the debate. As I processed through some of the debate, I heard—and we will see if some of my colleagues agree with this—a lot of conversation on the details of the agreement in trying to walk through the actual process. What does the text say? There seem to be two very different opinions about this. I will share what I am hearing.

There are key things that Iran needs to be able to complete a nuclear weapon,

and it doesn't seem that this agreement stops them in the process, and it seems that the goal of this agreement was to stop them from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

What does Iran need? Well, they need time. This agreement gives them time. It lays out a schedule, backs up and slows down the process of inspections. It allows them time to be able to finish their research.

It allows them money. That is a key aspect that they need not only for their funding of terrorism but to actually be able to complete the technological research they have to have in those facilities. Billions of dollars are released to Iran almost immediately in this agreement for them to be able to complete their research.

It allows them ballistic missile capability, which is shocking to a lot of people I talked to in my State. They assume this deal actually slows down their ballistic missile research and capability. It actually doesn't. It actually paves the path for them and gives them permission to continue their ballistic missile research.

It allows them to be able to continue toward highly enriched uranium. Again, a lot of people I talked to have been surprised at that because the assumption was, after hearing about it from the President so many times, they shouldn't be allowed to have uranium and shouldn't be allowed to do that. That was the conversation 5 years ago, but now the conversation is, how much uranium can they enrich and what does that look like?

There have been some conversations today by individuals who have said that this will decrease the number of centrifuges they have. That is entirely correct. It does decrease the number of centrifuges, but let me give an illustration. If your company had 20 computers that were built in 1995 and you were told you could replace those 20 computers from 1995 with 3 computers from this year, would you take that deal? I bet you would. That is the deal we are giving to Iran. We are telling them they will have to get rid of two-thirds of their oldest centrifuges—their oldest, originally built—but they can still keep 5,000 of even their oldest centrifuges and they can install 1,000 of their newest technology centrifuges and keep those going. I would certainly think that is a deal they would take—and by the way, they are taking it, and they are asking us to take it as well.

They have time, they have money, they have ballistic missile research, they have highly enriched uranium and the permission to be able to continue their work on their most advanced centrifuges, and they have additional defensive capabilities. They are allowed to continue to stockpile conventional weapons under this agreement and to even add things such as surface-to-air defense capabilities to be able to defend their military sites.

So you tell me, does Iran have what it needs to be able to complete a nuclear weapon under this deal—time, money, ballistic missiles, ability to be able to complete their research, advanced centrifuges, and defensive weaponry to be able to put around their facilities? Yes.

Here are some of the things which we don't know, which we really can't discuss, and which we would appreciate being able to discuss today—the side deals. We have the documents that have come in. In fact, I have posted them on my Web site, and many others have done the same. We want Americans to be able to read those things because most Americans, when they read them, are stunned with what this agreement says. But what we can't get is the side deal.

Again, I have heard over and over from the President that we are not going to trust Iran, we are going to verify. We don't trust, we are going to verify. Literally, with the side agreements—people keep hearing “What is the side agreement?” Here is what the side agreement is. The main agreement gives broad parameters. For instance, it says we will have inspections. Well, that is great. How are the inspections to be done? Well, that is in the side agreement. So we are agreeing that, yes, there will be inspections. When we asked the question about how the inspections were to be done, we were told that we can't read that document, that it is a separate agreement between the U.N. and Iran. Literally I cannot verify how we are going to verify. I have been told to trust and verify. I can't verify how we are verifying. That seems absurd to me, and it is hard for me to imagine anyone in this body would say: Yes, I would sign off on something I have never read and have never seen. In fact, the people in the administration have said they have never read or seen it. Yet we are being asked to sign off on it and to give our authorization to say: Yes, we will support that. I have a problem with that, and it is one of many reasons why I cannot support this deal.

What I have heard over and over again by individuals who do support this deal today is that this is the deal, it is in front of us, the President has agreed to it, and it will look bad if we don't agree to it. My problem is not looking bad; my problem is a nuclear-armed Iran. That is the problem. At the end of the day, this is not about saving face as America, this is about protecting U.S. interests and U.S. citizens and those of our friends in the gulf. This is not about saving face for the President.

I have heard over and over again: It would be too hard to get the coalition back together to be able to renegotiate this. May I remind everyone that the reason we have this coalition together is because the crippling sanctions are

one thing—you cannot do business with America and with Iran. That is the deal. If we continue the sanctions in place, it is not about getting the band back together, it is about leaving those sanctions in place, and if you want to do business with the United States, you will also have to agree to not do business with Iran. It is not about getting everyone back together. Leave them in place and let's finish renegotiating it.

I have heard over and over again: It is either war or it is this. Quite frankly, I think this deal in its place takes us closer to a conventional war. Why? Because it allows Iran to begin to almost immediately begin stockpiling conventional weapons. Those in the gulf region are so concerned about that that we are promising them they can get more weapons and buy more advanced weapons from us. How does a conventional arms race in the Middle East take us further from war? Under this agreement, it destabilizes.

I have heard over and over again today: What is our message to the world when the rest of the world has signed off on this and yet we say no? Well, here is our message to the world: Iran is screaming "Death to America," not death to other countries, except for Israel. They are chanting "Death to Israel." Israel is also standing up and saying: This is a terrible deal for our nation and the stability of the world.

It is not about our message to the world; it is about standing up and being the world's superpower. That is who we are. Let's take responsibility for our position in the world and be able to finish well while we are doing it.

I have also heard multiple times today: Well, let's sign off on this deal and then we will have tougher diplomacy in the future. I have to say that every time I heard that, I smiled and thought, are you kidding me? What do you mean, we will sign off on this deal and then we will do tougher diplomacy in the future? With what leverage? This is our leverage. The sanctions are the leverage. We are not going to get tougher in the future. This is the toughest moment. It gets softer from here.

Iran is still the single largest sponsor of terrorism in the world. They made no change in their actions against Yemen and leading the coup in Yemen. They made no change in their actions propping up Assad in Syria.

We are giving this away if we sign on to this agreement. This deal is built on hope, not on facts and trust, and I know everyone in this body hopes to get a diplomatic solution. We cannot base an agreement with Iran on hope. If we cannot verify it, if we cannot see the documents, if there has been no change in behavior, I think we should assume we still have status quo Iran.

Let's push back. Let's get the better deal. Let's not allow advanced cen-

trifuges to stay in place. Let's not allow them to continue their ballistic missile testing. These are not hard issues to be able to finish. The deal is half-cooked. Let's get it fully baked, and let's finish a diplomatic solution but not just hope that this works out in the days ahead.

With that, I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise tonight to speak about a very troubled time in my life and in this body. I didn't think this moment would arise in my tenure here in the U.S. Senate, but tonight I am very troubled about being a Member of this body.

Just a few short months ago, we told the American people, in our Foreign Relations Committee, that we could work together. We unanimously passed a bill that gave this body, the U.S. Congress, a right that the President and his administration had denied us by not allowing this to be treated as a treaty. Yet we stand here tonight—even though a unanimous bill came out of the committee and 98 Senators voted for us to get a look and a vote on this deal—without the ability to tell the people back home that we will, in fact, have a vote on this deal. I find that terribly troubling. As a matter of fact, I am embarrassed. The people back home deserve better than this body is providing.

There is bipartisan opposition to this deal. There are good Democrats who in their deep conscience are going to oppose the President, and I respect that, but there is not bipartisan support for this deal. There is a huge difference. Only one group in this body is supporting this President's deal with Iran. I am troubled by that.

I applaud Senator CARDIN, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee. I applaud Senator CORKER as the chairman of that committee. Under their leadership, we got to this point. Without this deal, without a vote, we wouldn't even be sitting here tonight. We would already be implementing this deal, and we would have told the American people: Yes, we don't have the constitutional balance between the United States and the House of Representatives and the legislative branch that the Constitution calls for. We gave up.

Well, here we are. I would like for every Member of this body who is going to vote for this deal to answer to the people back home: How does this make the world safer for their children and their children's children?

In the Presiding Officer's business career and in my business career, we have seen a lot of deals and we have negotiated a lot of deals. The way I look at deals is to try to evaluate what both sides get in a deal. So let's look at this from that perspective.

First of all, Iran gets a windfall for bad behavior. They have 30 years of

noncompliance with NPT requirements, and the first thing we are going to do is give them a windfall—somewhere between \$60 and \$150 billion.

We know by the administration's own admission that we can depend on some of that money—last year \$6 billion went to terrorist support around the Middle East and other parts of the world from Iran. Last year Iran spent \$17 billion supporting their own military. That puts this windfall into perspective. One of the first things Iran did when the administration announced this deal is they sent representatives to Moscow. Does it take much imagination to see that their behavior is not going to change in this deal just because we give them a windfall? As a matter of fact, we are encouraging bad behavior.

Second, I would like to know where our four American hostages are. They get to keep them.

Third, Iran gets to enrich. This is my biggest problem, and I have said it many times. My biggest problem with this deal is that we gave up the ability right off the bat to stop Iran from enriching. To me, that is the fundamental problem in this deal. Breakout without enriching capabilities is 2 to 3 years, not 2 to 3 months like this deal provides. As a matter of fact, the President himself said this deal, after 13 years, allows Iran to have a breakout period that is basically zero. Who are we kidding here? And after 15 years, all bets are off. What we have done is provided a pathway to enriched uranium, and I find that very troubling.

Unlike many other countries that have similar nuclear programs that are peaceful and are not allowed to enrich, we allowed this bad actor to step up and be treated the same as countries such as Germany, Japan, Holland, Brazil, and Argentina. I find that very troubling.

Fourth, they get access to the world's arms market in just 5 short years. Why is that important? It is important because of their support of terrorism, but also, more importantly, it gives them access to a nuclear weapons capability through technology available only through the arms market.

Fifth, after 8 short years, they get access to the intercontinental ballistic missiles technology. Why in the world does a rogue nation like Iran that says they only want a civil nuclear program for power generation—why in the world in the eleventh hour do this administration and our negotiators give up and give them the right to have access, after 8 short years, to ballistic missile technology? They currently have a missile that has a 1,200-mile range. That very easily brings Israel and Eastern Europe into range. If they have access in 8 years to ballistic missile technology, their only intent can be to have a missile that can deliver a missile armed with a nuclear warhead

to Washington, DC, and points beyond. I find that very troubling.

Sixth, Iran gets access to technology for centrifuges. This is almost the most unbelievable thing. Not only do they get to keep every centrifuge, they are not destroying every centrifuge; they don't have to destroy any one. But I agree with what Senator LANKFORD just said, and that is this: They have antiques right now. What we are allowing them to do is to trade up to modern technology, and IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges. There is only one reason for that. It shortens the time for them to develop enough fissile material to have a nuclear weapon.

Seventh, Iran gets to limit and delay inspectors. This is only important because we allow them to enrich; don't miss that. But what we have done is allow them to dictate the inspection protocol. I have never seen a deal where that was allowed, honest to goodness. This to me is unconscionable. The fact that we have secret deals, yes, this is important, but the fact that we are allowing them—with no U.S. participation, by the way, on the ground in Iran with the IAEA—we are allowing Iran to actually take samples under the protocol of inspection.

The side deals are unconscionable. I would never in business sign a deal where every legal document was not exposed. How in the world—I understand these side agreements are normal operating procedure within the IAEA and their countries that they are inspecting. This is different. This is a public global deal, dealing with a rogue country such as Iran, and we need to see that. I can't imagine how we would approve a deal—anybody would approve a deal and go home and explain to their constituents how this makes sense for the safety of their children and grandchildren when we don't know what is in every legal document.

Now, what did we get? I would argue that basically, from what I hear, the No. 1 goal of this administration is a legacy for this failed President. I am sorry, but that is the only real benefit I can see. We get Iran, the world's largest sponsor of terrorism and proven violator of past nuclear agreements to promise to be a good actor. Really? That is what we get? Yet, the Ayatollah just today—just today—said that Israel will not exist in 25 years. This does not sound to me like a good actor who is going to change their behavior because we have brought them into the community of nations.

Why do we believe the word of a nation that has been a revolutionary pariah since 1979? Have we forgotten that 52 United States American citizens, members of our embassy, for 444 days were held hostage in Tehran just 35 short years ago? This is the same regime, these are the same clerics, the same mentality, that created that situation. We just now have entered into

the most devastating foreign policy agreement in my lifetime and maybe in the history of the United States. No deal that I can read in history puts the United States in more jeopardy going forward than this nuclear deal with Iran.

Under this deal, we get an Iran that will continue its bad behavior. I think that is easy to predict. Their sponsorship of terror continues. Their human rights violations have worsened. Even during the negotiations, they continued to back Assad's murderous regime in Syria, which is the source of one of the most devastating humanitarian crises of the 21st century that is just now coming to light.

The Presiding Officer and I made a trip, along with the leader, just a few months ago. We sat in Jordan and we listened to the plea of those people over there who are receiving refugees. They are telling us how serious this plight is. Now the media has picked up on it, and we see the devastating impact of what is going on in the Middle East. This deal is a manifestation of a much bigger problem.

This President has failed in this foreign policy requirement that the executive branch is given in our Constitution. This is just a manifestation of a bigger failure, but it is devastating to the future security of our kids. Today, Iran has a national holiday called Death to America Day. As a matter of fact, one of the hostages, one of the four hostages just this year, earlier this year, was moved from the second worst prison in Iran to the worst prison in Iran, and guess what day he was moved on? Death to America Day. I find that insulting.

As we just heard, there are three things—I have a little different view of what a country needs to have a nuclear weapon. First of all, I am an engineer, so this will be very pedantic, and I will move very quickly with this. But, quickly, a country needs three things. First of all, they have to have fissile material. We allow this in this deal. There is a pathway for them to get there legally. They don't have to violate this agreement. They will eventually get there in a very short period of time.

The second thing is they have to have a device for a warhead. In five short years they have access to the military arms community where that is totally accessible today.

Third, they have to have a delivery mechanism. In eight short years, as we just said, they will have access to intercontinental ballistic missile technology. Basically, in eight years, if they want to break out, they will have missile technology that can bring a missile warhead right down on our heads here in this chamber.

Without domestic enrichment, Iran's breakout period is really 2 to 3 years, again, not 2 to 3 months. President

Obama has claimed that we could not get a deal without giving them the right to enrich. I don't understand that. This brought them to the table in the first place. We gave up on that too early. The President gave us a false choice, and I am insulted by that, and people back home are too. It is either this deal—and everybody agrees this is a bad deal; even the Democrats today are telling us how flawed this deal is. I didn't hear one person today stand up and tell us how great this deal was. Basically, I heard this is the best deal we can get. Let's give it a try. We can't be any worse off in 10 years. I would argue yes, we can, and yes, we will be worse off in 10 years.

It is absolutely possible to have a better deal. We don't need P5+1 if, in fact, we have the determination to make our own sanctions stick. This \$18 trillion economy is big enough to bring them back to the table and absolutely get the kind of deal that would protect our kids and grandkids.

In previous deals with South Africa and Libya, just as two examples, they gave up their enriching capabilities in order to be accepted into the NPT fraternity of countries that are good actors regarding proliferation of nuclear technology. This deal not only allows Iran to enrich but it gives their illicit nuclear enrichment program the blessing of the international community. The President and the negotiators even threw in technical assistance for Iran's enrichment program. I just don't understand that. As a dumb business guy, I just don't understand how they, in good conscience and without smirking, can stand in front of the American people and say this is a good deal. In fact, I don't hear many people saying that. Even Secretary Kerry basically said this is the best deal we can get, we can't get a better deal, and the only alternative is war. I am insulted by that.

The second thing, they need to design for a warhead. We talked about how getting into the arms community allows them to do that. We don't know whether they have it or not today. Iran would need many things, but one thing they need is access to capital and access to global markets to drive their economy. But let's remember one thing: Why do they need all of this in the first place? Why did this get negotiated? Because they want a nuclear weapon.

The goal in this agreement, according to the administration, was never to allow Iran to become a nuclear weapons State. Yet, we see nothing but pathways that allow them to do that, even legally. I just don't understand how the administration and a few Democrats are standing up today and saying this is a good deal, and we need to vote for it because it won't preclude Iran from ever becoming a nuclear weapons State. It just doesn't do that.

As a matter of fact, in 1994, we signed a similar deal with North Korea. The

President at that time, President Clinton, told the American people that if we voted on that deal, that deal would guarantee we would never have a nuclear weapon on the peninsula of Korea. How did that work out for us? I would argue today that we are facing a similar situation that is just as predictable. Looking at the facts, we can see this deal all but guarantees a nuclear Iran. I can't support this in good conscience.

This is one of the worst deals I have seen in my lifetime. I am embarrassed that we sit here in front of the American people and actually have to discuss this. This is so bad, it is so threatening to our children and our children's children that we have to stand up and we have to fight this all the way through to get a vote on it, first of all, and to defeat this.

I urge my colleagues to join me tonight and this week in opposing this deal.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for substitute amendment No. 2640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Kelly Ayotte, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jerry Moran, John McCain.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk for the underlying resolution, H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Kelly Ayotte, John Thune,

Cory Gardner, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jerry Moran, John McCain.

Mr. MCCONNELL. For the information of all colleagues, this cloture motion would ripen on Friday, but I am optimistic that we will be able to get consent to have the vote tomorrow afternoon.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. BOOZMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Georgia, and I certainly associate myself with them.

This debate is vital. Despite President Obama's initial objections to congressional oversight, the American people deserve a vote in this critical national security matter, which I would note has been negotiated behind closed doors.

The bill that we passed in May accomplished that. Now the Senate Democrats are talking about taking that away by filibustering this debate.

How we went from passing Senator CORKER's bill by a vote of 98 to 1 just a few months ago to a potential filibuster is baffling to the American people. Our constituents want this debate. They have a number of concerns about this deal. We are their voice. We are here to represent them, not to protect the President from a difficult veto.

When these discussions began, President Obama claimed we would be able to diplomatically dismantle Iran's nuclear program. The final agreement suggests this is far from the case. It is apparent that the President and his negotiating partners were willing—eager, even—to give in to every demand made by the world's largest State sponsor of terrorism. The goalposts were moved from dismantling Iran's clandestine nuclear weapons program to blindly hoping we can contain it.

The deal President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry have orchestrated has several key faults. For starters, under the deal, Iran is not required to destroy a single centrifuge, not one. That means well over 1,000 centrifuges will remain in place at Fordow, one of Iran's most infamous nuclear sites. Many will continue to operate. This is no ordinary facility; it is a fortified, underground military bunker built into the side of a mountain. It was constructed in secret, and it has served only one purpose: to covertly produce weapons-grade, highly enriched uranium.

When the talks began, the President was adamant that Fordow must be closed as part of the final agreement. However, over the course of the negotiations, the President caved. The Iranians will be able to maintain the capacity to continue enrichment activities at Fordow.

The President claims that verification will ensure Iran's compliance. Verification appears to be exactly where this deal is lacking any punch. There is nothing in this deal that lets us confidently say we know what is truly going on at any of the nuclear sites in Iran.

There are no anytime, anywhere inspections, including at Fordow. Even worse, international inspectors will not even be the ones handling the inspections at the country's military complex in Parchin. The Iranians themselves will be. How this is acceptable to anyone is astonishing. There is absolutely no reason, given the regime's history, to believe that the Iranian inspectors will be honest about what is going on in Parchin.

A lack of verification is far from the only troubling aspect of this agreement. The Iranian regime believes that the agreement gives them full, permanent relief from sanctions.

Lifting sanctions will provide Iran with approximately \$100 billion in previously frozen assets which the administration has ultimately admitted will go, at least in part, to the Iranian military and its terrorist offshoots. It was hard enough to get the international community to commit to sanctions in the first place. With a reprieve of this nature, we will never be able to reestablish them should Iran not live up to its end of the agreement, which is a strong possibility given the Iranian regime's actions in the past.

Along with sanctions relief, the international arms embargo and ban on ballistic missile research will also be lifted. Within the next 8 years, Iran will have access to modern offensive weapons. This does not bode well for peace in the region. It puts our security and that of our allies at great risk. Remember, we are talking about the world's leading state sponsor of terror.

What we are giving up as a result of this deal, the sanctions relief, the arms embargo, the ongoing enrichment, makes the world a more dangerous place. We have a responsibility to ensure that Iran never achieves its goal of becoming a nuclear power. If Iran goes nuclear, Saudi Arabia and other nations in the region surely will follow. The deal gives us little confidence that we will be successful in this regard.

A nuclear Iran could be devastating for America and our allies. This is about saving our children and grandchildren from the prospects of nuclear war. I cannot confidently say this agreement will accomplish this goal. In fact, I fear it moves us in the wrong direction. For that reason, I oppose the deal and intend to support the resolution of disapproval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, as we come together and debate President Obama's agreement on Iran, I believe it

is one of the most consequential national security decisions we may ever face. I have heard my peers talk many times about the things that trouble them, the things they fear, the “things that keep us up at night.” I will tell you that this nuclear agreement is one of those things that keeps me up at night, as a mother, as a grandmother, and as a soldier.

Having proudly worn our Nation's uniform for over 20 years and having deployed to the region, I can tell you that protecting and defending this country is something I take very seriously and very personally. I had hoped our President would approach the American people with a deal that reflected the high ground our Nation has stood on against Iran for decades.

Unfortunately, now that I have seen the available details, I believe the President has not negotiated a good deal with Iran. The agreement before us fails to dismantle Iran's nuclear program and does not end Iran's support of terrorism. The President has squandered his opportunity to enhance our national security and the security of our Israeli and Arab allies by failing to live up to his own goal of ending Iran's capability to build a nuclear weapon.

The administration is asking the American people to accept a deal which will, at best, freeze Iran's nuclear program for 8 years—that is, if the Iranians actually live up to their end of the bargain. One of the major failures in this deal is the lack of anytime, anywhere inspections to ensure that they do. In April, the President's own Secretary of Energy, Dr. Moniz, a nuclear physicist whom the President often refers to as a leading authority on nuclear programs. He said: “We expect to have anywhere, anytime access” when referring to what our country needed to ensure Iran was abiding by a nuclear agreement.

How can we ever be certain of compliance if Iran decides to cheat and we have a weak inspection regime as part of this deal? I would argue that we can't. Another part of this debate that has been very troubling to me is that the President continues to tell the American people there are only two options: his agreement or war. During one of his major speeches on this deal, he actually mentioned the word “war” 50 times in an attempt to hammer this false choice home.

Despite this misinformation campaign designed to pressure the American people into agreeing to a bad deal, our military leaders and distinguished former administration officials clearly denied that our choice is either support the deal or go to war with Iran. In testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff GEN Martin Dempsey disagreed with the President's assessment that the American people face a choice of supporting the agreement or going to war with Iran.

Later that same week, the President's pick to lead the U.S. Navy said war was not the only alternative and that we need to use the full set of capabilities that the joint force and the Navy can deliver to deter that. The military contribution is also just a subset of a whole-of-government approach, along with our allies in the region. It is not just leaders within our military saying this.

Gen. Michael Hayden, former Director of the CIA and NSA, said:

There is no necessity to go to war if we don't sign this agreement. There are actions in between those two extremes.

Dr. Richard Haas, president of the Council on Foreign Relations, said: “I would echo that” during the same hearing. Ambassador Edelman, a former Under Secretary of Defense for Policy and Ambassador to Turkey, said: “I agree with you, I don't think those are the only alternatives.” Ambassador Nicholas Burns, a former top U.S. negotiator with Iran on its nuclear programs and former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, said: “I don't believe that war would be inevitable. . . .”

Rather than misrepresenting the facts and our country's options, I challenge the supporters of the agreement to explain to the American people why they are supporting a flawed and bad deal today, when we should be putting our citizens' interests and their security first. I would also note that this administration was willing to leave the negotiating table without securing an end to Iran's support of terrorism.

Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terror. We are giving them a free pass in this deal to continue those efforts. In addition to the billions of dollars in sanctions relief, which leaves Iran poised to double down on its support of terrorism, the President also agreed to lift the U.N. arms embargo for advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missiles.

As a veteran of Kuwait and Iraq in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, I am beside myself, as are many other Americans who served in Iraq, regarding the President's support for sanctions relief for one terrorist in particular: the leader of Iran's elite covert force, the Quds Force, General Qassem Soleimani.

General Soleimani is directly responsible for the deaths of several hundred Americans and the wounding of thousands more during the Iraq war. Throughout the Iraq war, we lost many Americans, killed in action, and many more wounded by Iraq Shia militia who were supported or controlled by General Soleimani. In 2010, Ambassador James Jeffrey, then-U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, said: “Up to a quarter of the American casualties and some of the more horrific incidents in which Americans were kidnapped . . . can be traced without doubt to these Iranian groups.”

One of the significant tolls to attack American servicemembers was an improvised explosive device, IED, known as an explosively formed penetrator or EFP. These EFPs were provided by Iran exclusively to groups they controlled in order to kill Americans.

If you ask American servicemembers who served in Iraq during the war, they will tell you these types of IEDs used by Iranian-supported Shia militias were some of the most deadly and devastating types employed by any of the Iraqi insurgency groups, including Al Qaeda in Iraq. While many of my colleagues share the concern regarding General Soleimani and Iran's targeting of Americans during the Iraq war, we seldom hear from Americans who have firsthand experience in fighting these Iranian-supported Iraqi Shia militias.

My staff recently spoke to a currently serving U.S. Army officer, originally from Waterloo, IA, who deployed with the 1st Cavalry Division on a 15-month deployment to Iraq during the surge. This Iowan described to us the impact Iran's effort in Iraq had on him and his tank platoon in Baghdad saying:

The threat of EFPs was quite real during our deployment to Iraq. Understanding the pipeline from Iran into Iraq, the abundance of the munitions and the lethality on US Forces, the sense of peril never left our psyche. While I was never fearful of losing a limb, I knew if I was struck, I would follow certain death, one that I welcomed ten months into a fifteen month deployment.

Removing sanctions on Soleimani is an embarrassment for this administration and in the words of some of our Iraq veterans, “a slap in the face.” Then there is Luke, a retired Army servicemember with the storied 101st Airborne Division. While on patrol during the division's second tour to Iraq, Luke lost his leg in combat, after his vehicle was hit with an Iranian-made EFP.

He told us that “we come home blown up and try to put our lives back together only to hear that our country is going to be lifting sanctions that will free up billions for Iran to kill more innocents. We may not be at war with them, but they're at war with us. I'm a wounded veteran and I spend a great deal of time helping other guys like me. I can assure you that this deal directly affects us. It is a slap in the face to all veterans. All those who served. . . .”

We owe it to veterans and our current servicemembers who have sacrificed to stop Iran's support of terror. I urge the President and my colleagues to consider Iran's true intent and not to underestimate Iran's will to enhance its capability to destabilize the Middle East, threaten American security, and the security of our allies in the region and around the globe.

In closing, the decision we make on this agreement will have lasting results for our Nation, the world, and future generations of Americans.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject the President's bad deal and put the security of the American people, our allies, and the global community first.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, we are here today to engage in an honest and open debate about the nuclear agreement that the administration has brokered with Iran.

Let me at this point commend Chairman CORKER for the way he and his committee have handled a very difficult process that has not been coordinated with the administration, where their consideration was for Congress to be cut out. I think Chairman CORKER has done a wonderful job and inserted the Senate of the United States where it should be, as part of this agreement.

I am here to tell you that this deal is not based on absolute value, absolute knowledge of Iran's activities or its intentions—including its nuclear ambitions—but it is naively and dangerously based on faith and hope. Our national security should not be based on faith and hope. Our Nation's security is too precious to be based on faith and hope alone—faith that we will detect any Iranian efforts to cheat and hope that the Iranians will not cheat.

Secretary of State John Kerry told the American people in June that “we know what they did,” “we have no doubt,” and “we have absolute knowledge of the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.” Let me say that again: “We have absolute knowledge of the possible military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program.”

As chairman of the Intelligence Committee, I can tell you we don't have absolute knowledge of anything. Our intelligence is good, but it is not perfect, and it is disingenuous for Secretary Kerry to suggest otherwise.

We must accept the self-evident fact that Iran has a horrific record of complying with nonproliferation commitments. When our best tools are faith and hope, we are putting our own national security, as well as our allies', at risk.

I respectfully ask my colleagues, as you consider your vote on this agreement, to think about the following questions:

Do you know where every potential nuclear facility is located?

Do you know the location or activity of every nuclear-related laboratory, whether it is in a military facility or a university campus?

Do we know whether Iran intends to purchase sensitive nuclear materials from a rogue nation or whether we will detect the sale or the transfer of that nuclear material?

Do we know the intentions of the Supreme Leader or what he and his successor may be thinking in 10 years?

Do we know everything about Iran's past culpability, its future intent or

ability to conceal illicit, nuclear activities?

Have we assumed too much about Iran's willingness to abide by the agreement?

Unlike Secretary Kerry, I do not believe that we know everything about Iran's past nuclear efforts. I do not have faith that we know, with any degree of certainty, this regime's intentions, as he suggests.

Our intelligence community does amazing things, and I am continually impressed with the dedication, drive, and the capability of its people. Our intelligence community regularly provides our civilian and military leadership insights and assessments on the toughest national security problems, but they never—they never—claim—and I wouldn't believe them if they did—to have absolute knowledge of any issue. Again, intelligence is imperfect.

Secretary Kerry told the American people and the Members of this body:

No part of this agreement relies on trust. It is all based on thorough and extensive transparency and verification measures.

With all due respect, the Secretary is oversimplifying the very complex and difficult world of treaty compliance and verification. The Secretary should come clean and truthfully state that this agreement does not rely on trust; it relies on hope and faith—faith that we will detect any Iranian efforts to cheat and hope that Iran will not cheat.

My colleagues should be mindful before casting their votes. Your eyes should be wide open to the uncertainty we as a nation are accepting with this agreement. If the IAEA and our intelligence community are not 100 percent certain and our collective assumptions respect wrong and we get caught unaware or we are surprised, the consequences will be significant. They could be disastrous and we will, without a doubt, regret entering into this agreement.

The agreement the administration has negotiated with Iran is based on faith that we know everything about the nuclear program today and hope that the Iranian regime will abide by the terms of this agreement.

The administration is displaying misguided faith that Iran will not use the billions of dollars soon to be available to continue its efforts to fund terrorist proxies worldwide. I call my colleagues' attention to recent comments by National Security Advisor Susan Rice, who said: “we should expect” that some of the money Iran gets under sanctions relief as a result of the nuclear deal “would go to the Iranian military and could potentially be used for the kinds of bad behavior that we have seen in the region.”

Again, this deal ignores the facts and instead hopes that it will work out. Iran is the world's central bank of terrorism, and this additional income is

not likely to be solely dedicated to streamlining their postal delivery routes in Iran.

Secretary Kerry testified in July that “they [Iran] are committed to certain things that we interpret as terrorism.”

The administration is relying on faith that the IAEA and our intelligence community will be able to detect any trace of nuclear material and any prohibited activity and has hope that the IAEA will continue to have “access” to Iranian nuclear sites—“access” that in some cases is being defined as “the ability to deliver things to Iranians at the gate of a facility, so they can conduct their own surveillance”—anytime, anywhere to deliver the equipment to the Iranians and ask them to do self-inspections inside the gate.

If the IAEA is prevented from gaining the necessary access to declared or suspected facilities in a timely manner, we will be at a significant—significant—disadvantage, and the sanctions pressures we have obtained over years of efforts cannot be remade overnight.

Our reliance on the IAEA is now also tied to two side agreements with Iran that Members of this body have not yet been provided. I will remind my colleagues that when the President signed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the law required him to provide to Congress the agreement and “all related materials and annexes,” and that has not happened. Yet the administration asked that we have faith that these will not have a material effect on the agreement and our ability to ensure Iranian compliance with its terms.

It raises additional questions. Do we have absolute certainty that we know what those agreements include? Do we understand how they may affect Iran's activities, assumptions or willingness to abide by the terms of its agreements with the United States? Do we know without a doubt where every potential nuclear facility is located?

The President argued:

Although it may take 24 days to finally get access to [a] site . . . high school physics will remind us that that [nuclear materials] leaves a trace. And so we'll know that, in fact, there was a violation of the agreement.

I don't have absolute certainty that this is true and question the administration's willingness to give up a requirement for anywhere, anytime access. If Iran isn't hiding anything, why wouldn't they offer that access?

Do we trust Iran's claim that they don't have a covert facility? Do we have faith that they do not? Are we hoping that they do not build one? Do we or can we have absolute certainty on this issue?

A former IAEA deputy director stated in 2013 that “if there is no undeclared [nuclear] installation today . . . it will be the first time in 20 years that Iran doesn't have one.”

Ultimately, I believe this deal is built on a foundation that is far more unstable than the administration would have us believe.

While I realize that all the parties involved in this deal have been trying to spin the narrative to their benefit, I cannot believe that a deal as tough as the administration would have us believe would be referred to by the Iranian President as a “legal, political, and technical victory for Iran.”

The administration has chosen to trade all of our economic leverage—leverage that was working—for a near-term possible delay in Iran’s breakout timeline. No doubt we will still have leverage, but it will be limited, perversely, given the President’s statements about opponents of this deal to military action, something we have tried to avoid for many years as it relates to Iran. The administration hopes that it will not have to use military action.

Can you tell me with absolute certainty what the Supreme Leader’s intentions are? Can you tell me what he is thinking or what he will be thinking in 10 years when Iran will have rebuilt its struggling economy and will be nearing the end of what limited restraints may remain on its nuclear research and development activities? Did we just enable a regime based on a false choice that we didn’t fully understand?

One of the President’s chief criticisms, typical of his straw-man approach to debate, has been to suggest that opponents of the deal only want a military action. Oddly enough, it is the President’s own agreement with the Iranians that has stripped us of all leverage except military action if the agreement is not adhered to. The strategic decision to engage Iran in the resulting deal cannot be based on absolute certainty of Iran’s nuclear programs or its intentions. The agreement is based on questionable assumptions, allows far too much maneuvering by Iran, and naively trusts the regime that has a history of evasive activities and false declarations to the very body, the IAEA, entrusted with enforcing the agreement.

Do we know without a doubt what is going on in every laboratory in Iran, whether it is on a military facility or a university campus?

I applaud the efforts of our negotiators, our intelligence community, and our diplomats, but I am sorry to say that they were sent on a fool’s errand by the President. They were provided a false choice between this agreement and war. The narrative just doesn’t add up.

I have spent the better part of 15 years as a member of the House or Senate Intelligence Committee. I understand the nature and the nuance of intelligence work, and I know that there are no absolute certainties in this business.

This deal is based not on an absolute knowledge of Iran’s activities and its intentions, as the administration would have us believe, but as you can see, it is naively based on faith and hope.

I, for one, will not vote to enable a regime that supports terrorism, evades international inspections, disregards U.N. Security Council resolutions, and is opposed to the very existence of another nation in the region. The United States has effectively led the international community and enacted sanctions that have restrained the hostile regime, and it now looks as though this administration will undo those years of efforts and enable the same regime by filling its coffers with badly needed resources.

I don’t know with absolute certainty where this agreement will lead, but I do understand that there are too many unanswered questions to move forward.

I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, it has been a long day. We have heard about everything that can be heard from a lot of different people, and I have come to some conclusions that there are some things that are incontrovertible after hearing both sides of the debate all day long. There are six things we should be looking at. I will quickly summarize these. I think it is kind of a good wrapup.

There are six things. First of all, this deal rewards and legitimizes Iran for violating international laws and treaties and United Nations Security Council resolutions. I say it rewards and legitimizes.

The second thing it does is it rewards Iran with \$100 billion dollars. You heard it today. That could be a floating figure. We are not sure just how much it is, but we do know this: what they do with their money is to expand their influence with terrorist organizations.

The third thing is it places the Middle East on the brink of a new arms race. This is something we have heard from others for quite some time, and now we already have some countries coming forward with what their intentions are.

The fourth thing is it fails to dismantle Iran’s enrichment infrastructure. That has been stated by a lot of people. No one really is denying that.

And fifth, it places no restrictions on Iran’s ballistic missile program. You have to keep in mind we have been talking about bombs all day, but you have to deliver the bombs to make them effective. That is when the missile program comes into play.

And sixth—and I think it is most important—there is, in my opinion, no verification at all.

I would like to summarize all of that real quickly. In speaking about the

fact that the agreement rewards and legitimizes Iran’s violations, keep in mind they have violated almost every international law or treaty or United Nations Security Council resolution. The Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, for developing nuclear weapons—they have violated that. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which has to do with the freedom of expression, the freedom of religion, freedom from discrimination, and freedom from torture—they have violated that. The International Convention against the Taking of Hostages—several people have mentioned today—I think the junior Senator from Georgia asked: What about the four hostages who are over there?

I would carry that one step further. One of the hostages is an FBI agent named Robert Levinson. Robert Levinson now holds the record of having been held hostage longer than anyone else in history, and he is still there. He is still there at a time we are in this process.

The U.N. security resolutions on access to nuclear facilities—they have violated that. I think everyone knows that.

Iran has shown from time to time they can’t be trusted. The Director General of the IAEA has said Iran has consistently failed to provide information or access needed to allay the IAEA’s concerns about the weapons potential.

So that is the first thing. The second thing is rewarding the world’s leading sponsor of terrorism. The United States does not normally negotiate with terrorists. This is something I have heard for many, many years, as long as I have been here, until now. Iran remains the world’s leading state sponsor of terrorism, as we have heard all day today.

According to the State Department’s “2009 Country Reports on Terrorism,” they have provided training and weapons to the Taliban fighting our forces in Afghanistan. Iranian IEDs have killed U.S. troops in Iraq. They have paid the Taliban in Afghanistan to kill U.S. troops. Iran supports Hamas in Palestine, Hezbollah in Lebanon, and Assad in Syria.

I had occasion to be in the Persian Gulf on the USS Carl Vinson just a few weeks ago. It was during the negotiations. There I was in the Persian Gulf at the same time an Iranian ship was taking weapons down to Yemen to kill Americans. That was while we were negotiating.

Iran is bankrolling the slaughter of tens of thousands of Syrians and has publicly committed to the annihilation of the State of Israel and has called for “Death to America” while we are in the middle of negotiations.

General Austin, the commander of the U.S. Central Command, made the

statement—and I was there when he made this statement—that “Iran represents the most significant threat to the central region . . . Iran continues to pursue policies that threaten U.S. strategic interests and goals throughout the Middle East.”

As was stated by my good friend before me, even Susan Rice, who would do almost anything the President asks, has said we can expect some of this money—this \$100 billion dollars or whatever the amount ends up being—is going to be used to fortify their terrorist friends. So we can only conclude the financial windfall estimated to be over \$100 billion will be used to fortify more terrorism.

The third point I think was made today is—and these are the six I think have become incontrovertible—this agreement places the Middle East on the brink of a new arms race.

Dr. Kissinger, who testified before our committee—the Armed Services Committee just the other day—when testifying regarding the ongoing nuclear negotiations with Iran, said, “The impact of this approach will be to move from preventing proliferation to managing it.”

We all recall last month, when Prime Minister Netanyahu warned us and said, “The deal that was supposed to end nuclear proliferation will actually trigger nuclear proliferation. It will trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.”

Saudi Arabia has been talking recently about possibly being the first to jump in there on this new program, so we can expect that to happen. We know it is going to happen.

The fourth thing is, the agreement fails to dismantle Iran’s enrichment infrastructure. I think that has been driven home by many people here. And it permits Iran to retain its enrichment infrastructure, including advanced centrifuges and continued development of its enrichment technology. That is something that is now pretty much agreed to.

Fifth, and next to last, is it places no restrictions on Iran’s ballistic missile development. People have not talked much on the floor about this fact. They have talked about the bomb, but there has to be a delivery system before the bomb can be effective.

I can remember in 2007 that our unclassified intelligence report said that by 2015 Iran would have the bomb and a delivery system. Well, here it is 2015, and they weren’t that far off. So we know what the capability is out there, what they are planning on doing, and the U.S. intelligence assesses—this is the quote and this is very significant—“that Iran’s ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction and that Iran’s program on space launch vehicles improves Tehran’s ability to develop longer range missiles, including an

intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).”

What no one has mentioned on this thing is we made an arrangement in the previous administration knowing that Iran was going to have this capability. We have some 30 ground-based interceptors, but they are all on the West Coast, because we thought that was where it was going to have to come from. But guess what. All of a sudden Iran is going to be coming from the other direction. Well, the first thing this President did when he took office was to do away with our commitment.

We had an arrangement with the Czech Republic to have a ground-based interceptor there. I remember so well that one of the best friends we have over there made the statement: Are you sure if we enrage Russia by having this system that you are not going to pull the rug out from under us?

I said: Absolutely.

That was Vaclav Klaus, one of our best friends over there.

I said: Absolutely.

Of course, that is what the President did. Now we have that same problem with the delivery system.

The last thing I think is most important—and I may be the only Member of the Senate who believes this, but I look at this and I go back home. A lot of times you don’t find the wisdom here in Washington; you have to go back home. Certainly over this past month, being around my State of Oklahoma, people have asked the question: Well, wait a minute, if they have all this time once accused of something or if the IAEA should say “We believe they are making a bomb in a certain location”—once they do that, if they have the ability under this deal to delay that not just 24 hours, not just 24 days, but they can go on and delay it for two additional periods by applying to the joint commission for 15 days and then the Minister of Foreign Affairs for 15 days—that is 54 days. I suggest we stop and think about that. If we know somebody has something, but they have 54 days to either destroy it or hide it or put it someplace else, they are going to do it.

So my people in Oklahoma say there just isn’t any kind of verification. And we all remember what Ronald Reagan said: “Trust, but verify.”

These pages are too young to remember what happened with the Soviet Union and all those problems, but clearly that was the major concern at that time. So this is the situation that was pointed out way back during the joint presentation of the House and the Senate by Netanyahu. If he would just change his registration, I would love it if he would run for President of the United States. He is the kind of guy we need. He made the statement at that time that no deal is going to be better than the bad deal that is on the table. I believe that is true.

I had occasion to publish an op-ed last week in the Wall Street Journal urging States to hold fast to their sanctions on Iran. Even if they consider strengthening and expanding those sanctions, here is the thing people don’t understand. The reason the President gets by with not calling this a treaty that would have to be confirmed and verified by this body is that it is dealing with the States and not the Federal Government. So my hope is that many other States will be doing what we are doing in the State of Oklahoma and holding on to our sanctions and not releasing any of them. I think that could certainly be, if this thing becomes a reality, one of the few things we can do.

I will end with a quote from then President Bill Clinton in 1994. I remember this because I was there, and I heard him make this statement. After the deal with North Korea, this is what he said:

This is a good deal for the United States. North Korea will freeze and then dismantle its nuclear program. South Korea and our allies will be better protected. The entire world will be safer as we slow the spread of nuclear weapons. The United States and international inspectors will carefully monitor North Korea to make sure it keeps its commitments.

Two decades later, the Defense Intelligence Agency announced that it had “moderate confidence” that North Korea has a nuclear weapon small enough to be placed on a ballistic missile.

So that is what is going on. In today’s New York Times—I don’t know how anyone can take them seriously when we have the guy who is the real boss over there—the Ayatollah Khamenei, talking about Israel, said: I’m telling you first, you will not be around in 25 years. We will annihilate you in that period of time. Then he talked about the United States. He said: Iranians must not forget the United States is the Great Satan. Ayatollah Khamenei warned, criticizing those calling for better relations, wanting to show this Satan as an angel, but the Iranian nation has pushed this Satan out. We should not allow it to sneak back in through the window.

These are the guys we are negotiating with. With that, I would say this is not a treaty, it is not a deal, it is surrender.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last month, before the August recess, the Senate

took up legislation introduced by my friend Senator JONI ERNST that would have ended Federal funding for Planned Parenthood, transferring subsidies to other women's community health clinics. Unfortunately, the bill failed on its first vote, but the questions raised by the Planned Parenthood scandal and the challenges it presents to Congress and to the American people have only grown since then.

At issue are undercover videos released over the last few months that provide an unprecedented behind-the-scenes glimpse inside America's leading abortion provider. These undercover videos were captured by a pro-life organization called the Center for Medical Progress. They contain images and conversations unlike anything ever before submitted for public scrutiny. So far, CMP has released 16 hours of footage depicting what appears to be the routine mutilation of American children, born and unborn; the harvesting and sale of those children's body parts for profit; the means by which Planned Parenthood avoids public detection of and perhaps criminal prosecution for their actions; and, finally, in many ways the most terrifying of all, the nonchalant, blood-chilling amusement Planned Parenthood personnel seem to derive from all of the above.

To date, no one has rebutted the evidence contained in these videos. Planned Parenthood's friends and political clients gamely try to change the subject. They take umbrage and they shoot the messenger. They deflect and distract as best they can—the political equivalent of a checkmated lawyer banging his shoe angrily on the table. Even the guilty deserve a defense, after all. But they are guilty. We all know it. You only have to watch the videos for 5 minutes and you know it is true.

The subjects of these videos are sincere and candid—casually sharing the secrets of their grisly business with people they think are their co-conspirators. The evidence points to only one conclusion: Planned Parenthood really does these horrifying things. Planned Parenthood makes money at it and laughs about it over lunch. But aside from the primary evidence, do you know how else we know it is true? Because if it were false, we would know for sure that it was false. The mainstream media—Big Abortion's loudest shoe banger of them all—would be thundering Planned Parenthood's vindication from every headline, every homepage, every network satellite. If these videos were false—if a pro-life group somehow fabricated this narrative of Planned Parenthood's greed, barbarism, and cruelty—it would be a story.

Who are we kidding? It would be the story, a career-making scoop, with fame, Pulitzer Prizes, lucrative book deals, and speaking tours awaiting the

journalist who broke the story. Yet if you open a newspaper, click on the legacy media sites, and turn on the news—nothing. You see nothing. The major networks have gone dark on the videos over the last month, and major newspapers have scrubbed the scandal from their front pages.

Why the silence? Simple. They know it is true too. The media looked for the facts, they found them, and then they turned away. In the case of the Planned Parenthood undercover videos in the court of public opinion, as they taught me in law school: *Qui tacit consentire videtur*—the media's silence indicates the media's consent.

Everyone who has watched these individual videos knows they have the power to change minds and in only one direction. So the pro-abortion news media is doing everything they can to suppress the videos' exposure.

So tightly have the wagons been circled that the media can't even attack the Center for Medical Progress as much as they would surely like to because doing so would require context. That context would be exceedingly painful here.

Even describing these videos—even mentioning them to a wider audience—can only lead to curious Google searches, then tweets, then Facebook shares, YouTube views, and inevitably to public horror at what people would see and the organization responsible for that horror. This, Planned Parenthood's friends in the media cannot allow, and so they ignore the undercover videos, just like they tried to ignore the harrowing case of Dr. Kermit Gosnell in 2013, the perennial scandal of dangerous clinic conditions and the horror of partial-birth abortion in years past.

Every pro-choice activist, including those with press credentials, knows that the greatest threat to abortion-on-demand is the truth about what it entails. As Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn put it in his Nobel lecture: “[Violence] is necessarily interwoven with falsehood.”

The media hides the truth about Planned Parenthood and about Big Abortion—even at the expense of their own credibility, even to the endangerment of vulnerable women and the enrichment of monsters.

Like Tolkien's Gollum, they must protect the “precious.” I am not a reporter, nor am I an editor or a producer. I am certainly not a network news anchor, a job for which I lack the skills, the experience and, alas, the hairline necessary for that position. I am a lawyer by training and now a Senator. Therefore, I cannot make leading newspapers, news sites, and television networks tell this story, but it occurs to me I can try to tell it myself on the Senate floor. More than just tell that story, I can make the case to our colleagues and to our fellow Ameri-

cans. For the next several weeks, for as long as it takes, I will come to the floor of the Senate—the American people's great deliberative Chamber—and make that case. The public deserves to know the truth about Planned Parenthood, the inhumanity it practices, the laws it may be breaking, and the lies it tells. Taxpayers deserve to know what their money—more than a half billion dollars last year alone—is paying for and how their taxes might be more conscientiously spent.

Americans deserve to know what evil is abroad in their land and what good can be done to overcome it. In the struggle between Planned Parenthood and its victims, President Obama and his party have sided a rich and violent special interest group over the innocent women they exploit, the tiny children they mutilate, and the vulnerable communities they poison.

I harbor no illusions about softening such weaponized extremism with a few floor speeches, nor do I believe that the 45 Senators who voted in August to reaffirm Planned Parenthood's eligibility for hundreds of millions of dollars in Federal funding will change their minds—at least not yet.

The history of our Nation is the story of a good and loving people who stubbornly, if sometimes slowly, overcome narrow, prejudicial legacies. When presented with the truth, Americans have always come to see and defend the innate dignity of our once overlooked brothers and sisters and welcome them out of the shadows and into our hearts and our society.

Indeed, the gradual embrace of our youngest Americans is well underway. In fact, it is gaining momentum all the time. With every Instagrammed ultrasound image, every overjoyed Facebook post, and every advance in embryology and obstetrics, Americans move closer and closer to the truth about the unborn. At the same time, every new undercover video released by the Center for Medical Progress is bringing us all a little closer to the truth about Planned Parenthood.

In coming weeks, I hope these speeches might help my colleagues and anyone who might be listening to come a little closer to the truth about both. As I make the case against using taxpayer funds to facilitate, protect, and promote Planned Parenthood's deceptions and violence, I hope my colleagues on the other side of these questions will join me from time to time. A good debate is always more fruitful than a monologue. But as long as Planned Parenthood's friends remain mute, I will endeavor to improve upon the silence and, hopefully in time, improve upon our inadequate legal protections for the dignity of human life.

As I said, even the guilty deserve a defense, but so do the innocent. However vulnerable they may be—both children in the womb and mothers in

the waiting room—however forsaken, however afraid, the innocent are never defenseless. Their defense is the truth, and I am going to do what I can to tell it.

I thank the Presiding Officer and yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise this evening to discuss the recent nuclear deal with Iran. I join my colleagues in opposition to this deal, and I agree with many of the arguments that have been put forward. Like so many Nebraskans who have contacted me to express their opposition, I have a number of concerns regarding this deal.

One of the difficulties when it comes to explaining opposition to the deal is the sheer volume of the problems with it. There is no simple and succinct way to package all of the deal's weaknesses, which range from highly technical questions about access to suspicious sites to broad overreaching problems.

Overall, I believe that, while the administration claims this deal permanently prohibits Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, the plain language of this agreement simply does not support that claim. I am very worried that inspectors do not have the access they need to verify Iran's compliance. Moreover, there is no effective mechanism for punishing the low-level violations that Iran is sure to attempt. However, even if you put aside the technical questions and assume the agreement will function exactly as it is intended, the fact of the matter is that all meaningful restrictions on Iran's nuclear program expire in 15 years. At that point, Iran's program is legitimized, and it is free to build an industrial-scale enrichment program if it chooses. This means the 1-year breakout time the administration has placed so much emphasis on is only temporary.

In their analysis of the agreement, the nonproliferation experts at the Institute for Science and International Security concluded that after year 15 of the agreement, "Iran could have in place a nuclear infrastructure that could produce significant quantities of weapon-grade uranium rapidly and turn that material into nuclear weapons in a matter of months." Some may contend that even if it is not a permanent prohibition, as the administration claims, it is still better than the status quo. Even if we are right back where we started in 10 or 15 years, buying time isn't a bad thing, they insist. But, colleagues, we won't be right back where we started. We will be in a far worse position.

Iran's current program was built in violation of its Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty obligations and U.N. Security Council resolutions. The illegality of its program served as the basis for international sanctions, and it relegated Iran to a pariah status in the community of nations. Now, with this deal, Iran's program is legitimized. It is welcomed as a member in good standing with the NPT, and the sanctions regime is repealed, not temporarily waived. Thus, if the United States sought to limit Iran's program after year 15, we would be attempting to rebuild a sanctions regime from scratch and to target a program that, under this agreement, is deemed to be acceptable.

Supporters of this agreement, many of whom argue that the sanctions regime is already on the brink of collapse, need to ask themselves this: How likely is it that sanctions could ever be imposed if Iran rapidly expands its program after year 15 of this agreement? I think the answer is that it would be incredibly unlikely. Is permanently giving up our ability to sanction Iran in exchange for a temporary delay of its nuclear aspirations a fair trade? Of course not. Is buying 10 to 15 years' time worth agreeing to the perpetual instability of an unrestrained nuclear Iran after that point? No.

There are many other reasons to conclude that we will be in a worse position in 15 years despite the administration's claims to the contrary. Not only will Iran's nuclear program be able to proceed without limitations, but it will be far richer with this agreement. There is some debate about how much Iran will receive when the agreement comes into effect. But whether it is \$50 billion or \$100 billion or \$150 billion, there is no disagreement that Iran stands to profit massively from this deal. Moreover, as sanctions are repealed and trade resumes, Iran's economy will grow, bringing further profit to that regime. Although the administration argues that alternative restrictions can be used to hinder Iran's support for terrorist groups, it is difficult to believe that relieving sanctions pressure and infusing Iran with cash will do anything other than improve the positions of Iran's proxies and the terror groups that it funds.

The additional resources will also allow Iran to increase its military capabilities, which will further be enhanced by the negotiators' decision to end the U.N. conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology embargoes on Iran. I find this decision to lift the embargoes—particularly on the transfer of ballistic missile technology to Iran—highly concerning and a compelling example of just how this deal fails to advance our interests.

Rolling back Iran's ballistic missile program has been a key objective of the United States for some time be-

cause, as Director of National Intelligence Clapper put it in his statement assessing worldwide threats before the Armed Services Committee this year, "Tehran would choose ballistic missiles as its preferred method of delivering nuclear weapons."

Secretary Carter, in his confirmation hearing, built on this and unequivocally stated that Iran's ballistic missile development was "a threat not only to the United States, but friends and allies in the region."

Last year I joined a number of my colleagues in sending a letter to the President urging him to use the negotiations process to achieve further restrictions on Iran's ballistic missile program. The administration's response to our letter stated that Iran's ballistic missile program "will need to be addressed in the context of a comprehensive solution." This position was repeated by the U.S. negotiators. Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman also stated on multiple occasions that Iran's ballistic missile program "has to be addressed as part of a comprehensive agreement."

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Dempsey, weighed in at a July 7 hearing before our Senate Armed Services Committee, testifying that "under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Then, a week later, news reports surfaced that negotiators had agreed to an eleventh hour Iranian demand that the embargoes be lifted.

Indeed, when the deal was announced on July 14, the President revealed that after 5 years, the conventional weapons embargo will be removed, and after 8 years, restrictions related to ballistic missile technology would also expire. I will repeat that point. Instead of exchanging sanctions relief for further limitations on Iran's ballistic missile development, as many of us in this body had urged, U.S. negotiators agreed at the last minute to relax those restrictions. These are the weapons that our intelligence community tells us will be Iran's preferred way to deliver a nuclear weapon, and our most senior military officer testified that we should "under no circumstances" relieve that pressure. When the administration said Iran's ballistic missile programs would have to be addressed, few would have guessed that this is what they meant.

Now, Secretary Kerry has argued this concession won't have an impact because many other tools, such as the Missile Technology Control Regime and the Proliferation Security Initiative, are available to prevent Iran from acquiring ballistic missile technology. But the United Nations restrictions were imposed in order to bolster those measures which were on the books long before the U.N. measures were passed. Removing them will give our counter-

proliferation efforts one less tool to limit Iran's military development and, in particular, its ability to build an ICBM that is capable of hitting the United States.

The administration has also argued that keeping the embargo on conventional weapons in effect for 5 years and 8 years with respect to those ballistic missile restrictions is a victory. After all, they claim, Iran, Russia, and China wanted to have those restrictions removed immediately. Watering down last-minute demands of a minority of negotiators is not a victory for the United States. Any attempt to argue that we were lucky to avoid complete capitulation to the demands of Iran and Russia and China admits a negotiating atmosphere so dysfunctional that no positive agreement could have emerged.

I believe the repeal of the U.N. embargoes will foster Iran's conventional weapons and ballistic missile development. Thus, under this agreement, in 15 years we are likely to see an Iran that has emerged as a threshold nuclear state with an advanced enrichment program, has a more advanced conventional army, and commands a larger, better trained, and better equipped proxy force. It may even have an ICBM with which it can threaten to retaliate against any U.S. attack. All of this will be achieved without violating the agreement that is before us today, which reflects how far short it falls of advancing U.S. interests.

Worst of all, legitimizing Iran's nuclear program diminishes the chance that sanctions could ever be imposed on Iran in the future, and fostering its military development undermines the threat of force should Iran ever attempt to develop a nuclear weapon.

I believe this vote will be one of the most important I will make as a U.S. Senator, and it is worthy of a robust debate. I am disappointed that more of my colleagues—in particular those on the other side of the aisle—have not come to the floor to share their opinion, their position. I find their silence deafening.

As I have looked around this Chamber today, I have been wondering, where are the supporters of this agreement? Why are they not on the floor to defend the substance of this deal? Forget the politics. Forget the false choices, the straw men, and the bluster. We should be here to debate substance.

In conclusion, I cannot support an agreement that attempts to trade inadequate short-term limits for dangerous long-term concessions.

Nebraskans and all Americans and their families are depending on us to ensure that our Nation's security is protected. This deal should not be approved.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING LIEUTENANT GENERAL PATRICIA D. HOROHO

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, it is an honor to commend LTG Patricia D. Horoho, the 43rd U.S. Army Surgeon General and Commander, U.S. Army Medical Command, upon her retirement following 32 years of service to our Nation and the U.S. Army. She leaves behind a legacy of transformation that will benefit the health care of our soldiers and their families for years to come.

Lieutenant General Horoho was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the U.S. Army Nurse Corps in 1982 upon her graduation from the University of North Carolina. Over the course of her service, she commanded medical units to include the U.S. Army Medical Command, the Walter Reed Health Care System, the Western Regional Medical Command, and the Madigan Army Medical Center. She also deployed in support of the International Security Assistance Force Joint Command in Afghanistan in 2011.

During her tenure as the 43rd U.S. Army Surgeon General, Lieutenant General Horoho demonstrated her resolve to transform Army Medicine from a health care system to a system of health. Her strong leadership efforts resulted in the Army and the Department of Defense adopting many initiatives to improve the quality of care for military members, families, and retirees—validating the Army Medical Department's professionalism as a High Reliability Organization. She is a national leader and innovator in health care who provided vision and direction that positively transformed Army Medicine.

Lieutenant General Horoho is a true patriot who has dedicated her life to the security, health, and welfare of our Nation. Her loyalty and commitment to the soldiers and their families have never wavered. She is leaving the U.S. Army Medical Department in a high state of readiness, capable of accomplishing its important missions. We thank her for her outstanding service

to a grateful nation and wish her well in her future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING JOSEPH M. CASEY

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate Joseph M. Casey on his upcoming retirement as general manager of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, also known as SEPTA. Mr. Casey has served SEPTA in this position for the last 7 years and will officially retire on September 30, 2015.

For those who do not know, SEPTA is the largest transit system in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the sixth largest in the Nation. Services including bus, subway, commuter rail, light rail, and electric trolleybus are provided to over 3.9 million people in and around Philadelphia, PA, including parts of Delaware and New Jersey. A lifelong resident of the Philadelphia area, Mr. Casey's first memories of SEPTA were riding the trolley to visit his grandmother in the city and to attend games at Connie Mack Stadium.

Mr. Casey began his career at SEPTA in 1982. Before becoming general manager in 2008, he served for 6 years as chief financial officer and treasurer. In senior leadership positions at the Internal Audit and Finance departments, he received praise for his efforts to implement fiscal responsibility at the authority.

As general manager of SEPTA, Mr. Casey oversaw 9,000 employees and instituted several necessary programs for the authority. He shifted SEPTA's customer relations focus to reflect the "Four Cs"—Cleanliness, Convenience, Courtesy and Communication—and implemented initiatives to reduce energy consumption on vehicles and at facilities. As a result, SEPTA received the 2012 American Public Transportation Association, APTA, Outstanding Public Transportation System Award.

Throughout his tenure, Mr. Casey has focused on community engagement and policy reforms with the aim of helping riders and the overall transit infrastructure system. I applaud Mr. Casey for his work with SEPTA over the past 34 years and his service to the residents of southeast Pennsylvania. His leadership and determination should serve as an example for his successor.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM 50TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, today I wish to commend all foster grandparents on the program's 50th anniversary this year. The Foster Grandparents Program provides ways for volunteers age 55 and older to stay active by serving children and youth in their communities. These volunteers give

their time and talents as role models, mentors, and friends to children in need.

More than 25,000 foster grandparents volunteer through over 300 programs throughout the United States. Last year, foster grandparent volunteers provided 23 million hours of service to their local communities, serving more than 189,000 children facing academic, social, and financial challenges. These volunteers serve at thousands of locations, helping children build reading skills, providing one-on-one tutoring, mentoring troubled teenagers and young mothers, caring for premature infants or children with disabilities, and assisting children who have been abused or neglected.

I am particularly proud to honor the more than 500 seniors in Kansas who contribute their time and talents serving children in my State. Foster grandparent programs operate across Kansas out of Augusta, Hays, Kansas City, Manhattan, Paola, Topeka, and Wichita. Volunteers serve in an array of locations throughout the State, including schools, hospitals, juvenile correctional institutions, and early childhood education and childcare centers. These compassionate individuals have reached more than 5,000 Kansas students over the last 50 years. The following are just a few examples of their inspiring service:

Alice Reid has been part of the Foster Grandparent Program since 2004. At the age of 92, she has consistently given an average of 33 hours per week and 11,341 lifetime volunteer hours. She primarily works on reading with children younger than 5 years of age, but Grandma Alice is happy to help any student. She often spends her lunch hour in the cafeteria eating with the children. Grandma Alice is so valued that the school had a big celebration for her 90th birthday. There were more than 400 children involved in this birthday celebration for their friend. The students made birthday cards and sang to her. A kindergarten teacher remarked, "We love Grandma Alice and we appreciate all that she does for us. She has been a wonderful part of our school."

In WaKeeney, Grandma Deb Fabrizio serves in kindergarten classrooms at Trego Grade School and has formed trusting friendships with many of the children she serves. She shared a story about a child, "a sweet little guy who is quiet, very particular about his work and has a great smile. This little boy does not hug a lot, but when he does it, it is special—he's very sincere about it." The child told Grandma Deb that he wanted to share a secret with her. She followed him to his locker, where he took out a folder from his backpack with papers in it. The papers detailed what he wanted to be when he grew up. Grandma Deb was touched that he trusted her enough to keep his

secret, and she told him that his parents would be proud of him and encouraged him to share his dreams with them. Foster grandparents such as Grandma Deb are sometimes the only adults with whom children have consistent, loving, nonjudgmental relationships. Grandma Deb and other foster grandparents do their best to encourage students and inspire them to have self-confidence and reach for the stars.

Carol Sheffield, Udena McKee, Naomi Graves, and Margaret Hill work as foster grandparents in the Manhattan area. These women note the work they do for the kids is very fulfilling, and they plan to continue to serve in the classroom for years. By giving positive attention to kids, the volunteers and teachers have been able to see a real turnaround in students' lives. Carmen Flaz, principal of Oakdale Elementary School in Salina, said that foster grandparents have a large effect in the classroom.

Grandma Linda Downs is the only foster grandparent in Waterville, a town of around 700 people in northeast Kansas. Grandma Linda serves students in her local preschool as well the afterschool and summer elementary programs. She volunteers at least 30 hours each week for her community.

Grandma Melinda serves as a foster grandparent at Lucas-Luray Elementary School in Luray. When she was younger, she lost her right thumb in an accident. While most people do not notice her missing thumb, Grandma Melinda says, "Leave it to a kid! They look you over from head to toe. They spy my missing thumb right away. They watch me holding a crayon or glue stick. They are always watching my hand to see what I can do." When children at school ask her about her missing thumb, Grandma Melinda lets them look closer and touch her hand if they want. She uses this opportunity to teach the children a life lesson about each person being special in their own way and about accepting everyone.

Grandpa Hubert Brown serves in a Head Start classroom in Great Bend, where he gives special attention to three particular students. A set of two boys have formed a close bond with him. Another child, a little girl who is very shy and did not talk much with other students, always finds a place near Grandpa Hubert during circle time. Through her friendship with Grandpa Hubert, she has increased her involvement in class and developed friendships with her classmates.

The special way of life we live in Kansas and across this great country would not be possible without individuals committed to giving back to improve their own communities, and foster grandparents change the world for the better one soul at a time. Their acts of kindness and selflessness are in-

spiring to us all. I honor foster grandparents for their shining examples of service to others. This commitment to service enriches our own homes and strengthens our Nation.

Thank you, congratulations on your 50th anniversary, and all the best for many more years of helping others.●

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT CHARLES GLINIEWICZ

● Mr. KIRK. Mr. President, on September 1, 2015, Lieutenant Charles Joseph Gliniewicz of the Fox Lake Police Department made the ultimate sacrifice. Lieutenant Gliniewicz, who served his community as a police officer for over 30 years, was nearing retirement when he was shot and killed while in pursuit of suspects during his morning patrol.

Lieutenant Gliniewicz, known as "G.I. Joe," was a pillar of his community, committed to his job, his family, and the children he trained at the Fox Lake Police Explorer Post 300. As founder of Post 300 and leader since 1987, Lieutenant Gliniewicz trained young people ages 14 to 21 for a career in law enforcement. Hundreds of these "Explorers" entered into law enforcement and military careers following Lieutenant Gliniewicz's training and mentorship. Prior to his career in Fox Lake, Lieutenant Gliniewicz was a member of the U.S. Army and proudly served his country from 1981 to 2007, receiving numerous service awards during that time.

While Lieutenant Gliniewicz dedicated much of his time to his community, he was also a loving family man. He was married to his wife Mel for 26 years and the couple have four children.

I wish to express my deepest condolences to the family and friends of Lieutenant Charles Joseph Gliniewicz and the entire Fox Lake community. On behalf of the people of Illinois, I thank Lieutenant Gliniewicz for his dedication and service to his community and his country. I encourage all law enforcement personnel to honor his memory by continuing his mission to foster positive relationships between police officers and the people they serve and to inspire the next generation of law enforcement.●

CUSTER STATE PARK BUFFALO ROUNDUP 50TH ANNIVERSARY

● Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the Custer State Park Buffalo Roundup. The Buffalo Roundup will be celebrating its 50th anniversary on September 25, 2015. The exciting and historical event is accompanied by an arts festival, a buffalo wallow chili cook-off, concerts, and more.

Taking place in the beautiful Custer State Park, located in the Black Hills, the Buffalo Roundup is a spectacular

event. Each year, thousands of visitors watch as a herd of approximately 1,300 bison is driven into corrals by cowboys on horses, all-terrain vehicles, and pickup trucks. Following the roundup, the bison are sorted for sale and medical evaluations.

Millions of bison roamed the Great Plains hundreds of years ago, but in the 1800s the bison population dwindled to less than 1,000. Custer State Park purchased 36 bison in 1914 as part of an effort to conserve the bison population, and the herd was often gathered for culling and inspection. It was not until 1965 that the roundup became an annual event.

The Buffalo Roundup is integral to maintaining a healthy bison herd in Custer State Park. At its largest, the herd included 2,500 bison. Once the bison are in the corrals, they are vaccinated, branded, and sorted for sale. Several hundred bison are sold each year in order to prevent overgrazing and preserve the grasslands.

I offer my congratulations to the Custer State Park Buffalo Roundup on its 50th anniversary and wish them prosperity in the years to come.●

TRIBUTE TO MARTIN GUTIERREZ

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, today I honor Martin Gutierrez, division director for Catholic Charities Archdiocese of New Orleans and the recipient of the 2015 Excelencia Award as a Community Leader by the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana.

Martin grew up in the New Orleans area, graduating from Chalmette High School and going on to receive a degree in business administration and management from the University of New Orleans. While still in high school, Martin took a job at a local bank where he continued to work for the next 14 years.

Following his banking career, he became the executive director of the Hispanic Apostolate of New Orleans. While there he supported the work of 16 church parishes that offered a ministry targeted to the Hispanic community. In 2007, he became the director of Immigration/Refugee Services and Hispanic Outreach for Catholic Charities in New Orleans. Since then, he has served as the executive director for Neighborhood Community Services and as vice president for Community Services Ministries. He was named division director last year and in that role he manages a number of programs that include a staff of around 100 people and a budget of approximately \$7 million.

In addition to his work with Catholic Charities, Martin is also involved in a number of other community organizations. He serves on the board for the New Orleans Family Justice Center, UNITY for the Homeless, Puentes New Orleans, and ASI Federal Credit Union. He has also participated in training

with the Jefferson Parish Sheriff's Office Citizens Academy, New Orleans Police Department Citizens Academy, and the FBI Citizens Academy.

In 2006, he received the Galvez Cut from the New Orleans Hispanic Heritage Foundation in recognition of his work in the Hispanic community and in 2010, he was presented with the Role Model Award by the Young Leadership Council. I am pleased to join with the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce of Louisiana to recognize Martin Gutierrez as an outstanding community leader.●

RECOGNIZING THE LIVINGSTON PARISH CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, I wish to honor the Livingston Parish Chamber of Commerce for being awarded the 2015 Louisiana Chamber of Commerce of the Year Award.

The Livingston Parish Chamber of Commerce is made up of more than 500 members from across Livingston Parish, representing a wide range of businesses including small mom-and-pop shops to large corporations. While serving the interests of more than 20,000 employees of local businesses, the chamber of commerce has worked to make Livingston Parish one of the fastest growing parishes in the State. Their exemplary hands-on approach to support members of the community is evident through programs such as "Leads for Lunch" and "Breakfast on the Run," events designed to allow members to promote their businesses and encourage referrals for other chamber members.

One of the most distinctive aspects of the Livingston Parish Chamber of Commerce is its commitment to supporting and training local students and educators. Through scholarship opportunities, Student of the Month awards, and other educational programs, it is clear the chamber of commerce recognizes the importance of training the business leaders of tomorrow. Additionally, all members of the chamber can feel confident knowing they will have ample opportunities to learn from their peers, connect with members of the community, and network with local officials. By providing such a strongly interconnected business community, the Livingston Parish Chamber of Commerce has proved to be vital in the success of its local economy.

It is my honor to recognize the Livingston Parish Chamber of Commerce for their unwavering service to the local business community and for being an exemplary role model for the rest of the State and country.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and a withdrawal which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:19 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, without amendment:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1344. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

H.R. 1462. An act to combat the rise of prenatal opioid abuse and neonatal abstinence syndrome.

H.R. 1725. An act to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2820. An act to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 2nd Annual Fallen Firefighters Congressional Flag Presentation Ceremony.

H. Con. Res. 74. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for an event to commemorate the 20th Anniversary of the Million Man March.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 1344. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 1725. An act to amend and reauthorize the controlled substance monitoring program under section 3990 of the Public Health Service Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

H.R. 2820. An act to reauthorize the Stem Cell Therapeutic and Research Act of 2005,

and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2659. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Miscellaneous Corrections" ((RIN3150-AJ60) (NRC-2015-0105)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2660. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; IL; MN; Determinations of Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard for Chicago and Eagan" (FRL No. 9932-63-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2661. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan and Wisconsin; 2006 PM2.5 NAAQS PSD and Visibility Infrastructure SIP Requirements" (FRL No. 9932-65-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2662. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Montana; Revisions to the Administrative Rules of Montana; Correction" (FRL No. 9932-53-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2663. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard" (FRL No. 9932-81-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2664. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9932-95-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2665. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Nebraska; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9932-84-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2666. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Klamath Falls, Oregon Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory and SIP Strengthening Measures" (FRL No. 9932-40-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2667. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas; Cross-State Air Pollution Rule" (FRL No. 9932-85-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2668. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Idaho: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program; Revision" (FRL No. 9932-87-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2669. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NORTH CAROLINA: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions" (FRL No. 9932-93-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2670. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans (SIP); State of Nebraska; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS)." (FRL No. 9932-78-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2671. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prevention of Significant Deterioration and Title V Permitting for Greenhouse Gases: Removal of Certain Vacated Elements" (FRL No. 9932-11-OAR) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 19, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2672. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works),

transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Calcasieu Lock, inland navigation project; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2673. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Water Quality Standards Regulatory Revisions" (FRL No. 9921-21-OW) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2674. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana and Ohio Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2010 NO2 and SO2 NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932-15-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2675. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Movement of the Northern Virginia Area from Virginia's Nonattainment Area List to its Maintenance Area List" (FRL No. 9932-35-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2676. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; Alcoa BART" (FRL No. 9932-18-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2677. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Rhode Island Low Emission Vehicle Program" (FRL No. 9932-46-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2678. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Interstate Pollution Transport Requirements for the 2006 24-Hour Fine Particulate Matter Standard" (FRL No. 9932-55-Region 3) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2679. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Klamath Falls, Oregon Nonattainment Area; Fine Particulate Matter Emissions Inventory and SIP Strengthening Measures" (FRL No. 9932-40-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate

on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2680. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri, Controlling Emissions During Episodes of High Air Pollution Potential" (FRL No. 9932-39-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2681. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Promulgation of State Implementation Plan Revisions; Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2008 Lead, and 2010 NO₂ National Ambient Air Quality Standards; Colorado" (FRL No. 9932-52-Region 8) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2682. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval of North Carolina's Request to Relax the Federal Reid Vapor Pressure Gasoline Volatility Standard for Mecklenburg and Gaston Counties" ((RIN2060-AS64) (FRL No. 9931-94-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 14, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2683. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Distributive Share When Partner's Interest Changes" ((RIN1545-BD71) (TD 9728)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2684. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Time to File Certain Information Returns" ((RIN1545-BM50) (TD 9730)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2685. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Requesting Competent Authority Assistance Under Tax Treaties" (Rev. Proc. 2015-40) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2686. A communication from the Acting Chief of the Regulations and Disclosure Law Division, Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Liberalization of Certain Documentary Evidence Required as Proof of Exportation on Drawback Claims" (RIN1515-AE02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2687. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch,

Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Applicable Federal Rates—September 2015" (Rev. Rul. 2015-19) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2688. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Transfers of Property to Partnerships with Related Foreign Partners and Controlled Transaction Involving Partnerships" (Notice 2015-54) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2689. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update of Weighted Average Interest Rates, Yield Curves, and Segment Rates" (Notice 2015-55) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2690. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Section 4980I—Excise Tax on High Cost Employer-Sponsored Health Coverage" (Notice 2015-52) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2691. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Income Tax Treatment of 2014 Fuel Credits Allowable Under Section 6426(c) and Section 6426(d)" (Notice 2015-56) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 21, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2692. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updated Static Mortality Tables for Defined Benefit Pension Plans for 2016" (Notice 2015-53) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2693. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure: Procedures for Advance Pricing Agreements" (Rev. Proc. 2015-41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2694. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Basis in Interests in Tax-Exempt Trusts" ((RIN1545-BJ42) (TD 9729)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2695. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certifi-

cation of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1397); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2696. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1389); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2697. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1390); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2698. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1391); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2699. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1392); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2700. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1393); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2701. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1394); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2702. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1395); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2703. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1396); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2704. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1398); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2705. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-025); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2706. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report relative to the interdiction of aircraft engaged in illicit drug trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2707. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0080-2015-0081); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2708. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b, as amended, the report of the texts and background statements of international agreements, other than treaties (List 2015-0085-2015-0092); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2709. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report prepared by the Department of State on progress toward a negotiated solution of the Cyprus question covering the period April 1, 2015 through May 31, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2710. A communication from the Chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's Fiscal Year 2014 Annual Report on the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2711. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2013 inventories of commercial and inherently governmental activities; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2712. A communication from the Special Counsel, Office of the Special Counsel, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2713. A communication from the General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, General Services Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2714. A communication from the Acting Director of the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fees for Testing, Evaluation, and Approval of Mining Products" (RIN1219-AB82) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2715. A communication from the Chair of the Community Preventive Services Task Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Task Force's 2014-2015 Annual Report to Congress; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2716. A communication from the Deputy Director, Health Resources and Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Countermeasures Injury Compensation Program: Pandemic Influenza Countermeasures"

(RIN0906-AA79) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2717. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a petition to add workers who were employed at Westinghouse Electric Corporation in Bloomfield, New Jersey, to the Special Exposure Cohort; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2718. A communication from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits" (29 CFR Part 4022) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2719. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Mica Based Pearlescent Pigments; Confirmation of Effective Date" (Docket Nos. FDA-2014-C-1616 and FDA-2015-C-0245) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2720. A communication from the Program Manager, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Closed-Circuit Escape Respirators; Extension of Transition Period" (RIN0920-AA60) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2721. A communication from the Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Institutes of Health Undergraduate Scholarship Program Regarding Professions Needed by National Research Institutes" (RIN0925-AA10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 11, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2722. A communication from the Director of Regulations and Policy Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract" (Docket No. FDA-2014-C-1552) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2723. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Health, United States, 2014"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2724. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of Health and

Human Services, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 5, 2015; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2725. A communication from the Director, Administrative Office of the United States Courts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to applications for delayed-notice search warrants and extensions during fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2726. A communication from the Secretary of the Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Hart-Scott-Rodino Annual Report: Fiscal Year 2014"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2727. A communication from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Solutions for Safer Communities: FY 2013 Annual Report to Congress"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2728. A communication from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Contraband and Inmate Personal Property: Technical Amendment" (RIN1120-AB63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2729. A communication from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Report of the Proceedings of the Judicial Conference of the United States" for the March 2015 session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2730. A communication from the Human Resources Specialist (Executive Resources), Small Business Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Chief Counsel, Small Business Administration, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 24, 2015; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

EC-2731. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loan Guaranty: Adjustable Rate Mortgage Notification Requirements and Look-Back Period" (RIN2900-AP25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 13, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2732. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Additional Compensation on Account of Children Adopted Out of Veteran's Family" (RIN2900-AP18) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 12, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2733. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Vet Centers" (RIN2900-AP21) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 10, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2734. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to

law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0826)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2735. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2013-0834)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2736. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0652)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2737. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0487)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2738. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0348)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2739. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited Airplanes” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3139)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2740. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Kidde Graviner” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0751)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2741. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc Turbofan Engines” ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0095)) received during adjournment of

the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2742. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (100); Amdt. No. 3653” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2743. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (32); Amdt. No. 3654” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2744. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (45); Amdt. No. 3651” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2745. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (166); Amdt. No. 3652” ((RIN2120-AA65) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2746. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 26; Endangered and Threatened Wildlife Sea Turtle Conservation” ((RIN0648-BE68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2747. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8” ((RIN0648-BD81) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2748. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sus-

tainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 20” ((RIN0648-BE30) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2749. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure” ((RIN0648-XE037) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2750. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Revisions to Charter Halibut Fisheries Management in Alaska” ((RIN0648-BE41) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2751. A communication from the Chairman of the Office of Proceedings, Surface Transportation Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services—2015 Update” (Docket No. EP 542 (Sub. No. 23)—Board Decision 44285) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 6, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2752. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Alcohol and Tobacco Tax and Trade Bureau, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Establishment of the Squaw Valley-Miramonte Viticultural Area” ((RIN1513-AC12) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2753. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2754. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2755. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Administrator, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration,

Department of Transportation, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2756. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; United States Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area" (RIN0648-BD69) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2757. A communication from the Chief of the Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules For Unlicensed Operations in the Television Bands" ((FCC 15-99) (ET Doc. No. 14-165)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 25, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2758. A communication from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Action Concerning Review of Interpretations of Magnuson-Moss Warranty Act; Rule Governing Disclosure of Written Consumer Product Warranty Terms and Conditions; Rule Governing Pre-Sale Availability of Written Warranty Terms; Rule Governing Informal Dispute Settlement Procedures; and Guides for the Advertising of Warranties and Guarantees" (RIN3084-AB24; RIN3084-AB25; RIN3084-AB26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2759. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantial Product Hazard List: Extension Cords" (CPSC Docket No. CPSC-2015-0003) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2760. A communication from the General Attorney, Office of the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Substantial Product Hazard List: Seasonal and Decorative Lighting Products" (CPSC Docket No. CPSC-2014-0024) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 18, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2761. A communication from the Trial Attorney, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Securement of Unattended Equipment" (RIN2130-AC47) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2762. A communication from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Mission Support Directorate, National Aeronautics and

Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Removal of Obsolete Regulations" (RIN2700-AE20) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2763. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Habitat Conservation, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Resource Agency Hearings and Alternatives Development Procedures in Hydropower Licenses" (RIN0596-AC42; RIN1090-AA91; RIN0648-AU01) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 20, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 145. A bill to require the Director of the National Park Service to refund to States all State funds that were used to reopen and temporarily operate a unit of the National Park System during the October 2013 shutdown (Rept. No. 114-124).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 403. A bill to revise the authorized route of the North Country National Scenic Trail in northeastern Minnesota and to extend the trail into Vermont to connect with the Appalachian National Scenic Trail, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-125).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment and an amendment to the title:

S. 521. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of President Station in Baltimore, Maryland, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-126).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 583. A bill to establish certain wilderness areas in central Idaho and to authorize various land conveyances involving National Forest System land and Bureau of Land Management land in central Idaho, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-127).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 593. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to submit to Congress a report on the efforts of the Bureau of Reclamation to manage its infrastructure assets (Rept. No. 114-128).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 610. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of P.S. 103 in West Baltimore, Maryland and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-129).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 720. A bill to promote energy savings in residential buildings and industry, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-130).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 873. A bill to designate the wilderness within the Lake Clark National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska as the Jay S. Hammond Wilderness Area (Rept. No. 114-131).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1103. A bill to reinstate and extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving Clark Canyon Dam (Rept. No. 114-132).

S. 1104. A bill to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project involving the Gibson Dam (Rept. No. 114-133).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with amendments:

S. 1240. A bill to designate the Cerro del Yuta and Rio San Antonio Wilderness Areas in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-134).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute and an amendment to the title:

S. 1305. A bill to amend the Colorado River Storage Project Act to authorize the use of the active capacity of the Fontenelle Reservoir (Rept. No. 114-135).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, with an amendment:

S. 1483. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to study the suitability and feasibility of designating the James K. Polk Home in Columbia, Tennessee, as a unit of the National Park System, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-136).

By Ms. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 2011. An original bill to provide for reforms of the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-137).

S. 2012. An original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-138).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2010. A bill to provide for phased-in payment of Social Security Disability Insurance payments during the waiting period for individuals with a terminal illness; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2011. An original bill to provide for reforms of the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf of the United States, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; placed on the calendar.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2012. An original bill to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes; from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; placed on the calendar.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2013. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases

at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself and Ms. COLLINS):

S. 2014. A bill to demonstrate a commitment to our Nation's scientists by increasing opportunities for the development of our next generation of researchers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. ALEXANDER (for himself, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. ISAKSON, Ms. AYOTTE, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ENZI, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. HATCH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KIRK, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. DAINES, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. LEE, Mr. PAUL, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 2015. A bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. KAINE:

S. 2016. A bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to promote the responsible transfer of firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2017. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to recognize Alexander Creek, Alaska, as a Native village, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2018. A bill to convey, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to certain non-Federal land in Glennallen, Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. GRASSLEY):

S. 2019. A bill to prohibit brand name drug companies from compensating generic drug companies to delay the entry of a generic drug into the market; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CANTWELL (for herself, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. KAINE, and Mrs. GILLIBRAND):

S. 2020. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY):

S. Res. 249. A resolution honoring the Red Land Little League Team of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania for the performance of the team in the 2015 Little League World Series; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL,

Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN):

S. Res. 250. A resolution relative to the death of Richard Schultz Schweiker, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 469

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 469, a bill to improve the reproductive assistance provided by the Department of Defense and the Department of Veterans Affairs to severely wounded, ill, or injured members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and their spouses or partners, and for other purposes.

S. 498

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 498, a bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Illinois

(Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 705

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 705, a bill to amend section 213 of title 23, United States Code, relating to the Transportation Alternatives Program.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 857

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 857, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program of an initial comprehensive care plan for Medicare beneficiaries newly diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease and related dementias, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 954

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 954, a bill to establish procedures regarding the approval of opioid drugs by the Food and Drug Administration.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. WICKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. RISCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS), the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. JOHNSON), the

Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1121

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1121, a bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1302

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1302, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to provide leave because of the death of a son or daughter.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to amend title

XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1431

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1431, a bill to provide for increased Federal oversight of prescription opioid treatment and assistance to States in reducing opioid abuse, diversion, and deaths.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the names of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1466

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1466, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to modify payment under the Medicare program for outpatient department procedures that utilize drugs as supplies, and for other purposes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to curtail the use of changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund to inflate spending.

S. 1503

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1503, a bill to provide for enhanced Federal efforts concerning the prevention, education, treatment, and research activities related to Lyme disease and other tick-borne diseases, including the establishment of a Tick-Borne Diseases Advisory Committee.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1603

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1603, a bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1680

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1680, a bill to improve the condition and performance of the national multimodal freight network, and for other purposes.

S. 1709

At the request of Ms. WARREN, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1709, a bill to reduce risks to the financial system by limiting banks' ability to engage in certain risky activities and limiting conflicts of interest, to reinstate certain Glass-Steagall Act protections that were repealed by the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1714

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1714, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to transfer certain funds to the Multiemployer Health Benefit Plan and the 1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension Plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1755

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1755, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for a 5-year extension of the tax credit for residential energy efficient property.

S. 1775

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1775, a bill to direct the Secretary of Homeland Security to accept additional documentation when considering the application for veterans status of an individual who performed service as a coastwise merchant seaman during World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1814

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1814, a bill to withhold certain Federal funding from sanctuary cities.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1883

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1883, a bill to maximize discovery, and accelerate development and availability, of promising childhood cancer treatments, and for other purposes.

S. 1926

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 1926, a bill to ensure access to screening mammography services.

S. 1937

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1937, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve nutrition in tribal areas, and for other purposes.

S. 1965

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the names of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 1965, a bill to place restrictions on the use of solitary confinement for juveniles in Federal custody.

S. 1977

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1977, a bill to provide family members and close associates of an individual who they fear is a danger to himself, herself, or others new tools to prevent gun violence.

S. 1992

At the request of Mr. ROUNDS, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1992, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to provide that a member of the Armed Forces and the spouse of that member shall have the same rights regarding the receipt of firearms at the location of any duty station of the member.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 217, a resolution designating October 8, 2015, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day".

S. RES. 242

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the names of the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Missouri (Mrs. MCCASKILL), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 242, a resolution celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself and Mrs. BOXER):

S. 2013. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to facilitate additional housing and services for Southern California's veterans. It would allow the Department of Veterans Affairs to leverage the resources of local governments and non-profits to build supportive housing for veterans at the West Los Angeles VA Medical Center Campus. My colleague Senator BARBARA BOXER is a cosponsor of this bill. Congressman TED LIEU is introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives.

The Department of Veterans Affairs, Mayor of Los Angeles and Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors all support this legislation.

Los Angeles has the largest concentration of homeless veterans in the United States, currently estimated to be 4,300. These are brave men and women who served our nation with honor, and I believe it is our duty to ensure they have access to housing and the clinical services of the Greater Los Angeles VA Health System.

This legislation would provide two authorities to the department. First, it

would allow the West Los Angeles VA to use enhanced-use leases to engage in public-private partnerships to provide supportive housing for veterans. Enhanced-use leases allow the department to leverage private or local funding and partners to construct new housing on the campus. For example, California passed a bond measure in 2014 that provides \$600 million in funding for the construction of supportive veteran housing. I want to note that this enhanced-use leasing authority is the same authority that the department has for every other VA campus in the nation.

Second, my bill would allow the West Los Angeles campus to enter into out-leases to provide critical services to veterans housed on the campus, ranging from education to recreation. Services must be provided to create a healthy and sustainable community for veterans. Veterans housed on the campus will need access to mental health care options, job training, and physical recreation. These services can be provided by community partners leasing property on the campus, such as the University of California—Los Angeles.

I would like to make you aware of the long history of the West Los Angeles VA campus. This campus is approximately 400 acres and is located at the intersection of Wilshire Boulevard and Interstate 405. The land was deeded to the Federal government by former Senator John P. Jones, for use exclusively as a "soldier's home." The beautiful campus has numerous historic buildings, including a church.

In 2007, I included language in an appropriations bill to prohibit the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to lease or sale any property on the West Los Angeles Campus, due to reports of mismanagement and inappropriate leasing of VA property to commercial entities. In several cases, these commercial entities had nothing to do with serving veterans.

After the ban was signed into law, questionable practices continued through land-sharing agreements. This led to the American Civil Liberties Union, ACLU, of Southern California filing a lawsuit against the department in 2011 over its mismanagement of the campus.

In a large part due to our new Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Robert A. McDonald, the department reached a settlement with the ACLU earlier this year to return the campus to its original purpose to serve veterans. The ACLU and the department are working to create a new Master Plan for the campus that includes community input, which I expect will include a focus on ending veteran homelessness in Los Angeles. My legislation will provide the department with the tools it needs to get veterans off the streets and ensure the West Los Angeles campus truly serves the veterans of Los Angeles.

This legislation contains important oversight provisions to ensure the management mistakes of the past are not repeated.

First, it maintains a restriction put in place in 2007 that prohibits any part of the West Los Angeles campus from being sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of.

Second, it requires the VA to report to Congress 45 days before entering into any lease, and to provide an annual evaluation of all land-use and leases on the campus.

Third, it requires regular audits by the Office of the Inspector General, OIG, and restricts the VA from entering into any new leases if the OIG finds any violation of Federal law or policy, or gross mismanagement of the campus. The VA would have to certify to Congress that it addressed any issues found by the OIG before entering into new leases on the campus.

Finally, the legislation requires all land-use, including leases, to be consistent with the new Master Plan that is agreed upon for the campus. It also requires all leases to principally benefit veterans.

I believe these oversight provisions will ensure that the historic mismanagement of the West Los Angeles campus will not recur.

Let me conclude by saying that Congress must meet its responsibility to care for the veterans who have fought for our Nation's freedom and security. It would be a shame to leave private resources untapped in a city where 4,300 veterans are currently homeless. I hope all of my colleagues will support enacting this legislation as quickly as possible.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2017. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to recognize Alexander Creek, Alaska, as a Native village, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation, already pending in the House of Representatives, where it was first introduced in 2009, 2011, and 2013 by Alaska Congressman DON YOUNG to finally settle a long-standing injustice to the Native residents of Alexander Creek, a Native village built along the creek that runs into the Susitna River near its entrance to Cook Inlet, north of Anchorage and southwest of Wasilla, AK.

The story of Alexander Creek's Alaska Natives is a sad story, in that it is a story of Natives whose village happened to be located at the site of one of the State's prime salmon fishing locations, a site that may have prompted efforts by some to deliberately prevent the village from rightfully gaining the lands it was entitled to receive under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, ANCSA, passed by this Congress in 1971.

It is especially sad since the villagers succeeded in the Federal courts in winning confirmation of their status as a village under ANCSA nearly four decades ago but because of decades of mistakes and misunderstandings, still have received only about 10 percent of the land village residents are entitled to receive.

The legislation I am introducing today would give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to enter into negotiations to settle aboriginal land claims with Alexander Creek, after conferring village instead of group status on the community. It gives the Secretary wide latitude to find a just, environmentally acceptable, and economically reasonable means to bring Alexander Creek to "approximate parity" to the other more than 210 villages that were established by the 1971 law that settled all aboriginal lands claims in Alaska.

Alexander Creek, whose Native name is Tuqentnu, traditionally was a healthy Native village with abundant resources, whose residents lived off fish traps located near the mouth of the Susitna River year round. While its population suffered as a result of whooping cough, measles, and influenza epidemics in the early 1900s caused by the influx of the non-Native population into upper Cook Inlet—the village being literally decimated by the 1918 epidemic—by 1939 the village had been reoccupied by Native families. When the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act passed in December 1971, there were 37 residents of the village, 12 more than the 25 needed to be entitled to form a village corporation under the act and to be entitled to receive 69,120 acres around the core townships of the village.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs in 1971 made that determination. But the village had the misfortune of being located in a prime salmon fishing area that was sought by the State of Alaska at the time of statehood in 1959 and that was later conveyed by the State to the then new Matanuska-Susitna Borough at the time of its creation in the early 1960s. Thus there was opposition to Alexander Creek being allowed to claim its lands. The State, in fact, protested its eligibility for land under ANCSA. A hearing was held before an administrative law judge on July 11, 1974, but oddly the hearing was not widely noticed and a number of village residents were specifically not told of the hearing, so they were not in attendance. When the appeals board released its decision on November 1, 1974, the board ruled that the village only contained 22 residents—3 short of the required number for creation—simply because 5 other families and their children had not appeared at or testified at the hearing.

The board's decision was appealed to U.S. district court that reversed the

appeals board's decision on November 14, 1975, ordering the reinstatement of Alexander Creek's ANCSA eligibility. While that decision was appealed by the State of Alaska, the lower court decision was upheld by the DC Circuit Court of Appeals on August 29, 1976, which ordered that the case be remanded back to the Secretary of the Interior for further proceedings. But since all of the land around Alexander Creek had already been conveyed to the State and to the Mat-Su Borough, the village was required to join other Cook Inlet region villages in selecting "deficiency lands" near Lake Clark to the southwest of the region. But the creation of the Lake Clark National Monument in 1978, prior to passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act in 1980, further complicated the land selection issue for the village.

Alexander Creek villagers, who could not afford independent legal counsel following the 1976 district court and court of appeals rulings, did not immediately pursue their claims to full village status and apparently did not understand the complexities of the Lake Clark land conveyance decisions. Somehow, they instead were convinced to sign an agreement with Cook Inlet Region, Inc., the regional corporation for the area, and the Interior Department in December 1979, where the village dropped its claim to be a village in exchange for receiving "group" status under the ANCSA, and also in return for being guaranteed 7,680 acres of land, some of which was to come from the State of Alaska and or the borough. While the State did provide the village with 1,686 acres, no borough or Federal land was conveyed to complete the 7,680-acre "group" agreement reached in 1979 until just recently.

It wasn't until the next generation of Native leaders arrived in the village that they realized that Alexander Creek never received the lands it should have received.

Over the past decade residents of the village have been seeking to have the original court of appeals decision affirmed and implemented. Over the years they have been gaining support for their efforts. First, BIA Alaska Region Field Representative Charles F. Bunch concluded after "a thorough assessment" that the BIA's original determination was correct and that Alexander Creek "met the requirement" for village eligibility and that the land conveyances should have been implemented. Recently the Alexander Creek village leaders have received support from the Alaska Federation of Natives, Cook Inlet Region, Inc., CIRI, the State of Alaska and the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, all agreeing that the village should receive its full lands promised under ANCSA—plus from a host of other groups.

So this legislation will reinstate Alexander Creek's eligibility, overriding the 1979 "group" agreement, reached under section 1432(d) of ANCSA, and giving the village the right to negotiate a fair settlement with the Interior Department. Under the act the Secretary is free, at his sole discretion, to propose what assets are to be provided Alexander Creek to capitalize the corporation, not setting any predetermined amount of land, cash, surplus Federal property or other assistance. The bill does hold the regional corporation for the area, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. harmless from any impacts of the village corporation's creation.

The Alexander Creek case represents a sad chapter in the story of the settlement of Native aboriginal land claims in Alaska. It is a story of Native land owners being actively discouraged from selecting their traditional lands, of being deliberately misinformed about land selection processes so they would not qualify for their lands, of being pressured to accept inferior compromises so they would gain less land, and of then being ignored for far too long when it came time to consummate the inferior deal they were encouraged to accept. It clearly is time this Congress rewrites that chapter and allows it to have a happier ending.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2018. A bill to convey, without consideration, the reversionary interests of the United States in and to certain non-Federal land in Glennallen, Alaska; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today I introduce legislation to aid an Alaska higher educational institution obtain title to property it no longer needs, and that the Federal Government clearly no longer wants. I rise to introduce legislation to clear the title to a 210-acre parcel in Glennallen, AK, so that the land can be put to more productive uses in the future.

Back in 1926 the Central Alaska Mission began operations in Glennallen. In 1954 it received a Federal land grant from Congress, modified in 1959, and received 210 acres in "downtown" Glennallen—the current site of the hospital and radio station and former site of the Alaska Bible College. In 1961 it actually opened the Bible College on 80 acres of the tract, the site apparently having about 64 separate buildings erected on it. The 1959 land grant, like many in first the Territory of Alaska and later the State of Alaska, had a clause that should the property no longer be used for religious/public purposes that it would revert to the federal government. The Bible College, because of a lack of students in Glennallen, moved into the Matanuska-Susitna Borough, to Palmer, AK, last decade. Now it wishes to be

able to sell the property to be rid of the maintenance costs on the facilities.

The problem is that there apparently are no non-profits or few businesses in Glennallen that can afford to pay the officially appraised value for the properties. The parent of the Bible College 3 years ago asked the Federal Bureau of Land Management, BLM, administratively to start a process where it would decide the value of the properties and what it would have to pay the government to buy out the value of the "reversionary clause" so it could obtain clear title to sell the properties for whatever amount it could get. That appraisal was conducted mutually and came back late last year that the 210-acres, minus a sewage lagoon on the property that has no sales value, is worth \$210,000. The college says the college can't afford that amount to buy out the value of the reversionary clause—because regardless of the appraisal, there is no entity in Glennallen that can afford to pay anywhere near that amount for the properties given the level of economic activity at present in the upper Copper River Valley in Alaska.

The college is arguing, correctly, that the Federal Government is wrong in setting the value of the reversionary clause as the full appraised value of the property for tax purposes. If willing sellers can't be found who can afford to pay the "appraised" value of the property, then obviously the appraisal process is faulty. Secondly, the college is arguing that it has fully met the goal of Congress in 1959 that the land be used for the public purpose of operating an educational institution. For more than 40 years the property was used by Alaska Bible College, the college only moving into a more urban part of Alaska when student levels proved insufficient to support the school. Clearly it makes no sense for the reversionary clause to remain in effect in perpetuity when land use patterns have changed. Third, the Federal Government does not need the land for any federal purpose. The land, not located in an urban setting in the small town of Glennallen, population 491, is not suited for a park. The land is not needed for any Federal facility given its location in sparsely populated east central Alaska. Being inside the Glennallen city limits, the land can not be allowed to revert to a natural vegetative state under the town's ordinances. It simply makes good sense for the land to be sold for economic purposes so it can generate more revenues for the town's tax rolls. Given the real estate market in Glennallen, the Federal Government will lose far more money than it will make if it has to tear down the unwanted buildings in order to sell the property, or maintain them until another purpose for the structures can be found, at the current appraised tax values of the properties.

In each case, reversion of the lands to the Federal Government would result in Federal ownership of tracts unneeded for Federal purposes, but lands that would produce greater conveyance and management costs to the Federal treasury than are likely to be recovered through fair market sales. There is just no public policy purpose in the 21st century not to permit these very limited Federal reversion extinguishments, especially since the land did meet the purpose of the reversionary clause for more than four decades.

Passage of this act would cost the Federal Government nothing, but would aid the citizens of Glennallen by allowing the lands to be put to a better use, hopefully adding to the city's economy and perhaps increasing its future tax revenues. I hope this bill will be able to advance and become law within the 114th Congress.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 249—HONORING THE RED LAND LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM OF LEWISBERRY, PENNSYLVANIA FOR THE PERFORMANCE OF THE TEAM IN THE 2015 LITTLE LEAGUE WORLD SERIES

Mr. CASEY (for himself and Mr. TOOMEY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 249

Whereas on Saturday, August 29, 2015, the Red Land Little League team won the United States championship at the Little League Baseball World Series, defeating a versatile and dynamic team from Pearland, Texas with a walk-off hit in the bottom of the sixth inning to win 3-2;

Whereas on Sunday, August 30, 2015, the Red Land Little League team competed against the Kitasuna Little League team from Tokyo, Japan in the 69th Annual Little League World Series championship and set the record for the most runs scored in the first inning with 10 runs;

Whereas the Red Land Little League is the first York County team to win a national Little League championship and the first team from Pennsylvania to win the national Little League championship since 1990;

Whereas the Red Land Little League team is comprised of: Camden Walter, Braden Kolmansberger, Dylan Rodenhaver, Adam Cramer, Jaden Henline, Chayton Krauss, Kaden Peifer, Cole Wagner, Zack Sooy, Jake Cubbler, Jarrett Wisman, Bailey Wirt, and Ethan Phillips;

Whereas the Red Land Little League team is managed by Tom Peifer and coached by J.K. Kolmansberger and Bret Wagner, among others; and

Whereas the Red Land Little League team has brought tremendous excitement, pride, and honor to the city of Lewisberry, the county of York, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) congratulates and honors the Red Land Little League team and its loyal fans, affectionately known as the "Red Sea", on the performance of the team at the 69th Little League World Series championship;

(2) recognizes and commends the hard work, dedication, determination, and commitment to excellence of the members, parents, families, coaches, and managers of the team; and

(3) recognizes and commends the people of Lewistown, Pennsylvania and the surrounding area for their outstanding loyalty, support, and countless hours of volunteerism for the Red Land Little League team throughout the season.

SENATE RESOLUTION 250—RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF RICHARD SCHULTZ SCHWEIKER, FORMER UNITED STATES SENATOR FOR THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MERKLEY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. WYDEN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 250

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2648. Mrs. FISCHER (for Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1603, to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2648. Mrs. FISCHER (for Mr. JOHNSON) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1603, to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Customs and Border Protection Officers at United States ports of entry carry out critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection Officers in a timely fashion, including meeting the congressionally funded staffing target of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015.

(3) An estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year.

(4) Recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures must be enhanced to ensure that qualified individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, op-

portunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 3. EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERABLE QUALIFICATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall identify Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **HIRING.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider hiring qualified candidates with the Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under subsection (a) who are eligible for veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ENHANCEMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS TO RECRUIT SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, and acting through existing programs, authorities, and agreements, where applicable, shall enhance the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The enhanced recruiting efforts under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include Customs and Border Protection Officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(2) place U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials or other relevant Department of Homeland Security officials at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(3) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(4) include outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers of available hiring opportunities to become Customs and Border Protection Officers;

(5) require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense to work cooperatively to identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring U.S. Customs and Border Patrol officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(6) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(7) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 5. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each of the 3 successive years, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a description and assessment of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to hire separating service members as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a detailed description of the proposed efforts under section 4, including—

(A) elements of the enhanced recruiting efforts;

(B) goals associated with those elements; and

(C) a description of how the elements and goals will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(2) a detailed description of the efforts that have been undertaken under section 4;

(3) the number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies;

(4) the Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under section 3(a) and a rationale for such identifications;

(5) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members; and

(6) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members under veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 6. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(a) to supersede, alter, or amend existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(b) to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this Act.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Andrew MacDonald, a State Department fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KAINE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for Michael Pascual, a fellow in my office, to be granted floor privileges during today's session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL NEEDS TRUST FAIRNESS ACT OF 2015

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 178, S. 349.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 349) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 349) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 349

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Special Needs Trust Fairness Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FAIRNESS IN MEDICAID SUPPLEMENTAL NEEDS TRUSTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 1917(d)(4)(A) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396p(d)(4)(A)) is amended by inserting "the individual," after "for the benefit of such individual by".

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to trusts established on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

BORDER JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT OF 2015

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 196, S. 1603.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1603) to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Customs and Border Protection Officers at United States ports of entry carry out critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection Officers in a timely fashion, including meeting the congressionally funded staffing target of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015.

(3) An estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year.

(4) Recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures should be undertaken to ensure that

qualified individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 3. EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERABLE QUALIFICATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall jointly identify Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **HIRING.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider hiring qualified candidates with the Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under subsection (a) who are eligible for veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ESTABLISHING A PROGRAM FOR RECRUITING SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall establish a program to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The program established under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include Customs and Border Protection Officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(2) place U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials or other relevant Department of Homeland Security officials at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(3) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(4) conduct outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers of available hiring opportunities to become Customs and Border Protection Officers;

(5) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring U.S. Customs and Border Patrol officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(6) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work cooperatively to ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(7) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 5. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each of the 3 successive years, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly

submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a description and assessment of the program established under section 4.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a detailed description of the program established under section 4, including—

(A) programmatic elements;

(B) goals associated with those elements; and

(C) a description of how the elements and goals will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(2) a detailed description of the program elements that have been implemented under section 4;

(3) a detailed summary of the actions taken under section 4 to implement such program elements;

(4) the number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies;

(5) the Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under section 3(a) and a rationale for such identifications;

(6) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members;

(7) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members under veterans recruitment appointment authorized under the section 4214 of title 38, United States Code; and

(8) the results of any evaluations or considerations of additional elements included or not included in the program established under section 4.

SEC. 6. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(a) as superseding, altering, or amending existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(b) as authorizing the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this Act.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported substitute amendment be withdrawn; the Johnson substitute amendment be agreed to; the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed; and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee-reported substitute amendment was withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 2648) in the nature of a substitute was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: In the nature of a substitute)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) Customs and Border Protection Officers at United States ports of entry carry out critical law enforcement duties associated with screening foreign visitors, returning United States citizens, and imported cargo entering the United States.

(2) It is in the national interest for United States ports of entry to be adequately staffed with Customs and Border Protection Officers in a timely fashion, including meet-

ing the congressionally funded staffing target of 23,775 officers for fiscal year 2015.

(3) An estimated 250,000 to 300,000 members of the Armed Forces separate from military service every year.

(4) Recruiting efforts and expedited hiring procedures must be enhanced to ensure that qualified individuals separating from military service are aware of, and partake in, opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 3. EXPEDITED HIRING OF APPROPRIATE SEPARATING SERVICE MEMBERS.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF TRANSFERABLE QUALIFICATIONS.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, shall identify Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **HIRING.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall consider hiring qualified candidates with the Military Occupational Specialty Codes, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under subsection (a) who are eligible for veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 4. ENHANCEMENTS TO EXISTING PROGRAMS TO RECRUIT SERVICE MEMBERS SEPARATING FROM MILITARY SERVICE FOR CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION OFFICER VACANCIES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Homeland Security, in conjunction with the Secretary of Defense, and acting through existing programs, authorities, and agreements, where applicable, shall enhance the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **ELEMENTS.**—The enhanced recruiting efforts under subsection (a) shall—

(1) include Customs and Border Protection Officer opportunities in relevant job assistance efforts under the Transition Assistance Program;

(2) place U.S. Customs and Border Protection officials or other relevant Department of Homeland Security officials at recruiting events and jobs fairs involving members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service;

(3) provide opportunities for local U.S. Customs and Border Protection field offices to partner with military bases in the region;

(4) include outreach efforts to educate members of the Armed Forces with Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies that are transferable to the requirements, qualifications, and duties assigned to Customs and Border Protection Officers of available hiring opportunities to become Customs and Border Protection Officers;

(5) require the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense to work cooperatively to identify shared activities and opportunities for reciprocity related to steps in hiring U.S. Customs and Border Patrol officers with the goal of minimizing the time required to hire qualified applicants;

(6) require the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Homeland Security to work

cooperatively to ensure the streamlined interagency transfer of relevant background investigations and security clearances; and

(7) include such other elements as may be necessary to ensure that members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service are aware of opportunities to fill vacant Customs and Border Protection Officer positions.

SEC. 5. REPORT TO CONGRESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and not later than December 31 of each of the 3 successive years, the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly submit a report to the appropriate congressional committees that includes a description and assessment of the efforts of the Department of Homeland Security to hire separating service members as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

(b) **CONTENT.**—The report required under subsection (a) shall include—

(1) a detailed description of the proposed efforts under section 4, including—

(A) elements of the enhanced recruiting efforts;

(B) goals associated with those elements; and

(C) a description of how the elements and goals will assist in meeting statutorily mandated staffing levels and agency hiring benchmarks;

(2) a detailed description of the efforts that have been undertaken under section 4;

(3) the number of separating service members made aware of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies;

(4) the Military Occupational Specialty Codes and Officer Branches, Air Force Specialty Codes, Naval Enlisted Classifications and Officer Designators, and Coast Guard Competencies identified as transferable under section 3(a) and a rationale for such identifications;

(5) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members; and

(6) the number of Customs and Border Protection Officer vacancies filled with separating service members under veterans recruitment appointment authorized under section 4214 of title 38, United States Code.

SEC. 6. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act may be construed—

(a) to supersede, alter, or amend existing Federal veterans' hiring preferences or Federal hiring authorities; or

(b) to authorize the appropriation of additional amounts to carry out this Act.

The bill (S. 1603), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

RELATIVE TO THE DEATH OF RICHARD SCHULTZ SCHWEIKER

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 250.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 250) relative to the death of Richard Schultz Schweiker, former United States Senator for the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FISCHER. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 250) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2015

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, September 10; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time equally divided until 4:30 p.m.; further, that the debate be structured with alternating 1-hour blocks controlled by the two leaders or their designees until 4 p.m., and that the majority control the first hour, starting at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mrs. FISCHER. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the provisions of S. Res. 250 as a further mark of respect to the late Senator Richard Schweiker of Pennsylvania.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:37 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 10, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION

CHARLES R. BREYER, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

RICHARD FRANKLIN BOULWARE, II, OF NEVADA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES SENTENCING COMMISSION FOR A TERM EXPIRING OCTOBER 31, 2019, VICE KETANJI BROWN JACKSON, TERM EXPIRED.

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUALS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be major

KATHLEEN E. AKERS
BRETT W. SMITH
SAIPRASAD M. ZEMSE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

MICHELLE T. AARON
SUSAN B. BOWES
NORMAN C. FOX
PHILIP E. GOFF
MELISSA R. HOWARD
WILLIAM C. ISLER III
GUY R. MAJKOWSKI
TERRY R. MATTHEWS
THERESA J. MEDINA
BRIAN E. MOORE
COREY J. MUNRO
CHRISTOPHER I. PATRICK
PETER D. REINHARDT
TERESA K. ROBERTS
DANELLE K. RODDY
MONICA U. SELENT
LYNN M. SHINABERY
MITZI D. THOMASLAWSON
KIRK P. WINGER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

PAUL R. BREZINSKI
TERENCE T. CUNNINGHAM IV
MARY A. GARBOWSKI
KARA A. GORMONT
JOSEPH V. HALE
KEITH A. HIGLEY
EDWARD J. LAGROU
MICHAEL J. ROBERTS
KEVIN P. SEELEY
VITO S. SMYTH
THOMAS E. WILLIFORD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DONNETTE A. BOYD
DAVID L. CARR
SHON NEYLAND
PAUL D. SUTTER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

QUENTIN D. BAGBY
ALLAN E. BIGTAS, JR.
SEAN M. CHICKERY
BRANDON N. CHRISTENSEN
KWAME A. CURTIS
STEVEN W. DAWSON
STEVEN A. DEZELL
JOSE DIAZ
PAUL R. EDEN
JERRY M. FAUSCH
MARSHALL A. FISCUS
GRETCHEN ANN FIVECOAT
MICHAEL G. FLEMING
JOHNNIE FOSTER, JR.
JAIME RIVAS HARVEY
JEREMY S. HASKELL
ERIC M. HENDRICKSON
DEREC S. HUDSON
SAMANTHA J. KELPIS
WESLEY T. KINERK
JOSEPH B. KIRKMAN
KAREN P. KRAMER
JIMMEY N. LABIT, JR.
THAI H. LE
MICHAEL S. LUBY
WILLIAM E. LUJAN
NATHAN B. MAERTENS
THOMAS J. V. MALLEY
TIMOTHY J. MCDOWELL
MICHAEL A. MILLIS
ELIZABETH NAJERA
JAIME R. K. OKAMURA
ARON R. POTTER
NAYDA O. PROTZMAN
ALEJANDRO RAMOS
PATRICIA ROHRBECK
MICHAEL J. RUTTER
JENNIE S. SHEFFIELD
CHRISTIE SIMPSON MCKENZIE
TRACY L. SNYDER
KIM SUNDERLAND
BRANDON M. TOURTILLOTT
GEORGETTE A. TREZVANT
ANTHONY R. TY
DEREK C. UNDERHILL
DERRICK F. VARNER
KHAI H. VUONG
JANA M. WEINER
CLAYTON D. WILSON III
MARY A. WORKMAN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DWAYNE A. BACA

ROBERT D. BARRIENTOS
JONATHAN A. BERGMANN
DANIEL R. BOWEN
ALEJANDRO BRECEDA
MICHAEL A. CLEMENT
STEVEN B. DADD
TIMOTHY M. DEATER
GABRIEL R. DINOFRIO
ERIC L. DOGGETT
JENNIFER LAURIE EDWARDS
WADE S. EVANS
GLEN N. GILSON
CHRISTOPHER G. GONZALES
BRYAN K. A. JERNIGAN
DANA JOSEPHINE LONGO
TARA E. LOVELL
MICHAEL PATRICK METZ
TIMOTHY A. MORRIS
ROBERT J. ORLANDO
MARK W. OVERLIE
AMANDA M. PHLEGAR
ROBERT B. RUSSIN
EDWIN Y. SANTOS
JEFFREY B. SCHULER
STEPHANIE A. STEMEN
JAMES D. ULRICH
RAMON L. VEGLIO
RAYNOLD E. VINCENT, JR.
LIANA LUCAS VOGEL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

MARIA J. BELMONTE
STEVEN R. BLEVINS
FARA M. BUSS
JONATHAN A. CASEY
ERIKA R. CERANOWSKI
ANITA F. CHAPEL
PAULA M. CHAVIS
JAMES D. COTE
DEBORAH L. DAVIDSON
AMALIA M. DIVITTORIO
KATHERYN W. ELLIS
CYNTHIA L. ENNIS
JASON P. FEESSE
TIMOTHY E. GILLISPIE
MICHELE J. HOLDERNESS
DONNA L. HORNBERGER
ROCKY D. HOSIE
SHERRY A. JOHNSON
GWENDOLYN S. KAGGY
KRISTOPHER J. KILLIUS
SHERRY M. KILLIUS
BERNICE S. KING
ERIN J. KNIGHTNER
MICHAEL E. MACLAIN
KRISTI R. NORCROSS
MICHAEL J. OKEEFE
KIMBERLY A. POLSTON
MARQUITA N. PRICE
LEE ANN RICKARD
JENNY PATTERSON SPAHR
PAMELA L. STEARNS
DEBRA J. STORMS
DIANNE M. STROBLE
MATTHEW R. UBER
STEPHEN J. URBAN III
LEWIS S. WILBER
DEVERIL A. WINT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

ROBERT H. ALEXANDER
REBECCA L. ARNESON
WESLEY P. ARNOLD
JACQUELINE L. ASTRERO
JASON L. BAKER
LINDA A. BEEMAN
CANDEE B. BERCK
SHARISE M. BIJOU
JASON R. BINGHAM
KARL F. BITUIN
ALLISON K. BRADFORD
CRYSTALYN E. BROWN
JARED P. BUECHE
MATTHEW P. BUSSA
JAY M. BUTLER
LANCE W. CAMACHO
DIANE L. CAMPBELL
JULIE A. CARPENTER
BENJAMIN H. CARTER
MICHELE L. CHURCH
ELIZABETH K. COMBS
CHRISTOPHER W. DANIELS
GABRIELA T. DANIELS
ZARAH J. DAVIS
NICOLE E. DESCHEPPER
GEORGE Y. DIAZ
WILLIAM R. DICK
LAURA J. DOSSETT
RACHEL L. DUCHOSLAV
CHRISTOPHER A. DUFFORD
AMANDA E. FERGUSON
NICOLE M. FERGUSON
LYNDSY M. FERRIS
DEREK S. FINDLAY
ALISHA LYNNETTE FLORENCE

ALEXANDER G. FORD
DENISE TORRES GARCIA
ZACHARY K. GARRETT
MEGAN C. GARRISON
ANGELA L. GILBERT
MICHAEL A. GLOTFELTER
JACLYN D. GUESS
WHITNEY N. HASBROUCK
CORY G. HEDIN
MINETTE S. R. HERRICK
JOANNA HESKETT
LINDZI S. HOWDER
DANIEL A. JACOBSON
BRIAN D. JAMAIL
JASON R. JARECKE
BENJAMIN D. JONES
LEAMON P. JONES
CHAD W. KILLPACK
KENNETH A. KIRK II
FRANCIS J. KUCHERA
RYAN R. LANDOLL
RAHEEM R. LAY
ELIZABETH M. LIEBNER
CARRIE L. LUCAS
MEGAN B. MARTIN
DONALD E. MASON
WILLIAM C. MATTHEWS
NAGENIA Y. MCBEAN
BENJAMIN J. MCGARVEY
TRACEY J. MCGAUGHEY
JESSICA H. MCGLADE
JENNIFER M. MIDDLEBROOKS
GEORGE B. MITZNER
CARLI B. MURPHY
ALISON M. NEY
CHI L. NGUYEN JOHNSON
MARK J. NOAKES
MATTHEW P. NOWOCZYNSKI
JOSEPH V. NOYA
ERIN K. OCONNOR
STEPHEN O. OSAKUE, JR.
JESSICA S. PABON
MICHAEL A. PALMER
STEVEN M. PARFITT
RYAN M. PROFFIT
AMANDA C. QUELLY
VENITA S. RAMIREZ
FELIPSON Z. RAMOS, JR.
JUSTIN R. READ
JAIME L. REED
REED T. REICHWALD
BRANDY LEIGH RENNER
GLEN M. ROBINSON
SHANNON N. ROMAN
ELIZABETH A. SALTZ
KEITH A. SANDERS
NATHAN C. SANDMANN
MICHELLE L. SANGER
RACHEL M. SATTER
MICHAEL P. SCANNON
MICHAEL A. SCHMIDT
ROBERT W. SEALS
NICOLE M. SEARS
DEBRA S. SECREST
CHAD P. SHAFFER
LEIGHCRAFT A. SHAKES
CASEY R. SHOOP
DAVID A. SHWALB
JASMINE A. SIMMONS
BRYAN W. SIXKILLER
JONATHAN JOSEPH SNYDER
DAVID W. SPAULDING
CHARLES J. STALLINGS
DANIEL J. STRAIT
NINA J. TACHIKAWA
JOSEPH C. TEODORO
SALLY L. TO
DONALD JOSEPH TRIGG
LETICIA R. TURNER
DANIELLE KAY GLEASON TUTTLE
THERESA P. UMIPEG
DAVID P. VALENTINE
KAREN A. VANDOR
STACEY R. VIERRA
BRYAN H. VRALSTED
STEPHANIE L. WHITE
DANIEL ADAM WILLIAMS
OWEN JOHN R. WILLIAMS
SUMMER L. WILLIAMSON
JENNIFER L. WINCHELL
JUSTIN DAVID WRIGHT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

RENI B. ANGELOVA
ALLISON NIASHAR BAIN
SCOTT A. BAKER
WAYNE EMMANUEL BARNUM
JOHN M. BERNABE
GARY L. BILLINGSLEY
CRAIG M. BUEHRIG
JASON J. CARTER
STEPHANIE A. CERON
KRISTINE L. COTHREN
TENISHA L. DEALBA ASCENCIO
MELISSA S. DELA CRUZ
CARMELLA S. ESSIEN
VANESSA V. EVANS
SEAN M. FINNEY

JAY A. FURY
BRANDEE N. HAYNES
ZANE H. HOLLAND
CHRISTOPHER M. HOLLIS
JAMES N. HOLSTEIN
SEAN RODERICK HOSKINS
TOMMY L. JEFFERSON II
CRYSTAL C. KARAHAN
ELISABETH E. LEONHARDT
ANSON MICHAEL LLOYD
MIJI DALTON MCCONNELL
INNA ALEXANDRA MIKHAILOVA
CYNTHIA L. NEWBERRY
CHRISTOPHER TRAVIS OGREN
CHRISTOPHER D. PARKER
STEPHANIE A. PROELLOCHS
BARRY O. REESE
JEROD B. RIEGER
SUMMER A. ROSE
KENNETH A. ROSENBLUM
MELISSA R. ROUNTREE
KAITLIN B. B. SALLE
TAMMY S. SHY
BLAKE M. SMITH
ALLEN K. SOLENBERG, JR.
GILLIAN T. TAYLOR DORSETT
ANGEL LUIS VARGAS
AMANDA MARIE WEBER
NICHOLAS J. WEIGHTMAN
GRANT W. WISNER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be major

DAVID R. ALANIZ
MARK CHRISTOPHER ALBRIGHT
LORREN D. ANDERSON
NOEL B. ARAGONA
DENNIS M. BARBER
MADISON L. BASILE, JR.
JERED E. BEAIRD
THERESA A. BEDFORD
MONICA D. BEEBE
SUSAN Y. BERGANIO
KATE M. BERRY
SUZANNE M. BOHN
VIRGIL E. BRECKENRIDGE, JR.
FRANK E. BRISENDINE
WEEADA Y. BROWN
STACEY M. BRUNDRETT
JAMES S. CARPENTER
REBECCA J. CASTANEDA
ELYSSABETH N. CASTEEL
SHERRY D. CHANDLER
JENNIFER M. CHILDRESS
ANNA M. CHO
BRADFORD R. CLOWER
JOHN T. CONNORS
LAWANNA H. COX
MELISSA M. DASSINGER
JANICE D. DAVIS
GRADYNE M. DEARBORN
TANYA L. DESTINHILL
MOHAMED H. DIALLO
SORIYA DIEP
KAREN E. DOMBKOWSKI
YATASHA A. FLYNN
APRIL D. FRANKLIN
ANNA M. FRISCIA
JOANALYN S. GADUANG
REYNEL A. GARCIA
DAWN M. GRANT
BELINDA J. GREEN
MILAINEE J. GRIFFIN
HELENA H. GUERRA
KANDACE N. HARDSON
SCOTT R. HOLCOMB
ADRIANA A. HOLLIS
JODY L. HUSS
KATRINA INEZ JANOUSEK
JOANNA TANAP JIMENEZ
WANDA I. JIMENEZ
MARITESS JINGCO
DONNICA JONESKEOWN
JAIME F. KELBAUGH
KATHERINE L. KNOTT
DIANA L. KOPRON
ELMER M. LACSAMANA
CYNTHIA LEFRERE
JILL A. LEMIEUX
CHERIE ANN LITTLE
JENNIFER B. MAY
JANA J. MCBURNEY
JENNIFER J. MCGOUGH
LISA G. MCIVER
CHARLES R. MCMICHAEL
SUZANNE M. MIRTS
MARISSA D. MULLICAN
ANNEMARIE T. NESBIT
SYRAH E. NICAISSE
JENNIFER E. OLIVER
KRISTEN M. OSTER
MELISSA S. PENN
VERONICA L. PERRY
ELIZABETH T. A. PETERS
KATHY K. PICKEREL
MICHELLE D. PIERSON
RENEL RAMOS
MATTHEW F. RIST
CHERYL A. ROBY

LYDIA G. RODRIGUEZ
MELINDA M. ROVAN
EUGENIA M. RUSH
ERWIN B. SANPEDRO
FREDRICK R. SANTILLAN, JR.
CATARINA J. SCHLOSSER
ELIZABETH E. SHOCKEY
MICHELLE R. SMITH
CAMILLE N. ST JULIAN
TEISHA S. ST ROSE
ANNETTE M. STEPHENS
AMY L. SVANBERG
REGINA A. TAI SEE
JULIE M. THOMPSON
ROBERT P. THORNHILL
PHI T. TRAN
MICHELE L. TRIMBLE
NICOLE TURNER
JENNIFER L. VARNEY
MARGARITA VERA
CARA M. VOMHOF
DORIS C. WAGNER
STEPHANY L. WATKINS
GARY C. WEBB
DEVON L. WENTZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE AIR
FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JOHN M. GOOCH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

To be lieutenant colonel

HERMAN W. DYKES, JR.

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR AP-
POINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED
STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C.,
SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

JUDITH S. MEYERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

THOMAS W. WISENBAUGH
HAROLD P. XENITELIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER IN THE GRADE INDI-
CATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY UNDER TITLE 10,
U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

KIRBY R. GROSS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR REGULAR AP-
POINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED
STATES ARMY NURSE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C.,
SECTIONS 531 AND 3064:

To be major

FRANCESCA M. DESRIVIERE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

JERRY L. TOLBERT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER R. FORSYTHE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE RESERVE OF THE
ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be colonel

FRANCIS G. MARESCO, JR.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

REGINE REIMERS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOEL V. FINNY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
RESERVE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 716 AND 12203:

To be lieutenant commander

NATALIA C. HENRIQUEZ

To be captain

ERNEST C. LEE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 5582:

Executive Message transmitted by
the President to the Senate on Sep-

tember 9, 2015 withdrawing from fur-
ther Senate consideration the fol-
lowing nominations:

FOREIGN SERVICE NOMINATIONS BEGINNING WITH
JASON DOUGLAS KALBFLEISCH AND ENDING WITH STU-
ART MACKENZIE HATCHER, WHICH NOMINATIONS WERE
SENT TO THE SENATE ON JULY 8, 2015.

WITHDRAWALS

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING THE 75TH
ANNIVERSARY OF CAMP BOWIE

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th Anniversary of the establishment of Camp Bowie in Brownwood, Texas. This month, the community of Brownwood will gather to mark this occasion with a symposium to honor the history of Camp Bowie.

Camp Bowie, named in honor of a Texas hero James Bowie, was established on September 19, 1940, by the United States War Department. This installation was the first major project authorized during the World War II era. In the same year, President Franklin D. Roosevelt was given the power to mobilize National Guard Units across the nation. Shortly after its completion, Camp Bowie became the new home of the 36th Texas National Guard Division.

After the U.S.'s entry into World War II, the 36th Division was deployed for training at Camp Blanding, Florida. On September 9, 1943, these brave men were the first allied soldiers sent to the beaches of Salerno, Italy to defeat Hitler's European fortress from the west. The 36th Division served 400 days of combat, and five campaigns in Italy, France, Germany, and Austria. The men of the 36th Division came home and demobilized on Christmas Day in 1945.

Since World War II, Camp Bowie has trained over 420,000 service members and is an instrumental part of our nation's defense and preserving our nation's liberty. Camp Bowie's history serves as an example to many generations of what it takes to defend our freedom. I am proud to represent Camp Bowie and Brownwood, and I am honored to share their history with my colleagues in Congress. On September 16th through the 18th, 2015, the Brownwood community will be honoring this historic milestone at Howard Payne University. I would like to commend Tarleton State University, Howard Payne University and the Brown County Museum of History for their hard work in organizing this symposium.

TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF THE LIFE
OF SCOTT T. CAREY

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to my friend and distinguished constituent, Scott T. Carey, a former Mayor of Palo Alto and a resident of Portola Valley, California,

who died at his home on August 11, 2015 after a brief illness at the age of 82.

Scott Carey was born on March 11, 1933, to Paul T. Carey, an artist, and Stanleigh Carey, a pianist. He was raised in Berkeley, graduated from Berkeley High School and earned a bachelor's degree from the University of California. He earned his law degree from Boalt Hall and served our country as a pilot in the U.S. Air Force from 1953 to 1958, rising to the rank of Captain.

Scott Carey practiced law in San Francisco and Palo Alto before joining his uncle Pat Carey's real estate brokerage. Founded in 1935, Cornish & Carey was primarily a residential brokerage firm when Scott joined the company in 1968. He soon upgraded the company's commercial division and it became the brokerage of choice for many Silicon Valley technology companies. He served as Chairman of the firm's Board of Directors.

Scott Carey was known for his honesty, dedication, integrity, wise counsel and his ability to think fast and explain complex deals in a personable, confident manner. He was an ardent and able golfer, and a public servant as a member of the Palo Alto City Council from 1975 to 1979, including a term as Mayor. He was instrumental in obtaining the Council's support for the \$7.5 million acquisition of more than 500 acres of lower foothills property which later became the core of the Arastradero Open Space Preserve. He also served on various boards, including that of the Woodside Priory School and the Berkeley Center for Law, Business and the Economy. He oversaw the sale of Cornish and Carey to BCG Partners, an endeavor in which he was deeply involved.

Scott Carey leaves his beloved wife Susan Carey, the great love of his life; his children Michael T. Carey, of San Mateo, Dennis Carey, of Hanoi, Jeff Beaty, of Concord; Cynthia Carey, of Napa Valley, Kimberly Corso, of Menlo Park and Christopher Corso, of Portland, Oregon; Lisa Lamb, of Atherton, and Mike E. Carey, of Santa Barbara; brother Peter Carey of Palo Alto. He also leaves his grandchildren Tyler Woods; Cole T. Carey; Zachary, William and Alexandra Lamb; Sophia Phillips; and Benjamin Carey as well as his nephew, Brendan Carey; and niece, Nadia Carey.

I was privileged to have known Scott for over 35 years and call him my friend. He was a thoroughbred professional, a loyal friend and he was respected by everyone who had the privilege of knowing him.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the life of Scott T. Carey, a man of many talents and accomplishments and a true patriot. As the full House extends our condolences to his family and friends, we are grateful for his life and his work which made our community and our country stronger and better.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUZANNE BONAMICI

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the motion to suspend the rules and pass S. 1359, E-Warranty Act of 2015, I was not able to cast a vote because of a delayed flight. Had I been present I would have voted yea.

THE MAJOR CASE SQUAD OF
GREATER ST. LOUIS CELEBRATING 50 YEARS OF INVESTIGATIVE EXCELLENCE

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge The Major Case Squad of Greater St. Louis in celebrating 50 years of investigative excellence to the St. Louis Area. This multi-jurisdictional Major Crime Investigative Task Force was established in 1965 to unite the most qualified investigators from Illinois and Missouri law enforcement agencies within the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan area. The goal was to establish a cooperative effort to investigate and provide an expeditious solution to the most heinous crimes constituting a community threat.

Since its inception the Major Case Squad has investigated thousands of crimes and is proud of the fact that more than 86 percent have resulted in arrest clearance with an incredibly high criminal conviction rate.

Throughout the 50 years of operational success, the men and women of the Major Case Squad have perfected the investigative process to deliver a swift and professional response to violent crimes that affect the Greater St. Louis Metropolitan area.

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE
DEFUNIACK SPRINGS WOMAN'S CLUB

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the One Hundredth Anniversary of the DeFuniack Springs Woman's Club. Throughout the last century, the Club has served the local community, and I am privileged to honor and recognize their dedication

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

to bettering the lives of the citizens of Northwest Florida.

As one of the oldest civic organizations in the Florida panhandle, the Woman's Club was unofficially formed in 1915 when a group of 5 resourceful and determined women representing each of the churches in DeFuniak Springs gathered at the request of the mayor to take on the beautification and sanitation of the town. The group, which would later become the DeFuniak Springs Woman's Club, set about establishing sanitation standards by improving drinking water and sewer systems, as well as working to make the town as aesthetically pleasing as possible. They were able to secure extra law enforcement officials to prevent the free roaming livestock, and they beautified the parks and train depot by planting gardens.

Once their original purpose was met, the Woman's Club began to provide care to women and children, a mission that continues today. In addition to promoting good health and home sanitation, the Woman's Club has taken on projects to provide food for school children, library books, quality woman's clothing at discounted prices, and, as a sponsor for the Children's Advocacy of the Emerald Coast, support for child abuse victims.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the centennial anniversary of the DeFuniak Woman's Club in DeFuniak Springs, Florida. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating all the members past and present on one hundred years of exceptional service to the Northwest Florida community.

IN MEMORY OF ALBERT "AL" P.
PIANTANIDA

HON. TONY CÁRDENAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sadness that I rise to honor the life of my good friend and community leader, Albert "Al" P. Piantanida, who passed away on Monday, August 31, 2015.

Al was not only a great friend to me, but a leader in the Northeast San Fernando Valley. Al's dedication to his neighborhood and the surrounding community will be noticed by future generations.

Al was a proud Vietnam War Veteran, serving for three years. Al shared his familiarity and experience as a member of my Veterans Advisory Committee. He was also a proud member of the American Legion Post 817 in Panorama City.

While born in East St. Louis, Illinois, Al made his home in Arleta, California for more than thirty years. Al believed that building a better world begins in one's own back yard. Al's intrinsic motivation was to inspire others to become involved in the community.

Al was the perfect constituent. He not only engaged his elected representatives, he offered his service and personally invested in finding solutions to the issues facing the community. He was the perfect American.

He was an active member of his community, serving diligently as the President of the Arleta Neighborhood Council for three years as well as President of the Village Green East Home Owners Association.

Al was the founder of the Arleta Community Watchdogs Organization and member of the Arleta "Looky Loos" Neighborhood Watch Group for over twenty-five years.

Al was always there and involved, actively participating in community events, projects, and programs. Al had a lifelong commitment to public service and improving the Northeast San Fernando Valley.

Al's dedication went beyond his own neighborhood. He was an active member of the Los Angeles Police Department's Foothill and Mission Division Community-Police Advisory Boards, the Police Foundation, and Valley Traffic Advisory Council.

He devoted his life to the betterment of the students and less fortunate—actively participating in food banks, senior centers, and schools. His tireless efforts were recognized when Al received the 2011 Pacoima Spirit Award for community activist of the year.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of Albert "Al" P. Piantanida. Although Al is no longer with us in person, he will always remain in our hearts and memories. His legacy will continue for future generations.

CELEBRATION OF THE 70TH YEAR
OF ALBERT "RED" SCHOEN-
DIENST IN PROFESSIONAL BASE-
BALL

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the celebration of the 70th year of Albert "Red" Schoendienst in professional baseball.

During his years involved with professional baseball, 45 seasons were in uniform with the St. Louis Cardinals as a player, manager, and coach. He is still currently involved with the organization as a special assistant to the manager. The organization, players, and fans will be celebrating Red all season long using the hashtag #LoveRed2.

His career with the Cardinals started in 1945 when he left his hometown of Germantown, Illinois, here in the 15th District. He quickly developed into one of the best hitting and fielding second basemen of all time. With multiple World Series wins and National League pennants won as both a player and a coach and as a member of the Baseball Hall of Fame, I am honored to recognize such an accomplished athlete who hails from the district.

I look forward to Red's continued involvement with the Cardinals for many years to come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE GUN TRAFFICKING PREVENTION ACT

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud that members of Congress from both sides of the aisle came together to deal with the gun trafficking epidemic that has spread across our country and across our borders.

Our bill, the Gun Trafficking Prevention Act, will create a dedicated federal statute to combat gun trafficking, and impose stiffer penalties for "straw purchasers" who buy guns for convicted felons and others who are prohibited from purchasing weapons. The bill also includes important enhancements for organizers of trafficking networks that funnel illegal guns into cities across the country.

These stronger penalties will enable law enforcement and prosecutors to bust these trafficking rings and make our communities safer from the threat of gun violence.

According to the ATF, more than 100,000 guns were recovered from crime scenes in Mexico between 2009 and 2014, and over 70 percent of those originated in the U.S. It's clear that gun trafficking across the border to Mexico is a major national security threat, but our current laws are so weak that it's not worth it to prosecute gun traffickers.

In testimony to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee in 2012, ATF Special Agent Peter Forcelli called the current laws against gun trafficking "absolutely toothless." And the consequences have been dire:

On Christmas Eve, 2012, a convicted felon named William Spengler, who served 17 years in prison for killing his 92-year-old grandmother with a hammer, sat down in his home in Webster, N.Y., and wrote a note vowing to torch his neighborhood.

He promised to "do what I like doing best, killing people." After setting fire to his own house and several others, Spengler ambushed the first responders, killing two firefighters by spraying them with bullets from a 12-gauge shotgun and a Bushmaster rifle.

How did Mr. Spengler—a convicted felon—get his guns? He used his neighbor as a straw purchaser.

And this May, authorities in New York charged 10 people in a gun trafficking ring that had channeled 90 guns from as far away as Maine onto our streets in just the previous six months.

Thank you to Representatives CUMMINGS, MEEHAN, FITZPATRICK, KELLY, KING, DUCKWORTH, and DONOVAN for their steadfast commitment to end gun trafficking, and their support of this critical legislation.

IN MEMORY OF THE HEROES OF
BENGHAZI: NAVY SEAL CHRIS
DOHERTY, DIPLOMAT SEAN
SMITH, AMBASSADOR CHRIS
STEVENS, AND NAVY SEAL TY-
RONE WOODS

HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor and in memory of the four American Heroes who died in the Benghazi Terrorist Attack three years ago on 9/11 in service to our country. Ambassador Chris Stevens, Diplomat Sean Smith, Former Navy Seals Chris Doherty and Tyrone Woods. Their courage and service to our Nation will always be remembered. On this third anniversary our thoughts and prayers go out to them and their families. I submit this poem penned in their honor by Albert Carey Caswell.

Out of the Woods, and into the light
Those brave hearts who evil must fight
Those ones who served their country tis of
thee so magnificently,
all on that most heroic of all nights
Who stood strong, who stood long,
ever so bright
To see heaven's light
Out of the Woods,
and into the light
The ones who chose to be in harm's way,
standing up for what is right
Indeed, it is but a special breed.
who in the name of public service who will
intercede and so fight
Whether, an Ambassador, a Diplomat, or
Brothers In Arms,
who together chose to unite
STAND DOWN
HELL NO
Against all odds as into that darkness they'd
go
Leave no brother behind was how they all
lived and so died
As their Mothers cried,
with tears in their eyes
As Heaven them chose,
they'd rise
In the moment of truth,
only the bravest of all hearts so choose to
fight
While, against all odds,
these heroes acted like gods bringing their
light
All in their creed,
showing us what we all need to make this
world right
Courage and Faith,
and unending Conviction to make it a far
better place
Because minutes are all that we have
To make a difference,
all in that fight of Good versus Bad
It's better to live for something noble,
than die for nothing at all
As they went into the darkest of Woods,
with Strength In Honor one and all
Rest
Rest, our four American Sons,
your battle's over now, it's done,
you're out of the Woods and into the light
For Heaven holds a place,
for all of those men and women of such
splendid faith
Who to this our world bring their most self-
less light
Amen

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MIKE BOST

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 490 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

IN COMMEMORATION OF ARTHUR A. COLLINS' 106TH BIRTHDAY

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the birthday of a true innovator and representative of American ingenuity: Arthur A. Collins. Fascinated and inspired by the invention of the radio, Collins tinkered with home-made antennas and transmitters from an early age at his home in Cedar Rapids, Iowa. As a young adult, Arthur turned his hobby into a basement business where he sold the first complete radio transmitting equipment in the country.

Since its humble beginnings in Iowa in the thirties, the Collins Radio Company evolved and adapted to design and manufacture flight control instruments, first commercially successful data modems, and the communications equipment for the Apollo, Gemini, and Mercury space programs. Today, Rockwell Collins, the largest employer in the First District of Iowa, continues to create innovative technology for both the defense and civilian sectors. The company, still based in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, designs, engineers, and builds electronic communication systems, avionics, and in-flight entertainment systems worldwide.

Arthur A. Collins pioneered one of the greatest technological revolutions in history and left an enduring legacy in the business world. Today, on what would have been his 106th birthday, I honor the genius of this great Iowan and celebrate his American success story. Mr. Collins is an amazing example of the American Dream and a testament to the power of hard work, foresight, and perseverance.

HONORING JULIE CARSON

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Wilton Manors City Commissioner, Julie Carson and her work with the LGBT community.

Commissioner Carson is being presented with the "Community Partner for Equality" award from Equality Florida for her tireless work for the LGBT community.

In 2010, Carson became the first openly lesbian elected official in Broward County. Throughout her tenure as Commissioner, she has focused on helping the homeless, assist-

ing the elderly, advocating for people living with HIV/AIDS, and supporting the transgender community. Specifically, she sponsored the Equal Benefits Ordinance and the Broward County Vendor Preference Ordinance, which ensured equal benefits to all married couples. She is also proud of her continued dialogue and collaboration between the Transgender community and the Wilton Manors Police Department.

Outside of her duties as Commissioner, Carson is a free-lance paralegal and a guest lecturer at Florida Atlantic University. She enjoys spending time with her partner Susan and horseback riding in her free time.

I congratulate Commissioner Carson on her award and thank her for all her tremendous work for the South Florida LGBT community. I am proud to represent her in the 22nd District and wish her all the best in her future endeavors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 490 I was unable to attend the following vote due to a flight delay from my district in Southwest Washington. Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN CROSLAND, JR.

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of John Crosland, Jr., who passed away on Sunday, August 2, 2015 after a long battle with Parkinson's Disease.

Mr. Crosland made a name for himself as a successful real estate developer, but more importantly for his philanthropic work in our community. In 1954, he joined his father at the John Crosland Company. He successfully navigated multiple housing crises through the decades while becoming a champion of affordable housing in the Charlotte area. Additionally, he was the founding chairman of Habitat for Humanity of Charlotte.

Throughout his successful career, he always knew the importance of giving back and helping the local community. In 2012, Mr. Crosland gave \$1.1 million for a new school in Charlotte, now named The John Crosland School, that specializes in assisting children with learning disabilities.

His dedication to serving our community has made an everlasting impact on thousands of lives.

He also served his country in the U.S. Army in Korea and Japan. I am grateful for his service to our country, our state, and to our local community.

Mr. Speaker, please join me today in honoring the life of John Crosland, Jr., for his successful career and for his dedication to

bettering the lives of so many North Carolinians.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, due to the recent passing of a beloved family member, I was unable to cast my vote yesterday for an important piece of legislation. Had I been in the chamber, I would have voted yes on S. 1359, the E-Warranty Act of 2015.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD L. HANNA

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, on Roll Call number 490 on S. 1359, I am not recorded because I was absent for personal reasons. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 8, 2015, I was absent for rollcall vote 490. Had I been present for rollcall vote 490, on passage of S. 1359, I would have voted "yes".

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ROD BLUM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. BLUM. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 490 my flight was unavoidably delayed due to severe weather. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I attended a visitation for Shane Clifton, a St. Paul firefighter who died while on duty, and missed votes on September 8, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in support of the E-Warranty Act of 2015 (S. 1359).

IN HONOR OF "JOHN" ARTHUR J. HOWARTH

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere condolences and to honor the memory of "John" Arthur J. Howarth for his achievements, contributions, and service to his community as a loving husband, father, grandfather and pillar of civic engagement.

John Howarth spent his life serving his community for 40 years as an electrician for the International Brothers of Electrical Workers (IBEW), putting the needs of others before his own. John was also active as a member of his local union, serving as Recording Secretary. In addition to imparting the importance of citizenship to his children and grandchildren at an early age, he served as an inspiration to IBEW members. He taught them the value of a day's work and to appreciate life's gifts and opportunities.

John also served as general foreman on some of the largest projects in South Jersey. I had the privilege of working under him on the Garden State Park Race Track. He had a passion for passing on his trade to the next generation and I was privileged to be among the many IBEW members to benefit from his years of experience.

Mr. Speaker, John Howarth was an incredible man, devoted to his family, and dedicated to his community. He leaves behind a great legacy and I join my IBEW brothers and sisters and the entire state of New Jersey in honoring the achievements and the life of this extraordinary man.

HONORING SAL ESPOSITO

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Sal Esposito of Plantation, Florida, who turned 100 years old on August 27, 2015.

Mr. Esposito moved to the 22nd District in 1980 from New York. Before moving to South Florida, he proudly served in the military and was overseas for nearly three years during World War II. He worked in a factory making tools and dies for 45 years.

Mr. Esposito still works with machinery and tools in the Lauderdale West Community. He helps to make toys for children for the Plantation Historical Museum. He also enjoys playing tennis, playing cards, and performing in shows.

I thank Mr. Esposito for his service to our country and wish him many happy and healthy years to come.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, September 8, 2015, I was not present due to a medical procedure and missed the following vote:

Roll Call Vote 490, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3154—S. 1359, The E-Warranty Act of 2015. I would have voted "aye."

TRIBUTE TO MARILYNN THANNEY

HON. GWEN MOORE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ms. Marilynn Thanney on her retirement. Ms. Thanney has served the 4th Congressional District for over 18 years. She has served in various positions during her tenure including Office Manager, Caseworker, Casework Supervisor and currently Casework Manager for my office.

Marilynn began her employment with the House of Representatives in 1998 beginning in the office of my predecessor Representative Gerald Kleczka. She joined my office in 2005. She was one of my first hires due to her welcoming spirit and knowledge of the district. Before joining federal employment, Ms. Thanney spent six years working for the Silver Spring Neighborhood Center and she also worked for the Better Business Bureau in their Milwaukee office.

Marilynn Thanney is the proud mother of four, three daughters: Jennifer, Rachel, and Rebecca and son Joshua. She is the grandmother of 3: Makayla, Jackson, and Noah; they all reside in Minnesota where she will retire. She has been married to her soulmate Karen Mahler for over 15 years and was officially married to Karen in April 2014 in a ceremony held in Minnesota.

Marilynn has worked tirelessly on behalf of the constituents of the 4th Congressional District; she has tackled some of the most difficult problems and cases with many positive results. She is an exceptional leader and has been an advocate on issues regarding mental health, women, seniors, LGBT, and the disability community.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues of the 114th Congress to join me in congratulating Marilynn Thanney on her well-deserved retirement. She has been a true friend to her colleagues and friends and has exemplified in deed the true meaning of public servant. She has been a treasure for the 4th Congressional District and will be missed by my office, this community and the State of Wisconsin.

HONORING JOSEPHINE DEFINA
STETSON

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Josephine DeFina Stetson for her work in the U.S. Army War Department.

Josephine was born in New York City to Pasqual and Antoinette DeSimon, as the youngest of eight children. From a young age, Josephine had a passion for dance, a talent which led her to teach soldiers how to dance as a volunteer for the USO.

Josephine served as a civilian employee for the U.S. Army War Department for four years, developing flow charts illustrating the organizational structures of various commands.

After working for the Army, Josephine began selling real estate in the Palm Beaches, opening her own firm in 1973. She was consistently ranked one of the top firms in the area and the nation. Josephine is an enthusiastic member of the Palm Beach community, serving on the Palm Beach Board of Realtors for many years and as a longtime member and parishioner of the St. Edward's Church guild.

In honor of her years of commitment to her country and dedication to her community, I'm pleased to recognize Mrs. Josephine DeFina Stetson and thank her for her service.

75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE APPA-
LACHIAN ELECTRIC COOPERA-
TIVE

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to recognize an organization that has had a huge impact on rural areas of my District and the State of Tennessee.

The Appalachian Electric Cooperative is celebrating its 75th anniversary during its annual meeting on September 26th in White Pine, Tennessee, where up to 2,000 people are expected to attend.

Governor Bill Haslam has proclaimed September 26th as Appalachian Electric Cooperative Day.

Since 1940, the member-owned, non-profit Appalachian Electric Cooperative has been providing reliable and affordable electricity across East Tennessee.

Today, it serves 45,000 people in Grainger, Hamblen, Jefferson and Sevier Counties.

Several years ago, I was named the number one champion of rural America in the entire House of Representatives.

I have always rooted for the little guy or the underdog in life. It is very important to stand up for small towns and rural areas because they do not have the resources of big cities and often get shortchanged.

I read recently that two-thirds of the counties in the U.S. are losing population. There

are many small towns and rural areas across the Appalachian region that are barely holding on.

Without affordable, reliable electricity, these rural areas would cease to exist. We must do everything we can to support rural America and help stem this population loss.

Mr. Speaker, the Appalachian Electric Cooperative has been a lifeline for many thousands of people across rural East Tennessee for the last 75 years. I urge my colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to congratulate them on this milestone and thank them for their service to Tennessee.

GREATER LOVE HAS NO MAN
THAN THIS, THAT A MAN LAY
DOWN HIS LIFE FOR HIS
FRIENDS

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, etched in white marble on a gravestone in Arlington National Cemetery is the name of Army Staff Sergeant Brian T. Craig. Born on April 2, 1975, he passed away 13 days after his 27th birthday on April 15, 2002 in Afghanistan.

Brian was a son, a friend and, most importantly to him, a Christian. Brian loved his family, and he made it a weekly ritual to call home early on Saturday mornings to let his parents know he was okay. He graduated from Klein Forest High School in 1993 and from there went on to enlist in the United States Army the next fall. His parents had encouraged him to go to college, but Brian was dead set on enlisting; it was in his blood. His father, Arthur, was stationed in Thailand with the Air Force during the Vietnam War. Brian served in Anchorage, Alaska as an Airborne Infantry soldier.

Upon reenlistment, he served in a range of Explosive Ordnance Disposal (E.O.D.) missions in support of the United States and NATO, even serving in Bosnia/Kosovo and The Republic of North Korea. He was deployed in support of Operation Noble Eagle/Enduring Freedom to Kandahar, Afghanistan in November of 2001, when he was later killed.

His parents, Arthur and Barbara Craig, heard news that four U.S. soldiers were killed in Kandahar as they dismantled confiscated rockets, they feared their son was among that four.

Barbara was returning from the airport, after dropping her husband off for a mission trip, when she saw an Army car pull up in front of the house. Her worries were confirmed, Brian was among the dead in Afghanistan.

Brian paid the ultimate sacrifice; he laid down his life for not only his family and friends, but people he had never met. He was working to keep the civilians of Afghanistan safe, to make the world a little safer, too. Brian worked with a small team that went around and collected old bombs and rockets. They then took these explosives to a safe location to detonate them, so they would not harm other people. As his father put it, rather

than using these weapons of destruction, Brian was cleaning up munitions left by past and present wars.

On the homepage of a memorial website for Brian reads a verse from the Book of John: "Greater love has no man than this that a man lay down his life for his friends." This short scripture is a living testimony of the man that Brian was. He was a man of great faith whose life was a light in dark circumstances.

The website features one of Brian's last letters home. In this three page letter, Brian describes his walk with Christ. He says that during his time in Afghanistan, he had grown spiritually. He was a member of a men's bible study and reiterated that it was an answer to his prayers. He also stated that he never thought he could grow in his relationship with God and the people he worked with and that he wanted to make a difference in these men's lives.

And he did.

On the message board of his memorial website are short messages from Brian's friends, family and coworkers. A comment from Major Chris Miller, Commander, Special Forces, reads: "He let his silent comportment and deep faith speak for him instead of his words. This is such a rare quality in young people these days." In his letter, Brian graciously thanks his parents for their love and support. He let them know, the Lord was answering their prayers for him; he could feel it. He simply asked them to continue their prayers and sent his love.

Brian was a person of tremendous character and faith. He will not be forgotten. For his service, he was awarded the Purple Heart Medal and the Bronze Star Medal.

We should always support our troops, and we should always keep them in our thoughts and prayers. For the warriors across the globe who fight every day ensuring our well-being, there is no greater love.

God Bless our troops, and God Bless Army Staff Sergeant Brian T. Craig.

And that's just the way it is.

IN HONOR OF COUNCILMAN DAVID
DUNCAN

HON. DONALD NORCROSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my sincere condolences and honor the memory of Bellmawr, New Jersey, Councilman David Duncan for his exemplary life of service to the Bellmawr community. In addition to being a beloved husband, father, and grandfather, Mr. Duncan was a resident of Bellmawr for almost forty-five years and spent his time giving back to his city.

Mr. Duncan was an experienced insurance agent and a member of the Union Ironworker Local #399 for 35 years. For years, he led the effort to get out the labor vote on Election Day. As Councilman, David oversaw the Department of Public Safety, and Department of Health, and served as the Planning Board Liaison. In addition, Mr. Duncan was active in many Bellmawr organizations. He served on

the executive board of the Bellmawr Democrat Club, as president of the Bellmawr Lions Club, and as a member of the Bellmawr Men's Club.

Mr. Duncan was also a veteran of the United States Navy, as well as a dedicated member of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, one of the largest organizations for combat veterans in the world and I thank him for his service to our great nation.

Mr. Speaker, David Duncan was an incredible man, dedicated to his family, community and country. He leaves behind a great legacy and I join the Bellmawr community and the entire state of New Jersey in honoring the achievements and the life of this great man.

HONORING VINCENT A. MIRO

HON. LOIS FRANKEL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mr. Vincent A. Miro for his service in the United States Navy and to congratulate him for being presented with eight medals.

Mr. Miro served in the Navy for over 2 years during World War II. He enlisted as soon as he was old enough and served up until the end of the war in Europe. Mr. Miro served in the D-Day invasion, storming the beaches of Normandy when he was just 18. We are honored to present him with the following medals: World War II Victory Medal, American Campaign Medal, Asiatic Pacific Campaign Medal, Navy Expeditionary Medal, European-African-Middle Eastern Campaign Medal (with bronze star appurtenance), Combat Action Ribbon, Discharge Button, Honorable Service Lapel Pin (Ruptured Duck).

In honor of his commitment and sacrifice for his country, I am honored to recognize Mr. Vincent A. Miro and offer him my sincerest congratulations.

HONORING GAYLES MEMORIAL MISSIONARY BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. BILL FOSTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the 65th Anniversary of Gayles Memorial Missionary Baptist Church in Aurora, Illinois.

Since 1950, the members of Gayles Memorial Missionary Baptist Church have committed themselves to serving the west side of Aurora. From humble beginnings, the church has grown into a local institution with over 250 members, nine deacons, 10 associate ministers, and almost 30 ministries offering services including the children's choir, Sunday school classes, and youth bible study. Members are also dedicated to service outside of the church, volunteering at local charities, providing transitional counseling for incarcerated men and women, raising money for scholarship programs to help area youth, and an-

swering many more calls for assistance from Aurorans.

I would like to thank the Reverend George Marshall and the congregation of Gayles Memorial Missionary Baptist Church for their continuing stewardship of our community.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,143,313,299.53. We've added \$7,524,266,264,386.45 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JOHN'S EPISCOPAL CHURCH

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the St. John's Episcopal Church in Washington, Connecticut.

The history of St. John's Episcopal Church in Washington dates to before the Revolutionary War when missionaries celebrated Anglican rites with local residents. A handful of families bound by the mission of faithful service founded St. John's Episcopal Church and built their first wood frame church in Davies Hollow in 1794. In 1815, the wooden structure was moved by wagon to the parish's current home on the Green.

As the church's membership continued to grow, the congregation raised funds to build a new church. In 1915, renowned architect Ehrick Rossiter designed the stone structure that is still in use today. Over the decades, the church flourished. The ministries expanded to include a choir, Sunday school, and many community outreach activities. In 2012, Rev. Susan McCone was installed as the thirteenth Rector of St. John's Episcopal Church, the congregation's first female head.

Over the past 200 years, the Town of Washington grew around the church. Today, St. John's stands as an architectural landmark and spiritual beacon on Green Hill welcoming 200 families in fellowship. St. John's inclusive hospitality and dedication to promoting interfaith dialogue through educational programs and spiritual events builds the sense of community for parishioners and neighbors alike. The congregation supports the town through programs like the St. John's Emergency Fund, which helps Washington residents who experience urgent and unforeseen hardship with monetary assistance for food, medicine, and other necessities.

On August 29, 2015, St. John's Episcopal Church celebrated its 200th anniversary and the 100th anniversary of the historic stone church. Congratulations to Rev. McCone and all the parishioners of St. John's Episcopal Church. I wish you many more successful years ahead.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I was absent due to illness and was not present for roll call votes on Tuesday, September 8, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted in this manner:

Roll Call Vote #490—S. 1359, E-Warranty Act of 2015—yes.

HONORING THE LIFE OF CAPTAIN JAMES ALAN "TRUCK" HICKS

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of James Alan "Truck" Hicks, who was a Captain in the N.C. Air National Guard.

Captain Hicks died unexpectedly on Monday, July 27, 2015 after helping fight a house fire in Stanly County. He is the first member of the N.C. Air National Guard's fire service to die in the line of duty. On Sunday, Captain Hicks' unit was assigned to bring more water to the fire. However, more firefighters were needed on the interior of the home and Captain Hicks joined the attack.

Throughout his life, Captain Hicks was dedicated to his community and to helping others. In 1986, he began working with the Harrisburg Volunteer Fire Department. As time passed, he also worked with the Flowes Store Volunteer Fire Department as well as the Jackson Park Volunteer Fire Department, where he served as Chief for two years.

In addition, he worked for Concord Fire and Rescue for 10 years and was also with the Badin Volunteer Fire Department. Afterwards, he joined the North Carolina Air National Guard Fire Department for five years and served as Captain for two years.

Captain Hicks was a man of faith and served as a deacon at the Independence Square Baptist Church in Kannapolis. Despite his full schedule, he also served as a fire instructor at the Cleveland Community College in Shelby, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful for Captain Hicks' service and dedication to our local communities and I join them now in grieving his passing.

TRIBUTE TO ALISON PARKER AND
ADAM WARD

HON. J. RANDY FORBES

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Alison Parker and Adam Ward, the young Virginia TV news reporter and cameraman who were tragically killed during a live broadcast on August 26th, 2015. In the face of such horrific evil, words fall short. But the lives of Alison and Adam will be remembered with great love. The thoughts and prayers of the nation remain with the families and loved ones of Alison and Adam, as well as the whole WDBJ news team and community of Franklin County, Virginia.

HONORING AND WELCOMING
CZECH AMBASSADOR PETR
GANDALOVIC AND SLOVAK AM-
BASSADOR PETER KMEC TO MIS-
SOURI'S FIFTH DISTRICT

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 9, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to welcome Czech Ambassador Petr Gandalovic and Slovak Ambassador Peter Kmec to Missouri's Fifth Congressional District, which I proudly represent. The Ambassadors were invited by Kansas City based honorary consuls, Sharon Valášek (Czech Republic) and Ross Marine (Slovak Republic) for a "Celebration of Czechs & Slovaks Collaboration." The celebration includes meetings with local business leaders, a tour of The National World War I Museum and Memorial, a commemorative wreath-laying ceremony at the Truman Presidential Library and Museum and a special musical performance by world renowned Slovak violinist, Filip Pogády, sponsored by the National Czech & Slovak Museum and Library in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

This is an especially notable visit because of the Midwest's strong relationship with their two home countries, the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic. Thousands of immigrants from these central European countries have come to the heartland since the early history of our country. They farmed, worked hard labor jobs, became teachers and took great pride in being Americans. While the numbers are smaller than in the past, Czech and Slovak people continue to come to the Midwest and assimilate into our economy and our way of life.

The Czech Republic and Slovak Republic have been allies and friends of the United States, dating back to the formation of Czechoslovakia on Oct. 28, 1918, as witnessed by the close relationship of the two presidents, Woodrow Wilson of the United States and Tomáš Garrigue Masaryk of Czechoslovakia.

The United States encouraged political and economic transformation in Czechoslovakia after its liberation from communism in 1989,

and established diplomatic relations with the Czech Republic in 1993 after the country split into two republics (Czech Republic and Slovak Republic). The two sovereign nations are fellow members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and are important and reliable allies in promoting U.S. interests. The two countries work together to strengthen security, promote economic development and democratic values, and defend basic human rights.

Both nations have growing economies and are immersed in the global marketplace. The Slovak Republic has been recognized as a large and upcoming competitor in technology and automotive industries and was ranked in one of the highest tiers for "Doing Business" by the World Trade Organization. Similarly, the Czech Republic is a leader in aerospace and aviation, automotive manufacturing and engineering. The Czech government continues to emphasize Czech-American collaboration in the most demanding fields which require high quality and innovative products.

Missouri's Fifth Congressional District is particularly proud to have been the host of the signing of Czech Republic's NATO admission documents in Independence, Missouri at the Truman Presidential Library. It is appropriate then that the Ambassadors have the opportunity to visit the Truman Library during their visit.

Many communities in the Midwest take pride in their Slavic heritages, and the Fifth District is pleased to be one of them. The rich cultural and historical ties between our District and the Czech and Slovak Republics are a demonstration of the melting pot culture we celebrate in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in expressing our heartfelt congratulations to the Czech Republic and Slovak Republic for their relentless efforts in extending good will, commerce and democratic principles, not only within their borders, but to the global community, including Missouri's Fifth Congressional District. I urge my colleagues to please join me in expressing our appreciation to these two nations and their Ambassadors, who continue to advance democratic principles.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 10, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED
SEPTEMBER 16

- 10 a.m.
Committee on Environment and Public Works
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the cause, response, and impacts of EPA's Gold King Mine spill.
SD-406
- Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings to examine achieving the promise of health information technology, focusing on improving care through patient access to their records.
SD-430
- Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings to examine regulatory reform proposals.
SD-342
- 10:15 a.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
To hold hearings to examine reforming the Electronic Communications Privacy Act.
SD-226
- 2:15 p.m.
Committee on Indian Affairs
To hold an oversight hearing to examine EPA's Gold King Mine disaster, focusing on the harmful impacts to Indian country.
SD-628
- 2:30 p.m.
Committee on Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine S. 290, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the accountability of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 563, to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing shortages and long appointment waiting times, S. 564, to amend title 38, United States Code, to include licensed hearing aid specialists as eligible for appointment in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1450, to amend title 38, United States Code, to allow the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to modify the hours of employment of physicians and physician assistants employed on a full-time basis by the Department of Veterans Affairs, S. 1451, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to adjudicate and pay survivor's benefits without requiring the filing of a formal claim, S. 1460, to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend the Yellow Ribbon G.I. Education Enhancement Program to cover recipients of the Marine Gunnery Sergeant John David Fry scholarship, S. 1693, to amend title 38, United States Code, to expand eligibility for reimbursement for emergency medical treatment to certain veterans that were unable to receive care from the Department of Veterans Affairs in the 24-month period preceding the furnishing of such emergency treatment,

S. 1856, to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for suspension and removal of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs for performance or misconduct that is a threat to public health or safety and to improve accountability of employees of the Department, S. 1938, to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the approval of certain programs of education for purposes of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and other pending calendar business.

SR-418

SEPTEMBER 17

10 a.m.

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Adam J. Szubin, of the District of Columbia, to be Under Secretary for Terrorism and Financial Crimes, Department of the Treasury.

SD-538

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Subcommittee on Primary Health and Retirement Security

To hold hearings to examine biosimilar implementation, focusing on a progress report from FDA.

SD-430

Committee on the Judiciary

Business meeting to consider S. 1814, to withhold certain Federal funding from sanctuary cities, S. 32, to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and the nominations of John Michael Vazquez, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey, Wilhelmina Marie Wright, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota, and Paula Xinis, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

SD-226

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 10, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. YOUNG of Iowa).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 10, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID YOUNG to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Brian Pate, one of his secretaries.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF THOSE LOST ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in memory of those lost in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001.

It is hard to believe that so many years have passed since the tragic events of 9/11, since the sadness and loss are so fresh for many throughout this Nation.

The attacks on the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and my home State of Pennsylvania stand as the most cowardly and senseless acts of terrorism ever perpetrated against the United States and its citizens.

My family and I continue to solemnly offer our thoughts and prayers for those who were impacted that day.

We also salute those who came to aid, those who rushed into the World Trade Center before the towers fell, the first responders at the Pentagon, and the passengers who made the ultimate sacrifice, downing United Flight 93 in Somerset County before it could reach its intended destination.

Among those who lost their lives in the attack on the World Trade Center in New York City was Mary Ellen Tiesi. Mary Ellen was a native of Irvona, Clearfield County, and was working in the South Tower on that morning 14 years ago.

Family members have said that, after the attack, Mary Ellen was exiting the stairs of the tower with a friend.

She stopped to wait for her boss, who she knew had a heart condition. Her boss eventually took the elevator, but Mary Ellen continued down the stairs.

She did not make it out of the building and was the only Clearfield County native to lose her life in the attacks in New York. Three years ago the Pennsylvania Route 53 bridge in Irvona was renamed in her memory.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of the kindness Mary Ellen Tiesi showed for her coworker on one of the worst days our Nation has ever known. Let us never forget the thousands like Mary Ellen who truly embody the undying resolve of the American people.

WILDFIRES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I concluded my summer tour of Oregon at the fire control center on the Warm Springs Indian reservation.

Summer was an amazing time in my State. Smoke enveloped downtown Portland and drifted all the way for 270 miles to the south in Medford. As I drove past, into central Oregon, the Crater Lake National Park consumed 25 square miles.

Throughout the West, 8.5 million acres have already been burned this year. And like we hear almost every year, the 2015 fire season is one of the worst on record.

We should acknowledge the amazing men and women who are on the front lines and the tremendous strain they bear.

We need so many people that we have actually had active military personnel brought online for the first time in a

decade. Even firefighters from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada have come to assist in these efforts.

One cannot say enough about the tremendous bravery and sheer hard work involved on so many levels with the men and women who are literally putting their lives on the line for this heroic fight.

But it is important to note that we are not just decimating our forests. We are decimating the Forest Service budget. The portion of the overall budget spent on fighting wildfires has grown in the last 20 years from 16 percent to over one-half, 52 percent.

Because Congress refuses to treat wildfires like other natural disasters, the Forest Service budget is being consumed, squeezing out other critical areas, not just maintaining these special places and trails and recreational opportunities, but even the efforts that would deal with forest health and reduce the danger and the cost of future firefights.

The trend is that two-thirds of the budget in the next 10 years will be firefighting. Absolutely, totally unacceptable.

These fires ought to be treated like any other natural disaster, not decimate our ability to manage our national forests.

The people dealing with these megafires know that part of the problem is climate change making itself felt. Less than 2 percent of these megafires consume almost one-third of the total fire suppression costs because our forests are drier.

There is less snow and rainfall, one more graphic reminder of the devastating impact of climate change, with higher temperatures and less water.

It is past time that Congress steps up to reduce carbon emissions. Perhaps the Pope in 2 weeks will inspire us to do something about climate change.

But, in the meantime, we should at least pass H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Act—bipartisan legislation introduced on the very first day of this Congress, but languishing in committee—that would treat megafires like other natural disasters, not discriminate against the Forest Service.

One final point is that we should stop making the problem worse by allowing more and more people to move into the fire zone in the wildland-urban interface and give these people the illusion that somehow they are going to be provided with urban-level fire protection. Sixty percent of the new homes since 1990 have been built in the flame zone.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

We should stop this madness because we are putting more people at risk not just to their properties and their families, but also the men and women who fight forest fires to protect structures.

Remember the 19 hotshots who were killed in Arizona a couple years ago who lost their lives trying to save homes that probably shouldn't have been there in the first place?

Commonsense budgeting, fighting climate change, and reasonable land use will reduce costs, protect lives, and allow us to begin spending money on prevention, which will, in turn, reduce further costs. It more than pays for itself.

Sensible budgeting, prevention, sound land use planning, will protect people and our forests, along with our budgets, while we start our long overdue actions to reduce carbon pollution.

It is time that Congress steps up to start addressing these problems now. This is not rocket science.

MINNESOTA'S BEST BAGGER GOES TO THE SIXTH DISTRICT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lauren Gillson of St. Cloud for her first place win in the Minnesota Grocers Association 2015 Best Bagger Contest, which took place at the Mall of America last month.

I would also like to commend the Minnesota Grocers Association for hosting this competition. It demonstrates how much value they place on providing excellent customer service.

Anyone who visits a grocery store will understand just how crucial a bagger's role is to the industry. They are, by far, one of the most memorable employees in the store, as they are the last person to be in contact with the customer. A bagger can often make or break the customer's overall experience.

Lauren competed against nine others before winning first place. Her win is truly impressive, as she has only worked at Lunds & Byerlys in St. Cloud for less than a month.

I wish Lauren good luck as she competes in the 2016 National Grocers Association Best Bagger Championship this February.

LIVE UNTIL THE DAY YOU DIE

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim Davis for all that he has done to help those affected by cancer.

Over the past 4 months, Jim has flown throughout the continental United States and given free plane rides to cancer survivors and patients. By sharing his passion for flying, Jim has brought comfort and everlasting memories to these individuals in their time of need.

What truly is amazing about Jim's story is that he is going through a similar situation as the people he is helping.

After being diagnosed with liver cancer and given just 9 months to live, Jim decided that he wasn't going to give up. Instead, he made it his mission to help others affected by this terrible disease.

Jim has said, "Some people get a cancer diagnosis and just sit and wait to die. Not me. I want to live. Cancer patients, live until the day you die."

Jim, I want to thank you for your amazing acts of kindness. I am in awe of your positive attitude and capacity for helping others.

MINNESOTA IS PROUD OF HER VETERANS

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the individuals from my district who were recently recognized for Veterans' Voices Awards.

I am proud to recognize State Representative Bob Dettmer of Forest Lake, Minnesota; Ralph Donais of Elk River; Jim Tuorila of St. Cloud; Megan Allen of Ramsey; Scott Glew of Elk River; and Shelby Marie Hadley of Rice.

These awards are given to individuals who have nobly served their country in the Armed Forces and gone on to volunteer in their communities after returning home.

Each one of these incredible men and women, chosen by the Minnesota Humanities Center, has positively impacted the United States and Minnesota's Sixth District in a major way.

There is so much to thank these individuals for. Thank you for defending our country and for realizing that there was still so much to be accomplished once you returned home. Your work has not gone unnoticed, and we are forever grateful.

THREE AMERICAN HEROES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the three young men from Sacramento County who have deep roots in my district and whose quick thinking onboard a train to Paris saved lives and inspired our country.

Alek Skarlatos, Anthony Sadler, and Spencer Stone sprang into action to stop a man wielding a gun and a box cutter onboard their train. The childhood friends were on vacation when the gunman burst into their cabin.

As an Oregon Army National Guardsman, Army Specialist Alek Skarlatos had recently returned from a tour in Afghanistan. He was the first to sound the alarm, telling his friends, "Let's go," as they moved to subdue the gunman.

Anthony Sadler, a senior at Sacramento State University, and Airman

First Class Spencer Stone of the United States Air Force acted without hesitation.

Stone was slashed while trying to disarm the man, but the injury did not stop him. After subduing the gunman, the trained EMT went on to help treat other injured passengers.

These men showed bravery as they put themselves in harm's way to save those around them. Today I commend them and recognize their great service.

A parade in their honor will be held tomorrow in Sacramento. The date September 11 is fitting. They will be welcomed home and honored for their heroism. The story of these three men is a reminder that everyone can be a hero.

Thank you, Alek, Anthony, and Spencer. You have made your hometown proud, and you have made the United States proud.

REFUGEES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to the tragic humanitarian crisis currently underway with the migration of refugees from Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey making their way into Western Europe.

With the unfolding of the horrific conflict in Syria and the continuing grotesque violence of ISIS, we can only expect that hundreds of thousands more will attempt to flee hostile regions for the safety of Europe and beyond.

Since 2011, at least 4 million Syrians have fled their country, uprooting their families to escape brutal violence and miserable living conditions.

□ 1015

However, the refugees' plight for a safe environment since leaving Syria and escaping to Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey has been bleak.

In just the last few days, we have seen heartbreaking images of refugees making the difficult journey to enter European countries, sometimes paying with their lives. These migrants and refugees will do anything for a better future.

I was proud to see the leadership of Angela Merkel in Germany accepting so many of these people in need. I strongly encourage all European Union countries to follow Chancellor Merkel's lead in welcoming these migrants and refugees and also supporting Germany's efforts in ensuring this undertaking is spread across the continent.

Most importantly, the United States must also offer any humanitarian assistance we can to ensure these vulnerable refugees have all available resources to return to a sense of normalcy. The world must step up, and I

hope this Congress will play a role in the process of assisting these refugees.

Mr. Speaker, the conflict in Syria is one of the great blemishes on human history. Approximately 250,000 people have been killed. This administration said early on that Bashar al-Assad had to go. Nothing happened. The administration then said that, if Mr. Al-Assad used chemical weapons, then he really had to go. The dictator did, gassing innocent people, including children, and the world did nothing.

This is a heavy burden we carry now, and that is why it is essential that we do everything we can to assist these refugees. My parents were refugees; my grandparents were refugees, and the United States took us in and gave us an opportunity. The world must also now account for our failure in Syria and do everything we can to help these innocent people.

WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION DAY

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize today, September 10, as World Suicide Prevention Day. Anyone who has been impacted by the horrible tragedy of a suicide, whether it be a family member, friend, or colleague, is well aware of the devastating impact when one person they love takes their own life.

It is critical that we continue the conversation about not only suicide, but mental health issues as well. People of all ages, races, and socioeconomic status can be plagued with mental health problems, and we must ensure those who are suffering receive the proper diagnosis and treatment.

In addition, communities must work together to foster understanding rather than judgment. If you or a loved one is experiencing difficulties, I encourage you: Please, take the time to seek counseling from a professional.

Every life is worth living, and every life is precious. Let's come together to support our friends and neighbors and work to address mental illness and prevent suicide.

MADURO BORDER CLOSING

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it was recently announced by Venezuela's de facto dictator, Nicolas Maduro, that the single remaining border crossing with Colombia will be completely bolted.

This action is only the latest example of Maduro's weak attempts to search for phantom scapegoats of his regime's failed economic policies. The figment of Maduro's imagination is Colombians are the cause of food shortages, the collapse of the Venezuelan currency, and his country's rampant crime. As a result, the Venezuelan dictator has ordered the border between Colombia and Venezuela closed.

Colombians living in Venezuela have been unlawfully arrested and have had their homes bulldozed, leaving them with no other option but to flee; but with the latest and final border clo-

sure, Colombians are forced to return to their home country using very dangerous routes. This has been dubbed a humanitarian crisis by the United Nations.

Make no mistake, this crackdown by Maduro is a sick and twisted attempt to distract the Venezuelan electorate from Caracas' failed socialist and anti-democratic policies ahead of the December elections.

Unfortunately, the horrible suffering these policies have caused for both Colombian refugees and the Venezuelan people are all too real.

WATER AND DROUGHT IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, as we come back from the August recess, I would like to speak on an issue that hits very close to home and to the Southwestern States—yes, the Southwestern States—and this is the drought.

The drought in particular that is facing California is the worst one recorded in history in our State, and I believe it will define this era.

My home State is entering its fourth year of consecutive drought, with nearly 93 percent of residents experiencing severe droughts, and there is no foreseeable end in the future.

The lack of water in California is so serious that our Governor Jerry Brown declared a state of emergency and asked that all residents cut back on water 25 percent. Even with us hitting that, a recent study estimates that it will take at least 11 million gallons of water to replenish our drought losses.

Water conservation and infrastructure is a life or death issue, not just for the residents of my district, but for all of California. Without water infrastructure, farmers in the Central Valley cannot adequately grow and sell their crops; the price of foodstuff skyrocketed; wildfires rage and destroy acres of property; State energy production is crippled; the economy slows; and the list goes on and on.

While other areas of California are just now setting the initial framework for water conservation and recycling projects, my home district recycles almost 70 percent of the water that we use both in business and at home.

How are we able to do that? Well, when I came here 19 years ago, I championed a project called the Groundwater Replenishment System, and it is located in Orange County. It is the water table underneath our homes.

This system recycles treated waste water into clean drinking water, which exceeds Federal and State standards; and it has produced over 160 trillion gallons of new water and serviced mil-

lions of Orange County residents since its creation.

This system has become the largest reclamation project in the world. In fact, people from around the world and from across our great States come to take a look at how we replenish our water supply.

Legislation to fund projects like our groundwater replenishment system—well, it should be commonsense to fund those. However, the drought has continued in the past 4 years, and there has been no meaningful action on infrastructure improvements to move water, to reclaim water, to save water.

While residents of California are feeling the effects of our historic drought, this Chamber continues to stall on meaningful drought relief and water infrastructure legislation. Back in my home district, I have held numerous briefings about the drought and recognized community members who are cutting back and being more efficient with their water.

I recently spent part of this August recess meeting with community members of the Central Valley to discuss water storage and recycling projects.

In this Congress, I have cosponsored the Drought Recovery and Resilience Act of 2015. It is commonsense legislation which addresses innovative water financing, it improves water infrastructure and water management, and it assists in planning for future droughts.

The residents of my State have been doing their part to conserve the water; so now, it is time for Washington, D.C., to help us to do what is right for California and to do what is right for the other Southwestern States.

While the House Republicans are bickering amongst themselves to avoid another embarrassing government shutdown, I will continue to fight for meaningful water infrastructure to secure the water independence of future generations because with water comes growth and California will grow.

HONORING TYRELL CAMERON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Tyrell Cameron, a young man from northeast Louisiana whose life was cut tragically short in an accident on the football field last Friday night.

Tyrell was a bright student at Franklin Parish High School with a promising future, surrounded by a supportive and loving community.

I live about 20 miles from the high school. I consider Winnsboro an extension of my home. I know their people well. I know that this is a strong community that supports each other, helps each other, and loves each other.

As Tyrell's family and friends come to grips with this tragedy, we will mourn; we will grieve, and then we will start the healing process.

While we pray for Tyrell, his family, his teammates, and Franklin Parish, I also ask that you keep the Sterlington community in your prayers. They were on the other sideline during the game, and I know this has been a difficult experience for them as well.

Louisiana is a special place. We love our high school football. Our young men play with heart for their schools every Friday night. As competitive as it can get, we know what is most important. I have been so impressed with the outpouring of support for Tyrell and Franklin Parish that has come from high schools throughout the entire State of Louisiana.

Many local teams will wear Tyrell's number, number 48, on their helmets for the remainder of the season. That says a lot to me about the strong character of our young men back home.

Others like me are wearing blue today, his team color, to honor Tyrell, just as his teammates are doing this week also.

My thoughts and prayers are both with Franklin Parish and Sterlington communities, and I encourage them to keep playing for Tyrell.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. KELLY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, time and time again, I have come to this floor to urge my colleagues to stand with me against the rampant plague of gun violence spreading across our Nation, and I stand here again heartbroken.

I recently had the difficult and tragic duty of speaking at Tamara Sword's funeral. Tamara was the mother of five and the daughter of Chicago gun violence prevention advocate Andrew Holmes, a personal hero of mine.

Andrew is a man who has dedicated his life to preventing gun violence and supporting families of gun violence victims. For decades, he has traveled to hundreds of crime scenes to console those who lost friends and family members. In a cruel twist of fate, he was the one who needed consoling when Tamara was caught in the crossfire while at a gas station.

I wish Tamara's story was an exception, but we know it is not. It is a tragic reminder that only in America does an everyday trip to the gas station, the movie theater, or church end in gun violence or maybe you are a reporter and a photographer just doing your job or a sheriff filling your car with gas.

All across America, gun violence is surging. More than 30 cities are reeling from a summer of senseless shootings, with death tolls reaching historic lev-

els. In Chicago last week, we marked the highest number of gun homicides in a single day in more than a decade.

After each mass shooting, Congress launches into its ritual that is used as an end run around real reform. We give our speeches; we hold our moments of silence, and then we wait for the national buzz to fade.

My colleagues seem to forget that our actions may fade, but the violence remains. Violence—gun violence—is a major public health problem in the United States. Every moment that we don't act, we risk losing even more lives to senseless gun violence, which might be homicides, suicides, or accidents.

Last week, I hosted a dinner for a group of parents who lost their children to senseless gun violence. They think we simply do not care. They wonder. There has been Newtown; there is Hadiya Pendleton; there is the church shooting, movie theaters, the mall, but still, we do nothing.

Today, I rise again on behalf of victims of gun violence. I rise to say that we can no longer dismiss the mass shootings as isolated incidents and ignore everyday shootings altogether because the fact is, when our Nation is averaging one mass shooting a day, they aren't so isolated. When shootings are so commonplace that they are called everyday shootings, they cannot be ignored.

□ 1030

Over the Labor Day weekend, 9 people were killed and 34 were wounded by gun violence in Chicago. It is time that we own up to the gun violence problem that is gripping our Nation and robbing us of a generation of young people one shooting at a time.

This year, for the first time in history, gun deaths are on pace to be the leading cause of death of Americans aged 15 through 24, and the suicide rate is climbing, also. The future of our Nation is hanging in the balance here.

It is time for Congress to act. There are a number of gun violence reform bills that truly make sense and that are truly bipartisan.

I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people and to take action, because the American people are on the side of gun violence reform that makes sense.

The other thing you can do is to try attending a funeral of an innocent person—of a mom of five kids, who cling onto her coffin, or of a young teen who lost his life to senseless gun violence. I wonder how you would feel then.

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, as we have heard so far during debate on

the Iran Joint Plan of Action, there are dozens of shortcomings and concerns when it comes to this administration's nuclear deal—the so-called P5+1. No doubt, we will hear dozens more before all is said and done.

The more we study this agreement—Republican or Democrat—the clearer it is to see that it does not measure up to its ultimate goal: to prevent a nuclear Iran.

The essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology sunset in as soon as 10 years, leaving an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program with breakout times shrinking down to nearly zero—and that is if Iran doesn't cheat—but we will have a tough time knowing because what was "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iranian nuclear sites has now become "managed access," leaving Iran as long as 24 days to scrub sites, enough time to nearly completely remove incriminating evidence of wrongdoing or the option of self-reporting compliance in places like their military base at Parchin.

However, what this deal does accomplish is to precipitate a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—a reality we are already seeing as nations like Egypt, Jordan, and Saudi Arabia have already begun building up their nuclear infrastructure in response.

Any of those details should be enough to reject this deal, but that would not even mention the most objectionable portion: that this good-faith agreement with the world's largest state sponsor of terror frees up hundreds of billions of dollars in economic sanctions and frozen assets seemingly without any regard for what that money will be used for.

Mr. Speaker, for the last 6 months, I have had the opportunity to chair the Task Force to Investigate Terrorism Financing, which is a bipartisan group that was established by both parties of the Financial Services Committee, to look into the increasing ability for terror groups to fund and finance their actions and to evaluate the United States' response to these challenges.

Specifically, the task force examined the impact of this nuclear agreement on Tehran's state sponsorship of terror proxies across the region.

What became abundantly clear was that the influx of hundreds of billions of dollars to Iran that have been authorized in this deal will increase that nation's ability to continue regional destabilization through the support of groups like Hamas, Hezbollah, Iraqi Shiite militias, the Houthis in Yemen, and Syrian President Bashar al-Assad's regime in Damascus.

This deal goes about rolling back sanctions while expert witnesses have testified before our task force, even as recently as yesterday, advocating for increased sanctions. There is a real disconnect here between what the experts

tell us and what the administration is doing.

Iran's budget already features a nine-figure line item to support terrorism, and there is no doubt that the activities it funds will expand Iran's radical efforts—a fact even acknowledged by the administration following negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, what we have today is a bad deal, one that clears the way for a nuclear Iran, that gravely endangers allies like Israel, and, with our blessing, that makes an already volatile, unstable Middle East less safe by giving Tehran more power to fund its terror syndicates.

What is so troubling to me is that a number of my colleagues, after 2 years of negotiations that have been predicated on no deal being better than a bad deal, have begrudgingly accepted a self-admitted bad deal solely because it is better than no deal.

A better deal would include, truly, "anytime, anywhere" inspections of Iran's entire nuclear program, a plan of action to oversee and manage any funds returning to Iran through sanctions relief or a return to the international banking community, the release of American prisoners improperly held by the regime, and a payment of the \$22 billion in compensation owed by Iran to families of September 11 victims, including Bucks County residents. The court judgments should be paid before Iran receives any funds under this agreement.

I urge them to reconsider what the reality of this bad deal means for the safety of the world and the future of our Nation's foreign policy.

I urge my colleagues to reject this deal because it is one that will have decades-long consequences to our national security.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING DEPUTY DARREN GOFORTH, HARRIS COUNTY SHERIFF'S OFFICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to Deputy Darren H. Goforth, 47 years old, who lost his life more than 10 days ago in Houston, Texas, in an execution-style killing, doing his job and serving his community.

Deputy Goforth was a Harris County Sheriff's Deputy and a man who loved his job. He loved his family, his daughter and his son, and he loved his beautiful wife. Might I share with you her words, Kathleen Goforth's:

"My husband was an incredibly intricate blend of toughness and gentility," she said in a statement following his tragic death.

He was fueling his vehicle at about 8:30 on a Friday night, and someone

came behind him—the individual now in custody—and, in execution style, killed him.

"There are no words for this," his wife said. "He was always loyal—fiercely so. He was ethical. The right thing to do is what guided his internal compass."

Of course, she wanted us to know, "If people want to know what kind of man he was, this is it. He was who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor," Goforth said in a statement.

She went on to say, "However, I am who was blessed so richly that I had the privilege of calling him my husband and my best friend."

To Kathleen and her family, Deputy Goforth was the best friends of all of us. He was the best friend of the community. He was the best friend of children whom he stopped and talked to or of young people whom he sought to inspire.

He was the best friend of his friends and neighbors, as was evidenced by the 11,000 people who attended his funeral. He was the best friend of law enforcement officers. He was the best friend of the integrity of what law enforcement and first responders are all about.

He was a young man, as we came to know during the eulogy and the various statements of friends and officers, who desired to be just a helper to anyone.

We were told that, even as he worked, his father had a business and, when he had his time off, he would go to that business and help his father.

We have come to understand that it was his mode of law enforcement to, again, protect and serve but to reach out even to talk to those who weren't even looking his way. It was our understanding that he was gentle and kind and had a great sense of humor and, yes, looked like he did a little baby-sitting as well.

So I rise today to speak to this Nation about this officer and to claim the time for ending senseless violence and to recognize that his life—Deputy Goforth's life—is a testament to the goodness of the American people and our citizens in Houston and Harris County. Certainly, all of our State and local and congressional officials were there to acknowledge our deepest sense of loss.

I want to thank the people of Harris County, when we see officers, for distributing 30,000 wristbands to pray for police. I went out to the gas pump where he was so heinously and tragically shot, and all of the flowers and notes and people raising money touched all of our hearts. Everyone stopped to pray and talk and hug.

I remember someone saying, "I am a conservative male, but I am so glad to see you here."

And I said, "My brother, I am glad to see you here. Can I hug you?" And we hugged because tragedy brings us to-

gether, but purpose should have us going forward. There should be a purpose as we lost this wonderful father and husband and law enforcement officer.

As the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, that is the very purpose that I am so excited about: this opportunity to talk about walking together, finding ways for solutions, and making sure that the life of a gentle, strong law enforcement person continues to have a presence in our lives through the way we handle our legislation and our coming together.

Foremost among these dangers, of course, are those who come upon officers in the line of duty. Just a week ago, an officer in Illinois faced an enormous tragedy and lost his life, but we realize that they understand that as they go to serve their communities.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials, the Nation—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security for all persons. It reminds us how much work we have to do and how much we are interwoven with our first responders and our law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago, I was at the 9/11 commemoration, the memorial, and it reminded me of the strength of Deputy Goforth. So I would simply say we honor them.

At this time, I will ask for a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow but an abiding admiration that I rise today to acknowledge the life and service of Deputy Darren Goforth of Houston, Texas.

Deputy Darren Goforth, a ten year veteran of the Harris County Sheriff's office, died on Friday, August 28, 2015, while refueling his patrol car.

He was shot fifteen times by a man who, by all accounts, never knew Darren Goforth and the light he brought into this world.

In a senseless act of violence, the love and care Darren Goforth gave to his wife, Kathleen and two young children, and the community he served, ended entirely too soon.

According to Kathleen Goforth her husband was an "intricate blend of toughness and gentility," a man who was fiercely loyal and always strived to do the right thing; a person "who you wanted for a friend, a colleague, and a neighbor."

May I add, Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth was what we want in an American.

Mr. Speaker, Darren Goforth's life is a testament to the goodness in the American people, but his death is a reminder of many difficult and painful truths.

Foremost among these are the dangers the men and women of our nation's law enforcement departments face every time they walk their beats and patrol their communities.

Their families, the persons who know them best and love them most, deserve to welcome them home at the end of each shift, safe and sound.

Mr. Speaker, we must confront the reality that police departments and the communities they protect are all too often adversarial.

We must all work together—law enforcement, community residents, public officials—to make our communities places where we trust one another and cooperate to achieve our mutual goal of safety and security of for all persons.

The murder of Deputy Goforth also reminds us that we must do more to stem the tide of gun violence that tears through this country.

Neither our country nor our hearts can afford to lose people of such quality as Darren Goforth to gun violence in the staggering quantities that we do.

Mr. Speaker, over 32,000 Americans die from gun violence each year.

So, while Darren Goforth's death is most certainly a tragedy, death by gun violence happens all too often in our country.

This normalcy of gun violence is inexcusable.

Mr. Speaker, according to media reports, the person who ended Deputy Goforth's wonderful life, struggled with mental illness for quite some time.

We absolutely have to do more to ensure that society's most dangerous weapons stay out of the hands of the most mentally or emotionally unstable persons.

It is important that we do this because it is estimated that 61.5 million Americans experience mental illness in a given year.

This is why we must, as a nation, attach as much importance and provide the same level of resources for mental health as we do for physical health.

We can no longer afford to ignore the struggles of nearly 20 percent of the population and fail to provide adequate treatment and services that could alleviate some of that struggle and prevent horrific events like the one that claimed the life of Deputy Darren Goforth.

Mr. Speaker, I stand here today mourning the loss of Deputy Darren Goforth but I have hope.

I have hope that out of this tragedy we will be moved to act to make this country safer for the men and women who risk their lives to keep their communities safe.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to observe a moment of silence in honor of Deputy Darren Goforth, an extraordinary human being and a shining example of what is meant when we remember him and say: "he was one of Houston's finest."

IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WILLIAMS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as this President comes closer to his final year in office, it is no secret that he only cares about shaping and molding his legacy.

When discussing the Iran deal last year, his Deputy National Security Advisor said to reporters: "This is probably the biggest thing President Obama will do in his second term on foreign policy. This is health care for us."

Four years earlier, that health care—ObamaCare—was described by our Vice President as a "big—explicative—deal," but only time will shape this President's legacy.

Seventy-five years ago, Winston Churchill proclaimed that Neville Chamberlain had a "precision of mind and an aptitude for business which raised him far above the ordinary levels of our generation."

Although this description is far too generous to describe our current President, who has no aptitude for business, Mr. Chamberlain was portrayed in a very different light than he is today. If he could be characterized in one word today, it would be "appeaser."

Regardless of his intellect, Mr. Chamberlain's incorrect decision to concede to Adolf Hitler's demands for the purpose of avoiding a conflict in Europe overshadowed anything else he ever accomplished as Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran deal, I believe, is President Obama's Chamberlain moment.

As the Associated Press reported 2 weeks ago, under this deal, Iran "will be allowed to use its own inspectors to investigate a site it has been accused of using to develop nuclear arms."

These reported "secret deals" acknowledge what many of us have known to be true and confirm what President Obama and his administration still deny—that this deal is based on trust.

This deal is based on trusting the Iranians in that they will not break their promise to build a nuclear bomb. How can we trust Iran's Supreme Leader, who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel"? How can we trust a Supreme Leader who said this week that Israel will not exist in 25 years?

As the former Democratic chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee appropriately said, this deal would be "the equivalent of having an athlete accused of using performance enhancing drugs submit an unsupervised urine sample."

Any deal with Iran must protect America's interests at home and abroad, and this deal does not.

As Israel's Prime Minister warned in his speech before this very Chamber only a few months ago, Iran's regime poses a grave threat not only to Israel, but to the peace of the entire world.

The President and his deal supporters have ignored these warnings. This deal will shift the balance of power in the Middle East. This deal goes against the wishes of Israel, our greatest ally in the region.

I challenge all of my Democratic colleagues who support this deal to come to the floor and look into the camera—and, quite frankly, look in the mirror—so, when history comes full circle, the American people will know who in this body let our Neville Chamberlain give Iran the bomb.

□ 1045

Despite the warnings from those within his own party and leaders of ally nations, this President has made it clear he is not concerned about the safety of Americans.

This President and his administration have made it clear they are not concerned about Israel. This President and his administration have made it well known that they are not concerned about the fate of the world. And this President and his administration are only concerned with the legacy they have in the future.

For that reason, I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is this President prepared to suffer the same legacy as Neville Chamberlain?

I urge President Obama and his administration to simply let their conscience be their guide.

In God we trust.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, well, I will look the camera in the eye and say why I am supporting this agreement. I think there is only one common thing that is agreed upon here in the House and in the Senate: that we don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons.

If the U.S. were to walk away from this deal and say we want to go back to the table, they will be sitting in an empty room, and the only people at the table will be U.S. representatives. There will not be any other nations from Europe, Russia, or China; and Iran won't be at the table either.

This is a deal that is not perfect. Sure, it is far from perfect. They say: Well, Iran could become a nuclear threshold state again in 10 or 12 years because of the way this agreement is written. If we walk away today, they are a nuclear threshold state; and they will build a bomb, and they will have it within 3 or 4 months. Then what?

Well, we do have options, of course. They are being recommended by Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu, all who were cheerleaders for the Iraq war and who were oh so wrong about the greatest foreign policy mistake in the history of the United States of America. But they learned nothing from that, and they think yet another war in the Mideast is a better solution than this.

Now what does Iran give up? Two-thirds of its centrifuges. They are allowed to keep the oldest, most primitive centrifuges. Ninety-seven percent of its enriched uranium stockpile will be gone. Their mine sites will be monitored 24/7. Their mill sites for uranium will be monitored 24/7. There will be an intrusive inspection regime. They have to fill in the core of the nearly finished Iraq reactor—which can take them on

the plutonium path to a bomb—with concrete and convert that to peaceful use.

Natanz, underneath the mountain that some would have us bomb—unfortunately, it is underneath the mountain—that will become a medical facility monitored 24/7. No. That is Fordow, excuse me, not Natanz. Yet we hear the drumbeat for war over here. They don't want to say they want to have a war, but that is the ultimate conclusion.

If you don't want Iran to have nuclear weapons, this is the best deal we can get, and we amazingly got this deal with the support of Russia, China, and four nations in Europe.

Now, they are already flooding into Iran in anticipation of this deal going forward. They have no intention of going back to the table. The Chinese want the oil. Russians want to sell them weapons. The planes have been totally full coming out of Europe with high-level corporate executives wanting to go into Iran and do business.

No. This is the only alternative before the United States Congress and the only one that can prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon in the short term. Yes, 12, 15 years down the road, we may have to deal with this again. Yet again, 12 or 15 years from now, under this regime, perhaps Iran will have changed. We will see.

So I am proud of this vote, and I think it is the best path. I am also incredibly proud of my vote against popular opinion and such sagacious people as Dick Cheney, John Bolton, and Benjamin Netanyahu about invading Iraq, which has turned the Middle East into an unbelievable mess that will not be undone in my lifetime. ISIS is basically a product of the Iraq war, an invasion by the U.S.

So let's not create even worse problems. Let's take this imperfect agreement, but let's take it because it prevents Iran from having a nuclear weapon and having a weapons race in this incredibly unstable part of the world.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. YODER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the people of the Third District of Kansas and on behalf of American people who are counting on us to put their security before the obvious partisan politics of Washington, D.C. I also join a bipartisan majority, leaders of each party in each Chamber, to stand up and be counted as one of the many voices in this country in opposition to the President's deal with Iran.

Like others who plan to oppose the ratification of this deal, I am not opposed to the idea of diplomacy, but I am opposed to the idea of surrender diplomacy. This administration asked us

to trust Iran; but as Iran continues to be the largest world state sponsor of terror, as they continue to shout "death to America" and call for our destruction and the obliteration of Israel, our greatest ally, how can we trust Iran?

With secret deals, side deals, and self-verification, this President's capitulation will lead to a nuclear Iran for the first time in history and an American endorsement of their efforts to get there.

Well, the Ayatollah has convinced the President that it only needs nuclear capacity for peaceful purposes. But why does Iran need nuclear capacity at all? Iran has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, totalling 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, totalling 1.193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

With such a robust energy sector, why should Iran, a nation that has consistently defied the international community on this issue, be granted the ability to proceed with a nuclear energy program? Why should we trust Iran? Have they earned the right to be trusted?

Simply put, Mr. Speaker, this is a gift to the ayatollahs of Iran. For starters, it releases hundreds of billions of dollars in assets to the regime in Iran, giving them a gift basket full of cash to flood terrorist organizations which seek to harm Americans and our allies.

The deal gives the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a stamp of legitimacy and the means to expand its destabilizing influence through massive amounts of sanctions relief, even before Iran has demonstrated full adherence to the deal's term. It does, however, bring home the four Americans being imprisoned in Iran.

When questioned as to why, this administration claims that it did not demand the release of American prisoners because it wanted to limit negotiations to just Iran's nuclear program.

On the contrary, Iran won key non-nuclear concessions through the process. The deal grants amnesty to Qasem Soleimani, the head of the Quds force in Iran's Revolutionary Guard, who is one of the world's most leading terrorist masterminds and the man thought responsible for the death of at least 500 United States troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.

It also lifts the conventional arms embargo on Iran in spite of public testimony from Secretary of Defense Ash Carter and Joint Chiefs Chairman Martin Dempsey that we should do so "under no circumstances."

Lifting this embargo means Iran can begin to stockpile conventional weapons, and Russia and China can begin to legally profit off major weapons exports to Tehran.

Yet perhaps the most troubling aspect of this deal is its inspections re-

gime. Gone are the anytime, anywhere inspections that were required by Congress and outlined by the administration. In its place, a 24-day notice period for Iran, combined with secret side deals that this Congress has no knowledge of and in which the proponents of the plan are happy to be blissfully ignorant.

Mr. Speaker, the proponents of this deal know that it does not make us safer or more secure. They know that we cannot trust Iran. They know that the verification process is weak and is built upon secret deals, they know we shouldn't lift the arms embargo, and they know that the hundreds of billions of dollars being released to the Ayatollah will end up on the battlefield in the hands of terrorists who will use it to kill Americans and our allies. Mr. Speaker, they know this is a bad deal.

I'm proud to have my name listed along with Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan majority opposing this deal.

Mr. Speaker, those who ignore history are doomed to repeat it. In 1994, we heard President Clinton sell his nuclear agreement with North Korea on many of the same talking points President Obama used in his speech to sell this deal with Iran. Yet in 2006, we watched as the North Koreans detonated a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, there is still time to stop this, and I urge—I beg—my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote against this deal so we aren't watching Iranians detonate their own bomb just a few years from now.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agreed to the following resolution:

S. RES. 250

In the Senate of the United States, September 9, 2015.

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker served in the United States Navy during World War II from 1944 to 1946;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker faithfully served the people of Pennsylvania with distinction in the United States Congress;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States House of Representatives in 1960 and served 4 terms as a Representative from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Representative, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Government Operations of the House of Representatives;

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was elected to the United States Senate in 1968 and served 2 terms as a Senator from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania;

Whereas as a Senator, Richard Schultz Schweiker served on—

(1) the Committee on Labor and Human Resources of the Senate;

(2) the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, and Human Services of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate; and

(3) the Select Committee to Study Governmental Operations with Respect to Intelligence Activities of the Senate; and

Whereas Richard Schultz Schweiker was appointed as the Secretary of Health and Human Services by President Ronald Wilson Reagan in 1981 and served as Secretary of Health and Human Services until 1983: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow and deep regret the announcement of the death of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker, former member of the United States Senate.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit an enrolled copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That when the Senate adjourns today, the Senate stand adjourned as a further mark of respect to the memory of the Honorable Richard Schultz Schweiker.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment in the decision by the House leadership to back off from a direct vote on a resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear accord as provided under the Corker Act.

Clearly, the President has not complied with the requirements of Corker to provide Congress with the full text of its agreement with Iran, most specifically, the side deals referenced in the agreement between Iran and the IAEA.

H. Res. 411, which declares the administration out of compliance with the Corker Act, is well-founded, but there is no reason to cancel the vote on the resolution disapproving the agreement as specified in the Corker Act and as promised by the House leadership for the last 6 weeks.

H. Res. 411 rightly disputes September 17 as the deadline for congressional action to stop this treaty from taking effect, and I support that resolution, but it cannot authoritatively settle this dispute. That leaves the deadline as an open question, and this House must not let that deadline pass without definite action as provided by Corker.

I oppose the act because it guts the Treaty Clause of the Constitution that requires treaties to be ratified by a two-thirds vote of the U.S. Senate. Despite the President's contention that

this is an agreement and not a treaty, the fact that it explicitly modifies the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty makes it obvious that it requires Senate ratification.

Unfortunately, the Congress overwhelmingly approved the Corker Act, establishing a very different framework with respect to this particular treaty. Instead of a two-thirds vote of the Senate to ratify it, Corker, in essence, requires two-thirds of both Houses to reject it through a resolution of disapproval, an almost impossible threshold.

Under Corker, the resolution of disapproval is the specific legal act required to reject this treaty. This is what the leadership had promised the House would vote on this week, until yesterday. Now we are to vote on a legally meaningless bill to approve the treaty that is expected to be voted down. It is specifically designed to have no legal effect but merely to give Members political cover.

Thus, the House will fail to take action on a resolution of disapproval called for under the Corker Act by the disputed September 17 deadline. On that deadline, the President will declare victory, implement the treaty, and the Congress will be left sputtering. The world will correctly interpret this dereliction as a capitulation by the House to this treaty. And years from now, maybe, possibly, the courts will intervene to declare the President's action illegal or maybe not.

Mr. Speaker, the House is right to dispute the September 17 deadline because clearly the President did not comply with provisions of Corker and provide the full text of the side agreements to the Congress; but the House is dead wrong to refuse to take action on the resolution of disapproval prior to the disputed deadline to assure that the House has spoken clearly, unambiguously, and indisputably according to the provisions of the Corker Act that the Congress, itself, enacted in May. Once it has acted, the House can still dispute whether the President's submission meets the requirements of Corker, but it will not have this momentous question dangling unresolved and in dispute.

The argument we hear for this course is that the Senate is unlikely to take up a resolution of disapproval; therefore, we should hold the President to the letter of Corker. Well, what the Senate does is up to the Senate; but for our part, the House has a moral obligation to act within the undisputed timeframe to legally reject this dangerous action by the President.

There is little doubt that this treaty will trigger a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. The leaders of Israel, Egypt, and Saudi Arabia have already made that abundantly clear. There is little doubt it is unverifiable.

There is no doubt it will release \$150 billion of frozen assets to Iran with

which it can finance its terrorist operations and continue its nuclear research.

□ 1100

I fear the Iran nuclear agreement may be just as significant to the fate of the 21st century as the Munich Agreement was to the 20th century. The American people and the world deserve a clear, unambiguous, and indisputable act of the House to repudiate this act. What the House leadership is now pursuing falls far short of this moral imperative.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. BARR) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, last month, I traveled to Israel with more than 35 of my colleagues to meet with key leaders in that country, including Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand what our closest ally in the Middle East thinks about the proposed Iran nuclear agreement, also known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 countries and Iran.

The consensus view from the Israelis across the political spectrum, from the Prime Minister to the opposition leader in the Knesset, Isaac Herzog, from the President of the State of Israel, Reuven Rivlin, to the military leaders in the Israeli Defense Forces, they all agree that the deal negotiated by Secretary Kerry and championed by President Obama is a dangerous and historic mistake.

This confirms what we have learned in briefings and hearings in Congress. This deal will not deliver the safety and security the American people deserve. Instead, it will transform Iran from the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism with an illicit nuclear program into the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism awash in billions of dollars in sanctions relief with an internationally sanctioned nuclear program on an industrial scale.

This is not just a bad deal for Israel. This is not just a bad deal for America. A nuclear Iran is a global threat to everyone everywhere. Consider the counterparty to this deal. Since the seizure of the U.S. Embassy and the taking of 52 American hostages during the 1979 revolution, the Islamic Republic of Iran has taken the long view on its global ambitions of exporting its revolution, supporting terrorist proxies like Hamas, Hezbollah, Houthis, and Boko Haram.

The Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and the leader of its elite Quds Force, Qasem Soleimani, is responsible for the killing of over 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

The Iranian regime has covered up and lied about its nuclear program for

decades, deceiving international inspectors, agreeing to intrusive inspections, and then allowing those inspections to be implemented only provisionally and selectively. Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, regularly chants "death to America" and openly calls for the annihilation of the Jewish people and the destruction of Israel.

In Jerusalem, we visited the Yad Vashem Holocaust memorial museum. There, we saw exhibits recounting the horrifying images of the Holocaust. During our visit with Prime Minister Netanyahu, he made a profound observation. He said they compare this to the 1930s.

This is not like the 1930s. In the 1930s, the Nazis concealed their intentions for the Jewish people in the Holocaust. Here, they are actually telling us. They are telling us what they want to do to the Jewish people and death to the Great Satan. Let's not give them the tools to actually carry it out.

The President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections has been replaced with managed access to suspect nuclear sites in which international inspectors must appeal to Iran, Russia, and China. This bureaucratic process could take up to 24 days at least, during which Iran would remove anything covert or in violation of the agreement.

The Associated Press now reports that at least one of two secret deals between the IAEA and Iran—secret deals neither Congress nor even the Secretary of State has been allowed to see—allows Iran to use its own inspectors at the military complex long suspected as the headquarters of Iran's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile program.

Given the Iranian regime's past behavior and contempt for U.S. negotiators it knows are weak, there is little doubt Iran will cheat and dare the Obama administration to find violations which prove the very deficiencies of the deal it negotiated.

Even if Iran does not cheat, even if Iran actually complies with the deal, three bad outcomes are guaranteed. First, Iran will be allowed an arsenal—not a bomb—an arsenal of nuclear weapons in as little as 10 years.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology, is permitted to retain vast enrichment capacity, may continue research and development on advanced centrifuges, and will be allowed to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles in as little as 8 years. Intercontinental ballistic missiles—those are not for Tel Aviv; those are for Washington, D.C., and New York.

Second, Iran gets sanctions relief, at least \$56 billion almost immediately, and that is according to the Obama administration itself. Independent analysis projects the relief could be as much as \$150 billion. As a member of

the Task Force to Investigate Terrorist Financing, I have heard extensive testimony that, when these funds are released, a significant percentage will go to Iran's terrorist proxies in Gaza, Lebanon, Iraq, Yemen, Nigeria, and elsewhere. Experts warn it will be impossible to snap back effective sanctions.

Third, because Iran's neighbors know this deal reverses a decades-long bipartisan U.S. policy blocking Iran's nuclear program, this agreement will spark a nuclear arms race in the broader Middle East. Turkey, Saudi Arabia, and Egypt have already signaled their intent to acquire nuclear retaliatory capability if this deal is finalized. The people who know Iran the best trust them the least.

This President says it is this deal or war, but that is a false choice. Rejecting this deal will keep most sanctions in place and allow Congress and our allies to turn up the pressure on Iran to get a better deal. In fact, I signed a letter with 366 colleagues outlining the conditions we would consider to be part of a better deal, none of which were included in the one before us.

On the last night we were in Israel, one of the last nights, as we finished dinner at a restaurant on the Sea of Galilee, the owner of the restaurant took the microphone and announced that Members of the American Congress were here to stop this bad Iran deal. The whole restaurant stood up and sang "God Bless America."

To conclude, Mr. Speaker, on the Iran deal, I proudly stand with our allies in Israel, not with the mullahs in Tehran.

WHY THE IRAN AGREEMENT MUST BE OPPOSED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to just associate myself with the comments of my good friend from Kentucky, who was just up here and I think eloquently was giving a case as to why this deal with Iran is such a bad deal.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that the national security consequences of the nuclear agreement with Iran will haunt America for generations if Congress does not step in to stop it. This shouldn't be about party. It should not be about loyalty to the President because, if one thinks about this current President, whether you like him or don't like him, whether you agree with him or don't agree with him, this administration ends in 15 months, but the national security consequences of this deal will go on and haunt America for generations to come.

This deal, this agreement, needs to be evaluated on the substance and how it will impact America and will it make America safer.

Mr. Speaker, an overwhelming bipartisan majority of Americans and a bipartisan majority of this Congress are against this agreement. It makes America less safe. If it survives, it is only because the President was able to ram it through on a wholly partisan basis. That is not something to celebrate, Mr. Speaker. The fact that there is zero bipartisan support for this pact in the United States Congress further demonstrates just how dangerous this is for our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, in my very first speech on the floor of this House in 2011, I stated my belief that Iran was the greatest national security threat that we had. Today, I am even more committed that Iran is the greatest threat that we have to our own national security.

By proving that aggression and defiance will be rewarded, this agreement makes the world less safe and, tragically, war more likely. What are we saying to our neighbors? If Iran gets a nuclear weapon, surely its neighbors will go on a nuclear arms race as well and will make this dangerous part of the world even less safe than it already is, far more volatile.

These concerns have been bipartisan. According to Democratic Senator BOB MENENDEZ, this agreement doesn't end Iran's nuclear program, it preserves it. According to Democratic Senator CHUCK SCHUMER: "If Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement, it must simply exercise patience."

Simply put, this agreement won't block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. Instead, it leaves Iran's nuclear infrastructure intact and amounts to a containment strategy. Settling for only containing a nuclear Iran is a grave mistake that leaves the long-term safety of the United States and our allies vulnerable to nuclear blackmail by Iran.

We are all familiar with the basic reasons for why this reckless agreement should be opposed. The agreement relies on a sure-to-fail inspections regime that falls well short of anytime, anywhere inspections that are so critically needed. It fails to deliver on the commitment to dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

Iran actually receives a signing bonus that trades permanent sanctions relief for temporary limitations on its nuclear program. This will provide Iran, the world's greatest state sponsor of terror—and that is not up for debate; that is not disputed—with \$150 billion, which they will no doubt use to fund terror through their proxies in Hezbollah and Hamas, through Assad in Syria, and through cells in South and Central America—sunset provisions, which simply gives Iran a patient path to a nuclear weapon.

This agreement lifts conventional arms embargo in 5 years and ballistic

missile embargo in 8 years. Why were these even on the table, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I ask you: What do you use an intercontinental ballistic missile for? It is not to drop leaflets; it is not for humanitarian needs. It is to deliver a nuclear warhead to Washington, to New York, to Chicago.

I am perplexed because, Mr. Speaker, like many here in this body, I have three children, and they have children. We have constituents that are out there. I have a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old, and an 8-year-old. By the time my 8-year-old goes to college, she will not know a world without Iran having a nuclear weapon. The chants of "death to America" in the streets, at some point in time, we have to take their word that that is exactly what they want to do.

When we look at this agreement, this legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and provides Iran's illicit nuclear pursuit with international stamps of approval. This is what Iran has been desperately seeking; yet we have just handed it to them on a platter.

Let's remember, when the negotiations began, Iran was an isolated nation. Their economy was in ruins; they were under heavy sanctions and were outside the international community, but this process has ended with the administration isolating and hammering Israel and the administration coercing Congress to accept a deal by asserting that the United States would otherwise be blamed for it falling apart.

On August 5, the President gave a speech to promote the Iran agreement, and he delivered the following line, which had its intended effect of isolating Israel and minimizing her concerns. Because this is such a strong deal, he said, every other nation in the world has commented publicly, with the exception of the Israeli Government, that they have expressed their support.

I understand my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, but I do want to just note again that a nuclear-armed Iran is the greatest threat we have to our own national security going forward, and giving the international stamp of approval to them will make the world a less safe place and jeopardize the United States of America, our citizens, and our allies abroad.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 13 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Andrew Walton, Capitol Hill Presbyterian Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

As vacations and recesses draw to a close, we give thanks for the gift of rest and recreation afforded us while so many in our country and world have spent those same days in fear and suffering.

May we leave business as usual in the shadows of yesterday, seeking to shine with renewed purpose, inspired wisdom, and transformative action.

May every person associated with these Halls of power remember their calling as public servants to humbly hold the hopes, dreams, and trust of people from every walk of life in every State, city, town, village, and neighborhood of our country and world.

As numerous streams of opinion, interest, and need flow into the procedures, process, and decisions of this day and days ahead, may there be wisdom and patience to allow them to find their way to pools and ponds of peace, rivers of mercy, and eventually oceans of compassion and common good for all people.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN DEAL: NOT VERIFIABLE, ENFORCEABLE, OR ACCOUNTABLE

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is a clear fact that these are dangerous times and that the regime in Iran is a dangerous threat to world peace. The President's legacy of failed policies of weakness has led to the Middle East in chaos, with refugee families fleeing for their lives and many drowning at sea.

It is not too late to stop a bad situation from getting even worse. A nuclear-armed Iran is a threat to every country everywhere. We need a deal that is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

Is it verifiable? No. Because of secret deals, it will be the Iranians who get to certify whether or not they are complying.

Is it enforceable? No, because the sanctions that have been effective in forcing them to the bargaining table will be lifted. Iran will then have the money it needs to complete its nuclear programs, missile development, and expand their funding of terror. With future terrorist attacks, media should trace the funding to determine if the source is from this deal.

Is it accountable? No, because the deal permits Iran to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges to enrich uranium.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

KEO 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION ON FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 50th anniversary of the Kauai Economic Opportunity, a non-profit multiagency known as KEO.

For half a century, this agency has been providing services to thousands of Kauai residents in need, to ease the pain of poverty, and to help them achieve self-sufficiency. As the only human services organization on that island, they have been a lifeline for low-income families and individuals who are looking for a second chance. In the past year alone, KEO has assisted over 5,000 individuals with housing, education, food, medical services, legal services, child care, transportation, disaster preparedness, employment opportunities, and so much more.

I would like to say mahalo nui loa to CEO MaBel Ferreiro-Fujiuchi, Chair Brenda Viado, the board members, staff, volunteers, and everyone else who selflessly dedicated their time, attention, and aloha to ensure the people of Kauai always have a friend to help them in their time of need.

STOP THE BARRIERS OF OUR FOREST SERVICE

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, well, once again, with the end of a summer vacation that still has, in California and the West, the onset of fire season, California has seen twice the number of acres of trees burned so far this year, and fire season is far from over.

While we are working to pass reforms to return responsible management to our national forests, the work doesn't stop when the fires are put out.

Every single day that a tree lies dead on the floor of the forest means it loses more and more of its salvage value and then becomes a cost of the taxpayers to remove later, and it is also more dangerous fuel for the next fire.

It is imperative that the Forest Service act rapidly to salvage these downed trees and conduct replanting and forest recovery or we will simply end up with more fuel on the ground the next time an area burns.

While the Forest Service estimates there are 12 million dead trees already in the Sierra Nevada, virtually no work is being done to remove these dead trees from these forests. We must stop the barriers to getting the work done that is needed for our forests to be healthy and safe.

JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

(Mr. MOULTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to ask a simple question of those who oppose the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Can you show me a viable alternative to this agreement that will lead to tougher international sanctions on Iran and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon?

Scholars and diplomats, including President Bush's Iran negotiator, Ambassador Nicholas Burns, have stated before Members of this very body that there is no way we will be able to keep Russia, China, and India in the sanctions regime if we reject this agreement. We tried secondary sanctions in 1996, and they failed. Our European allies have made it clear that, should the United States reject this agreement, we are on our own.

Despite these facts, it baffles me that some of my colleagues have concluded that, by rejecting this agreement, we can somehow get a better deal with less leverage.

No deal is perfect, especially one negotiated among adversaries, but the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the best option we have on the table today. This agreement puts the United States in a better position to confront the Iranian regime's threat to world peace.

OPPOSITION TO THE PRESIDENT'S EXECUTIVE AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the President's proposed agreement with Iran.

Iran is the world's number one state sponsor of terrorism. They support the murderous Assad regime in Syria, they support Hezbollah terrorists in Lebanon, and they support the Houthi rebels in Yemen. Iran-backed militias have killed American troops in Iraq.

Negotiation is founded upon trust, and there can be no trust for the mullahs who run Iran. To quote Nobel Peace Prize winner Elie Wiesel: "Regimes rooted in brutality must never be trusted. And the words and actions of the leadership of Iran leave no doubt as to their intentions."

In March, I joined with 366 of my fellow Members of Congress, including 130 Democrats, in a letter to President Obama. We agreed that any deal with Iran must last for multiple decades and include full disclosure of Iran's past nuclear pursuits with anytime, anywhere inspections for verification. This agreement does not meet these standards.

For these and many other reasons, we must not support it.

POPE FRANCIS

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, Pope Francis will address this body in a joint session this month, and I join my colleagues on both sides of the aisle when I say I am eager to receive the Holy Father's message of peace as a reminder of where our priorities should be in our work here in the House.

As the Pope explained earlier this year in an encyclical, becoming a better steward of our environment should be a priority for all of us.

The leader of the Catholic Church accurately points out that it is a moral imperative to care for others and the gifts we have been given by addressing climate change, and addressing it now. It is time to work together to better protect our environment and build a culture of stewardship.

I thank Pope Francis for his focus on this issue, and I hope the words he will share in 2 weeks ring true with all of us, including those who continue to deny climate change, both in this body and around the world. For having the wisdom to change one's mind and evolve in thought is a blessing.

I hope the Pope's encyclical will encourage deniers to work with us to find creative ways to clean up our environ-

ment, help create jobs, and make our world just a little bit better and more peaceful for our kids and our grandkids.

RECOGNIZING DR. VICKI RUIZ

(Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of Dr. Vicki Ruiz, a distinguished professor of history and Chicano/Latino studies at the University of California, Irvine.

Dr. Ruiz is also the president of the American Historical Association, and was most recently named a recipient of the 2014 National Humanities Medal. The National Humanities Medal is awarded to those who have deepened the country's understanding of humanities and broadened citizens' engagement with history, literature, languages, and philosophy.

This afternoon, Dr. Ruiz will be one of only 10 honorees from top universities to receive this prestigious award from President Obama. In fact, Dr. Ruiz is the first faculty member of UCI to receive the National Humanities Medal.

As the first in her family to earn an advanced degree, Dr. Ruiz began her work at UCI in 2001. In 2008, she was named Dean of Humanities, and currently chairs the Department of Chicano/Latino Studies in the School of Social Sciences.

Please join me in recognizing Dr. Ruiz as she receives this prestigious award today at the White House.

RESTORE HONOR TO SERVICE MEMBERS ACT

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on repealing Don't Ask, Don't Tell 4 years ago, we noted that gay and lesbian Americans have fought with distinction in every war in our Nation's history, which is true. But while they fought to protect us, we failed to protect them.

Over 100,000 Americans were discharged from the military between 1945 and 2011 solely because of their sexual orientation. These discharges were often less than honorable, which impacted their veterans benefits and served as a rebuke to their service and sacrifice.

We can and must do better.

The Department of Defense allows veterans who were discharged solely for their sexual orientation to petition for an upgrade to an honorable discharge. I encourage all of my colleagues to conduct research in their districts to inform veterans of this opportunity and to assist them in their applications.

Congress should pass the Restore Honor to Service Members Act, introduced by Senator KIRSTEN GILLIBRAND and Congressman MARK POCAN, to codify this opportunity for veterans to remove this insult from their records.

A good and grateful Nation owes these brave Americans nothing less.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. CRAWFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Iranian agreement's completion, its proponents have insisted that the deal is based on verification, not on trust. That is because Iran is not a country that can be trusted, evidenced by their funding of terror, detention of American citizens, and past attempts of secretive nuclear armament.

However, as details are continuing to be revealed, it is clear that negotiations were, in fact, based on trust. The verification this agreement hinges upon has been entrusted to the Iranians themselves, while objective inspections of their facilities can be delayed for weeks and weeks at a time. To top it all off, Congress still doesn't have access to the agreement in its entirety.

It is entirely naive for supporters of this agreement to trust an unstable, hostile theocracy to self-certify on nuclear weapons when the Federal Government doesn't even trust our own American citizens, farmers and ranchers, to self-certify on farm fuel storage.

I strongly encourage all attempts to disarm Iran, but the Ayatollah's aggressive actions and statements against the U.S. and our allies, particularly Israel, have shattered their credibility in the international community. And the President's threat to veto alterations to his deal confirms his personal commitment to his own legacy rather than the concerns of the American people and our closest allies.

Congress cannot accept the terms of this agreement which empower an untrustworthy and hostile nation in an already dangerously unstable region.

□ 1215

DIEZ Y SEIS PARADE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 50th celebration of the Diez y Seis parade in my hometown of Fort Worth, Texas.

In 1965, Juanita Salinas and Pauline Valenciano both recognized that Fort Worth did not have a public celebration for Mexico's Independence Day. Together, the organization that they worked with began organizing the parade as a way to celebrate this impor-

tant event for the Latin American community.

For the last five decades, their work has grown—and the celebration has, too—into one of the largest in the country for Hispanic heritage events. The hard work by the committee will be seen during this year's parade on September 12, which also will serve as the kickoff for National Hispanic Heritage Month.

I want to personally thank Juanita and her committee for their continued commitment to the Hispanic community in Fort Worth. I wish them their best on this 50th year.

RULE FOR IRAN DEAL

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian nuclear deal unacceptably lifts certain sanctions on individuals like:

Qasem Soleimani—in the middle—the current commander of Iran's Quds Force, who was responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American servicemen and -women in Iraq and that is right now leading Iran's efforts against the U.S.'s interests in the Middle East;

Ahmad Vahidi, the former Quds Force commander and defense minister, who is still wanted by Interpol for his role in the 1994 AMIA Jewish community center bombing in Buenos Aires, which claimed the lives of 85 people;

The former head of Iran's atomic energy agency who was sanctioned by the U.N. for his nuclear and ballistic missile activities;

Gerhard Wisser—right here—the German engineer who facilitated the sale of nuclear equipment to North Korea, Iran, and Libya;

Also, the former head of Iran's nuclear weapons program, who has been described as Iran's Dr. AQ Khan.

Mr. Speaker, this is just a brief sample of the many people who will have additional resources, access, and freedom to continue their terror and nuclear weapons activity as part of this unacceptable program. We can and must get a better nuclear deal.

REPUBLICAN DYSFUNCTION

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because I am disgusted and ashamed.

Instead of working to address our most pressing issues like jobs, the economy, long-term highway transportation funding, and a responsible budget, my Republican colleagues are meeting behind closed doors, scheming up

plans that delay our work here—putting our economy and our constituents' jobs at risk. It is past time that Republicans put the needs of the Americans before partisan politics.

American businesses that have what it takes to compete globally are being left behind because of the Republicans' refusal to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

The uncertainty placed on State and local governments by the Republicans' refusal to put forth a long-term highway funding bill is unconscionable. Let's not forget that we have yet to produce and pass a responsible budget. We cannot have a repeat of 2013 with our people out of work.

I urge my colleagues to put partisan politics aside, and let's do what we have been called here to do. Based on the latest antics, I can't tell if I am a freshman in high school or a freshman in Congress.

IRAN

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject President Obama's Iranian nuclear deal, which would lift sanctions on the regime before delivering any proof that it is acting in good faith to curb its nuclear program.

I continue to have concerns that this deal is dangerous and will simply delay Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. We should seek a strong deal to ensure that the current regime is never able to obtain a nuclear weapon.

This is not what we have been delivered by the negotiators. Sanctions against the regime are the reason they came to the negotiating table. We should negotiate from a position of strength and not surrender to removing sanctions before there is proof of compliance.

The President is attempting to sell the American public on a deal that provides billions of dollars that can be used to support Iran's clandestine activities, which will further destabilize the region. Any agreement must first advance our national security and the security of our allies.

A clear indicator of future performance is always past performance. Unfortunately, Iran has a decades-long history of misrepresentation when it comes to its nuclear program.

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZATION ACT

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we mark the 14th anniversary of the 9/11 attacks on America.

This day will forever remain as one of the most somber in American history; but out of all of the horrific and heartbreaking stories, there are also stories of heroism and honor.

In the minutes, hours, and days after the attacks, thousands of firefighters, paramedics, police, and other first responders ran into the Twin Towers, toward the Pentagon, and to the Pennsylvania crash site. They risked their lives for all of us.

Now we need to make sure we are still there to support them, which is why I am proud to cosponsor the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act.

This legislation provides medical treatment and financial compensation to the first responders who were harmed in the 9/11 attacks. We owe them this with their medical bills and so much more. Our Nation will forever be grateful for their sacrifice.

A BAD DEAL FOR AMERICA AND THE WORLD

(Mr. MOOLENAAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, successful diplomacy requires statesmanship, a mutual benefit, and a commitment to peace. None of these elements are a part of the administration's deal with Iran.

On statesmanship, this administration's acquiescence has been met with Iranian hostility. Just this week, the Ayatollah said Israel would be destroyed within 25 years. Words matter, and we cannot discount Iran's dangerous rhetoric.

Where is the mutual benefit?

Short of immediate access to a nuclear bomb, Iran has been given all it wants. It will receive billions of dollars it can use to fund terrorism against our country and our allies. It will be allowed to reject "anytime, anywhere" inspections that are vital to verifying compliance and ensuring our national security. In less than 15 years, Iran will be allowed to have a nuclear weapons program that is capable of attacking targets anywhere in the world.

The fundamental question is: Are we willing to gamble that Iran's Government will end its destructive behavior and belligerent rhetoric in the coming days?

I, for one, am not willing to take that chance. I believe this is a bad deal for America and the world, and I oppose it.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian deal—I stand in the absolute, strongest possible opposition.

What would make America think that Iran's having a nuclear capability in 13 years would be a good idea?

What would make any American believe that, in 5 years, relaxing the sanctions on conventional arms—the same 10,000 missiles that struck Israel—and, in 8 years, relaxing the sanctions on ICBMs would be a good idea? There is only one purpose for an ICBM, and that is to attack every city in the United States.

Lastly, because this deal does not dismantle anything, in 13 years, Iran could legally have a path for at least 100 ICBMs.

Those are the facts in voting for this bill when there are secret deals that no Congressman has seen. No Congressman has looked at the deal.

My job is truth. My job is to deliver truth to the American people, to deliver truth to Montana, and this deal is not truthful. We are rewarding Iran with \$50 billion to \$100 billion.

Terrorism—the idea that we take this deal or go to war is patently false. Sanctions work. We need a dismantle for this mantle. I ask my colleagues to be Americans first and vote against this bill.

CORRECTION OF COSPONSOR

(Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on September 9, 2015, one of my staff members mistakenly added Congresswoman MCSALLY from Arizona to H.R. 3443, as a cosponsor, instead of to H.R. 3339.

Both my staff and I acknowledge and take full responsibility for this unintended addition of Ms. MCSALLY's name, and I apologize for any confusion and inconvenience that this error has caused. This cosponsorship was not authorized by Representative MCSALLY.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3443

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove the name of the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) from H.R. 3443.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, when I got on the plane to return from

Texas yesterday, I felt like it was a done deal—the Iran deal was going to happen.

But guess what. Conservatives in the House came together with a better idea, fueled by hundreds of folks out on the lawn when Senator TED CRUZ was speaking.

We have come up with a solution that will at least possibly stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It is the bill we have got coming up, which points out that the President has not met his requirement.

The entire deal, together with the side agreements, puts the President and the banks and businesses that are doing business with Iran—and who might start to do that—on notice that they are potentially civilly and criminally liable. We are going to use the judicial branch of the government to help keep America safe.

As I read on one of the signs on the lawn yesterday: What part of "death to America" do you not understand?

The Iran deal is a bad deal, and it needs to be stopped, and we are fighting here in the House of Representatives to do that.

PHILIPPI HEROES

(Mr. MCKINLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend three local citizens from Philippi, West Virginia.

The first is Twila Smith, a teacher at Philip Barbour High School. On August 25, one of her students brought a gun to school and held her classmates hostage. Twila did a miraculous job in calming the teenager and buying time until the police could arrive.

Philippi Police Chief Jeff Walters and the young man's pastor, Howard Swick, are our next two heroes. They negotiated the release of the student hostages and then convinced the teenager to surrender voluntarily.

Because of these heroes and their courage in a threatening situation, more than 700 high school students were unharmed, and this man will now be able to receive the help that he needs.

OPPOSE THE IRAN NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEAL

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this agreement with Iran will bring the world closer to war.

Under this deal, Iran can make its centrifuges used to make nuclear weapons;

Iran is trusted to inspect itself;

The U.S. must come to the aid of Iran if there is sabotage against its

weapons program, and in the meantime, Iran is buying anti-aircraft weapons and fighter jets from Russia to strengthen their military;

Iran will have the sanctions lifted with no proof required that they are in compliance;

The President himself admits this deal neither denies nor deters Iran from a nuclear bomb—only delays. Meanwhile, Iran continues to chant “death to America” and “death to Israel,” and it continues to imprison four Americans—the same Iran that supplies weapons and help to terrorists throughout the world.

The Iran nuclear deal makes the Middle East and the world far more perilous and war inevitable. It is naive and dangerous to believe otherwise. The American people rightly oppose this deal, and I oppose this deal. For the sake of peace, Congress must oppose this deal.

□ 1230

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about one of the most important national security matters this Chamber will vote on, and that is the President's dangerous nuclear deal with Iran.

We have heard a lot about this this morning. I heard a lot about it while I was in the district during the August work period. I traveled across Georgia's 12th District and spoke with my constituents about this terrible agreement.

Today I come to the floor again to voice the concerns I heard from the overwhelming majority and to say to my colleagues in the House and Senate we must stop this deal.

The consequences of the President's agreement are clear. We have heard it over and over. It will chart a clear path to allow Iran nuclear capability. In the meantime, the Iranian regime will use billions of dollars in sanctions relief to continue promoting terrorism.

I visited Israel last month and met with the nation's leaders, including Prime Minister Netanyahu, and learned firsthand about the security threats Israel and the region face every day. We cannot allow this deal to move forward and further empower those who seek the destruction of Israel, the same leaders who shout “death to America.”

I reject the President's false choice between this bad deal or war.

FIGHTING TERRORISM

(Ms. MCSALLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the anniversary of September 11, 2001, when Islamist terrorists attacked our country, killing nearly 3,000 innocent people.

While that day brought terrible destruction, it also sparked a renewed sense of determination and unity that should not be forgotten.

Today, we must recognize that the threat from Islamist extremism is as great as ever. We are in a generational fight against terrorists like ISIS who seek our complete destruction and that of our allies and our way of life. We must remain vigilant and have the courage and will to stand against this evil to protect Americans and ensure our enemies never have a chance to attack us again.

This week, we remember Americans who lost their lives 14 years ago—Americans like Aaron Jeremy Jacobs and Karol Ann Keasler, both born in Tucson, Arizona, and killed in New York City—and we remember the bravery and selfless acts of the first responders and ordinary citizens who put themselves in danger so that others may live.

Our thoughts and our prayers continue to be with the family and friends of those who died.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 9, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 9, 2015 at 9:42 a.m.:

Appointments:

Congressional Award Board.

Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 411, FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3461, APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3460, SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 412 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 412

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except two hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) three hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the Minority Leader or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate, with 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee, 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee, and one hour controlled by the Minority Leader or her designee; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman and my friend from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Texas delegation, I want to say to the Speaker pro tempore, "Happy birthday." We were celebrating your birthday at the Texas lunch. We are sorry you were unable to attend.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, this rule would empower the U.S. House of Representatives with the opportunity to block this administration's devastating nuclear deal with the country of Iran. It is my belief that this deal needs to be ripped up word by word, line by line, and it is this body that needs to help do that. The process is going on today and tomorrow, and it needs to continue until we kill this deal.

This rule includes three legislative items and is designed to give the U.S. House of Representatives multiple opportunities to block this disastrous Iran deal.

I want to make one thing perfectly clear from the beginning: There is nothing unprecedented about this rule. What is unprecedented is that the administration, an administration of the United States, has negotiated a deal that pardons a state that supports terrorism and turns it into a legitimate nuclear state in a matter of time.

There is nothing to hide in this rule; whereas, a significant part of this so-called deal with Iran is still hidden, not just by side agreements, but in facts of the case that it was up to the United States Congress to openly understand, to debate, and then to make decisions on.

First, H. Res. 411 would find that the President has not complied with the requirements of section 2 of the Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which passed Congress and became law of the United States of America in May of 2015. This resolution simply says that the President should follow the law—the law he signed only 4 months ago—and give Congress access to all parts of the deal as they pertain to this nuclear opportunity and deal that is being cut, including the IAEA and Iran.

Second, H.R. 3460 would stop the administration from lifting sanctions placed currently on Iran.

Third, H.R. 3461 would allow for a vote to approve the deal that the administration made with Iran regarding its nuclear program. While previous legislation would have allowed Congress to disapprove this deal, this legislation would not allow the deal to go forward without congressional approval.

So, Mr. Speaker, what does the administration deal do? Well, first, the deal guarantees permanent sanctions relief, but only temporarily blocks Iran from building a nuclear bomb. In other words, this deal would inject—I assume really as a signing bonus—\$150 billion into the Iranian economy with almost completely no rules or regulations related to the use of the money, and it would allow Iran to build and possess a nuclear bomb in just a matter of a few, short, 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, we should not encourage the leading funder of terrorism in the world to have immediate access to billions of dollars now and billions of dollars later. Let there be no doubt, this money will go to Hezbollah, Hamas and the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, groups that are dedicated to wiping out not only the United States but our friends and allies around the world, including their number one target, Israel.

Mr. Speaker, when I visited the Middle East in May of this year, we met with our partners all around the region, and they were furious that this administration was negotiating with Iran. Presidents from both parties have spent decades in the United States persuading countries around the region not to build a nuclear bomb, yet now this administration wants to allow Iran to have access to that, that which we have been protecting and holding away from even our closest of friends. We will give that to this country that calls us the "evil empire."

Under this administration, for 6 years, America has led from behind. We have led from behind when it should have been chosen to lead from the front. Now this administration has decided to engage with a nation that jails Americans and where "death to America" and "death to Israel" is chanted every single day all over the streets of Iran and by its chosen leaders. Even worse, when the administration chose to engage with Iran, it chose to negotiate from a position of weakness. This negotiation ended with a deal that gives Iran literally everything it wants and, as I see it, delivers nothing for the American people.

So what does this deal exactly do? Instead of allowing international inspectors into sites within 24 hours, the administration agreed to give Iran 24 days' notice. The plan also ends restrictions on the Iranian interconti-

mental ballistic missile, ICBM, program in just over 8 years, which means, within a decade, Iran can go back to developing warheads that could reach the United States.

Mr. Speaker, they cheat on every single deal they make. Why would you negotiate with someone you don't trust? Why would you give someone you don't trust and who had a track record, give them everything they wanted?

Well, even worse, reports have indicated that there is also a side deal, a side deal between Iran and the IAEA, that allows Iranians to inspect their own nuclear sites. Mr. Speaker, this will be like a person in college or any school being allowed to grade their own test. That is not the right way you handle international affairs. When the Republicans say you negotiate with weakness, this is exactly what we are talking about.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is not clear what the American people would get from this deal. What is clear is that this deal will empower a stronger Iran to be the strongest country in that region, to be competitive against the United States, and to have everything they want to pursue nuclear weapons in their future.

So what is at stake here? Congress is being asked to join in this deal. They are being asked to endorse a plan that would eventually legitimize the Iranian nuclear state and fund its terrorism activities and to support our President in doing this.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here today. We are going to debate it. We are going to pass this legislation, and we are going to put this House on record of where we would be.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1245

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the vote on the Iran nuclear agreement has been touted by the majority as the most consequential of our careers, maybe even our lifetimes. We have had months of consideration, hearings, questions, open debate following rules and customs of the House, more or less, surrounding the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran, an agreement carefully negotiated by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, and Germany to curb Iran's nuclear activities.

As you listen this morning, you would think this was a negotiation between Barack Obama and the Ayatollah. Apparently, that is all that they want to think. The other countries played major roles here, and they are the most important economies in the world. This agreement is the best available option for peacefully and verifiably cutting off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon.

On Tuesday evening, the Committee on Rules had a hearing on the third floor of the Capitol that lasted over 3 hours, and there was testimony from chairs and the ranking members of the relevant committees. We had a robust discussion and a healthy back-and-forth. We prepared for the rule debate.

We had our statements written, but 12 hours later, the dissident wing of the majority's party emerged from a neighborhood bar, the Tortilla Coast, with a different path in mind. They rendered all our work moot, and the House was forced into a holding pattern all day yesterday while Republican dissidents brought their party to its knees.

Once again, instead of regular order, in a perversion of our legislative process, we are thrown into chaos by a majority chasing its tail in a last-minute ploy, throwing together three bills that might as well have been scribbled on the back of a cocktail napkin.

These bills trivialize our institution. They have been whipped up in an afternoon to mollify the disgruntled wing of the majority's party that shows no interest in governing. Their only goal with this trio of bills—which are contradictory, let me add, and I will say more about that later—is to feed the monster seething within their own ranks.

There has been no committee action on these bills. There has been no debate. There has been no time even to consider them.

Now, why didn't we do them in our regularly scheduled Tuesday night meeting? It is because we didn't even know they existed. Instead of addressing an issue of international global importance, we are occupied with the Republican Conference's internal politics, and it is an embarrassment to this country.

This dog-and-pony show has turned Congress into a stage to play out the internal drama that diminishes our constitutional role. If the majority cannot devise a process for a measure on which they agree, on which they have their vote unanimously, if they can't devise a process for a measure like that, I shudder to think what is coming with act two, which we are hurtling toward, because we are days away from a government shutdown.

We have no budget; our troops would not get paid; flights would be canceled, and what is more, the last time we had a Republican-inflicted shutdown, \$24 billion was lost to our economy at a time when we were struggling even more than now to regain it.

Even so, here we are, forced to join in yet another pointless exercise, and the Senate has said they will not take up these bills, and so this nuclear agreement will be implemented, which leaves the Republican Party with the majority in both houses, which they control, with no consensus.

What is more, keeping Iran from building a nuclear weapon is a once-in-

a-lifetime opportunity to silence the drumbeats of war. There is no opportunity to renegotiate this. With all you have heard this morning about "this won't do" and "we can't have it" and "it is awful," have you heard a single alternative? There is not one. The possibility of peace in a powder keg region of the world should be considered carefully.

Mr. Speaker, in May of 1946, shortly after World War II ended, when the horrors of global violence were fresh in our collective memory, Albert Einstein asserted that: "The unleashed power of the atom has changed everything save our modes of thinking, and thus, we drift toward unparalleled catastrophe."

Very rarely do we have an opportunity to stop that so-called drift toward catastrophe, but we do with this measure, and all of our allies have agreed to it. Only we are trying to hold it up.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action provides for unparalleled access to Iran's nuclear facilities. The agreement blocks all four possible pathways to a bomb. Contrary to falsehoods reported by the media, Iran will not be self-monitoring.

The inspectors from the International Atomic Energy Agency have unprecedented and continuous daily monitoring authority, and it is so easy, they tell me, to detect the radioactive material if they were to break this agreement.

Only certain sanctions will be lifted. Many will be kept in place, for example, what they do with terrorist organizations and supplying arms to other people. We are continuing those sanctions. If Iran fails to comply, all the nations involved in the negotiation have said they will be reinstituted by using a snapback provision which is in the bill.

Let me repeat that. We have heard from ambassadors of almost all those nations yesterday saying that their countries would absolutely comply with reintroducing the sanctions.

Now, let me remind people that should the Iranians attempt to conceal their work, even a nanogram—a billionth of a gram—of dust of nuclear work is detected.

Retired American military leaders, former Secretaries of State from both parties, the Israeli security professionals, and even faith leaders have come out in full support of this accord. The former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and former Secretary of State under President George W. Bush, retired four-star General Colin Powell, called this agreement "remarkable."

The former head of Israel's intelligence and special operations agency, the Mossad, Efraim Halevy, supports the agreement as well. He said recently to PBS' Judy Woodruff: "I believe this agreement closes the roads and blocks the road to Iranian nuclear military

capabilities for at least a decade." That is not a trivial thing.

Domestic faith leaders have implored this Congress to follow the Old Testament creed to "seek peace and pursue it."

The agreement was painstakingly negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry, Deputy Secretary of State Wendy Sherman, and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz representing the United States. When hailing this agreement, Brent Scowcroft, the national security adviser to both Presidents Gerald Ford and George H.W. Bush, said of this team: "There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Moniz . . . when he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to a fissile material . . . responsible people listen."

It is now clear, based on the declared supporters in the Senate, that the effort to kill this agreement will end in the upper Chamber, and the accord will survive and be implemented.

Regardless of that certainty, the House majority has nonetheless thrown us into disarray. We will vote today on two bills, another one tomorrow. It was decided that, first, there will be a bill to say that the President cannot lift the sanctions and a bill on side agreements that they think are out there that nobody else knows about, and then the most interesting one is the bill tomorrow will be to approve it.

You have already had all this discussion on "we won't have it, we can't have it, the bill will not survive." They are going to approve it; but just in case, because the Senate won't take up an approval message, they kept another rule last night.

First, they did away with it, then they put it back so that, next week, we can come up with a disapproval rule; but by next Thursday, it is all over, the 60 days are up, and the President may go ahead with the agreement.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this rule and support this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Harding Township, New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), the chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule before us and in strong opposition to the Iranian nuclear agreement.

While there may be many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality. The Iranian nuclear agreement fails to achieve its critical objective, blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with an international endorsement of an industrial scale nuclear weapons program.

My colleagues, we must not forget where it started, with the President declaring Iran must never be allowed to

achieve a nuclear weapons capability, but to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators have made some inexcusable and dangerous concessions on inspections and verification and on Iran's missile defense program and their access to conventional weapons.

Worse than that, Iran will economically be strengthened by early relief from sanctions, providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Force and its global terrorism network.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict this deal will lead to more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our own part, the agreement talks about the normalization of economic relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement in good faith based on mutual respect; but how can there be respect for a regime that actively promotes regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase "death to America" as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, our first responsibility as Members of Congress is to provide for our national defense. This deal is bad for our national defense. I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not.

It is a vote of conscience far and above politics, and that is why I will vote "no" on the motion to approve this disastrous agreement and "yes" on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Rule before us and in opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

While there are many reasons to stand against this deal, it comes down to a fundamental reality: the Iranian nuclear deal fails to achieve its critical objective: blocking all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon. In fact, this deal provides Iran with international endorsement of an industrial-scale nuclear weapons program.

My Colleagues, we must not forget where we started: with the President declaring that Iran must never be allowed to achieve a nuclear weapons capability. But to get from that point to where we are today, our negotiators had to make numerous and serious concessions:

They dropped snap "anywhere, anytime inspections";

We will not receive credible information about the potential military dimensions of Iran's previous nuclear research efforts;

Existing restrictions on Iran's ballistic missile program will cease;

International sanctions targeting Iran's support for global terrorism and human rights violations have been eased.

Each and every one of these important elements was discarded as the Obama Administration worked to achieve its landmark deal with Iran.

The reality is that this agreement will provide a legal path to a nuclear weapons capability to a country that remains a rogue state and has violated a whole series of international obligations and U.N. Security Council resolutions. Simply put, the Iranians have cheated before. We would be fools to assume they will not cheat again.

While the President insists "this deal is not built on trust," key verification provisions are buried in confidential side agreements that allow Iran to conduct its own inspections of nuclear weapons research facilities. This brings me to the conclusion that we would be better off with no deal, rather than this deal.

Worse than that, Iran will be economically strengthened by early relief from sanctions—providing the Ayatollah with fresh resources with which to fund the Quds Forces and its global terrorism network. If Iran violates the agreement, building international support for new sanctions would take too long to be effective. And furthermore, our allies appear to be more interested in their own trade and commercial interests than in halting Iran's nuclear aspirations.

Supporters of this agreement have proclaimed loudly that the only alternative to this agreement is war. I reject that notion and predict that this deal will lead to even more Iranian aggression in the Middle East.

For our part, the agreement talks about normalization of economic relations with Iran and states that the parties shall implement the agreement "in good faith . . . based on mutual respect."

But how can there be respect for a regime that actively instigates regional instability, publicly and constantly advocates for the destruction of the State of Israel, and uses the phrase "Death to America" as a mission statement?

Mr. Speaker, the first responsibility of each Member of this House is to provide for our national defense—and that includes confronting the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism everywhere. If we fail to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon this year, next year or in the next decade, we will have allowed the weakening of that defense. And we will have failed our children and future generations.

I sincerely regret that this vote has been characterized as a partisan measure. It is not. It is a vote of conscience far above and beyond politics. And that's why I will vote "yes" on the resolution of disapproval.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH).

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman, and I want to thank my colleagues. Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I agree with many of the points that you made. This is a vote of conscience for all of us.

The question is not whether we trust Iran. We don't. The question is not whether we want Iran to have any pathway to a nuclear weapon. Proponents of this agreement—I am one—and opponents of this agreement—there are many, my friend, Mr. STEWART—don't want Iran to have a nuclear weapon. This question about trust, we have got to step back a minute.

One of the fundamental challenges that a strong and confident country faces is to secure its national security. That requires the Commander in Chief, whose fundamental responsibility is to exercise his judgment about what will work to increase our security, to enter into negotiations with adversaries; and there may be no greater adversary to the United States, to our allies, particularly Israel, than Iran.

Keep in mind, President Kennedy negotiated with the Soviet Union after one of their leaders said they will bury this country, and he did that, and it turned out that he was right to limit nuclear proliferation. President Nixon went to China when it was Red China, an absolute adversary of this country and our way of life, and it has worked to the benefit of the national security of this country, and President Reagan did the same.

The fundamental question here is not at all about whether we trust Iran. We don't trust Iran. It is not about whether you negotiate with people you trust. You have to negotiate with people that are your adversaries.

The question is whether the terms and conditions of this agreement that the President is recommending, along with our very close allies—Germany, France, Great Britain, and Russia and China—will improve our national security and that of our allies, particularly Israel. My judgment is it will.

Number one, there is no pathway for Iran to have a nuclear weapon under this agreement.

Number two, this is not based on trust. It is based on distrust and strong verification provisions that will give us a heads-up if there is any effort of Iran not to comply.

Third, we have the opportunity to snap back the sanctions all of us supported that brought Iran to the table. We don't have to get a majority vote; we can do that unilaterally.

□ 1300

Then, finally, we do have to ask the question of not whether this is the perfect agreement—undoubtedly, there could be a better agreement that might give more satisfaction and security and peace of mind to all of us—it is a question of this agreement or no agreement. That is the question that we face.

The weight of the opinion and judgment is that, if we repudiate this agreement, the sanction regime that we constructed on the leadership of President George Bush and President Barack Obama would dissolve. What happens then? Iran gets the money and they have no restraint on their ability to get the bomb.

I urge us to support this agreement in the national security interest of the United States of America, Israel, and our allies.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania (Mr.

KELLY), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today not to speak for Republicans, but to speak for America.

When 80 percent of the American people say “no” to this deal, how can America’s House, how can we who have been elected by the American people, come here and say, “You are wrong, and we are right”?

A vote for this deal is a vote against the American people. History tells us that in 1938, Chamberlain came home from meeting with Hitler and said, “Peace in our time.” Judas went to the Last Supper, pointed to the Lord, and they gave him 30 pieces of silver. We are not even getting 30 pieces of silver.

President Obama says this is the best deal we could get. In my lifetime, anytime anybody comes back from a negotiation and says, “This is the best we could do,” it means they lost. They did not get what they wanted. They got the best they could. In this case, it is the losing hand.

This deal endangers the safety, security, and stability of not only America, but the entire world. This deal comes with absolutely no accountability, no verification, and no enforceability.

I ask you, how can you sit in America’s House, when the President’s number one responsibility is to protect the American people, and say, “This is the best we could get.” This gives the American people nothing. This gives Iran everything.

Now, in just 24 hours, we are going to commemorate the 14th anniversary of a terrorist attack on the United States, and we are going to grant the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world \$150 billion to show how much we have turned a deaf ear to the cries of the dead and a blind eye to the destruction of America that day.

To sit here and even begin to think that somehow this is good for America is false. To try and sell this to the American people is a lie. We are sacrificing the safety of 330 million Americans for the legacy of one man. That is not what America wants. That is not who America is. That is not who America should ever allow itself to be.

And to sit here and listen to somehow we have not done our job; ladies and gentlemen, our main job is to protect the American people. It always was. It always is. This has morphed into something greater than that; I understand that. But at the base of the day, it is to protect the American people.

And let me tell you, as tomorrow we have dawn and the sun comes up, all you have to do is turn your ears to the east and our enemies will be shouting, “death to the Great Satan,” “death to America,” “death to Israel.” And the Supreme Leader, himself, says that, within 25 years, there will be no Israel.

The hypocrisy to stand before this House today, America’s House, and sell the American people down the river because of one man’s legacy is a travesty of who we are. And it is more than that. It flies in the face of the 1.4 million Americans in uniform who have given their life to give us this opportunity to defend this great Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Almost every observer, even the host of candidates seeking the Republican Presidential nomination, recognize that President Bush’s invasion of Iraq was a foreign policy disaster for which so many military families are continuing to pay a high price. And American taxpayers will ultimately pay over a trillion dollars for that failure, spurred on by some of the speeches like the one we just heard.

So we look next door to Baghdad, at Tehran, and we see a despicable government there, just as there was one in Baghdad. We have ample intelligence evidence that that despicable government was pursuing a nuclear weapon program that is unacceptable to us. And we try to learn: Is there a way for America to use its other power, its diplomatic power, to stop that? Because we know our use of military power did not accomplish positive foreign policy objectives by itself in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

We found an approach that, in fact, had strong bipartisan support—imposing strong economic sanctions on the Iranians. It didn’t work so well originally, the first time that I and almost everyone else in this House voted for it, because America couldn’t go-it-alone any more than it could be successful in a go-it-alone invasion of Iraq.

But when we brought the rest of the world along, including some people that have been our adversaries, like Russia and China, to join in this sanctions regime, it finally forced Iran to the table to begin to deal with the critical elements of this nuclear weapon program.

Step by step, through very hard negotiations, by bringing the rest of the world along to force those economic sanctions on Iran—all of which I supported—they began to move forward on trying to resolve this issue through diplomacy, through acting that way, rather than bombing first and asking questions later, as some of these folks have advocated. At every step in that process, as we approached an interim agreement, we had an “object first, read later” approach from those who are pushing this rule.

The interim agreement was announced. They rejected it that night before they had even read it. It proved that their objections were totally unfounded: We gained more in terms of

intelligence; we came to understand better the Iranian program; and we put a stop to it in that interim agreement. Our families are safer today because that agreement was adopted.

And we come along to about March of this year, and the same folks that are advocating this rule were out here telling us there was one thing this Congress had to do: It had to have the power to disapprove this agreement if it did not feel the final agreement met the objectives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. That is how we began this week with the resolution of disapproval. But yesterday, they brought their self-styled foreign policy experts to Washington—Sarah Palin, Glenn Beck, Donald Trump—and they said a resolution of disapproval is not enough.

So today, Republicans have abandoned the only tool they had to stop this agreement—a resolution of disapproval; that is not even in this resolution—and they are off on a three-pronged approach to satisfy the most extreme views that prefer to use war as the first instrument instead of the last instrument.

We have a choice in this Congress, and it is the choice of using the strong power of America, with verification, to prevent this program rather than calling on more military families to sacrifice for an unnecessary endeavor.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, we will do everything in our power to try and stop this bad deal; you are darn right we will.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Farmington, Utah (Mr. STEWART), a member of the Intelligence Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and a member of the United States Air Force for years and years, a veteran of this great Nation.

Mr. STEWART. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for that gracious introduction.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement is deeply, deeply flawed; and when you talk to our friends across the aisle, in moments of honesty, they will admit that it is deeply flawed.

This is the most important national security question of our generation. We have got to get this right, and we simply haven’t done that yet.

If I could elaborate on my background that leads me to this conclusion, as the chairman said, I sit on the House Intelligence Committee. For 14 years, I was an Air Force pilot. I flew aircraft that carried nuclear weapons. I worked for the implementation of various nuclear treaties. I understand that for any treaty to work, there has to be a modicum of trust. There has to be a kernel of trust between the two parties.

Let me ask you this: Do you think we can trust the Iranians?

I asked Secretary Kerry on two occasions to give me a single example of where the Iranians have worked with us or our allies in any positive fashion, and he could not do that. But I can give you a long list of where they have worked against us, where they have created death and chaos: Hezbollah, Hamas, assassinations in Central America. Hundreds of Americans have been killed and maimed because of the Iranian-backed Shia militia. This is what they do. And we are supposed to trust them?

And by the way, I believe they are going to cheat, because they are cheating even now. In the last few months, they tried to buy prohibited equipment from Germany. They refuse to answer questions from the IAEA even now.

Which brings me to my second question: Do you think we can trust this President?

I would ask you to give me a single example of what you consider a foreign policy success of this administration—give me a single example—and then let me give you a long list of foreign policy failures, beginning with China claiming much of the South China Sea; with Russia, after the reset, going into Crimea, controlling much of eastern Ukraine now, even now building military posts in Syria.

We went into Libya and created chaos and walked away. We snatched defeat from the jaws of victory in Iraq. We are doing the same thing in Yemen, the same thing in Afghanistan. Why should we trust this President?

I believe that most people think this agreement is doomed to fail; and I believe that when it does, we now have to turn towards the question of: What do we do when we have an entirely nuclearized Middle East? When we have four or five countries in the next few years that have nuclear weapons there, how are we going to deal with that, coming from a President who declared it was his goal to see the elimination of all nuclear weapons across the globe? It is a terrible irony that he is going to preside over the greatest and most dramatic expansion of nuclear capabilities in the most chaotic part of the world, that he will preside over that, and that will be his foreign policy legacy.

We need to defeat this agreement while we still can.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this extremely convoluted rule as well as the underlying legislation.

When I was a child in the 1980s, I remember my mother taking me to Mothers Embracing Nuclear Disarmament rallies. I recall wondering why America possesses enough nuclear weapons to blow up the entire world at

least seven times over. As an adult, I have never succeeded in finding a satisfactory answer to why we want to be able to blow up the world seven times.

Now, we are all here because the potential for nuclear war is one of the greatest threats to the future of humanity and perhaps to the future of life on the planet itself. That is why this agreement to make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, does not acquire nuclear weapons is so important.

Let's be clear about what this deal is and what it isn't.

It is not a peace deal. It is not a deal that calls on us to trust Iran or like Iran. In fact, the very reason we want to make sure that Iran doesn't develop nuclear weapons is we see how much damage they caused through their mischief-making through support of Hezbollah and others on the conventional front. If that were compounded by nuclear capabilities, it would significantly increase the chance of global destruction.

This agreement is based on verification and enforceability. It is built on extensive electronic monitoring and unprecedented access for international investigators at known or suspected Iranian nuclear sites.

Of course, there are things in this deal that I would change or you would change. No deal is perfect. But perfection can't be our standard or we would never be able to support anything around here. Our job is to consider if this deal is better than the alternatives.

□ 1315

If Congress rejects this agreement and it leads to a nuclear Iran, what then?

It was multilateral sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table, not American sanctions alone; and it is clear that Russia and China will likely grant Iran sanctions relief, regardless of what the U.S. decides to do. We also worry about the dedication of our European allies in this regard.

With sanctions disappearing and Iran's money being unfrozen, the deal is moving forward. Shouldn't we want this agreement to proceed with the oversight of the United States of America, to make sure that Iran abides by the very letter of this agreement not to develop nuclear weapons?

Instead of standing in its way, we, in Congress, should play a leading role in the implementation and rigid enforcement of this deal to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

This agreement is an unprecedented opportunity to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program cold and make the world a safer place. Of all our options, it is the one most likely to succeed in preventing Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues not to stand in the way of this important deal, to

make sure that Iran, a country that supports terrorism, has a terrible record of human rights violations at home, and even just 2 days ago said that the State of Israel wouldn't last 25 years.

It is important that we ensure that they don't have access to the nuclear weapons that will allow them to carry through with their terrorist goals.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Windsor, Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, President Obama negotiated with a band of villains. The President believed Iran would change their ways because of his kind and forgiving nature, but we have seen Iranian hypocrisy far too long to believe they can change. It is time to face reality and prevent them, at all costs, from acquiring nuclear capability.

Iran's leaders promised to wipe Israel off the map. They deny the Holocaust and refer to our country as the Great Satan. The Ayatollah even takes to Twitter to call for Israel's annihilation.

Iran's actions are as dishonorable as their rhetoric. The administration has negotiated with Iran on nuclear non-proliferation as if they were an honorable country with honorable intentions, but it is certainly not honorable when our Department of State lists Iran as a state sponsor of terrorism, and no honorable country would occupy that unworthy distinction for the past 30 years, nor would an honorable country supply terrorists around the world with weapons to kill Americans and Israeli. In fact, Iran supplied IEDs that killed and maimed American soldiers and marines in the Iraq war.

On the day we remember the worst terrorist attack on U.S. soil, we are going to vote on whether or not to allow billions of dollars of funding to the world's largest state sponsor of terror. This deal is, at best, delusional and, at worst, despicable.

Iran is in pursuit of a nuclear weapon, and their intention for the United States is death.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a vote in favor of this rule.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the agreement reached by Secretary Kerry and the international community because I believe there is no better alternative for preventing Iran from immediately developing a nuclear weapon.

Since the first sanctions were imposed on Iran a decade ago, I have supported tough economic measures as a means to bring Iran to the negotiating table. In that respect, the sanctions worked, but sanctions alone will not stop Iran from moving toward nuclear weapons.

After strenuous review of the July 14 agreement and all its annexes, I have reached the conclusion that the agreement is the best option available today for keeping nuclear weapons out of Iranian hands. Under the agreement, Iran is bound “under no circumstances ever to seek, develop or acquire nuclear weapons.”

Among other things, Iran must reduce its active centrifuges by two-thirds, give up 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and reconfigure the Arak reactor so it cannot produce weapons-grade plutonium.

The number of inspectors in Iran will triple. They will gain full access to nuclear facilities, including the entire uranium supply chain, at any time. This is indeed the most intrusive inspection regime of any nonproliferation agreement in U.S. history.

That is important because it will give the United States and the international community far greater insight into the regime's behavior and enable us to monitor them closely.

It is true that Iran may try to cheat, but that is exactly why we need this agreement. With severe restrictions and an aggressive inspections regime in place, we will be much more likely to discover any violations.

In that event, the United States will be authorized to reimpose sanctions on Iran immediately, and that applies not just to the U.S. sanctions, but to U.N. sanctions as well.

In summary, this agreement comprises harsh restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities, a strong monitoring system, and tough penalties for violation.

A group of 29 leading American scientists, including Nobel laureates, has called it “a technically sound, stringent, and innovative deal that will provide the necessary assurance in the coming decades and more that Iran is not developing nuclear weapons.”

If we walk away from this agreement, the only remaining alternative is military action. We have been down that path for 15 years, and we have seen the grave consequences of not allowing diplomatic efforts to move forward.

Ronald Reagan said of the Soviet Union: “Trust, but verify.”

This agreement is not rooted in trust but in our ability to verify compliance and to deal with enforcement. I believe it meets the goals of our negotiations to deny a dangerous Iranian regime access to a nuclear weapon.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Sugar Land, Texas (Mr. OLSON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. OLSON. I thank my friend.

Mr. Speaker, one of the worst parts of President Obama's agreement with Iran is that it opens the door to nuclear bombs blowing up right here in America.

This man is a terrorist from Iran. His name is Manssor Arbabsiar. He comes from a family of hate.

In 2011, he approached the notorious Los Zetas drug cartel with a scheme to kill the Ambassador from Saudi Arabia right here in this city. He offered them \$1.5 million for that hit. Luckily, we caught him.

President Obama's agreement gives Iran at least \$100 billion to hire Los Zetas and others to unleash nuclear material and death on innocent Americans. We caught them once. Will we catch them again?

I urge my colleagues to vote for the rule today and tomorrow. Vote to reject President Obama's agreement with Iran.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Let me thank our ranking member for yielding me time and also for your leadership on this vital global peace and national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 412, the rule providing for consideration of three bills surrounding the nuclear agreement negotiated by this administration and the P5+1.

Make no mistake, these bills are nothing more than yet another attempt to purposefully and deliberately thwart the Iran deal.

Mr. Speaker, all of us have the same goal, to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. Now, as one who has been involved in many nuclear nonproliferation efforts since the 1970s, I am convinced that this deal brings us much closer to a nuclear-weapons-free Iran.

I believe that the President negotiated with our P5+1 partners—while not perfect, this deal achieves that goal. The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action cuts off all pathways to a bomb and ensures robust oversight and inspection. It is the best way to promote regional security and global peace, and the majority of Americans agreed.

According to a recent University of Maryland poll, 55 percent said that Congress should get behind this agreement. That is why we need to be clear on the ramifications of rejecting the deal.

If the United States walks away, we will be walking away alone. As United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent Politico op-ed: “If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door number two. No do over. No rewrite of the deal on the table.”

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners and will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran.

Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate their weapons programs with no oversight, and it will significantly undermine our ability to engage with our

partners on critical issues like addressing international terrorism.

Simply put, rejecting this deal would isolate the United States and would put us back on the path to war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. LEE. The Scriptures do say let us study war no more, so that is why it is critical for us to support the President and our diplomats and give this deal a chance to succeed.

This is a defining moment for our country and for the world. Let us continue to work for peace because the military option, that is always there. Let us work for a world worthy of our children and future generations.

I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this rule.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Fairhope, Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and in strong opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

Mr. Speaker, President Obama has created a false choice by claiming the only alternative to this deal is war.

First of all, this deal itself can most definitely lead to war. By giving one of our biggest enemies access to nuclear weapons, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and billions of dollars in sanctions relief, we are effectively giving Iran the tools they need to live out their dream of bringing “death to America.”

The other flaw in the President's logic is that there are actually other alternatives than war. What about a better deal that includes anytime, anywhere inspections? What about increasing the sanctions which were clearly working to begin with? What about requiring the release of Americans held as political prisoners in Iran? These are clear alternatives.

Mr. Speaker, this is the people's House, so I think it is critically important that we actually listen to the people. Last month, I held over 15 town-hall meetings all across my district. At each and every stop, someone asked me what Congress is going to do to stop the Iran nuclear deal.

Just look at the public opinion polls. Only 21 percent of those surveyed in a recent poll said they approve of this agreement. That is less than one in four Americans who believe this is a good deal.

I implore my colleagues to put the opinion of the American people over loyalty to some political party. I ask my colleagues to listen to our Nation's military leaders, who have made clear the serious consequences of giving Iran

access to ICBMs, instead of party bosses.

I plead with my colleagues to look past the short-term legacy of our President and, instead, look at the long-term ramifications this deal will have on the safety and security of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, there is no greater responsibility of this House than to do everything we can to keep the American people safe.

With that in mind, I strongly urge my colleagues to stand strong and oppose this deal.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Iran nuclear agreement and in strong opposition to this convoluted rule and process.

Today, the House should have already completed several hours of debate on the Iran deal. Instead, we have before us a convoluted process with three measures that won't go anywhere in the Senate and will never reach the President's desk.

The fact is that the President has the votes to move this historic agreement forward. We should be having a serious debate and moving toward a vote in a timely fashion.

□ 1330

Instead, House Republicans have cooked up a series of votes to needlessly drag this process out and appeal to their extremist base.

We all know how serious the Iran nuclear agreement is for the security of the Middle East, the United States, and the world.

After reading and listening to many diverse views, I believe it is the strongest available option to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon and prevent yet another war.

These negotiations were never meant to solve all of the problems that we have with Iran. Their purpose was clear from the beginning: to shut down the pathways available to Iran to develop and produce a nuclear bomb, period.

Quite simply, is it better to have an Iran capable of producing a nuclear weapon by early next year or is it better to shut down that capability for the next 10 to 15 years and even longer?

And let me be clear. The agreement is set up to ensure that Iran remains a nuclear weapon-free state with mechanisms for inspections and verifications that remain permanently in place.

Now I know that some hoped that a "better deal" might somehow be renegotiated if we just keep increasing sanctions and threaten—or even use—military force against Iran.

But we already know that 10 years of sanctions and military threats only

gave us a significant increase in Iran's nuclear capacity and that the number of centrifuges needed to produce weapons-grade enriched uranium also increased.

Only when serious negotiations began 2 years ago did we see Iran's program stopped and then rolled back. The final agreement degrades even further Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon, blocks all pathways for Iran to acquire the materials needed to develop a bomb, and imposes the most comprehensive inspections regime of any nuclear arms control agreement to date.

In return, Iran will receive sanctions relief that is phased in over the next decade, dependent on Iran's compliance.

Do I trust Iran? Certainly not. Iran doesn't trust us either. But, again, that is the whole point of negotiations: for nations that don't trust one another to sit down and to hammer out a deal that all parties can live with and abide by.

Nelson Mandela is credited with saying, "The best weapon is to sit down and talk." This means compromise, for all parties to get something out of the final agreement.

For Iran, that is sanctions relief. For the world, that means an Iran without a nuclear weapon. It is not based on trust. It is based on tough inspections and verification.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an accord between just the U.S. and Iran. Six of the world's major powers—Russia, China, France, Germany, the U.K., and the U.S.—hammered out this deal with Iran.

If the U.S. walks away now, we will never be able to put the pieces back together or get these nations to take a risk with us again. Without this agreement, Iran could simply return to developing a nuclear weapon.

After 2 years of arduous negotiations, why would the U.S. insult the very nations whose cooperation and commitment we need to ensure Iran's compliance?

Why would we undermine our international standing as a good-faith negotiating partner not just on this agreement, but on every other negotiation we are engaged in now and in the future?

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the IAEA inquiry into Iran's past nuclear activities is a side deal. It is its own separate bilateral agreement. It neither affects nor delays the P5+1 agreement's rigorous inspections and verification process or Iran's obligation to significantly degrade and dismantle its nuclear infrastructure before getting any sanctions relief.

But, quite frankly, the U.S. long ago reached its own conclusions about Iran's nuclear activities. We believe that, if left unchecked, Iran would soon acquire enough weapons-grade pluto-

nium and highly enriched uranium to make a nuclear bomb.

It is why we approved U.S. nuclear-related sanctions and supported similar international sanctions, and it is why the White House began serious multilateral negotiations with Iran to cut off every pathway Iran might have to make a nuclear weapon. And we were successful. We were successful.

Mr. Speaker, my support for the comprehensive agreement is not something I give reluctantly or grudgingly. I am proud to support this deal and to cast my vote in support of the resolution of approval.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in opposing this rule, in supporting the resolution approving this historic agreement, and in rejecting both the Roskam and the Pompeo bills that seek to delay its implementation.

This is a good deal. It deserves our support.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), who serves on the Foreign Affairs Committee as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the August break, I talked to a lot of folks. Many of them were fearful. They were fearful about national security. And it focused on the on deal, the Iranian deal that we are here for today.

The Iranian deal, Mr. Speaker, is bad for America. It is bad for Israel. It is bad for the Middle East. But, oh, what a deal for Iran.

If we approve this deal, there will be singing and dancing in the streets in Iran, especially with the High Ayatollah leading the dancing. Why? Because it is wonderful for Iran.

The deal certifies a nuclear Iran, eventually. We can argue over when, but they are going to get nuclear weapons. How lovely is that. Is the world going to be safer because of that? No.

We need to see the world for what it is. Iran is a wolf in wolf's clothing. They make absolutely no secret about they want us dead.

They want Israel dead first. They were preaching this while we are working on this peace, peace, peace at any price deal, talking about how they want to destroy us.

So why don't we just look at the law right now. We have heard a little bit about a side deal. Secretary Kerry was before our Foreign Affairs Committee.

I asked him about a side deal that came up about the IAEA deal with Iran. He said he hadn't read it, he has been briefed on it.

Congress needs to read the side deals before we ever vote to approve this deal. We have to read the fine print, like all of us are supposed to do when we sign a contract.

Now let's read what the law says. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is quite clear, Mr. Speaker. The President is obligated by law—the law he signed—to provide Congress “the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.”

That is in the law. I haven't seen the side deal. I haven't seen anybody in Congress that has seen the side deal.

The law the President signed says we are to see all these side deals, agreements, before we even vote on whether or not to approve this deal; otherwise, the clock doesn't start ticking for the 60-day approval requirement.

So show us the side deal. Let us read it. I think Congress maybe has had enough embarrassment over the years voting on laws where we haven't seen all of the information before we voted on it. Show us the side agreement. Let us go from there.

Of course the deal in itself is a bad deal for all of us. I don't understand why we are giving \$150 billion to Iran while we have got \$47 billion in claims by Americans against Iran for terrorist activities. Why don't we give them the money first?

And I know I am out of time. But let's not approve the deal. Let's vote for the rule and make sure, before we ever see any vote on the agreement, we see the side deal.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the Members that the gentleman from Texas has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from New York has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire of my colleague if he has further speakers? If not, I am prepared to close.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, in response to the gentlewoman, I have three or four more speakers.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss what I believe will be one of the most consequential votes in the history of this body.

A fundamental duty of the Federal Government—so much that it is enshrined in the preamble to our Constitution—is to provide for the common defense.

We must ask ourselves: Will this deal enhance the safety and security of the American people? The answer is clearly no. On the contrary, it imperils the United States and our allies around the world.

Look only to those who know Iran best, its neighbors, who universally op-

pose the deal. Why? Because it is built on trusting a regime that has cheated on international agreements time and again and because it will launch a nuclear arms race in the most unstable region in the world.

So today we have a choice. To me, the choice is clear. We can support this deal and stand with a regime that spreads terror around the world, leads its people in chants of “Death to America,” and whose leaders refer to our country as the “Great Satan,” or we reject the deal and stand strong as a country, resolute in our pursuit of freedom and justice, stand with our allies, like Israel, and stand with the American people, who overwhelmingly opposed this deal.

I know where I stand. I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this deal and sending a clear signal to the world that we will not accept a nuclear Iran.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE), a gentleman with compassion and healing, a gentleman who is a physician, a gentleman on from the Education and the Workforce and Veterans' Affairs Committees.

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of legislation expressing disapproval of this proposed nuclear deal with Iran.

Forty years ago I was a young soldier just south of the militarized zone in Korea when they did not have a nuclear weapon. Now that they have joined the nuclear community, does the world feel safer with a rogue nation having a nuclear weapon?

I pose the question: What is in this agreement for America? Does it make us safer?

Mr. Speaker, this is not a Republican or a Democrat issue. This is an American issue. This affects all of us. It affects the Middle East, where our closest ally feels endangered, and I agree that they are.

And I pose the narrative question: What is it about “death to America” this administration does not understand?

The President presents a false narrative: war or this agreement. I could not disagree more. The sanctions brought the Iranians to the negotiating table.

What kind of an agreement did we negotiate? What happened to “anytime, anyplace” inspections? What happened to Americans actually being on the inspection team?

I think everyone, every thoughtful person, realizes this just slows the process down. But, ultimately, the Iranians will develop a nuclear weapon.

I support the rule and the underlying bills.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Miami, Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), the former chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, we need to ask ourselves if this nuclear deal with Iran makes the United States safer. Does it make Israel safer? Does it make the world safer?

As a result of this deal, Iran will be nuclear-capable, and its neighbors will not be complacent knowing that Iran can't produce a nuclear weapon.

The billions of dollars that the regime is set to receive will undoubtedly go towards building its military capabilities, not to mention its support for terror and other illicit activities.

Because this deal jeopardizes Iran's neighbors, the administration is promising Gulf countries military arms sales to defend against the increased Iranian threat.

We then will be the major proliferator of nuclear and conventional arms in the Middle East. Do we really believe that arming an extremely unstable and violent Middle East region to the teeth and having nuclear-capable Iran right there in the middle will make us or the world safer?

The answer is clear, Mr. Speaker. This deal is dangerous. It is bad public policy. We must oppose it.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wheaton, Illinois, (Mr. ROSKAM), the distinguished gentleman who spent several hours, 4 or 5 hours, with us in the Rules Committee last night.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman SESSIONS.

Mr. Speaker, Secretary Kerry came and gave a briefing to a closed session of Congress. Part of it was open for discussion. He said something provocative at the end. He said, “Folks, what is the alternative?”

And I said to him in a question and answer session, “You know, Mr. Secretary, for 2 years, the administration has been telling us that no deal is better than a bad deal. And if no deal is better than a bad deal, that means that there was an alternative.”

Secretary Kerry, during that same briefing, said that he walked away from the deal three times with the Iranians. And I said, “Secretary, when you walked away from the deal, that means that there was an alternative.”

So the administration does not get to argue today, Mr. Speaker, to this Congress or to the American people that there is no alternative. There is an alternative. And this House is prepared to offer alternatives.

I appreciate Chairman SESSIONS. I appreciate the Rules Committee bringing forth this package of bills that we can begin to discuss getting us out from underneath a disastrous deal.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

□ 1345

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and against the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot in good conscience accept a deal that is laden with secretive side agreements brokered by this administration, nor can we possibly grant \$150 billion to the world's foremost sponsor of terror and, in the process, turn our back on Israel.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this bad deal that the Supreme Leader of Iran now is publicly emboldened to say that Israel will not exist in 25 years and that terror will continue to plague the Middle East, Israel, and the entire world.

Mr. Speaker, as we approach September 11, I would ask my colleagues to please join me in rejecting this bad deal, and let's defeat terrorism rather than advance it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST).

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the deal with Iran. Iran is one of the world's largest state sponsors of terrorism.

It provides military and financial support to groups responsible for the deaths of Americans and our allies. In addition, the regime is working to undermine governments across the Middle East, including Iran, Syria, Yemen, and Lebanon.

As Iranians rally behind "death to America," I am left to wonder what other options we have but stopping them from obtaining the most dangerous weapons on Earth. Unfortunately, I believe this deal falls way short of that goal.

I pledge and will be working with my colleagues to make sure that we oppose this deal and that we find other alternatives.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, the weight of this decision falls heavily on this Chamber. Instead of following regular order, the majority's insistence on governing by crisis has once more taken over, and we are thrown into disarray.

The Iran agreement is the best option that we have to curbing Iran's nuclear ambitions. People who know—nuclear scientists, ambassadors, people of the military—have all said, including Colin Powell, I may add, that this is a good bill, this is a good negotiation that will help to keep us safe.

The work ahead will be arduous, and it is going to take coordination with our international partners who also negotiated this agreement with us, but peace is always preferable to war.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and vote "no" on this rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I want to thank my distinguished colleagues, my friends on the Rules

Committee, both Mr. MCGOVERN, Judge HASTINGS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER, for their participation today. I thank you very much, Ms. SLAUGHTER, for your professional attributes in this very, very difficult debate in the last few days that have taken many, many hours.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me that the deal that the administration negotiated is a disaster. We have talked about that all morning. Speaker after speaker after speaker after speaker spoke about the lack of benefit to the American people. It undermines American leadership abroad; it empowers the Iranian regime, and ignores what has been decades of policy where Americans would not deal with terrorists.

By overturning the decades of this bipartisan national defense policy, the administration is telling the world the United States is willing to negotiate with rogue states, those people that say "death to America," and give them exactly what they want. This will embolden future actors. It will limit the United States' ability to aggressively pursue sanctions against other countries.

The rest of the world will take note of our weakness. This is not leading; this is weakness. If the United States is willing to lift sanctions against Iran, we will unilaterally limit our ability to resolve issues through democracy, diplomacy, and through peace.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for Congress to stop this deal, which is why Republicans are on the floor today. We invite all of our colleagues to vote with us because it is the right thing, the adoption of this rule. Obviously, the lengthy debate we are going to have today is going to lead us to the conclusion that the underlying piece of legislation must be properly voted on.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, President Obama has sold our nation's security for some magic beans. This Iran deal is a bad deal for our national security. It is a bad deal for our allies—particularly Israel.

Removing sanctions against ballistic missiles and conventional arms, would happen before Iran halts its nuclear activity. If we try to re-impose sanctions, Iran gets to walk away from the deal free of sanctions all together and keep its money and nuclear weapons.

The way I see it, Iran is the only one benefiting from this deal. President Obama wants people to believe this is the best deal possible. I say, if this is the best deal, then I don't want any deal at all.

I am voting NO on this deal because I made a promise to my children and grandchildren that I would fight to make this nation safer and stronger for the next generation. I cannot break that promise to my grandchildren. This is a bad deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote YES on the rule and NO on passage of this agreement.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 186, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Gowdy	Mulvaney
Aderholt	Granger	Murphy (PA)
Allen	Graves (GA)	Newhouse
Amash	Graves (LA)	Noem
Amodel	Graves (MO)	Nugent
Babin	Griffith	Nunes
Barletta	Grothman	Olson
Barr	Guinta	Palazzo
Barton	Guthrie	Palmer
Benishek	Hanna	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Hardy	Pearce
Bishop (MI)	Harper	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Harris	Pittenger
Black	Hartzler	Pitts
Blackburn	Heck (NV)	Poe (TX)
Blum	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Pompeo
Boustany	Hice, Jody B.	Posey
Brady (TX)	Hill	Price, Tom
Brat	Holding	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Hudson	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Huelskamp	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga (MI)	Renacci
Buchanan	Hultgren	Ribble
Buck	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Rigell
Burgess	Hurt (VA)	Roby
Byrne	Issa	Roe (TN)
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Chaffetz	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Clawson	Jones	Ros-Lehtinen
Coffman	Jordan	Roskam
Cole	Joyce	Ross
Collins (GA)	Katko	Rothfus
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Royce
Conaway	King (IA)	Russell
Cook	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Costello (PA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Salmon
Cramer	Kline	Sanford
Crawford	Knight	Scalise
Crenshaw	Labrador	Schweikert
Culberson	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Curbelo (FL)	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sessions
Denham	Latta	Shimkus
Dent	LoBiondo	Shuster
DeSantis	Long	Simpson
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Diaz-Balart	Love	Smith (NE)
Dold	Lucas	Smith (NJ)
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Duffy	Lummis	Stefanik
Duncan (SC)	MacArthur	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Stivers
Ellmers (NC)	Marino	Stutzman
Emmer (MN)	Massie	Thompson (PA)
Farenthold	McCarthy	Thornberry
Fincher	McCaull	Tiberi
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Tipton
Fleischmann	McHenry	Trott
Fleming	McKinley	Turner
Flores	McMorris	Upton
Forbes	Rodgers	Valadao
Fortenberry	McSally	Wagner
Fox	Meadows	Walden
Franks (AZ)	Meehan	Walker
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Walorski
Garrett	Mica	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Miller (FL)	Weber (TX)
Gibson	Miller (MI)	Webster (FL)
Gohmert	Moolenaar	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Westerman
Gosar	Mullin	Westmoreland

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Speier
Swellwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—4

Cuellar

Maloney,
Carolyn

Neugebauer
Walberg

□ 1416

Messrs. FATTAH, NOLAN, BRADY of Pennsylvania, JEFFRIES, and CARSON of Indiana changed their votes from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 114-58)

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2015, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2015.

FINDING THAT THE PRESIDENT HAS NOT COMPLIED WITH SECTION 2 OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 411) finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the resolution is considered read.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 411

Whereas section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as enacted by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, defined the term “agreement” as meaning “an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally

binding or not, including any joint comprehensive plan of action entered into or made between Iran and any other parties, and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future.”;

Whereas section C(14) of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action requires Iran to implement the “Roadmap for Clarification of Past and Present Outstanding Issues regarding Iran’s Nuclear Program” (referred to as the “Roadmap”) which was agreed to with the IAEA;

Whereas the Roadmap identifies two separate, confidential agreements between the IAEA and Iran, one to address remaining outstanding issues related to “Possible Military Dimensions” of Iran’s nuclear program, and another “regarding the issue of Parchin”;

Whereas both of those agreements constitute side agreements within the meaning of section 135(h)(1);

Whereas section 135(a)(1)(A) requires the President to transmit the agreement, including any side agreements, as defined by section 135(h)(1) to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership;

Whereas the Executive Communication numbered 2307 and captioned “A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a letter and attachments satisfying all requirements of Sec. 135(a) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Pub. L. 114-17), as received July 19, 2015”, did not include the text of either side agreement with the IAEA; and

Whereas the President has not subsequently transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the text of the separate agreements identified in the Roadmap: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That—

(1) the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 because the communication from the President did not constitute the agreement as defined by section 135(h)(1) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; and

(2) the period for review by Congress of nuclear agreements with Iran under section 135(b) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 has not commenced because the agreement has not yet been transmitted to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution shall be debatable for 2 hours, equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their respective designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 1 hour. The gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend and submit extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all know why we are here to debate this resolution today. The bottom line is that, for those of us that were involved in this agreement, we always thought that international inspections were going to be done by international inspectors, not by the Iranians, not by those in the Iranian regime.

Whether you like the Iran agreement or not, one thing I think all Members can agree on is that sound verification must be the bedrock of any viable agreement.

Iran cannot cheat and get away with it. And the reason this is an issue for us is because Iran has cheated on every past agreement. That is why the verification was so important.

The problem is key aspects of this verification agreement have not been presented to Congress to review. Indeed, there are two separate arrangements agreed to between Iran and an arm of the U.N. here, the International Atomic Energy Agency.

One is regarding the regime's past bomb work, of which there are a thousand pages of evidence that the IAEA tell us about, and the other involves access to the Iranian military base at Parchin, where that evidence shows that that testing took place.

In order to fully assess the agreement, Members of Congress should have access to these documents. This is especially important since Iran will almost certainly treat these arrangements as setting a standard for future IAEA requests to access any suspicious sites, especially military sites, since they have made it clear nobody is going to their military sites.

Physical access by the IAEA to Parchin is critical to understanding Iran's past bomb work. This is where "Iran constructed a large explosives containment vessel," to quote the IAEA.

Why did they do it? To conduct experiments related to the development, say the international inspectors, of nuclear weapons. Iran has blocked the international inspectors' access to Parchin for years.

In the meantime, we are told by those inspectors that they watch on spy satellite as Iran bulldozes and paves over this site and then paves over the site again.

If the international inspectors cannot attain a clear understanding of the experimentation that took place, then the United States will have great difficulty figuring out how long it would take Iran to rush toward a nuclear weapon.

In recent congressional testimony, administration officials expressed con-

fidence in their access to suspicious sites that the agreement provides the IAEA.

Yet, these separate arrangements have the potential to seriously weaken our ability to verify the agreement as a whole even is true, that Iran is going to do self-inspections here, which is what Iran asserts.

Mr. Speaker, the history of Iranian negotiating behavior, as we know, is to pocket past concessions. And then what do they do? They push for more and more and more.

The separate arrangement agreed to between the IAEA and Iran regarding inspection of the facilities at Parchin will almost certainly be regarded by that government in Iran as a precedent for their IAEA access to future suspicious sites in Iran.

In other words, if you don't get access to this site, you are not going to get access to other military sites where there is evidence that the same type of thing has occurred.

So if Iran won't let international inspectors do the international inspecting today, what makes us think that the Iranians will allow intrusive terms to these agreements in the future after sanctions have been lifted when we find evidence of the next site?

I have little doubt that the side deals of today will become central to the agreement's verification provisions tomorrow. This makes it imperative that these agreements are made available to Congress.

Mr. Speaker, 350 Members of this House, Democrats and Republicans—I think we had the majority of the Democrats, and I think we had every Republican—wrote to Secretary Kerry last fall.

Iran's willingness to resolve concerns over its bomb work, as we said in that letter, is a fundamental test of Iran's intention to uphold a comprehensive agreement. That is why we all wrote that letter together, in order to make that point.

The administration once took the same position that we are taking right now on the House floor as well, but it gave that position away in negotiations. It gave away that position.

Reviewing these side agreements is critical to understanding whether Iran intends to pass that test. We need access to those agreements.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after several years of difficult negotiations with a dangerous and malevolent regime, the administration and representatives of the other P5+1 nations reached an agreement with Iran over its nuclear program.

The primary objective of the United States in the negotiations was to prevent Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon. Given the unthinkable con-

sequences of Iran, the world's foremost sponsor of terrorism, obtaining the bomb, this has been an overriding national security imperative of the United States for decades.

As an American and as a Jew who is deeply concerned about the security of Israel, it is also intensely personal.

I believe our vital interests have been advanced under the agreement, since it would be extremely difficult for Iran to amass enough fissionable material to make a nuclear weapon without giving the United States ample notice and time to stop it.

We will still need to guard against any Iranian effort to obtain nuclear material or technology from proliferators abroad, a reality even if Iran had given up all enrichment.

But the agreement likely gives the world at least a decade and a half without the prospect of an Iranian nuclear weapon and without going to war to make that so. That is a major achievement.

The United States realized this objective by securing a number of important provisions in the agreement, including the power to snap back sanctions, in whole or in part, and not subject to a veto in the United Nations.

The United States and its allies also procured an extensive and intrusive inspections regime that lasts for 25 years or more. By applying to the whole chain of the enrichment process, from the ground to the centrifuge, it realistically precludes Iran from developing a hidden and parallel enrichment process.

With respect to those inspections, I think it is very important to clarify something which I often hear the opponents obscure, and that is there are inspections with respect to Iran's prior military work, inspections of known nuclear sites and inspections of other sites which we may suspect Iran may conduct work in the future. And the mechanisms with respect to each are different.

With respect to the known nuclear sites, there are 24/7 eyes on Iran's enrichment activities that would be the most extensive and intrusive inspections any nation has seen of its nuclear program.

□ 1430

With respect to its potential sites—that is sites we don't know, where we suspect in the future they may do work—we will have a mechanism to obtain inspections in a timely way and certainly in a timely enough way that, if they were to ever utilize radioactive material, they would be detected.

Finally, we have the inspections into their prior military work. I will say this with respect to the prior military work, those of us that have reviewed the intelligence know that we have an extensive bank of information about what Iran had been doing in the past.

To the degree that we need a baseline for what Iran's work has been, we have that baseline, and I think that is a pivotal consideration going forward.

As recently as yesterday, the Director of National Intelligence stated that he has great confidence that we can determine if Iran fails to comply with the agreement.

For me, it is the size and sophistication of Iran's nuclear enrichment capability after 15 years that is the key challenge. At that point, it is the work necessary to produce the mechanism for the bomb that becomes the real obstacle to a breakout, and that work is the most challenging to detect. Nevertheless, I have searched for a better, credible alternative and concluded that there is none.

When it comes to predicting the future, we are all looking through the glass darkly, but if Congress rejects the deal agreed to by the administration and much of the world, the sanctions regime will, if not collapse, almost certainly erode.

This does not mean that Iran necessarily dashes madly for a bomb, but it will almost certainly move forward with its enrichment program, unconstrained by inspections, limits on research, and development of new centrifuges, metallurgy, or other protections in the deal.

In short, Iran will have many of the advantages of the deal in access to money and trade with none of its disadvantages. Instead of rejecting the deal, therefore, Congress should focus on making it stronger.

First, we should make it clear that, if Iran cheats, the repercussions will be severe.

Second, we should continue to strengthen our intelligence capabilities to detect any form of Iranian non-compliance.

Third, we should establish the expectation that, while Iran will be permitted to have an enrichment capability for civilian use, it will never, never be permitted to produce highly enriched uranium, and if it attempts to do so, it will be stopped with force.

Fourth, we will share with Israel all the technologies necessary to maintain its regional military superiority and, if necessary, to destroy Iran's nuclear facilities no matter how deep the bunker.

Finally, we are prepared to work with Israel and our Gulf allies to make sure that every action Iran takes to use its newfound wealth for destructive activities in the region will prompt an equal and opposite reaction, and we will combat Iran's malignant influence.

The Iranian people will one day throw off the shackles of their repressive regime, and I hope that this deal will empower those who wish to reform Iranian governance and behavior. The 15 years or more this agreement provides will give us the time to test that proposition.

Then, as now, if Iran is determined to develop the bomb, there is only one way to stop it, and that is by the use of force; but the American people and others around the world will recognize that we did everything possible to avoid war.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. NUNES), chairman of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence.

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, although the Obama administration has pitched the Iran nuclear accord as a way to prevent the Ayatollahs from developing nuclear weapons, the agreement lifts the key restrictions on Iran's nuclear activities after 10 to 15 years. Many of my fellow Members wonder how the administration can be so naive as to pave the way for an Iranian bomb in the course of trying to prevent an Iranian bomb.

Well, the answer is clear to me. The President is gambling. He is betting that the very act of engaging with Iran will moderate the regime's behavior so that, in a decade or so from now, we won't have to worry about it anymore. He has called his engagement with Iran a calculated risk. Indeed, it is a risk.

As I said, the President is placing a bet; but why would anyone bet on the moderation of the Iranian regime? It has not changed one iota since the Ayatollahs seized power in 1979. Thirty-six years later, Iran is the world's biggest state sponsor of terrorism. It is also responsible for the deaths of thousands of U.S. soldiers in Iraq.

Obama has spoken of the Ayatollah Khamenei as possibly seeking to rejoin the community of nations. This is a thin reed to justify giving Iran a path to the bomb in the near future. With their ritual "death to America" chants, I don't know how the Iranians could make it any more clear that they do not want to rejoin the community of nations. They want to blow up the community of nations.

Soon after the Iranian agreement was signed, Khamenei himself tweeted a silhouette image of President Obama holding a gun to his head. I just don't understand what is more clear that this regime could do to make its intentions clearer to the American people, but our President sees things differently.

As he told *The New York Times*, if the nuclear agreement is signed, "Who knows? Iran may change."

Well, consider this: if you are rolling the dice at a casino, who knows? You may roll a 7. If you are at the roulette wheel, who knows? It may land on your number. When you are gambling, one thing is for sure; in the long run, the casino always wins.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, this is not about a casino, nor is it about a

gambler losing money. This is about gambling on human lives, U.S. lives and our Western allies' lives.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, reasonable people disagree about the merits and shortcomings of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

In the strongest democracy in the world, we have a sacred duty to uphold the high standard of debate and govern responsibly. That is why I am profoundly disappointed by vitriolic personal attacks and character assassinations on both sides of this debate; and I am outraged by the Republicans' attempt to score political points on this critical issue of national and global security.

The threat to pursue wasteful litigation and to tie the hands of our President until the end of his term are particularly outrageous, when the Senate has indicated it will not even consider these measures. I strongly oppose the blatantly irresponsible partisan political measures before the House this week.

As ranking Democratic member of the House Committee on Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, I have participated in dozens of classified and unclassified Iran briefings with the Obama administration, including members of our negotiating team and colleagues in Congress during the last 2 years.

I have thoroughly evaluated the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action released in July, met with foreign leaders, nuclear experts, and heard from thousands of thoughtful and passionate constituents.

After careful consideration, I will vote against approval of the agreement. Sufficient safeguards simply are not in place to address the risk associated with this agreement, and it will not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure.

First, in 15 years, Iran will become an internationally recognized nuclear threshold state capable of producing highly enriched uranium to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, relieving U.N. sanctions on conventional arms and ballistic missiles and releasing billions of dollars to the Iranian regime will lead to a dangerous regional weapons race and enable Iran to bolster its funding of Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis, and Bashar al-Assad.

Third, the deal does not explicitly require Iran to fully disclose its previous military work before sanctions relief is provided. Inspectors will not have anytime, anywhere access to the most suspicious facilities, particularly the Parchin military complex, with a process that lacks transparency and could

delay inspectors access for up to 24 days.

Finally, there are no clear accountability measures regarding punishment for minor violations of the agreement. In recent weeks, the administration has responded to some of my concerns by committing to additional security assistance to Israel and our Gulf partners and to improving international cooperation on countering Iran's non-nuclear destabilizing activities.

I will work in Congress and with the administration to expeditiously implement these commitments to enhance—not just maintain—nonnuclear-related sanctions to establish stronger mechanisms to deter Iran and to ensure Iran never develops a nuclear weapon.

One of my highest priorities will continue to be the protection of Israel's qualitative military edge so that our closest ally in the region can defend itself against all threats from Iran or its proxies.

In the same week, my colleagues, that Congress holds this important vote, Iran's Supreme Leader vowed again to annihilate the Jewish State of Israel and to vilify the Great Satan that he calls the United States of America.

It is my sincere hope that we can work together in a bipartisan way moving forward. The security of the United States of America and our allies depends on it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), who chairs the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa and was the author of some of the Iran sanctions laws that are in force today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my esteemed chairman for his leadership on this critical issue. I also want to congratulate Mr. POMPEO, whose resolution we are discussing.

Mr. Speaker, this deal will allow Iran to become nuclear capable in just a short order. It will allow Iran to grow and expand its military. It will allow Iran to continue with its support for terror. These facts are indisputable.

What is also indisputable is that the regime in Tehran detests the United States, the West, and the democratic Jewish State of Israel, our steadfast partner. The Supreme Leader of Iran constantly incites chants of "death to America" and "death to Israel." Are we not listening?

Through its proxies, Hezbollah and Hamas, Iran seeks to make this threat into a reality. Earlier this week, the Supreme Leader threatened that Israel will no longer exist in just 25 years.

Because of this agreement, Mr. Speaker, the regime will now have the weapons; it will now have the capabilities to pose an even greater threat to us, to Israel, and to our interests in the region. Giving a regime that openly

calls for and works toward our destruction and the destruction of Israel is insane. We are providing Iran a path to nuclear weapons and increased conventional weapons capability.

This isn't just bad policy. It is dangerous. It is naive to think that this nuclear deal with Iran won't make us and the world less safe, less secure, and less peaceful. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we must reject it.

I thank Chairman ROYCE and Mr. POMPEO for this resolution.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the distinguished assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated between the United States, the permanent 5 members of the United Nations Security Council plus Germany, the European Union, and Iran.

I support this deal because it is the best available option to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, an outcome that all of us agree must be prevented. The opponents of this agreement say that Iran supports terrorism. I don't disagree with that.

This deal, however, is about only one issue—the issue that the entire world agrees is by far the most pressing—preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. It is precisely because Iran is so nefarious that this deal is so important.

□ 1445

As dangerous as Iran is and may remain, Iran would be far more dangerous if they acquired a nuclear weapon. This deal is the best way to prevent that unacceptable outcome.

The opponents of this agreement say that we can't trust the Iranians to abide by the agreement's strict restrictions on their nuclear program. That may be true. And I wouldn't be supporting the agreement if it required us to trust the Iranians, but it doesn't.

This deal is built around the strictest verifications ever devised. If Iran tries to dash toward a bomb, we will be more likely to catch them using the verification procedures under this deal than we would be without it.

With this deal in place, if you do catch Iran dashing toward a nuclear weapon, all options will be on the table to stop them. But military force must always be a last resort. I have not heard any of the opponents of this agreement present any realistic diplomatic alternative that would be anywhere near as likely to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, and if we reject this deal, military action will become more likely.

Whenever we send Americans into harm's way, we must be able to look them and their families in the eye and honestly tell them that we have exhausted every other option. This deal

is a diplomatic option we must exhaust. This deal's opponents present no other.

The late Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin, said: "You don't make peace with friends. You make it with unsavory enemies."

We are now faced with three choices: this deal, a drastically increased likelihood of military confrontation, or a nuclear Iran. I support this deal, and I ask my colleagues to join me in doing so.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, what was previously unacceptable, an Iranian nuclear state, is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel and other friends in the region—and is a significant risk to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable red line was no enrichment whatsoever—but under this agreement, Iran will be able to assemble an industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to sunset in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake about it, Iran's decades-long rabid hatred of Israel shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran's Supreme Leader said to Israel, "You will not see the next 25 years," adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, inspections are anything but anytime or anywhere, the Obama administration's previous pledge to the Nation and the world. We have learned that the IAEA has entered into a secret agreement that precludes unfettered, robust inspection. That also violates the Corker law. We have not gotten that information.

Mr. Speaker, Iran is the world's leading supporter of terrorism. This agreement provides tens of billions of dollars for weapons and war-making material.

The Supreme Leader also criticized any call to end its ballistic missile program, another eleventh hour concession. The Supreme Leader called that stupid and idiotic, and that they should mass produce such weapons and means of delivery.

Countries build ICBMs, Mr. Speaker, to deliver nukes.

The administration was reluctant, but I held two hearings and the chairman held several hearings on the Americans being held hostage. Pastor

Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured, or missing. Why are they not free?

President Obama continues to tell Congress and the American people that the Iran nuclear agreement is the best deal possible and advances peace. Such boasting collapses under scrutiny. What was previously unacceptable—an Iranian nuclear state—is now inevitable under the terms and conditions of what is officially known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Tragically, the deal is riddled with serious flaws, gaps, and huge concessions to Iran. Taken as a whole, the deal poses an existential threat to Israel, our allies in the region—and even poses significant risks to the United States.

Not only is Iran now permitted to continue enriching uranium—a previous nonnegotiable redline was no enrichment whatsoever—under this agreement, Iran will not be required to dismantle its bomb-making technology and will have an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program once the agreement begins to “sunset” in as little as a decade.

And make no mistake, Iran’s decades-long rabid hatred of Israel shows no sign of abating anytime soon. Yesterday, the Times of Israel reported that Iran’s Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said to Israel: “You will not see (the) next 25 years,” adding that the Jewish state will be hounded until it is destroyed.

On the inspections front, Supreme Leader Khamenei has stated that he will “never” permit inspectors to inspect Iran’s military bases. Even after the agreement was signed, the Iranian Minister of Defense reportedly said that “Tehran will not allow any foreigner to discover Iran’s defensive and missile capabilities by inspecting the country’s military sites.”

Inspections under this agreement are anything but “anytime, anywhere”—the Obama Administration’s previous pledge to the nation and the world. We have learned that the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has entered into a secret side agreement to preclude unfettered, robust inspection, and in another bizarre concession by the Administration and our negotiating partners, even allows Iran to self-monitor in certain circumstances.

Yet the agreement itself contains many limits on access by IAEA inspectors to suspected sites, including a 24-day period in which Iran is allowed to continue to refuse the IAEA’s request to visit a facility followed by a very long process needed to increase pressure on Iran to permit access if it still blocks access by inspectors. During this period, Iran will have sufficient time to remove, cover up, or destroy any evidence. “Managed access” would be better called “manipulated access” as inspectors will get access to suspected sites only after consultations between the world powers and Iran, over nearly a month.

Given Iran’s repeated cover-ups of its clandestine nuclear program, its refusal to give the IAEA access to its Parchin military facility (where Iran is believed to have tested detonators for nuclear warheads), and its stonewalling the IAEA concerning evidence that it had done extensive research and development on a nuclear explosive device, verification is fundamental to ensure that Iran

is abiding by the agreement’s terms. Secretary of State John Kerry, after an Iranian history of refusal to allow inspections at Parchin, would only assure us of inspections there “as appropriate,” whatever that means.

Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman has said that pledges by Obama Administration officials that the agreement would guarantee “anywhere, anytime” inspections of Iran’s nuclear facilities were only “rhetorical.” Mere words without substance? Why would our allies in the region trust us if our word—and negotiating positions—are indeed only rhetorical flourish?

The key restriction on Iran’s nuclear program—the ability to enrich at high levels—begins to expire in as little as 10 years. Once these restrictions expire, Iran could enrich on an industrial scale and the U.S. and its allies will be left with no effective measures to prevent Iran from initiating an accelerated nuclear program to produce the materials needed for a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the IAEA has uncovered significant evidence that Iran has engaged in activities related to the development of a nuclear weapon. Despite many agreements with the IAEA in which Iran has pledged to provide satisfactory information, the IAEA has repeatedly said that Iran has given it virtually nothing. Secretary Kerry has said that the U.S. has “absolute knowledge” of Iran’s past military activities regarding its nuclear program, but Gen. Michael Hayden, the former Director of the CIA, recently testified to Congress that the U.S. did not have that capability.

Furthermore, as witnesses testified at a joint hearing in July by three Foreign Affairs subcommittees, there is ample evidence that Iran has a longstanding nuclear collaboration with North Korea. In light of the abundant evidence they will present, what gives the Administration certainty that the Iranians won’t at some point during this agreement acquire fissile material beyond what they are allowed to produce for themselves or actual warheads from North Korea?

Why was the Iran-North Korea nuclear collaboration not factored into the Iran nuclear agreement? Surely Secretary Kerry is aware of the Iran-North Korea nuclear linkage. Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs Douglas Frantz, previously a high-ranking Kerry Senate aide, wrote a 2003 article about Iran’s ties to the North Korean nuclear program. Are we to believe Frantz and Kerry never discussed this issue? He dodged the question at today’s committee hearing.

Mr. Speaker, in March 2007, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1747 which, *inter alia*, established an embargo on the export from Iran of all arms and related materials, thereby banning all states and groups from purchasing or receiving arms from Iran. The resolution also called on all states to “exercise vigilance and restraint” in their supply of any items covered by the U.N. Register of Conventional Arms to Iran.

However, reports indicate that Russia is eager to sell massive amounts of military hardware to Iran. Major General Qassem Suleimani, Iran’s Revolutionary Guard leader, recently visited Russia. How will this shape other regional conflicts in which Iran is currently involved, including Iraq, Syria, and

Yemen? After the conventional arms embargo is lifted in just 5 years, what limitations, if any, will there be on Iran’s ability to export arms, specifically heavy weapons? Besides Russia, who else will sell weapons to Iran? China?

Moreover, the Administration and its supporters of the Iranian nuclear agreement downplay the possibility of Saudi Arabia, for example, producing a nuclear weapon as part of a Middle East arms race. However, the Saudis are building King Abdullah City for Atomic Renewable Energy to train nuclear scientists and already have greater science and mathematics capacity than Pakistan had when it developed nuclear weapons. Why couldn’t and why wouldn’t the Saudis join the nuclear arms race when faced with a more nuclear and conventionally armed Iran? Secretary Kerry would have us believe that the Saudis and others in the region would prefer the current agreement to an effort to achieve a more effective one and would agree not to pursue nuclear weapons even though Iran is on the path to develop or acquire its own.

Mr. Speaker, ballistic missiles are a central component of any country’s nuclear weapons program as they allow for the quick, accurate delivery of nuclear weapons over long distances. While the agreement calls for Iran to abide by all U.N. Security Council resolutions—including the requirement that “Iran shall not undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons,” Iranian Supreme leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei’s criticized the call for Iran to end its ballistic missile program, characterizing it as “a stupid, idiotic expectation” and claiming “The Revolutionary Guards should definitely carry out their program and not be satisfied with the present level. They should mass produce.”

In an 11th hour concession by the Obama Administration and others, the agreement “sunsets” U.N. sanctions on Iran’s ballistic missile program after 8 years, and also requires that the European Union do the same. U.S. intelligence estimates Iran to have the largest arsenal of ballistic missiles in the Middle East. Congress has received expert testimony that “no country that has not aspired to possess nuclear weapons has ever opted to sustain” a costly, long-range missile program. Simply put, countries build ICBMs to deliver nukes.

Under this agreement, the Iranians have stated they are under no obligation to stop developing ballistic missiles. In fact, this agreement would allow them the two things they need to advance their program: money and foreign assistance.

Iran dared to insert ballistic missiles and conventional weapons into the nuclear negotiations without fear of disturbing the talks. Meanwhile, the Administration was reluctant to use its leverage during the negotiations to free the four Americans held hostage in Iran today. Pastor Saeed Abedini, Amir Hekmati, Jason Rezaian, and Robert Levinson remain in jail—abused, tortured or missing.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement requires “full implementation” by October 15 of the commitments in the “roadmap” made by Iran to the IAEA in their 2011 agreement, following which the IAEA is to provide its “final assessment on the resolution of all past and present outstanding issues.” However, there is no stated

penalty if Iran continues to refuse to provide sufficient information to fully answer the IAEA's questions, which Iran cannot do without admitting it had a secret nuclear weapons program.

Iran has repeatedly agreed to answer the IAEA's questions regarding extensive evidence that it had a secret research and development program regarding a nuclear device, including fitting it onto a ballistic missile. All that resulted was the Iranians stonewalling the inspectors.

Is the failure to resolve the possible military dimensions as required by the IAEA a violation of the agreement? Why would Iran provide any information now when there is nothing in the agreement to compel it to do so?

Iran currently is the world's leading supporter of terrorism, and this agreement provides funding that will drastically expand Iran's regional destabilization efforts—from Israel to Iraq to Yemen to Lebanon and elsewhere. The Administration disputes the figure of \$150 billion to be released to Iran, but even a portion of that amount would provide significant resources to fund Iran's terrorism in the region—threatening our allies in the region and global security.

Moreover, the Administration underestimates the revenue from both rising oil prices at some point and the tax revenues from increased commercial investment and activity.

Congress should oppose in any way possible the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, reinstate comprehensive, robust sanctions and direct the executive branch to resume the struggle to craft an enforceable accord to ensure no nuclear weapons capability for Iran—ever.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Defense.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support for the Iran nuclear agreement.

As the ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I am acutely aware of the harmful influence Iran and its proxies have on the security situation in the greater Middle East. However, despite my clear and deep distrust of Iran, I firmly support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, given the improvement it works.

This hard-fought multilateral agreement will severely limit Iran's nuclear ambitions, establish a verifiable and robust inspection regime, allow for the timely reinstatement of sanctions for violations of this agreement, and in no way limit U.S. military options.

I cannot argue that the agreement is perfect, and I am frustrated at its limited scope. However, in any negotiation, especially one among sovereign nations, each having their own economic and security considerations, some compromise is necessary. Critically, I believe the agreement reached

accomplishes the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I concur with the sentiments of my esteemed friend and former Senator Richard Lugar, who recently wrote that congressional rejection of the Iran deal would “kill the last chance for Washington to reach a verifiable Iranian commitment not to build a nuclear weapon” and “destroy the effective coalition that brought Iran to the negotiating table.”

I believe it is vital for the duration of the agreement that the U.S. leads the international community to maintain focus on Iran's compliance and ensure that Iran does not undermine regional stability through other pathways. To accomplish this, we must remain steadfast in our commitments to Israel and all our regional partners.

I ask all to constructively work to improve the security situation in the Middle East, rather than using all of their energy to undermine the agreement. We cannot rely on force of arms alone to bring lasting stability to any region of the world.

In conclusion, I do hope that the exhaustive multilateral negotiation that led to this agreement will serve as a template for future U.S. and international engagement on other outstanding issues that have led to instability and violence in the region.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE), chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade.

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the chairman, the gentleman from California, for his leadership on this critical national security issue.

Mr. Speaker, this Iranian deal promises peace—peace in our time—by guaranteeing a nuclear weaponized Iran in our children's time.

Anyone who has read the Iran Nuclear Agreement Act should support this legislation before us. The Iran Nuclear Agreement Act, known as the Corker bill, is to allow representatives of the American people—us—to read what is in the deal before we vote on the deal. The nuclear deal with Iran may be the most important international agreement in our lifetime.

The Corker bill is crystal clear when it comes to defining exactly what the President needs to provide Congress before the review period of 60 days begins. The President is obligated under the law—and let me read a portion of the law that the President signed. Here is what it says:

Congress is allowed to have the agreement itself and any additional materials related thereto, including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements.

The logic behind this requirement is simple and essential: Congress cannot

review an agreement without having access to everything, including the fine print. We need to see all the secret side deals, Mr. Chairman.

Testifying before the Foreign Affairs Committee, Secretary Kerry, who was making the deal for us, said that even he had not seen the secret side deals. And these secret deals are not just technical formalities. The deals I am talking about are the IAEA agreement to let Iran inspect itself at the Parchin military facility. The Parchin facility is known as the place where Iran has worked to build nuclear warheads.

There is absolutely nothing normal about allowing Iran to inspect itself. That is what this side agreement apparently does, if we ever get to see the whole thing.

I was a judge in Texas for a long time. It is like having a burglar coming to trial and saying: “Judge, I want 12 burglars on my jury.” We would never let that happen, but we will let Iran inspect itself? We want to see these side secret deals.

And these revelations may be only the tip of the iceberg. What else is included in these secret deals, these side deals? Well, we really don't know because we haven't been furnished—by law—these deals.

It is the legal right of Congress to know all of those details before voting to approve or disapprove this nuclear agreement. We in Congress are the representatives of the people. Isn't it about time we start reading all the information before we vote? I don't know that Congress has learned that lesson.

The citizens of this country have a right to know absolutely about these side deals. The President signed the Corker bill. It is the law. He has to live by it, whether he likes it or not.

And that is just the way it is.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. In 2002, the President of the United States and this Congress voted to address the perceived threat of a mushroom cloud coming from Iraq by going to war, a war that unleashed massive violence in the Middle East and threatens the world even today.

The Obama administration, faced with the actual threat of a nuclear weaponized Iran, has chosen, instead, the path of diplomacy, the path of peace, and I am proud to support this historic agreement.

As the President said: “This deal demonstrates that American diplomacy can bring about real and meaningful change—change that makes our country, and the world, safer and more secure.”

Voices inside and outside the Congress are calling for a rejection of this historic agreement, among them the same neocons who stampeded the United States into war with Iraq. They

were wrong then, and they are wrong now. Iran is now 2 to 3 months from being able to produce a nuclear weapon, and yet the critics have offered no credible alternative to a deal that blocks all the paths to a nuclear weapon.

Now, we know this deal is not perfect. Iran is a bad actor. The President and all of us would have much preferred a deal that prohibits Iran from enriching any uranium forever and maintains sanctions until Iran changes its behavior and becomes a responsible member of the world community. But that deal didn't happen—because it never could have happened.

This deal greatly improves the outlook for peace by blocking all of Iran's paths to a nuclear weapon, and this is carefully spelled out in the agreement itself, often in very technical language: Iran's stockpiles of rich uranium will be reduced from enough for 10 bombs to less than 1; the number of Iran's installed centrifuges is reduced by over two-thirds; and far from trusting Iran, the deal demands the most robust, intrusive inspections regime ever in an international agreement.

We heard yesterday, many of us, from the ambassadors from five of our allies in the P5+1. These ambassadors said if the United States walks away, the deal collapses. Iran would be without any constraints to move ahead with its nuclear weapons program. All paths would be open. There would be no inspections whatsoever, no insight into Iran's activities. The ability of the United States to build meaningful international coalitions would be eroded for the foreseeable future.

I view this upcoming vote on Iran as one of the most important of my career, and, my colleagues, I would say that is true for everyone. It is one of the most important of my life. For me, the choice is clear: diplomacy over war.

Colleagues, let's remember, nothing is off the table. But why wouldn't we choose peace and give peace a chance?

□ 1500

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Part of diplomacy is making certain that you have verification, and our problem here is that the Iranians are boasting right now that the U.S. is not going to have access—or any other international inspectors are going to have access—to their military sites where they do this work. The problem is that inspectors don't get 24 hours' notice; they get 24 days' notice, and then they go through a process in which Iran and China and Russia can block.

The former head of the CIA Michael Hayden testified in front of the Foreign Affairs Committee that we never believed that the uranium at Iran's declared facilities would ever make its

way into a weapon. We always believed that that work would be done somewhere else, in secret.

So again, if you cannot get international inspectors into Parchin where they did that work, what makes you think, what makes us believe, that in the future we are going to have international inspectors, once that is the established premise, go anywhere else, go anywhere else?

As Hayden said, requiring consultations between the world powers in Iran takes inspections from the technical level and puts it at the political level, which he calls a formula for chaos, obfuscation, ambiguity, and doubt.

And we do not even know how bad the capitulation was in the site agreements, a capitulation that will undermine the ability to catch Iranian cheating. That is why we are concerned about the way this was negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO), the author of H. Res. 411.

Mr. POMPEO. Thank you, Chairman ROYCE. A great deal about what we have learned has come out of your committee, about what we have learned about this deal and what the Iranians' objectives are. So thank you for all the hard work that the Foreign Affairs Committee has done related to this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things to say about the Iranian deal that this President has set up, but this bill is very narrow and very simple and very straightforward. It is aimed to establish a simple precedent, which says, if the President signs something into law, he is going to fulfill the obligation which he has made for himself.

I have listened to the debate so far today. I can tell you that we have not had any Member of this House stand up and tell you that they have read the entire agreement. I suspect that we will not. That is because there is no American who has read the entire agreement. That is right—not the President of the United States, not the Secretary of State, not Undersecretary Sherman. No Member of Congress, no member of the public, no American citizen has read this entire agreement. And yet we have got Members who say: This a great deal, and I am excited to vote for it.

I don't know how one can feel that way about an agreement that one has not read.

We have Members of Congress stand up and demand that they see the text of bills that rename post offices, and yet this is a historic agreement, and many of my colleagues are saying they are going to vote for it without even knowing what the details are about important components of how we are going to verify whether the Iranian regime has complied with this agreement. I think that is deeply troubling.

I think, as Representatives, we have a moral obligation to understand what

it is we are voting on. I think we have a constitutional duty to require that the President comply with his obligations, and I know there is a legal obligation for the President to turn over every element of this deal.

Mr. Speaker, in July, Senator COTTON and I traveled to Vienna, where we were informed by the Deputy Director of the IAEA of these two secret side deals. He looked us straight in the eye and said he had read them but I wasn't going to get to.

I think that is wrong. I think that makes it impossible for a Member of Congress to support this agreement.

He informed me—that is, the Deputy Director of the IAEA informed me—that Iranians had read these two secret side deals, but Senator COTTON and I weren't going to get to read them.

I have spent the intervening 50 days asking, cajoling, demanding, praying that this President would do what he is required to do under Corker-Cardin and what every Member of Congress is entitled to have—that is, provide us with the deal. Well, we don't have that.

H. Res. 411 simply says we, as Members of Congress, are going to demand that this President comply with what Corker-Cardin sets out. Show us the terms of the deal. Allow us the opportunity to read the agreement so that we can form judgments and the American people can form judgments about its scope.

In the absence of that, H. Res. 411 makes clear that the President can't lift sanctions. That was the deal. In exchange for not demanding that this be a treaty, Corker-Cardin said what we want is simple transparency; just show us the simple terms of the deal. And this President couldn't do it.

I ask all of my colleagues to vote for H. Res. 411 and demand that the President show us the secret side deals.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), the chairman of the House Democratic Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. I thank the ranking member, Mr. SCHIFF, for yielding the time.

Mr. Speaker, the goal of America and the international community in our negotiations with Iran is and has been to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons. By all accounts, Iran had already reached a point where it was perhaps just months away from crossing that nuclear threshold—I repeat, months away; not years, not decades—months away.

So few votes can be taken more seriously than one intended to halt the spread of nuclear weapons. That is why this Congress and the American people should support the agreement negotiated to prevent Iran from producing and possessing nuclear weapons, and we should vote here in this Congress against any of these congressional

measures attempting to thwart its implementation.

The negotiated agreement provides for inspection and verification, a regime which Iran had to consent to and it must now submit to. That regime for inspection and verification is not just credible, it is enforceable, and those who have conducted nuclear inspections will tell you that. Ask those who deal with nuclear materials, and they will tell you that. And ask those who have butted heads with and had to negotiate with Iran, and they will tell you that.

Our ability to respond as well, should Iran decide to regress from its obligations, is real and it is robust. Nothing in this negotiated agreement is based on trust. The inspections, the penalties, they all are mandatory and unambiguous in their terms.

No deal is perfect. We can all think of ways of making a deal better. But thinking is not doing, and speculation won't stop Iran from reaching a nuclear weapons capability.

It should escape no one's notice that every measure, every economic sanction in place today against Iran has failed to stop Iran's lurch towards a nuclear weapon—remember, perhaps only months away from that nuclear threshold.

It was time for America and our international partners to take this to another level before the only alternative available to all of us was the use of military force. This is why the U.S., Great Britain, Germany, France, Russia, and China joined together to force and drive Iran to the negotiated agreement.

How often, these days, can we utter the names of those six countries together working for the same cause?

This agreement constitutes a meaningful and enforceable check on Iran's nuclear ambitions and any intentions it might have to cheat.

Back in July when this agreement was reached, I stated that it "must constitute measurable progress in halting nuclear proliferation, driving the region and the world further away from nuclear Armageddon."

The negotiated agreement meets that test, and with the support of Great Britain, Germany, France, yes, even Russia, and, yes, even China, we will hold Iran to that test. And that is why we should support the negotiated agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS).

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in firm opposition to the Iran nuclear deal. This deal represents a direct threat to the United States, Israel, and the world.

Recently, I visited Israel and met with Prime Minister Netanyahu. Prime Minister Netanyahu was firm in his warning—this is a very bad deal, and it

could result in grave consequences for the world.

First, this deal allows Iran to continue to enrich uranium that can be used to develop a nuclear weapon.

Second, this deal abandons the President's promise of anytime, anywhere inspections to a process that allows Iran to delay up to 24 days.

Third, this agreement would result in the comprehensive lifting of the economic sanctions that have stifled Iran's quest for a nuclear weapon.

Bottom line, this deal presents far too many risks for the U.S. and far too many rewards for Iran. When the Ayatollah chants "death to America," he means it, and that should cause serious concern in every American citizen.

It is time for America to wake up and understand the danger and threat this deal presents to our national security.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

First, I want to address briefly the very strained interpretation I think my friends are giving the Corker legislation. To accept the arguments of the opposition to the deal, you would have to accept the proposition that the Corker legislation requires the administration to provide an agreement between the IAEA and Iran to which the United States is not a party, to which the United States has no obligation, and of which the IAEA is precluded from providing to the administration. That seems to me a very farfetched interpretation of the Corker legislation.

What's more, if you accept the argument that we can't have a vote on the agreement until we have this document between the IAEA and Iran, then why has the majority scheduled a vote on the agreement for tomorrow? So it is inconsistent with what their own majority has scheduled.

But finally, I don't think anyone is fooled by the nature of this procedural motion or bill. No one expects, in the least, that anyone who has voiced their opposition to the agreement is somehow going to change their opinion if they have access to this private document between the IAEA and Iran. What's more, as we know, the IAEA enters into these agreements with individual nations around the world, so this is not at all unique to the situation with Iran.

One final point I would like to make: We are now well into the debate on the agreement, and for all the arguments that have been advanced as to why we should have concerns about provisions in the agreement or concerns about Iranian behavior, many of which I share, there is one thing we have heard precious little about from the opposition to the deal, and that is, what is the credible alternative?

So, I ask the question: What is the credible alternative?

And the answer, from what I am able to divine from the scarce attention that the opposition pays to this—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SCHIFF. I yield myself an additional minute.

The answer, as far as I can discern from the opposition to the deal, is this: This is how the alternative would work.

Congress rejects the deal. Congress, the administration, then, somehow goes out and persuades the rest of the world to maintain sanctions, even when we rejected an agreement adopted by the other major powers, and even when those other powers tell us explicitly that there will be no new negotiations. But somehow we maintain the sanctions regime under this theoretical alternative.

And what? Iran gives up all enrichment and comes back to the table prepared to capitulate everything?

That seems so fanciful, so far removed from the reality of the situation, that it is no surprise that the opposition devotes very little, if any, time to discussing a credible alternative, because, indeed, there is no credible alternative.

So, again, this is why I think it is so important for us to focus on how we can strengthen the constraints in the agreement, mitigate the risks that we will face, and that is a much more constructive path forward than rejection of this, seeing Iran going back to spinning up its centrifuges, picking up where they left off at 20 percent enrichment and going beyond, picking up where they left off with 19,000 more centrifuges and thousands of kilos of uranium.

Is that really the path we want to go down? I think not.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1515

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

There was a credible alternative. There was a credible alternative that this body passed by a vote of 400–20, bipartisan legislation which the administration blocked in the Senate, legislation which would have put that additional pressure on the regime in Iran.

Knowing that the United States is the 800-pound gorilla, knowing that countries do not have the option and companies around the world do not have the option of making a choice when they have to make that choice between doing business with the United States or doing business with Iran, they have to do business with the United States.

We have put that bill into the Senate. The administration blocked it. That legislation would have ensured the type of pressure on Iran that would have forced the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his plan to construct a

weapon or economic collapse for that regime.

We would have had that leverage in this negotiation. That leverage was given up by this administration by blocking that bill in the Senate in the last Congress. And, frankly, that option is still available to us.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is September 11, a solemn day in our history when thousands of Americans lost their lives in the worst terror attack in our history.

It is disturbing that we happen to be debating whether a state sponsor of terror should have a glide path to nuclear weapons at this time. But we are.

I have been a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee for a long time, almost 20 years now. I chaired the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

I can tell you without any reservation that this deal with Iran is a disaster. It will weaken the security of our allies in the region, and it will make Americans less safe here at home.

If this deal goes through, Iran will receive up to \$150 billion. That is 25 times what Iran currently spends on its entire military. Does that seem like a good idea?

We are talking about the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism here. This money will fund more and more terror across the globe and here.

My district is the greater Cincinnati area. GE Aircraft Engines is headquartered there. Wright-Patterson Air Force Base is just up the road. They have been top potential targets for ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, since the cold war.

This deal allows Iran to get more sophisticated ICBM technology from Russia, which will allow them to target not only Tel Aviv, but Washington and New York and Cincinnati. This is just nuts.

What happened to the "anytime, anywhere" inspections? Gone. It will take months to get the inspectors in. And, by that time, they will have moved the incriminating evidence elsewhere.

The bottom line is the Obama administration wanted a deal, any deal, more than the Iranian mullahs did. This administration was willing to sell out Israel and our allies in the region and make us less safe here at home.

This is a lousy, lousy deal, and it ought to be rejected.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume just to take a brief moment to respond to my colleague from California.

I wish it were so simple that a credible alternative was the passage of a bill in Congress that had not passed before that we could pass now and,

through the mere act of our legislation, compel the rest of the world to join us in a new negotiation and a stronger round of sanctions. We simply don't have that power to coerce the rest of the world with a bill we pass here in Congress.

What is more, to imagine that a new sanctions bill will somehow force Iran to come back to the table ready to concede its entire enrichment program is simply not credible. If that is what we are left with, we are really left with no really good alternative.

Again, I think that is precisely why we need to move forward with the agreement that has been reached between the world powers and Iran.

At this point, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is fundamental to the national security of the United States.

I applaud the tremendous efforts of Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz, who worked in concert with the world's most powerful military and economic nations to reach a verifiable agreement that will deny the ability of Iran to develop a nuclear weapon.

In a past era, when politics was civil and foreign policy was bipartisan, this diplomatic agreement would have been championed by Republicans and Democrats as a nonproliferation triumph, as it is today in Great Britain, our greatest ally. This agreement will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

As an Israeli intelligence analyst has said, "This is not about trust and goodwill between sides. It is the strict inspection and verification regimes that will ensure the success of the agreement."

And if Iran violates the agreement, sanctions will "snap back" and the international community together will take action.

I strongly support this agreement, and I am grateful for President Obama's unwavering leadership in the face of hostile and unprecedented attacks from Republicans and Israel's Prime Minister.

The New York Times calls the Republican efforts a "vicious battle against Mr. Obama" and an "unseemly spectacle of lawmakers siding with a foreign leader against their own Commander in Chief."

I want to be crystal clear: I support our Commander in Chief.

The Republicans and Israeli opponents of this agreement are the same neocons who sold the war in Iraq to America based on lies, distortions, and misinformation.

And now what do the Republicans offer as an alternative? Nothing. They have no plan, no plan other than to kill this agreement, which means that Iran will either obtain a nuclear weapon or the U.S. goes to war to stop them.

Well, let me tell you: I am not interested in another Republican war in the Middle East.

Now is the time to put the national security of the American people first. Let's reject this Republican game playing and support a tough diplomatic agreement that will stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Mr. SHUSTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice strong opposition to this fatally flawed Iran deal.

By signing the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, the President agreed to allow all documents, secret annexes, and side deals to be reviewed by the U.S. Congress.

But, once again, President Obama has not complied with the law of the land and, therefore, does not have the authority to waive sanctions on Iran.

By lifting sanctions on the Iranian regime, a nation that finances the likes of Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist groups will receive over \$100 billion in assets and no doubt will continue to fund terrorist organizations at probably greater levels than they are able to do today, those terrorist organizations with the motto "death to America."

Have we learned nothing from our past mistakes? The same person that negotiated the deal with North Korea also led the discussions with Iran.

We must ask ourselves, Is the world a safer place when unstable nations like North Korea are testing nuclear weapons?

The number one responsibility of the United States Congress charged to us in the Constitution is national security.

This agreement jeopardizes our security because I believe, as the Prime Minister of Israel believes, that this will ensure that Iran will get a nuclear weapon.

For the security of America and our friends and allies around the world, we must oppose this agreement.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I commend him for his extraordinary leadership as the ranking member on the Intelligence Committee, which has served us so well.

His leadership has served us so well in this debate today and in our deliberations leading up to this debate. It has served us well in the ongoing as we use intelligence to protect the American people. So I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. SCHIFF).

I did not go to the well as usual for the leader, but I wanted to be here because I have some materials that I want to share with you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think today and tomorrow, the next 24 hours, is a very, very special time in the Congress of the United States. Members will be called upon to make a decision that affects our oath of office, to protect and support the Constitution and, of course, the American people.

This is a moment that we are prepared for. That is what I have this binder here for, to say I commend my colleagues because they have spent thousands of hours reviewing the agreement, reviewing the annexes and the classified materials, speaking with experts, gaining information, acquiring validation from outside sources other than the administration and the agreement itself, conversations with each other, conversations with their constituents, all to have, again, a sense of humility that we all don't know everything about this subject.

And we have to get our assurances from those whose judgment we respect, as well as to support this agreement on the merits. It is a very fine agreement.

I will take a moment just to talk about my own credentials because I see that people are doing that in their statements. I read with interest Senator MENENDEZ' statement where he talks about his service in the Senate, and I will talk about mine in the House.

For over 20 years, I have served as a member of the Intelligence Committee both as a member of the committee, as the top Democrat on the committee, and as the Speaker and leader *ex officio* over the years, longer than anyone in the history of the Congress.

I went to the Intelligence Committee because I had a major concern which sprang from my district, which was a very big interest there in stopping the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

Plowshares, an organization dedicated to that purpose, was founded there. They saluted President Reagan and the actions that he took when he was President. And they are very actively supporting this agreement now.

But I mentioned my credentials because I brought that experience to make a judgment on the agreement after it was negotiated.

Of course we were briefed, as members of the committee and members of the leadership, on the ongoing as to the progress that was being made in negotiations.

Again, having been briefed all along the way, I still was pleasantly pleased to see what the final product was. What the President negotiated was remarkable. It was remarkable in several respects.

One was that the P5, the permanent members of the Security Council, plus

one—that would be Germany—the P5 nations negotiated this agreement with Iran: China, Russia, France, the U.K., the United States.

This is quite remarkable, that all of those countries could come to agreement. And an important part of that leadership was the leadership of President Obama to have that engagement sustained over a couple-year period.

Now, President Bush took us a bit down this path, and that is referenced in an op-ed that was put forth by Brent Scowcroft.

When he supported this legislation, he says that "The deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer."

But he talks about the fact that this has been a goal, as what Ronald Reagan did with the Soviet Union arms control and what President Nixon did with China. It was a negotiation.

And he talked about the fact that this particular agreement was one that was worked on under the presidency of President Bush. Actually, he places it in time.

So let me read his comment:

"Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media.

"In my view, the JCPOA"—as it is known—"meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council."

He goes on for a couple of pages.

Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD Brent Scowcroft's statement.

[From the Washington Post, August 23, 2015]

THE IRAN DEAL: AN EPOCHAL MOMENT THAT CONGRESS SHOULDN'T SQUANDER

(By Brent Scowcroft)

Congress again faces a momentous decision regarding U.S. policy toward the Middle East. The forthcoming vote on the nuclear deal between the P5+1 and Iran (known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or JCPOA) will show the world whether the United States has the will and sense of responsibility to help stabilize the Middle East, or whether it will contribute to further turmoil, including the possible spread of nuclear weapons. (Strong words perhaps, but clear language is helpful in the cacophony of today's media)

In my view, the JCPOA meets the key objective, shared by recent administrations of both parties, that Iran limit itself to a

strictly civilian nuclear program with unprecedented verification and monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency and the U.N. Security Council. Iran has committed to never developing or acquiring a nuclear weapon; the deal ensures that this will be the case for at least 15 years and likely longer, unless Iran repudiates the inspection regime and its commitments under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and Additional Protocol.

There is no more credible expert on nuclear weapons than Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who led the technical negotiating team. When he asserts that the JCPOA blocks each of Iran's pathways to the fissile material necessary to make a nuclear weapon, responsible people listen. Twenty-nine eminent U.S. nuclear scientists have endorsed Moniz's assertions.

If the United States could have handed Iran a "take it or leave it" agreement, the terms doubtless would have been more onerous on Iran. But negotiated agreements, the only ones that get signed in times of peace, are compromises by definition. It is what President Reagan did with the Soviet Union on arms control; it is what President Nixon did with China.

And as was the case with specific agreements with the Soviet Union and China, we will continue to have significant differences with Iran on important issues, including human rights, support for terrorist groups and meddling in the internal affairs of neighbors. We must never tire of working to persuade Iran to change its behavior on these issues, and countering it where necessary. And while I believe the JCPOA, if implemented scrupulously by Iran, will help engage Tehran constructively on regional issues, we must always remember that its sole purpose is to halt the country's nuclear weapons activities.

Israel's security, an abiding U.S. concern, will be enhanced by the full implementation of the nuclear deal. Iran is fully implementing the interim agreement that has placed strict limits on its nuclear program since January 2014 while the final agreement was being negotiated. If Iran demonstrates the same resolve under the JCPOA, the world will be a much safer place. And if it does not, we will know in time to react appropriately.

Let us not forget that Israel is the only country in the Middle East with overwhelming retaliatory capability. I have no doubt that Iran's leaders are well aware of Israel's military capabilities. Similarly, the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) members have impressive conventional militaries, and the United States is committed to enhancing their capabilities.

Congress rightfully is conducting a full review and hearing from proponents and opponents of the nuclear deal. However, the seeming effort to make the JCPOA the ultimate test of Congress's commitment to Israel is probably unprecedented in the annals of relations between two vibrant democracies. Let us be clear: There is no credible alternative were Congress to prevent U.S. participation in the nuclear deal. If we walk away, we walk away alone. The world's leading powers worked together effectively because of U.S. leadership. To turn our back on this accomplishment would be an abdication of the United States' unique role and responsibility, incurring justified dismay among our allies and friends. We would lose all leverage over Iran's nuclear activities. The international sanctions regime would dissolve. And no member of Congress should be

under the illusion that another U.S. invasion of the Middle East would be helpful.

So I urge strongly that Congress support this agreement. But there is more that Congress should do. Implementation and verification will be the key to success, and Congress has an important role. It should ensure that the International Atomic Energy Agency, other relevant bodies and U.S. intelligence agencies have all the resources necessary to facilitate inspection and monitor compliance. Congress should ensure that military assistance, ballistic missile defense and training commitments that the United States made to GCC leaders at Camp David in May are fully funded and implemented without delay. And it should ensure that the United States works closely with the GCC and other allies to moderate Iranian behavior in the region, countering it where necessary.

My generation is on the sidelines of policymaking now; this is a natural development. But decades of experience strongly suggest that there are epochal moments that should not be squandered. President Nixon realized it with China. Presidents Reagan and George H.W. Bush realized it with the Soviet Union. And I believe we face it with Iran today.

□ 1530

Ms. PELOSI. I also want to quote another Republican—Brent Scowcroft served in the administration of President George Herbert Walker Bush—Senator John Warner joined Senator Carl Levin. These are two chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee—one a Democrat, but before him, a Republican, John Warner. They talk about they support this. They say:

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Mr. Speaker, I submit Carl Levin and John Warner's statement for the RECORD.

WHY HAWKS SHOULD ALSO BACK THE IRAN DEAL

(By Carl Levin and John Warner)

We both were elected to the Senate in 1978 and privileged to have served together on the Senate Armed Services Committee for 30 years, during which we each held committee leadership positions of chairman or ranking minority member. We support the Iran Agreement negotiated by the United States and other leading world powers for many reasons, including its limitations on Iran's nuclear activities, its strong inspections regime, and the ability to quickly re-impose sanctions should Iran violate its provisions.

But we also see a compelling reason to support the agreement that has gotten little attention: Rejecting it would weaken the deterrent value of America's military option.

As former chairmen of the Senate Armed Services Committee, we have always believed that the U.S. should keep a strong military option on the table. If Iran pursues a nuclear weapon, some believe that military action is inevitable if we're to prevent it from reaching its goal. We don't subscribe to that notion, but we are skeptical that,

should Iran attempt to consider moving to a nuclear weapon, we could deter them from pursuing it through economic sanctions alone.

How does rejecting the agreement give America a weaker military hand to play? Let's imagine a world in which the United States rejects the nuclear accord that all other parties have embraced. The sanctions now in place would likely not be maintained and enforced by all the parties to the agreement, so those would lose their strong deterrent value. Iran would effectively argue to the world that it had been willing to negotiate an agreement, only to have that agreement rejected by a recalcitrant America.

In that world, should we find credible evidence that Iran is starting to move toward a nuclear weapon, the United States would almost certainly consider use of the military option to stop that program. But it's highly unlikely that our traditional European allies, let alone China and Russia, would support the use of the military option since we had undermined the diplomatic path. Iran surely would know this, and so from the start, would have less fear of a military option than if it faced a unified coalition.

While the United States would certainly provide the greatest combat power in any military action, allies and other partners make valuable contributions—not just in direct participation, but also in access rights, logistics, intelligence, and other critical support. If we reject the agreement, we risk isolating ourselves and damaging our ability to assemble the strongest possible coalition to stop Iran.

In short, then, rejecting the Iran deal would erode the current deterrent value of the military option, making it more likely Iran might choose to pursue a nuclear weapon, and would then make it more costly for the U.S. to mount any subsequent military operation. It would tie the hands of any future president trying to build international participation and support for military force against Iran should that be necessary.

Those who think the use of force against Iran is almost inevitable should want the military option to be as credible and effective as possible, both as a deterrent to Iran's nuclear ambitions and in destroying Iran's nuclear weapons program should that become necessary. For that to be the case, the United States needs to be a party to the agreement rather than being the cause of its collapse.

In our many years on the Armed Services Committee, we saw time and again how America is stronger when we fight alongside allies. Iran must constantly be kept aware that a collective framework of deterrence stands resolute, and that if credible evidence evolves that Iran is taking steps towards a nuclear arsenal, it would face the real possibility of military action by a unified coalition of nations to stop their efforts.

The deal on the table is a strong agreement on many counts, and it leaves in place the robust deterrence and credibility of a military option. We urge our former colleagues not to take any action which would undermine the deterrent value of a coalition that participates in and could support the use of a military option. The failure of the United States to join the agreement would have that effect.

Ms. PELOSI. Again, I refer to the statements of my colleagues. They are thoughtful; they are serious, and they are courageous in support of the agreement.

I would like to thank President Obama and the entire administration

for being available as Members sought clarification to respond to their concerns. I want to thank the President, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and so many others for their leadership and availability to us in a bipartisan way in our Democratic Caucus.

For years, Iran's rapidly accelerating enrichment capability and burgeoning nuclear stockpile has represented one of the greatest threats to peace and security anywhere in the world. We all stipulate to that. That is why we need an agreement.

That is why I am so pleased that we have so many statements of validation from people. The experts say:

This agreement is one of the greatest diplomatic achievements of the 21st century.

It is no wonder that such a diverse and extraordinary constellation of experts have made their voices heard in support of this—again, I use the word—“extraordinary” accord.

On the steps of the Capitol the other day with our veterans and with our Gold Star moms who have lost their sons, we heard the words of diplomats and soldiers, generals and admirals and diplomats by the score—Democrats, Republicans, and nonpartisan.

We heard from our most distinguished nuclear physicists; we heard from those scientists, and we heard from people of faith. I would like to quote some of them. More than 100 Democratic and Republican former diplomats and ambassadors wrote:

In our judgment, the JCPOA deserves congressional support and the opportunity to show that it can work. We firmly believe that the most effective way to protect U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more risky alternatives.

That is the diplomats.

The generals and admirals wrote:

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence, and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

Twenty-nine of our Nation's most prominent nuclear scientists and engineers wrote:

We consider that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action the United States and its partners negotiated with Iran will advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.

I quote “and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.”

This is an innovative agreement, with much more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated nonproliferation framework.

They went on to say more.

Mr. Speaker, 440 rabbis urged Congress to endorse the statement, writing:

The Obama administration has successfully brought together the major international powers to confront Iran over its nuclear ambitions. The broad international sanctions move Iran to enter this historic agreement.

They urge support.

Mr. Speaker, 4,100 Catholic nuns wrote to Congress stating:

As women of faith, followers of the one who said, "Blessed are the peacemakers," we urge that you risk on the side of peace and vote to approve the Iran nuclear deal.

Treasury Secretary Jack Lew warned of the hazards of rejecting the agreement, reminding us that foreign governments will not continue to make costly sacrifices at our demand. I say this in response to something that my distinguished colleague from California said:

Indeed, they would be more likely to blame us for walking away from a credible solution to one of the world's greatest security threats and would continue to reengage with Iran.

He went on to say:

Instead of toughening the sanctions, the decision by Congress to unilaterally reject the deal will end a decade of isolation of Iran and put the United States at odds with the rest of the world.

We certainly don't want to do that.

Today, something very interesting happened, Mr. Speaker. It was a statement put forth by U.K. Prime Minister David Cameron, French President Francois Hollande, and German Chancellor Angela Merkel. They wrote an op-ed for the Washington Post and said:

This is an important moment. It is a crucial opportunity at a time of heightened global uncertainty to show what diplomacy can achieve.

This is not an agreement based on trust or any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting.

They went on to say:

We condemn in no uncertain terms that Iran does not recognize the existence of the State of Israel and the unacceptable language that Iran's leaders use about Israel. Israel's security matters are and will remain our key interests, too. We would not have reached the nuclear deal with Iran if we did not think that it removed a threat to the region and the nonproliferation regime as a whole.

We are confident that the agreement provides the foundation for resolving a conflict on Iran's nuclear program permanently. This is why we now want to embark on the full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, once all national procedures are complete.

Our own President wrote to Congressman JERRY NADLER:

I believe that JCPOA, which cuts off every pathway Iran could have to a nuclear weapon and creates the most robust verification regime ever negotiated to monitor a nuclear program, is a very good deal for the United States, for the State of Israel, and for the region as a whole.

Many of us share the views that had been expressed by those in a position to make a difference on this agreement.

Tuesday night, again after the votes here in this House, dozens of Members supporting the nuclear agreement stood on the steps of the Capitol. We were honored to be joined by military veterans and Gold Star families, men and women whose sacrifices remind us of the significance of putting diplomacy before war. They remind us of the significance of this historic transformational achievement.

Congratulations. These nuclear physicists, they congratulated the President on this agreement. I congratulate him, too.

Our men and women in uniform and our veterans and our Gold Star moms remind us of our first duty, to protect and defend the American people. I am pleased to say we achieve that with this agreement.

I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and to vote "no" on the other items that are being put before us today.

I think we all have to, as we evaluate our decision, ask ourselves: If we were the one deciding vote as to whether this agreement would go forward or that we would fall behind, how would we vote? None of us has the luxury to walk away from that responsibility.

I am proud of the statements that our colleagues have made, the agreement the President has reached; and I know that tomorrow we will sustain whatever veto the President may have to make.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY), the deputy chief whip and a member of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this important matter of national security.

Today, I rise in opposition to this bad nuclear deal the President has negotiated. I don't oppose it because the President negotiated it. I don't oppose it because it was brought forth by this administration.

I oppose it because it is bad for the security of America. It is bad for the security of the world. It is bad for the security of our most sacred ally, Israel. It is bad for the nonproliferation strategies the world has had to mean that we have fewer nuclear weapons on this planet.

Now, you have to ask yourself a few basic questions: Has Iran warranted the trust of the international community to enter into this agreement? The answer is no. It is very clear by their actions over the last 20 and 30 years that they should not be trusted.

Number two, we hear the Supreme Leader of Iran saying, time and again, "death to America and Israel." He has declared his nation is committed to the destruction of Israel. He has called America the Great Satan.

Now, how can we believe a country is fully committed to our destruction yet, at the same time, uphold their end of the bargain? We can't. We must oppose this agreement based off of what is best for international security and what is best for our Nation's security.

We also have to oppose this because it will mean, during my lifetime or during my children's lifetime, we will have more nuclear weapons, not fewer.

This is a bad agreement, and we should reject it.

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to yield the balance of my time and the ability to control the time to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, since 1998, I have had the privilege of sending a group of high school students each year to Israel where they are paired with Israeli teens to learn about what life is really like in Israel.

When these students return, they have learned life lessons that stay with them forever, but just as important, they have made friendships that will also last a lifetime.

I am a proud and strong friend and ally of Israel, and I have been for a very long time. This is why I believe we must support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and why I am here to oppose the resolution. The world cannot tolerate a nuclear-armed Iran, and I will not stand by as Iran continues to gain ground towards that objective.

This agreement puts real, concrete steps in place to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons, steps that have already begun to degrade Iran's ability to produce nuclear material.

According to the independent experts, this deal "effectively blocks the plutonium pathway for more than 15 years." These experts also assess that, without the deal, Iran may shrink its breakout time to a few weeks or even days.

The steps outlined in the agreement complement existing prohibitions on the development of a nuclear weapon by Iran.

□ 1545

Under this agreement, the international community will have unprecedented access to ensure that Iran never gets one.

This agreement will not be monitored merely according to the goodwill of Iran. Its enforcement mechanisms are verifiable and transparent.

Under this agreement, there will be more inspectors than ever in Iran. These inspectors will have daily access to Iran's declared nuclear sites and will

be able to have access to undeclared sites that they suspect may be involved in nuclear activity. Inspections will be regular, and they will be invasive. They will not be oriented around Iranian convenience but, rather, around compliance, ensuring that the international community remains safe and, indeed, informed.

If at any time Iran is found to be in violation of the agreement, the full brunt of international sanctions will snap back, once again hobbling the Iranian economy.

It is important to note that many sanctions will still be in place. Relief will come only from those sanctions related to nuclear activities. Bans on technology exports, restrictions against the transfer of conventional weaponry and WMD technology, sanctions based on terrorism activities, and bans on foreign assistance will all continue.

Without this deal, experts estimate that Iran will have enough nuclear material for weapons in 2 or 3 months. During negotiations, Iran stopped installing centrifuges, but they will resume if this agreement falls apart, potentially accelerating that timeline.

The opponents of this agreement propose rejecting this deal and pursuing a stronger one, but that plan could have grave consequences. If the United States rejects this deal, Iran will continue developing more sophisticated enrichment technologies. By the time any new negotiations begin, Iran would likely already be a nuclear state. There is also no guarantee that Iran would return to the negotiating table after having wasted 2 years on this agreement.

Is this worth the risk? I do not believe that it is. We should support this agreement.

This agreement accomplishes a critical goal: establishing a set of verifiable provisions to prevent Iran from developing enough nuclear material to build a bomb.

This deal does not change, in any way, our solemn commitment to protecting Israel, nor does this prevent us from using any other measures if Iran should violate this agreement, including using the full force of the strongest military in the world.

But the United States must lead not only with our military might; we have worked diligently to achieve a peaceful resolution to this issue, and it is time for us to show our integrity and values for which we stand.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), a true American hero who served this country with distinction in Korea and in Vietnam and as a prisoner of war for nearly 7 years.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at this grave hour, I come to express my opposition to President Obama's deal with Iran.

To this day, Iran chants "death to America." In fact, Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism. Its regime has the blood of America's servicemembers on its hands.

Iran is our enemy.

The President asks us to trust Iran; but what has Iran done to earn our trust? Nothing. This is a deal of surrender, and, with it, Iran will go nuclear.

The alternative isn't war. The alternative is to strike a better deal. I say this as one of the few Members of Congress who has seen combat, who has fought two wars, and who has spent nearly 7 years as a POW.

So I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Do the right thing. Put country above party. Listen to the American people. Uphold your most sacred duty—safeguard our Republic from those who seek to destroy it. Vote this deal down.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. I thank my good friend for yielding to me on this important subject for our country today and in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, while many Republicans have been trying to find a way, just this very day, not to have a vote on the Iran agreement, I have been searching for a way to represent my 650,000 constituents by voting on any version offered. Five nations, whose systems differ from one another in every conceivable way, and the United Nations have approved this deal, but the Republicans are torn on whether to even vote on the deal at all.

No wonder.

Left with no credible argument against the deal, itself, Republicans have changed the subject, even knowing that Iran is close to getting the bomb as I speak and risking the loss of U.S. international credibility. Instead, Republicans cite side agreements. However, they have all of the information available to any nation on all nuclear agreements, or they cite issues not under negotiation at all, like Iran's role in the Middle East.

Here is what my constituents cite, Mr. Speaker:

\$12,000 in Federal taxes per resident—the most per capita in the United States—but no vote on the Iran deal or on anything else on this House floor. With statehood, D.C. would vote "yes" and be counted just as Uncle Sam counts our taxes every single year.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the chairman for yielding this time. I thank him

for his strong leadership to reject this administration's agreement with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, this deal is a dramatic reversal of U.S. policy in the Middle East and towards the Iranian Government. For years, the Iranian Government has actively opposed U.S. interests in the region and has directly financed some of the world's most oppressive terrorist groups, most notably, Hezbollah.

As a result of this agreement, over \$100 billion will be released from repatriated oil profits back to the mullahs in Iran, and 46 banks in Iran will now be approved to transmit money through the international financial system. Look at what they have done previously with their finances. We gave them \$700 million a month as a precondition just to come to the negotiations—\$12 billion over a 16-month period. You can see their footprint in Lebanon; you can see it in Iraq; you can see it in Yemen; you can see it in Syria; you can see it in South America.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing today is going to translate into increased, enhanced terrorist activities throughout the world. May we look back on this day as one of the most consequential votes we will take tomorrow in this Chamber, as consequential as what we did in declaring war against Japan and Germany. May we recognize the reality of what is taking place.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. I thank the gentleman from Maryland, the distinguished ranking member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak as a freshman Member of this body who has been able to learn a great deal about this difficult, difficult area of the world—a place where America has invested too many lives and too much money—and to talk about my journey in coming to the decision to vote with the President and feeling like he deserves a congratulatory note for this accomplishment in a very difficult and complex piece of diplomacy, perhaps equal to the difficulty and the complexity of this area of the world which has had so much turmoil and history.

I have spent the last 60 days taking every opportunity to listen to constituents and experts.

I, with a small group of my freshman colleagues, have been personally briefed at the White House by President Obama. I traveled to Israel for the first time and met with high-level Israeli officials for almost 2 hours, including with Prime Minister Netanyahu. I learned about the 3,000 years of history and animosity amongst groups and also of the very close proximity in which those groups have lived for thousands of years and shared their difficult history. I met

with leaders of our international coalition, and I continue to be a staunch supporter of the U.S.-Israeli relationship as, I believe, most of my colleagues on both sides are.

I held six townhalls—a certain measure of masochism, perhaps, by a freshman Member—that took hours, meeting with both pro and opponents in my district, in the San Francisco Bay Area. We received over 1,000 phone calls, emails, and constituent questions on this issue, and more than 70 percent of them were in favor of the proposal.

Ultimately, at the heart of my decision in supporting a deal is the possibility that this deal promotes the long-term investment in peace on this difficult part of our planet. In addition, it creates security and stability, ultimately, for the United States. I believe that this accord is our best option for achieving both of those goals.

As recently as yesterday, I was able to listen to advisers and leaders who represent our coalition partners. The sanctions regime, due in large part to the European Union's participation, deflated Iran's economy and forced them to the negotiating table. In 2012, Iran's economy shrank for the first time in two decades by almost 2 percent.

This is the final proposal, I believe, if the U.S. were to withdraw. Our coalition partners that helped negotiate this deal and create the ability and the leverage to negotiate will not come back to the table. Our authority and standing in the world community will be severely diminished.

There are some who say that Iran cannot be trusted, and I think we all agree on that. The future of this rollout is not black-and-white, and it has many unknowns and hypotheticals on both the supporters' and the opponents' sides. We do not know if Iran will cheat, but we do know that oversight and compliance is strong and consequential, and consequences for cheating will be enforced by the international community.

In my view, it is in the national security interests of the United States of America to support this agreement. It is an opportunity to let diplomacy work and to put it in action.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my disapproval of President Obama's deal with Iran.

I ask myself this question: Has Iran earned the right to be trusted?

We must ask this because we know there are secret deals that my colleagues and I were not privileged to. Therefore, a vote to support this deal is a vote to trust Iran.

The behavior of Iran's leaders over the last 30 years offers no indication that the next decade will be any different; and now, with these secret details, we cannot know if the deal is verifiable, enforceable, and accountable.

The people who know Iran best trust them the least. Iran's neighbors have already requested additional arms from the United States to protect themselves from this very deal. Any deal should include these three powerful principles: safety, security, stability. This deal falls short, and I cannot support it.

□ 1600

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, this has probably been one of the most difficult decisions I have had to make during my time in Congress. For the record, I still have deep reservations about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

However, while it is not without flaws or risks, I believe the plan presents our best chance to limit Iran's nuclear ambitions and protect the security of the United States and our allies, particularly the State of Israel.

The preamble to the agreement is both critically important and crystal clear when it states that "Iran reaffirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons." And we will hold Iran to it in perpetuity, as they have committed.

Mr. Speaker, I do not trust Iran. But this agreement is built on verification, not trust, and I believe that it includes the needed monitoring and enforcement tools.

If Iran violates the deal in any way, increased international monitoring will allow us to know quickly and act decisively. Conversely, if we were to abandon this agreement despite the international community's support, Iran's nuclear ambitions could go unchecked, and that is not a risk I am willing to take.

Mr. Speaker, like many of my constituents, I still have significant concerns with the agreement and with Iran's pattern of behavior, particularly its support of terrorism.

That is why I am committed to exercising rigorous oversight of this plan's implementation, leaving no doubt that cheating will result in severe repercussions.

As the President has said publicly and he has reiterated to me personally, all of our options remain on the table when it comes to responding to failed Iranian commitments, including military options and the reimposition of sanctions, either in whole or in part, either unilaterally or multilaterally.

Additionally, all the terrorism-related sanctions are outside the scope of

this agreement and remain in force, and I am committed to providing any further tools necessary to constrain Iran's destructive nonnuclear activities.

Mr. Speaker, Congress should also establish an oversight commission or Select Committee to ensure Iranian adherence to the deal and recommend courses of action in response to any breach of Iranian commitments.

This would be in addition to the Oversight Committee related to Intelligence or the Foreign Affairs Committee or other committees, including the Armed Services Committee that might also have jurisdiction.

The more eyes on Iran in this agreement in making sure that they are living up to the commitments, the better.

Mr. Speaker, we need to show our resolve and ability to execute the fundamental objectives of the JCPOA, preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

While I have deep concerns about aspects of the deal, rejecting it now would potentially lead us down an even darker path without the support of the international community and with severe and unpredictable consequences.

I will vote to support this deal and what I believe is now our best chance to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear threat, our best chance for an international community united in support of our interests, and our best option for peace. We must give diplomacy a chance to work.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe the House of Representatives will stand on the right side of history in rejecting this dangerous deal. I have asked myself, as many people in this Chamber have asked, "Why is this a good deal for the United States?"

Iran is holding four Americans illegally hostage in their country. That was not part of the negotiations. Iran continues to support worldwide terrorism. There is no restrictions on that in this deal.

Fifty billion dollars will be immediately released to the regime with no restrictions on its use. That was not part of the deal. They continue to develop ICBMs, intercontinental ballistic missiles, that could reach the American mainland. There were no restrictions on that during this deal.

We are told by the administration that, if we reject this deal, the rest of the P5+1 will not join us. Well, last week Iran's top cleric said America remains Iran's number one enemy.

Days after the deal was announced, Iran's Supreme Leader called for "death of America," not the death of France, not the death of Great Britain, not the death of Russia, not the death of China. It was the death of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield another 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, since when is America afraid to stand alone?

I was one of the fortunate freshman that got to go to Israel recently and I sat with the Prime Minister, who told us this deal guarantees that, in 15 years, Iran will have a nuclear arsenal. Just yesterday the Supreme Leader tweeted that Israel won't exist in 25 years.

I also visited the Holocaust Museum and, like many people who weren't alive during that historic tragedy, I asked myself, "Why didn't anyone stop this?" Well, my fear is that some day in the near future people are going to ask, "Why didn't America stop Iran?"

The bottom line is that this is a bad deal for America. It is a bad deal for Israel, and it is a bad deal for the world.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time each side has?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 14 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 27 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this historic agreement with Iran. It is good for America, absolutely critical for Israel, and is a historic step toward a more stable Middle East.

We entered into P5+1 negotiations with one prevailing goal, to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. That is what this agreement does.

Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon. I want to repeat that because there has been a lot of false reports and fearmongering about Iran being able to build a bomb in 10 years or 15 years. Under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon.

This is the third provision of the deal: "Iran affirms that under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons."

Iran has agreed to never have a nuclear weapon. With this agreement in place, we will have an unprecedented inspection regimen to guarantee it.

IAEA inspectors will have more access in Iran than in any other country in the world. No nuclear site is off limits. They will have access wherever they need it, whenever they need it, and at every single stage of the process.

This agreement is built on verification and full cooperation. If Iran fails to meet either of those standards, if at any point inspectors believe that Iran is stonewalling or being uncooperative, the deal is violated and strict sanctions return.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good deal, and there is no possibility of a so-called

better deal. Our partner nations have made it clear that, if we walk away from this agreement, they will not support the tough sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place.

That is the reality. As a result, a vote against this agreement is a vote to weaken international sanctions against Iran. It is a vote to allow them a clear path to a nuclear weapon, and it is a vote to make Israel less safe and the Middle East more dangerous.

I urge my colleagues to recognize that reality, to support this agreement and allow our President and our Nation to take these historic steps toward a more peaceful world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA).

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to President Obama's disastrous Iran nuclear deal. This deal not only threatens the safety and security of the United States, one of our closest allies, Israel, it threatens the safety and security of the entire world.

It fails to prevent Iran from eventually having a nuclear weapon, the exact opposite of what it is intended to do. Iran now simply just has to wait a decade before becoming a nuclear power.

In the meantime, because Iran gets everything they need and want in return for so-called reductions in their nuclear capabilities, they can dramatically expand their dominance in the region, build up their ballistic missile and weapons capabilities, grow their economy and military, and have even greater ability to fund and promote terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, can we really expect to trust a government like Iran's whose leaders chant "Death to America"?

I strongly advise my colleagues to oppose this horrible deal. Our Nation and our allies deserve better.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action not as a perfect agreement, but as the only viable path forward to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I do not come to this decision lightly or easily.

Iran is a deadly state sponsor of terrorism, and the Iranian regime has repeatedly threatened America and our close ally, Israel.

Despite decades of sanctions by the United States, Iran has come within months of succeeding in its effort to acquire sufficient material for a nuclear bomb.

Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is not, Is this a perfect agreement that addresses all of Iran's dangerous behavior? The truth is there are no perfect options in dealing with this regime.

Instead, we must ask: "Will this agreement verifiably prevent a nuclear armed Iran? Will this agreement advance American national security interests in the region? Will this agreement advance the national security of our ally, Israel?"

Through a very long and deliberate process, I have reached the conclusion that the answer to these three questions is yes.

I believe that it is better to have this imperfect international agreement that we can aggressively enforce than to have no agreement at all.

During August I spent a week in Israel meeting with political and military leaders and hearing from ordinary citizens who are deeply concerned about Iran's intentions.

As I stood on the Golan Heights, I could see the smoke rising from shellings in Syria. That smoke is a visible sign of the chaos and danger in the region for both the United States and for the entire Middle East.

I am keenly aware of the very real threats Iran poses to Israel's security and to our national security. I share the deep concerns of many of my constituents, of many Jewish leaders, who distrust Iran.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I believe that, after this week's vote, we have another critical choice to make. It is an important choice to make for our children, our grandchildren, and our men and women in uniform.

Our choice is this: Will we come together as Americans to enforce the Iranian nuclear agreement in the years to come?

As the Iran nuclear agreement goes into effect, we must work together—no matter our vote this week—to enforce Iran's commitments and to stand prepared to act decisively when Iran tests our resolve. We cannot afford to cast a vote and walk away.

Mr. Speaker, we have the greatest opportunity to achieve stability in the region when we lead our allies and work with other international partners, as we did when we created the international sanctions that have brought Iran to the negotiating table.

The Iranian nuclear agreement is the beginning of a long-term, multinational commitment. We must stand strong with our allies. We must commit to ensuring that the inspectors have the access and resources to carry out the agreement.

We must stand ready to act, to lead the world to respond to signs of cheating or other Iranian efforts to undermine its obligations.

□ 1615

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE).

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge rejection of the underlying Iranian agreement. The President

did not submit to Congress two inspection side agreements secretly negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

Congress and the American people have no information on what these secret side agreements entail, although news reports have suggested that Iran will be able to inspect at least some of its own military facilities.

Under the underlying agreement, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism—an antagonist of the United States, of Israel, and of several Arab nations, a 35-year-old regime known for horrible human rights abuses—will receive at least \$100 billion immediately, some of which will undoubtedly be used for terrorism.

A better underlying agreement can be negotiated, making sure Iran does not acquire nuclear weapons or ICBMs whose only purpose can be militaristic. It is important to note that a clear majority of the American people and a clear majority of both houses of Congress—Republicans and some Democrats, together the representatives of the American people—oppose this deal.

This is the most consequential vote I shall cast as a Member of Congress on foreign policy since I have been privileged to be here.

I urge rejection of the Iranian agreement, which is not in the best interests of the national security of the United States.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to just clear up some things. The IAEA's separate arrangements with Iran are not part of the agreement within the definition of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. The separate arrangements were negotiated between the IAEA and Iran to resolve outstanding issues. The arrangements between Iran and the IAEA are considered safeguard confidentials, meaning that the IAEA does not share the information with member states.

The U.S. also has safeguard confidentials, arrangements with the IAEA, and we would not want any member state to be able to request access to information about our nuclear infrastructure.

Beyond that, Mr. Speaker, IAEA Director General Amano has declared that the arrangements between the IAEA and Iran are technically sound and consistent with the Agency's long-established practice. They do not compromise the IAEA safeguard standards in any way.

Let's be clear. There is no self-inspection of Iranian facilities, and the IAEA has in no way given responsibility for nuclear inspections to Iran, not now and certainly not in the future. That is not how the IAEA does business.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak against a deal which I believe will become one of the most dangerous mistakes in U.S. history. This deal does not stop Iran from pursuing a nuclear program. It recognizes and legitimizes their nuclear program in short order.

It allows Iran to develop ballistic missiles and brings an end to the arms embargo against that regime. It frees up hundreds of billions of dollars to fund and export terrorism. I am convinced that this deal will also lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. This deal, Mr. Speaker, is one of the biggest mistakes that we, our children, and our grandchildren will pay a very dear price for.

Mr. Speaker, history will record this deal as the moment that the United States and the world granted the largest, most dangerous sponsor of terrorism that which it covets the most, nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them.

I hope I am wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I fear that I am not.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to be clear that this agreement isn't based on trust. It is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history. The international inspectors will have 24/7 access to surveillance of enrichment facilities and reactors and regular non-restricted access to all other declared sites.

Beyond declared facilities, the inspection provisions give the international inspectors the access they need, when they need it, to carry out the most intrusive inspection system ever peacefully negotiated.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, this Chamber has a lot of heroes. SAM JOHNSON is one of those. I am proud to have followed him, and I salute him.

I have been fortunate to do many things. I was an Army officer in West Germany, a high school teacher, and a local elected official. Now, as a Member of Congress, I am honored to cast votes for the people that I represent.

My constituents want the President to follow the law, as is his responsibility under article II of the Constitution. The President did not submit all the necessary documents as required under the law. I and my constituents want to know what is in these side agreements.

To my colleague from Maryland, those assurances are not good enough when we are going down this path of peace and war to trust the IAEA with no documents, not being able to see that.

Our primary responsibility here is to protect our citizens against all enemies, foreign and domestic. This deal gives Iran more money. They will remain the number one state sponsor of terror. They will continue to chant "death to America" and "death to Israel." They will not free our citizens.

Now, we assure that Iran will get nuclear weapons; the region will go into a nuclear arms race, and the world and the U.S. will be less safe. This is a terrible deal, an embarrassing deal, and one we will regret in the future.

Vote to fully disclose this deal; vote against the deal, and vote to keep the sanctions on.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants Iran to have a nuclear weapon; I certainly don't think the President wants them to, but I think it is clear that they are going to. The question is when. Clearly, the President tried to make a good deal. I don't think he thinks that Iran can be trusted, but I do think he thinks that they won't cheat.

Mr. Speaker, the road to hell was paved with good intentions, and I am sure that the administration had and has good intentions, but the facts remain. Iran has been cheating, literally, for thousands of years—or at least that region has—and certainly, we know the facts.

The facts are, for the last 36 years, Iran has cheated on every single agreement they have signed. They are cheating at this very moment. An agreement that is based on that, that they wouldn't cheat, is an agreement that is fatally flawed.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same country that won't cheat, this is the same country that leaders recognize and recommend the stoning of women, the hanging of homosexuals, the sponsor of mass terrorism. This is the nation that we have signed an accord with.

Mr. Speaker, the other side will tell you that this is a great agreement with robust controls and an inspection paradigm. With all due respect, none of us know what that is; yet the pillar of this agreement is based upon solely that, an inspection paradigm that is so robust that Iran can't cheat, and no one knows what it is. We are literally voting for something and on something that we don't know what it is, and we are being urged to vote for it.

Mr. Speaker, Iran cannot be trusted. The blood will not be on my hands from these rockets that Hamas launches into Israel and these American soldiers that come home in body bags in the future.

I just want to let everybody know that the blood will not be on my hands and the hands of those who vote against this agreement.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to this debate all day, and I really have to be, I guess, angered by the amount of misstatement of fact here and about this House being so negative about this country and about our President.

You can't get away with criticizing Presidents or leaders of other countries being negative about us when you are standing around being negative about our own country and our own President.

This agreement is about trust, and it isn't about trust with Iran. It is about trust with the International Atomic Energy Agency. Nobody has spoken about what that Agency does, other than the chairman, about how important it is.

It has been around since 1957. We helped create it. It has 2,400 employees. We probably trained most of them. They know about inspections. They are an international organization. They don't belong to anybody. No country owns them.

You can't go and trash all day that they have a secret agreement with Iran when they have a secret agreement with the United States and with Russia and with China and with all the other signatories. That is their business. They go in and verify.

We don't allow them to go into our top classified areas without some agreement of how you are going to handle that classified information. They are not going to release that information to other countries. They wouldn't have any credibility.

When you are asking that the President release that information, he doesn't have it. He doesn't own it. It is the IAEA and Iran. What if Iran was saying, We don't want to enter into this agreement because we don't know what the IAEA has entered into with the United States?

Stop trashing the process. Trust this organization. We have been proud of it for 58 years. It is the top cop on nuclear inspections, all the 1,100 facilities around the world, nuclear power plants, military bases with nuclear equipment, weapons. They are the inspectors. They are the ones that trust and verify. Give them a chance.

Everybody in the world thinks this is the toughest agreement ever negotiated. Why would we not be celebrating it? This is diplomatic history.

We have done great things here, and you want to trash it, and you want to trash the administration. That is not America. Give peace a chance.

Vote "no" on this awful bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have seen this before. Some of us were around for the North Korean nuclear agreement, and President Obama's Iran nuclear deal looks increasingly like the dangerous deal that we struck with that regime in North Korea.

In 1994, the U.S. Government signed a deal with North Korea that, according to then-President Clinton, would make the United States, the Korean peninsula, and the world safer, in his words.

The agreement, we were told, did not rely on trust, but would instead involve a verification program which would stop the North Koreans from ever acquiring a nuclear bomb. That sounds familiar today.

Unfortunately, the North Korean deal had holes that you could fire a ballistic missile through. The deal did not dismantle North Korea's program. It committed the United States to rewarding North Korea with large quantities of fuel oil without requiring the regime to implement the terms.

Worst of all, the deal relied on inspection provisions that were naive and ultimately were worthless. The predictable result was that, on October 4, 2002, North Korea revealed it had been lying all along and that it had continued to secretly develop nuclear weapons.

Four years later, North Korea's dictator, Kim Jong Il, ordered an underground nuclear test, and today, North Korea is a global menace, and it supports and sponsors terrorism, and it is the most unstable nuclear power on Earth. There is a reason why some of us raise these issues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ROUZER).

Mr. ROUZER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to this so-called Iran deal because it paves the way for Iran to obtain nuclear capabilities that will not only threaten Israel and create an arms race in the Middle East, but will also be a direct threat to America.

□ 1630

Time and time again, the Government of Iran has demonstrated its unwillingness to be transparent and open regarding their nuclear arms development and fraudulent behavior. Let's not forget that we just recently discovered two of their secret nuclear facilities, and who knows how many more they have.

The sanctions relief included as part of this deal guarantees that Iran, the world's number one sponsor of terrorism, will have billions more to fund

their evil acts. And if there is any confusion, Iran's stated intentions of wiping Israel off the face of the Earth and its public chants of "death to America" make their intentions very clear.

Mr. Speaker, America has always stood for what is right—the greatest force for good mankind has ever known. Let's keep it that way and defeat this agreement.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH).

Mr. YOH. Mr. Speaker, I stand in opposition to this deal. This is a terrible deal for America, for the Middle East, and for the world.

This is a deal that can't be verified. The IAEA, as so eloquently talked about by my colleague across the aisle, is the same IAEA that had their inspector buying nuclear material for North Korea.

This is a deal that will embolden Iran. It will make them stronger. They are the number one sponsor of terrorism in the world, shouting, "Death to America." When they stop having the rhetoric from their Ayatollah and from their President saying "death to America" and they start denouncing terrorism and release our hostages, then we can go forward with this. But this will do nothing but embolden Iran, make them stronger, and make the Middle East more unstable.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution.

The Congress is not on the clock, because we haven't received the entire agreement. And for anyone out there who wants to be supportive of this deal, let's think what the President was telling the American public and all of us.

The House has a deal that wasn't based on trust; it is built on verification. How do you support a deal based on verification without knowing what the verification is?

I would be happy to yield if anyone wanted to stand up and explain how you support a deal without knowing what the verification is. You can't. That is why we are asking for it.

And for those who say that opposing this deal is somehow negative towards America, I took an oath to be an officer of the United States military, willing to fight and die in protection of our freedoms and liberties. I love this country. I took an oath to serve here the members of my district because I love America.

So don't tell me that somehow opposing this deal is negative toward America. I oppose this deal because I love my country.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, did you notice something? Did you notice that, for the past 2 years, the President of the United States has said that if we were going to have a deal, it was going to be based on full disclosure?

Mr. Speaker, the President said that we were going to know all of the information. And the State Department submitted to the Congress a document that said: Here is all the information.

But after that, Mr. Speaker, you know what we found out? There are two secret deals. There are two secret side deals, side arrangements, that we have not seen.

Now, think about it. There are two alternatives: either this is sacrosanct between the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Iranian Government and no one is allowed to see it under the law—no one absolutely; it is totally confidential—or it is not.

Now, how can it be, Mr. Speaker, that some elements of the administration have been briefed on those documents but they have not been disclosed to Congress and they have not been disclosed to the American public? How can that be?

I will tell you how it can be. Because this is absurd. The administration has not disclosed material information.

And so why are we here today? Why is Chairman ROYCE managing this time? Why are we contemplating this resolution that is brought forth by Congressman POMPEO and Congressman ZELDIN? It is to say this: Administration, you have not complied. Therefore, Corker-Cardin has not been invoked. Therefore, the House is not going to vote on this nefarious deal.

This is an awful deal, Mr. Speaker, and it should be wholeheartedly rejected with all urgency. I urge the passage of this resolution to make it very clear that we are not going to be complicit. We are not going to be complicit, Mr. Speaker. We are not going to be midwives and bring into the world this awful thing. We won't be complicit.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

A few speakers ago, there was a statement made about folks loving America. Well, guess what. We all love America. The fact that we may have disagreements with regard to this proposal does not take away from our love of this great country. We may differ, but the fact still remains that we love our country. And I just want to make that clear, because it is sickening to hear those kinds of comments.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. The American people have spoken and overwhelmingly oppose this agreement. Our

allies in the region, who know Iran best, oppose this deal. The President, enabled by Senate Democrats, continues to live in a fantasyland.

The President's track record in the region is appalling: Libya, Yemen, Somalia, Benghazi, the reset with Russia, red lines in Syria, his failed ISIL strategy, and his catastrophic withdrawal from Iraq, just to name a few, now handing billions, intercontinental ballistic missiles, and a legal pathway to a nuclear weapon to Iran.

The American people deserve the truth rather than lies and half-truths about snapback sanctions; secret side deals; anytime, anywhere inspections; Iran's right to enrich uranium or plutonium; and, as we stand here today, Congress' role in this bad deal.

Members of Congress must ask themselves two questions: Does this deal make us more secure? Does this deal make us more safe? The answer to both questions is a resounding, no, it doesn't.

Secretary of State Kerry said "no deal is better than a bad deal." I couldn't agree more.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: Iran is an enemy to the United States of America, not by our declaration but by a proclamation of the most senior military leaders of that nation that have stated their destiny is to destroy the United States of America. Now, I was recently told by the Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, that when someone says they want to destroy you, believe them.

So what are we to trust? Are we to trust Iran, when they say that their destination, their goal, is to destroy the people of the United States of America? Or do we trust them when they say that they will commit to not develop a nuclear weapon? Or do we trust an international organization who has details about verification that they won't even share with the representatives of the people of this Nation who would be drastically affected by that?

Oh, yes, but I have been told it is not about trust; it is about verification. But the details of the most critical part of that verification are being kept secret from the Members of this Congress who are expected to approve this deal that would have drastic effects upon the people of the United States.

I would submit to you that those who chant "death to America," the leaders in Iran, know the details of it.

We must stop this now.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I thank the chairman for the work that he has done on this issue and the awareness that he has helped to raise not only with Members of this body, but with the American people.

The American people are speaking out. They do not want this Iran deal to be on the books. And there are good reasons why.

As I was home and talking to my constituents, many are like me. They are a mom, they are a grandmother, and they fear for what this will do to our country. They fear for what it will do to the safety of our children and future generations. They are asking the right questions:

Does Iran deserve the right to be trusted? Absolutely not.

When their neighbors don't trust them, should we trust them? The answer is of course not.

Is this a transparent agreement? Of course not. The secret side deals that have been made, why would we do that? Why would we incentivize, create a pathway, for Iran to have a nuclear weapon?

I think what we should do is require the President to come forward with every component to expose this so we know what kind of future this creates for our children and our grandchildren.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Returning to an argument I was making earlier about this body's experience with North Korea, it does look to me like many are willing to concede to Iran the same loopholes that we gave North Korea.

Supreme Leader Ayatollah has declared that his country would never agree to anywhere, anytime inspections. That is what is a little confusing about this. Especially, he says, in Iranian military sites. What we are informed of is that Iran is going to do its own inspection at Parchin. Without a full picture of Iran's nuclear program, without full ability to inspect these sites, we will be verifying in the dark, just as we were with North Korea.

The Ayatollah is also demanding sanctions be lifted before Iran dismantles its nuclear infrastructure. In short, the Supreme Leader, again, is not going to let international inspectors into the places he builds his secret weapons, and yet he wants billions of sanctions in relief that he could funnel into terrorist groups that he funds, including Hezbollah and Hamas.

Just like North Korea, Iran wants its rewards upfront. Again, like North Korea, what is Iran demanding? The best prize of all: the stamp of international legitimacy for its nuclear program.

The truly stunning thing about this nuclear deal is that even if Iran fulfills all of its commitments in a few short

years, the mullahs will be free from restraints, have international blessing for Iran's nuclear program, and will have billions of dollars that they will use, in my opinion, for destabilizing the region. Because the IRGC controls most of these business contracts, their military controls the contracts.

It is not too late to stop Iran from getting nuclear weapons, but to do so, we need to learn from our mistakes; and if we don't, the Ayatollah, just like Kim Jong-il before him, will have, in my view, an easy path to the bomb.

Mr. CUMMINGS. May I inquire as to how much time we have remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 3 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this agreement is not based on trust; it is based on the most intrusive verification regimen in history.

There has been a lot of talk about \$100 billion—others have floated other figures—in sanctions relief, but we know that it is more like around \$50 billion, and it is conjecture as to how Iran will spend this money. Our terrorism sanctions will remain firmly in place to combat the money that Iran passes to any terrorist groups.

□ 1645

This is a good deal, not because the President says so, not because I say so, not because anyone else in this Chamber says so. It is a good deal because the experts say so.

Nuclear physicists, disarmament experts, antinuclear proliferation experts, members of the intelligence community—including the former head of Mossad—and our allies all agree that the right thing to do to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is to support this deal.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Neville Chamberlain landed at Heston Aerodrome on September 30, 1938, and spoke to the crowds. He said: "The settlement of the Czechoslovakian problem has been achieved."

He said, "This morning I had another talk with German Chancellor, Herr Hitler, and here is the paper that bears his name on it, as well as mine."

He went on to say, "We regard the agreement signed last night and the Anglo-German Naval Agreement as symbolic of the desire of our two peoples never to go to war again."

Later that day, he stood outside of 10 Downing Street and read again. He said: "My good friends, for the second

time in our history, a British Prime Minister has returned from Germany bringing peace with honour."

He said, "I believe it is a peace for our time. We thank you from the bottom of our hearts. Go home and get a nice quiet sleep."

Mr. Speaker, we all know how that turned out.

My friends, if this deal passes—and make no mistake, it is quite a deal for Iran—Americans will not get a quiet night's sleep.

As long as Barack Hussein Obama is in office aiding and abetting the Iranian terroristic regime, we will not be safe and Americans will not sleep well.

This is a bad deal. You don't argue, you don't make deals with the devil, deals with the enemy. Do we not learn from history?

Did we not learn anything from World War II?

This is a bad deal. I urge my colleagues to vote this deal down. It is time to put America first.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we have heard some try to demean the importance of what the chairman and others here on the Republican side are trying to do right now.

The fact is that, when we talk about the information that has not been provided about the outside agreements with the IAEA, it is not only material, relevant, but it is also critical.

I am reading directly from the Iran deal. Eight years after the adoption date or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, whichever is earlier—it goes on to talk about sanctions that will be lifted.

Another place, same thing, or when the IAEA has reached the broader conclusion that all nuclear material in Iran remains in peaceful activities, then another protocol is lifted.

If we don't know what the agreement is with the IAEA, then these years mean nothing. The IAEA, I have already heard say, as far as it knows, nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes. That would mean that these years are worthless.

We have got to have the secret agreements.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time we have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland has 1½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

With regard to what the gentleman just stated, I would refer him to Senator BOB CORKER, who drafted the process that gave Congress the right to review the agreement. In talking about this situation that we are addressing today, he says that the motion is not worth considering. Apparently, he feels satisfied that the arrangement with regard to the IAEA has been satisfied.

Let's also focus with the matter at hand, and the matter at hand is preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, instead of working on pointless partisan measures like this one and others we will be considering tomorrow.

This entire piece of legislation that we have been debating is about accusations that the President did not comply with the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. Even, as I said a moment ago, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee does not believe that.

Let's get back to the business of the people and stop wasting their money and wasting their time.

I urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I guess the point that I would begin by making is that Iran won't have to cheat like North Korea did to get close to a bomb, and that is because the essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology expire or, in the words of the agreement, sunset in 10 to 15 years.

After these restrictions expire, Iran will be left with an internationally recognized industrial scale nuclear program. Iran could even legitimately enrich to levels near weapons-grade under the pretext of powering a nuclear navy. All these activities are permissible under the nonproliferation treaty, and all would be endorsed by this agreement.

Indeed, to quote the President, President Obama said, of this agreement, in year 13, 14, 15, Iran's breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero.

A former State Department official testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that this sunset clause is a disaster. It is a disaster as it will enable the leading state sponsor of terrorism to produce enough material for dozens of nuclear weapons, all under the terms of the agreement.

As another expert witness pointed out, the bet that the administration is taking is that, in 10 to 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran. The agreement does not dismantle Iran's nuclear infrastructure. Iran doesn't have to dismantle any centrifuges or give up any of its nuclear facilities. Even Iran's once-secret facility at Fordo, buried under a mountain top, does stay open.

Instead, the deal temporarily restricts elements of the program. It does do that. It restricts elements of the program, but it does it in exchange for something else that is permanent.

What is permanent in this, as opposed to temporary? What is permanent is the sanctions relief. Key restrictions begin to expire after only 8 years.

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime, which Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations.

I will remind the Members again, this was a hard-fought case over several administrations; and, in point of fact, in the prior Congress, myself and ELIOT ENGEL had legislation which would have put additional pressure on Iran that passed here by a vote of 400-20.

It was the administration and it was Secretary of State Kerry who made certain that that bill was bottled up in the Senate and could not see the light of day.

Now, the billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get up front will support its terrorist activity, but those billions are just a downpayment, as this agreement reconnects Iran to the global economy.

One of the things that bothers me most about this is that Iran is not a normal country with normal businessmen running those companies. When those companies were nationalized, they were turned over to the IRGC. They were turned over, basically, to the leaders in the military, and they were turned over to the clerics.

As future contracts go forward with Iran, it is that entity that is going to be rewarded. It is going to have the political power.

For those of us that hoped to see change in Iran, now the best connected people in Iran are going to be the IRGC leaders. If we think for a minute what that will mean for those that would like to see real change, I think we lost a historic opportunity here to put the kind of pressure that would have forced change, but we did not do that.

In a major, last-minute concession—and this is the final point I would make—the President agreed to lift the U.N. arms embargo on Iran, and in 5 years, Iran will be able to buy conventional weapons and, in 8 years, ballistic missiles.

Russia and China want to sell these dangerous weapons to Iran, and that is why they pushed. That is why it was Russia pushing, at the eleventh hour, after we thought this agreement was done.

The reason we were waiting those extra days is because Russia was running interference for Iran, saying: Oh, no, wait. We also want the arms embargo lifted, including the ICBM embargo lifted.

As the Secretary of Defense of our country testified, the reason that we

want to stop Iran from having an ICBM program is that the “I” in ICBM stands for intercontinental, which means having the capability of flying from Iran to the United States.

Ask yourself why Iran wants to build ICBMs, why it is that the Ayatollah says it is the duty of every military man to figure out how to help mass-produce ICBMs.

Someone once asked President Kennedy the difference between our space program and the ICBM program that Russia was building at that time, and he quipped “attitude.” Kennedy’s answer was “attitude.”

The answer here is that attitude counts for a lot, and the attitude in the regime, when they say they are not even going to be bound by this and are now going to transfer rockets and missiles to Hezbollah and Hamas, tells us a lot about their attitude.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, for years, the Congress, the President, our European partners, and the international community have imposed a series of tough economic sanctions on Iran with the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Those sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table and I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the entire team, along with our P5+1 partners, for their efforts to negotiate an agreement to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

The question for Members of Congress, who will vote on this agreement, is whether it achieves its stated goals. Given the importance of this question, I believe every Member of Congress has an obligation to thoroughly review the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), consider the testimony presented at the Congressional hearings, and listen to competing views before reaching a final judgment.

Since the JCPOA was submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, I have carefully reviewed all of its terms, attended the classified briefings and numerous presentations, and reviewed the transcripts of all the hearings that have been held in both the House and the Senate. I have also met with opponents and supporters of the agreement. While I respect the opinions of those on both sides of this issue, I have concluded that this agreement advances the national security interests of the United States and all of our allies, including our partner Israel. This agreement is the best path to achieve our goal—that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. Indeed, I firmly believe that, should Congress block this agreement, we would undermine that goal, inadvertently weaken and isolate America, and strengthen Iran.

The benefit of any agreement must be measured against the real-world consequences of no agreement. Many forget that when these negotiations began in earnest two years ago, Iran was a threshold nuclear weapons state and remains so until and unless this agreement is implemented. As Prime Minister Netanyahu warned at the United Nations in 2012, Iran was a few months away from having enough highly enriched uranium to

produce its first bomb. Today, prior to the implementation of this agreement, it has a nuclear stockpile that, if further enriched, could produce up to 10 bombs. It currently has installed nearly 20,000 centrifuges that could convert that fuel into weapons material. Indeed, many analysts believe that the combination of Iran’s nuclear stockpile and its centrifuges would allow it to produce enough weapons-grade nuclear material for a bomb in two months.

In addition, Iran has been enriching some of its nuclear material at its deep underground reactor at Fordow, a very difficult target to hit militarily. Moreover, Iran was in the process of building a heavy-water reactor at Arak, which could generate plutonium to be used for a nuclear weapon. Finally, Iran has been operating for years under an inadequate verification regime that increases the risks of a covert program going undetected.

This agreement blocks all of these paths to acquiring weapons-grade nuclear material and puts in place an inspection system that assures the detection of any violation and future dash to acquire a nuclear weapon. The Interim Agreement has already neutralized Iran’s stockpile of highly enriched uranium that Prime Minister Netanyahu highlighted in his speech. This final agreement will significantly scale back the remainder of its program. Iran’s stockpile of enriched uranium will be cut from 9,900 kg to 300 kg, and that remainder will be limited to low-enriched uranium that cannot be used for a weapon. In addition, the agreement removes two-thirds of Iran’s installed centrifuges. No enrichment activities may be conducted at Fordow for a period of 15 years, and the facility at Arak will be permanently converted to one that does not produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Taken together, these measures will extend the breakout time from about two months to at least a year and put in place layers of verification measures over different timelines, including some that remain in place permanently. It is generally agreed that these measures would allow us to detect any effort by Iran to use its current nuclear facilities—Natanz, Fordow, or Arak—to violate the agreement. The main criticism with respect to verification is that the agreement does not sufficiently guard against an effort by Iran to develop a secret uranium supply chain and enrichment capacity at a covert place. However, the reality is that the agreement permanently puts in place an inspection mechanism that is more rigorous than any previous arms control agreement and more stringent than the current system. The agreement ultimately requires inspections of any suspected Iranian nuclear site with the vote of the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the European Union. Neither the Chinese nor the Russians can block such inspections in the face of a united Western front. Are we really better off without this verification regime than with it?

In exchange for rolling back its nuclear program and accepting this verification regime, Iran will obtain relief from those sanctions that are tied to its nuclear program. However, that relief will only come after Iran has verifiably reduced its nuclear program as required. Moreover, if Iran backslides on those commitments, the sanctions will snap back into place. The

snapback procedure is triggered if the U.S. registers a formal complaint against Iran with the special commission created for that purpose. In addition, those U.S. sanctions that are not related to the Iranian nuclear program will remain in place, including U.S. sanctions related to Iran's human rights violations, support for terrorism, and missile program.

There are some who oppose the agreement because it does not prevent Iran from engaging in adversarial actions throughout the Gulf, the Middle East, and elsewhere. That conduct, however, was never within the scope of these negotiations nor the objective of the international sanctions regime aimed at preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. President Reagan understood the distinction between changing behavior and achieving verifiable limits on weapons programs. He negotiated arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, not because he thought it would change the character of "the Evil Empire" but because limiting their nuclear arsenal was in the national security interests of the U.S. and our allies. That reality is also true today. An Iranian regime with nuclear capability would present a much greater threat to the region than an Iran without one. In fact, today, as a threshold nuclear weapons state, Iran wields more influence than it will under the constraints of this agreement. That is why our focus has appropriately been on reining in the Iranian nuclear program.

The lifting of the sanctions will certainly give Iran additional resources to support its priorities. Given the political dynamic in Iran, some of those additional resources will likely be invested to improve the domestic standard of living. But even if all the resources were used to support their proxies in the region, respected regional observers agree that they are unlikely to make a significant strategic difference. Moreover, any effort by Iran to increase support for its proxies can be checked by the U.S. and our allies through countermeasures. Finally, it is clear that any alternative agreement opponents seek would also result in the lifting of the sanctions and freeing up these resources.

In my view, opponents of the agreement have failed to demonstrate how we will be in a better position if Congress were to block it. Without an agreement, the Iranians will immediately revert to their status as a threshold nuclear weapons state. In other words, they immediately pose the threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned about in his U.N. speech. At the same time, the international consensus we have built for sanctions, which was already starting to fray, would begin to collapse entirely. We would be immediately left with the worst of all worlds—a threshold nuclear weapons state with diminished sanctions and little leverage for the United States.

I disagree with the view that we can force the Iranians back to the negotiating table to get a better deal. All of our European partners have signed on to the current agreement. Consequently, the U.S. would be isolated in its quest to return to negotiations. And in the unlikely event that we somehow returned to negotiations, the critics have not presented a plausible scenario for achieving a better agreement in a world where fewer sanctions means less economic pressure.

The bottom line is that if Congress were to block the agreement and the Iranians were to resume nuclear enrichment activities, the only way to stop them, at least temporarily, would be by military action. That would unleash significant negative consequences that could jeopardize American troops in the region, drag us into another ground war in the Middle East, and trigger unpredictable responses elsewhere. Moreover, the United States would be totally isolated from most of the world, including our Western partners. The folly of that go-it-alone military approach would be compounded by the fact that such action would only deal a temporary setback to an Iranian nuclear program. They would likely respond by putting their nuclear enrichment activities deeper underground and would likely be more determined than ever to build a nuclear arsenal.

We don't have to take that path. This agreement will give us a long period of time to test the Iranians' compliance and assess their intentions. During that period, it will give us a treasure trove of information about the scope and capabilities of the limited Iranian nuclear program. Throughout that period and beyond, we reserve all of our options, including a military option, to respond to any Iranian attempt to break out and produce enough highly enriched material to make a bomb. But we will have two advantages over the situation as it is today—a more comprehensive verification regime to detect any violation and a much longer breakout period in which to respond.

As former Secretary Clinton has indicated, the fact that we have successfully limited the scope of Iran's nuclear program does not mean we have limited its ambitions in the region. We must continue to work with our friends and allies to constantly contain and confront Iranian aggression in the region. The United States and Israel must always stand together to confront that threat. The fact remains that Iranian support for their terrorist proxy Hezbollah continues to destabilize Lebanon and poses a direct threat to Israel, as does its support for Hamas. We must do all we can to ensure that our ally Israel maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, including providing increased funding for Israel's Arrow anti-ballistic missile and Iron Dome anti-rocket systems. Consideration should also be given to previously denied weapons if a need for such enhanced capabilities arises. We must always remember that some of Iran's leaders have called for the destruction of Israel and we must never forget the awful past that teaches us not to ignore those threats.

The threats Iran poses in the region are real. But all those threats are compounded by an Iran that is a threshold nuclear weapons state. This agreement will roll back the Iranian nuclear program and provide us with greater ability to detect and more time to respond to any future Iranian attempt to build a nuclear weapon.

For all of the reasons given above, I've concluded that this is an historic agreement that should be supported by the Congress.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the nuclear agreement reached between the P5+1 nations and Iran.

This month marks the 70th anniversary of the nuclear age. The dangers of nuclear war

remain very real but the path to contain the nuclear demon has not been easy. The Iran Nuclear Agreement is the latest attempt to reduce the nuclear danger and perhaps one of the most complex set of issues ever confronted in shaping an international agreement.

In my judgment this agreement enhances the security of the United States and reduces the likelihood of nuclear confrontation in the Mideast. Failure to accept the terms of this agreement, on the other hand, seems likely to either exclude the United States from a role in preventing nuclear proliferation in the Mideast as other nations move ahead without us or, more ominously, set the region on a path of escalating tensions. I believe either of those last two options are unacceptable, and reckless. With determination, patience and U.S. leadership, this agreement has the potential of opening the door to further agreements on non-nuclear security issues.

No agreement is perfect and no agreement will fully satisfy everyone. Agreements negotiated with our adversaries by their nature mean that we are seeking to achieve our security goals by diplomatic means not by imposing our will by military means. U.S. security experts have expressed their support for the agreement as the best option as have our nation's nuclear experts. Leading Israeli security experts have also voiced their support as have the leaders of many leading U.S. Jewish organizations because of their concerns for Israel's security. Should our diplomatic efforts in this agreement fail to close the path to an Iranian nuclear weapon we would still be in a better position as to time and means to choose other options.

I commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their leadership on this issue. The stakes for the United States, for the Mideast region and for the world are too high for us to miss this opportunity.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this legislation to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. The agreement is not in the best interest of our country and will have a lasting impact well beyond this Congress and Obama's presidency.

It boggles the mind that we would put faith in a regime that is the world's leading state sponsor of terror and continues to openly destabilize the Middle East. Furthermore, this deal fails to establish acceptable consequences for violations, and financially strengthens the Iranian regime via international trade and technology assistance.

This international gamble will adversely affect generations of Americans and Middle Easterners hoping to live in a more peaceful world.

We must do everything we can to prevent implementation of this dangerous agreement, and remain firm by defending freedom and protecting American interests at home and abroad. That is why I urge my colleagues to vote against implementing this deal.

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, over the course of this debate, you're going to hear about the failures of this deal from members of both parties. You'll hear about how this deal fails to provide the "anytime, anywhere" inspections that the Administration promised. You'll hear about how it relies on Iran to self-inspect at military nuclear facilities such as Parchin. And

you'll hear about how Iran will get over a hundred billion dollars in immediate sanctions relief in exchange for a limited inspections regime that expires within 15 years. These are all important reasons to reject this deal, but I want to focus on something different: the character of the Iranian regime.

The Islamic Republic of Iran's founding action 35 years ago was to declare war on the United States, violating all international laws and agreements by invading our embassy and taking our diplomats hostage. Since then, Iran has been complicit in the murders of thousands of our soldiers. Iran's Lebanese terrorist proxy, Hezbollah, murdered hundreds of Marines in Lebanon in the 1980s, and in the last decade, Iranian-sponsored militias murdered thousands of American service members in Iraq. As we debate this deal today, Iran continues to hold American hostages. This is a regime that was born in terror and that exists to spread terror across the world.

It's the character of the Iranian regime that makes its pursuit of nuclear weapons so dangerous. Countries like Japan have enough stockpiled plutonium for thousands of bombs, but because it doesn't sponsor terror or threaten its neighbors, no one is concerned with the Japanese nuclear power industry. An Iranian regime that espouses terror and threatens genocide can never be allowed to have a nuclear program, not today, not in ten years, not in a century.

Iran's development of a nuclear weapon will have repercussions far beyond its own borders. Iran's terrorist allies are currently waging war against America's allies across the Middle East. Iranian proxies Hezbollah and Hamas continue to threaten Israel with tens of thousands of rockets, Iranian death squads in Iraq and Syria have killed tens of thousands of people, and Iranian backed rebels overthrew the pro-American government of Yemen. This is not ancient history; this is all within the past year.

Any deal that the United States signs must result in the dismantlement, destruction, and irreversible rollback of Iran's nuclear program. There is no acceptable level of enrichment for an Iran that sponsors terrorism and threatens its neighbors. If Iran won't accept a deal on these terms, then the United States should keep the sanctions in place and tighten them until they force the Iranian regime to its knees. Iran will never be a normal nation as long as its government is ruled by radicals whose ideology is terror. When Ronald Reagan was pursuing nuclear arms reduction negotiations with the Soviet Union, he famously operated under the principle of "Trust, but verify." In contrast, this deal requires blind trust without any meaningful verification. It does nothing to change the character of the Iranian regime and instead counts on the good will of a terrorist state that openly proclaims "Death to America." I refuse to trust the security of America and our allies to the Iranian regime's promises. I don't trust Iran and I cannot support this deal.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to reiterate my deep-seated belief that the Iran nuclear deal is a dangerous mistake of historic proportions.

On my recent trip to Israel, I learned firsthand how the Iranian regime will use this deal

to further its terrorist ambitions and threaten the peace and security of the entire Middle East.

Because of the unprecedented number of concessions offered to the Iranians by the Obama Administration, this deal will do little to prevent Iran from ultimately obtaining a nuclear weapon.

In actuality, instead of averting Iran's quest for the bomb, this deal will speed other nations' desire for nuclear arsenals and provide one of our greatest enemies with the resources it desperately needs. Resources that Iran will turn around and use to fund attacks on our interests in the Middle East and beyond.

We are providing our sworn enemy with the means to attack us, and all we get in exchange is a brief delay in their unending quest for a nuclear weapon.

This terrible deal not only affords Iran legitimacy for a partial nuclear program at present, but allows them a full and unfettered program after 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, under this deal, Iran will receive hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief and be allowed access to advanced weaponry and ballistic missiles it can use to threaten its neighbors and the United States.

Iran will be free to use the weapons and money provided by this agreement to fuel its terrorist aspirations around the region, threatening our ally Israel and further inflaming a region already in crisis.

Under this deal, the world's number one sponsor of terrorism will suddenly have access to enormous resources that it can distribute to its allies Hamas, Hezbollah and the Assad regime in Syria.

This is a completely unacceptable outcome for the United States, Israel, and our allies in the Middle East.

Wagering the peace and security of the U.S., Israel and the world on the small chance that a hateful regime will suddenly see the error of its ways is not only wrong, it is dangerous.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that, no matter how much the President may wish it to be so, Iran's decades long record of terrorism, extremism and hate will not suddenly change simply because this deal has been signed.

Our allies are almost uniformly opposed to this deal. On my recent trip to Israel, I had the honor and privilege of meeting with Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu for over two hours.

We discussed the Iran deal at length, and I came away even more convinced that this deal is not only foolhardy, it is dangerous.

Prime Minister Netanyahu explained to us how the Obama Administration has sold out our Israeli allies to strike a deal with a murderous and untrustworthy Iranian regime.

The President expects Congress to stand idly by and do nothing while he trades the security of the U.S. and its allies for a legacy-burnishing accomplishment.

He expects us to sit on the sidelines while his Administration offers one concession after another to the Iranians, and agrees on a deal that would endanger the stability of the entire Middle East and jeopardize U.S. national security.

But that will not happen. We will not stand idly by while the American people's security is traded for some empty promises.

A nuclear-armed Iran would start a new arms race in the Middle East and pose an intolerable threat to the national security of the United States and our allies, especially Israel.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children, and our children's children, we must face down this threat now before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to review this agreement with an eye towards history, towards the past, present and future of a region critical to America's national interests.

Iran has a record of deception and hostility towards American interests, no amount of wishful thinking will change their core tendencies.

Congress must use this opportunity to stand up for what is right.

The United States must not capitulate in the face of persistent evil. We must stand together, united against the threat of a nuclear Iran, in order to guarantee a free and peaceful tomorrow.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks I have been carefully considering the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), the agreement that is intended to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. There is no question that preventing Iran from ever developing a nuclear weapon is in the best interest of the United States, Israel and the Middle East, and the rest of the world. I favor diplomacy over military action whenever and wherever reasonably possible, and I strongly agree that an engaged and unified international community, led by the United States, is the best option to preserve peace by keeping close watch over a rogue state that seems to respond only when the world's major powers speak in one voice. It is through this lens, and with these goals, that I approached my analysis of the JCPOA and the potential consequences of Congress accepting or rejecting the agreement. I will vote to support the agreement and advocate for vigorous oversight and enforcement.

To reach this decision, I carefully read the agreement, reviewed classified intelligence materials, and participated in both classified and unclassified briefings. I have spoken with President Obama, and I've heard thorough explanations from Secretary of State Kerry and Secretary of Energy Moniz. Knowledgeable critics of this agreement offered compelling arguments, which I considered in my analysis. I asked questions of the Administration and other experts and evaluated their responses. I have discussed the agreement with people from Iran and Israel, and others with deep ties to both nations. Constituents have offered significant input in letters, emails, phone calls, conversations, and at town hall meetings across Northwest Oregon. As I deliberated, I recalled my time visiting Israel, and always kept in mind my knowledge and understanding of how volatile the region is and what it's like to live under constant threat.

Reaching this decision was not easy. The consequences of this agreement will shape the future of the region and the world. The complexity of the agreement, and the questions it raises about the future that cannot be answered irrefutably, contributed to the fervent, well-reasoned, and passionate opinions on all sides. Many people who I know and respect deeply have reached a different conclusion; I acknowledge their concerns but have

concluded that rejecting the deal will not diminish the possibility that Iran will obtain a nuclear weapon. In my assessment, if Congress rejects the agreement, it could result in a higher likelihood of Iran developing a nuclear weapon while at the same time diminishing the global leadership of the United States.

Implementing the JCPOA, on the other hand, will preserve the principal role of the United States in dealing with Iran in the future, and it is our best chance to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Right now, without the agreement, the “breakout time” for Iran to acquire fissile material for a nuclear weapon is a mere 2–3 months. Under the JCPOA, the breakout time for at least the next decade will be extended to a year, and there will be no sanctions relief until that breakout time has been extended and Iran has taken multiple required steps and completion of those steps has been verified. These steps include reducing Iran’s stockpile of enriched uranium by 97 percent, removing the core of the heavy water reactor and filling it with concrete, and submitting to ongoing inspections and continuous, unprecedented monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Iran can only enrich uranium to 3.67 percent, a level far below the 90 percent range that is necessary to build a nuclear weapon. Sanctions “snap back” and can be reinstated if there is a violation. The JCPOA does not affect the existing U.S. bans on weapons sales, and, importantly, no option, including military force, is taken off the table.

Like most negotiated agreements, however, the JCPOA is not perfect. Because of that, some suggest that we should reject the deal and bring the parties back to the table in an effort to make it better. But our negotiating partners agree that this is a deal worth pursuing, and I concur with many experts who say it would be a near impossibility to convince all parties to return to the table. Even then, it is not at all clear that the outcome of future negotiations would be better than the current agreement. Others have argued that the agreement is likely to fail given Iran’s history of noncompliance. Yet throughout this process, no one has suggested that the Iranian government can be trusted. This is not a deal built on trust, but rather on verification. The agreement puts in place a comprehensive inspection regime, some of which is permanent, that will supplement the work of intelligence agencies and provide confidence that Iran could not dash for a nuclear weapon without being caught.

Rather than reject the agreement, Congress should come together and commit to vigilance in holding Iran to every aspect of the JCPOA and to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which provides that Iran, as a signatory, is never allowed to develop a nuclear weapon. We should make clear—very clear—that anything short of strict compliance will result in the swift reimposition of sanctions. Working together in Congress and with other world leaders will give us the best chance to make sure that Iran complies with its obligations and the best chance to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. I support this bill.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I’ve travelled throughout Alabama’s 2nd Congressional District the last few weeks and I’ve listened to the

concerns expressed by those I represent. I want to clearly state my views on the President’s proposed nuclear agreement with Iran.

Many remain puzzled as to why we are negotiating in the first place with a regime that has a stated intent to destroy the United States and Israel. Remember that just days after this deal was reached, Iran’s Supreme Leader applauded and encouraged a large crowd gathered in Tehran as it chanted “Death to America!” and “Death to Israel!” Also puzzling is, even if we are going to negotiate, why be so unwilling to walk away when our stated objectives fall one after the other?

I share my constituents’ frustration at a flawed, weak deal that seems to serve Iran’s interests at the expense of our own.

How is that? First, inspections are not “anywhere, anytime” like negotiators originally said would be a deal-breaking must. In fact, at certain sites the Iranians could have up to 24 days’ notice before inspectors are allowed in. That’s a joke. And, even then, Americans are prohibited from making unilateral inspections.

Second, the “snap back” provisions the Administration points to as accountability mechanisms are weak by their own admission. Secretary Kerry and President Obama have repeatedly said that our unilateral economic sanctions don’t work and put the United States at a disadvantage. Yet, the threat of those very sanctions “snapping back” into place is supposed to be the way we make sure Iran lives up to the agreement. They can’t have it both ways. If our sanctions aren’t strong enough on their own now, why would we rely on them as a way to hold Iran accountable in the future?

Third, under this deal, as much as \$150 billion would flow into Iran’s coffers. Let’s not kid ourselves to think that the world’s foremost state sponsor of terrorism won’t turn around and fund those who want to harm Americans and our allies. So, not only will we have paved the way for Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon and potentially initiated a nuclear arms race in the Middle East, but we will have strengthened the hand of this adversarial state while weakening our own.

I will continue to work with my colleagues to point out these weaknesses and make those supporting the deal explain why to the American people.

One silver lining is that the agreement is subject for review in the next administration because this is an executive agreement and not a treaty. Let’s pray our next president doesn’t adhere to a foreign policy doctrine of “leading from behind.”

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of peace in the Middle East. Peace for our allies and friends in the region. Peace for the Iranian people. And sustainable peace for the United States.

Throughout my 29 years of military service, I served during war and peace. Throughout the Cold War, we constantly trained to respond to and combat the greatest nuclear threat the world has ever faced: the Soviet Union. I deployed to Germany on what was effectively the front line, within walking distance of this grave threat. Afterwards, I fought in Desert Storm, with the Iraqi chemical and biological arsenal a threat at any moment. Finally, I deployed several more times to Iraq

during the most recent war, fighting for stability against Islamic terrorists bent on death, chaos, and destruction.

In each of these experiences, I found the best and worst in humanity, and was always working towards lasting peace and stability.

I now have the honor to serve in the United States Congress, where I seek to prevent engagements in various regional conflicts, including those in Libya and Syria. I seek to bring a more democratic process to deploying American personnel into combat, which was the intent of the original 1973 War Powers Act. I take these positions because I know that the best and most responsible means of preventing conflict, or the exacerbation of conflict, is through strong diplomacy.

Today, I continue to fight to keep the United States out of another war. I work to protect and keep safe our allies and friends throughout the Middle East and the world. This is why I say no to an agreement that will only make us and our allies less safe in both the short and long term. The Iranian regime is the same regime that calls for death to America and Israel. This is the same regime engaged in destabilization of Iraq, Afghanistan, Yemen, and elsewhere. This is the same regime that funds the Assad regime in Syria which has used Weapons of Mass Destruction, killing hundreds of thousands of people. This is the same regime that funds terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Houthis. This is the same regime that directly funded, trained, and engaged in combat alongside radical Shiite militias that fought, injured, and killed American service men and women, including those under my command.

This deal not only allows, but in fact tacitly approves, Iranian access to modern conventional arms within five years. Within eight years, it lifts the ban on access to ballistic missile technology. The deal also allows Iran to immediately access tens of billions of dollars through sanctions relief, ensuring the modernization of its depleted conventional military and support for its world-wide terror network. The deal seeks to eliminate the legislative sovereignty of the United States Congress, our states, and our municipalities when it comes to key aspects of our foreign policy. The deal does not permit anytime, anywhere inspections. The deal does not outline how inspections will take place. The deal does not stop nuclear research and development in Iran. The deal does not prohibit Iran from seeking and obtaining nuclear weapons either through cheating or after the expiration of the terms.

I am afraid that this deal could hasten the pace to war, not end the threat of it. But this can be prevented. We can return to the negotiating table and engage from a position of strength. We can do so through stronger diplomacy; a more credible and consistent military posturing that does not appear haphazard and reactive; we can enact stronger sanctions, if needed; and finally, we must be willing to stick to a true red line and say no to a bad deal. I plead with my colleagues in the United States Congress, as well as President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and others in this Administration: do not go ahead with this ill-fated and weak deal that hurts our national and international security.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, after careful study of public and classified information, extensive discussions with people on both sides of the issue, and much thought and deliberation, I have concluded that supporting the Iran nuclear agreement is the best option we have at this time to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons. That is why I am supporting H.R. 3461, the legislation approving the Iran agreement.

While this agreement is not perfect, the deal provides unprecedented oversight and transparency over Iran's nuclear program that is not possible today. Furthermore, if the United States does not support the deal, I am concerned it could potentially isolate us from our partners who have given all indications that they are not prepared to walk away from this agreement.

We know Iran cannot be trusted. Therefore, if this deal is approved, there is no question we must be vigilant to make sure Iran does not violate the terms of the agreement. If there are any indications Iran is violating the deal, immediate action must be taken. We must never allow Iran to move towards having a nuclear weapon, and we must never give up working with Israel and our other allies until we achieve peace and stability in the Middle East.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I stand in proud support of the international agreement reached by the P5+1 nations (France, Germany, the United Kingdom, Russia, China, and the United States) that is aimed at preventing Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed state. Preventing a nuclear arms race in the Middle East is essential to the security of the U.S., Israel, and the larger international community. It is why the U.S. led negotiations on this agreement and why this agreement has the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council, over 90 nations, our Gulf state allies, and the world's largest powers.

Under this agreement, Iran has committed to obligations that go far beyond the requirements of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. The agreement will block every pathway to a bomb for at least 15 years. It will require Iran to eliminate 97 percent of its stockpile of enriched uranium, remove two-thirds of its installed centrifuges that enrich uranium as well as remove all the pipework and infrastructure that connects the centrifuges, and terminate the use of its advanced centrifuges to produce enriched uranium. Iran will be required to fill the core of the heavy water Arak reactor with concrete and repurpose it for peaceful purposes. Additionally the deal directs Iran to ship all spent fuel from the reactor out of the country, and prohibits Iran from building any new heavy water reactors. Experts say that these steps are not easily reversible and it would take Iran anywhere from 2 to 5 years to rebuild that infrastructure. Efforts to rebuild it would be detected within a few days.

Under the agreement, Iran's uranium and plutonium manufacturing capabilities will be both severely limited and strictly monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The IAEA will be granted around-the-clock access to Iran's uranium mills, mines, conversion facilities, centrifuge manufacturing and storage facilities, making it nearly impossible for the Iranian government to violate their

manufacturing restrictions. The IAEA will also have access to sites of concern where they believe unauthorized production to be taking place.

If Iran fully complies with this agreement it will be an historic moment not only for the U.S. but for the rest of the world. If Iran violates the agreement, U.S., U.N., and E.U. sanctions will be snapped back into place. Further, all U.S. sanctions on Iran related to their involvement in terrorism and human rights abuses remain in place. All of the P5+1 partners understand that the U.S. will continue to strongly enforce these sanctions, including sanctions that impact non-U.S. entities.

While I will not question the intentions of my colleagues, since we all have the same goal which is to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, some of the rhetoric in opposition to this agreement has been damaging, unhelpful, and at times absurd. Opponents of the agreement have called into question the integrity of the IAEA and their ability as the world's foremost independent organization on nuclear non-proliferation to do their work—for example, by claiming that the confidential nuclear safeguards agreement between the IAEA and Iran is a "side deal" and must be made available to the U.S. government. There is too much at stake and this debate merits a serious conversation based on facts. We need to move beyond the irresponsible, heated rhetoric and do what's necessary to assure that this agreement is successful, will not be violated by Iran, and ensuring that if violations occur there will be serious consequences.

When this agreement is implemented Iran will be further away from the bomb than they are today. It will result in prolonging their timeline for creating a nuclear bomb from a matter of months to at least one year. Without the agreement, Iran would be able to continue their nuclear program unrestrained. If the U.S. walked away from the agreement, Iran would most likely ramp up their centrifuge production—as they did after the U.S. imposed sanctions—which would surely spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Congress should play a supportive role in ensuring that the president can implement this agreement and provide oversight of Iran's compliance. Instead, my Republican colleagues are attempting to scuttle and undermine it, damaging U.S. credibility in the international community and creating a potentially dangerous security position for our nation. While I have not always agreed with President Obama's foreign policy choices I have fully supported his efforts to resolve the crisis over Iran's nuclear ambitions through diplomacy. The conclusion of this agreement demonstrates just how far the U.S. has come in repairing the damage wrought during the Bush administration. It proves that once again the U.S. can be trusted in working with both our allies and adversaries in navigating some of the world's most challenging security issues.

The U.S. has nothing to lose by implementing this agreement—all options remain on the table, but we have a lot to lose if we walk away. Rejecting this agreement like some of my colleagues are advocating would take us back to some of the darkest years in U.S. history. Opponents of this agreement are using arguments put forth by Dick Cheney and Ben-

jamin Netanyahu, two leading cheerleaders of the Iraq war—the worst U.S. foreign policy mistake in the history of our nation. Nobody wants to become further entangled in an endless war in the Middle East. The U.S. wasted more than \$4 trillion on the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan and spent more money rebuilding Afghanistan than we did on the Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after World War II. What have the results been? Afghanistan is still a mess and Iraq is rife with religious and ethnic strife and partially overrun by ISIS.

Preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon would be a huge step forward in the most unstable and dangerous region of the world. Implementing this agreement is the only option and the best alternative available to taking military action.

Lastly, I'm hopeful that the successful implementation of this agreement will lead to a permanent peaceful resolution to this matter and open up a new chapter in Iranian-U.S. relations. Iran's future is also at stake and there is a young Iranian population that would like to see better relations with the U.S. and a more open Iran. This agreement should not be viewed as an irreversible capitulation to Iran. It is the first step in what will be a very long and arduous road to resolving critical issues with Iran and ensuring a safer Middle East.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, after careful review of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), analysis by experts pro and con, consultation with advocates from AIPAC, and prayerful consideration, I have concluded that the JCPOA is a strong, verifiable agreement which, if implemented, provides the best available option, short of military action, to prevent Iran from securing a nuclear weapon.

Israel is our nation's closest friend in the Middle East and one of our nation's key allies. Our relationship is based on shared democratic values, mutual respect, and our Judeo-Christian heritage. I have witnessed first-hand Israel's remarkable culture, innovation, entrepreneurship, and patriotism, especially when I traveled to the Holy Land.

Drawing from my experience as a member of the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, and the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans' Affairs, I have an acute appreciation for the tremendous security challenges Israel and its people face as the nation seeks to survive and thrive in a very hostile neighborhood. Consequently, I have always supported funding for Israel's missile defense programs; a peaceful resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through direct and bilateral talks; and efforts such as the United States-Israel Strategic Partnership Act of 2013 to promote closer military, scientific, and economic ties between our two countries.

Moreover, I have consistently supported international sanctions against Iran, not merely to inflict economic hardships on the government and people of Iran because of their anti-American, anti-Israeli, and anti-Semitic conduct, but to ultimately bring Iran to the negotiating table to deter its nuclear weapons program, which poses a real and grave threat to Israel, the United States, and the entire world.

Because the threat of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon is so ominous, our country was

able to persuade a multitude of nations to join us, albeit reluctantly, in imposing these severe sanctions which have effectively brought Iran to the negotiation table regarding its nuclear weapons program. On July 14, 2015, negotiators from Iran, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China, along with the European Union, announced completion of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran—the JCPOA.

The JCPOA requires that the full extent of the Iran nuclear program will be under constant surveillance—24 hours a day, 7 days a week—by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for at least 15 years, which is the strongest nuclear non-proliferation monitoring agency anywhere in the world. Even after 15 years, Iran will be permanently obligated to follow all international Nuclear Non-Proliferation treaty requirements. Monitoring of the most sensitive parts of Iran's nuclear program will continue indefinitely.

The JCPOA affirms that under no circumstance will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons. It also places severe restrictions on Iran's uranium enrichment facilities, dismantles its plutonium production capabilities, and provides the IAEA access to all known and potential covert sites.

If Iran complies with the JCPOA, international sanctions will be lifted and Iranian funds frozen in foreign banks will be released. However, if Iran violates the agreement, sanctions will snap back into place and all options—including the use of military force—will remain available to the United States, Israel, and our allies to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. These options will only be strengthened by the intelligence gathered from the IAEA monitoring and inspections, as well as by the vast array of U.S. intelligence assets across the region and the world.

The JCPOA is not perfect. Neither side got everything they wanted. And a skeptical international community has deep concerns about Iran's long and nefarious record of human rights violations, financing of terrorism, hostility to Israel and the United States, as well as its destabilizing role throughout the Middle East.

Many Americans, Israelis, and other allies have serious doubts as to whether Iran will actually comply with the terms of the JCPOA, and believe Iran cannot be trusted. I share these concerns. But the JCPOA is not based on trust but on verification through constant monitoring.

While intense inspections by the IAEA under the agreement are not sufficient to satisfy some critics, over 70 nuclear non-proliferation experts such as former Senators Sam Nunn and Richard Lugar; Generals Brent Scowcroft and Colin Powell; 29 top U.S. scientists; 440 Rabbis; more than 60 former Israeli Security Officials; over 50 Christian leaders; and more than 100 former U.S. Ambassadors have endorsed the agreement publicly. The United Nations Security Council voted unanimously to support the JCPOA as well.

From a practical perspective, it makes little sense for the United States to walk away from the JCPOA given the broad diplomatic consensus and lack of reasonable alternatives to rolling back Iran's nuclear program. Our negotiating partners, who had reluctantly agreed to sanctions in the first place, have said in no un-

certain terms that a better deal with Iran under current circumstances cannot be found. In fact, if the U.S. were to now reject the agreement, the broad international support currently in favor of sanctions would disappear, the guarantee of nuclear inspections would vanish, and our nation's diplomatic stature in the world would be greatly diminished.

To be sure, it is vital that the JCPOA be backed by a strong commitment to ensuring that Iran remains in full compliance or face overwhelming military force. Current intelligence confirms that Iran is within months of developing nuclear weapons capability. Under no circumstances should Iran ever be allowed to pursue a nuclear weapon. Yet, before military action is pursued, I firmly believe that our nation must, as it has through the JCPOA, exhaust all of its diplomatic options and give peace a chance.

In His Sermon on the Mount, Jesus Christ said: "Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God." Waging peace is hard and requires far more than trust and good intentions. It requires verification and transparency, which this agreement more than provides. For these reasons, I will support the JCPOA and oppose the passage of any legislation disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin with a couple quotes from the President about the agreement:

"There is nothing more important to our security and to the world's stability than preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

"It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency."

Mr. Speaker, you would be forgiven if you thought I was quoting President Obama. However, I was quoting President Bill Clinton lauding his nuclear agreement with North Korea in 1994. Additionally he stated, "This agreement will help to achieve a longstanding and vital American objective: an end to the threat of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, we now know that reality turned out to be very different. Despite assurances from President Clinton, the North Koreans violated the deal, began a clandestine program to enrich uranium and in 2006 conducted its first underground test of a nuclear weapon.

Once again we are told by a Democrat President that an agreement will prevent an adversarial country from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We would be fools to believe that they will not violate the Obama agreement just as North Korea violated the Clinton agreement. The stakes here are even higher. Iran is a regime that will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to achieve its long-stated goals: the destruction of both Israel and America.

The Iran Nuclear Deal that was agreed to by President Obama is wholly inadequate and unacceptable. The deal gives up-front, permanent sanctions relief to the Iranian mullahs and allows Iran to have an internationally recognized nuclear program after 15 years that could quickly produce a nuclear weapon.

Most laughable are the "anytime, anywhere" inspections. In fact, the agreement grants the

Iranians 24 days to allow the IAEA access to undeclared nuclear facilities. This gives Iran ample opportunity to cheat and continue its march toward a nuclear weapon. We have also learned that the Iranians will be able to provide their own samples from their military base at Parchin to international inspectors. This is essentially asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

I also have great concerns about what happens once sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars are flowing back into Iran. While the UN Security Council resolutions allegedly prevent Iran from shipping arms to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Assad in Syria, nothing prevents them from sending money. In an incredibly dangerous concession, the U.S. even agreed to shorten the length of the arms embargo against Iran. There is no question that this will negatively impact regional stability as well as the U.S. Navy's access to the Persian Gulf. An article in the Washington Post pointed out that the funds available to Iran immediately upon implementation of this deal would equate to approximately 10% of its GDP. That would be equivalent to a \$1.7 trillion injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this agreement will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I believe it will do just the opposite. In no way should a country that vows to wipe Israel off the map and chants "Death to America" be allowed nuclear capabilities. Today marks a turning point for the future of one of our greatest allies, Israel. If this deal goes through, President Obama and Democrats in Congress will own the consequences of allowing the Iranian regime to become a nuclear power.

We can and must have a better deal. A deal that truly allows for anytime/anywhere inspections. A deal that would keep restrictions on Iran's nuclear program for decades. A deal that forces Iran to end its missile development program. A deal that allows Iran truly limited enrichment capability. A deal that releases U.S. hostages in Iran. It is a catastrophic failure that President Obama did not insist on these provisions in the nuclear deal. We should be embarrassed that as the leader of the free world and the most powerful country on earth, this is the best deal President Obama could negotiate.

We have been presented with a false choice of accepting this deal or going to war. We should reject this deal and return to work, not to war. We cannot allow the sanctions to be lifted, we must reject approval of the deal and we must have all the information—including side agreements—before the clock can begin on the deal. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally Israel and with the American people. The consequences of these votes are truly life and death.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, over the past two years, the U.S., Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia have been negotiating with Iran in order to stop Iran's nuclear weapons capability. On July 14, the international coalition announced that an agreement had been reached. This week Congress will get a chance to vote on the agreement.

I have carefully studied the text of the agreement, attended classified briefings, reviewed classified documents compiled by intelligence agencies, listened to the thoughts and concerns of Wisconsinites, and met with experts on both sides of the issue, including Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu during a recent trip to Israel.

Although the agreement is not a perfect solution to a complex problem, I believe the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is the best option to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. Before negotiations began, Iran was steadily improving its nuclear weapon capability. It was estimated by our intelligence community that Iran was only a few months away from developing a bomb, which is unacceptable.

Under terms of the agreement, Iran must significantly dismantle its nuclear program. Iran's uranium stockpile will be greatly reduced, its number of nuclear enrichment centrifuges cut by two thirds, and its advanced centrifuge research and development severely limited. A group of our nation's top nuclear scientists praised the technical terms of the agreement and argued that it provides assurance that Iran will not develop a nuclear weapon in the next decade.

Iran's history of cheating on agreements, such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, has fostered an environment of distrust, which is why this agreement is based on "distrust and verify." The agreement will be enforced and monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) with our help and resources. The inspection regimen is unprecedented, and most experts believe that it would be very difficult for Iran to cheat without detection. Should Iran fail to comply with the agreement, the sanctions that forced Iran to the negotiating table will "snap back" into place. The president has made clear that no options are taken off the table under this agreement.

The JCPOA is not perfect. I have serious concerns with some aspects of the agreement, especially the prospect of Iran receiving billions in sanctions relief that may be used for nefarious purposes. We must continue to enhance the security of Israel and other allies in the region. It is important to make it clear to Iran and the international community that Israel's security is our security.

Given the rhetoric coming from some in Iran and its behavior in the region, Israel is understandably skeptical of any agreement with Iranian leaders. But after speaking to opponents of the agreement, including Netanyahu, I have yet to hear a viable alternative that will maintain an international coalition to continue economic sanctions or support preemptive military action if needed.

It is easier to deal with an Iran without a nuclear weapon than trying to work backwards once Iran has manufactured a weapon. This agreement gives us the best opportunity to avoid military action and may accomplish our ultimate objective: to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, protecting the security of our allies in the region, and avoiding a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following letter:

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader.

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader.

Hon. HARRY REID,
Minority Leader.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BOEHNER AND PELOSI AND SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID: As you know, on July 14, 2015, the United States and five other nations announced that a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) has been reached with Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. In our judgment as former senior military officers, the agreement will not have that effect. Removing sanctions on Iran and releasing billions of dollars to its regime over the next ten years is inimical to the security of Israel and the Middle East. There is no credibility within JCPOA's inspection process or the ability to snap back sanctions once lifted, should Iran violate the agreement. In this and other respects, the JCPOA would threaten the national security and vital interests of the United States and, therefore, should be disapproved by the Congress.

The agreement as constructed does not "cut off every pathway" for Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. To the contrary, it actually provides Iran with a legitimate path to doing that simply by abiding by the deal. JCPOA allows all the infrastructure the Iranians need for a nuclear bomb to be preserved and enhanced. Notably, Iran is allowed to: continue to enrich uranium; develop and test advanced centrifuges; and continue work on its Arak heavy-water plutonium reactor. Collectively, these concessions afford the Iranians, at worst, a ready break-out option and, at best, an incipient nuclear weapons capability a decade from now.

The agreement is unverifiable. Under the terms of the JCPOA and a secret side deal (to which the United States is not privy), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will be responsible for inspections under such severe limitations as to prevent them from reliably detecting Iranian cheating. For example, if Iran and the inspectors are unable to reach an accommodation with respect to a given site, the result could be at least a 24-day delay in IAEA access. The agreement also requires inspectors to inform Iran in writing as to the basis for its concerns about an undeclared site, thus further delaying access. Most importantly, these inspections do not allow access to Iranian military facilities, the most likely location of their nuclear weapons development efforts. In the JCPOA process, there is substantial risk of U.S. intelligence being compromised, since the IAEA often relies on our sensitive data with respect to suspicious and/or prohibited activity.

While failing to assure prevention of Iran's nuclear weapons development capabilities, the agreement provides by some estimates \$150 billion dollars or more to Iran in the form of sanctions relief. As military officers, we find it unconscionable that such a windfall could be given to a regime that even the Obama administration has acknowledged will use a portion of such funds to continue to support terrorism in Israel, throughout the Middle East and globally, whether directly or through proxies. These actions will be made all the more deadly since the JCPOA will lift international embargoes on Iran's access to advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology.

In summary, this agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous, render

the Mideast still more unstable and introduce new threats to American interests as well as our allies. In our professional opinion, far from being an alternative to war, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action makes it likely that the war the Iranian regime has waged against us since 1979 will continue, with far higher risks to our national security interests. Accordingly, we urge the Congress to reject this defective accord.

Sincerely,

Admiral David Architzel, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Stanley R. Arthur, US Navy, Retired; General William Begert, US Air Force, Retired; General J.B. Davis, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Leon A. "Bud" Edney, US Navy, Retired; General Alfred G. Hansen, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Thomas Hayward, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James Hogg, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Jerome Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Timothy J. Keating, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Robert J. Kelly, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Thomas Joseph Lopez, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James A. "Ace" Lyons, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Richard Macke, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Henry Mauz, US Navy, Retired; General Lance Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Leighton Smith, US Navy, Retired; Admiral William D. Smith, US Navy, Retired; General Louis C. Wagner, Jr., US Army, Retired; Admiral Steve White, US Navy, Retired; General Ronald W. Yates, US Air Force, Retired.

Lieutenant General Teddy G. Allen, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson, III, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Marcus A. Anderson, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Spence M. Armstrong, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Harold W. Blot, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Bowman, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General William G. "Jerry" Boykin, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward S. Briggs, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Richard E. "Tex" Brown III, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General William J. Campbell, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward Clepton, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Daniel L. Cooper, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Brett Dula, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Gordon E. Fornell, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas B. Goslin, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Earl Hailston, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Bernard M. Kauderer, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Timothy A. Kinnan, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral J.B. LaPlante, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Tony Less, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Bennett L. Lewis, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Malone, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral John Mazach, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Fred McCorkle, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert Monroe, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jimmy Pappas, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral J. Theodore Parker, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Garry L. Parks, US Marine Corps, Retired; Lieutenant General Everett Pratt, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral John Poindexter, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Clifford "Ted" Rees, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral William Rowden, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert F. Schoultz, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General E.G. "Buck" Shuler, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Hubert "Hugh" G. Smith, US Army, Retired.

Vice Admiral Edward M. Straw, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General David J. Teal, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral D.C. "Deese" Thompson, US Coast Guard, Retired; Lieutenant General William E. Thurman, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Billy Tomas, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral John Totushek, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Tuttle, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Unruh, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Timothy W. Wright, US Navy, Retired.

Rear Admiral William V. Alford, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Major General Thurman E. Anderson, US Army, Retired; Major General Joseph T. Anderson, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip Anselmo, US Navy, Retired; Major General Joe Arbuckle, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James W. Austin, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral John R. Batzler, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral John Bayless, US Navy, Retired; Major General John Bianchi, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Vaux Boecker, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Jerry C. Breast, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bruce B. Bremner, US Navy, Retired; Major General Edward M. Browne, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas F. Brown III, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Lyle Bull, US Navy, Retired; Major General Bobby G. Butcher, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jay A. Campbell, US Navy, Retired; Major General Henry D. Canterbury, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Carroll D. Childers, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Ronald L. Christenson, US Navy, Retired; Major General John R.D. Cleland, US Army, Retired; Major General Richard L. Comer, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Jack Dantone, US Navy, Retired; Major General William B. Davitte, US Air Force, Retired; Major General James D. Delk, US Army, Retired; Major General Felix Dupre, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip A. Dur, US Navy, Retired; Major General Neil L. Eddins, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Paul Engel, US Navy, Retired; Major General Vince Falter, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James H. Flatley, US Navy, Retired.

Major General Bobby O. Floyd, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Paul Fratarangelo, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Veronica "Ronne" Froman, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral R. Byron Fuller, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frank Gallo, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Albert A. Gallotta, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral James Mac Gleim, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert H. Gormley, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral William Gureck, US Navy, Retired; Major General Gary L. Harrell, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Hickman, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey Higginbotham, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General Kent H. Hillhouse, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Tim Hinkle, US Navy, Retired; Major General Victor Joseph Hugo, US Army, Retired; Major General James P. Hunt, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Grady L. Jackson, US Navy, Retired; Major General William K. James, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral John M. "Carlos" Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Pierce J. Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Steven B. Kantrowitz, US Navy, Retired; Major General Maurice W. Kendall, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Charles R. Kubic, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frederick L. Lewis, US Navy, Retired; Major General John D. Logeman, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Homer S. Long, Jr., US Army, Retired; Major General Robert M. Marquette,

US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert B. McClinton, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral W. J. McDaniel, MD, US Navy, Retired; Major General Keith W. Meurlin, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Terrence McKnight, US Navy, Retired; Major General John F. Miller, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Burton R. Moore, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral David R. Morris, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Ed Nelson, Jr., US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General George W. "Nordie" Norwood, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Everett G. Odgers, US Air Force, Retired.

Rear Admiral Phillip R. Olson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert S. Owens, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert O. Passmore, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard E. Perraut, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral W.W. Pickavance, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral L.F. Picotte, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas J. Porter, US Navy, Retired; Major General H. Douglas Robertson, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral W.J. Ryan, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Norman Saunders, US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General John P. Schoeppner, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Edison E. Scholes, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Hugh P. Scott, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard Secord, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James M. Seely, US Navy, Retired; Major General Sidney Shachnow, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral William H. Shawcross, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bob Shumaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Willie Studer, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Larry Taylor, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jeremy Taylor, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard L. Testa, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert P. Tiernan, US Navy, Retired; Major General Paul E. Vallely, US Army, Retired; Major General Kenneth W. Weir, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General John Welde, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James B. Whittaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey P. Wiedeman, Jr., MD, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral H. Denny Wisely, US Navy, Retired.

Brigadier General John R. Allen, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General John C. Arick, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Loring R. Astorino, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert E. Besal, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General William Bloomer, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General George P. Cole, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Richard A. Coleman, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General James L. Crouch, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Marianne B. Drew, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Philip M. Drew, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Larry K. Grundhauser, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas W. Honeywill, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Gary M. Jones, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Stephen Lanning, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas J. Lennon, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Bobby C. Lee, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Robert F. Peksens, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Joe Shaefer, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Graham E. Shirley, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Stanley O. Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Hugh B. Tant III, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Michael Joseph Tashjian, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General William Tiernan, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Roger W. Searce, US

Army, Retired; Brigadier General Robert V. Woods, US Air Force, Retired.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Over these summer months my colleagues and I have engaged in—what I believe has been—enormous thought, analysis, consultation, and heartfelt introspection in taking a position on a matter that may determine the safety of the Middle East, and the United States' continued leadership in the world. For several years our nation has spearheaded sanctions, which have brought Iran to the negotiating table, and our President has presented to our nation a path to peace. For the last 30 years, American-Iranian relations have been trapped in not only suspicion and mistrust, but intractability; denying us the ability to develop even an agreement as to how we will manage our and our allies' relationship and interests in Iran. As a nation of democracy, dignity and freedom, fought for and defended by ourselves and our allies, I believe that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is the best means to protect and advance the best interests of our nation and those of our allies. I choose to support measures designed to build bridges to a future that may one day lead to peace.

I fundamentally support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and commend Secretary John Kerry and Secretary Ernest Moniz for their leadership in these negotiations. We are not the only party to this Agreement and we are well aware that all other nations in the negotiation are ready and willing to sign the JCPOA. They are also ready to resume commercial relations with Iran, which will effectively remove economic sanctions, the stick which initially brought them to the table. Our leadership role demands that we follow through with the terms of this Agreement and continue to be at the helm of monitoring Iran. We must never walk away from our commitment to peace in the region and our alliance with Israel. If we walk away now, however, we have no voice. We isolate not only our leaders, but also our nation.

No one believes this is a perfect outcome or that we have entered with complete faith in the other side. As a lawyer, I understand that no party is ever completely satisfied with agreements such as this. I am particularly concerned that the Agreement will require lifting the sanctions against Iran, which has been our main enforcement measure. Iran stands to recover approximately \$100 billion once released from previously imposed sanctions. If we reject this deal, we waive any leverage to ensure the money is not used to advance a regime that would threaten our national and international security. I will work with my colleagues in Congress and the Administration as we ensure Iran abides by the terms of the Agreement and uses the money to promote economic stability globally and within the region.

I have met with my constituents including those from both the Muslim and Jewish communities and am thankful for their thoughts on this subject, and even more so for their commitment to uplift the people of the Virgin Islands, our country and the world.

Most important to this decision is my fear that military action would be the likely alternative to rejecting the Agreement, and my constituents—mostly underserved and unemployed minorities—will be the individuals to bear the brunt of the fight. As the Representative of a community that serves in our Nation's military in greater proportion than most communities on the mainland, and as a mother of three service-age sons, I cannot support this outcome.

On this anniversary of the attack of September 11, 2001, and our nation's subsequent decision to enter war, we see that we must exhaust every option before entering war and suffering the casualties of such conflicts, which rob us of the most precious resource of our nation; our people. The alternative to not supporting the Agreement is not a viable option for our nation. We as leaders must work diligently for peace in the Middle East, and to ensure we protect the interests of Israel, our most trusted ally in the region.

I believe that President Obama has secured enough votes in the Senate to advance the Agreement, and hope we in Washington will now focus on efforts towards addressing and improving our long-term infrastructure needs, maintaining our social safety net system, alleviating the continued inequities in this great country, and uplifting the lives of all Americans.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, as the Ranking Member on the Defense Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, I am acutely aware of the harmful influence the Islamic Republic of Iran and its proxies have on the security situation in the Greater Middle East. Simply put, Iran pursues policies that threaten U.S. strategic interests and goals throughout the Middle East, often by enflaming sectarian tensions that are exploited by violent extremist elements in the region.

However, despite my clear and deep mistrust of Iran, I firmly support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). This hard-fought multilateral agreement will severely limit Iran's nuclear ambitions, establish a verifiable and robust inspection regime, allow for the timely reinstatement of sanctions for violations of this agreement, and in no way limit U.S. military options. If fully implemented and rigorously enforced, the JCPOA will result in the removal of a source of risk and uncertainty within the region for the foreseeable future. I believe this will substantially increase the security for our nation and all of our regional allies.

Under the JCPOA, Iran's access to nuclear material will be significantly curtailed from what we know exists today. Specifically, Iran will not produce or acquire either highly enriched uranium or weapons-grade plutonium for at least 15 years, and they will reduce their stockpile of low enriched uranium by 98 percent, from 12,000 kilograms to 300 kilograms. Additionally, two-thirds of Iran's centrifuges will be removed from nuclear facilities, to be secured and constantly monitored by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Also important to note is the commitment Iran has made under the agreement to not pursue certain research and development programs directly linked to the development of a nuclear weapon. All told, these restrictions significantly

increase the amount of time Iran would need to produce enough fissile material for a weapon and to build a nuclear device.

The agreement provides for the establishment of a verifiable and robust inspection system, including constant monitoring of Iran's known nuclear facilities throughout the entire chain of development, from the uranium mines to its centrifuges. Access to the supply chain makes it improbable that Iran could establish a covert nuclear program without detection. Further, the JCPOA ensures continuous monitoring of Iran's declared nuclear facilities and IAEA inspectors can request access to any location they suspect is involved with nuclear activities, including military sites. In anticipation of difficulties with access, the JCPOA contains a dispute resolution mechanism should Iran deny the IAEA access to any site. While the time allowed for the dispute resolution process has been criticized as too lengthy, I am certain any suspicious site will receive the full attention of U.S. observation assets during that period. Additionally, nuclear inspection experts express the utmost confidence that IAEA environmental sampling would detect the presence of any nuclear material.

In order to receive new sanctions relief, Iran must satisfy IAEA demands about the possible military dimensions of its nuclear program, dismantle the vast majority of its uranium capability, and remove the core from the Arak reactor. To receive full relief from the remaining sanctions, Iran must continue meeting commitments for the years agreed to in the JCPOA. If the terms of the agreement are not met at any time, the JCPOA provides for the ability to re-impose both unilateral and multilateral nuclear-related sanctions. And notably, the agreement allows the U.S. and its European allies to re-impose United Nations sanctions over the objections of any member of the Security Council, including China or Russia.

Further, the JCPOA only applies to nuclear-related sanctions. The United States will maintain several strong sanctions authorities due to Iran's designation as a state sponsor of terrorism and for its abysmal record on human rights. For example, U.S. sanctions will continue to apply to several top-level officials in Iran's security apparatus, to the transfer of weapons of mass destruction technologies, missile technologies, and conventional weapons.

Finally, the agreement in no way constrains the U.S. military options at our disposal, as has been repeatedly pointed out by General Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in testimony before Congress.

I cannot argue that the JCPOA is perfect, and I share the frustration expressed by its opponents with its limited scope. In particular, I would have preferred if the agreement kept the constraints on Iran's nuclear program for longer periods of time, further reduced the number of operational centrifuges, did not allow for the future elimination of sanctions on conventional arms and ballistic missiles, contained restrictions on Iran's use of the sanctions relief, and addressed the detention of American citizens in Iran. However, in any negotiation, especially one with many sovereign nations, each having their own economic and security considerations, some compromise is necessary. Critically, I believe the agreement

reached accomplishes the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I fundamentally disagree with those supporters of the deal who have stated that "war" will be the immediate result if the agreement is rejected, and find that opponents of the deal have only presented alternatives that are best described as delusional. Rather, I concur with the sentiments of my esteemed friend, and former Senator, Richard Lugar, who recently wrote that Congressional rejection of the Iran deal would, "kill the last chance for Washington to reach a verifiable Iranian commitment not to build a nuclear weapon," and, "destroy the effective coalition that brought Iran to the negotiating table." We cannot reasonably expect foreign nations, even our closest allies, to continue making costly sacrifices at our demand if the U.S. unilaterally withdraws from its commitment to the JCPOA. And I can say with some confidence that China and Russia will have no hesitation to resume trade with Iran if the agreement were rejected. Iran negotiated because of crippling sanctions and a unified international community, neither of which will exist should Congress reject this agreement.

The ultimate success or failure of the JCPOA will be determined by time and verification based on Iranian behavior. However, it is vital for the duration of the agreement that the U.S. leads the international community to maintain focus on Iran's compliance and ensure that Iran does not undermine regional stability through other pathways, negating the security gains from this agreement. To accomplish this, we must remain steadfast in our commitments to all of our regional partners, including Israel, and help improve their capacity to counter Iran and mitigate the effects of their malign activity. Additionally, we must keep combining diplomacy, economic pressure, and the resolve to keep military options on the table.

Assuming the agreement is affirmed, I ask all to constructively work to improve the security situation in the Middle East rather than using all their energy to undermine the agreement. We cannot rely on force of arms alone to bring lasting stability to any region of our world. And I hope that the exhaustive multilateral negotiations that led to the JCPOA will serve as a template for future U.S. and international engagement on other outstanding issues that have led to instability and violence in the region.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) negotiated by the Administration and under consideration by Congress. I believe that this agreement is the best way forward to prevent the Islamic Republic of Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and provides the United States and our allies with mechanisms to monitor and verify Iran's nuclear program. The agreement has the support of the international community and it gives us the best opportunity to avoid direct military conflict with Iran. Many men and women from Guam have paid the ultimate sacrifice in support of our country across the world, but most especially in Iraq and Afghanistan. Every lost or wounded servicemember is a constant reminder of the ultimate price we

pay when diplomacy fails or, worse, isn't attempted. As Guam's representative to Congress, I have a responsibility to my constituents to use my best judgment and to do what is necessary to avoid putting their lives at risk when there are other options to solve serious geopolitical challenges.

As Congress debates the JCPOA, it is important to recognize that the effort to halt Iran's effort to obtain nuclear weapons was not a unilateral effort by the United States but rather a multilateral effort with other countries holding a vested interest in a nuclear-free Iran. To believe that these countries will agree to renegotiate the agreement ignores the political realities of the P5+1 countries. If Congress votes to reject this agreement, it would impede our ability to promote nuclear nonproliferation in the Middle East, and there are no guarantees that other nations, such as China and Russia, would continue to impose economic sanctions on Iran. This past weekend, regarding the other nations, former Secretary of State Colin Powell stated, "... they're all going to be moving forward. We're going to be standing in the sidelines." The United States does not belong on the sidelines. We must recognize the political realities of this deal regardless of whether it is perfect or not. It is folly to believe that a better deal is out there if we reject the JCPOA.

As the representative of the people of Guam, I understand the dangers when hostile nations are able to obtain nuclear weapons; my constituents live under threat that North Korea could develop nuclear weapons that directly threatens our island. While there are flaws in the agreement that was reached in 1994 with North Korea, I believe it is important that we give this deal a chance to be implemented. Though we always reserve the right to defend our nation, our allies, and our interests, our values dictate that the United States does not have to lead with the sword. Diplomacy is always preferable to a military solution. However, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter noted that military options remain viable should Iran violate the agreement. He wrote, "... nothing in the Iran deal constrains the U.S. Defense Department in any way or its ability to carry out such a mission."

I have reviewed the agreement and have been briefed by Secretary of State John Kerry and Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, who led the U.S. negotiating team. I find their explanations of the agreement's details and arguments in favor of its adoption to be compelling. While I cannot vote on the floor of the House of Representatives, it is my responsibility to make my position on an issue of such importance known to my constituents and to our nation. I support the JCPOA and urge my colleagues to reject efforts to play politics with our national security.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the resolution and on the preamble.

The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 186, not voting 2, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

YEAS—245

Abraham	Griffith	Paulsen
Aderholt	Grothman	Pearce
Allen	Guinta	Perry
Amash	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodei	Hanna	Pitts
Babin	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Barietta	Harper	Poliquin
Barr	Harris	Pompeo
Barton	Hartzler	Posey
Benish	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Black	Hill	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribble
Blum	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bost	Huelskamp	Rigell
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Rokita
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Byrne	Jolly	Rothfus
Calvert	Jones	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Royce
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Russell
Chabot	Katko	Ryan (WI)
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Salmon
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Coffman	King (IA)	Scalise
Cole	King (NY)	Schweikert
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Scott, Austin
Collins (NY)	Kline	Sensenbrenner
Comstock	Knight	Sessions
Conaway	Labrador	Shimkus
Cook	LaMalfa	Shuster
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Simpson
Cramer	Lance	Smith (MO)
Crawford	Latta	Smith (NE)
Crenshaw	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Culberson	Long	Smith (TX)
Curbelo (FL)	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Davis, Rodney	Love	Stewart
Denham	Lucas	Stivers
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DeSantis	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Thornberry
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Tiberi
Dold	Marino	Tipton
Donovan	Massie	Trott
Duffy	McCarthy	Turner
Duncan (SC)	McCauley	Upton
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Valadao
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Wagner
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walberg
Farenthold	McMorris	Walden
Fincher	Rodgers	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Walorski
Fleischmann	Meadows	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meehan	Weber (TX)
Flores	Messer	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Mica	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Westerman
Fox	Miller (MI)	Westmoreland
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Whitfield
Frelinghuysen	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Garrett	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mulvaney	Wittman
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Womack
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Woodall
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Yoder
Gosar	Noem	Yoho
Gowdy	Nugent	Young (AK)
Granger	Nunes	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)	Olson	Young (IN)
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	Zeldin
Graves (MO)	Palmer	Zinke

NAYS—186

Adams	Bass	Bera
Aguilar	Beatty	Beyer
Ashford	Becerra	Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer	Grayson	Norcross
Bonamici	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Green, Gene	Pallone
F.	Grijalva	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Gutierrez	Payne
Brown (FL)	Hahn	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bustos	Heck (WA)	Peters
Butterfield	Higgins	Peterson
Capps	Himes	Pingree
Capuano	Hinojosa	Pocan
Cardenas	Honda	Polis
Carney	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Quigley
Cartwright	Israel	Rangel
Castor (FL)	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Richmond
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Ciulline	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Rush
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Cleaver	Kennedy	Sanchez, Linda
Clyburn	Kildee	T.
Cohen	Kilmer	Sanchez, Loretta
Connolly	Kind	Sarbanes
Conyers	Kirkpatrick	Schakowsky
Cooper	Kuster	Schiff
Costa	Langevin	Schrader
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cuellar	Lawrence	Serrano
Cummings	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lewis	Sinema
DeFazio	Lieu, Ted	Sires
DeGette	Lipinski	Slaughter
Delaney	Loebach	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Speier
DelBene	Lowenthal	Swalwell (CA)
DeSaulnier	Lowe	Takai
Deutch	Lujan Grisham	Takano
Dingell	(NM)	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Doyle, Michael	(NM)	Titus
F.	Lynch	Tonko
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Edwards	Matsui	Tsongas
Ellison	McCollum	Van Hollen
Engel	McDermott	Vargas
Eshoo	McGovern	Veasey
Esty	McNerney	Vela
Farr	Meeke	Velazquez
Fattah	Meng	Visclosky
Foster	Moore	Walz
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Wasserman
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Schultz
Gabbard	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Galego	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Garamendi	Neal	Welch
Graham	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—2

Maloney, Wilson (FL)
Carolyn

□ 1722

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 492, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3461

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION.

Congress does favor the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and the minority leader or their designees.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) will control 90 minutes. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in the Foreign Affairs Committee, we have held 30 hearings and briefings on Iran since these negotiations began. We have reviewed this agreement in depth; but, Mr. Speaker, I can come to no other conclusion than not only does it come up short, it is fatally flawed and, indeed, dangerous. I will oppose the measure before us. We should have gotten a better deal.

Indeed, when the House passed stiff Iran sanctions legislation—now, this was in 2013—in the prior Congress, we passed this legislation, authored by myself and Mr. ENGEL, by a vote, a bipartisan vote in this body, of 400–20.

The intention of that legislation was to put that additional leverage on Iran and force the Ayatollah to make a choice between real compromise—real compromise—on his nuclear program and economic collapse if he did not.

□ 1730

Unfortunately, the Secretary of State and the administration worked to ensure that the other body never took that measure up.

This legislation would have put more pressure, as I say, on Iran and might have led to an acceptable deal; but instead of an ironclad agreement that is verifiable and holds Iran to account, we are considering an agreement that leaves Iran, in a few short years, only

steps away from a nuclear weapons program, one that would be on an industrial scale.

Under the agreement, Iran is not required to dismantle key bomb-making technology. Instead, it is permitted a vast enrichment capacity, reversing decades of bipartisan nonproliferation policy that never imagined endorsing this type of nuclear infrastructure for any country, never mind a country that lives by the motto “death to America.”

While Members of Congress insisted on anywhere, anytime inspections, U.S. negotiators settled for something called managed access. So, instead of allowing international inspectors into those suspicious sites within 24 hours, it will take 24 days, and that is to commence the process.

Worse, there have been revelations in recent days about an agreement between Iran and the United Nations’ nuclear watchdog. This agreement sets the conditions in which a key Iranian military site that is suspected of nuclear bomb work—suspected in the sense that we have 1,000 pages of evidence of that bomb work—will be explored.

Mr. Speaker, as we have heard, those details have been kept from Congress. We don’t have those details in our hands; but it is reported that, instead of international inspectors doing the inspecting, the Iranians, themselves, will take the inspection lead. Iran has cheated on every agreement they have signed, so why do we trust them now to self-police?

The deal guts the sanctions web that is putting intense pressure on Iran. Billions will be made available to Iran to pursue its terrorism. Indeed, Iran’s elite Quds Force has transferred funds—and this should bother all of us—to Hamas. It has committed to rebuild the network of tunnels from Gaza to attack Israel.

Mr. ENGEL and I were in one of those tunnels last year. They have agreed in Iran to replenish the medium-range missile arsenal of Hamas, and they are working right now, they claim, to give precision-guided missiles to Hezbollah. I can tell you I was in Haifa in 2006 when it was under constant bombardment by those types of rockets, but they weren’t precision-guided. Every day, they slammed into the city, and there were 600 victims in the trauma hospital. Now Iran has transferred eightfold the number of missiles, and they want to give them the guidance systems. They need money to pay for those guidance systems.

Iran won late concessions to remove international restrictions on its ballistic missile program and on its conventional arms, and that imperils the security of the region and, frankly, the security of our homeland.

For some, the risks in this agreement are worth it as they see an Iran that is

changing for the better. As one supporter of this agreement told our committee, President Obama is betting that, in 10 or 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran.

But that is a bet against everything we have seen out of the regime since the 1979 revolution. Already, Iranian leaders insist that international inspectors won’t see the inside of Iran’s military bases and that Iran can advance its missiles and weapons without breaking the agreement. It is guaranteed that Iran will game the agreement to its advantage.

So we must ask ourselves: Will international bureaucrats call out Iran, knowing that doing so will put this international agreement at risk? We are not calling them out now as they are transferring weapons.

Will this administration, which didn’t even insist that four American hostages come home as part of this agreement, be any tougher on Iran in implementing this deal?

Does this serve the long-term national security interests of the United States? Does it make the world and, frankly, the region more safe? more stable? more secure?

Is there any other reason Iran—an energy rich country—is advancing its nuclear technology other than to make a nuclear weapon?

And why do its leaders chant “death to America” and “death to Israel”?

The New York Times ran a story on Quds Day, which is the national parade. It was some weeks ago. There was President Rouhani—the so-called moderate—marching in that parade. Behind him, the crowd was chanting. It was chanting “death to America.” In front of them, they carried placards on either side of him that read, “Death to Israel.” Why does their leader march in the Quds parade, and why does that refrain constantly come from the clerics?

I hope that all Members will consider these questions as they consider this vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Over the past 2 years, I have supported our negotiating team in the P5+1. I have favored giving time and space to achieve a diplomatic breakthrough to foreclose Iran’s pathways to a nuclear weapon. I am grateful for the tireless efforts by President Obama, Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, Secretary Lew, and Undersecretary Sherman. I appreciate the work of our P5+1 partners in concluding an agreement with Iran.

But, unfortunately, I cannot support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and I plan to oppose this resolution.

Let me say at the outset, I was troubled that Iran was not asked to stop enriching, while we were talking, despite several U.N. Security Council resolutions calling for a pause; and after

using this review period to assess the details of the agreement, I am not convinced that this deal does enough to keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran's hands.

I have raised questions and concerns throughout the negotiating phase and review period. The answers I have received simply don't convince me that this deal will keep a nuclear weapon out of Iran's hands. It may, in fact, strengthen Iran's position as a destabilizing and destructive influence across the Middle East.

First of all, I don't believe that this deal gives international inspectors adequate access to undeclared sites—24 days is far, far too long a time. Iran can stall, and, in 24 days, they can cover up whatever they have. I am especially troubled by reports about how the Iranian military base at Parchin will be inspected. With these potential roadblocks, the IAEA inspectors may be unable to finish their investigation into the potential military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program. I don't think it is essential that Iran provide a full mea culpa of its past activities, but we should have a clear picture of how far Iran has gotten in developing a nuclear weapon.

I also view as a dangerous concession the sunset of the international sanctions on advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. I was told that these issues were not on the table during the talks; so it is unacceptable to me that, after 5 years, Iran can begin buying advanced conventional weapons and, after 8 years, ballistic missiles. Worse, if Iran were to violate the weakened provisions in this agreement, such an action wouldn't violate the JCPOA and wouldn't be subject to snapback sanctions.

In my view, Iran is a grave threat to international stability. It is the largest state sponsor of terrorism in the world. It continues to hold American citizens behind bars on bogus charges, and our prisoners still languish there. We have an agreement. Their release was not part of the agreement. Iran's actions have made a bad situation in a chaotic region worse.

Even under the weight of international sanctions these past few years—when Iran had no money, when its currency was worthless, when its economy was in the toilet—Iran found money to support international terror. Iran has been able to support terrorist groups, such as Hezbollah, Hamas, and other violent extremists. Awash in new cash provided by sanctions relief, Iran will be poised to inflict even greater damage in Syria, Yemen, Iraq, Lebanon, Israel, and our Gulf partners. Iran's leadership has every interest in shoring up support from hard-liners. After all, if a deal goes through, hard-liners will need to be placated.

I can tell you that, within the next few years—in the next Lebanon war

with Israel—Hezbollah will have missiles raining down on Israel, and some of those missiles will be paid for by the windfall that Iran is going to get as a result of sanctions being lifted. I think that is unacceptable.

We can have no illusions about what Iran will do with its newfound wealth. We can have no doubt about the malevolent intent of a country's leader who chants "death to America" and "death to Israel" just days after concluding a deal. The ink was not even dry on the deal, and 4 days later, the Supreme Leader led a chant of "death to America." After negotiating with us and agreeing to this agreement, he could not even wait more than 4 days—back to the same old "death to America."

Finally and very importantly, I have a fundamental concern that, 15 years from now, under this agreement, Iran will be free to produce weapons-grade, highly enriched uranium without any limitation. What does that mean? It means Iran will be a legitimized nuclear threshold state after the year 2030, with advanced centrifuges and the ability to stockpile enriched uranium. So, in reality, this agreement does not prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon; it only postpones it.

If Iran pursues that course, I fear it could spark a nuclear arms race across the region. After years of intransigence, I am simply not confident that Iran will be a more responsible partner.

Before I finish, I would also like to say a few words about the debate surrounding this issue so far.

We can disagree on the issues. We should debate the details of any important policy, such as this one, and we must rely on our democratic institutions to carry us forward as they have for so long; but we cannot question the motives of any Member of Congress no matter where he or she stands on this issue.

So, instead of using this time to grind a political ax, let's, instead, look down the road. After all, we know that this deal is going forward, and when that happens, we need to ask how we can make this agreement stronger.

How do we ensure the security of Israel and our other friends and allies in the region? How do we keep resources out of the hands of terrorists as sanctions are lifted? What support does Congress need to provide so that the United States and our partners can hold Iran to its word and ultimately keep it from getting a bomb?

The time to start answering these questions is now.

That is why, in the days and weeks ahead, I will reach out to colleagues—Republicans and Democrats alike—to chart a path forward. I will be working with Chairman ROYCE and others on both sides of the aisle. I will develop new legislation to counter Iran as it dumps its soon-to-be-acquired billions of dollars into terrorist groups and

weapons programs. I will work with other lawmakers toward new initiatives that support Israel and our Middle East allies so that they can stand up to an unleashed Iran; and I will work here in Congress and with the administration to make sure the deal is fully implemented to the letter.

We need to focus on strengthening our deterrence in the region; and, most importantly, we have to work hard to continue to enhance the U.S.-Israel relationship. We must reinvigorate the bipartisan consensus which has been the foundation of America's relationship with Israel; and we must ensure that Israel is able to maintain its qualitative military edge and its ability to defend itself.

The world is watching us this week. The United States is being looked to, not for rhetoric and outrage, but for leadership and resolve. So let's present our arguments and cast our votes. Then let's work together to move forward in a productive way. I appreciate how we have worked together on the Foreign Affairs Committee with Chairman ROYCE.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1745

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the bipartisan relationship that all of the Members on the Foreign Affairs Committee have, but especially today, the words of Mr. ENGEL that every Member of this House should be mindful that impugning motives, questioning the motives of those who disagree with us, is not conducive to an honest and fair debate over these issues. I thank him for making that point on the floor today.

At this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the majority whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, when the President started these negotiations with Iran, I think, when you look at the fatal flaw in the beginning of those negotiations, they should have started with one basic premise. That premise, Mr. Speaker, ought to have been to finally force Iran to dismantle their nuclear weapons program.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that was not the objective of these negotiations. In fact, if you look, it seemed there was more interest on making sure that a deal could be reached that China and Russia and Iran could finally agree to.

And the problem is, when you look at the fatal flaw of that negotiation, what has it yielded? And why is there such strong opposition across the country from members of both parties to this agreement?

I think most Americans recognize that Iran cannot be trusted with a nuclear weapon. Just look at their own rhetoric. Just this week the Ayatollah himself led the chant "death to America."

These are the people that the President is negotiating with to ultimately end up at the end of this deal with the ability to develop not just a nuclear bomb, but a nuclear arsenal, Mr. Speaker.

Just look at the tenets of the deal itself. One of the conditions in the deal actually allows Iran to have more than 5,000 centrifuges. If they comply with the deal, they can keep more than 5,000 centrifuges to enrich uranium.

It took Pakistan about 3,000 centrifuges to develop their bomb, and Iran will have over 5,000 centrifuges if they comply with the deal, let alone if they cheat. And we know the history there.

Let's look at other components of the deal, Mr. Speaker. In this deal, if there is a site that is undeclared and our intelligence along the way over these next few years exposes the fact that there is something there that we want to go look at, that we question whether or not they are cheating, Mr. Speaker, we have to get permission under this deal and wait over 24 days.

Imagine all of the things that can be hidden in 24 days if we have the intelligence that they are cheating. How could this be part of a deal that we would agree to that is in the American best interest?

Ultimately, what we have to come to an agreement on is what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, we also ought to be concerned about our allies, Israel, and the other Arab states in the region that have deep, grave concerns about this, others that are indicating that this will start a nuclear arms race in the Middle East.

Within 10 years, you could have nearly a half a dozen states in the Middle East with nuclear arms. This isn't the way we ought to go.

Then, of course, there are the secret side deals. We have seen evidence now that there are secret side deals that the President won't disclose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, under the law that President Obama himself signed, the law actually says the President has to disclose to Congress and the American people all information related to this deal, including "side agreements."

And now we are hearing at least two secret side agreements exist, one that allows Iran to actually do their own inspections.

Mr. Speaker, these are the people that this deal is going to allow to inspect their own nuclear facilities. The President ought to release to the American people the details of these secret side agreements right now or withdraw this entire proposal.

President Reagan said, "Trust, but verify." Under this agreement, President Obama is saying trust Iran to verify. You cannot allow this to go through.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject this deal. The President lays out a false premise that it is this deal or war.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, there is a much different approach, a much better approach, and that is to go get a better deal that protects the interest of the United States of America for today and for decades to come.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), a very valued member of our committee and one of the subcommittee ranking members.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, when I came to this House in 1997, a few months after I started serving on the Foreign Affairs Committee, I said back then that the Iran nuclear program was the greatest single threat to the security of Americans. It was true then. It is true now.

On July 14, a few hours after the deal was published, I came to this floor and said that what this House ought to do is consider a Resolution of Approval of the nuclear deal and to vote it down by a large vote. That is exactly what we will do tomorrow morning.

Let me go through a number of points that proponents and opponents of this deal can both agree on. The first is this resolution is quite a bit different than the one we have been thinking about for the last month.

This is a Resolution of Approval. And even if we vote it down, the President can and will carry out this agreement.

That is very different from the Resolution of Disapproval that we have all talked about and made commitments about.

We don't have any commitments on this resolution. It is a totally new resolution. This resolution will express the feelings of Congress, but will not prevent the President from carrying out the deal.

Second, we can agree this deal is better during the next year and a half than it is the next decade. The controls on Iran's nuclear program are much stronger for the first 10 years than they are thereafter.

Whether you like the deal or hate the deal, you have got to agree that it is better up front than it is in the out-years.

The third thing we can agree on is that the President only promised Iran that he would sign the deal and that he would carry out the deal and that he would use his veto, as he has threatened to do and has successfully done, in effect—that he would carry out the deal using his powers to do so. That is already settled.

Mr. Speaker, the President never told Iran that Congress would approve this deal. Why should we give Iran more

than they bargained for? They bargained for the President's signature together with his freedom to carry out the deal. That is already settled. Why should we give Iran something extra in return for nothing?

We should not vote to approve this deal.

The next thing we can all agree on is that this deal is not a binding agreement as a matter of U.S. Constitutional law or international law.

The Constitution defines a treaty. This is not a treaty and certainly wouldn't get a two-thirds vote confirmation in the Senate.

If you look at the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, this is not a ratified treaty, it is not an unratified treaty, it is not a legislative executive agreement. It is simply an agreement between the executives of the respective governments.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing we can agree on is that we don't know what the best policy for America is in the next decade. Let's keep our options open. Iran is not legally bound by this agreement. Even if they were, they would conveniently ignore that any day of the week.

We cannot feel that we are legally bound. Now, as a legal matter, we are not. But appearances matter. And if this agreement that has been signed by the President gets a positive vote of approval in this House, there will be those around the world who believe that it is binding on the United States, even while, as a legal matter, it is not binding on Iran and, oh, by the way, their legislature hasn't voted to approve it.

So we need freedom of action. What form will that action take? Will we demand that Iran continue to limit its nuclear program beyond year 10, beyond year 15?

After all, we are continuing the sanctions relief all through the next decade. I don't know if that will be the right policy or not.

Mr. Speaker, the current President's hands are untied. He gets to carry out his policy for the remainder of the term. Vote no on this resolution. Because if we vote yes, we are tying the hands of future Presidents in a decade to come.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), chairman emeritus of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who currently chairs our Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to highlight the hard work of our esteemed chairman, Mr. ROYCE of California, and our ranking member, Mr. ENGEL, who have done an incredible job throughout—I don't know how many hearings we have had in our Foreign Affairs Committee—highlighting the many flaws of this deal and giving the other side the opportunity to present what is good about this deal.

Mr. Speaker, after all of those hearings in our Foreign Affairs Committee led by Mr. ROYCE and Mr. ENGEL, it is simple to realize what is before us today. This deal paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran in as little as 15 years.

This deal lifts the arms embargo. This deal lifts the sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program. This deal releases billions of dollars that will allow the regime to increase funding to support terror, as it has been doing, to support its regional hegemonic ambitions.

If all of that were not bad enough, with this deal, the P5+1 countries will actually be obligated to help Iran modernize and advance its nuclear program. Yes. You heard that right. This is important because this modernization requirement gets lost with all of the other many flaws of this deal.

We actually have an agreement before us to help Iran strengthen its ability to protect against nuclear security threats, to protect it against sabotage, to protect all the physical sites.

Incredibly enough, we will be helping Iran with its nuclear program. So now, not only do we have to allow Iran to enrich, not only do we have to allow Iran to become a nuclear threshold state, but, yes, we must actually protect Iran's nuclear program from sabotage and outside threats.

Mr. Speaker, how does a rogue regime that has been in violation of its nonproliferation treaty obligations for decades, a rogue regime that has been in violation of—one, two, three, four, five—six United Nations Security Council resolutions and a regime that violates other international obligations get to be the beneficiary of such protections from the U.S. and other P5+1 countries?

This is madness, Mr. Speaker. It simply defies logic. We must oppose this deal. Let's vote that way.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), a very important member of the committee, the ranking member of the Middle East and North Africa Subcommittee.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I thank the chairman for his leadership in the committee.

Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of points made during this debate. I would like to set some context for the rest of the evening.

Iran's regime is anti-American. They are anti-Israel. They are homophobic. They are misogynistic. They violate the human rights of their people.

Iran's support for terrorists has led directly to the deaths of American citizens. It actively works to destabilize the Middle East. It vows to destroy Israel.

It is responsible for the death of civilians and members of the military

from Beirut to Buenos Aires. It has assisted in Assad's slaughter of 300,000 of his own people.

As we gather here today, four Americans—Jason Rezaian, Amir Hekmati, Saeed Abedini, my constituent Bob Levinson—are in Iran, held by the regime and unable to return home to their families.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that I oppose this deal. On the nuclear issue, it does not dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It pauses it.

Now, inspections in Nantanz and Fordow are very positive, as is the monitoring of the fuel cycle and the reduction in enriched uranium. But we cannot access other suspected nuclear sites in less than 24 days.

If we find Iran in violation of this agreement, we cannot restore sanctions to the punishing level of today and, if we snap back sanctions, Mr. Speaker, Iran has the right to cease performing its obligations under the agreement altogether.

□ 1800

While there has been a lot of speculation about what could happen in the absence of a deal, we know that, under this deal, the regime will get billions of dollars to support terrorism; we know the arms embargo will be lifted, meaning that the most advanced weapons will be available to the regime; and we know that the ban on the development of ballistic missiles will be lifted.

Now, I have heard a lot of criticism of those of us who oppose the deal. I don't want war, Mr. Speaker. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from using billions of dollars to cause more violence and its surrogates to cause more bloodshed.

I don't want the start of an arms race. To the contrary, I want to prevent Iran from developing advanced centrifuges and an industrial nuclear program with an unlimited number of centrifuges so that other nations will not seek nuclear weapons.

Mr. Speaker, I don't oppose this deal because of politics or my religion or the people who live in my district. I have simply concluded that the risks are too great.

Now, these past few weeks have been challenging for all of us. Reasonable people can disagree, and I am saddened by the often vitriolic comments hurled at those of us with different views on both sides. I also disagree with the decision by the Republican leadership to make up new rules, ignoring our ability to have an impact right now through the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that passed 400-25.

The consequences of this deal, Mr. Speaker, present us with some harsh realities, but rather than denying them, it is now time for Congress to begin the work of defying them, and it will require bipartisan support to do it.

That means ramping up intelligence sharing and counterterrorism coopera-

tion with Israel and our Gulf partners and making clear to our allies that Iran's violent activities in the region will not be tolerated. It means enhancing Israel's qualitative military edge and making Iran know that the penalties should it cheat and break out to a bomb will be punishing.

It means intensifying sanctions already enshrined in U.S. law for Iranian support for terrorism and violation of human rights. President Obama rightly made this point last week: nothing in this deal prevents the United States from sanctioning people, banks, and businesses that support terrorism, and we must do so together.

What happens next? I will vote against the deal. Mr. Speaker, there will be a day after the final resolution of this nuclear deal, and on that day, this House must work together to ensure that Iran's terrorism is checked and that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. On that, we all agree.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. McCAUL), chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security and a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, for the last decade, Congress has passed bipartisan sanctions to get to the point where we are today, and the purpose of these sanctions was to dismantle Iran's nuclear weapons program.

This agreement does not achieve that goal. In fact, this agreement puts Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terror, on a glidepath to a nuclear bomb. Proponents say it is the only alternative to war, but I believe that is a false choice.

I recently met with Prime Minister Netanyahu, and he agreed that our goal should be a good deal, but that we cannot put our security at risk for a bad deal. Make no mistake, this is a bad deal for America and for our allies.

It will not stop Iran's nuclear program. It will leave Iran with the ingredients for a bomb and infrastructure to build it, and it will spark a nuclear arms race in the Middle East. It will give Iran a cash windfall, freeing up over \$100 billion to fuel the regime's global campaign of Islamist terror.

Incredibly, this agreement lifts restrictions on Iran's ballistic missiles, which the Ayatollah himself said that they will mass-produce. There is only one reason to develop an ICBM, Mr. Speaker, and that is to deliver a nuclear warhead across continents, which means the United States.

A top Iranian general bragged recently that his country will have "a new ballistic missile test in the near future that will be a thorn in the eyes of our enemies."

President Reagan's famous negotiating advice was to "trust, but verify." We can't trust a regime that has cheated on every deal. President Rouhani

says his country's centrifuges will never stop spinning and that they will "buy, sell, and develop any weapons we need and will not ask for permission or abide by any resolution."

Now, the White House is counting on verification measures spelled out in secret side deals between Iran and the IAEA, which Secretary Kerry testified to me that even he has not seen. Astonishingly, the AP reports that the side deal allows Iran to self-inspect its nuclear sites.

Now, the American people, through their representatives in Congress, are expected to vote on this measure without seeing these secret deals, which goes to the heart of verification. This, in my judgment, is nothing short of reckless.

Let's be clear-eyed about what we are debating. This was not a negotiation with an honest government; it was a negotiation with terrorists who chant "death to America" and are responsible for more than a thousand American casualties in Iraq alone. If we allow this deal to go forward, we are putting the security of the world at grave risk.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our Nation's security and in defense of the free world, I cannot in good conscience support this agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida, DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to approve this agreement. After a thorough review process, I believe it is in the best national security interests of the United States and our allies for Congress to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

I have been a public official for nearly 23 years. This is the most consequential vote I have taken and the most difficult decision I have ever faced. I have spent the review period methodically going through the agreement, raising concerns with the administration, and speaking with independent sources, including nuclear nonproliferation experts, economists, and foreign ambassadors.

I also held a series of meetings and spoke with many constituents who fervently hold very strong and differing positions. My goal was to determine whether the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the most likely path to prevent Iran from achieving their nuclear weapons goals.

This agreement is clearly not perfect. It is one tool that we have to combat Iran's nuclear ambitions. Ultimately, my support is based on substance. Importantly, my Jewish identity and Jewish heart weighed heavily in my decisionmaking process.

As we listen to Iran's leaders call for the destruction of the Jewish people in Israel, history offers a brutal reminder of what happens when we do not listen.

Iran continues to be a leading state sponsor of terrorism, but an Iran with a nuclear weapon or Hezbollah or Hamas with a nuclear shield is far more dangerous. With the JCPOA in place, we will have Iran's nuclear program under the most intrusive monitoring and inspection mechanisms in place, while we continue to combat Iran's terrorist reach.

I have personally spoken with the President and my colleagues about steps that we must and will take to continue strengthening Israel's and our other allies' intelligence and military capabilities. Opponents say we must press for a better deal, but after thoroughly investigating this prospect, I am left with no evidence that one is likely or even possible.

I heard directly from our allies, top diplomats, and analysts from across the political spectrum that the sanctions regime that we have in place now will erode, if not completely fall apart. Moreover, our partners will not come back to the negotiating table, and neither will Iran, and no one opposed to this deal has produced any evidence to the contrary.

I cannot comprehend why we would walk away from the safeguards in this agreement, leaving Iran speeding toward a nuclear weapon. Safeguards like 24/7/365 access, monitoring all of Iran's previously declared nuclear sites, eliminating 98 percent of Iran's highly enriched uranium stockpile, and the unprecedented standard of monitoring every stage of the nuclear supply chain.

Even if Iran cheats, we will know much more about their nuclear program, allowing us to more effectively eliminate it if that ever becomes necessary.

As a Jewish mother and as a Member of Congress, nothing is more important to me than ensuring the safety and security of the United States and Israel. I am confident that supporting this agreement is the best opportunity that we have to do that.

Mr. Speaker, we have an expression in Judaism, may the United States go from strength to strength, and as we say in synagogue, the people of Israel live—am Yisrael chai.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), chairman of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. HENSARLING. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran. Now, the President says it is a good deal; and you know what, he is right. It is a very good deal for Iran; but it is a very bad deal for America.

I fear, in his rush to try to build a legacy, the President has clearly given up far too much for far too little. He has done this at the expense of our security, as well as the security of our friend Israel and other U.S. allies.

Mr. Speaker, this is a deadly serious matter. The first thing the President does in his agreement with Iran is to give them some startup capital. An estimated \$120 billion held abroad will now be repatriated back to Iran's central bank, \$120 billion to a regime whose Supreme Leader, to this day, calls for the annihilation of Israel, a regime that still chants "death to America," a regime that has put bounties on the heads of American soldiers and has the blood of American citizens on its hands, a regime whose sponsorship of Hezbollah has left our closest ally in the region, Israel, with 80,000 rockets trained on it.

In sum, it is a regime that simply represents the world's largest and most dangerous state sponsor of terrorism.

Now, President Obama would have us believe that waiving sanctions against this regime would make the world safer, but this is the very same President that dismissed the Islamic State as the JV team, and we see what that has gotten us.

This is simply not an administration whose assessment of national security threats is credible, and the stakes involved with a nuclear Iran leave zero room for error.

In truth, Mr. Speaker, I fear it is we who sent the JV team to negotiate with Iran. Sadly, they were outplayed, outmaneuvered, and outwitted; and the result of their failure is the dangerous agreement we have before us today.

It is such a flawed agreement that the President, yet again, tells Congress we have to pass something to actually find out what is in it. In other words, the President has utterly failed to provide the secret side agreements.

President Obama once told us we cannot allow Iran to get a nuclear weapon, but under his deal, Iran's nuclear program will not be dismantled, only temporarily slowed, and that is if the Iranians don't cheat; but the President's team has failed to achieve anytime, anywhere inspections. Thus, it will be impossible to ensure the Iranians aren't cheating.

Ah, but don't worry, Mr. Speaker, we are told the Iranians will turn themselves in if they cheat—really? In short, the President's agreement rewards Iran's terrorist-sponsoring regime with billions of dollars in relief without any guarantee of compliance.

When you look at the record, Mr. Speaker, I don't trust this administration. I don't trust the Iranians. Why would we ever trust the two together? For the sake of our national security, I urge all of my colleagues to reject this flawed, dangerous agreement.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this historic nuclear agreement reached by the United States and our

negotiating partners with Iran. For the sake of our national security and that of our allies, we must seize this unique opportunity.

In the midst of all these wild charges, let's just try to get some perspective. In fact, this agreement goes far beyond any negotiated nuclear deal in history.

□ 1815

It will reduce Iran's stockpiled uranium by nearly 98 percent; it will permanently prevent the plutonium pathway to a nuclear weapon at Arak; it will disable and mothball two-thirds of Iran's enrichment centrifuges, including more advanced models; it will terminate all enrichment at Fordow; and it will provide for intrusive inspections of nuclear sites in perpetuity.

This is an unprecedented degrading—not just a freezing, a massive degrading—of Iran's nuclear program. No military strike or strikes could achieve as much.

I challenge any of the agreement's detractors to present a viable alternative that achieves the same result and will verifiably prevent a nuclear-armed Iran for the foreseeable future. They won't—and they haven't—because they can't. There simply isn't a viable diplomatic or military alternative for preventing an Iranian nuclear weapon.

The notion that we could somehow unilaterally reject the agreement and still compel the P5+1 to resume negotiations is pure fantasy. Our international partners have made clear that reinstating the effective sanctions regime that brought Iran to the negotiating table would be impossible. For Congress to scuttle the deal would destroy our credibility as a negotiating party and would very likely put Iran right back on the path to developing a weapon.

The stakes couldn't be higher. The nuclear issue should transcend political opportunism and partisan rancor. We should be working together across party lines to ensure the swift and effective implementation of the JCPOA. We should be exploring ways that we can enhance cooperative efforts with Israel and the international community to address Iran's support for Hezbollah and its gross abuse of human rights as well as other critical challenges in the Middle East.

Today, we can start down that path by supporting the agreement. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX).

Ms. FOX. I want to thank my colleague from the Foreign Affairs Committee for his leadership on this work.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong opposition to this legislation that would clear the way for the President's misguided deal with Iran.

The United States must continue to stand between Iran and nuclear weap-

ons capability, but instead, the deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear achievements and strengthens its extremist regime.

The agreement gradually removes the key barriers that prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons capabilities, from growing its economic influence in the Middle East, and from continuing its state funding of terrorist organizations that threaten the security of the country and the well-being of our allies.

This deal lifts critical economic sanctions that have limited Iran's scope of influence in the region, removes the arms embargo, and lifts missile program restrictions.

For these reasons, I oppose the President's deal and urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement should be judged on what is best for our national security and what is more likely to produce peace. I believe that peace has a better chance if we reject this deal, keep sanctions on, and go back to the negotiating table to get a better agreement.

This agreement was supposed to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, but, at best, Iran will be a nuclear threshold state in 15 years. By practically guaranteeing and legitimizing this access, there will be a rush by others in the region to gain their own nuclear weapons, creating an enormously dangerous arms race in the most volatile part of the world.

The inspections protocols in the agreement are troubling because they give Iran 24 days to delay inspection requests at suspected nuclear sites, a far cry from "anytime, anywhere." And the agreement contains deeply concerning sanctions relief on Iran's acquisition of conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology in 5 and 8 years, respectively.

These are just some of my concerns that lead me, after careful consideration, to oppose this agreement.

Mr. Speaker, we should and we can do better. I urge my colleagues to reject this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. TROTT).

Mr. TROTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL for all of their hard work.

The fact that we are even debating whether to enter into this agreement is very troubling.

Let's be clear what we are talking about. The United States of America is going to enter into a deal with a rogue nation who refuses to release the four Americans they are holding, who has

cheated on every deal they have been party to over the past 30 years, who is a party to secret deals we cannot see, who calls all of us the Great Satan, who calls for death to our citizens and wants to wipe Israel off the face of the Earth. And we are told the deal is necessary because the United States of America has no other option.

Has it really come to this? We have options. One option is a better deal, and a better deal looks like this: release the four Americans, no sunset clause, and inspections just like we were promised—anytime, anywhere. And if these terms are unacceptable to Iran, then the United States of America will use all of its economic might to put tough sanctions back in place.

If we do this deal, let's look at what the next 25 years looks like.

Immediately, in the next 12 months, Iran will get their hands on \$50 billion to \$150 billion. The money will not be used for their citizens. It will be used to perpetuate terror around the world. Iran will get its money; we won't get our four Americans.

Over the next 12 months, they will start to cheat and they will get a bomb or two. Over the next 12 months, we are going to start an arms race in the Middle East. Over the next 1 to 5 years, we will try and snap back sanctions, but that will be ineffective because all the long-term contracts will be grandfathered in.

In 5 years, Iran will be buying conventional weapons. In 8 years, they will have a ballistic missile. In 10 years, because of their cheating, they will have a ballistic missile with a nuclear bomb pointed at the United States of America. And in 25 years, our friend and ally Israel may not exist.

I was in business for 30 years before I got here, and the one thing I knew is you cannot do a good deal with a bad guy.

We cannot do this deal with Iran.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the resolution of approval of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Throughout this debate, there have been accusations questioning the motives and loyalties of Members in making this decision. It is precisely because I believe this agreement is in the interest of the United States and because I have been a strong supporter of Israel my entire life that I am supporting the Iran nuclear agreement.

This must not be a vote of politics but of conscience. I, for one, could not live with myself if I voted in a way that I believe would put the lives of Americans and Israelis at greater risk of an Iranian nuclear bomb.

My priority and overriding objective in assessing this agreement has been to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear

bomb. The interests of the United States and of Israel in this respect are identical. In addition to constituting an existential threat to Israel, a nuclear-armed Iran would make Iran's conventional threats more dangerous and difficult to counter and pose a greater danger to the United States, to the region, and to the world.

The question before us is not whether this is a good deal. The question is which of the two options available to us—supporting or rejecting the deal—is more likely to avert a nuclear-armed Iran. I have concluded, after examining all the arguments, that supporting the Iran nuclear agreement gives us the better chance of preventing Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The agreement will shut Iran's pathways to developing the necessary fissionable material for a nuclear bomb for at least 15 years. The inspection and verification procedures against illicit plutonium production or uranium enrichment are airtight.

The questions that have been raised about inspection procedures—the so-called side deals, the alleged self-inspection—do not relate to the central issue of production of fissionable material. And without fissionable material, you cannot make a bomb.

Even after 15 years, when some of the restrictions will be eased, we would still know instantly about any attempt to make bomb materials because the inspectors and the electronic and photographic surveillance will still be there. The options available to a future President for stopping Iran then would be better than the options available now if the deal is rejected because we would have more access, instant intelligence, and more knowledge of the Iranian program.

The argument that if we reject the deal, we can force Iran back to the negotiating table and obtain a better deal is a fantasy. It is not a viable alternative. The other countries that have joined us in multilateral sanctions against Iran have made it clear that they will drop their sanctions if we reject the deal; and American sanctions, by themselves, have been proven ineffective in coercing Iran.

We must be very clear that, if necessary, the United States will use military force to prevent an Iranian nuclear bomb; but the odds of that being necessary are significantly less with approval of this deal than with rejection of the agreement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. NADLER. Going forward, it remains vital that we continue to pursue ways to further guarantee the security of the United States, of Israel, and of our other allies in the Middle East. This will require strict and diligent oversight of the implementation of the

agreement, maintaining Israel's qualitative military edge, and countering Iran's support for terrorism and other destabilizing conduct.

We must be ready to take action against Iran's nefarious behavior, and Iran must know that the United States will never allow it to pose a nuclear threat to the region and the world.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DENT), chairman of the Committee on Ethics.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and the underlying Iran nuclear agreement.

Despite entering into these negotiations from a position of strength—that would be the United States—the deal before us fails to achieve the goal of preventing Iran's capacity to develop a nuclear weapon. It simply contains or manages Iran's nuclear program.

By agreeing to a lax enforcement and inspections regime and fanciful, unrealistic snapback sanctions, the administration has accepted that Iran should remain 1 year away from a nuclear bomb. I am not prepared to accept that. The sanctions relief will provide Iran with billions of dollars of funds that will bolster the Revolutionary Guard and nonstate militant groups. The deal ends the conventional arms embargo and the prohibition on ballistic missile technology. Not only will this result in conventional arms flowing to groups like Hezbollah, it concedes the delivery system for a nuclear bomb.

This agreement will provide Iran with nuclear infrastructure, a missile delivery system, and the funds to pay for it all. And, by the way, the I in ICBM means "intercontinental." I don't believe that New Zealand and Mexico are the intended targets. That would be us.

This deal cripples and shatters the current notion of nuclear nonproliferation. If Iran can enrich uranium, which they can under this agreement, their Gulf Arab neighbors will likely want to do the same.

I do not want a nuclear arms race, a nuclearized Middle East, a region of state instability in irrational nonstate actors. Someone explain to me how deterrence works under that scenario. We should not reward the ayatollahs with billions of dollars and sophisticated weapons in exchange for temporary and unenforceable nuclear restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a diplomatic resolution to the Iran nuclear issue, but this is a dangerously weak agreement. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

□ 1830

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VARGAS).

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action between the P5+1 and Iran. The deal fails to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. It fails to guarantee intrusive enough inspections to ensure that Iran does not cheat, it fails to keep Iran from achieving nuclear threshold status, and it rewards Iran's horrific behavior.

In the initial phase of this agreement, Iran would quickly receive a whopping sanctions relief package potentially totaling \$150 billion. We all know that Iran is the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism and that this money will embolden a regime openly committed to confronting the United States and destabilizing the Middle East.

In 8 years, Iran legally begins expanding its ballistic missile program and continues expanding its intercontinental ballistic missile program under the guise of satellite testing.

And who do we think these missiles are aimed at?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. VARGAS. As recently as yesterday, Ayatollah Khamenei declared: "I am saying to Israel that they would not live to see the end of these 25 years. There will be no such thing as a Zionist regime in 25 years."

This is a bad deal, and we should reject it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), chairman of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. CONAWAY. I thank Chairman ROYCE for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the approval process that is going on and the underlying deal with Iran. It is one of the most consequential foreign policy issues that we will confront, certainly since I have been here and, I expect, for the next several decades.

This is a terrible deal. I can't state it any more forcefully.

We have seen this movie before. In 1994, President Bill Clinton made a deal with North Korea. His deal with North Korea would rid the Korean Peninsula of nuclear weapons and would usher North Korea onto the stage as a responsible citizen of the world's nations. That didn't happen. This is the exact same verbiage we heard on this floor then that is being said tonight, and this is the exact same outcome we will get with Iran and their nuclear program.

Look at their current record. Chief sponsor of state terrorism around the world. As their economy improves with the dropping of the sanctions and the resources they will get, do you realistically think that this ayatollah will, in fact, become a moderate voice within his country?

Do you not think he will take those resources and expand the mischief and terror that he has conducted around the world already under the sanctions that were in place?

The other side has already given up on the snapback provisions. They have argued very eloquently that those won't happen because we can't reinforce the sanctions that were the heart of what got Iran at the table today.

Mr. Speaker, this deal ushers in a world that is less safe, less stable, and less secure.

Trust must be earned. I trust Iran's word when they say that Israel must go away. I trust Iran when they say "death to America." I do not trust Iran when they say they will abide by this agreement.

I wouldn't play golf with these people because golf is one of those events where you have to self-assess your penalties. They will not do that in playing golf, and they are not about to do it with respect to this nuclear program that is going on.

We have no way of knowing what their covert activities might be over the next several years. They will cheat. They have cheated, and they will continue to cheat. We cannot trust these people with a deal.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the motion of approval and reject this deal. Tell the world where we stand. Whether our partners around the world can see the clear-eyed threat that these folks represent to the world for the next several decades, we can see it, and we must vote "no."

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA).

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.J. Res. 64, which disapproves of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action negotiated by the P5+1.

I reviewed the agreement thoroughly, participated in classified briefings, and listened to the many details and intricacies present by the nuclear and security experts on all sides. This agreement may not be perfect, but it is the most viable option we have in reducing Iran's capability of acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA prolongs Iran's nuclear weapon breakout time, reduces their number of operating centrifuges, and decreases Iran's current stockpile of low enriched uranium.

More importantly, the agreement allows the International Atomic Energy Agency the ability to access and inspect Iran to verify and ensure compliance.

Should Iran cheat, the international community will come together and once again reimpose the sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table.

In every situation that involves the possibility of using military force to overcome a threat, I will always side

with exploring and exhausting every possible avenue towards a diplomatic resolution first.

I support the JCPOA because it provides a reasonable, balanced, and diplomatic solution rather than a worst-case scenario.

In closing, with the support of 36 retired generals and admirals and 29 of the Nation's top scientists, I am confident we are on the right track with this plan. All of these highly distinguished and experienced leaders agree that this agreement is the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chair of the Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose this legislation and the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, also known as the Iran nuclear deal. A chief reason for this opposition is important, yet simple: The Iran nuclear deal doesn't make America safer, it doesn't make Israel safer, and it doesn't make the rest of the world safer either.

Whatever your thoughts on this Iran nuclear deal, we should all be able to agree, the world will be a much more dangerous and unstable place if Iran were to obtain a nuclear weapon. Unfortunately, the deal the President negotiated won't stop that from happening.

Instead, under this deal, Iran gets to keep its nuclear facilities. Amazingly, it will be allowed to self-police those facilities and report directly to the IAEA, an idea that would be laughable if it were not so crazy.

Iran will get to enrich uranium, all while receiving sanctions relief to the tune of \$150 billion—\$150 billion pumped into a \$400 billion a year national economy; \$150 billion that will no doubt be used by Iran to bankroll terrorist organizations, further destabilize the Middle East, and continue their work to wipe Israel off the map.

It was Ronald Reagan who said "trust but verify" during arms control negotiations with Communist Russia more than a generation ago, but it seems the Obama administration is asking us to trust Iran and then trust some more. Well, I'm not willing to do that, and the American people aren't willing to do that either.

We need to stop this bad deal before it is too late and negotiate a better deal, a deal that stops Iran's nuclear program and ensures the safety of America, Israel, and the rest of the world now and into the future.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) has expired.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and against

the resolution—well, actually, in favor of the resolution of approval.

I must say, in starting, we are at a paradoxical moment. The fears, the haunting specter, a terrible thing, the existential threats posed by a nuclear Iran are all legitimate fears and legitimate haunting specters, regional hegemony to be avoided.

But ironically, those concerns and those fears and those outcomes raised by my friends on the other side of the aisle and the opponents of this agreement actually come true and are realized if we do what they want us to do, which is to reject this agreement.

The alternative to this agreement is an opaque, unconstrained Iranian nuclear program, Mr. Speaker, hanging like the sword of Damocles over all of our heads. And the security of the United States and Israel and regional partners, who knows?

The false hope offered by the critics is let's return to the negotiating table to seek a better deal. A man that I respect, at one of our hearings that Chairman Ed ROYCE chaired on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, former Senator Joe Lieberman, said just that.

I said: How did that work? He said: Well, let's just go back to the partners and Iran and say, we just couldn't sell it; let's start over.

The proposition that we would renounce our own agreement that we negotiated, wrought by more than a year of tough negotiations, and expect that our negotiating partners, including Russia and China and, of course, Iran itself, would sit back down at the table and start all over again under our leadership is specious, if not delusional, as an argument.

We cannot be naive about the scenario in which Congress rejects this agreement brokered by our own country. Among our allies, we divest ourselves of the goodwill that undergirded these negotiations; and among our adversaries, we would confirm their suspicion we cannot be trusted.

The international sanctions regime that drove Iran to the negotiating table would collapse, and our diplomatic leverage would be diminished in all future U.S.-led negotiations.

Most concerning of all, we would return, once again, to the situation we are at, one of deep anxiety and uncertainty regarding Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Critics of the agreement have offered no alternative and have tried to define that agreement by what it is not. It is not a perfect deal that dismantles every nut and bolt of the Iranian nuclear development program, peaceful or otherwise.

It is not a comprehensive resolution of the entire relationship and the myriad issues the U.S. and our allies have with the repressive regime in Tehran and its reprehensible support for terrorist insurgencies in the region. No one ever said it would be.

What arms control agreement in the history of our country has ever attempted to circumscribe every aspect of a relationship with an adversary?

And certainly not this one. In other words, this agreement is the diplomatic alternative we sought to attain when we entered into these very negotiations.

The deal adheres to the high standards of verification, transparency, and compliance on which any acceptable agreement with Iran must be founded. That isn't just my word. That is what former Republican Secretary of State Colin Powell says. That is what Republican former NSC Adviser Brent Scowcroft says. That is what former Republican Senator John Warner from my State says.

The agreement erects an unprecedented and intrusive inspection regime that provides the IAEA with access to declared nuclear facilities and suspected covert nuclear development sites.

Additionally, they will be able to monitor Iran's entire nuclear program supply chain, including uranium mines, mills, centrifuges, rotors, bellows production, storage facilities, and dedicated procurement for nuclear-related or dual-use materials technology.

The agreement also rolls back major components and places strict restrictions on the Iranian nuclear program. If these restrictions are not adhered to, the United States can, at any time, unilaterally revive the sanctions currently in place.

Congress should immediately begin to conduct close oversight to ensure those terms are implemented and that Iran is living up to its obligations.

This isn't about trust. It was Ronald Reagan who said "trust, but verify." Former Secretary of State Clinton today kind of echoed those words, saying "distrust and verify," and that is why she supports the agreement. It does just that.

More broadly, the United States must signal to Iran that its condemnable record on human rights, terrorism, and regional subversion will not be tolerated; nor will we hide, with this agreement, that action and our response to it. In fact, quite the opposite. We will redouble our efforts to stop them in that egregious behavior.

□ 1845

Mr. Speaker, in closing, article I, section 8, clause 11, of the Constitution vests Congress with the duty to authorize war.

Implicit in that text is Congress' additional responsibility to exhaust all reasonable alternatives before committing the American people and our men and women in uniform to such a fateful path.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action represents our best endeavor to provide just that alternative. It is the

product of earnest diplomacy. Congress should put aside partisanship and support it for the sake of our country.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, several Members spoke of Iran's commitments under this agreement. While it is true that Iran has committed to taking certain steps under the agreement, it is also true that Iranians have never complied with any agreement related to its weapons program.

So let's start with considering what Iran's leaders have been saying today about this agreement. This is what they say. They say that Iran can pursue the development of missiles without any restrictions. How can that be, given what is in this agreement?

Well, President Rouhani—the supposed moderate here—has argued repeatedly that the only restrictions on Iran's missile developments are in the U.N. Security Council resolution.

Endorsing the deal, he says, it is not in the agreement itself. They don't recognize the Security Council resolution. So he says: We are not restricted by this agreement. So what the gentleman is quoting, they say they are not restricted by that.

Mr. Speaker, Iranian leaders say that Iran can violate the U.N. Security Council resolutions without violating the agreement. Sanctions do not, therefore, snap back if Iran violates the U.N. Security Council resolutions, according to Iran, and that Iran intends to violate the U.N. Security Council restrictions on weapons sales and on imports.

This is President Rouhani again:

We will sell and buy weapons whenever and wherever we deem it necessary. We will not wait for permission from anyone or any resolution.

So Iran's defense minister has said that Iran is negotiating right now to purchase Russian fighter jets. We know they are negotiating in terms of ballistic missiles right now. They are in violation of the agreement, yet we don't see any intention to enforce that.

So we have got to ask ourselves: Just what kind of agreement is this? Who is this agreement with?

As the committee heard yesterday, it is an agreement with a regime whose world view was founded in large part on a fiery theological anti-Americanism and a view of Americanism as Satanism.

I don't have to tell the Members here. I mean, they hear it every week, those of you that are watching what is coming out of Iran "death to America" every week.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement gives up too much too fast with not enough in return, and we have to judge it on the long-term national security interests of the United States.

Does it make the region and the world more safe, secure, stable? In my

mind, clearly it does not. So I don't feel this is worthy of the House's support.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I too rise in opposition to the so-called Iran nuclear accord. I do so for all the reasons that have been well-articulated over the last couple of hours.

But I also do so based simply on the reason of history. And it is a history that is actually shared with the chairman, in that we were here together in the 1990s.

Then-President Clinton at that time met with North Korea. They formed an accord that basically said: We will give you benefits now for the promise of becoming a responsible member of the world community going forward. The benefits went and accrued to North Korea. The responsible membership in the world community never came.

In that regard, though, the President is certainly well-intended in his efforts. This promise will prove as real as this notion of, if you like your health insurance, you can keep it.

His intentions were good in that regard, with regard to providing health insurance, but it just didn't pan out. I don't think it will be any different in this particular deal.

In that regard, I think it is important to think about what neighbors think of neighbors. In this case, it is important to look at what the Prime Minister of Israel has said in that he believes this is a mistake of "historic proportions."

I think in many ways it mirrors what we saw in 1938. At that point, Neville Chamberlain negotiated with Hitler and gave away Czechoslovakia in the process.

But there in the Munich accords there was this promise of peace, lasting peace in our time. The peace lasted less than a year, and it did not materialize.

I think that the saying is that those who don't learn from history are destined to repeat it.

I think we would be very well-advised to look at the recent history of the 1990s in the North Korea deal, the history of the 1930s, and a whole lot of history across the last 1,000 years that say trading off peace for security is never something that works so well.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, before I recognize the gentleman from New York, I would simply say I think that last analogy is invidious.

The history of World War II is the fact that people ignored warnings for so long that, by the time Munich happened, it most certainly was appeasement.

What should have happened was active engagement to preclude that ever happening. That is precisely what this administration has done.

It will prevent a Munich. It will prevent appeasement. It will provide the

dynamic engagement we need to prevent a nuclear Iran.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS).

Mr. MEEKS. I thank the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King once said, "On some positions, Cowardice asks the question, 'Is it safe?' Expediency asks the question, 'Is it politic?' Vanity asks the question, 'Is it popular?' But Conscience asks the question, 'Is it right?' And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but one must take it because one's conscience tells one that it is right."

I have often reflected on those words when faced with tough decisions.

Today's vote on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is one of the most consequential votes we will take as Members of Congress.

My support for the Iran agreement is about doing what is right for America, our allies, and the world. It is, indeed, a matter of conscience.

Mr. Speaker, since the conclusion of the agreement, I have traveled to 10 nations and vetted this deal from every angle I could think of so that, at this moment of decision, I could act without reservation and with full understanding.

As I listen to this debate, I am deeply disheartened that we are not adequately weighing the realities of our globalized world.

After years of effort toward a more unified approach to addressing Iran's nuclear ambitions, key partners in the Middle East region and most of our allies consider the Iran agreement as an important next step in diplomatic efforts.

Former U.S. ambassadors; former Israeli military; former U.S. Secretaries of State, including Colin Powell; and so many others from an array of vantage points have expressed support for this landmark deal, as have over 100 nations.

We should not ignore the considered judgment of scientists, security experts, renowned diplomats, and our allies. The consensus is that this is a good deal.

Now, some of my colleagues believe that, despite the risk, rejecting this deal can lead to a better deal down the road. Others oppose the deal out of reckless political gamesmanship.

But what has become clear to me in my assessment of the risks involved in supporting or rejecting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is that, if Congress derails this deal, history will record such act as a monumental mistake and the alternatives would not change Iranian nuclear and weaponization pursuits.

Mr. Speaker, rejecting the plan and resorting to unilateral sanctions would prove futile, as it has in the past, while

relying on military action would not curb Iran's ambitions or erase its technical knowledge.

Critics also assert that this deal does not address concerns about issues with Iran that are outside the scope of the plan. We know from past experience that reaching an agreement on one critical issue does not preclude us from working on other serious concerns by other means.

We negotiated with the Soviet Union during Strategic Arms Limitation Talks, which took place in the midst of the Vietnam war that was waged against us with Soviet-made arms, yet those agreements lessened the danger of nuclear confrontation.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the Obama administration has shown tremendous leadership on the world stage by choosing diplomacy first. Leadership is never easy. By definition, it is a lonely and sometimes an unpopular exercise.

Today we must show leadership, we must display fortitude, and do what is right. And what is right in this scenario is that we support the Iran agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, this deal is a capitulation by the greatest nation in the world to the most rogue nation in the world.

What makes the deal so bad is that Iran doesn't even have to cheat to emerge in 10 or 15 years with an industrial-sized nuclear program and with little or no breakout time to achieve nuclear weapons capabilities.

By lifting the financial sanctions, we are literally financing the very weapons and terror that will be directed at us and our allies by the biggest state sponsor of terrorism in the world today.

Amazingly, we are abandoning the arms embargo and the ballistic missile embargo against Iran for good measure.

Not only is our national security threatened, but our close ally, Israel, fears for its very existence under this deal. We simply cannot abandon Israel.

Let history record that I stand against this weak and dangerous deal with a regime that hates the U.S. and hates Israel.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution approving the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding the nuclear program of Iran negotiated by the Obama administration in concert with five other nations, the P5+1.

I want to commend President Obama's Secretary Kerry, Under Secretary Sherman, Secretary Moniz, and

their teams for their leadership and continued, persistent engagement with our international partners and Members of Congress to make this moment possible.

None of us comes to this decision lightly. It is perhaps the most important decision of our public life, no matter what decision we come to.

But after reading the agreement and the classified and unclassified underlying documents, taking part in numerous briefings at the White House and here on Capitol Hill, meeting with constituents, and studying the analyses of experts, I am confident that this strong diplomatic achievement provides the only option that prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and, by some estimates, in as few as 2 to 3 months. This is not achieved by trust, Mr. Speaker, but through verification.

Mr. Speaker, after 14 years of continuous military engagement for our armed services, this agreement cuts off all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon and does so without unnecessarily risking American lives in yet another military action, even as the agreement preserves that ultimate option, should it become necessary in the event of Iran's default.

This agreement sends a clear message to Iran that the global community stands united today and well into the future in ensuring that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon.

Much has been said of Iran's capacity after 10 to 15 years. And even there, the agreement places Iran in the confines of a nuclear non-proliferation treaty, just as the rest of us are.

If Iran violates the agreement, they will, without question, face complete isolation, even more severe repercussions, and the U.S. retains our ability to engage unilateral sanctions and our military option.

It is true that this agreement is not perfect. But if this agreement does not go forward, there is no better deal, Mr. Speaker. In fact, there is no deal. No sanctions, no international partners, no inspections, no deal. This is a negotiation which is, by definition, not perfect.

□ 1900

It is my hope that we will divorce ourselves from the hyperbole and the rhetoric in favor of the seriousness this issue deserves. I have concluded that the agreement is the best path forward.

This is not just my considered judgment; it is the judgment of the highest levels of the military, nonproliferation experts, nuclear scientists, and our diplomatic partners who join in their overwhelming support of the agreement.

As a Congress, we can only do our best and our part to move forward to provide the necessary resources for proper oversight to ensure effective

monitoring and aggressive verification. If Iran cheats, we will know it; we will know it quickly, and we will act decisively.

Once again, the world turned to the United States for our leadership on dealing with Iran and its nuclear program. This agreement, reached through rigorous diplomacy, in conjunction with our partners, provides the tools we need to ensure a pathway to peace and security for the United States, for Israel, the region, and the world.

I will vote to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just note that over 200 retired generals, flag officers, and admirals signed a letter in opposition; and we have heard continuously, including this week, from retired generals, officers, and admirals about their concerns about this agreement.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS), the Republican Conference chair.

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, the votes this week on the President's nuclear deal with Iran are some of the most important we have taken in years. As the world's largest sponsor of terror, Iran continues to play an enormously destructive and destabilizing role in the world.

Iran's actions are destroying the lives of millions of vulnerable innocents. The current refugee crisis in the Middle East and Europe is only the most recent example.

Iran has been propping up Assad's regime in Syria for the past 4 years, sending weapons and thousands of fighters there to brutalize the Syrian people. ISIS has exploited these conditions, and now, millions of Syrians have been displaced, many of them going to unimaginable lengths to seek refuge in Europe. Iran bears responsibility for this.

This deal is not reform. This deal is incentivizing bad behavior. A vote in favor of this deal is a vote that favors party politics over the will of the American people and global security. It is a terrible way to do business.

The American people deserve full transparency from the White House on this deal, as required by the law and even basic respect for American voters.

The President is required to turn over all the agreements—even the side deals made with third parties—and he has yet to do that.

While I was home the last few weeks in my district in eastern Washington, not a day passed that I didn't hear grave concerns about this deal. It wasn't Republicans versus Democrats, liberals versus conservatives; it wasn't anti-President Obama. People are sincerely worried about what this deal means for our safety and security.

We were told by the administration early on that no deal was better than a

bad deal. Now, the President claims it is either this deal or war.

Mr. Speaker, we aren't asking the President to stop his efforts to reach an agreement with Iran. We need a better deal. We are asking the President to continue and strengthen his efforts so that we get a deal that, first, truly denies Iran a path to a nuclear weapon by dismantling its extensive infrastructure; second, includes a robust inspections process, not one that is conducted by Iran itself; and, third, compels Iran to cease its support of terrorist organizations and brutal dictators like Assad, whose actions are destabilizing the entire region, as well as Europe.

Until this deal includes, at a minimum, these three components and the President has made his obligations under the law, I will continue to oppose it, and I will urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to do the same.

Let's send the President back to the negotiating table.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Maybe the President could get some advice from the leadership of the Republican Conference in how to figure out what resolution to bring to the floor.

I now proudly yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE), my friend.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, the question before us today is whether or not this body will approve the negotiated agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. It is one of the most consequential issues of our time and requires serious and sober consideration by every single Member of this body.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that in a matter of such gravity involving the foreign affairs of our Nation and the safety and security of our allies, particularly Israel, we could set aside urges to score political points and avoid dangerous hyperbole and instead debate the merits of this agreement.

I regret that the process for considering this agreement has sometimes devolved into a sad show of partisanship. Our Nation is better than this.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am mindful of President Kennedy's inaugural address, which he delivered from the east front of the Capitol, just a few hundred feet from this Chamber. Addressing the threat from the Soviet Union, President Kennedy said: "Let us begin anew—remembering on both sides that civility is not a sign of weakness."

He went on to say: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

Those words still ring true today. This agreement shows the power of diplomacy to advance our national security interests and ensures that, before being required to send our brave men and women into a dangerous military

conflict, that we have had the courage to exhaust every possible alternative.

Like all of my colleagues, I have spent the last 2 months carefully studying the terms of this agreement that the United States and our negotiating partners reached to prevent a nuclear Iran; meeting with military, scientific, and nonproliferation experts; participating in dozens of classified briefings and committee hearings; meeting with the President and members of his administration, as well as meeting with my constituents.

After a great deal of serious deliberation, I believe that the United States and the world are safer with this deal in place than without it.

I fully recognize that this agreement is not perfect—far from it—but like any decision in life, we have to confront the choices we face, not the one we would rather have before us or like to imagine.

I believe approval of this agreement is the most responsible and effective way to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. By its very terms, it affirms that under no circumstance will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to consider what we will be giving up if we reject this deal. This agreement requires Iran to submit to the most intrusive and rigorous inspections regimen ever negotiated. This is in stark contrast to the complete lack of access currently available to the international community to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

If Congress rejects the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, it will mean zero restrictions on Iran's nuclear ambitions, no limitations on their enrichment activities or centrifuge production, and no ability for international inspectors to monitor Iran's nuclear program.

Many experts agree that rejection of this agreement would mean Iran could develop a nuclear weapon in just a matter of months, the worst possible outcome.

Approval of this agreement does not end our responsibility, Mr. Speaker. Congress must work closely with the administration to ensure that we take additional steps to mitigate the risks reflected in the agreement, to discourage Iran from escalating its destabilizing activities in the region, and to enhance the likelihood that Iran complies with all the terms of the agreement.

Additional resources have to be devoted to supporting, monitoring, verification, and intelligence gathering activities.

Above all else, we must make it absolutely clear to Iran that any violation of the agreement will be met with swift and decisive action by the United States and the international community.

I look forward to working with the administration and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make certain that all of this happens.

In the end, this was not an easy decision or one I arrived at quickly. There is risk in accepting this agreement, and it contains real tradeoffs. No responsible person should claim otherwise.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that rejecting this agreement would present even greater and more dangerous risks to our national security and our allies than the risks associated with going forward. Because of this, I intend to support the resolution of approval and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman ROYCE for his outstanding leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, our Founding Fathers included in the preamble of the United States Constitution the intention of our government to provide for the common defense. Protecting and defending our Nation was not an afterthought; it was a first thought.

The defense of America and our allies has always been a strategic and moral goal. The agreement we have before us today, however, primarily meets Iran's goals. Sanctions are lifted; nuclear research and development continues, and America's safety is compromised. Under this deal, in a matter of years—likely in our lifetimes, but certainly in the lifetimes of our children and grandchildren—Iran will have a bomb.

The President of the United States has said that this agreement is not based on trust, but on verification. I wish that was true because this agreement shouldn't be based on trust. I certainly do not trust a government that has acted as a bank for terrorists.

Any agreement should be based on verification; but where is the simple assurance of anytime, anywhere inspections? We don't have verification. What we have is misplaced hope, hope that Iran has disclosed all of its past nuclear activities, hope that Iran will be transparent, hope that Iran has somehow changed.

Earlier this year, 367 bipartisan Members of Congress sent a letter to the President outlining several conditions that any final nuclear agreement must address. Unfortunately, the agreement we have before us does not meet congressional standards and has numerous fatal flaws.

For example, in 2012, Congress barred Iranians from coming here to study nuclear science and nuclear engineering at U.S. universities. One would think that is a good policy, given that they are seeking to get a bomb.

In one of the most outrageous provisions of this deal, the Department of

Homeland Security and the Department of State will no longer be allowed to enforce the bar. This deal will actually make the U.S. an accomplice to Iran's nuclear weapons program by granting Iranians the ability to come to the U.S. to acquire knowledge instrumental in their being able to design and build nuclear bombs.

Other concerns include giving Iran a signing bonus, lifting the arms embargo, failure to cut off Iran's pathway to the bomb, and the lack of protection for not only our own safety, but for the safety of the world. A nuclear Iran is a threat to our great ally, Israel, but is also a threat to the rest of the Middle East, America, and the world.

While the administration has said that any deal is better than no deal, Thomas Jefferson once said, "Delay is preferable to error," and I agree with Jefferson.

Had our negotiators remained at the table a while longer, perhaps we would not be where we are today; yet, as it stands, this so-called deal, if it goes through, will likely mark the pages of history as a great error.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am reminded back to Churchill. He said it is always better to jaw-jaw than to war-war.

I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, I want to thank Representative CONNOLLY for yielding me time and, really, for your tremendous leadership on this very vital issue. Also, I must salute our Leader PELOSI for her unwavering support and hard work for global peace and security.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3461, a resolution to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Now, in the last two Congresses, mind you, I introduced the Prevent Iran from Acquiring Nuclear Weapons and Stop War Through Diplomacy Act, which called for the appointment of a high-level special envoy to address Iran's nuclear program and an end to the no-contact policy between our diplomats.

Since the 1970s, quite frankly, I have worked on many nuclear nonproliferation issues and believe very strongly that the deal that President Obama and our P5+1 partners negotiated demonstrates how effective diplomacy can be. It will lead us closer to a world where our children and future generations can live without the fear of Iran acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The JCPOA, supported by the majority of Americans and key international allies, including France, Germany, and Britain, though not perfect, it is the best way to prevent Iran from ever acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The Iran nuclear deal puts into place the most intrusive inspection system, including a 24/7 surveillance of Iran's

enrichment facilities and reactors; it cuts off all of Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon, and it will enhance regional and global security.

□ 1915

United Nations Ambassador Samantha Power stated in her recent political op-ed: "If we walk away, there is no diplomatic door No. 2, no do-over, no rewrite of the deal on the table."

Rejecting the Iran deal will isolate the United States from our international partners. It will not make us any safer, and it certainly won't result in a better deal with Iran. Instead, it would allow Iran to accelerate its weapons programs with no oversight. That is unacceptable. We cannot afford the alternative to this deal.

This is a defining moment for our country and for our world. Let us continue to work for peace. We all know that the military option is always there. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this resolution of approval.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this resolution and against this disastrous nuclear agreement with Iran.

The actions that Iran will be allowed to pursue under this agreement are a direct threat to the United States and to our allies, and it falls far short of the commitment the President made to the American people, which is to verifiably prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Under the deal, Iran will maintain a robust nuclear infrastructure. They will be able to conduct research on advanced centrifuges that are capable of rapidly enriching uranium and developing ballistic missiles that are capable of carrying a bomb to Israel, Europe, or the United States. Instead of anytime, anywhere inspections, the bureaucratic process ensures lengthy delays, which will allow Iran to cover its tracks.

This troubling deal will provide billions of dollars to fund Iran's international terror enterprise even as they call for Israel's annihilation and chant "death to America."

It is time to lead the world to a better deal that will result in Iran's forever abandoning its threats to the world.

Mr. Speaker, while this House actually votes on the merits of this deal, I know what happened today in the other House of Congress—the Senate. There, almost all Democrats have joined to block a vote on this deal. One Democrat who wanted to vote was Senator SCHUMER of New York. Senator SCHUMER released a statement last month that showed he understands the

serious defects of this deal—from the inadequate inspections to the billions that will flow into Iran's terror enterprise. Because of these defects, Senator SCHUMER concluded, we will be worse off with this agreement than without it.

But there is another choice, Mr. Speaker—a better deal—one negotiated with a clear understanding of the nature of our enemy.

I ask my colleagues to reject this deal, to encourage the President to go back to the negotiating table, and to vote “no” on this resolution.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, it was John Kennedy who negotiated the first nuclear Test Ban Treaty successfully with our archenemy that threatened to bury us—the Soviet Union. He said that we should never negotiate out of fear, but we should never fear to negotiate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the P5+1 nuclear agreement with Iran, formally known as the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Like my vote against the Iraq war, this decision is one of the most important foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress.

The intent of sanctions and negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase the transparency of their nuclear activities. It is clear to me, as well as to numerous nuclear, diplomatic, and national security experts around the globe, that this agreement achieves these critical goals.

It not only cuts off all pathways to a nuclear weapon, but it also imposes unprecedented and permanent inspections, and it ensures we can automatically reinstate international sanctions if Iran violates the agreement.

In contrast, defeating this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent.

Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our Nation and our allies, including Israel.

While the risks of a nuclear-armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending American troops into harm's way. This is, undeniably, one of those decisions. Under this agreement, every option is and will remain on the table, including that of military force; but we have a solemn obligation to ensure that every diplomatic avenue is

exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq war and why I support this nuclear deal with Iran.

This deal has certainly not been perfect, but perfect is not and never has been an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative, yet no such alternative has been put forward. This agreement before us is the best path available. It has my full support.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DESANTIS), a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, in 2012, when the President was running for reelection, he said: Look, with Iran, it is very simple. We will remove the sanctions when they dismantle and give up their nuclear program.

That was a promise he made to the American people, but this deal doesn't even come close to that. Iran is allowed to maintain a vast, vast nuclear infrastructure.

Two years ago in this House, we passed more robust sanctions, which would have further tightened the screws on the Iranian regime. I think, at that time, Iran desperately wanted to get out of the sanctions. If you had asked Iran what they wanted, they would have, obviously, wanted the sanctions relief because they needed the money—the regime needed it to solidify themselves in power—but they also would have wanted to keep their nuclear program. Then, of course, they would have wanted to continue to fund terrorism.

This agreement basically gives Iran everything it wants, so I join my colleagues who have urged that we resoundingly reject this agreement.

I want to point out something that, I think, is very personal to a lot of veterans.

If you look right here, this is an up-armored Humvee in Iraq in, probably, the 2007–2008 time period. It has been ripped to shreds by an EFP device—an explosively formed penetrator. This is something wherein the explosion will cause these pieces of metal to go 3,000 meters per second. It will ravage the individuals who are in the Humvee, and it will even go through the armor. These devices caused the deaths of hundreds of our servicemembers, and they wounded many, many more.

Why do I bring that up?

Because this was perpetrated by this man, Qasem Soleimani, who is the head of the Quds Force—Iran's Revolutionary Guard terrorist outfit. He was orchestrating those attacks on American servicemembers. That is enough, right? We are doing a deal with a country that has a lot of American blood on its hands.

It is even worse than that. This deal relieves the international sanctions on

Qasem Soleimani and the Quds Force. It empowers the very people who harmed our servicemembers in Iraq. I think that that is an insult to the memories of the people who lost their lives on our behalf and an insult to their families.

For that reason, in addition to all of the other great ones that have been mentioned, we need to resoundingly reject this deal.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I would simply point out for the record that Soleimani remains on the list.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, in 2012, Prime Minister of Israel Netanyahu went to the U.N. with a graph, much like the one right beside me. It was a picture of a bomb with a red line. The Prime Minister said: “The red line must be drawn on Iran's nuclear enrichment program.”

This deal does that.

Today, we can say that Iran cannot produce or stockpile highly enriched uranium, and it has to get rid of 98 percent of its low enriched uranium. To make sure that they don't achieve a nuclear weapon, we have the strictest inspection regimen in the history of nuclear agreements. The impetus for 2 years of negotiation has been achieved.

So what is the problem?

The gears of war are halted when we prove that negotiation and diplomacy are the best methods of achieving peace. This deal is a triumph of diplomacy over military conflict. It is a win for those who reject the misconception that diplomacy is weakness.

In 2003, Vice President Cheney said: “I have been charged by the President with making sure that none of the tyrannies in the world are negotiated with.” The ensuing decades of war brought 6,840 U.S. soldiers home in coffins and squandered trillions of hard-earned, American tax dollars.

Yet, we have learned from that.

We have learned our lesson that we must negotiate, that we must talk it out before we begin to shoot it out. The fact that a majority of Americans supports this deal means that people are tired of sacrificing so much for the bankrupt idea that a conversation is capitulation.

This agreement keeps nuclear weapons out of Iran's hands for decades. In 2003, Iran had 164 centrifuges. In 2005, they had 3,000. In 2009, they had 8,000. By 2013, they had 22,000. While we were rattling sabers and making bravado-type comments about what we were going to do to them, they were making centrifuges. When the President got down to the business of negotiation, we had brought that process to a stop.

We will continue to sanction human rights violators wherever they are, including in Iran, and we will also continue to confront people who export

terrorism; but the best way to empower reformers within Iran is to engage. Diplomatic victories require playing the long game. You need patience, and you need unshakable courage in your convictions.

Let me say that I remember the moment in 2007 when then-Senator Obama said he would engage in personal diplomacy with leaders in the Middle East in order to stop bloodshed in the region. That is the moment that I knew I would vote for him, and I am proud to stand here nearly a decade later to congratulate the President for this diplomatic victory.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO).

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues have come to the floor today and have stated that this is the most important vote or the most important series of votes that we will take in this Congress. I agree with them because these votes boil down to the fundamental question:

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

What kind of a world do we want for ourselves? for our children? for our grandchildren? for future generations?

Do we want to live in a world where we legitimize the most radical, the most extremist, the most terrorist government in the world—a government that has a long and well-documented history of lying to the world? of holding Americans hostage? of hanging homosexuals from cranes? of executing juveniles?

Do we want to empower that government with an investment of at least \$56 billion, a portion of which will surely go to terrorist activities not just in the Middle East but all over the world?

Do we want to guarantee that whether it is in 10 years or in 13 years or in 15 years or in 20 years that that same government will have the ability to build a nuclear arsenal?

Do we want to afford that same government—the mullahs in Iran—the ability to have intercontinental ballistic missiles? Those aren't for Israel. Those aren't for the Middle East. Those are for us. The only purpose of those missiles is to carry a nuclear warhead.

What kind of a world do we want to live in?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that, many years from now, my daughters, ages 5 and 3, will look up how their dad voted on this critical issue. I think—and I am very hopeful and I am confident—that they will thank me, because this is a bad deal. This is a deal that not only endangers our allies in the Middle East, it endangers us. This is a deal where we have to ask ourselves who we are, what we stand for, and what kind of a world we want to live in.

For that reason, I am opposing the Iran deal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

□ 1930

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, our friend from Florida asks the right questions. He has just got the wrong answer. I can answer those questions.

I want a world that rolls back the nuclear capability of Iran, not a world based on a false hope that we can make it work somehow without a plan.

That is what puts the world at risk. That is what puts my children and grandchildren at risk. I am not willing to take that risk.

Mr. Speaker, before I recognize Mrs. DAVIS of California, can I inquire how much time is left on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FORTENBERRY). The gentleman from Virginia has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 42½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Forty-two?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Yes.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Okay. What a lucky man my friend from California is.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mrs. DAVIS).

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, after much deliberation and soul searching, I am convinced that the P5+1 Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action creates a viable path to reduce Iran's nuclear weapons capability.

For that reason, I believe this agreement is in the best interest of the United States. Of course, the agreement must also be in the best interest of our friends in the Middle East.

As someone who has lived in Israel and has returned many times since, I understand that, for Israelis and Americans with close ties to Israel, Iran threatening to wipe Israel off the map is not an abstract concern.

It has been less than a hundred years since the Jewish people nearly suffered such a fate. The threat of annihilation is very real to Israelis, and it is very real to me.

I would never take a vote that I thought could leave my grandchildren a world without a strong, safe Israel.

Mr. Speaker, I am under no illusions that this agreement will end Iran's hegemonic ambitions, but I can't allow their destabilizing behavior to have the protection of a nuclear umbrella.

I agree with the former head of the IDF, the Israeli Defense Force, the head of that intelligence agency, Amos Yadlin, that, if we walk away from this agreement, Iran will remain closer to a nuclear bomb in the coming years, and the chances of a collapse of the sanctions regime will increase.

Nobody in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, trusts Iran. That is why we need and we must have and take the responsibility to come together after this vote to make sure that the United States is exercising all of its initiative to implement this agreement and to address what we know will come, those inevitable challenges.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HECK), a

member of the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees.

Mr. HECK of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, when President Obama announced that the P5+1 had reached an agreement on Iran's nuclear program, he stated that the deal was not built on trust, that it was built on verification.

This was a clear acknowledgement by the administration that the Iran regime is not a trustworthy negotiating partner and that any agreement must contain stringent verification guidelines to ensure that Iran adheres to its obligations.

Unfortunately, the verification procedures in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action are impotent at best. While the agreement does allow for 24/7 monitoring of declared sites, it includes a provision that gives Iran up to 24 days to grant inspectors access to suspected undeclared facilities.

According to former IAEA officials, this greatly increases the probability that nefarious nuclear activities could escape detection.

While this verification scheme is already embarrassingly weak, it gets worse when one considers the secret side deals that prevent inspection of the Parchin military complex and allow Iran to inspect itself. This is not the "anytime, anywhere" inspections the administration claimed it was pursuing.

The fact is that, in spite of claims of the administration, this agreement is not built on verification. It is built on trust.

It requires us to trust a regime that is the largest exporter of terrorism in the world, that has already violated the interim nuclear agreement and whose Supreme Leader just today stated that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

Mr. Speaker, as the President himself has said, no deal is better than a bad deal. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, in 1963, President Kennedy, who served in this Chamber, spoke at American University about preventing nuclear war and that to do so it was necessary to deal with our most feared and distrusted enemy at the time, the Soviet Union, as mistrusted and evil in the eyes of Americans then as Iran is today. As you recall, Prime Minister Khrushchev boldly stated, "We will bury you."

President Kennedy understood, though, that in negotiations with an enemy, "We must avert those confrontations which bring an adversary to a choice of either a humiliating retreat or nuclear war."

President Obama, along with the other five nations at the negotiating table in Vienna, confronted the same reality.

When President Reagan engaged in detente with the Soviet Union, he also

was negotiating with our most feared and distrusted enemy.

In negotiations with Iran, it has been the same for President Obama as it was for President Kennedy in negotiating with the Soviet Union.

Both President Kennedy and President Obama had the same goals as America has had for over a half a century, and that is to prevent nuclear war. And to do so, it has been necessary to deal with an untrusted foe.

I have listened to my constituents. I have been privy to many classified briefings. I have spoken personally to President Obama and Secretary Kerry.

I have met with officials in Vienna at the headquarters of the IAEA and with diplomats and officials from Europe and Asia and considered the opinions of renowned physicists and military generals.

Over those past several weeks and months, I have often thought about President Kennedy's eloquent words at American University in August of '63 when he said that, in the final analysis, "We all inhabit the same small planet. We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal." The same holds true today.

I support this agreement based upon the information I have gleaned from the aforementioned individuals and groups and with the understanding there is no more important mission than preventing nuclear war.

Mr. Speaker, our people and our planet are in the balance. I am convinced this is the most effective way that Iran will not build a nuclear weapon.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), chairman of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California, the chairman of the committee, for yielding me time and for the excellent job he has been doing tonight during the debate on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, this week is a somber week for our Nation. September the 11th reminds us of the sacred responsibility we, in Congress, have to protect the American people from those who want to kill us. That is why we must oppose the Iran deal.

This deal only emboldens our enemies at the expense of our friends and our own national security. So it is no surprise that a majority in Congress oppose this deal, as do most Americans, for many reasons.

First, it allows Iran to develop nuclear weapons in the future.

Second, it lists sanctions and frees up as much as \$150 billion in assets for Iran. These funds inevitably will be used by Iran to export terrorism as even the President himself has admitted.

Third, the longstanding arms embargo against Iran will be lifted. This en-

ables Iran to buy long-range surface-to-air missiles from Russia by the end of the year.

Fourth, there is no credible way to conduct inspections of Iran's nuclear weapons-building sites. Under the proposed deal, Iran is given weeks, if not months, of advanced notice of any inspection. This provides ample time for Iran to hide evidence of nuclear weapons activities and violate the agreement.

Secret deals that the administration has hidden from Congress and the American people have now been revealed. One secret deal permits Iran to conduct its own inspections at a military facility suspected of ties to nuclear weapons.

Finally, by increasing the odds of a nuclear Iran, this deal directly threatens the security and future of Israel. The Iran deal destabilizes the Middle East, jeopardizes America's security, and endangers the world. The Iran deal must be opposed now and in the future.

Remember, this is not the law of the land. This deal is a nonbinding executive agreement. Only the Constitution is the law of the land.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I hope our fellow Americans understand what is really at stake here: engagement and the rollback of a nuclear threat or the kinetic option, which is military intervention that takes us down a path that will lead to more terrorism, more violence, and the necessity of troops on the ground. I choose the former, and I believe our fellow Americans will, too.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to raise my vehement objection to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and to call on my colleagues to do the same.

In March, I joined 346 of my bipartisan colleagues in a letter outlining the issues needed to be addressed by Iran in a comprehensive nuclear agreement.

The last sentence of that agreement said: Congress must be convinced that the agreement's terms foreclose any pathway to a bomb, and then and only then will Congress be able to consider permanent sanctions relief.

Mr. Speaker, I have read this entire agreement, and I am profoundly disappointed to say that it falls remarkably short of foreclosing a pathway to a bomb.

To the contrary, this agreement brings Iran to the brink of becoming a nuclear weapons state and 8 short years from now provides them a pathway to acquiring technology to strike Europe and well beyond.

To ease the concerns of my noncommittal colleagues, the President has promised a military option remains on the table.

I am simply awestricken by the fact that my colleagues on the left have fallen for these assurances. It is the same administration that promised the red line in Syria.

It is the same empty rhetoric that has sustained the Syrian civil war, the Libyan civil war, ISIL's control of western Iraq, and, of course, the imperialist Vladimir Putin that has annexed the sovereign territory of the Ukraine.

I therefore urge my colleagues to reject this deal and any deal that enables a belligerent state sponsor of terror to have access to hundreds of billions of dollars and nuclear weapons that will allow its atrocities to continue in perpetuity, all the while four Americans, one of them a native of the State of Michigan, my home State, Amir Hekmati, is being held hostage.

Mr. Speaker, in no other world, public or private, would this agreement be considered credible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Michigan. I was saying that, in no other world, Mr. Speaker—and to all of you—having served in the public and in the private sector, have I ever seen an agreement where we are negotiating with a party that has no respect for the other party.

In this case, the Supreme Leader of the State of Iran as late as yesterday referred to the United States as the Great Satan and called for us to be wiped off the face of the Earth, not just Israel.

We are the Great Satan. They are Satan, according to the Ayatollah. We are the Great Satan. I object to entering into an agreement with a country that has no respect.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to start by thanking Democratic Leader PELOSI for her tireless and unyielding advocacy for the Iran nuclear deal agreed to between Iran and six major world powers, with the unanimous support of the U.N. Security Council.

□ 1945

I very much share the leader's view that diplomacy and peace must be given every chance in our dealings with Iran before we contemplate the use of any other options.

I also want to acknowledge the fact that, acting with the President's full support, Secretary of State John Kerry has done a masterful job of holding the P5+1 coalition together. It was far from certain that Russia and China, intent as each of them is on reducing America's influence in the world, would continue their participation in the tough multinational effort necessary to get us to this point.

This agreement proves that world leaders, despite being divided on a range of issues, can still work together and reach an agreement with profound implications for international peace and security. This is truly extraordinary.

I support this agreement not because it is perfect, but because it is a deal that stands up extremely well as a barrier against nuclear proliferation for at least 15 years. It also establishes an intrusive inspections regimen to ensure that Iran's program remains heavily monitored and exclusively peaceful for even longer.

One of the most important provisions of this deal allows any permanent member of the U.N. Security Council who can show that Iran has violated the agreement the ability to snap back the tough sanctions that had previously been in place.

Now, I know there are critics who believe that, by rejecting the deal and increasing sanctions on Iran, that the U.S. can somehow coerce the leaders of Iran to completely dismantle its nuclear program. As effective as the current sanctions have been in bringing Iran to the table to negotiate, they have not stopped Iran from becoming a threshold nuclear state.

If Congress rejects this deal, it will not lead to a better one. If the U.S. walks away from this deal, we will have squandered the best chance we have to solve this problem through peaceful means. In fact, U.S. rejection of the deal is more likely to isolate the United States rather than Iran from the rest of the world.

It would reinforce questions around the world about our commitment to multilateralism and American political dysfunction. Furthermore, it would seriously undermine our ability to lead any future diplomatic efforts on terrorism and on a range of other issues important to our national security interests.

I urge my colleagues to support this resolution, which is necessary for the success of the nuclear deal, the preservation of the international financial sanctions architecture, and for maintaining the credibility of U.S. diplomatic commitments in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this ill-conceived agreement between our current administration and the fanatical regime ruling the nation of Iran.

I find it impossible to understand how those who are sworn to protect the security and interests of the American people could enter into such a one-sided deal. This is a deal that expands the lethal potential of a ruthless regime by giving them a path to a nu-

clear weapon; a regime whose stated objective is the destruction of the United States; a regime committed to the complete and utter destruction of Israel, our most trusted friend and ally in the Middle East; and a regime that almost no one believes will honor this deal.

It is incomprehensible that we would so blindly ignore the warnings of the world's most aggressive supporter of terrorism by allowing them access to \$150 billion in assets and allowing them to use those assets to project their war against our Nation and our allies.

If the rantings of this regime are not enough to cause us to reject this deal, then we should let history instruct us. This regime has been responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers. This regime has been responsible for the deaths of innocent civilians in Israel and other nations. In 2009, this regime murdered their own citizens who courageously advocated for the freedom of the Iranian people. The actions of the Iranian regime speak for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, history is a great teacher, and I believe the past mistakes of world leaders who failed to recognize the lethal danger posed by ruthless and ambitious regimes have been written in the pages of history with the blood of millions upon millions of people.

We must not allow our Nation to take rank with those nations and leaders who chose appeasement over courage, who chose to take what appeared to them to be the easy path, instead of bearing the responsibility of making the harder decision because it was the right decision.

If the administration is correct that allowing the ruling regime in Iran to become armed with nuclear weapons will pose no threat to America and Israel, then no one will remember how the Members of this Congress voted; but if this administration and the supporters of this agreement are wrong and we suffer a catastrophic loss of lives, no one will ever forget what we did here. We will bear the burden of this vote for the rest of our lives.

America's foreign policy is at a crossroads. I am reminded how a great President described how we should deal with dangerous nations. President Theodore Roosevelt said we should speak softly and carry a big stick. He described this approach as the exercise of intelligent forethought and of decisive action sufficiently far in advance of any likely crisis. This deal does not meet that standard.

Mr. Speaker, this is the time when the burden of leadership that has been entrusted to every Member of Congress falls most heavily upon us. The American people look to us to do our duty and bear this responsibility without regard to party or politics, to put their safety and security first and foremost. I urge all the Members of this House to

put aside the politics and partisanship that otherwise divide us and stand together in opposition to this deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the goal of the negotiations between world powers and Iran has always been to prevent them from developing a nuclear weapon. I think we have to be realistic about this.

This agreement, as opposed to rejecting the agreement, takes us very far toward that goal; and I think accomplishes that goal in a way that we should all be able to live with and accept. The alternative is just too treacherous, I think, for us to even imagine.

I have been involved in this issue for as long as I have been here, this last 2½ years that I have been in Congress. I, as many Members, have had countless hours of briefings. I have read the documents; I have read the classified reports, and I am confident that this agreement, simply put, makes the world a safer place, both for the U.S. and our allies.

What this agreement does not do, however—and I think it is important to keep in context—this agreement does not make Iran a good actor on the world stage. It is intended to tamp down their nuclear aspirations.

It doesn't mean that Iran can be trusted. In fact, the very nature of the agreement is that it will rely on inspections; it will rely on the eyes of the world to be on Iran to ensure that the agreement is adhered to with robust inspections.

Like any negotiated agreement, it is not perfect. If Iran cheats, we will know it through inspections. If Iran violates the agreement, our allies and the United States will be able to put back in place those sanctions that were so important to get them to the negotiating table in the first place. In fact, even if our allies don't agree, we would have the ability to unilaterally take steps to reinstate those important sanctions.

Finally, I think, importantly, under this question, the U.S. will be in a much stronger position than we are today if, in fact, military intervention ultimately is required because we will have allowed the diplomatic process to work, I believe, and I think most Americans believe, it strengthens our hand, it strengthens our standing in the world if, in fact, the necessity of military action does come upon us. The fact that we gave diplomacy a chance, I think, is a really important point.

Now, I have heard, from friends on both sides of the aisle, concern about the Americans that are being held, and this is a subject that I know something about. I represent the family of Amir Hekmati, and I appreciate the efforts of Members on both sides to call upon

Iran to release the Americans that they hold.

I personally thank Chairman ROYCE for his effort through his leadership on the Committee on Foreign Affairs to assist me in developing a resolution that allowed this House to speak with one voice on that question.

It would be a mistake, as some have suggested, to have included the freedom of innocent Americans as one of the provisions of an agreement because, by the very nature of an agreement through negotiation, in order to secure a concession, in order to secure the release of those Americans in exchange for something else that was negotiated at the bargaining table, we would have had to exchange something that makes the world a less safe place.

Don't take my word for it. Listen to the position taken by that young, brave man that I represent, that young marine, Amir Hekmati, who himself has said that the onus is on Iran to unilaterally release him and not to include him as part of a transaction that deals with Iran's nuclear capabilities.

That is the position that I take because I think it is the right position, but I think it is important to note that that is also the position that this brave young man, who for 4 years has been sitting in an Iranian jail cell, also takes.

Finally, we have to be honest with ourselves about the question that is before us. Now, if I were to have written this agreement by myself, it would be a different agreement, and I am sure that is true of virtually everybody in this House.

The fact of the matter is, when evaluating our position on this question, we have to first search our own conscience, but we have to measure the effect of this agreement and the consequences of adhering to it and enacting this agreement with the consequences of walking away from a multilateral negotiated agreement with no prospect.

Listen to the voices of the other nations involved, with no prospect of being able to come back to the negotiating table.

The conclusion, I think, that I have come to in examining my conscience is that we are in a far better position as a world and we are far more secure through this agreement than we would be with the uncertainty of walking away from the diplomatic process and allowing Iran to pursue a nuclear weapon in the next months.

The conclusion, I think, that I have come to in examining my conscience is that we are in a far better position as a world and we are far more secure through this agreement than we would be with the uncertainty of walking away from the diplomatic process and allowing Iran to pursue a nuclear weapon in the next months.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, this is the conclusion that I have come to, but this is also the conclusion that experts on both sides of the political spectrum have come to.

Ambassadors from across the world—former Secretary of State Madeleine Albright thinks this is the right path forward; former Secretary of State Colin Powell thinks this is the right path forward.

I understand that individuals in this House may come to different conclusions after examining the facts. The only thing I ask and encourage my colleagues to do is to vote your heart. Vote what you think is right.

Examine the documents and do what you think is in the best interests of this country and of the world, and the conclusion that I have come to is that supporting this agreement is the right thing.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would also point out, though, that we have heard from many experts. We have heard from many generals, admirals, and there are over 200 generals and flag officers, admirals who have come to the opposite conclusion, who have come to the conclusion that this makes the country less safe, and throughout the course of the afternoon and evening here, supporters of this agreement have argued that we will be aggressive against Iran, aggressive against Iran on its regional aggression, aggressive against Iran on its human rights violations.

□ 2000

I will just bring up some concerns I have for the consideration of the body here.

I don't see it. This administration was silent during Iran's Green revolution, when the Iranian people were in the streets revolting against the regime at the time of the stolen election there in Iran. They needed U.S. leadership the most at that time.

And since the administration began its negotiations with Iran, we have had a grand total of three human rights abuse designations from the administration—three designations against the backdrop of a record number of executions under the so-called moderate Rouhani, more executions this year than under alternative leadership in the past.

So if you are seeing unparalleled levels of repression and executions and we don't see that being countered forcefully, I come to a certain conclusion. I see the same thing with the administration not confronting Assad's mass murders. Assad is Iranian-backed.

From my standpoint, if the administration is locked into an agreement, I will tell you how I think. I presume the administration will defend that agreement, and I presume that that will mean ignoring Iran's abuses at home and probably ignoring Iran's aggression abroad. The negotiations were a constraint on the administration taking action and protesting, and I presume that the new agreement is going to be

a constraint on the administration's taking action against Iran.

I am just pointing out my view of this, based upon what I have observed going back to the Green revolution and this desire for a rapprochement with Iran. I wish that the administration would take on a new life in confronting Iran. I don't see it. And we will have a really bad deal to contend with.

The other part about the deal, and other points were made here tonight, but sanctions relief provided to Iran under this agreement will enable them to increase the size and scope of their ballistic missiles.

So the other observation I would make is the medium-and long-term threat of an Iranian ballistic missile that can reach the United States is very real. That is what we have heard from so many retired officers and what we have heard from the Pentagon, and yet the administration has been reluctant to ensure that the United States has adequate protective measures to guard the homeland against the Iranian ballistic missile threat.

The missile defense program has suffered greatly under President Obama. One of his first major decisions was to cut funding for the Missile Defense Agency. Then there was the unilateral abrogation of signed missile defense agreements with our allies Poland and the Czech Republic in terms of the interceptor program that was supposed to defend Europe and the United States against any future Iranian potential launch.

And contrary to the representation provided to Congress as part of the New START, the President canceled phase 4 of the European missile defense plan, which was specifically designed to increase protection of the U.S. homeland.

So now that this agreement will pump resources and technology advancements into the ballistic missile threat to the U.S. by Iran, my other hope is that this institution will have uniform opposition to the administration's record of cutting missile defense and support proactive measures to protect the U.S. homeland. Because I will remind everyone here, Iran claims today that they are not bound in this agreement on the issue of ballistic missiles. They do not recognize the U.N. sanctions on their ballistic missiles, and they are claiming we did not put it specifically into the agreement. So as far as they are concerned, they are moving forward. They are moving forward with their ballistic missile program.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN).

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Iran agreement.

In 2009, I was able to visit Israel and was in separate meetings with Prime Minister Netanyahu, then-President Peres, and the Israeli Chief of Staff of the IDF, or Israeli Defense Forces. I

asked the same question: What would it take to stop Iran from gaining a nuclear weapon? And they all gave me the same answer. They said: You have to impose economic sanctions that are tough enough that the Government of Iran fears a collapse of the economy and a resulting loss of power. And that is the only thing short of war that will cause them to give up their quest for a nuclear weapon.

The Obama administration, merely to bring them to the negotiating table, threw them a lifeline and relaxed economic sanctions. And then, even before going to the Congress of the United States, they went to the United Nations to unravel economic sanctions on Iran.

Michael Oren, Ambassador to the United States from Israel, said that, even though the President has tried to box the Congress in—the United States has a \$17 trillion economy, and that by the United States imposing economic sanctions on Iran, that in fact other countries will be forced to follow in order to be able to do business with the United States.

This is really the hope and change applied to American national security. The hope and change is that the conduct of Iran will change over time; that the ruling mullahs will in fact somehow become enlightened. And that when they say “death to America,” it is more of a cultural expression.

In 1983, 241 marines died from an Iranian-backed Hezbollah guerilla in a truck bomb.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. COFFMAN. In 1996, 19 airmen died in the Khobar Towers by an Iranian-backed attack.

When they say “death to Americans,” they mean death to Americans.

In 2005, I was in Iraq with the United States Marine Corps, and we were losing soldiers and marines on the ground due to IEDs, but we up-armored our vehicles and we did better route reconnaissance and security. Iran introduced what was called an EFP—a shape charge, or an explosive force penetrator—that was designed to penetrate the thickest hulls of our vehicles and killed hundreds of soldiers and marines on the ground. When the Iranians say “death to Americans,” they mean it.

This deal will threaten the stability of the region, the security of the United States and of Israel, and I would urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH).

Mr. LYNCH. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for leading this debate on our behalf, and I want to thank her for the great work she has been doing on all of this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3461, legislation to approve the Iran nu-

clear agreement. While I will admit this deal is not absolutely perfect, I believe it does offer the best chance of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, the Iran nuclear agreement is an opportunity, the likes of which we could not even imagine a few years ago: a chance to stop Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and to do so without engaging in another costly and bloody war.

Now, I did not reach this conclusion lightly. I did so only after closely examining the deal and the classified and unclassified supplementary documents. I also spoke to experts and numerous officials who were closely involved in the talks, including one of the IAEA inspectors, and carefully weighed the arguments from both sides.

While I still have some concerns, I simply do not see an alternative that will constrain Iran's nuclear program and maintain the global cooperation needed to enforce these limits.

Mr. Speaker, the plain language of this agreement explicitly states that “under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop, or acquire any nuclear weapons.” There is no waiver, no exception, no qualifier or sunset. Iran may never have a nuclear weapon, period. That is what the agreement says.

Now, of course, nobody believes a simple affirmation alone is enough, especially with Iran's history, which is why this deal imposes tough limitations on Iran and includes safeguards to better ensure that if Iran cheats, we will know and can respond by reimposing economic sanctions, or, as the President has indicated, the military option remains on the table.

I want to note some of the limitations that are in the agreement.

Iran must cut its low enriched uranium stockpile by 96 percent. It currently has 7,500 kilograms of low enriched uranium. It has to cut that to 300 kilograms—from 7,500 to 300.

Iran must cut its centrifuge capacity by over 66 percent—from 19,000 centrifuges to 6,104; and of the 5,000 it may run, all must be the lower efficiency, first generation centrifuges.

The reactor core in the heavy water plant at Arak must be removed and filled with concrete, making it unusable for nuclear weapons, and it must be redesigned for nuclear energy purposes only.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that this deal is not based on trust. In fact, it assumes Iran will try to cheat. That is why the inspections regime is so intrusive. In addition, IAEA inspectors will have full access to all declared sites and use of the most advanced technology available.

It also subjects Iran's entire nuclear fuel cycle to inspections, from uranium mining to waste disposal and every stage in between. No other member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

is subject to that scrutiny, nor would we be inspecting Iran's whole fuel cycle if we trusted them.

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear about something. The United States did not negotiate this agreement alone. This was a joint effort with the UK, Germany, France, China, Russia, and the EU. Those countries are in a more vulnerable position than the United States if Iran should violate this agreement.

Now, any observer of foreign affairs will tell you that in recent years it has been next to impossible to get this mix of countries to agree on anything, much less a deal with such significance as this. Yet that is what we have here—an agreement that major global powers back and are ready to enforce the agreement. And if we sabotage it now, if we are the only country to say “no” to diplomacy and “yes” to military action, we may very well do so alone.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, this agreement is not perfect. However, no one got everything they wanted in this agreement. For every critic who says the P5+1 gave away too much, there is one in Iran who says the Iranians did the same.

This deal has vast potential, but its success will ultimately hinge on its implementation. It would be better use of our energies to focus on ensuring that this deal succeeds and that the IAEA has what is necessary to carry out its mandate.

One final point, if some of the critics are right and we eventually have to resort to a military option with or without our international neighbors, I think it would be much better for us to have had hundreds of inspectors on the ground inspecting nuclear and non-nuclear facilities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LYNCH. It would be far better for us and our international allies to have had international inspectors—hundreds—on the ground in Iran, so that if we do have to take military action, we have that information, we have that intelligence, so that any military action that eventually is necessary will be much more effective.

But I agree that this agreement is our best chance, this opportunity for diplomacy, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

□ 2015

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in strong disagreement with the President's deal.

Tonight is the eve of the 14th anniversary of attacks on America by radical Islamic terrorists. These were direct, premeditated attacks on our soil

that targeted and murdered thousands of Americans, just because they were Americans.

It was a dirty, cowardly act that reflects the lack of civility and values of all terrorists, those who finance terror, those who plan terror attacks, and those who carry them out.

Who would have thought we would be here at this time debating whether to approve an agreement with the number one state sponsor of terrorism in the world, a deal with a country that chants “death to America” while holding four American hostages, a deal that removes sanctions and allows billions of dollars to flow into a regime that wants to annihilate us and our allies, a deal that allows thousands of centrifuges to continue spinning and enriching nuclear fuel that can and most likely will be used in nuclear weapons.

There is a better way to deal with this regime, by not making any concessions until Iran ends their support of terrorism and demonstrates they can be civilized and trusted. They must earn our trust.

Mr. Speaker, America’s \$18 trillion to \$19 trillion economy dwarfs Iran’s \$400 billion economy, and some sell America short to say that the world would stand with Iran over us if we kept our sanctions and showed resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would see the day when America negotiated with terrorists, and I certainly never thought I would see the day when those who swore to protect her would agree to a deal shrouded in secrecy—not Congress’ deal, not the American people’s deal, the President’s and the minority that supports its deal that jeopardizes so much of our safety and security and gains so little.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman another 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I encourage a strong “no” vote on this deal. I encourage this Chamber, the Senate, and the administration to do the right thing by rejecting this deal in its entirety; and I pray that God would intervene and help us.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FOSTER).

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as the only Ph.D. physicist in Congress—in fact, the only Ph.D. scientist of any kind—I have taken very seriously my responsibility to review the technical aspects of the proposed agreement.

After over a dozen briefings, many of them individual classified briefings by the technical experts who have supported our negotiators, I have come to support this deal not based on trust of Iran, but based on science.

I would like to take a moment to make four technical points that underpin my support of this deal.

First, in regards to the claim that “Iran gets to be in charge of inspecting

itself” in investigations of its past weaponization activities, this is simply not true. The investigations will be carried out by a team of IAEA inspectors, using equipment and sampling kits prepared by the IAEA, with samples being sent to the international Network of Analytical Laboratories, of which a number of U.S. laboratories are members.

I urge my colleagues who harbor doubts about this inspection regime to avail themselves of classified briefings on the details. What I can say publicly is that our technical experts have full confidence in the technical inspection capability of the IAEA.

Secondly, in regards to the 24-day inspection delay, which has been a source of concern for many, including myself, under the proposed agreement, Iran’s declared nuclear facilities will be available for anytime, anywhere inspection.

However, for undeclared facilities, including military facilities, Iran has the opportunity to contest what is normally a 24-hour inspection regime under the nonproliferation treaty and additional protocol for a period of up to 24 days. This is clearly not ideal. It is a negotiated number.

However, when I look closely at the many steps that must be taken to produce and to test a nuclear weapon, the ability to detect activities in a window of 24 days versus 24 hours has limited operational significance.

This is because, while many steps toward weaponization can unfortunately be hidden from even a 24-hour inspection, things like design and testing of nonnuclear components, but the moment that Iran touches nuclear materials, it will be subject to detection by the IAEA, even months after any attempted scrubbing of the facility.

Thirdly, I support the administration’s estimate of a 1-year minimum breakout time. This is the reaction time that the world community will have for a diplomatic, economic, and military response if Iran decides to resume its nuclear weapons program.

Because of the importance of this issue, I have spent a great deal of time and effort personally vetting this estimate. The breakout time calculation is complex because there are many possible paths to obtain the fissile material for a first weapon, and each of these must be examined.

After many hours of study and detailed questioning of our experts, I have concluded that the 1-year estimate for the minimum breakout time is accurate.

Fourth, in regards to the weaponization timeline, this is the time needed by Iran from the point that it possesses a sufficient quantity of nuclear material for a first weapon, to the time that it will take them to assemble and to test that first nuclear weapon.

Unfortunately, Iran has made significant progress toward weaponization,

including such items as the multipoint initiation system for implosion devices that is referenced in the IAEA report of 2011.

Moreover, if Iran breaks out of this agreement, it will resume the weaponization activities during the same year that it takes to accumulate fissile materials for a first weapon.

Therefore, I concur with the assessment that, in the context of a 1-year breakout effort, the additional time for weaponization may be small. However, at the end of this agreement, when the breakout time to obtain fissile material is shortened, the weaponization activities become the dominant factor in the time line.

This underscores the importance of maintaining maximum visibility into all aspects of the Iranian nuclear capability, a position that is surely strengthened by the adoption of this agreement and, also, of significantly strengthening the nonproliferation treaty for Iran and for all other nuclear threshold countries.

This must be the work of the coming decade, so that by the end of the main terms of this agreement, Iran and its neighbors in the Middle East and around the world will be bound by a much stronger and more verifiable nonproliferation treaty.

As was emphasized by former Senators Dick Lugar and Sam Nunn, two gentlemen who have actually reduced the threat of nuclear war, instead of just talking about it, that this is not a perfect deal, but it is the best path forward and our best chance to achieve our goal of preventing Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as the best opportunity to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran. Remember, we did not negotiate this deal alone, but if we walk away, we walk away alone.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We did not negotiate this deal alone. Also negotiating this deal was Iran and was Russia and was China—true enough—but when it comes to the question of inspections, I do not have the document that indicates how these inspections will be done; but what I do know is what is reported to be the procedure and what is asserted also by the Iranians to be the procedure.

As reported, it is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the agencies the photos of the locations. It is Iran that will provide the Agency videos of the locations. It is Iran, not international inspectors, who will provide the Agency the environmental samples. It is Iran that will use Iran’s authenticated equipment, not the equipment of the international inspectors.

The point I make, again, is that one of the reasons we wanted to have the agreements, the side agreements, the

two side agreements, including the one addressing the 12 questions that have never been answered about the thousand pages of bomb work that the IAEA had in its possession, that Iran supposedly conducted at Parchin, was to get Iran to answer these questions. To this day, to my knowledge, scientists in Iran are not available to answer these questions.

Now, perhaps if we obtain these documents, these two side agreements, we will have the details that assure us that, finally, these 12 questions have been answered, but I can tell you, during the interim agreement, we only got half of the first question answered, and after that, Iran shut it down. There was to be no more discussion about their past bomb work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. KELLY).

(Mr. KELLY of Mississippi asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KELLY of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement.

On the eve of September 11, I remember the American lives lost to terrorism and the unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement, combined with my personal experience of being deployed in the Army in Iraq in 2005 and, again, in 2009 and 2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe that Iran will act in good faith in this agreement.

It is not just my concerns that I have regarding this deal, but it is also my concerns I have consistently heard throughout the August work month from my constituents, regardless of party affiliation, that did not support this agreement with Iran.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran, a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984, access to billions of dollars to finance terrorism activities in the region and to get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

I oppose with all my heart and soul the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security, nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East, nor is it in the best interest of America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my opposition to the administration's Iran nuclear agreement.

On the Eve of September 11, we remember the lives lost and unfortunate reality that people want to do America harm.

Based on my review of the agreement combined with my personal experience of being deployed to Iraq in 2005 and again in 2009–2010 and seeing firsthand the Iranian influence there, I have no reason to believe Iran will act in good faith.

It is not just concerns I have regarding the deal, but concerns I consistently heard from constituents, regardless of party affiliation, during the August work period.

Just this week, Iran's Supreme Leader said America remains the "Great Satan" and reiterated his desire to wipe Israel off the map. Common sense would prevail that the goal of Iran's nuclear program is not to promote peace but exactly the opposite.

Lifting economic sanctions that Congress has imposed for more than two decades only gives Iran—a recognized state sponsor of terrorism since 1984—access to billions of dollars to finance terrorist activities in the region and get closer to their ultimate goal of building a nuclear weapon.

Increased access to wealth coupled with a lack of "anytime, anywhere" inspections will only allow Iran to increase their support of terrorism in the region to groups like Hamas and Hezbollah and is not nearly sufficient in stopping their pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

I oppose the Iran nuclear agreement because I do not believe that the agreement negotiated by the administration is in the best interest of our national security nor is it in the best interest of our allies in the Middle East.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this agreement is the best option available to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The alternatives are simply too risky and too costly, which is why the deal's opponents have failed to articulate a realistic alternative.

During my time in Congress, I have voted for every bill that imposed crippling sanctions on Iran, which brought the regime to the negotiating table and united the world to stop Iran's pursuit of a nuclear weapon.

Sanctions were meant to be a tool to ensure negotiations; that is exactly what they have done, but as we have learned from the past decade, sanctions alone are not enough to stop Iran from expanding its nuclear program.

Before negotiations began, Iran greatly increased its enrichment stockpile and centrifuge capacity, despite sanctions. That is why a verifiable agreement that will cut off Iran's ability to build a nuclear weapon is necessary.

The International Atomic Energy Agency will have nearly continuous access to Iran's declared nuclear facilities and can gain unprecedented access to other suspicious, undeclared sites in as little as 24 hours.

Under this agreement, Iran will dismantle two-thirds of its installed centrifuges, remove over 97 percent of its uranium stockpile, and make changes to its Arak plutonium reactor before it receives sanctions relief.

United States Department of Energy Secretary and nuclear physicist Ernest Moniz has confirmed that the agreement increases Iran's breakout time significantly for well over a decade, from 2 to 3 months today to at least 12

months moving forward. This additional time will give us ample opportunity to catch and stop Iran should it choose to pursue a nuclear weapon.

Some have suggested that we need to reject this deal in order to get a better one, but I have found no evidence to believe that a better deal is possible.

It is clear that some of our negotiating partners and other allies do not want more sanctions. If we reject this deal, the robust international sanctions regime would certainly erode, if not unravel entirely.

In the meantime, Iran could move forward with its enrichment program without inspections; limitations on manufacturing, installation, research, and development of new centrifuges; and constraints on its enriched uranium stockpile. Simply put, no deal would mean no inspections and no constraints on Iran's nuclear ambitions.

Some have suggested that we cannot make an agreement with a country that we do not trust, but we must remember that this deal is not based on trust, but rather the most intrusive inspections regime upon which we have ever agreed.

We did not trust the Soviet Union, especially when we negotiated an arms reduction treaty with them as we fought in devastating proxy wars around the world.

□ 2030

Today we are not debating whether to trust Iran. We are debating whether and how we should enhance monitoring of its nuclear program.

I remain committed to working with the administration and my colleagues here in Congress to contain Iran's conventional capabilities that threaten stability in the region and throughout the world, but know that this deal is the best option to take the nuclear issue out of the equation.

I urge my colleagues to approve this agreement.

Again, I thank the gentlewoman from California for yielding.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in terms of viewing this as the most intrusive regime, I remember South Africa. We put the kinds of sanctions on South Africa that we tried to get the administration to put on Iran.

We had legislation here by a vote of 400–20 to do that, and the administration blocked that legislation in the Senate. That would have given us real leverage.

Why do I think so? Because in South Africa, when we put those sanctions on, it actually gave the regime a choice between compromise on its nuclear program and dropping apartheid and changing its system or economic collapse.

The choice was made in South Africa to turn over their nuclear bomb to the

international inspectors. Now, I would consider that an intrusive regime. I wouldn't consider this one.

In the case of Libya, they turned over their weapons programs to international inspectors, allowed them in, allowed them to take them out.

I don't know why we say this is the most intrusive regime. It seems to me that, clearly, in cases where we actually forced the issue, where we actually in South Africa put the totality of sanctions in place, that Congress both in the House and the Senate in a bipartisan way felt were mandatory to force the South African hand.

In that case, yes, we got them to give up their nuclear capabilities and their right to enrich and all of that. I don't see that here.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT).

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, for months now, the President has made promises that we have heard that would prohibit Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons through strict oversight.

Unfortunately, we see now that this deal does not do that at all. The Iranian regime has done nothing to earn the trust of the international community, yet this agreement rewards Iran with sanctions relief.

I was a member of the Iran Sanctions Conference Committee, and I support tough, strict sanctions against this regime.

You see, the Iran sanctions were designed to force a peaceful resolution to this ongoing situation. It was clear to many that the sanctions were working.

Iran had an inflation rate of 35 percent, the value of its currency was falling, and its monetary reserves were dwindling.

Iran had no choice but to come to the negotiation table. So the U.S. was in a position of power to negotiate a good deal.

Instead, we have a deal which allows Iran to continue to use centrifuges, a deal that allows them to continue to enrich uranium, a deal where, after 15 years, it will be unclear what, if any, access the inspectors will have to their facilities, and a deal where Iran can dispute inspections and delay for 24 days.

This is not, by the way, "anytime, anywhere" inspections that the administration also promised us.

The President may claim that this deal is built on verifications. That is simply not true. We now know that Congress hasn't even received all the details related to the deal. There are side deals as well.

So what makes us believe that Iran will abide by the agreement that we see, let alone by the side deals that we have not seen?

This deal asks us to trust a country that holds American hostages, that tortures its own people, and that has called for the destruction of the United

States and its allies. It is not a surprise that Iran and its allies are celebrating.

However, it is obvious that this deal does little to advance U.S. security. We can still reject this severely flawed deal. There are still alternatives. The U.S. can use sanctions, sanctions that have worked to negotiate a good deal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LOUDERMILK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 10 seconds.

Mr. GARRETT. We can use those sanctions, those sanctions from the very committee that I was on, to negotiate a good deal.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting the security of the United States and protecting the security of our allies as well by rejecting this misguided deal.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT).

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank Chairman ROYCE. He has actually dealt with this and done this very honorably.

It has been powerful to watch. There has been amazing testimony given to us. There have been great speakers here. But I fear something very important has not gotten enough understanding and enough focus.

Who in this body is going to take responsibility when the Iranian regime is flush with cash and the death and destruction that is coming with that?

Who here is going to take responsibility for the displaced people around the region?

Who here is going to take responsibility for what some of the experts have told us, the potential financing of a Sunni-Shia war in the region, the amount of death, whether it be the \$59 billion the administration talks about or the \$150 billion that sits in accounts around the world that is about to be handed back to the regime?

I hold up this board next to me so you can see this is more. This is so much more than just the neighbors around Iran.

The bad acts have been happening all over the world. Tell me why there is Iranian Revolutionary Guard money, Quds Force money showing up in our hemisphere.

Earlier this year I was at a series of meetings in Panama. We had parliamentarians from the region speaking to us, telling us that they are actually seeing Iranian money moving through their banks, financing bad actors in

their region, creating death and destruction, trying to finance the overthrows of their governments. That is in our own hemisphere.

Are we prepared as a body, particularly those who will vote for this, to step up and take responsibility for the lives that are about to be lost, for the governments that are going to be overthrown and the destruction and displaced people, the refugees, the cascades that are going to come from that?

We are about to hand billions and billions and billions of dollars to a regime that is committed to destroying our way of life, but also to destroying their own neighbors.

That is what is on the line right now. We are about to execute a vote here that is going to kill, maim, destabilize not only the region; the world.

Those who are about to vote for this, I expect you to step up and be responsible for what you have done.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot in these debates that have gone on today. I would like to take this opportunity to try to reinforce the tremendous support that we have for this deal.

I would like to also debunk the idea that somehow this administration is not concerned enough about the security of this country.

Let me just share with you the tremendous support that this deal has. I will do that by reading some excerpts from and insert into the RECORD an open letter signed by 36 retired U.S. generals and admirals who make the case that addressing the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is far superior than trying to do it militarily.

In their letter, these retired military leaders say about the nuclear agreement with Iran, "There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon," "If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark."

Recognizing the importance of strong multilateral coordination and action, the retired military leaders go on to say, "If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones."

Mr. Speaker and Members, while I have great respect for all of the Members of this House, for the most part, I do not accept the notion that Members who have not served in the way that

these generals and admirals have served this country would know better about our security.

So I would like to insert that letter into the RECORD.

THE IRAN DEAL BENEFITS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY—AN OPEN LETTER FROM RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

On July 14, 2015, after two years of intense international negotiations, an agreement was announced by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China and Russia to contain Iran's nuclear program. We, the undersigned retired military officers, support the agreement as the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The international deal blocks the potential pathways to a nuclear bomb, provides for intrusive verification, and strengthens American national security. America and our allies, in the Middle East and around the world, will be safer when this agreement is fully implemented. It is not based on trust; the deal requires verification and tough sanctions for failure to comply.

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. Military action would be less effective than the deal, assuming it is fully implemented. If the Iranian's cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

We agree with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said on July 29, 2015, "[r]elieving the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is superior than trying to do that militarily."

If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones.

For these reasons, for the security of our Nation, we call upon Congress and the American people to support this agreement.

GEN James "Hoss" Cartwright, U.S. Marine Corps;

GEN Joseph P. Hoar, U.S. Marine Corps;

GEN Merrill "Tony" McPeak, U.S. Air Force;

GEN Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN Robert G. Gard, Jr., U.S. Army;

LGEN Arlen D. Jameson, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN Frank Kearney, U.S. Army;

LGEN Claudia J. Kennedy, U.S. Army;

LGEN Donald L. Kerrick, U.S. Army;

LGEN Charles P. Otstott, U.S. Army;

LGEN Norman R. Seip, U.S. Air Force;

LGEN James M. Thompson, U.S. Army;

VADM Kevin P. Green, U.S. Navy;

VADM Lee F. Gunn, U.S. Navy;

MGEN George Buskirk, U.S. Army;

MGEN Paul D. Eaton, U.S. Army;

MGEN Marcelite J. Harris, U.S. Air Force;

MGEN Frederick H. Lawson, U.S. Army;

MGEN William L. Nash, U.S. Army;

MGEN Tony Taguba, U.S. Army;

RADM John Hutson, U.S. Navy;

RADM Malcolm MacKinnon III, U.S. Navy;

RADM Edward "Sonny" Masso, U.S. Navy;

RADM Joseph Sestak, U.S. Navy;

RADM Garland "Gar" P. Wright, U.S. Navy;

BGEN John Adams, U.S. Air Force;

BGEN Stephen A. Cheney, U.S. Marine Corps;

BGEN Patricia "Pat" Foote, U.S. Army;

BGEN Lawrence E. Gillespie, U.S. Army;

BGEN John Johns, U.S. Army;

BGEN David McGinnis, U.S. Army;

BGEN Stephen Xenakis, U.S. Army;

RDML James Arden "Jamie" Barnett, Jr., U.S. Navy;

RDML Jay A. DeLoach, U.S. Navy;

RDML Harold L. Robinson, U.S. Navy;

RDML Alan Steinman, U.S. Coast Guard.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. And, further, I would like to share with you something from someone that I came to know very well. It is a Washington Post article that I am going to quote from.

The quotes will be from Republican and former Treasury Secretary Paulson. He will not only make very strong statements about his support for this deal, he slams the naysayers of this Iranian deal.

Let me read from the Washington Post article from August 14 in which former Treasury Secretary Hank Paulson was asked what he thought about the viability of maintaining multilateral nuclear sanctions against Iran if the United States decided to walk away from the nuclear deal that has just been agreed to between Iran and the international community.

It is important to note that former Secretary Paulson, a Republican, was in charge of administering the administration's sanctions under President George W. Bush during the period when the international community was just beginning to enact the current regime of punitive sanctions over Iran's nuclear ambitions.

This was his response, "It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this, with the five other parties, and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us."

Paulson also viewed as far-fetched the idea that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hard-line approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Again, Mr. Paulson said:

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal, that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

□ 2045

In fact, the former Treasury Secretary could barely hide his disdain for those who think they could strike a path to a better deal than one that has been reached.

Further, he said: "I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big, intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions."

He said: "You were deciding between doing something that objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable. So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea."

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 14, 2015]

REPUBLICAN AND FORMER TREASURY SECRETARY PAULSON SLAMS NAYSAYER OF IRAN DEAL

(By Karoun Demirjian)

Not many high-profile Republicans have anything nice to say about the Iran deal.

But former Treasury secretary Hank Paulson—the guy who was in charge of the government's sanctions operation under President George W. Bush, when the international community was just setting up this regime of punitive measures over Iran's nuclear ambitions—thinks at this point, it would be pretty ill-advised to back away.

"It's somewhere in between naive and unrealistic to assume that after we've, the United States of America, has negotiated something like this with the five other, you know, parties and with the whole world community watching, that we could back away from that—and that the others would go with us, or even that our allies would go with us," Paulson said during a forum sponsored by the Aspen Institute on Thursday night to discuss his new book on China.

"And unilateral sanctions don't work, okay?" Paulson continued. "They really have to be multilateral."

Paulson was responding to a question from the moderator of the event, who had asked what Paulson thought about the viability of maintaining sanctions against Iran, should the United States walk away from the agreement struck in Vienna last month. Congress will vote on that very question next month, but naysayers need a veto-proof, two-thirds majority in both houses to kill the deal—a formidable hurdle to clear.

In Congress and on the campaign trail, the critics of the deal—many, though not all of them Republicans—have been advocating ripping up the agreement and either leaving the U.S. sanctions in place or stepping them up to make the point to Iran and the international community that the United States means business. Some lawmakers, including Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), and candidates have even suggested that the United States could force other nations into lockstep on a more hardline approach to Iran by threatening them with secondary sanctions.

Paulson thinks that idea is farfetched.

"I think it's totally unrealistic to believe that if we backed out of this deal that the multilateral sanctions would stay in place," Paulson said. "I'm just trying to envision us sanctioning European banks or enforcing them, or Japanese banks, or big Chinese banks."

Sanctions against Iran have become far more extensive since Paulson left office. And Paulson's comments, delivered in a resort city in Colorado, may not carry that much weight among his GOP colleagues in Washington.

The former Goldman Sachs chief executive came to the Treasury Department in 2006 on the eve of a colossal financial crash and left

as a controversial figure for the policies he spearheaded. Since leaving that post, he has broken from the mainstream GOP party line to advocate for more attention to issues like climate change.

Even others in the Bush administration probably wouldn't agree with Paulson: His former boss, George W., advised against lifting Iran sanctions this spring.

But Iran sanctions are Paulson's wheelhouse, and while he didn't direct any darts toward specific politicians or give his own point-by-point assessment of the merits of the deal, Paulson's disdain for those who think they can strike a path to a better solution than the one reached in Vienna was apparent.

"I had a seat in Washington when we dealt with a big, intractable, messy problem, where there weren't any neat, beautiful, elegant solutions," Paulson said. "You were deciding between doing something that was objectionable or doing nothing at all, which could even be more objectionable."

"So I don't particularly like it when people criticize something that's big and important that's been done if they don't have a better idea," Paulson said.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, having said that, I would like to discuss a point that I do not think has been given enough attention yet in this debate. Iran could move in any direction over the next 15 years and the postagreement dynamics in Iran would play out in a number of ways. We are aware of the less benign scenarios.

There is also the scenario in which the agreement helps to amplify the voices of those in Iran who want peace in regional and international accommodation. I have hope with respect to this latter possibility, and I will tell you why.

It is because more than half the population of Iran today—almost 55 percent—is under 30 years old, and the youth unemployment rate is somewhere between 27 and 40 percent. I hope that these young people, given the opportunity to work, to achieve prosperity, and to live peacefully, will, in fact, help animate the kind of change in Iran that will, indeed, move it to become a responsible member of the world community.

This is a possibility that I urge Members to keep in mind when they vote on the resolution before us today.

I have no more time, but I would just urge my colleagues to support this important deal and agreement, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, to begin with, I would like to also submit later for the RECORD a letter by 200 retired generals and flag officers and admirals in terms of why they are opposed to this deal and why they feel it would make the national security challenges for the United States more problematic.

The second point I would make is that Nasrallah, who is the head of Hezbollah, says this about this deal:

Iran will become richer and wealthier and will also become more influential under the

deal reached this week. This will also reinforce the position of its allies. A stronger and wealthier Iran in the coming phase will be able to stand by its allies and especially the Palestinian resistance more than at any other time in history.

What does that mean? I can tell you what it means because, in 2006, when I chaired the Terrorism Subcommittee, we were in Haifa when Nasrallah was firing off the Iranian-made rockets with 90,000 ball bearings in the warheads into the town of Haifa; there were 600 victims inside the trauma hospitals, and now, Iran has transferred over 80,000 missiles.

What is it Nasrallah wants that he doesn't have currently? He wants guidance systems so that those missiles will hit targets, such as individual buildings in Tel Aviv, the airport, Jerusalem. That is what he needs. That is what Iran is telling Nasrallah it will provide.

It needs the hard currency and with this agreement will come the hard currency. It is also committed to restock the inventory that Hamas used when it fired off its rockets into Israel from Gaza and to rebuild the tunnels; all of this is what the Iranians seek to fund, but to do that, they need the sanctions lifted.

When they lift those sanctions, who is going to be the primary beneficiary? It is going to be people such as the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps that will be strengthened.

Look, Mr. Speaker, if this agreement goes through, Iran gets a cash bonanza. It gets a boost to its international standing. It gets a lighted path toward nuclear weapons. With sweeping sanctions relief, we have lessened our ability to challenge Iran's conduct across the board. As Iran grows stronger, we will be weaker to respond.

The question before us today is whether temporary constraints on Iran's nuclear program are worth the price of permanent sanctions relief. When I say the Revolutionary Guard is going to be the beneficiary, I say that because they are the ones that have taken over so many of the major companies in Iran and they are working to destabilize the entire Middle East.

That organization fuels the Assad regime in Syria today. Those rockets are being launched by the Quds Force into Israel. They are going to provide them with more weapons and more military personnel. That organization backs the Houthi rebels. There were 200 Quds Forces that were on the vanguard when they overthrew our ally in Yemen, and they overran that country.

It is responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq. The IRGC exports terrorism throughout that region. It holds sway over Iran's nuclear program. It brutally, brutally represses internal dissent, and as part of the Iranian agreement, the IRGC is going to be bolstered in a big way, and I will explain how else. It is

going to have the funds to build up its tanks, its fighter jets, and the intercontinental ballistic missiles.

The European sanctions on the elite Quds Forces—this is the group that does the political assassinations, assassinations outside Iran, and does the terrorist work outside of Iran—that is going to be lifted on the European side.

The administration signed off on these concessions. The deal will allow sales of aircraft and parts to Iranian airlines, which the Quds Force uses to move its people and weapons throughout the region. The IRGC controls key parts, as I said, of the Iranian economy—the largest construction companies, the telecom sector, shipping.

Ninety current and former IRGC officials and companies will be taken off the sanctions list as a result of this deal. Even sanctions on the head of Iran's elite Quds Force, General Soleimani, will be coming off. Soleimani had been involved in the plot to assassinate the Saudi Ambassador here in Washington, D.C.

While still under a UN travel ban, Soleimani traveled to Moscow on July 24, 10 days after the Iran nuclear agreement was announced, and he held meetings with the Russian Defense Minister and with President Vladimir Putin. Believe me, those meetings are about weapon systems, which the Russians want to sell to the Quds Force, to the Iranians.

The IRGC is the biggest sponsor of terror throughout the Middle East and even tried to carry out a terrorist attack here. Under the nuclear agreement, as Iran is reconnected to the global economy, the IRGC is going to be the biggest winner.

The agreement helps legitimize Soleimani and gives additional resources to the mastermind behind the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism and eyeing future weapon sales.

It was Russia that teamed up with Iran in the eleventh hour, after we thought this deal was done, to insist on one more thing, the lifting of the arms embargo. I just ask you: If they did that, whose side do you think Moscow is going to take when Iran tests this agreement?

Now, we talked a little bit about the younger generation in Iran. Yes, yes, 55 percent is under 30, but it is not those 55 percent under 30 that are going to be empowered. The ones holding the strings now—because of the way the Iranian economy works—are the generals, are the clerics. They are the ones that have taken over the companies.

When you have got \$60 billion to \$100 billion, depending upon whose figure you use, and you lift the escrow on that and that money goes back to Iran, it is their accounts that it is going to go into, and they are going to control the contracts going forward.

How is that going to liberalize the economy or work to the benefit of the

next generation in Iran? No, it makes it more certain that the tyranny that this theocracy imposes is going to be strengthened.

We reverse decades of bipartisan U.S. policy; we remove the Security Council resolutions against Iran's illicit nuclear program, and we okay Iran as a nuclear threshold state. That is what has been done here.

You and I know that, once that process is underway, Iran is going to produce nuclear weapons on an industrial scale when they are at the end of that process, unless they cheat before they get to the end of the process.

Secretary Kerry had previously said we do not recognize Iran's right to enrich and that there is no right to enrich in the NPT. However, this agreement legitimizes Iran's vast nuclear program, including its right to enriched uranium, which can be used to produce a nuclear warhead.

I guarantee you that everybody in the region is going to be looking at that and saying: We want the same agreement Iran had. We want that same exemption to the NPT.

After the agreement's temporary limits expire, Iran's nuclear program will be treated in the same manner as that of any other nonnuclear weapon state party to the NPT. Okay, so we are going to treat Iran like it is Holland, but it is not Holland. It has been caught cheating. That is why we are here. It has been caught cheating in the past, over and over, on their agreements.

Iran can have a peaceful nuclear program without the ability to enrich uranium. This is something we all understand. Many countries have this. It is this key bomb-making technology that is so objectionable.

We had no problem with the idea of letting them have a peaceful nuclear program; but why give up the right to enrich? Preventing the spread of this dangerous technology has been the foundation of our nonproliferation policy for decades.

As a result, over 20 countries have peaceful nuclear energy programs without a domestic enrichment program. In fact, buying fuel for nuclear power plants abroad from countries like Russia is much more cost effective than producing it domestically.

You have to ask: Why do they want to produce it domestically? If this agreement is allowed to go forward, the United States will recognize the ability of Iran, the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, to enrich uranium.

Despite claims to the contrary, this will set a dangerous precedent; it will greatly undermine longstanding U.S. efforts to restrict the spread of this key bomb-making technology. How can we tell our allies they can't have it if we do this?

If fully implemented, this agreement will destroy the Iran sanctions regime,

which this Congress has built up over decades, despite opposition from several administrations. We did that in Congress. We pushed this. The billions in sanctions relief that Iran will get will support its terrorist activity, and those billions are just a downpayment.

Under this agreement, European sanctions on the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and the leader of its elite Quds Force—Soleimani, again—are removed, and their job is to export the revolution. That means their job is to export terrorism.

General Dempsey—I will close with this—testified that Iranian militias, such as those trained and equipped by Soleimani, killed 500 U.S. soldiers in Iraq. Removing sanctions on Soleimani and the IRGC is so shocking that, when the deal was first announced, many thought that it was a mistake, thought that that was not the case.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, like my vote against the Iraq War, consideration of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) is one of the most consequential foreign policy votes I will take during my time in Congress. After careful consideration I have decided to support the JCPOA because it is the best way forward to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and advance the national security interests of the United States and our allies.

The intent of sanctions and these negotiations has always been to diplomatically cut off Iran's pathways to a nuclear weapon and to verifiably increase transparency of their nuclear activities. After reviewing the agreement and its classified documents, participating in classified briefings with Secretaries Kerry, Moniz, and Lew, and listening to the insights of experts on all sides, it is clear that this deal achieves these goals.

The JCPOA will ensure that Iran will not have the materials or capability to build a nuclear weapon and extends the breakout time for building a nuclear bomb from two or three months as it currently stands to at least a year. And if Iran violates the agreement, unprecedented international inspections will ensure we know about it and can automatically reinstate international sanctions.

In contrast, blocking this deal would allow Iran to resume its nuclear program with no restrictions or oversight, increasing the likelihood of military conflict and a regional nuclear weapons race—precisely the scenario sanctions were designed to prevent. Another costly war in the Middle East would put American lives at risk and undermine the security of our nation and our allies, including Israel.

There are no decisions I take more seriously than those that involve potentially sending Americans into harm's way. This is undeniably one of those decisions.

Under the JCPOA, every option is—and will remain—on the table, including military force. But as a Member of Congress I have a solemn obligation to ensure every diplomatic avenue is exhausted before military action is taken. That is why I opposed authorizing the Iraq War and why I support the JCPOA.

This is a pivotal moment. We must certainly remain vigilant in the years and decades to come to ensure the deal is strictly enforced and that Iran upholds its end of the bargain, but the terms of this agreement are strong, verifiable, and long-lasting.

The JCPOA is certainly not perfect, but perfect is not an option. Those who are urging the defeat of this deal have a responsibility to propose a viable alternative—yet no such alternative has been put forward.

While the risks of a nuclear armed Iran are unquestionably dire, there is simply no scenario in which these risks are reduced by rejecting this deal. This agreement is the best option available and it has my full support.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am in strong opposition to House Resolution 3461, the to Approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

The President's failed legacy to execute a strategy of peace through strength has resulted in mass murders throughout the Middle East. We have seen his failure to take action after Syria violated the President's declared "red line" and used chemical weapons against its citizens. We have seen it in his failure to recognize ISIL/DAESH as a significant threat to Americans, not as the "JV" team. When it comes to Middle East policy, the President has been dangerously inaccurate, putting American families at risk.

In South Carolina's Second District, I hosted three town hall meetings on the deal, and the response from my constituents was overwhelming—the American people know this deal is dangerous in the tradition of Neville Chamberlain.

This week's vote on the Iranian nuclear deal is of historic proportions. If allowed, this deal would economically and militarily reenergize a regime bent on the destruction of democracy all over the world. It will put the young people of Iran who seek change at risk. We must act immediately to stop this deal and vote against the Resolution of Approval.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to begin with a couple quotes from the President about the agreement:

"There is nothing more important to our security and to the world's stability than preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and ballistic missiles.

"It does not rely on trust. Compliance will be certified by the International Atomic Energy Agency."

Mr. Speaker, you would be forgiven if you thought I was quoting President Obama. However, I was quoting President Bill Clinton lauding his nuclear agreement with North Korea in 1994. Additionally he stated, "This agreement will help to achieve a longstanding and vital American objective: an end to the threat of nuclear proliferation on the Korean Peninsula."

Mr. Speaker, we now know that reality turned out to be very different. Despite assurances from President Clinton, the North Koreans violated the deal, began a clandestine program to enrich uranium and in 2006 conducted its first underground test of a nuclear weapon.

Once again we are told by a Democrat President that an agreement will prevent an

adversarial country from acquiring a nuclear weapon. We would be fools to believe that they will not violate the Obama agreement just as North Korea violated the Clinton agreement. The stakes here are even higher. Iran is a regime that will not hesitate to use nuclear weapons to achieve its long-stated goals: the destruction of both Israel and America.

The Iran Nuclear Deal that was agreed to by President Obama is wholly inadequate and unacceptable. The deal gives up-front, permanent sanctions relief to the Iranian mullahs and allows Iran to have an internationally recognized nuclear program after 15 years that could quickly produce a nuclear weapon.

Most laughable are the “anytime, anywhere” inspections. In fact, the agreement grants the Iranians 24 days to allow the IAEA access to undeclared nuclear facilities. This gives Iran ample opportunity to cheat and continue its march toward a nuclear weapon. We have also learned that the Iranians will be able to provide their own samples from their military base at Parchin to international inspectors. This is essentially asking the fox to guard the henhouse.

I also have great concerns about what happens once sanctions are lifted and billions of dollars are flowing back into Iran. While the UN Security Council resolutions allegedly prevent Iran from shipping arms to terrorist organizations such as Hamas and Hezbollah, and to Assad in Syria, nothing prevents them from sending money. In an incredibly dangerous concession, the U.S. even agreed to shorten the length of the arms embargo against Iran. There is no question that this will negatively impact regional stability as well as the U.S. Navy's access to the Persian Gulf. An article in the Washington Post pointed out that the funds available to Iran immediately upon implementation of this deal would equate to approximately 10% of its GDP. That would be equivalent to a \$1.7 trillion injection into our economy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this agreement will prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. I believe it will do just the opposite. In no way should a country that vows to wipe Israel off the map and chants “Death to America” be allowed nuclear capabilities. Today marks a turning point for the future of one of our greatest allies, Israel. If this deal goes through, President Obama and Democrats in Congress will own the consequences of allowing the Iranian regime to become a nuclear power.

We can and must have a better deal. A deal that truly allows for anytime/anywhere inspections. A deal that would keep restrictions on Iran's nuclear program for decades. A deal that forces Iran to end its missile development program. A deal that allows Iran truly limited enrichment capability. A deal that releases U.S. hostages in Iran. It is a catastrophic failure that President Obama did not insist on these provisions in the nuclear deal. We should be embarrassed that as the leader of the free world and the most powerful country on earth, this is the best deal President Obama could negotiate.

We have been presented with a false choice of accepting this deal or going to war. We should reject this deal and return to work, not to war. We cannot allow the sanctions to be

lifted, we must reject approval of the deal and we must have all the information—including side agreements—before the clock can begin on the deal. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally Israel and with the American people. The consequences of these votes are truly life and death.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, an Iran with a nuclear weapon would present an existential threat to Israel, destabilize the region and undermine U.S. security interests. This agreement is our best option for avoiding such a scenario. If Congress rejects this agreement, there is a high probability Iran will continue developing weapons grade plutonium and uranium.

That could result in American military action—something I believe we should avoid—and that the American people oppose. A U.S. strike would be costly, causing loss of life on both sides—and could lead to attacks on Israel. Yet, it would only postpone Iran's nuclear weapons development by a few years.

Clearly, a strong, enforceable diplomatic solution is superior. Let's be clear—this agreement is enforceable. The monitoring and inspection provisions are more intrusive than any previous agreement. Most importantly, they will prevent Iran from producing fissionable material without the international community knowing.

There are some who suggest that even with this agreement Iran might still acquire nuclear weapons in the long term. While some provisions of this agreement are indeed time limited and the world will need to revisit this issue, this agreement remains our best chance of thwarting the immediate threat. Many estimates suggest Iran is two to three months away from acquiring a nuclear weapon—and this agreement addresses that very imminent threat.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard from constituents on all sides of the issue. I respect the opinions of those who do not support it. However, I believe this agreement is our best option.

Support the agreement. Vote yes.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise after careful consideration and review of the Joint-Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) and would like to extend my full support of the deal negotiated between Iran and the P5+1 countries. This historical agreement between the United States, China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, plus Germany, is in the best interest of our country, our major ally in the Middle East, and the global community.

The agreement, which will face Congressional scrutiny, has won endorsement by more than one hundred former American diplomats. The group that contains Republicans and Democrats described the deal, negotiated by Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Energy Dr. Ernest J. Moniz as a “landmark agreement.” It would make no sense to reject this diplomatic movement towards stability and peace in the region.

Twenty-nine top American scientists have also endorsed the deal, noting that it will “advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East, and can serve as a guidepost for future nonproliferation agreements.” The group of scientists includes six Noble Laureates. In a letter to President Barack Obama,

they pointed out that Iran was only “a few weeks away” from having fuel for nearby weapons. The agreement would stop Iran's nuclear program, the scientists wrote.

In the JCPOA, Iran agrees that it will not develop or acquire a nuclear weapon. The deal also includes a permanent ban on Iran's development of key nuclear weapon components and is based on four clear objectives; blocking the highly enriched uranium route, allowing no path to plutonium, intensive monitoring, and incentives for compliance.

Without the agreement, there will be no restraints on Iran's nuclear program. There will more than likely be an arms race to acquire and develop nuclear weapons by various nations in the Middle East. Such a climate would not be in the best interest of our country, and certainly not in the best interests of our ally, Israel, and the global community.

It is my firm belief that if this deal is not implemented due to a Congressional blockade, we risk devastating military conflict. I am hopeful that we can continue on this trajectory of peace and diplomacy as opposed to an unavoidable nuclear arms race and armed conflict in the region. As we move to the next phase and allow Congress to study and debate this agreement, we must listen to the non-proliferation experts who have worked tirelessly to move the deal forward. I urge my Congressional colleagues to support the deal. It would be negligent to walk away from a nuclear deal at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

□ 2100

IN MEMORY OF ELANOR BENSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized as the designee of the majority leader for half of the time remaining before 10 p.m., approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CARTER), my good friend.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

Mr. CARTER of Texas. I thank my friend from Arizona for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having a really great conversation here, and I

hope that everyone who has the responsibility of casting a vote on this so-called deal that the President has brought us has been listening very closely.

Mr. Speaker, the President wants Congress to approve what I would call an absurd deal that eases the path for an avowed enemy of the United States of America's and our allies to unleash a nightmare on the world.

I want us to take a look—and I ask the supporters of this deal to take a look—at what Iran has done to merit our trust.

We first saw these guys way back in the Carter administration when they stormed our American Embassy and took our people hostage and held those people for, I believe it was, 42 days. They abused them in every way they could think of. Quite honestly, they finally released them after pressure was placed on them. Since that time, I cannot think of a single instance where dealing with Iran has been a positive thing. In fact, let's look at the public face they put on.

They still chant "death to America." I heard them chant "death to America" last night on television and "death to Israel," one of our allies. They still support terror groups, and we just heard from the chairman of the committee of all of the terror groups that they will be able to support after this deal is done. They are still governed by cabal fanatics who are hell-bent on spreading their perverted view of their faith.

Now, is this a nation we should choose to strike a deal with—to make a nuclear deal?

To those people who say they support this, I would like you to make sure you have confidence in the people we are making a deal with. I don't know what the rest of the world calls a deal, but, generally, when you are making a deal, both sides have some kind of benefit. I can see all kinds of things that we are giving to these folks, to Iran, including a big bucketful of money—billions of dollars. Basically, we have given them everything that they desired as far as going forward. Our inspections are questionable.

My question is: What is the United States of America getting out of this deal?

We are getting a promise from a regime that has a long history—almost 50 years—of lying whenever it serves their purpose. We are taking their word that they are going to do certain things, and we are getting nothing else from this bill but their word.

Think about the cost if this is not the right deal. Those of you who are really thinking about America, think about the cost. To make a mistake on this vote is, quite honestly, catastrophic. Then there is the horror that would come to pass if they actually were to detonate a nuclear device if,

for some reason, our failure to do the right thing caused them to get on the fast track to get their hands on it. The blood will be on the hands of those who didn't take the time to decide: Are these trustworthy people for us to be dealing with? I would argue, they have no track record by which to argue that they are trustworthy.

Tomorrow's vote is probably as important a vote as anyone in this Chamber will ever take because it is a vote that could unleash nuclear war in the Middle East as a result of our failure to cut a real deal. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to think about this—to stand with America, to stand with Israel, to stand with those who oppose state sponsors of terrorism, and to oppose President Obama's irresponsible and dangerous Iran agreement.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. I thank Judge CARTER.

Mr. Speaker, this is something I, actually, have never done; but have you ever had one of those moments in your life when you want to come to the microphone and share it with whom-ever is willing to listen?

This has been a tough few days here. Many of us, as we come to these microphones, have these heavy hearts because we are fearful that what is going on around us may be one of those momentous moments where we remember this for the rest of our lives, where it is one of those votes—one of those debates—where you affect the world. There is another side to this on a personal basis where you realize how incredibly honored, lucky, blessed you are to get to be behind this microphone.

Last week, a woman from my community passed away. We all in our lives have those handfuls of people who actually make a difference and affect our lives. She is partially responsible for my being behind this microphone.

A woman named Elanor Benson, from Fountain Hills, died last week—I believe at age 95—and she changed my life. I was a 20-, 21-, maybe 22-year-old kid. I was selling real estate in our little town as a way to finance my way through Arizona State University at night. She, in her retirement at that age, decided to take on another job at our little office.

She sat me down, and she knew I had an interest in conservative politics. I still to this day remember her looking at me and saying: "DAVID, I like you. You are going to be the next president of the local Republican club." I tried to explain to her there was no way I would have time for such a thing, and she looked at me and said: "Don't worry. I will help."

This is a woman who moved to our little community on the side of Scottsdale, I believe, in the late seventies, and had such an impact. For years, I used to believe maybe a third of the town—half the town—had become in-

involved in politics, mostly Republican politics, because of her passion, her energy. You could not stop her.

She got me to be president of the local club and stood by me when I did dumb things and applauded me when I did good things and scolded me when I didn't say the right things and walked me through how to be more sensitive instead of being so caffeinated, which is a family problem.

I realized, in the chaos of doing this job, that I failed to tell her how much I loved her and how much she affected my life, because I don't believe I would be here today if it weren't for Elanor Benson, who not only changed my life but who, actually, I believe—with her work at the Fountain Hill Chamber of Commerce, her work for so many causes, her work for her church—made my community a much, much better place. We are all better in our part of Arizona because of her life. It was a life well lived. It was a long life. She was beautiful to the day she passed, and I wish I had let her know how much we cared.

So, Elanor, if you are out there, thank you. Thank you for changing my life. Thank you for making my community a better one.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IN MEMORY OF HELEN BURNS JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, Scripture says that you shall know the tree by the fruit that it bears. A good tree bears good fruit. Strong trees bring forth strong fruit. Loving trees bear loving fruit.

Mr. Speaker, what then is to be said about a tree whose fruit is a respected and courageous freedom fighter?

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of a great woman of distinction, Helen Burns Jackson, the mother of renowned Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson, Sr., who is the founder of the Rainbow PUSH Coalition that is based in the First Congressional District of Illinois.

□ 2115

Mother Burns Jackson, Mr. Speaker, was the epitome of a strong, good, fruit-bearing tree.

She made her transition from life to eternity on September 7, 2015, after a lengthy illness. She was surrounded by her loving family and her friends.

A native of Greenville, South Carolina, Ms. Burns Jackson instilled in her children a sense of dignity, self-respect, and loving justice in the face of the inhumane treatment of African Americans in the segregated South.

Born in 1925, she endured the hardships of poverty, the hardships of racism, to raise two sons of great accomplishment, great distinction, an American hero and civil rights legend, the Reverent Jesse Louis Jackson, Senior, and the Motown music phenomenon Charles Jackson. A gifted singer of world renowned.

Mrs. Burns Jackson herself was a singer and dancer, and she passed on a scholarship to a great college to raise her two sons.

Her life, Mr. Speaker, was the quintessential American story of overcoming the odds with an unbreakable will and a deep, abiding faith.

She planted the seeds of courage, the seeds of perseverance, and the seeds of hope in Reverend Jackson and in his brother, Charles.

Reverend Jackson would go on to not only free American hostages, but became the freedom fighter for those who are oppressed and those who are poor all around this globe.

It is on this very day, September 10, 2015, that I rise before the House of Representatives to pay tribute to this beautiful and extraordinary Movement mother.

Mrs. Jackson was a cosmetologist by profession, and she was known as a towering pillar of her community. Her home became the central station of the civil rights movement.

Mr. Speaker, she often provided me with great encouragement when she traveled to Chicago to visit her son and his family.

As a young activist, I certainly was inspired by her words of wisdom. As a young activist, she inspired me to commit myself to serving others.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that trees are the Earth's endless efforts to nurture life. Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson was a beautiful tall tree among all of us who has returned to the heavenly glory of her God, our God Almighty.

Her spirit lives not only in her children, her grandchildren, and in her great-grandchildren, but her spirit also lives in the righteous fruits that may be found in those of us who were touched by the endless love, the great kindness, the great grace, and the tremendous wisdom of Ms. Helen Burns Jackson.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of the First Congressional District and on behalf of my loving wife, Carolyn, we pay tribute to this remarkable and special woman, this great tree, this inspiration to all of us, Ms. Helen Burns Jackson. She is indeed a mother of the movement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the

gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a wonderful tribute from a man that knows courage. He has it, he has shown it, and he knows what it is to stand up for what he believes in.

A lot of great examples have served in this body, and that is what we need right now. We face as important an issue as we have had, certainly since I have been here, and possibly decades.

A deal with the devil is what it comes down to, a deal with what Ronald Reagan would say is evil. It makes the evil empire of the Soviet Union pale in comparison to the evil that Iran's leaders have perpetuated, and this administration has done a deal with them.

Chairman ED ROYCE has eloquently pointed out that Iran has violated every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

So wouldn't it fill the definition of insanity if another deal is entered by what used to be the lone superpower with the one and only country in existence right now in the world that has broken every agreement it has entered since 1979?

If someone were standing back as a historian and looking at what is going on right now and were totally objective, he or she would probably say: Well, it looks like the fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. They have made a deal with sheer evil. These evil leaders have lied. They have broken every agreement they have ever entered, and these fools running the United States are going to get what they deserve. It is going to happen again. People are going to die in greater numbers than ever before.

What grieves me more than anything is what seems to be the idea of some in the House and Senate that: Gee, since Iran is going to get nuclear weapons, surely they are going to cheat. They are going to get them. They are going to get them sooner rather than later. This deal is not going to allow anybody to stop them.

So what is important here is to provide political cover to Republicans. We can do that by acting like we are fighting real hard in the House, acting like we are fighting real hard in the Senate. Then we lose.

Then when Iran gets nukes and kills hundreds of thousands or millions of people, you say: See, we told you. We did what we could. But the trouble is that is not good enough because lives in this country and in the nation of Israel are all at stake here.

We have been told that: Gee, the 15 nations heading up the U.N. Security Council, they have agreed; so, it should be binding against the United States.

That argument was attempted to be made by the Secretary of State and the President himself, that: Gee, we have

to go along because the U.N. has already voted.

Well, yeah, that would be true if there were not something called the United States Constitution under which our first President under the Constitution took office in 1789.

And since this has been in effect—our U.S. Constitution, Article II, Section 2, second paragraph, has been in effect, he, talking about the President, shall have power by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to make treatise, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur. It is very clear.

And we also know it is very clear that you cannot have a treaty like the Non-Proliferation Treaty. The international agreement that was lauded by so many over such a long period of time—you cannot amend an international treaty like that unless it is with another treaty. You cannot amend that with an executive agreement. You cannot amend that with an agreement that is nonbinding.

Therefore, it is exceedingly clear that what the President and Secretary Kerry and Wendy Sherman that did such a good job helping with the North Korea deal so they got nuclear weapons—they say it is not a treaty. But absolutely it is a treaty.

So if we are going to uphold our oath of office, we have to acknowledge that this is a treaty and implore the Senate to announce that, even though the President has not submitted this treaty to them for ratification under Article II, since it is a treaty, they had the power to bring it up.

And, yes, there is a convenient Senate rule called cloture that HARRY REID actually suspended numerous times in the matter of some confirmations so they could get judges on the bench that would uphold whatever interpretation of the Constitution this administration cared to bring before them.

But there is a time when the Republicans in the Senate must say: You know what. This is too important to let a gaggle of minority Senators from the minority party keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. We are not going to let a rule that we make, that we put in place, that we can suspend, keep us from having a vote on the most important bill of our time, the treaty with Iran.

So the Senate can suspend, as HARRY REID did, the cloture rule with a vote of 51 Senators. Once they have the 51 that suspend cloture in this Iranian treaty, then bring the treaty to the floor for a ratification vote, it will not get two-thirds.

And then, once and for all time, it will be clear to everyone, except perhaps the President and Secretary Kerry—it will be very clear, as it is to constitutional law professors I have talked to—that we are not bound by the Iranian treaty with the only country in the world that has broken every

international agreement they have had since 1979.

□ 2130

The resolution that I had filed with numerous great cosponsors, it points out that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015—that is the Corker-Cardin bill—does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action regarding Iran—that is the Iran treaty—submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, because the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is a treaty, and pursuant to article II of the United States Constitution, the Senate must give its advice and consent to ratification if the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is to be effective and binding upon the United States.

It also states—because it is a fact—on March 11, 2015, Secretary of State John Kerry, in describing the administration's nuclear negotiations with Iran, clearly stated that it was “not negotiating a legally binding plan” with Iran, and therefore, it does not have to be submitted to Congress.

If it were not legally binding, then, no, Secretary Kerry and the President do not have to submit it to Congress; but the President and the Secretary of State have already given this facade, this charade away because they have already said: Well, gee, if Congress doesn't go along with it, we will be in breach of the agreement because the U.N. has already voted on it.

A-ha. You said it wasn't legally binding what you were negotiating, and now, you are telling us that is not true.

I mean, it conjures up memories of other statements like: “If you like your insurance, you can keep it. If you like your doctor, you can keep it.” It conjures up sermons by this administration and this President how we had to take out Qadhafi out of Libya for stability of the area, that it would make the place so much better in North Africa.

We saw what happened. Qadhafi would not have been removed without President Obama bombing on behalf of the rebels that were infused with al Qaeda that would end up ultimately attacking our consulate in Benghazi and killing four Americans.

We now see, as I did last week when I was in north Africa, this President, this State Department have created massive instability across north Africa. It has put tens of millions of people in fear. What do you think this crazy migration started from?

It started from the policies of this President in declaring that something that they love calling the Arab Spring but ended up becoming a cold, harsh killer of a winter was going to be helped along by the United States.

Some in north Africa reminded me of our President's statement that President Mubarak had to go. The President declared he has to go. He interfered

with what was going on in Egypt. He interfered with an ally, not a great guy at all. He created massive instability that allowed the Muslim Brother Morsi to take over. Yes, he was elected. Yes, as confirmed again this past week, there were plenty of fraudulent votes. He alleged to have 12 million or so votes.

After a year as President of usurping the power under the Constitution, totally disregarding the Constitution, taking powers that weren't his, moving to become dictator, over 30 million Egyptians rose up, went to the street. These were moderate Muslims; these were secularists, Christians, Jews that came to the streets and said, with one accord, one heart, one voice: We don't want radical Islamists running Egypt.

Our Muslim friends in Afghanistan in the Northern Alliance said the same thing. We don't want radical Islamists running Afghanistan, but the Egyptian people did it on their own. It may have been the greatest peaceful—it was the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of man. There have never been that many people peacefully demonstrating.

What was not peaceful was the Muslim Brotherhood because they want the world caliphate. They thought they were on the way with the help of President Obama. They were taking Libya. They felt like they were taking Algeria, Tunisia, and come on around north Africa and the Middle East, they were on their way to that world caliphate they were promising they would have, the same world caliphate that the former adviser to the Secretary of Homeland Security here in the United States tweeted out after another American had his head cut off that the international caliphate was inevitable, Americans just needed to get used to the idea, a man that I had been warning was a Muslim Brother and was a top adviser in this administration and needed to be out.

Finally, after he made it clear to even the most dense in this administration that he was in favor of an international caliphate, finally, they had to let him finish his term and let him go by retiring.

Well, the President is still getting that kind of advice, and the truth is that it is a disaster. It has done so much damage to this country. Those who say this is a great deal are the same people that said we had to remove Qadhafi. It created massive instability. It created a situation where you have so many deaths as people try to flee from north Africa.

Where do you think they are coming from? What do you think laid the groundwork for this? It was this President's intervention in Libya, this President's meddling in Egypt.

We heard the President himself say on national television—international television because ISIS heard it, that

ISIS is junior varsity, they are JV. I played on the JV, and I played on the varsity, and there is a vast difference. ISIS knew there was a difference. This President did not.

He said, if we could just arm the vetted moderate Syrian rebels, that everything would be fine in Syria. We have seen that he has created more chaos. He has created tens of thousands of more refugees because of his failed policies born out of massive ignorance—or somebody that is advising him is not ignorant, they know what they are doing—but it is setting the Middle East and north Africa, figuratively speaking, on fire and, in many cases, literally speaking.

We heard over and over of instances where the President's vetted moderate Syrian rebels that we spent millions and millions and millions of dollars training and arming, they kept having all that incredibly upgraded equipment taken over by ISIS. I have been over there. I met with the Kurdish commanders. They are begging for up-armored equipment so they can at least have some way to stay on the battlefield with ISIS that this President has armed through the so-called vetted Syrian moderate rebels.

Well, we heard tonight that Madeleine Albright thinks this is a good deal. Well, wow, I feel so much better that Secretary Albright that said, along with Wendy Sherman, that helped negotiate the deal with Iran, that, Gee, the key to keeping North Korea from having nuclear weapons is to give them nuclear power plants, give them the nuclear material they need because they are willing to promise, in writing, that they won't develop nuclear material or nuclear weapons if we will do all that for them. Well, that didn't work out so well.

People advising this President that were part of the advice—and we hear Madeleine Albright thinks that is a good deal? Then if there was any doubt in any Republican's mind—I don't think there is—but any doubt in any Republican's mind just how horrendous this deal is, that had to be completely dispelled tonight when we heard from our friend on the Democratic side that Hank Paulson, the former Secretary of the Treasury, thinks this is the thing to do.

This is the guy that gave us TARP. This is the guy that said when we asked, Well, if you don't know how much mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion, and in our conference call with other Republicans, the answer to that question was, Well, we just needed a really big number.

That is the guy that we are told, tonight, is assuring us that this deal with Iran is the way to go.

On August 6, 2015, White House press secretary Josh Earnest, at a White House press briefing, stated: “We don't

need Congress to approve this Iran nuclear deal.”

On July 28, 2015, Secretary Kerry, at a hearing before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, stated the reason why the Iran nuclear agreement is not considered a treaty is because it has become physically impossible to pass a treaty through the United States Senate anymore. It has become impossible to schedule. It has become impossible to pass.

Two days after Secretary Kerry testified to that, that that was the reason he didn't bring this treaty as a treaty, well, the United States formally ratified the amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material when Henry S. Ensher, the Department of State's Ambassador to the International Atomic Energy Agency, delivered the United States' instruments of ratification to the IAEA. Whoops—it turns out Secretary Kerry's testimony was not true. I don't think he lied. I just think he was that ignorant.

On June 4, 2015, less than 2 months before Secretary Kerry testified it had become physically impossible for the Senate to ratify treaties, he stated the Department of State is “preparing the instruments of ratification of several important treaties” and that he wants “to personally thank the U.S. Congress for their efforts on the implementing legislation for the nuclear securities treaties.”

Well, I don't think he was lying or ignorant. I just think he forgot that he had just thanked us for passing these treaties—or at least the Senate for ratifying these treaties. He forgot that he had just done that when he said it is physically impossible to ratify a treaty anymore.

May 7, 2015, the Senate held a vote on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, commonly referred to as the Corker-Cardin bill, in which every Senator voted on that bill with the understanding that the Iran nuclear agreement was an executive agreement, not a treaty, and the United States' sanctions on Iran's ballistic missile program would remain in place.

The Corker-Cardin bill actually states:

It is the sense of Congress that United States sanctions on Iran for ballistic missiles will remain in place under an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States.

The Corker-Cardin bill was intended as a review of the application of statutory sanctions against only Iran's nuclear program. The Corker-Cardin bill prescribes a process for congressional review only of “agreements with Iran related to the nuclear program of Iran.”

Under subsection (b) and (c) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, lawmakers may resolve to ap-

prove, disapprove, or take no action on nuclear agreements with Iran.

Under section 135(d) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by the Corker-Cardin bill, it calls for “congressional oversight of Iranian compliance with nuclear agreements.”

It is pretty easy to recall for those of us with a half-decent memory that actually, under the bill, the treaty being proposed by this administration, the Iran treaty actually doesn't allow Congress oversight.

□ 2145

Not only does it not allow Congress the oversight, it says the IAEA is going to have oversight, not Congress, and we don't even know the arrangement that has been negotiated or is being negotiated between the IAEA and Iran.

But we do know this. My friends across the aisle said in debate today—and I was amazed that this statement would be made—that if Iran cheats, we will know it. That was a quote from one of my friends across the aisle.

Well, if Iran cheats, we won't know it. We don't even know if the IAEA has a decent agreement. But we know this. Iran has made clear they will not allow the IAEA inspectors to go to their military sites. They made that clear in every communication they have had since this treaty came forward. And then we find out, actually, Iran has said: We are going to provide samples to you.

Oh, so, as my Democratic friend said, if Iran cheats, we will know it. What that means is when Iran cheats, they are going to bring samples from the area they won't let the IAEA inspect and say: Here are the samples that let you know we cheated, because our Democratic friends in Congress knew if we cheated, we would let you know we are cheating.

Seriously? Is that how naive this government has gotten?

We were told in debate by a Democratic friend that it would have been a mistake to demand the release of U.S. hostages. Oh, yeah, that would have been a mistake, that before we enter any negotiation, they have to show good faith by releasing the hostages so that we know that they are a country with whom we can deal? Of course that was the right thing to do.

And \$100 billion to \$150 billion going to Iran under this deal is more money than we have given or used to help Israel with since Israel came into being again in the late 1940s. And yet we are going to give it not to our close ally Israel. We are going to give it to their worst enemy that has even said this past week that they were plotting to overthrow Israel. This week they have said that they are plotting to overthrow Israel, and they are coming for the United States.

I have heard people, I believe, Mr. Speaker, wrongly compare Neville

Chamberlain to the current situation that the President and Secretary Kerry have proposed. I would submit that that is a grossly unfair comparison for Neville Chamberlain, because at the time Neville Chamberlain had that paper that he got Hitler to sign that caused him to say, “This is peace for our time”—a lot of papers messed it up and said “peace in our time”; he said “peace for our time”—at the time Chamberlain did that, Hitler had not violated every international agreement he had entered. He hadn't done that. Iran has.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said, “This is peace for our time,” Hitler had not been saying, “Death to England”; “death to France”; “death to the countries in Europe.” He had not been saying that. Iranian leaders have been, including the Ayatollah.

At the time Neville Chamberlain said this agreement means “peace for our time,” Hitler had not publicly stated he was plotting the overthrow of any of the countries in the area. Iran has. They are plotting the overthrow of Israel and to take out the United States.

Our friend TOM COLE said in the Rules Committee this week that he was concerned that this agreement will cause an arms race, and he is exactly right. That was confirmed again this past week as I was over there talking to people that know in the Egyptian Government.

The Saudis are already working a deal to buy nukes. The Saudis know they have got to have them because Iran is going to have them under this Iranian treaty if we don't stop the treaty.

You stop the treaty by the Senate voting on it as a treaty and not getting to two-thirds. That means it is not binding against the United States. Other countries in the area—Jordan, Egypt, even Libya, Lebanon, and all these countries—know they are going to have to have nukes if they are going to survive the area.

It is going to create the proliferation of nuclear weapons like there has never been in the world. And as someone said, mutually assured destruction with Russia was a deterrent, but with Iran, it is an incentive.

This is such a dangerous time. But the Iranian treaty amends the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in several places. You can't amend a treaty unless you are amending it with another treaty.

This is a treaty the Senate needs to step up and say it is a treaty. And for heaven's sake, this is far more important a situation where we suspend the cloture rule so that we do not allow a small segment of radicals supporting Iran to keep us from voting on the most important bill of our time. And then vote, and when you don't get two-thirds it is not ratified.

What the House is doing this week is actually not a bad strategy for the House because, as a treaty, we don't get a vote. But if we stand idly by and let the President treat it as if it has been ratified, then Israel will have to defend itself. Under the Iranian treaty, we will have to defend Iran, not Israel, and the unthinkable will happen, and that is the United States and Iran will be on the same side against Israel. We have got to stop that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 349. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to empower individuals with disabilities to establish their own supplemental needs trusts; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers; to the Committee on Homeland Security; in addition, to the Committee on Armed Services for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2654. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Organization; Mergers, Consolidations, and Charter Amendments of Banks or Associations (RIN: 3052-AC72) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2655. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David A. Dunaway, United States Navy, and his ad-

vancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2656. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William M. Faulkner, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2657. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas J. Robb, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2658. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Theodore C. Nicholas, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2659. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark F. Ramsay, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2660. A letter from the OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Limitations on Terms of Consumer Credit Extended to Service Members and Dependents [DOD-2013-OS-0133] (RIN: 0790-AJ10) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2661. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Richard P. Mills, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2662. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Moises Deltoro III and Captain Cedric E. Pringle, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2663. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General James C. Slife, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general and Colonel Paul E. Bauman, United States Air Force, to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2664. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Inventory of Contracted Services for Fiscal Year 2014 report for the Military Departments, Defense Agencies, and Department of Defense Field Activities, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2665. A letter from the Assistant, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Major final rule — Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards [Regulation H, Docket No.: R-1498] (RIN: 7100 AE-22) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2666. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Updating Regulations Governing HUD Fees and the Financing of the Purchase and Installation of Fire Safety Equipment in FHA-Insured Healthcare Facilities [Docket No.: FR-5632-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ27) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2667. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2015-2017 Enterprise Housing Goals (RIN: 2590-AA65) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2668. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's Major final rule — Derivatives (RIN: 3133-AD90) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2669. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Chartering and Field of Membership Manual (RIN: 3133-AE31) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2670. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting a letter stating that the National Telecommunications and Information Administration intends to exercise the first option in the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority functions contract to extend the period of performance for one year to September 30, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2671. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Listing of Color Additives Exempt From Certification; Spirulina Extract [Docket No.: FDA-2014-C-1552] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2672. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's Twentieth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to Sec. 1810 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2673. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's "2014/2015 Economic Dispatch and Technological Change" report to Congress, in response to Secs. 1234 and 1832 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2674. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of

Defense, transmitting Reports for the third quarter of FY 2015, April 1, 2015 — June 30, 2015, developed in accordance with Secs. 36(a) and 26(b) of the Arms Export Control Act; the March 24, 1979, Report by the Committee on Foreign Affairs (H. Rept. 96-70), and the July 31, 1981, Seventh Report by the Committee on Government Operations (H. Rept. 97-214) are provided by request; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2675. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting a notice of Proposed Letter of Offer and Acceptance to the Government of the United Kingdom for defense articles and services, pursuant to Sec. 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, Pub. L. 94-329, Transmittal No.: 15-50; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2676. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to the Export Administration Regulations: Removal of Special Comprehensive License Provisions [Docket No.: 140613501-5698-02] (RIN: 0694-AG13) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2677. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 7, 2015 Extension of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 150813713-5713-01] (RIN: 0694-AG71) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2678. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report as required by Sec. 181 of the 1992-93 Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Pub. L. 102-138, concerning Employment of U.S. Citizens by Certain International Organizations in 2014; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2679. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2680. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; Recreational Fishing Restrictions for Pacific Bluefin Tuna [Docket No.: 150305219-5619-02] (RIN: 0648-BE78) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2681. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Bigeye Tuna Catch Limits in Longline Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.:

150619537-5615-01] (RIN: 0648-BF19) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2682. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE007) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2683. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Revision to Prohibited Species Regulations [Docket No.: 150112035-5658-02] (RIN: 0648-BE80) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2684. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2015 Management Measures; Correction [Docket No.: 150316270-5662-02] (RIN: 0648-XD843) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2685. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's emergency rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibited Species Catch; Emergency Rule [Docket No.: 150629564-5564-01] (RIN: 0648-BF24) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2686. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a copy of the report "Tribal Crime Data Collection Activities, 2015", as required by Sec. 302(g) of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Street Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3732(g), as added by Sec. 251(b)(5) of the Tribal Law and Order Act of 2010 (Title II of Pub. L. 111-211); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2687. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Denied Access to NASA Facilities (2015-N002) (RIN: 2700-AE14) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2688. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards (RIN: 2700-AE18) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2689. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Allocation of W-2 Wages in a Short Taxable Year and in an Acquisition or Disposition [TD 9731] (RIN: 1545-BM11) received September 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2690. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Mission Support Directorate, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's direct final rule — Duty Free Entry of Space Articles [Docket No.: NASA-2015-0006] (RIN: 2700-AD99) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2691. A letter from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's "2015 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program", pursuant to Sec. 231 of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KLINE: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 511. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act; with an amendment (Rept. 114-260). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ISSA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3470. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RUTZ, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. BARR, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida):

H.R. 3471. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements in the provision of automobiles and adaptive equipment by the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mrs. BLACKBURN,

Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. COLE, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. BUCK, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SALMON, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the provisions of title 40, United States Code, commonly known as the Davis-Bacon Act, to raise the threshold dollar amount of contracts subject to the prevailing wage requirements of such provisions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to prohibit limitations on certain grants due to standards for covered farm vehicles and drivers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PASCRELL:

H.R. 3474. A bill to establish additional protections and disclosures for students and co-signers with respect to student loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Ms. BASS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to assist in the support of children living in poverty by allowing a refundable credit to grandparents of those children for the purchase of household items for the benefit of those children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. DELAUNO, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 3476. A bill to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to provide for an increase in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2016 and 2017, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477. A bill to enhance and integrate Native American tourism, empower Native American communities, increase coordination and collaboration between Federal tourism assets, and expand heritage and cultural tourism opportunities in the United States; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478. A bill to release wilderness study areas administered by the Bureau of Land Management in Luna and Hidalgo Counties, New Mexico that are not suitable for wilderness designation from continued manage-

ment as de facto wilderness areas; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MACARTHUR (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey):

H.R. 3479. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for developing and implementing plans to address non-point source pollution affecting nationally significant estuaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia (for himself and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3480. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481. A bill to require States to report to the Attorney General certain information regarding shooting incidents involving law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to implement various reforms to the social security disability insurance program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KILDEE (for himself and Ms. DUCKWORTH):

H.R. 3483. A bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into certain leases at the Department of Veterans Affairs West Los Angeles Campus in Los Angeles, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from participating in, or intervening in (including the publishing or distributing of statements), any political campaign; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486. A bill to reauthorize and amend the program of block grants to States for temporary assistance for needy families and related programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487. A bill to make the antitrust laws applicable to professional sports leagues that use, or promote or allow member teams or franchisees to use, the term "Redskins" or the term "Redskin"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, with respect to vehicle weight limitations applicable to the Interstate System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 3489. A bill to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addi-

tion to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PASCRELL (for himself and Mr. KING of New York):

H. Res. 414. A resolution expressing support for the designation of September 2015 as "Campus Fire Safety Month"; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H. Res. 415. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that regular order should be restored in the House and Senate; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SIMPSON (for himself, Mr. COLE, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. GOSAR, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BURGESS, and Mr. HARPER):

H. Res. 416. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives recognizing community water fluoridation as one of the great public health initiatives on its 70th anniversary; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

120. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution requesting the U.S. State Department and the U.S. Secretary of State to pursue a multilateral approach to promptly address the potential crisis in the Dominican Republic that could render tens of thousands of Dominicans of Haitian descent stateless; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

121. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to a resolution reaffirming the friendship between the Commonwealth and Taiwan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3470.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. WALORSKI:

H.R. 3471.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina:

H.R. 3472.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. BARLETTA:

H.R. 3473.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PASCARELL:

H.R. 3474.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VEASEY:

H.R. 3475.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3476.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

By Mr. MULLIN:

H.R. 3477.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have Power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 3478.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution of the United States grants Congress the power to enact this law.

By Mr. MACARTHUR:

H.R. 3479.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. CARTER of Georgia:

H.R. 3480.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas:

H.R. 3481.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Constitutional Authority—Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. I, Sec. 8, Clause 18)

THE U.S. CONSTITUTION
ARTICLE I, SECTION 8: POWERS OF CONGRESS

CLAUSE 18

The Congress shall have power . . . To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof

By Mr. GRAVES of Missouri:

H.R. 3482.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

" . . . and provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States . . ."

" . . . to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers . . ."

This legislation seeks to reform the Social Security Disability Insurance program. Therefore, it will affect the general welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3483.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3484.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the Constitution of the United States

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3485.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 3486.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clauses 1 and 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3487.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. RIBBLE:

H.R. 3488.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3489.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 167: Mr. LAMALFA and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 169: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 191: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 192: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 205: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 206: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 228: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 232: Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 239: Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. PAL-LONE, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 248: Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 282: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 300: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 304: Mr. LOEBACK and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 342: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 407: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 437: Mr. RENACCI and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 448: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 511: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mrs. ROBY.

H.R. 538: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 540: Mr. MULVANEY.

H.R. 546: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 556: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 563: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 572: Mr. COURTNEY.

H.R. 583: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 592: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. BUCHSON, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 602: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 605: Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 619: Mr. PASCARELL.

H.R. 680: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 691: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 692: Mr. GUTHRIE and Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 702: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. BURGESS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 703: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 748: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 771: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 775: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 799: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 815: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 828: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 829: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 841: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 863: Mr. BUCHANAN and Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 865: Mr. WENSTRUP.

H.R. 879: Mr. WOMACK and Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 885: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 912: Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 928: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.

H.R. 932: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 940: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 969: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. VELA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. KELLY of Illinois.

H.R. 985: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 990: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1016: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1057: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.

H.R. 1062: Mr. TURNER and Mr. WESTERMAN.

H.R. 1101: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1120: Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1185: Mrs. WALORSKI and Mr. YODER.

H.R. 1188: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1192: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BILL-RAKIS, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. GUINTA.

H.R. 1209: Mr. MOOLENAAR.

H.R. 1218: Mr. ROE of Tennessee and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 1248: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1258: Mr. POCAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. PAYNE, and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1274: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 1282: Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1343: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1358: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 1384: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. HIGGINS.

H.R. 1399: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROUZER, and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1401: Mr. CARNEY.

H.R. 1439: Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1475: Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 1478: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 1490: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 1505: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 1528: Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 1559: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.
 H.R. 1586: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
 H.R. 1602: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 1635: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 1669: Mr. WALDEN.
 H.R. 1684: Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1686: Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBSSACK, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 1692: Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 1718: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 1737: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.R. 1752: Mr. HUDSON.
 H.R. 1779: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 1786: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. ASHFORD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. VELA, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
 H.R. 1846: Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 1849: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1856: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 1859: Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
 H.R. 1942: Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GRAYSON.
 H.R. 1943: Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. ESTY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. COHEN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PETERS, Ms. KUSTER, and Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. NEAL, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2050: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 2067: Mr. JONES, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2077: Mr. ABRAHAM and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
 H.R. 2142: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2145: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2221: Ms. HAHN and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 2254: Mr. CAPUANO.
 H.R. 2264: Mr. KILMER, Mr. COLE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. JONES.
 H.R. 2278: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2280: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 2293: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. KUSTER, and Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 2313: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.
 H.R. 2403: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2404: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. DELBENE, and Mr. TIBERI.
 H.R. 2412: Mr. TAKAI.
 H.R. 2417: Mr. O'ROURKE.
 H.R. 2477: Mr. KING of New York and Mr. POE of Texas.
 H.R. 2521: Mr. ELLISON and Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 2602: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2653: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. ROSS.
 H.R. 2675: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2694: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2710: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 2713: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2744: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Ms. BONAMICI.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. CONYERS.
 H.R. 2844: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.
 H.R. 2848: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 2850: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 2858: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
 H.R. 2893: Mr. GROTHMAN.
 H.R. 2903: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
 H.R. 2904: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 2911: Mr. WALZ, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. PAULSEN, and Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS.
 H.R. 2940: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2948: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 2972: Mrs. DAVIS of California and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 3011: Mr. BURGESS and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H.R. 3013: Mrs. BLACK.
 H.R. 3036: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mr. CURBELO of Florida.
 H.R. 3051: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. KENNEDY.
 H.R. 3061: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3064: Mrs. BUSTOS and Mr. GARAMENDI.
 H.R. 3065: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 3095: Mr. KILMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3119: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 3123: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. HUDSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. COOK, and Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 3135: Mr. POMPEO.
 H.R. 3150: Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 3160: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3165: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3173: Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 3183: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 3184: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. VISCLOSKEY and Ms. MOORE.
 H.R. 3189: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. GOMERT.
 H.R. 3216: Mr. HENSARLING.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3250: Mr. LOEBSSACK.
 H.R. 3258: Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 3261: Mr. TAKANO.
 H.R. 3268: Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 3293: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 3294: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
 H.R. 3296: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 3301: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
 H.R. 3316: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3337: Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. MOORE, and Ms. MENG.
 H.R. 3338: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.
 H.R. 3341: Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. HAHN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. PETERS, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3412: Ms. DELBENE.
 H.R. 3423: Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BENISHEK.
 H.R. 3429: Mr. CONAWAY.
 H.R. 3431: Mr. KIND.
 H.R. 3437: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3439: Mr. ROYCE.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. THORNBERRY.
 H.R. 3444: Mr. PIERLUISI.
 H.R. 3455: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. NORTON, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. ROKITA, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DENT, Mr. BARR, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 3460: Mr. ZELDIN.
 H.J. Res. 49: Mr. MULVANEY.
 H.J. Res. 59: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. PALMER.
 H. Con. Res. 17: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. BORDALLO.
 H. Con. Res. 19: Mrs. WAGNER, Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. HOLDING.
 H. Con. Res. 65: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H. Res. 14: Mr. NOLAN.
 H. Res. 54: Mr. CUELLAR.
 H. Res. 245: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H. Res. 371: Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. JEFFRIES.
 H. Res. 383: Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. FORTENBERRY.
 H. Res. 386: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. CICILLINE.
 H. Res. 393: Mr. HOYER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. TITUS.
 H. Res. 394: Ms. JACKSON Lee, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WELCH.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3460, To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3460 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R.

3460 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3460, "To suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The provisions of H.R. 3461, To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of House Rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. HENSARLING

The provisions in H.R. 3461 that warranted a referral to the Committee on Financial Services do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Foreign Affairs in H.R. 3461 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H.R. 3461, "To approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of

Iran," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

OFFERED BY MR. RYAN OF WISCONSIN

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Ways and Means in H. Res. 411, "Finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015," do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3443: Ms. MCSALLY.

SENATE—Thursday, September 10, 2015

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, our rock, we trust You to guide our Nation. We find consolation in remembering how You have led us in the past.

Lord, our lawmakers need Your wisdom to make decisions that will reflect Your will. They can only guess about the future, but You comprehend the destiny of our world at a glance. The hearts of Kings, Presidents, and potentates are in Your hands, and You choreograph circumstances as You desire. So save us from ourselves by guiding our Senators with the might of Your prevailing providence.

Lord, let Your will be done on Earth as it is done in Heaven.

We pray in Your sovereign Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELLER). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 61

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, September 10, at 3 p.m., the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 be agreed to; the joint resolution, as amended, be read a third time; and the Senate vote on passage of the joint resolution, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—H.J. RES. 61

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motions with respect to the McConnell substitute amendment No. 2640 and H.J. Res. 61 be withdrawn; that the pending amendments and the motion to commit, with the exception of the McConnell substitute amendment, be withdrawn; that no other amendments, points of order, or motions be in order to the joint resolution or the McConnell substitute prior to the vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that at 3:45 p.m. today, the Senate proceed to vote on the McConnell substitute amendment; that the amendment be subject to a 60-affirmative-vote threshold; further, that if the McConnell amendment is agreed to, H.J. Res. 61, as amended, be read a third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The majority leader.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 61

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 occur at 3 p.m. today, with the time until 3:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the majority leader clarify the time of the vote?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw that consent and propound another one.

I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture vote on the substitute amendment to H.J. Res. 61 occur at 3:45 p.m. today, with the time until 3:45 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have a few brief remarks, and then I will respond to my friend.

By the end of the day, the Senate will have spent 3 days debating one of the most critical national security issues of our time—and that is probably an understatement—whether to support the agreement to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

From the beginning of this process, Democrats have done everything within our power to support this debate. We allowed the Senate to begin important debate without any procedural hurdles—none whatsoever. Democrats understand the severity of the urgent national security issue that is before this body, and that is why we offered a consent agreement at the beginning of the week to eliminate all procedural hurdles and move straight to the final passage vote after the debate. I did that again this morning, but the Republican leader did not take that offer. Instead, he filed cloture on the debate. By rejecting our offer, the Republican leader has made the cloture vote the decisive and definitive vote on this issue. That is why I once again will put forward my consent to skip cloture and all procedural votes and move to a vote on final passage.

Every Senator in this body should understand that if they are forced to vote on cloture, it is because Senator MCCONNELL, not Democrats, wanted them to. The idea that Democrats are somehow trying to stop debate or keeping us from a final vote is foolish. It is simply untrue.

Let's be clear. Let's be clear who is moving to end debate. It is the Republican leader who is moving to end debate, not me, not us. It is the Republican leader who filed a procedural motion last night and today.

What Democrats are offering is an opportunity to continue debate and move straight to a vote on final passage. This is exactly what we have done on many policy issues in the past because of Republican demands. In fact, since 2007 the Senate has regularly held votes on passage at a 60-vote threshold on policy and national security issues—for example, on national security issues such as Iraq policy resolutions; the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, or FISA; United States-India nuclear cooperation; foreign aid prohibition for Pakistan, Egypt, Libya; FISA reauthorization; terrorism risk insurance, or TRIA. These are just a few of the many votes we have taken at the 60-vote threshold demanded by our Republican friends.

Actions speak louder than words. Democrats acted to get this bill to the floor and debate it. Democrats are ready to vote on final passage. But if we are forced to vote on cloture, all Senators should understand that the cloture vote would then become the defining vote that determines whether the resolution of disapproval moves forward to the President's desk. A vote against cloture is a vote for the Iran agreement, plain and simple.

Mr. President, may I have the consent agreement restated? I think I understand it, but basically we would have a cloture vote and move immediately to a vote? No, just a cloture vote. I am sorry.

The question before the body—and they are waiting for me to respond—is, we would have a cloture vote on this matter because the leader has objected to my consent request, and we would have it at 3:45 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding.

Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Please wait. Staff is conferring here.

No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, just a few short months ago, Senators of both parties came together to pass a bipartisan bill based on an important principle: that the American people through the Congress they elect deserve a say on one of the most important issues of our time. We rallied around that principle, voting 98 to 1 to ensure the American people would have a real say on any deal with Iran. What a tragedy it would be, then, if at the very last moment some of those same Senators decided to filibuster to prevent the American people from having a real say on this incredibly important issue.

I know some of our colleagues are currently under immense pressure to shut down the voice of the people. But I would ask colleagues to reflect on the gravely serious nature of the issue before us. I would ask colleagues to consider the expectations they set with their constituents when they voted for the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. I would ask colleagues to consider something else as well. This is a deal that will far outlast one administration. The President may have the luxury of vacating office in a few months, but many of our responsibilities extend beyond that time. The American people will remember. They will remember where we stand today. Let's stand on their side.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2641 (to amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2642 (to amendment No. 2641), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2643 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2644 (to amendment No. 2643), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2645, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2646 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2645), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2647 (to amendment No. 2646), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 3:45 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I understand we are moving back to the incredibly important debate on Iran. I will come back and address that a little bit later.

REMEMBERING ALISON PARKER AND ADAM WARD AND PAYING TRIBUTE TO VICKI GARDNER

Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to pay tribute to the victims of another horrific act of gun violence.

On August 26, a gunman opened fire during a live television interview at Smith Mountain Lake in Virginia. By now, I think everyone in this Chamber and all across the country saw that event on live television. The gunfire killed WDBJ News 7 reporter Alison Parker, News 7 photographer Adam Ward, and the shooting severely wounded Vicki Gardner, a local chamber of commerce official who was being interviewed. I know my colleague Senator KAINE has already spoken on this, but I speak for everyone in the Com-

monwealth when I say our hearts go out to the Parker family and the Ward family. We are all pleased to hear that Vicki Gardner was released from the hospital on Monday, and she is on the road to recovery.

So Smith Mountain Lake in Virginia is now added to the all-too-familiar, heartbreaking litany—Charleston, Aurora, Sandy Hook, Tucson, and Virginia Tech. It became clear in the days following the 26th that Alison Parker and Adam Ward represented the best of their community. The outpouring of love and support for them and their families was remarkable. I had a number of conversations with Alison's father Andy, whom I knew from local government, and I will be meeting with him later today. Vicki Gardner, who was released from the hospital, will soon, hopefully, be getting back to her job at the chamber of commerce.

We feel—particularly those of us in Virginia—as if we knew Alison, Adam, and Vicki because the crime committed against them was so horrible and the details were reported so widely.

How many more parents must lose their children to gun violence? How many more anxious families must maintain a lonely vigil at the hospital before all of us here in Congress move on commonsense gun legislation?

More than 30,000 people are killed by firearms in this country every year. The last time Congress meaningfully engaged in a debate about gun reform was more than 2 years ago, after Sandy Hook. Even after the horrific loss of 20 children and 6 adults in Newtown at Sandy Hook, the Senate was still unable to pass responsible, commonsense reforms, such as closing the gun show loophole. Since Sandy Hook, there have been at least 136 school shootings in America. That is an average of one every week.

Probably like most of us, there are a lot of meetings we take in the Senate that kind of blur before our eyes. I will never forget the meeting with the Newtown families after that tragedy. I would have thought and would have expected with their grief that these families would have come in and asked for a whole array of legislative solutions, but they didn't. The families I met with came in and simply had one very reasonable, commonsense request of Congress: universal background checks to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and those with serious mental illness. Let me acknowledge that won't prevent every shooting. It is not a magical fix for violent, disturbed people who are determined to do harm, but it is a start at tackling the epidemic of gun violence.

I am a supporter of the Second Amendment—for many years I had an "A" rating from the NRA—but I believe background checks do not infringe on the Second Amendment. As a

matter of fact, gun owners understand this. In fact, a greater proportion of gun owners support requiring background checks for all gun sales than do non-gun owners. In a recent survey, 85 percent of gun owners and 83 percent of non-gun owners—so gun owners more than non-gun owners—supported requiring background checks for all gun sales.

Reasonable people can disagree about what additional steps might need to be taken, but the facts are not up for debate. Background checks do work, and they keep guns out of the hands of those who shouldn't have them.

According to the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the Brady law has blocked almost 2.4 million gun purchases since its enactment in 1994. Almost 200,000 purchases were blocked in the most recent year in which we have records. But, as we know, background checks aren't performed on every purchase. In fact, a significant number of transfers are done with no check whatsoever to determine whether a prospective buyer can legally possess a gun.

There is no reason why we shouldn't have a comprehensive background check system on all firearms sales. The Senate came close to making progress on this in the weeks following Sandy Hook. I want to particularly cite two colleagues, Senator MANCHIN and Senator TOOMEY, who both have strong records of support for the Second Amendment, who introduced and fought for bipartisan legislation that would have expanded background checks for many private gun sales, while still allowing families to appropriately transfer firearms within their family. However, this responsible and commonsense proposal fell short.

The cycle of tragedy followed by outrage followed by inaction has become all too familiar. These tragic events are not isolated in any one part of the country—Charleston, Aurora, Tucson, Roanoke. Each of them breaks our hearts. We should not and cannot simply acknowledge and accept them as the status quo. We must not be content, and we must recognize that Congress, those of us in this body, have an ability to act. Thoughts and prayers for victims are not enough; we need to take responsible action. We can debate and should debate how far reform measures should go, but at the very least, we should look at a way to renew a push for more meaningful background checks. We must do more to make sure criminals and those who are dangerously mentally ill cannot purchase guns. We must work together to make sure local and State governments have the resources and place an appropriate priority on inputting the correct data into the national background check system.

As recently as the end of June, Senators TOOMEY and MANCHIN indicated they were considering ways to renew

their efforts at meaningful background checks. I want to state clearly today that they will have my full support in this effort. I call on my colleagues to work with us to get legislation expanding meaningful background checks to the floor of the Senate before the end of this year. I can think of no better way to honor the lives of Alison Parker and Adam Ward and the thousands of other American families touched by gun violence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I intend to support the resolution of disapproval of the comprehensive plan of action negotiated by the Obama administration with the Islamic Republic of Iran. The agreement falls woefully short of the international goal to improve global security by stopping Iran's nuclear weapons ambitions.

The American people and Congress were promised an inspections regime providing anywhere, anytime access to facilities where tests were conducted. Instead, Iran can delay access to facilities for up to 24 days. This is inconsistent with the Obama administration's claims that no part of this agreement is based on trusting Iran at its word. A credible agreement would include stronger verification measures to ensure that the Iranians play by the rules, particularly given that government's well-documented efforts to conceal its nuclear activities and ambitions.

We are also concerned about the consequence of lifting the economic sanctions that forced Iran to the negotiating table. This agreement is an issue of long-term significance. Our country and our allies will be forced to deal with the repercussions of a strengthened Iran for the foreseeable future. This agreement is a bad deal for us and our allies, and I will not support it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I have been a Member of this body for nearly four decades. During that time, I have had the honor of participating in numerous debates that shaped the course of our future, but I can think of none more important than the one in which we are now engaged.

The Iranian regime is one of our most dangerous foes. It has declared the United States to be the "Great Satan." It has repeatedly claimed its intent to "wipe Israel off the map." It has perpetrated violence against American servicemen and civilians alike. It has sewn conflict across the most volatile region of the world. And it has repressed its people by some of the most ghastly methods imaginable.

Indeed, we should remember throughout this debate that our quarrel is not with the Iranian people. The Iranian people are our friends. We should re-

member throughout our plight and their desire for a cooperative relationship with the United States and the rest of the world. Instead, it is the dictatorial and fanatical regime that seeks to build and even use nuclear weapons, to destabilize the entire region, and to kill Americans and Israelis. Given the threat posed by this rogue regime, preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability is absolutely critical. It is a goal shared across party lines as well as among many of our friends and allies abroad.

All of us here prefer to prevent Iran from acquiring this capability by diplomatic means if possible rather than by armed conflict. In light of this shared desire to resolve the Iranian threat without a war, I examined the Obama administration's proposed agreement hopeful, if skeptical, that I could support the agreement. Nevertheless, the duty incumbent upon us as Senators is not to accept or reject this deal based upon knee-jerk reactions or blind partisan loyalty but rather to determine our stances based on thorough examination and reasoned judgment.

Regrettably, after much study, I have concluded that this is a catastrophically bad deal that I must strongly oppose.

Now, at the outset, I should note that the media is reporting that President Obama has gathered the votes to support his Iran deal. In reality, he has done no such thing. Were this a treaty, it would fall well short of the two-thirds requirement. It won't—and it can't—even muster a majority in either the House or Senate. There is nothing bipartisan about support for this deal. Only the opposition is bipartisan, and only the opposition is a majority. The deal lacks the most important kind of support—that of the American people. A strong majority of Americans oppose this deal, and they are right to do so.

Far from blocking the Iranian regime's path to nuclear weapons capability, this agreement actually secures what Mark Dubowitz, the executive director of the Foundation for Defense of Democracies, calls a "patient pathway" to nuclear weapons capability.

Consider the timeline. From day one, the Iranian regime will be allowed to enrich uranium using thousands of centrifuges and to conduct nuclear research and development. After 8 years, the regime will be allowed to begin building hundreds of new advanced centrifuges annually and will be allowed to expand its ballistic missile program.

After 15 years, it will be permitted to use advanced centrifuges to enrich uranium on an industrial scale, to stockpile significant quantities of enriched uranium, and to build heavy water reactors, according to the State Department's own fact sheet. After only 10 years, Iran's breakout time to rush for a nuclear weapon drops "almost down

to zero," as President Obama himself admitted.

In the words of former Deputy National Security Advisor Juan Zarate, this deal "stalls, [then] enables, and then validates an Iranian nuclear program." All that the Iranian regime has to do is abide by the terms of the agreement to achieve threshold nuclear status—with an expanded infrastructure for the production of nuclear materials and a visible means of delivering a nuclear weapon to targets as far away as the United States.

Moreover, the deal's means of verifying the Iranian regime's compliance with these temporary limits on its nuclear programs are, frankly, pathetic. Our only peaceful means of recourse under the deal, the so-called snapback mechanism, involves an incredibly cumbersome process.

It allows the Iranian regime to delay international inspections for up to 24 days without recourse, a critical gap that experts such as former International Atomic Energy Agency Deputy Director General for Safeguards Olli Heinonen and former National Nuclear Security Administration Deputy Administrator for Defense William Tobey assert could allow Iran to hide evidence of illicit nuclear activities.

Other parties' intransigence could also drag out the snapback mechanism more than 2 months before reimposing U.N. sanctions, approximately the same length of time as Iran's current breakout timetable, according to President Obama.

Furthermore, the deal only makes the snapback mechanism available for instances of "significant nonperformance," leaving no mechanism to respond to the kind of incremental cheating that has characterized the Iranian nuclear program thus far.

Perhaps most troubling, it remains unclear whether weapons inspectors will even have access to all Iranian nuclear facilities in the first place. Senior officials of the Iranian regime have repeatedly claimed that the deal does not allow access to military sites. The agreement's language appears to have been left deliberately vague on this point, hardly an encouraging development.

Moreover, press accounts of an IAEA side deal with Iran indicate that the international watchdog has already agreed to rely on the Iranian regime to conduct its own inspections at the Parchin weapons testing site, providing the IAEA with only photographs, videos, and environmental samples. Former IAEA Deputy Director General Heinonen may have put it best when he observed:

If the reporting is accurate, these procedures appear to be departing significantly from well-established and proven safeguards practices. At a broader level, if verification standards have been diluted for Parchin or elsewhere and limits imposed, the ramifications are significant as it will affect the IAEA's

ability to draw definitive conclusions with the requisite level of assurances and without undue hampering of the verification process.

Regarding these troubling reports, I have a number of outstanding questions and concerns that have only been amplified by the Obama administration's steadfast refusal to share the text of the agreement with Congress. This intransigence amounts to an evasion of the spirit and possibly the text of the bipartisan Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, a development that rightfully sows doubt and concern about what else the Obama administration might be hiding.

In light of these incredible concessions to the Iranian regime, I am also deeply troubled by the great benefit the Iranian regime stands to enjoy from this deal. To use the succinct words of one scholar, "President Obama is agreeing to dismantle the sanctions regime permanently. In return, Tehran is agreeing to slow the development of its nuclear program temporarily."

The current sanctions regime has imposed heavy costs on the Iranian economy. Oil exports have dropped by 60 percent. The inflation rate has risen to 40 percent. And foreign companies, deterred by harsh penalties, have avoided investing in Iran, thereby isolating Iran from the global economy. Along with the threat of military action, these sanctions played a critical role in bringing the Iranian regime to the negotiating table, and we should thus be very careful before sacrificing this leverage.

In exchange for these minimal, temporary concessions, the Iranian regime stands to reap enormous rewards in sanctions relief. According to figures cited by President Obama, the Iranian regime will regain control of more than \$150 billion currently frozen in the world's financial institutions. Sanctions relief will also allow an influx of international businesses into Iran, bringing about greater revenue for the regime.

Where should we expect this money to be spent? Will it go to the long-suffering Iranian people who are the victims of this regime, a people who have long contributed to the advancement of civilization and the good of mankind, a people whose true spirit has been continually repressed for almost 40 years, a people who have paid a high price because of the radical fundamentalism of their leaders, and a people who look to us for strength in the defense of our ideals, not capitulation to this heinous regime?

Unfortunately, we cannot expect such an outcome. If history is any guide, we should expect the Iranian regime to use sanctions relief to pursue its dangerous aims, including: to support its terrorist proxies that represent a dire threat to the stability of the whole region, such as Hamas in Gaza,

Hezbollah in Lebanon, the Houthis in Yemen, and the murderous Assad regime in Syria; to encourage the "swarming of [foreign] businesses to Iran," which the Iranian foreign minister believes will make it "impossible to reconstruct" broad international sanctions; to take advantage of the lifting of the U.N. arms embargo after 5 years to purchase sophisticated weapons systems such as the Russian S-300 air defense system, which would make American or Israeli military action against the Iranian nuclear program even more difficult than it already would be; and to shore up the political and financial standing of the most radical elements of the Iranian regime, reducing the likelihood of internal reform and a more constructive Iranian foreign policy.

If the Iranian regime suddenly becomes flush with cash, what incentive will it have to change priorities 15 years from now?

Doesn't this deal reward what the Obama administration called "bad behavior" in one of the most astonishing understatements that I have ever heard?

And in the words of one expert, "when in the course of human history did getting \$100 billion [or \$150 billion] at the stroke of a pen ever convince anyone that they have been wrong all along?"

For a deal built on the unfounded hope that the Iranian regime would change its ways, I see very little reason to expect success. And for an agreement that would supposedly reinforce the position of the Iranian moderates and bring relief to the Iranian people, I see only the prospect of strengthening the hand of the hard-liners and of sanctions relief diverted for more violent misadventures, rather than for the benefit of the Iranian people.

Reflecting on this spectacularly bad deal, I can only conclude that Obama administration officials proved to be weak negotiators because of an absolute desperation for a deal—almost any deal. These massive concessions to the Iranian regime for so little in return were produced by this administration's knee-jerk aversion to the prospect of using military force, a preoccupation demonstrated by the constant rhetoric that we hear from the White House that the only alternative to this deal is war.

That claim is patently false. We can and should go back to the negotiating table. While reassembling the sanctions coalition that this agreement throws away will not be easy and may not even be fully possible, a nation as strong as ours still has plenty of tools at our disposal. Our unparalleled economic and military might give us significant leverage to get a better deal, and we should not be misled by overly simplistic rhetoric to conclude otherwise.

War is never a happy matter to contemplate, especially from a position of responsibility such as in the Senate. In this body, we are saddled all too often with the sorts of decisions in which real people's lives hang in the balance: those of our friends and neighbors; our fellow countrymen; our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines; and even those in faraway distant places who look to America as a guardian of freedom and peace, what Abraham Lincoln called the last, best hope of Earth.

None of us relish the prospect of war, especially in an age in which our weapons have a power almost too terrible to contemplate. In particular, neither I nor any of my colleagues seek a war with Iran; as I stated before, the Iranian people are not our enemies. They are our friends. No people have paid a higher price for the regime's record of terrorism, mass murder, corruption, and duplicity than the Iranians. The prospect of inflicting collateral damage on our long-suffering friends further counsels against any course of action that leads to war.

It is not a cavalier attitude about war that leads me to oppose this deal; it is my unwavering judgment that this deal makes war much more likely that leads me to oppose it.

Let there be no doubt. A deal that paves rather than precludes Iran's path to a nuclear weapons capability makes war more likely. A deal that makes the Iranian regime more confident of its ability to protect its nuclear program from international pressure and military action makes war more likely. A deal that funnels tens of billions of dollars to terrorists bent on destabilizing the Middle East makes war more likely. A deal that provokes a nuclear arms race in the most volatile region on the globe makes war more likely. A deal that surrounds Israel not only with a nuclear Iran but also eventually with numerous other regimes with nuclear weapons capability and a genocidal attitude toward the Jewish State makes war more likely. And a deal that puts the Iranian regime and its terrorist allies one turn of a screwdriver away from a nuclear weapon and a means of delivering it anywhere across the world makes war more likely.

War may come, but it is not inevitable. As Members of "the world's greatest deliberative body," it is our duty to discern the wisest course of action that preserves the security of the United States and our allies—that reduces the risk of war but does not let the strong desire for peace we all share cloud our judgment about how we best preserve that peace.

In this solemn debate, it is my hope that the voice of reason will have the power to change minds and overcome the pressures of our politics that have the power to lead us astray. I am encouraged in my hope by the fact that almost every Member to come out in

support of this deal has noted its significant flaws. The opposition to it has been unambiguous, strong, and bipartisan, and it constitutes a strong majority in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I want to pay tribute to four of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who have bucked significant political pressure to vote their consciences against this bad deal.

We still have a chance to change course. All that is required is the bravery and good judgment to lead our Nation and the world to an agreement that can actually preserve the long-term peace. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in opposing this disastrous deal and in supporting a better way forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, first, I thank our honored President pro tempore for his outstanding comments.

But while my distinguished friend from Illinois is on the floor, I thought I would walk through a unanimous consent request, if that is OK. I think it has been cleared with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time be further divided as follows: from 10 a.m. to 11 a.m. would be Republican time, from 11 a.m. to 12 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 12 p.m. to 1 p.m. would be Republican time, from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 2 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. would be Republican time, from 2:30 p.m. to 3 p.m. would be Democratic time, from 3 p.m. to 3:45 p.m. it be equally divided between the leaders or their designees, and that Senator MENENDEZ be given 15 minutes of the Republican time and 15 minutes of the Democrat time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DURBIN. If I might ask the Senator from Tennessee to clarify, would the last part of his request relate to the period between 3 p.m. and 3:45 p.m.?

Mr. CORKER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. DURBIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Thank you.

Mr. President, so our side knows what will occur between now and the end of our time, the next 15 minutes will be for Senator GRAHAM, then 10 minutes to Senator BARRASSO, and then 10 minutes to Senator FLAKE.

With that, I yield the floor to one of the best national security voices in the United States of America, Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I just want to make sure people understand what we are trying to do here this morning. Our Democratic colleagues are filibustering an attempt to have a debate and an up-or-down vote on the

most consequential foreign policy decision in modern history. That is what you are doing.

Senator CORKER, in good faith, got us here in a bipartisan manner. And Senator REID has come out of nowhere to change what was the common understanding of how we would proceed—get 60 votes, a simple majority, and let the President act as he wishes.

But, no, we couldn't do that. They are more worried about protecting Barack Obama from having to veto this than they are about having a debate on the floor of the Senate.

Now, let me tell you a little about who you are dealing with here, folks. If I hear one more comment from my Democratic friends about how much they love Israel—with friends like this, you don't need an enemy. This is who you are dealing with. This was yesterday:

Iran's supreme leader predicted Wednesday that Israel would not exist in 25 years, and ruled out any new negotiations with the "Satan," the United States, beyond the recently completed nuclear accord.

In remarks published Wednesday on his personal website—

At least the Ayatollah has gotten into modern times—
and in posts on Twitter, the supreme leader—

Do you know why they call him the Supreme Leader? Because he is—

Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, responded to what he said were claims that Israel would be safe for that period. . . .

Where did those claims come from? It came from this administration, my colleagues on the other side. You are telling the world that this is the best deal for Israel. Guess what. Nobody in Israel who is in the current government agrees with you. It is just not Bibi. Everybody who is in the current coalition government understands this is not a good deal for Israel.

Why don't you listen to them? You want it to be a good deal for Israel. Well, it is not, and your wanting it doesn't change it.

So let's finish what he said.

[The Ayatollah] responded to what he said were claims that Israel would be safe for that period under the nuclear agreement reached in July.

"After nuclear negotiations, the Zionist regime said that they will not be worried about Iran in the next 25 years."

I repeat.

"After nuclear negotiations, the Zionist regime said that they will not be worried about Iran in the next 25 years."

Israel didn't say that. People over here said that.

The Ayatollah wrote:

"I am telling you, first, you will not be around in 25 years' time, and God willing, there will be no Zionist regime in 25 years. Second, during this period, the spirit of fighting, heroism and jihad will keep you worried every moment."

Clearly, somebody who is on the course of change, somebody we should

give \$100 billion to, create a pathway to a nuclear bomb in 15 years and let him buy more weapons in 5 years and build an intercontinental ballistic missile in 8 years—clearly, this is the man who has changed course and you have empowered him.

At least—at least—Chamberlain can say Hitler lied. At least Chamberlain can say: I negotiated with the Fuhrer. He told me to my face: If you give me this, I am done.

Well, we all know Chamberlain was a chump, and Hitler actually meant what he said when he wrote a book.

The question is, Does this man mean what he says when he tweets yesterday that the ink is not dry on the deal?

The one thing you can say about the old Ayatollah—who is crazy, who is a religious Nazi—is that at least he is honest. He doesn't want you to be confused as you vote as to what he wants to do to your friend Israel. See, he doesn't want you to misstate what this deal means to him. You obviously are writing him off. You obviously believe he doesn't mean it.

I guess he has a polling problem in Iran. He has to get his numbers up. He needs to say these things—because he doesn't mean it. But he has to keep his people happy because they like hearing this stuff. All I can tell you is his people tried to rise up against him in 2009, and our President sat on the sidelines and didn't do a damn thing. The biggest moment for change in Iran came in 2009, when young people and women took to the streets demanding a fair election that was stolen from them by the Ayatollah, and his response was to beat them, shoot them, put them in jail and torture them. This is the guy you are going to give \$100 billion to, a clear pathway to a bomb. He doesn't even have to cheat to get there and buy more weapons to attack us.

At least Chamberlain lied. This man is telling you what he is going to do as of yesterday, and between these times that negotiations have started until now, has he shown us a little leg about what will change? During the negotiations he has toppled four Arab capitals. During the negotiations he has supported the Houthis in Yemen, who destroyed a pro-American government, and we have lost eyes and ears on Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula—a Sunni extremist group that attacked Paris and will attack us.

During the negotiations they have done anything but be moderate. I cannot believe that you don't believe him. I cannot believe you made the biggest miscalculation in modern history by empowering a religious fanatic with the ability to attack our Nation, destroy our friends in Israel, and keep the Mideast on fire for 15 years. What are you all thinking over there?

All I can say is that on the last 9/11, 3,000 of us died because they couldn't get weapons to kill 3 million of us. If

you let this deal go forward, before too long the most radical regime on the planet will have the most lethal weapons available to mankind. They will share that technology with terrorists and they will come here. Why do they need an ICBM, folks? What are they going to do with it? They are not going to send people to space. What are you thinking? What are you all thinking over there? You are taking the most radical regime on the planet, a theocracy—this is not a democracy. The moderates were shot down in the streets. They were begging: Are you with us or are you with him, President Obama?

President Obama is absolutely the poorest champion of freedom and the weakest opponent of evil in history. Evil is flourishing on his watch. President Obama said you would have to be crazy not to support this deal. Let's walk through whether we should follow his advice about radical Islam.

This is the President who was told to leave troops in Iraq to make sure our gains would be maintained, and he pulled everybody out because he wanted to get to zero. He turned down every commander's advice to get to zero because he made a campaign promise. This is the President who was told by his entire national security team 3 years ago to establish a no-fly zone and help the Free Syrian Army because Assad was on the ropes, at a time when it would have mattered, when there was a Free Syrian Army to help and Assad was about to fall. Obama said: No thanks. This is the President who drew a redline against Assad, after he backed off, and said: If you use chemical weapons and you cross that redline, there will be a price.

Here are the facts. Assad is going to be in power and Obama is going to be gone. The last man standing is going to be Assad. So all I can tell you is this is the man who said: Don't worry about ISIL. They are the JV team. I killed bin Laden; Al Qaeda is decimated.

At what point in time do you realize President Obama has no idea what he is talking about? At what point in time is it obvious to anybody in the world who is paying attention that when it comes to radical Islam he has no clue?

So this is the guy we are going to send in to negotiate with a radical ayatollah—a guy who, in the eyes of the world, is a complete weak defender of freedom and a very poor adversary of evil. If that is not enough, the Iranians are rubbing this in John Kerry and Barack Obama's face by tweeting this out hours before you vote on this deal.

Just to remind you that no matter what you say on this floor about Israel, nothing has changed in his mind about Israel. When you claim Israel is safe, he is telling you: No, they are not. But you are not listening because you don't think he really means it. Well, I can tell you right now, you better be right.

How about this idea. When it comes to the Ayatollah, assume the worst, not the best.

To our friends in Russia, John Kerry said one of the big benefits of this deal is that we will bring Russia in and Iran will be a better partner in the Mideast, and we will have a major breakthrough where Iran begins to help us with problems like Syria. Well, here is Russia's response, before you vote. They are sending Russian troops—maybe fighter planes—into Syria to prop up Assad before you vote. They are taking everything John Kerry said about what would happen if you do this deal and rubbing it in his face.

Tell me how you fix Syria with Assad in power? What the Russians are doing is ensuring he will stay in power longer, and the longer he stays in power, the more refugees the world will have to deal with and the more Hell on Earth will occur in Syria.

The Syrian people want two things; they want to destroy ISIL and they want Assad gone because he has destroyed their families. So Secretary Kerry, how well is this working, with this new engagement of Iran and Russia. Things are really changing. Look at the tweet yesterday. What are you going to tell the American people this means? Interpret the Ayatollah for me. This is just all talk? He has to say these things? He doesn't get elected. He doesn't have to worry about the next election. He says these things because he believes them. He is a religious fanatic, compelled by his version of Islam to destroy everything in his religion that he doesn't agree with—to destroy the one and only Jewish State and attack democracies such as ours, and you are giving him more to do that with. This is, over time, a death sentence for Israel, if it is not changed.

If I had \$100 billion to negotiate with, for God's sake, could I get four people out of jail? I could get people out of jail here with \$100 billion. Who is negotiating with Iran? This idea we are going to separate all of their bad behavior from their nuclear program was the biggest miscalculation in modern foreign policy history.

To suggest we don't need to look at Iran as a whole unit; that we are going to ignore the fact that they have four hostages, U.S. personnel held in sham trials, a Washington Post reporter; that they are the largest State sponsor of terrorism; that they destabilize the region; that they have driven our friends out of Yemen; that they are supporting Hezbollah, a mortal enemy of Israel; and that they have taken over the Lebanese Government—we are not going to worry about all that? What do you think they are going to do with the \$100 billion? Do you really think they are going to build roads and bridges?

The best indication of the next 15 years is the last 35. When you separated their nuclear ambitions from

their destructive behavior, giving them access to more weapons and \$100 billion, you made a huge mistake because you are damning the Mideast to holy hell for the next 15 years, and you are giving the largest state sponsor of terrorism more money and more weapons to attack us—and you couldn't get four people out of jail.

The only reason they are not dancing in Iran is the Ayatollah just doesn't believe in dancing. I have friends over there whom I respect and admire. I have no idea what you are thinking. I have no idea why you believe the Ayatollah doesn't mean what he says, given the way he has behaved. If they would shoot their own children down in the streets to keep power, what do you think they will do to ours? And the only reason 3,000 people died on 9/11 is because they couldn't get the weapons to kill 3 million of us, and they are on course to do it now.

I have never been more disappointed in the body than I am today, a body known to be the most deliberative body in democracy in the history of the world. Yet you will not let us have a vote. You will not let us have a debate.

Please stop saying this deal makes Israel safer. That is cruel. Your response to this deal is to give them more weapons because you know they are not safer. I find it a bit odd that in response to this deal we are selling the Arabs every kind of weapon known to man and we are promising Israel every kind of weapon we have. If you truly thought this was such a good deal, why do you have to arm everybody who is in the crosshairs of the Ayatollah?

When they write the history of these times, they are going to look back and say that President Obama was a weak opponent of evil and a poor champion of freedom. They are going to look and say that the United States Senate refused to debate the most consequential foreign policy agreement in modern times, and the people in Israel are going to wonder where did America go.

Has it ever crossed your mind that everybody in Israel who is in power, who is running the government today, objects to this agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRAHAM. Senator CORKER, thank you for trying to have the debate we need. To my Democratic friends: You own this. You own every "i" and every "t" and every bullet, and you own everything that is to follow and it is going to be holy hell.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I am so proud of my colleague from South Carolina for the remarkable speech he just gave to this Senate about his concerns about this President's deal with Iran—the President's nuclear deal with Iran. That is what the Senate is debating right now—a deal President Obama

negotiated with Iran and whether that deal should stand or fall.

This agreement could affect American foreign policy in the Middle East and beyond for this generation as well as the next. It will affect America's relationship with our allies as well as with our enemies. Other countries are wondering whether America will accept a flawed agreement that gives Iran almost everything it has asked for or will we, as the United States of America, stand strong against outlaw nations with nuclear ambitions and dreams.

As Senators prepare to vote on this legislation we should ask: Does this agreement do enough to stop Iran's nuclear weapons program? Does this agreement do enough to protect the security of the American people and our friends around the world? I believe the answer is no. It would be irresponsible to support such a weak, such a naive, and such a dangerous deal.

The original goal of ending Iran's nuclear weapons program was a good one, and I wish the President had actually stuck with that goal. I wish the President had done a better job of negotiating with the Iranians. He did not. During the negotiations this administration was far too willing to make concessions, concessions that put our own national security at risk.

We were in a very strong position during these negotiations from the start, and the Obama administration squandered the advantage. The President badly wanted to strike a deal with Iran, and that is the problem because President Obama has shown once again that if you want a deal badly enough, you will end up with a bad deal. The President fell in love with this deal, even though it is deeply flawed. And deeply flawed is a description our Democratic colleagues continue to make about this deal. The President cannot see the flaws that our colleagues on the Senate floor can see because I believe the President is blinded by deal euphoria. He is in love with the deal.

The agreement President Obama has negotiated will legitimize Iran's nuclear program. It will accept Iran as a nuclear threshold state. To me, this is inexcusable. It is not the deal the President should have signed. It is not the deal the President could have signed. It is not the deal President Obama promised he would sign.

President Obama once said that Iran didn't need advanced centrifuges in order to have a limited, peaceful nuclear program, but under this agreement his administration did negotiate that Iran will not eliminate a single centrifuge. It will continue to research more advanced centrifuges, and it can even start building them.

So how did it happen? How did this happen? On the day the agreement was announced, the President of Iran

bragged—bragged—about how he had gotten the Obama administration to surrender on this point. "To surrender," that is the language I am hearing around the State of Wyoming and certainly the language we are hearing from Iran: The President surrendered.

At the beginning, the President said Iran would only need 100 centrifuges. Then the number went to 1,000, then 4,000, then eventually allowed more than 6,000. When it mattered most, the Obama administration wanted a deal so badly that it was willing to concede on point after point after point. This proves if you want a deal bad enough, you will get a bad deal—and that is what we have here today.

The same thing happened with ballistic missiles. GEN Martin Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States military, told the Senate Armed Services Committee, "Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking." Under no circumstances.

Defense Secretary Ash Carter also testified at the same hearing. Now, this hearing, of course, was only 6 days before the final deal was announced by the President. Secretary of Defense said, "We want them to continue to be isolated as a military and limited in terms of the kinds of equipment and materials they are able to get." That was 6 days before the final deal was announced.

So what happened? What did the President of the United States surrender on? With this agreement, Iran will have access to ballistic missile technology in as little as 8 years, even though the Secretary of Defense said no; even though the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said, "Under no circumstances." That is when Russia and other countries are going to be able to start selling this deadly technology to Iran—and I believe that Iran will use it.

Now, this was a last-minute demand that Iran made, and it should have been easy for President Obama to reject it, but he did not. He surrendered. The President was so desperate to get a deal that he gave in once again. It is always the same story with the Obama administration: If you want a deal bad enough, you are going to get a bad deal—and they have. When the Obama administration is negotiating with countries that need a deal much more than we do, the President of the United States surrenders.

This administration has no red lines when it comes to negotiating. They will give away anything to get a deal. There have been too many concessions for anyone to be comfortable with this agreement. There are too many red flags. President Obama cannot see the defects that are obvious in this plan.

He refuses to see what is so clear to the American people.

After this agreement, Iran will be a nuclear threshold state, and a military and an industrial power. It will have the money to support terrorists around the world—more money than it has had in the past. It will have the freedom to pursue its nuclear ambitions.

Even some Democrats who have said they support this deal are doing so with great reservations. They say they know it is not a good deal, but they say: It is the only option we have. Well, that is not a good enough reason for me to accept all of the risks and all of the concessions that the Obama administration allowed in this agreement.

The President says: The choice is the Iran nuclear deal or war. He has said it time and time again. It is fear mongering. It is not true. There is an alternative. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said so.

General Dempsey was asked about that at a hearing of the Senate Armed Services Committee. In answer to the question: Is it this or war, the general said, "I can tell you that we have a range of options, and I always present them"—present them to the President. "We have a range of options." It is not just a choice between this deal or war. It is a choice between accepting a bad deal or rejecting it. If the only choice is to take this deal or leave it, then we must leave it.

The Obama administration doesn't want us to have a vote here in the Senate. The Obama administration knows it signed a bad deal, and it wants the whole thing to disappear from the front pages before it causes them any more embarrassment.

So instead of having a full and honest debate on the floor of the Senate, the President and the Senate Democrat leader are trying to hide behind a filibuster. That is not how the Senate should handle this important resolution to disapprove the Iran deal. Every Member of the Senate should be willing to cast a vote up or down on this Iran deal. We should stand up, we should represent the people of our State and this Nation, and we should cast our votes.

The Obama administration has made its arguments, and it has failed to make its case. The President has not shown that America will be better off with this deal, and I believe we would be better off without it.

We have heard the administration's excuses. We have heard all of the ways the final deal fell short of their promises. America can't afford to let Iran have the nuclear program that this agreement will allow it to obtain. We should vote to disapprove the Iran deal. The President should drop his veto threat. The President should send his people back to the negotiating table because this deal poses too great a threat to America's national security for us to do anything else.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, as we continue the debate on one of the most important foreign policy matters this body has addressed in some time, I would be remiss if I didn't mention how honored I am to be a part of it.

It is not unusual for the Congress to engage in debate over matters like spending bills, bills to authorize various Federal agencies, executive branch and judicial nominations, or other business that we routinely attend to around here. But it is only on occasion that this body gets to have the opportunity to weigh in on some of the more pressing foreign policy matters. When it does, the legislation it considers often has lasting consequences for the United States and for the rest of the world.

Take, for example, the Taiwan Relations Act. Passed by both chambers in 1979 in response to the normalization of relations between the United States and China, this piece of legislation remains the cornerstone of the U.S.-Taiwan relationship to this day.

Likewise, this body has considered a number of arms limitation treaties over the decades between the United States and Russia. The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty, or START, was approved by this body in 1992 by a vote of 93 to 6. START II was approved in 1996 by a vote of 87 to 4. Most recently, the New START treaty with Russia was approved in 2010 by a vote of 71 to 26.

These bills address subject matter that was highly controversial. I am sure there was a fair amount of disagreement between Democrats and Republicans, and between the Congress and the White House. But in instances likely too numerous to count, Senate deliberation ended with a bipartisan vote that set the U.S. foreign policy into place for years, even decades, and signaled that America was speaking to the rest of the world with one voice.

I deeply regret the JCPOA will not build on this history. Unfortunately, the administration elected to negotiate this deal as an executive agreement rather than a treaty. That was the administration's call. It does mean, however, that the administration did not need to negotiate the JCPOA, mindful that it would need the support of 67 Senators. It also means the Senate does not have the opportunity to offer so-called RUDs—reservations, understandings, and declarations—that can accompany treaties and clarify its interpretation of the agreement.

To be sure, there are several troubling aspects of this agreement that could have been improved if the Senate had the opportunity to consider the JCPOA as a treaty. For example, the text of the agreement clearly states that any reimposition of the sanctions specified in Annex II would be viewed

by Iran as a violation of the agreement and would likely prompt Iran to cease abiding by its obligations under the agreement. The sanctions in Annex II include all the influential sanctions, such as those on Iran's Central Bank. These have had a profound effect on Iran's economy.

In hearings and briefings by the administration, I have asked whether the United States could reimpose these powerful sanctions at some point later down the line for other, nonnuclear-related behavior by the Iranian government to penalize Iran for regional activities or for committing acts of terrorism. This regime, as we know, has made achieving regional hegemony its calling card since its inception in 1979. Now, this administration has assured me that these sanctions would be available in the future, but, unfortunately, that simply does not square with the text of the agreement.

The question of reimposition of sanctions raises a further question of how this agreement might bind the hands of future Congresses and future administrations. As I previously mentioned, though the JCPOA has already been adopted by the United Nations, it will never be the supreme law of the land in the United States because it is not a treaty. A treaty that has been agreed to by at least 67 Senators gives the treaty the critical imprimatur that insulates it from political winds for the lifespan of the treaty. The JCPOA will benefit from no such imprimatur.

What if, for example, a future Congress or President wishes to reimpose sanctions against Iran or take some other action that might legitimately cause Iran to accuse us of violating the JCPOA? A future Congress or President could be put in the position of either having to preserve an agreement that neither had a hand in negotiating nor taking action that would result in Iran walking away from its nuclear obligations. It would be beneficial for U.S. foreign policy to steer clear of those lose-lose propositions.

The current administration has already expressed reluctance to push back against Iran's interpretation of the agreement even before it has been implemented. I have serious concerns that if there is reluctance to push back on Iran now, there will be even more reluctance to push back on Iran's regional behavior once the deal is in place. This gives Iran more leverage than it currently has moving forward, and that could have disastrous consequences on the Middle East. These are issues that could have been addressed in a positive manner by the Senate if the agreement had been submitted as a treaty.

Now, when this agreement was announced, I said I would take every opportunity to learn more about it, so I attended every hearing held by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I

commend Chairman CORKER and Ranking Member CARDIN for holding these hearings and going about this in such a deliberative and serious manner. I attended every classified congressional briefing and several other briefings, and had discussions with numerous experts and administration officials.

After these discussions, these hearings, these briefings, I believe it is a much closer call on this agreement than most want to admit. There are positive aspects on the nuclear side. Unfortunately, I think this deal suffers from significant shortcomings.

Hoping that Iran's nuclear ambitions might change after a 15-year sabbatical might be a bet worth making. Believing that Iran's regional behavior will change tomorrow while giving up tools to deter or modify such behavior is not a bet worth taking.

It is for these reasons that I reluctantly oppose the JCPOA.

I do hope that we can make up for this unfortunately partisan vote by working together, and with the President, to pass a regional security framework agreement that will not only reassure Israel and our allies in the region, but solidify this agreement throughout the duration of the JCPOA.

The United States is strongest when we speak with one voice on foreign policy matters.

BORDER JOBS FOR VETERANS ACT

Mr. President, yesterday, we were able to pass on a bipartisan basis—in fact, unanimously—a bipartisan bill to help put veterans back to work as Customs and Border Protection officers at understaffed U.S. ports of entry.

Earlier this week, Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson confirmed that the agency has not yet filled 1,200 of the 2,000 new CBP officer positions created by Congress in 2014 to improve security and reduce trade-stifling commercial traffic in ports. Secretary Johnson has attributed these shortfalls to delays associated with applicant background investigations. So we were able to pass legislation to force the Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security to work together with this legislation. Now they will do so, and hopefully it will improve the condition of trade and the backlogs we have on the border.

I applaud my colleagues for making this happen—cosponsors JOHN MCCAIN, CHUCK SCHUMER, RICHARD BURR, TAMMY BALDWIN, RICHARD BLUMENTHAL, DIANNE FEINSTEIN, and others. Thank you for passing this legislation. It will improve the situation on the Arizona-Mexico border.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I know the time has ended. I know that Senator DAINES wants to speak very briefly. Senator DURBIN is allowing that as long as we give back some time at a later moment. If we might have 3 minutes.

Mr. DAINES. I wish to thank the Senator. I appreciate that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, if Iran's ultimate goal is to obtain a nuclear weapon, the deal reached by the Obama administration sets Iran on course to do so. From the time this deal is agreed to, Iran has 10 years to fill their coffers with tens of billions of dollars from newly unsanctioned oil sales and pursue the research and development of nuclear capabilities. As the world's leader of state-sponsored terrorism, it will only be a matter of time before Iran achieves its ultimate goal, and that is obtaining a nuclear weapon. These are bipartisan concerns.

This deal will not prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and the American people deserve a better deal. This deal is stacked against transparency and accountability. It provides up to a 24-day delay before Iran is forced to comply with inspections of nuclear sites on their military bases. This is a long way from “anywhere, anytime” the American people were promised. Can you imagine if the EPA or the FDA came knocking on a Montana farmer or business owner's door, and they said: Well, you can't come and inspect right now, but come back in 24 days. That is what we have set up right now with the Iranian Government through this deal.

Through this deal, the American people are being asked to enter into a binding trust agreement with the world's leading state sponsor of terror. In fact, just yesterday I looked at my Twitter feed, and the Supreme Leader of Iran—he is called the Supreme Leader for a reason—Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said: “I say that you [Israelis] will not see the coming 25 years and, God willing, there will not be something named the Zionist regime in [the] next 25 years.” And then he went on to reiterate in calling America the Great Satan. This is whom the United States is making this bad nuclear deal with. It is not a mistake to push for tougher sanctions.

The American people deserve a better option. Two nights ago, I had a tele-townhall meeting, calling into 100,000 Montana households. Overwhelmingly, by 3 to 1, Montanans opposed this deal.

As we close, let me say this: As I step back and look at the numbers today, if we look at the Senate, it looks as if about 69 Senators are opposed to this deal. There are 42 supporting it. Those 58 who oppose it are bipartisan. The House numbers are similar in ratios.

The point is this: There is bipartisan opposition to this deal, both Democrats and Republicans joining together. The only support is partisan. It is a mistake to not push for a better deal that can be supported by more than one segment of one political party.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, so that those who are following this debate understand where we are, this morning the Democratic leader, Senator HARRY REID of Nevada, for the second time offered to the Republican side the following: that we will bring this critically important, historic measure before the U.S. Senate for an up-or-down vote—a clean up-or-down vote—at a margin of 60 votes.

Sixty votes is the margin that is used for every major and, I might add, controversial measure before the Senate. So what we are asking is not out of line. In fact, the Republican side had supported the notion of a 60-vote margin until they didn't have 60 votes. Now they are calling for some other approach.

So here is what we face. This afternoon at about 3:45 p.m., we will have a rollcall vote. It will be on the procedural question of whether we end debate on one aspect of this issue. It is known as a cloture vote. We will see how it turns out. But we have made a good-faith offer twice to the Republicans to finish this important debate and to bring this to a 60-vote close.

Every single Member of the Senate on both sides of the aisle has announced publicly in advance where they stand on the issue. No one is trying to avoid this tough vote, and it is a challenging vote. Everyone has faced it squarely and honestly, and that is where we should go. Senator MCCONNELL, on the Republican side, objected to this. We will face a procedural vote at 3:45 p.m.

What is troubling is that we are in disarray now in the Congress. This statute that brings us to the floor of the U.S. Senate, the resolution of disapproval on the Iran agreement, passed the Senate with a vote of 98 to 1—a strong bipartisan agreement that this is how we would approach it. This is what Senator MCCONNELL is working off of, the basic statute that brings us together. But look what is happening across the Rotunda. Yesterday the House of Representatives disassembled. When they were supposed to move forward procedurally to the same vote we are facing, they fell apart. There was a Republican caucus, and it was in disarray. Now they are proposing not the underlying statute which we are considering but three brandnew, different approaches to this. This is no way to run a Congress. It is no way to address a serious foreign policy issue, one of the more serious issues of our time.

My colleagues are here to speak. I am going to yield the floor to them. I have spoken from time to time, but I will say this: Understand what we are trying to achieve here. We are not putting a seal of approval on Iran and their conduct and their activity. That will never happen. Instead, what we are

saying is we have one goal in mind, shared by many nations around the world: to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. That is the goal. I believe this agreement comes as close to achieving that as we can hope for at this moment.

I wish it were stronger and better, but in the course of negotiation, we don't always get everything we want. But think of what happened here. We met in Switzerland at the table with five other nations—China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, and France. The European Union, I might add, joined the United States in this effort to negotiate this agreement and walked away. All nations involved in the negotiations said this is a good agreement and should move forward. In addition to that, we have had support from the Security Council of the United Nations. Over 100 countries have endorsed this.

Yet it has been categorically rejected by the Republicans in both the House and the Senate. The first evidence of their rejection was March 9 of this year while the negotiations were underway. Forty-seven Republican Senators sent a letter to the Supreme Leader in Iran, the Ayatollah, saying to him basically: Don't waste your time negotiating with the United States of America. That has never happened in the history of the United States—never. I asked the historians to check it. Never have we had Members of Congress sending a letter in the midst of negotiations telling the other side: Don't pay attention to our President; don't pay any attention to our Nation. It never happened before. So 47 of them made it clear even before the agreement was reached that they were rejecting it. That doesn't show good faith. That doesn't show an effort to try to be objective and honest about this.

Here we stand today with the first procedural vote this afternoon. There are two things we want to achieve with this vote and with this agreement: No. 1, stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. We do that by shutting down their production facilities, by closing down their centrifuges, and by sending in scores of international inspectors, who will be roaming through Iran during the entire pendency of this agreement, looking for violations that could trigger the sanctions being returned. No. 2, our goal is to bring peace and stability as best we can when it comes to the nuclear issue in the Middle East, particularly in support of our friend and ally, the nation of Israel. I think the President's good-faith effort here reaches that goal.

I support this, and I will be voting on the procedural side this afternoon to support the President's Iran agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, my dear friend and colleague and I disagree, but I very much respect the way he has conducted himself throughout this entire debate.

Every several years or so, a legislator is called upon to cast a momentous vote in which the stakes are high, and both sides of the issue feel very strongly about their views. Such is the case with the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. It demands reasoned and serious debate.

Over the years, I have learned that the best way to treat big decisions is to study the issue carefully, hear the full explanation of those for and against, and then, without regard to pressure, politics, or party, make a decision based on the merits. That is what I did with the Iran deal. I carefully studied the JCPOA, read and reread the agreement and its annexes, questioned dozens of proponents and opponents, and sought answers to questions that went beyond the text of the agreement. After deep study and considerable soul-searching, I announced that I would oppose the agreement and vote yes on the motion of disapproval.

While we have come to different conclusions, I want to give tremendous credit to President Obama for his work on this issue. The President, Secretary Kerry, and their team spent painstaking months and years pushing Iran to come to an agreement and, years before, assembling the international sanctions regime that brought Iran to the table in the first place. It was the President's farsightedness that led our Nation to accelerate development of the Massive Ordnance Penetrator, the MOP, the best military deterrent and antidote to a nuclear Iran. Regardless of how one feels about the agreement, all fairminded Americans should acknowledge the President's strong achievements in combating and containing Iran.

I also have a great deal of respect for the careful thought and deliberation my colleagues went through before making their final decisions. While I came to a different conclusion than many in my own caucus, I recognize for them that this is a vote of conscience, just as it is for me.

I wish to recount my reasoning here on the floor before a vote is taken. I examined this deal in three parts: nuclear restrictions on Iran in the first 10 years, nuclear restrictions on Iran after 10 years, and nonnuclear components and consequences of a deal. In each case, I didn't ask what is the ideal agreement. We are not in that world. I asked, are we better off with the agreement that we have before us or without it?

In the first 10 years of the deal, there are serious weaknesses in the agreement. First, inspections are not "anywhere, anytime." The potential delay of as many as 24 days before we can in-

spect undeclared, suspicious sites is troubling. It is true that declared sites will be monitored. That is one of the positives of this deal. But if Iran is going to cheat, it will not be at a declared site with the eyes of the world watching, it will be at a nondesignated site. If Iran is trying to cheat, it will certainly delay the inspection process as long as possible.

Even more troubling is the fact that the United States cannot demand inspections unilaterally. We require a majority of the eight-member joint commission. Assuming that China, Russia, and Iran will not cooperate, inspections would require the votes of all three European members of the P5+1 as well as the EU representative. It is a reasonable fear that once the Europeans become entangled in lucrative economic relations with Iran, they may not want to rock the boat by voting to allow inspections.

Additionally, the snapback provisions in the agreement seem cumbersome and difficult to use. While the United States could unilaterally cause snapback of all sanctions, there will be instances where it is more appropriate to snap back some but not all of the sanctions. A partial snapback of multilateral sanctions could be difficult to obtain because the United States would require the cooperation of other nations.

If the U.S. insists on snapback of all provisions, which it can do unilaterally, the Europeans, Russians or Chinese might feel it is too severe a punishment and might not comply.

Those who argue for the agreement say it is better to have an imperfect deal than nothing. When you consider only this portion of the deal, it is indeed better to have inspections and sanctions snapback than nothing, but even for this part of the agreement, the weaknesses with both of those processes make this argument less compelling.

Second, we must evaluate how this deal would restrict Iran's nuclear development after 10 years. In my view, if Iran's true intent is to get a nuclear weapon, under this agreement it simply must exercise patience. After 10 years, it can be very close to achieving that goal. Iran would be stronger financially, better able to advance a robust nuclear program. Unlike its current unsanctioned pursuit of a nuclear weapon, Iran's nuclear program would be codified in an agreement signed by the United States and other nations.

Finally, we must consider the non-nuclear elements of the agreement. This aspect of the deal gives me the most pause. For years Iran has used military force and terrorism to expand its influence in the Middle East by actively supporting military or terrorist actions in Israel, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, Iraq, and Gaza.

Under this agreement, Iran would receive at least \$50 billion in the future

and would undoubtedly use some of that money to create even more trouble in the Middle East and perhaps beyond. The hardliners could use these funds to pursue an ICBM as soon as sanctions are lifted and then augment their ICBM capabilities in 8 years after the ban on importing ballistic weaponry is lifted. Restrictions should have been put in place limiting how Iran could use its new resources.

Using the proponents' overall standard, not whether the agreement is ideal or whether it is better to have it or not have it, it seems to me, when it comes to the nuclear aspects of the agreement, within 10 years we might be slightly better off with it. However, when it comes to nuclear aspects after 10 years and nonnuclear aspects, we would be better off without it.

Ultimately, in my view, whether one opposes or supports the resolution of disapproval depends on how one thinks Iran will behave under this agreement—whether contact with the West and a decrease in economic and political isolation will soften Iran's hardline positions or whether the current autocratic regime views this deal as a way to get relief from onerous sanctions while still retaining their designs on nuclear arms and regional hegemony.

No one has a crystal ball. No one can tell with certainty which way Iran will go. It is true, Iran has a large number of people who want their government to decrease its isolation from the world and focus on economic advancement at home, but this desire has been evident for 35 years. Yet Iranian leaders have held a tight and undiminished grip on Iran with little threat.

Who is to say that this same dictatorship will not prevail for another 10, 20 or 30 years? To me, the very real risk that Iran will not moderate and will instead use the agreement to pursue its nefarious goals is too great; therefore, I will vote to disapprove the agreement, not because I believe war is a viable or desirable option, nor to challenge the path of diplomacy, it is because it is far too likely that Iran will not change, and under this agreement it will be able to achieve its dual goals of eliminating sanctions while ultimately retaining nuclear and non-nuclear power. It is better to keep U.S. sanctions in place, strengthen them, enforce the secondary sanctions on other nations, and pursue the hard, trident path of diplomacy once more, difficult as it may be.

For all of these reasons, I believe the vote to disapprove is the right one.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, I thank the Democratic whip for yield-

ing time to me and for his extraordinary leadership on this issue and tell him how proud I am of him and my other colleagues, no matter where we come down on this issue.

I have a little bit of a different approach to the serious matter that is before us. During the first week or two of the August recess, I did something that I suspect none of my colleagues did; I actually read the Iran deal and a lot of the materials that relate to the agreement. After putting it down, my mind wandered back to another time and place where there was an intense effort to end years of hostility and mistrust in the Middle East.

As Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors Association, I led a trade delegation in 1999 of business leaders, government officials, and citizens mostly from Delaware, many of them Jewish, and we went to Israel in the summer of 1999. We went looking to strengthen economic and cultural relations between Delaware and Israel.

Briefed by U.S. Department of State officials before departing on our mission, I also went looking for an opportunity to encourage Israeli and Palestinian leaders to seize the day and change the leadership in Israel in order to try and negotiate the two-state solution that always seemed just out of reach.

Those opportunities came sooner than I ever expected. Shortly after we landed there, we were whisked off in Israel to a sprawling outdoor Fourth of July celebration that was hosted by the U.S. Ambassador to Israel. Among the guests there that day were former General Ehud Barak, who was about to become Prime Minister of the country, and Bibi Netanyahu, the man he defeated. The other guests included the widow and daughter of the late Yitzhak Rabin, Labor Party leader Shimon Peres, former Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir, General Ariel Sharon, and a remarkable assemblage of who's who in Israel.

I spoke briefly that day with Ehud Barak and at length with him several days in his office after he had officially assumed his new duties as Prime Minister. The second conversation focused on the negotiations which lay ahead with Yasser Arafat, shepherded by the Clinton administration, to try to reach a land-for-peace deal once and for all with the Palestinians.

Ironically, a few days later, our delegation was invited to Ramallah to join Arafat and members of his leadership team for an extended lunch. Over that meal, I sat with Arafat and I shared with him the new Prime Minister's earnest desire to complete the work begun by former Prime Minister Rabin before his assassination. I urged Arafat to set aside generations of conflict and distrust in an effort to find common ground with the Israelis that would ul-

timately provide greater security for Israel and better relations with its neighbors in return for Palestinian statehood. The conversation seemed to go well. A few days later back in the States, I shared as much with the Clinton administration.

The negotiations that ensued over the course of the next year ultimately presented Arafat with the best land-for-peace proposal the Palestinians would ever receive. In the end, they turned it down. Dennis Ross, who played a key role in the negotiations for the administration, would later tell me that "Arafat simply could not take yes for an answer."

Sixteen years have passed since then. Another transformative opportunity has presented itself, and this time to America and to our five negotiating partners—the British, the French, the Germans, the Russians, and the Chinese as well as the people of Iran. We have a chance to ensure that the Iranian hopes of developing a nuclear weapon are put on the shelf for years—maybe forever.

The Iranians have a chance to bring to an end the crippling economic sanctions that the coalition we lead has imposed on Iran for years, and the Iranians have another opportunity; that is, to shed their status as a pariah among the nations of this world and assume a position worthy of their history and their culture.

Over the past 2 years, I have had countless meetings with people from Delaware and beyond our borders who fall on both sides of this issue. Some are vehemently opposed to any deal with Iran and others believe we absolutely must have a deal in order to avoid a war.

I came to support this agreement only after considering all of these points of view, reviewing the text of the deal again and again, hundreds of additional pages of supporting documents, and taking in dozens of briefings from experts on Iran and nuclear proliferation.

Two years of negotiations have produced an agreement that Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu and most of our Republican colleagues denounced almost as soon as the ink was dry on it and well before they ever read it. They said America should reject the deal and negotiate a better one. Well, to that I think you say: Good luck.

Last month, along with a number of my colleagues, I met here in Washington with ambassadors and representatives of the five nations that were our negotiating partners. To a person they argued—persuasively I thought—that this is a deal we should not reject. In effect, they urged us to learn from Arafat's mistake and this time take yes for an answer.

They are not the only ones who believe we should support this deal. There are dozens of former Israeli national security and military officials,

including retired Israeli Navy Admiral Ami Ayalon. He is pictured here. He was effectively the CNO of the Israeli Navy—the person in charge of the Navy in the last decade. I am an old Navy guy. I am a retired Navy captain. I spent 23 years in the Navy. I was interested in what he had to say when he came to my State.

Here is what he said, among other things: “The Iran deal is the best possible alternative from Israel’s point of view given the other available alternatives.”

Now, look, he is one significant Israeli leader who believes this is the right thing for Israel. As it turns out, there are dozens, and actually scores, of former Israeli military leaders and intelligence leaders who agree with him—not all but a lot, and we should listen to their voices. I have certainly listened to him.

To those who think there are dangerous people in Iran who want this deal so they can exploit it, I remind them that the Revolutionary Guard is vehemently opposed to this deal. A lot of people I have talked to in Delaware in recent weeks think that, well, the Revolutionary Guard, the bad guys and hardliners in Iran, if you will, are for it. As it turns out, they are not for it. It is quite the opposite.

Here is a photograph of Major General Mohammad Ali Jafari, commander of Iran’s Revolutionary Guard. He said: “We’ll never accept it.” That is not exactly a voice of endorsement for this agreement. I think this is all the more reason we should vigorously enforce this agreement through the intrusive inspections regime it mandates for the International Atomic Energy Agency to make for years to come, in order to ensure that the Iranians comply with every element required of them by this deal.

This deal blocks four pathways to a bomb. I will mention what they are: first of all, the uranium facility in Natanz, blocked; the uranium facility at Fordow, blocked; weapons-grade plutonium, blocked; covert attempts to make a bomb, blocked; intrusive and uncomfortable inspections; sanctions relief only after Iran meets its obligations. If they cheat, the harsh economic sanctions snap back. Who can snap them back like that? We can, the United States, and any of our negotiating partners as well. We don’t need their concurrence. We can do it alone.

Iran currently has 10,000 kilograms of enriched uranium and nearly 20,000 centrifuges, that puts them 2 or 3 months away with a nuclear bomb. Without a deal, it stays that way. With a deal, however, that enriched uranium stockpile must shrink to 300 kilograms and Iran must cut their number of centrifuges by two-thirds. And the ones they end up with are not the advanced centrifuges, they are actually the most elementary centrifuges. That change

blocks their pathway to a bomb, keeping them at least 1 year away for the next 15 years or maybe longer.

Our negotiating partners also made the following critical points repeatedly. If at the end of the day the agreement is implemented and the Iranians violate its provisions later on, we will know it. We will know it by virtue of our own intelligence, the intelligence of our partner nations, and the intelligence of the Israelis as well. If it becomes apparent that the Iranians have cheated, any of the six of our nations can mandate the reimposition of an international economic sanctions regime against Iran, the same crippling sanctions that brought them to the table 2 years ago and to this hard-fought agreement today.

Madam President, 35 years ago, the United States imposed sanctions against Iran that were largely unilateral. It was just us. Then we began ratcheting it up over time.

Unilateral sanctions by the United States were clearly a nuisance to Iran, but they did not bring Iran to the table. Only sustained, multilateral sanctions, joined in by our five negotiating partners and others around the world, succeeded in bringing Iran to the table in a mood to talk. In fact, under the agreement that has been negotiated, if necessary, they could be set up by the United States in their entirety at our request—our request—if we are convinced the Iranians are cheating. This agreement guarantees that if they are ever needed again, any of the six of us could pull the trigger and reimpose them. Conversely, if the United States rejects this agreement, we not only lose the ability to know that the Iranians are pursuing the development of a nuclear weapons capability, we will also lose the support of the rest of the world in reimposing sanctions in the event that a future government in Iran elects to pursue a nuclear weapons program. I don’t know about my colleagues, but that makes no sense to me—no sense. It also makes no sense to our negotiating partners.

Almost every American who was alive on 9/11, which we will commemorate tomorrow, remembers the horrifying images of that tragedy. To make matters worse, we had to endure the spectacle throughout the day and night of tens of thousands of Arabs across the world taking to the streets to celebrate the death of thousands of Americans. Lost among those images, however, was a remarkably different gathering that took place in another nation. It took place in, of all places, Tehran, the capital of Iran. There that night, thousands of Iranians came together in a candlelight vigil in solidarity with the United States. Most Americans have no idea that ever happened. I have never forgotten it.

A half-dozen years later in New York City, I would meet an Iranian leader

named Javad Zarif, living there with his family. He was the Iranian ambassador to the U.N. We didn’t have relations with them and we still don’t. But the Iranians have for some time had an ambassador there to the U.N. and he lives in New York City.

Zarif was educated, it turns out, at San Francisco State University and the University of Denver. I remember thinking when I met him that he spoke flawless English—better than I—and he knew more about Americans than most Americans. I think his kids were educated here as well.

Impressed, later on, after I came back to Washington, DC, I spoke to him and I said: Why don’t you come to Washington and meet some of our colleagues to give them a chance to get to know you and to have a dialogue.

He said: The George W. Bush administration won’t let me come. They won’t let me leave New York City.

So I said: Well, that is easy to fix, and I met with the Bush administration. Well, it wasn’t easy to fix, and they wouldn’t relax their travel ban.

So I later would ask Zarif in a conversation we had—this is when Ahmadinejad was the President of Iran, saying the holocaust was a figment of the imagination and the leaders of Israel should be blown off the face of the Earth. I said to Zarif: How do you get along with your President Ahmadinejad, and his response was: Not good.

He said: Ahmadinejad doesn’t trust me. I am not going to be here much longer.

And he was right. The next time I reached out to him, he was gone. He was gone, seemingly without a trace. I found out years later he had been recalled to Iran and had returned to private life writing, lecturing, and largely staying out of sight.

As Ahmadinejad’s second and final term began to wind down, a campaign to determine who would replace him ensued. A reformer named Rohani put his hat in the ring. Most people had never heard of him, at least not here. And most people in Iran said he would never have a chance to even get elected or run. Well, he got to run, and not only did he get to run, he won more votes than the other five candidates combined. In the end, he did serve.

Later on, the question was what kind of cabinet would he put together to surround himself as the leader of Iran. And what he did—we were watching to see who would be minister of this or that over there. So when Rohani submitted the names of the Iranian parliament, his submission for Foreign Minister was my friend, Zarif. You could have knocked me over with a feather. I never saw it coming, never imagined it would come. The man who had gone on to lead the Iranians in negotiations with our five negotiating partners over the past 2 years is a man

I have known for a half a dozen years or more.

Our negotiating team has been led superbly by Secretary of State John Kerry. By his side, however, for much of the past year has been a less well-known Cabinet Secretary, our Energy Secretary Ernie Moniz, who would end up playing a key role among all of the members of a very talented and dedicated team.

Dr. Moniz has never sought elected office. I first met him almost a decade ago at MIT where he was a leader and a professor in physics. He was regarded as one of the world's experts on all things nuclear. He testified one day at a field hearing I held at MIT focusing on spent fuel rods from nuclear plants. Later, I came back and people said: What is he like? And I said: This guy Moniz is a genius. And by God he is.

It turns out he is not just a genius; he leads a bunch of these national labs where people who are just as smart as he is know all kinds of information, including all things nuclear—more so than any other country in the world. As it turns out, they were harnessed to help us in this negotiation—the national labs—led by Ernie Moniz.

As it turned out, ironically, among the graduate students at MIT during Dr. Moniz's distinguished career, there was a young Iranian named Akbar Salehi. Later Salehi would return to his country and, as fate would have it, ultimately become Dr. Moniz's Iranian counterpart in the negotiations with the U.S.-led team. As it turns out, Salehi's thesis adviser at MIT was one of Ernie Moniz's closest friends at MIT, and thus was created maybe not a bond, but a connection, and a shared trust that went back to both Ernie Moniz, a former professor at MIT, and a former graduate student, Salehi at MIT.

It didn't take long for Secretary Moniz to make a profound impression during the negotiations. Shortly after he joined the team earlier this year, he gave the Iranians what several members of the U.S. team would later describe to me as a tutorial in all things nuclear, making it clear that the Iranians had "more than met their match." Adding Ernie Moniz to our team was I think a stroke of genius, not only bringing him here, but the national labs as well. In the countless meetings he has participated in with House and Senate Members, he has bolstered the credibility, probably as much as anybody, of the agreement—and the confidence of many in it—in ways that almost no other American could do.

Much has been made of whether we can trust the Iranians to do what they have committed to do. John Kerry, Ernie Moniz, and the other members of our team have made clear that the agreement they and our five partners from the other nations have hammered

out with Iran is not based on trust. Let me say that again: It is not based on trust. It is based, as we have already heard on this floor, on mistrust. We realize that some future Iranian regime may well ponder whether to violate the agreement and launch another pilot program to develop another nonpeaceful nuclear capability. If they actually attempt to do that, the key questions are these: Will we know it? Are the consequences for Iran severe enough to deter them from going forward with it? I am convinced the answer to both those questions is yes.

Today, Iran has much more than the hardline Revolutionary Guard whose influence has begun to wane. Iran today is a nation of 78 million people. Their average age is 25. Most of them were not alive in 1979 during the Iranian revolution. They don't remember the brutal Shah we propped up for years and allowed to come to our country when his regime fell. This new generation of Iranians is ready to take yes for an answer. I think we should too. This is a good deal for America and our allies, and that certainly includes Israel, one of our closest allies. I think it beats the likely alternative that there could well be war with Iran, hands down.

I will close with this brief conversation. About a year and a half ago I was up in New York in a house that Senator DURBIN had actually visited with me, as well as a couple of others where Zarif used to live. We had the opportunity to talk about the upcoming negotiations. I said: Zarif, you and Iran have a choice. You can have a strong, vibrant economy for your country again, or you can have a nuclear weapons program. You cannot have both. And we are not going to accept a nuclear weapons program.

We have the ability to know if they cheat. If they cheat, we have the ability to put right back in place these same crippling economic sanctions. If that doesn't do the job, we have other alternatives at our disposal. Nothing is off the table.

Sometimes around here we talk about voting our fears or voting our hopes. I am prepared to vote my hopes, for our Nation and the Iranians as well. Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I wish to thank my colleague, the Senator from Delaware. That was a very thoughtful presentation. The Senator from Delaware has a personal interest in and has made a personal commitment to this issue. I thank him for his insight.

I now yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. PETERS. Madam President, earlier this week I announced that I will

reluctantly support the Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action and oppose the resolution of disapproval, despite some very serious reservations.

I did not reach this position easily or quickly. Although there are many positive aspects to this deal, this agreement also has flaws that I believe need to be addressed in the months and years ahead.

The congressional review period has served a very useful purpose. My colleagues on both sides of the aisle have raised very important points about this deal as we were briefed by experts and administration negotiators. I commend Senators CARDIN and CORKER for their bipartisan efforts to establish this review and for affirming Congress's role in shaping our Nation's foreign policy.

After this debate is over, it is my hope that moving forward the Senate will forge bipartisan consensus and act with unity of purpose. We must work together and take action against Iran if they fail to live up to their obligations under this agreement, and we must work on legislation and multinational and lateral efforts to combat Iran's sponsorship of terrorist activities, arms smuggling, and hegemonic ambitions.

We need to look no further than the humanitarian crisis emanating from Syria to see the havoc and chaos that Iran and its proxies are wreaking on an already troubled region.

We need to provide robust oversight and work together to stem the proliferation of nuclear material, especially from nascent nuclear states and from Iran in particular. Nearly 20 countries produce safe nuclear power without domestic enrichment. America's longstanding policy is that the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty does not provide the right to enrich uranium.

While in the short term this agreement helps reduce Iran's capacity to enrich and eliminates the vast majority of their Iranian stockpile, I am concerned that in the long term other nations will view this agreement as a precedent that will lead to increased proliferation of nuclear enrichment and the potential for other nations to emerge as threshold nuclear states.

Just a few years ago, the United States signed and ratified a 123 Agreement with the United Arab Emirates that would help them build nuclear power capabilities while explicitly preventing them from enriching uranium on their soil.

The United States must take a leadership role in setting a threshold of acceptable levels of enrichment of uranium for the safe production of nuclear energy. As more nations look to meet growing energy needs while minimizing carbon output, a comprehensive policy to ensure only safe levels of uranium enrichment with strong international safeguards is critical to global security.

No nation faces a more severe threat than Iran's nuclear ambitions than the State of Israel. For decades, the Iranian regime has made it their mandate to eliminate the Jewish State. We must be united in ensuring that this never happens. We must always be ready to act to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and smuggling arms to its proxies in the region.

As the Middle East falls deeper into chaos, our alliance with Israel, a nation that shares so many of our values, has never been more important. America must reaffirm our longstanding commitment to Israel's security by renewing our memorandum of understanding, providing Israel with defense capabilities in order to cement its qualitative military edge in the region, and bolstering Israel's ability to initiate deterrence against Iran.

The JCPOA is not the end of our multilateral efforts against Iran and its illicit behavior. America must work with our allies to initiate multilateral sanctions against Iran for its terrorist activities, especially its funding of Hezbollah and Hamas.

We also need to set clear understandings of how Iran will be sanctioned for minor violations of this agreement that will not initiate the snapback of full sanctions. We must continue working in a coordinated fashion to ensure unity in purpose against Iran's nuclear ambitions, terrorist activities, and efforts to destabilize the region. We must also continue pressing for the release of all U.S. hostages currently imprisoned in Iran, including Amir Hekmati. Congress must address these issues.

In 2009 Congress debated whether to pursue sanctions or diplomacy with Iran first, with military force always being the last resort but a necessary final deterrent. I was proud to cosponsor the effort to pass sanctions in 2009 and help pass additional sanctions in the years since. As a new Member of the Senate, I joined a group of bipartisan Senators ready to pass additional sanctions against Iran as they continued to drag out negotiations. Iran needed to know that the patience of the United States was not limitless.

The JCPOA is a product of complex negotiations and painstaking compromises. But let's be clear. Either rejecting or accepting this deal comes with a set of distinct risks. However, those who oppose this deal have been accused of supporting war over diplomacy, and those who support this deal have been likewise portrayed as supporting containment and capitulation. Foreign policy is rarely so simple, and it is certainly not so simple in this case.

As leaders of this great Nation, we owe it to our citizens and the men and women in uniform to never let ourselves become so fractured by partisan politics on issues of such importance to

national security. I look forward to working with Senators on both sides of the aisle to protect the interests of our allies and the safety and security of this great Nation and to ensure that the United States of America remains both united in our goals and indivisible in our purpose.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I want to talk about this arrangement and agreement with Iran and cover several points and what I think are important realities that have not been emphasized in this debate, but first I would like to address the issue of the 60-vote margin.

First, I think it should be on the record that the minority leader offered to the majority leader a unanimous consent agreement that there would be no filibuster on the motion to proceed and there would be a 60-vote threshold required for final passage of the bill. As I understand it, that offer was rejected. That means the only alternative is to go the technical rule of the filibuster in order to require a 60-vote margin.

It is absolutely clear from the legislative record of the Corker-Cardin bill that everyone involved in that discussion, including the Senator from Tennessee, understood that a 60-vote margin would be required in the passage of this legislation. There is no question about it. There are quotes in the RECORD. Everyone understood that from the beginning of the consideration of the Corker-Cardin bill.

Finally, every major issue that has come before this bill since I have been here has required 60 votes, whether it was immigration or background checks or extension of unemployment benefits or the minimum wage. All of those have required a 60-vote threshold. That has been the standard in this body. We could debate whether that should or should not be the standard, but it is, it has been, and this is not a time to decide we are going to arbitrarily abandon that.

I must say I am sort of amazed to hear people discussing this as if this is some kind of new imposition of a rule, and it reminds me of "Casablanca": I am shocked—shocked—to understand that there might be a 60-vote requirement on this piece of legislation.

That has been the standard for this body certainly for as long as I have been here and for some time longer. As I say, we can discuss whether that should be the standard, but that is what it is, and no one should be surprised that is the way we are proceeding here today.

OK. Let's talk about the agreement—five quick realities.

No. 1, Iran is a nuclear threshold state today. There is a lot of argument. I sat through the long debate yesterday afternoon about what happens in 2030, what happens in 15 years, and would Iran be somehow a legitimized nuclear threshold state. They are a nuclear threshold state today. The risk to the world is imminent. It is not in 15 years; it is today. That is why this agreement is so important—because basically it freezes and rolls back Iran's nuclear capabilities for at least the next 15 years and probably longer.

The No. 2 reality: Iran is a rogue nation. It foments terrorism around the world. It is a state sponsor of terrorism. Everyone knows that. Under this agreement, as has been pointed out, because of the nature of the negotiations, which were "roll back your nuclear program in exchange for relief from the sanctions," they will indeed receive relief from the sanctions, and that will give them additional funds for their economy and possibly for their nefarious purposes. But I would submit that the only thing worse than a rogue Iran is a rogue Iran armed with nuclear weapons. That is the essence of this deal. It prevents their opportunity to gain nuclear weapons, to create sufficient fissile material. It rolls back what they already have.

I should point out that they became a nuclear threshold state during the imposition of various sanctions regimes. So it is clear that sanctions in and of themselves are never going to prevent their achievement of becoming a nuclear weapons state.

No. 3, this is a multilateral agreement. All the discussion around here acts as if it is the United States and Iran, Obama and the Ayatollah. It indeed involves the world's major powers. It involves Great Britain, France, Germany, China, Russia, and other countries that have helped to enforce those sanctions and make them effective. If we walk away from this deal, we are doing so alone.

We had an extraordinary meeting before the recess with Ambassadors from the P5+1 countries. They made it clear that they had accepted this agreement and that if we rejected it, their willingness to go back to the table, reimpose the sanctions, reinforce the sanctions—I believe one of the Ambassadors used the term "far-fetched"—it is not going to happen.

The sanctions are going to erode starting now, no matter what we do in this Congress. I can't figure out any way that a weaker sanctions regime—which is inevitable because other countries involved in the sanctions have already started to make moves toward doing business with Iran—I don't see how a weaker sanctions regime is ever going to bring Iran back to the table to get a better deal.

Reality No. 4: This agreement is flawed. It is not the agreement I would

prefer. There are elements that I think could be improved. I wish the 15 years was 20 or 30 years. I wish the 24 days was 12 days or 8 days or 1 day. But this is the agreement that is before us. And the analysis could not be strictly of the agreement itself and within its four corners, but compared to what? That is really the basic question here—not whether this a good deal or a bad deal. The question is, How does this deal, no matter what its flaws, compare with the alternatives that are out there? In all of the drama and all of the argument and all of the speeches and rallies that we have heard, no one has yet come up with a credible alternative. I have not yet heard a credible alternative. The only thing I hear is this: We will reimpose sanctions and bring them back to the table and get a better deal. It is going to be very hard to reimpose those sanctions without the support of our international partners. If we enter into the deal and Iran cheats, then we can bring the international partners back with us, but to do so—to try to think that we could do so now is just unrealistic. I wish there were a better alternative. I also wish I could play tight end for the New England Patriots, but it is not going to happen. It is simply not realistic. There is no credible alternative.

Finally, we have to talk about what happens after the deal. Congress has a responsibility. The administration has a responsibility. We cannot trust Iran. Everyone knows that. No one argues that.

There has been a lot of discussion about the IAEA. I serve on the Intelligence Committee. We had a briefing just yesterday morning with the heads of our intelligence agencies. It is not just the IAEA that is going to be watching this agreement, it is the world's intelligence community, and we have significant capability to know if they are cheating over and above and in addition to anything the IAEA brings to the table. This is not trust; this is verification based upon the IAEA's worldwide experience but also based upon the considerable intelligence assets of the United States and other countries that are supporting us in this effort.

Finally, there are risks. I understand that. There are risks on both sides. There are severe risks. This is not an easy call. It is one of the hardest decisions I have ever had to make. But if you analyze the alternatives and weigh the risks, I believe the risks of not going forward with this agreement are significantly greater than the risks of giving diplomacy a chance going forward with this agreement, which can be verified. If there is cheating, it can be caught, No. 1, and punished, No. 2, and if the agreement doesn't work, we have the same options we have today.

This is a difficult decision. It is one that has weighed on this body and on

this country. But I think this is a tremendous opportunity for us to avoid a nuclear-armed Iran and secure at least that part of a peaceful Middle East and more secure world.

Thank you, Madam President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, let me thank my colleague from Maine for his thoughtful presentation.

I would like to ask how much time remains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seven minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I am going to yield to the Senator from Ohio. I hope 7 minutes is adequate. If it is not, I would ask unanimous consent to extend that and offer time to the other side or whatever is necessary.

I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN. I thank you, Madam President, and I thank the assistant Democratic leader.

Madam President, I rise in support of the international agreement designed to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. No one in this body trusts Iran. No one in this body disputes that Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism, that it denies Israel's right to exist, and that it destabilizes the Middle East and violates the human rights of its people. That is why we need to prevent a nuclear-armed Iran, which would pose an exponentially greater danger to the security of the United States, to our long-time important ally Israel, and to the entire world. This is the only viable option.

As Senator KING said, no one has answered the question of what happens if we reject this agreement. Well, of the hundreds of calls I have made and the dozens of briefings and discussions I have had with people on both sides of the agreement—from Israeli officials, to American security people, to activists, engaged citizens on both sides of this—nobody has answered the question: What do we do if this agreement is killed in the Congress? What would follow? What is the alternative?

I am incredibly proud of the diligent work my Democratic colleagues have done over the last 6 weeks in researching, examining, and questioning this deal. There was no knee-jerk reaction on our side where people all went the same way almost immediately when the agreement came out. People on the Democratic side of the aisle listened to experts, and they listened to stakeholders. We came to thoughtful, informed decisions.

I made my decision after serious study of the agreement's contents, after listening to Ohioans on all sides of this, after consulting with nuclear experts, such as the Energy Secretary

and Nobel Prize-winning physicist Secretary Moniz. I attended hours of briefings from the President, from the Energy Secretary, from Treasury Secretary Lew, from Secretary of State Kerry, and other administration officials. I consulted U.S. intelligence officials, outside arms control experts, and met for over an hour with Israel's Ambassador to the United States. I met with all five of the Ambassadors of the P5+1 countries; those who have been long-time allies of ours from France, England, and Germany; those from China, and from Russia, who are allies on this issue, if not a number of others. All—every one of them individually, collectively, warned that the United States—it would be the United States which would be isolated internationally if Congress rejects this agreement.

Many of my colleagues talk about Iran's sponsorship of terrorism, its human rights abuses, and its pursuit of ballistic missiles. These are legitimate concerns, but they are not the focus of this agreement. Of course we would love to solve those issues. Sanctions on those issues will remain in place, but that was not the focus of this nuclear agreement.

Let's be clear. When I hear opponents say that Iran 10, 15 years from now would be a threshold nuclear state—maybe they will, maybe they will not. That is certainly debatable. It is not debatable that Iran is a nuclear threshold state right now. They are 2 to 3 months away from being able to produce enough fissile material for a bomb. That is a fact. They are 2 to 3 months away from being able to produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon.

The agreement provides for comprehensive restrictions today—beginning when Congress allows this agreement to move forward, to block Iran's pathway to a bomb. They include reducing Iran's installed centrifuges by two-thirds for at least 10 years, cutting its stockpile of enriched uranium by 98 percent for 15 years, reconfiguring its plutonium reactor to render it inoperable and deny Iran a source of weapons-grade plutonium.

To verify Iran's compliance, the deal requires 24/7 access to all declared nuclear sites. The United Nations inspectors will say that of the 120 country inspections they have done, this is the most comprehensive and the most intrusive. The deal provides time-certain access to all suspicious sites in Iran. It provides for a permanent prohibition on Iran acquiring or developing a nuclear weapon. It provides a permanent ban on nuclear weapons research and a permanent inspection regime for their nuclear program.

If Iran violates the deal, the agreement gives the United States extraordinary power to snap back both U.S. and international sanctions without fear of veto by other nations. The

President made clear that if 10 or 15 or 20 years from now Iran tries to build a bomb, this agreement ensures the United States will have better tools to target it. Americans fundamentally don't want another war in the Middle East. Americans strongly prefer a diplomatic solution, which this agreement is all about, that ensures that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear weapon.

At the beginning of my remarks, I spoke about the serious way, with great gravitas, that Democratic after Democratic Senator—the serious way we pursued coming to a decision on this. Let me contrast for a moment on this, one of the most significant national security issues Congress will face in a generation. I have been in the House and Senate for 20 years now. This will be one of the two most important decisions I have made on foreign policy. The first was my vote against the war in Iraq. It was clearly the right vote, even though at the time there was public support for it.

We know that the information we were presented was not exactly right in the end, even though there was huge support in Congress and a lot of public support for going into war with Iraq. I thought about that a lot. I made a decision that I thought the Iraq war would be disastrous for our country. That decision clearly was right. It was not so partisan back then, although we had a President that certainly pushed us and a Vice President, especially, that pushed us into that war.

But this agreement should not be subject to the kind of reflexive partisan attacks we have seen in recent months. Just a few months ago, 47 of my Republican colleagues signed a letter signaling their opposition to the emerging deal—not just that, they signed a letter to the Ayatollah—to the leader of the enemy, Iran—suggesting that the deal was not quite on the up-and-up because of the President of the United States. They signed a letter that was teaching the Ayatollah, if you will, some American civic lessons. Imagine, if Democrats in the Senate in the early 1980s had written a letter to President Gorbachev saying: Don't negotiate with Ronald Reagan. Imagine if we had done that.

I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Imagine if that had happened. So we start off with 47 Republicans writing to the Ayatollah, saying, fundamentally: Don't negotiate with President Obama. We have seen now not a single one of my colleagues is in support of this agreement, even though Secretary Powell supports it, even though former Senator Lugar, who was as respected as anybody in this country as a former Republican Senator, supports it. It is not just disappointing

that not a single one of my Republican colleagues supports this, but the first day the agreement came out, I heard talk radio saying: Read the agreement. Read the bill. The first day this agreement came out, 19 Republicans—on that first day—came out in opposition to this agreement. There is no way they could have read it. I know how complicated this agreement is. I have read it. I assume that every one of my Democratic colleagues, in an arduous, focused, difficult, persistent way, studied this issue. Then I see what happened on the other side of the aisle when it was—as Timothy Crouse said the press does in the “Boys on the Bus”—if one of them flies off the telephone wire, they all fly off the telephone wire.

That is what happened. I was just so disappointed. Senator CORKER is here, one of the people who did not sign that letter and one of the people who thought about this issue. But what I saw in the contrast of the way we looked at this, it was pretty disturbing.

I will conclude. My time is running out. This agreement will matter for our country. It is clearly in our national interests. I think there has been no good answer offered on what happens if we walk away. That is why I ask my colleagues to vote no on the next vote coming in front of us.

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, I want to thank the Senator for his comments. Just so we know how we are organized on this side for the next hour—and I think we are about evened up on the time, maybe 3 minutes more needs to come our way but roughly even. For the next 30 minutes, we have Senator COATS, one of our outstanding foreign policy, national security Senators, who served as an ambassador; 15 minutes for Senator GRASSLEY; and 15 minutes for Senator ROBERTS.

I thank you so much for being here and your incredibly responsible way of facing this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Madam President, I thank my colleague Senator CORKER for his diligent efforts, as it consumed literally hundreds, if not thousands, of hours as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in helping guide us through this very important, very difficult process.

I was on this floor earlier saying this is an issue that rises above partisan politics. This is something that each of us as a Senator has to weigh carefully. I don't know how many hours and how much time I have spent reading through, parsing through, trying to analyze and understand this agreement, its side annexes and everything connected with it. I would like to now

say to my colleagues, perhaps with an appeal that they at least, at the very least, set aside: The deal is done. You lost. Therefore, we are not even going to allow a vote on this matter.

This is one of the most historic, consequential measures that anyone in this Chamber will ever be confronted with. I know for me it is one of the most historic because of the consequences that may occur if we don't get this right. It is important that we debate this, have ample time to go through every bit of this, and have each Member weigh carefully what we hear from each other and what we come to understand on the basis of our own personal examination. I hope that will be the case. To deny us the opportunity to even let our yes be yes or our no be no before the public I think would be a tragic mistake.

I would like to go back a little bit and talk about my history with all of this. When I returned from my ambassadorship to Germany and actually had to deal with this as one of many different issues—because even back then there was great concern among both the United States and the German Government over Iran's pursuit of nuclear weapons capability. I engaged in a number of discussions and diplomatic efforts there in working with our allied country Germany on this issue. But when I did come back, I suppose partly because of my engagement there, I was asked by the Bipartisan Policy Center that had just been formed to chair a task force on this very issue, the Iranian pursuit of nuclear weapons.

We obviously wanted this to be bipartisan, so I recruited my fellow Senate colleague Chuck Robb, then a retired Senator from Virginia. Together we co-chaired that effort. Later we were joined by retired 4-star General and Deputy Supreme Allied Commander of Europe Chuck Wall. We put together a who's who of experts on the Middle East and experts on nuclear capabilities. We had renowned experts from across the spectrum come and present to us.

All of that resulted in three major reports titled: “Meeting the Challenge, U.S. Policy Towards Iranian Nuclear Development”; the second one, “Meeting the Challenge, Time is Running Out”; the third, “Meeting the Challenge When Time Runs Out.”

There is a treasure trove of information here about how Iran has violated U.N. treaty resolutions, violated the nonproliferation treaty agreement. We have talked about the consequences of all of this and made recommendations to the administration, whatever administration that would be. As it turns out, these recommendations went both to a Republican administration under President George W. Bush and to the Obama administration under our current President.

Clearly, we have outlined—and in the interest of time I will not be able to go

back through all of this. But let me just state a couple of the conclusions here relative to all of this. Absent necessary leverage, we believe it unlikely that Supreme Leader Khamenei will reciprocate President Obama's conciliatory gestures in a meaningful way.

First of all, we endorsed diplomacy to its ultimate, but we recognized that diplomacy has its limits. You can sit at a table and not come to agreement for decades. We had been trying diplomatic efforts with Iran and they were not succeeding. So then we talked about the necessity of having sanctions, ever-ratcheting, tightening sanctions, to bring Iran to the table. Included in that was the threat of the use of force if all else failed.

None on that committee were warmongers. We wanted to do everything possible to prevent conflict in this in solving this problem. So we laid out a long framework. Perhaps if this continues into next week, I will be able to go through some of this framework, but the key on this is stated here somewhere. The key to this was that you had to have a combination of tough diplomacy, which we had years of, and we were going to continue that, backed up by ever-ratcheting sanctions, to show Iran that there was a price to pay for not coming to agreement, and then backed up ultimately by the threat of force if we could not secure an agreement, which would reach the goal.

The goal was to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapon capability, knowing the destabilization that would take place in the Middle East, the historic impact this would have, and consequences this would have if we allowed that to happen.

Let me move on to what I believe are major problems with this deal. We know Iran's misbehavior, its violation of six U.N. treaties that it agreed to, its violation of the nonproliferation treaty, its support for terrorism. It is a bad actor, perhaps the world's worst bad actor, engaging in weaponization that killed American troops. We are dealing with a rogue nation here.

I don't know how my colleagues react to this, but when they cut a deal with the United States, they are cheering on the streets of Tehran. And the Supreme Leader came out yesterday and basically said: Well, don't worry, Israel won't be around in the next 25 years. They will be wiped off the map. We have already said "Death to Israel" and also "Death to the Great Satan, the United States." This is the party that we just negotiated an agreement with.

Now, if we had negotiated an agreement that achieved our goals, I would say good for us. Finally, the sanctions worked. We came up with a good agreement. But I have read through this document and parsed over every word, tried to find every meaning. I serve on

the Senate Intelligence Committee, and earlier I served on the Armed Services Committee. I have had more than a decade of experience in this.

I spent almost the entire weekend carefully reading this, hoping that we had achieved, if not all, at least some of the most important goals we had.

But to my dismay, we ended up not achieving any of those goals. The goal was to prevent Iran from having nuclear weapons capability that could break out and totally destabilize the Middle East. What we have come up with is an agreement that puts them on a path to do exactly that, justified now by this agreement, justified by the Security Council at the U.N.

I said there were two major things that needed to be talked about before we talk about some of the specifics: First is the false claim that we must choose between accepting this failed agreement or war, and the second is that the agreement prevents Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

This is the sales pitch from the White House. This is the sales pitch that is being made to the American people, and neither of these is true.

It has to be a desperate administration that has chosen to force this agreement on us by arguing that it is a choice between this deal and war. I am disgusted by the administration's sales strategy for this agreement and those who are led down the path of belief that the only option here is war, and therefore, no matter what we gave away, this deal is better than the alternative.

This false choice is among the most infamous, cynical, and blatantly false manipulations the Obama administration has used to distort this important debate, and they ought to be ashamed of themselves for using this tactic.

In fact, the false argument masks a far more valid argument that this deal makes future war far more likely, not less. By abandoning the tool of economic sanctions, in giving away a strong, principled negotiating position, the administration's desperate tactic is reducing our options when Iran does go nuclear, as we have put them on the path to do.

President Obama and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly said over the past year: No deal is better than a bad deal. They never argued that any deal is better than no deal, yet that is what they ended up conceding.

We had the strength of the six most powerful countries in the world—the United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia—sitting at one side of the negotiating table. On the other side of the negotiating table was Iran, crippled by sanctions and oil falling into the range of \$40 a barrel, costing more to extract and sell than they could get back. They were desperate to achieve some kind of relief from these sanctions.

We had the negotiating leverage. We gave away that leverage in these negotiations, desperate to conclude any deal whatsoever so that we could avoid making some difficult decisions down the line in terms of what we had said we must do.

Four Presidents—including this President, two Democrats, two Republicans—said it is unacceptable for Iran to achieve nuclear capability. We gave that away just to get them at the table. Just to get them at the table, we took off the use of any force, any leverage or additional sanctions or continuing sanctions in order to get to the table—not negotiating to get what we needed, but just to get to the table.

The administration has accepted, in my opinion, a deeply flawed deal and then set it in motion with a U.N. Security Council resolution on the next day, well before Congress could even respond to it.

Thank goodness Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN were able to convince their colleagues on a 98-to-1 vote to give Congress the right to have a say in this issue. Had that not happened, the President, by not declaring this a treaty, by declaring this simply an executive agreement, the President would have locked this thing in even before we had a chance to read it, before the American people even had a chance to know what it was except for what the President told them it was or the Secretary of State told them that it was.

So we are having this debate thanks to these two men, these two leaders—one a Republican and one a Democrat—who had the courage to stand up to this President and say: No, the American people deserve to have a say.

And, boy, what a say it is. I don't know about others. My mail is running 10 to 1 against this. Maybe I am talking to the wrong people. I don't know, but the more they learn about this agreement, the more they say: Are you crazy? We gave up that? For what? What did we get back?

I want to go over some of that, trying to move through this because I know time is of the essence here, but this idea that war is the only alternative—and then the sales pitch that I have heard so many of my colleagues and others who support the deal say: You know, I am for this because this prevents Iran from having a nuclear bomb. It is just the opposite. It gives Iran the pathway to have a nuclear bomb. This has a sunset clause in it, and it releases all the sanctions. It has a sunset clause that says after 15 years they can do whatever they want to do. We cannot reimpose sanctions. What kind of a deal is that? But the false narrative that this will not allow that—the agreement, even the annexes say we have to help Iran achieve nuclear research, nuclear research that can help them move toward this.

I looked at the annex and said: Surely, I am reading this wrong. We are

committed to help them? And if other nations, say Israel, want to take action against this because they think they are going to be extinguished from the face of the Earth—as the Iranians have told them that is going to happen—if they want to take action, we actually are required to convince the Israelis not to do that. We side with the Iranians.

I mean, you can't write this script. This is beyond comprehension. So those two false narratives alone ought to be reason to say: Wait a minute. Let's not go forward with this deal. Surely we can find a way to negotiate a better deal for us.

Our Bipartisan Policy Center committee—I want to read from this because we looked into this very question, and this was the conclusion: Even if Iran were to honor all of its obligations and fully comply with all the restrictions in the agreement—JCPOA—the deal would not prevent a nuclear Iran indefinitely. Starting in year 13, Iran will be able to break out, produce enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon in about 10 weeks, down from 1 year. In year 16 Iran would obtain nuclear weapons capabilities in a breakout time of less than 3 weeks.

That was the conclusion—not of Republicans—that was the conclusion of a bipartisan group of experts, chaired by a Republican and a Democratic former Senator at the time.

And what we have said actually has come true. The sunset clause should, by itself, be enough to persuade, hopefully, a majority of us to reject this deal. This doesn't make sense.

If President Bush in 2001 had presented to the American people this same deal with Iran and secured the votes to pass this deal, today Iran would be having breakout—unrestricted breakout, assisted by the agreement. And we are going to call that a diplomatic victory?

Fifteen years is going to go by very fast. They are going to have breakout capability much earlier than that and could easily—if you read the agreement—easily declare that we have breached the agreement, they are pulling back, and therefore they are going forward. And they will have well over \$100 billion to achieve that effort. They will have sanctions relief—total sanctions relief. They will be able to export all of the oil that they want, and Iran wins.

There are some particular problems with this, and they have been listed by people on the right, Charles Krauthammer, and on the left or at least in the middle, David Brooks. The New York Times is not exactly a Republican rag, and David Brooks is not necessarily far rightwing. They are basically saying: Every single major goal that we had going into this agreement has been given away in a desperate attempt to achieve any agreement so

that we don't have to deal with this. What we have to deal with can be pushed down the road.

So on that basis I went through the agreement and looked at some of these areas. I would like to identify for the record those that we had the leverage to achieve—a goal, a stated goal by the administration and by others negotiating to achieve—and we caved on every one of them.

First, verification inspections. Most people understand that anytime, anywhere means anytime, anywhere. Actually, now it means—well, a minimum of 24 days if Iran agrees with us initially that we should go through this convoluted process where Iran helps make the decisions. It is like giving Tom Brady and the Patriots the right to determine whether or not the footballs were deflated. I am from Indiana, it is the Colts, and they whipped us in the Super Bowl. I am probably biased in that statement.

On the other hand, just to simplify it for people, if you have an adversary that you don't trust and you want to have an ability to find out if whether or not what they do and say is true, you don't say: Go ahead, check it yourself, then tell me what you think, and we will take that for an answer. So, talk about caving anytime, anywhere on inspections.

The administration also argued this principle of short notice. Secretary Kerry, when asked this at one of our meetings here, basically said: No, we never pursued such a goal; and, indeed, we never heard of it.

I, along with every one of us here was relieved when the administration announced—I don't know if it was Secretary Kerry or one of his team supporters—announced inspections anytime, anywhere, and everybody said: Oh, OK, at least we have that.

Now we learn no American can be part of the inspection team. Now we learn that a U.N. independent agency will do inspections, and now we have learned that military and former weapon manufacturing and research facilities are off limits, and we are not even allowed to inspect them.

So anywhere, anytime has become a farce. How can you possibly—that in and of itself would be reason not to vote for this agreement. How go do you go home and say to people: Anytime, anywhere is a scrubbed version of 24 hours a day at a minimum as long as Iran agrees.

It doesn't take somebody with a Ph.D. or a law degree—or even a Senator or a Congressman who has dived into these issues—for people to say, are you nuts? Who would sign a deal like that?

Uranium enrichment—we caved there. Then talk about one of the key weaknesses is the agreement that the centrifuges are to be disconnected and only stored feet from their original po-

sition. They can be reintroduced into the enrichment system when the earlier expiration dates of the deal occur, whenever the Iranians choose to move quickly toward nuclear capability.

This involves some highly technical stuff, but the bottom line is almost all aspects of these enrichment details in dispute are in dispute by experts who understand the technical application of all of this, and they are not persuaded by the misleading leadership coming out of the administration—once again another cave.

Fordow. What is Fordow? Fordow is a facility at which some nuclear technology pursuit was being undertaken, and we wanted to be able to shut that down.

But the Iranians said: No, no, I don't think so.

So we said: OK, let's cave on that; let's move onto something else.

The same applied to military dimensions and undisclosed military facilities. So Secretary Kerry is faced again with Iranian intransigence and explained his new position now. He no longer was fixated on the past: That was something that we talked about months ago. I am not fixated on that anymore. So scratch that one off. Don't worry. Keep Fordow. Keep Fordow open, no problem. What is next?

Sanctions relief. This agreement does not generally relieve sanctions pressure as originally intended. Rather it abandons the sanctions regime entirely all at once. Indeed, the multilateral sanctions are now already gone. European nations and others are flocking into Tehran to sign long-term agreements that will never be subject to sanctions if they are snapped back. We lost again. So the re-imposition of sanctions, if we find out something is wrong here, is a farce. It is not implementable.

I talked about snap-back here, so I am going to move forward from that. This is one I mentioned before, but I still can't comprehend it.

The deal obligates the P5+1—that is the six of us, the six nations that were negotiating—to actually help Iran build up its nuclear infrastructure during the 15 years before they achieve a 3-week breakout. So we are actually helping them construct their nuclear infrastructure, which then can easily be converted to breaking out for a nuclear weapon. And in return for altering their timetable for nuclear industrial development, the Iranians secured not just international acceptance of that activity but actual assistance in pursuing it.

That is incredible. We are actually helping Iran get to the bomb? As we hear from some of our colleagues and others who support this agreement, they say: I am voting for this because this prevents Iran from getting the bomb. Read the agreement. It is not

easy to read. It is not fun to read. But it is alarming to read.

I was in the Senate during the 1990s and the negotiations with North Korea, and actually, Wendy Sherman, the principal negotiator along with Senator Kerry of this agreement, was the principal negotiator in the North Korea agreement. I remember being told on this floor through the President of the United States, then President Clinton and his Secretary of State and others: Don't worry; we have total verification procedures in place. If they cheat on us, we are going to know it. And when we know it, we are going to stop it. Well, here it is 2015, and North Korea has somewhere between 20 and 40 nuclear weapons sitting on top of ballistic missiles, and we didn't know it.

That made me a skeptic going into this thing because it is like *deja vu* here. We are being told the same thing: Don't worry; we will know if they cheat. We will be able to do something to stop them.

This is the assurance that this is a good deal. So that is a hard sale for me. It is a no sale for me. I didn't end up voting for that because I had some real suspicions about whether that would take place. But that actually ought to be a lesson for all of us here—that something that is promised by the President of the United States and his Secretary of State and his negotiating team won't necessarily come true and be the case. So the promises that have been made about what this agreement is and what it isn't and what we will be able to do I measure by what didn't work out really well in North Korea, and yet the same negotiator that negotiated that helped negotiate on this.

I don't know if my colleague from Tennessee is standing because I am running long on this, but I have a lot more I would like to say. I am going to try to move to a couple of last things here.

Some prominent people have been noted here as favoring the deal. Well, I think Henry Kissinger is someone who probably has some experience, at the age of 90-some years and a lifetime in diplomacy. I don't have to give his credentials. And George Shultz also has some credibility on this. So if you want to listen to one side on this, you ought to listen to the other. These individuals have said:

Previous thinking on nuclear strategy assumed the existence of stable state actors. . . . How will these doctrines translate into a region where sponsorship of nonstate proxies is common, the state structure is under assault, and death on behalf of jihad is a kind of fulfillment?

Sadly, their views have been largely ignored and not mentioned by anybody else. So if they are going to mention their guys, we are going to mention our guys.

Look, the last thing I want to say here before I conclude is there hasn't

been much discussion about the consequences for Israel, our democratic ally in the region, which I think should be a core issue. Prime Minister Netanyahu was here and spoke to a joint assembly of Congress. He received standing ovations for standing tall and standing hard and saying the very future existence of my nation is at risk here. He made the point that a bad deal is not better than no deal, that a bad deal could be worse than no deal, and that there are ways around this.

We cannot ignore the major risk that Iran will follow through with their often-repeated threats of obliterating the State of Israel—a threat that was just repeated by the Supreme Leader yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute to conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. I thank my colleagues.

In conclusion, with this agreement, we have paid too much and gained too little. The risks are not adequately acknowledged and not effectively addressed. I cannot support this agreement. I cannot approve the misguided desperation that led to it.

I cannot understand those who claim this is a great victory for diplomacy nor those who turn a blind eye to its obvious failings because of the appeal of party discipline nor those who have fallen prey to the Obama administration's manipulation of the deal with the U.N. prior to Congress having any say in this.

When I read about the gloating, the boastful joy in Iran—in Tehran, their capital—that all their needs were met and none of their redlines were crossed, I despaired. I despaired because this misadventure has been a failure of vision, a failure of will, and a historic failure of leadership. I fear these failures will lead to great suffering.

We have seen this before. Peace at any price is not peace. Peace at any price sometimes leads to tragic consequences. In the last century we saw the loss of tens of millions of lives because the goal was to seek peace at any price. We cannot make that mistake again.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORKER. Again, Madam President, I thank my colleague very much for his passionate comments and his concern from day one about this agreement.

I think we ran over a little bit. I know Senator BROWN of Ohio ran over. If I can ask how much time remains on our side, I think we maybe go to 1:04 p.m., at least, or something like that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-eight minutes for the majority.

Mr. CORKER. So I know you all each asked for 15. If we could make it, instead, 14 each, so it is equally divided, Senator ROBERTS will enjoy that. This

will be equally divided between our distinguished Senator GRASSLEY and Senator ROBERTS, and I thank them for letting me intervene and thank them both for being here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, this is a critically important debate on a nuclear deal that is going to have long-lasting impacts on our national security and the security of our friends and our allies. This debate is happening because 98 Senators expressed the desire to have a say on this agreement. This process will allow the American people to speak through their elected representatives, and I can say the American people overwhelmingly oppose this agreement. New public opinion polls released in just the last few days indicate that Americans in general are opposed to this deal by a margin of 2 to 1. Only 21 percent support it.

I participated in meetings with constituents in 25 of Iowa's 99 counties during the August work period. The message I received was overwhelmingly in opposition to this agreement. That is the same message I am hearing from Iowans who have written or called since the deal was announced in July.

After many weeks of studying the terms of the Iranian deal, also hearing from experts and attending classified briefings, and engaging in dialogue with my constituents, my initial skepticism has been confirmed. I have come to the conclusion this agreement presented to us is a bad deal that will not increase our national security or the security of our friends and allies and should be rejected.

The United States began the negotiations from a position of very real strength. The international sanctions were obviously hurting Iran, and Iran wanted out from under those sanctions. The sanctions regime that Congress put in place over the objections of President Obama drove Iran to the negotiating table.

The administration, leading up to the negotiations and throughout the entire process, outlined the conditions for a good deal. President Obama and Secretary Kerry both made important statements about the goals of the negotiations. The goal was, of course, to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. Secretary Kerry himself said in the fall of 2013 that Iran has "no right to enrich," and that a good deal with Iran would "help Iran dismantle its nuclear program."

Despite all these assurances that negotiations would include "anytime, anywhere" inspections, the deal falls real short. President Obama negotiated away from these positions over the course of these negotiations.

This agreement accepts and legitimizes Iran as a nuclear threshold state. Iran will not dismantle many important parts of its uranium enrichment

infrastructure, contrary to past U.S. policies that Iran not be allowed to enrich.

Iran also is permitted to continue a vast research and development program. Many of the significant limitations expire after 10 short years, leaving Iran an internationally legitimate nuclear program.

Iran could fully abide by this deal and be a nuclear threshold state, contrary to what we were promised by this administration and the initial goals that were announced by the President.

Now, with respect to inspections, international inspectors will not have anytime, anywhere access. They will have what is termed "managed access." In fact, the deal provides Iran with a 24-day process to further delay—we know what will happen—and hide prohibited activities. Iran has a track record of cheating, otherwise I couldn't say those things. They have cheated on past agreements. This deal allows Iran to stonewall the inspectors for up to 24 days.

The agreement also includes side agreements between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency that we can't review. Even the administration has not seen them. And people in this country expect us to read before we vote.

Of course, we can read the agreement, but we can't read side agreements that the law requires be given to the Congress to read under this special law. So we are going to be voting on things which we haven't seen and which the law says we should see.

The Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which passed the Senate 98 to 1, requires the administration to provide to Congress access to all "annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing material, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings and any related agreements" as part of our agreement with the President. It seems in this case we are being asked to put our faith in the Iranian regime to not cheat, contrary to what we know about them.

Iran has not provided details on the past military dimensions of its nuclear program even though the U.S. position was, very simply, that Iran had to come clean about that history before any sanctions relief. It is critical, for a robust verification regime to work, that the International Atomic Energy Agency have a full accounting of Iran's past efforts and stockpiles. Yet it appears that Iran will be allowed to supervise itself by conducting its own inspections and collect samples from its secretive military facility in Parchin, where much of the military dimensions of its nuclear program had been carried out.

I also oppose the last-minute decision to lift the embargo on conventional arms and ballistic missiles. GEN Martin Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint

Chiefs of Staff, testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in July that "we should under no circumstances relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking."

They didn't listen to the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. So under this agreement, after just 5 years the conventional arms embargo will be lifted. After just 8 years the ballistic missile embargo will be lifted. Iran has long sought the technology to develop intercontinental ballistic missiles, which would be a direct threat to the United States and our allies. And Iran's past arms trafficking to the Hezbollah, Hamas, and other terrorist organizations has long threatened the State of Israel and other Middle Eastern allies as well, and it of course threatens stability—very much so—in the region.

Once Iran has complied with the initial restraints on its nuclear program, many sanctions will be lifted. This will release somewhere around \$100 billion of frozen Iranian assets. The lifting of sanctions and release of these funds will only exacerbate Iran's support for terror and tradition of terror, with Iran having access to tens of billions of frozen assets to bolster its conventional military and further support global terrorism.

Even Obama administration officials have said that Iran is likely to use some of the funds to purchase weapons and fund terrorism that would threaten Americans and Israelis. Now, isn't that something—this administration negotiating an agreement where it is assumed that we are going to give them further resources to support efforts to kill Americans and Western Europeans.

The concept of "snapping back" these sanctions is another issue that has been discussed. These sanctions also appear less effective on the issue of snapping back than originally claimed. The complicated process to reimpose sanctions is unlikely to work even if Iran fails to comply with the agreement. Iran views snapback sanctions as grounds to walk away from the agreement, so any effort to reimpose sanctions will be regarded by all parties as to whether or not to dissolve the agreement and impose sanctions.

I support a robust diplomatic effort that will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapons capability, but I also strongly disagree with proponents of this agreement who argue that the only alternative to this deal is war. That, of course, is a false choice and intellectually dishonest.

Iran came to the negotiation table because it desperately sought sanctions relief. If this deal were rejected, we could impose even tougher sanctions, allowing our diplomats to negotiate a better deal that would more adequately safeguard our Nation's security interests and that of our allies. A better deal would not legitimize Iran as a nu-

clear threshold state, it would not trade massive sanctions relief for limited temporary constraints, and it would not provide concessions that will trigger a regional nuclear arms race.

If we reject this deal, we could push for an international agreement that would truly dismantle Iran's nuclear program and verifiably prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability.

A better deal would not ignore Iran's past bad behavior. Iran has for many years been the most active state sponsor of terrorism. Iran has an egregious record of human rights violations and the persecution of religious minorities. It continues to imprison U.S. citizens. At least 500 U.S. military deaths in Iraq and Afghanistan are directly linked to Iran and its support for anti-American militants.

This agreement will free up tens of billions of dollars in frozen Iranian assets without addressing any of these issues. We know Iran will use some of that money to support terrorist activities throughout the Middle East, and those are extended into the United States and Western Europe. Iran provides support for the brutal Assad regime in Syria, the Houthi rebels in Yemen, and provides weapons, funding, and support to Hamas and Hezbollah.

This deal appears to be the result of desperation on our side for a deal—any deal—and the Iranians knew that and took advantage of our weakness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I will put the remainder in the RECORD.

Mr. CORKER. Madam President, he may conclude.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. This deal is a result of President Obama's philosophy of leading from behind. As a result of this philosophy, we now have enemies who don't fear us and friends and allies who don't follow us because they question our credibility and they question our leadership. We have a more dangerous world because of it.

President Obama himself said that it is better to have no deal than a bad deal. This deal has far too many shortcomings and will fail to make America and our allies safer. It will not prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, while providing a windfall that will allow them to ramp up their bad behavior.

Obviously I oppose this deal, and I hope we can send a signal to the administration and Iran that we need a deal that improves our national security and the security of our friends and allies in the region and responds to the common sense of the American people who, through the polls, have shown they know this to be a bad deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Madam President, we all come here to make a difference, and we have on the floor two Senators who have done just that—Senator CORKER and his counterpart on the Democrat side, Senator CARDIN, who is a good friend of mine. Both are good friends of mine. History will note in salutary terms what both of them have contributed in regard to leadership, perseverance, and trying to make a bad situation much better. I thank them for that.

I rise today concerned, disheartened, and fearful about the vote—or, to be more accurate, not even having a vote—regarding the issue before us that affects our national security and that of others worldwide.

We have before us the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, an Executive agreement whose original goal was to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear-armed state. In keeping with our constitutional responsibility and Senate tradition, what we should have before us is a treaty, but we do not. Were the Senate taking up a treaty, we could be having debate on rational, commonsense, and effective amendments that would protect our country and reduce the flames of turmoil in the Middle East and in Europe, but we are not. We are voting on a resolution of disapproval, and we may well end up voting not to vote at all—a probability I find inexplicable and outrageous. In the Senate's 226-year history, it has taken up almost 1,900 treaties and only rejected 22, many of which have dealt with subjects of much less consequence.

I deeply regret that the administration would not even consider the Senate allowing a vote on this crucial foreign policy and national security issue as a treaty. During debate on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act in April, I voted in favor of Senator JOHNSON's amendment to do just that. We had the opportunity. The Senate failed to seize it.

I believe this agreement to be deeply flawed, and our failure to truly debate and fix what is in it represents an abrogation of our responsibilities—this in the face of an agreement or a “deal” that is already adversely affecting the daily lives and well-being of individuals all around the world. Refugees throughout the Middle East recognize the United States is yielding both power and persuasion to Iran, and they are fleeing for their lives.

As if failure to consider this agreement is not enough, now consider the fact that there are those in this distinguished body who will try to block cloture and in doing so prevent even a simple yes-or-no vote on the resolution. Talk about an upside down, “Alice in Wonderland” exercise.

The Senate has already voted 98 to 2 to have a vote, and yet we stand here today ready to abrogate that vote.

So, my colleagues, what are we doing? We are simply debating a flawed agreement submitted to us by the President. We are not amending or voting on the agreement at all; we are just debating. The path which we take today—a detour into a box canyon, achieving nothing—has been forced upon us by the very same people who made the Senate swallow the nuclear option.

Where on Earth has the Senate gone? Well, the President has been breaking arms and political legs, urging my colleagues to use Senate procedure and deny Senators the right to vote. It is pretty simple: The President doesn't want the Senate to vote no on what he considers his foreign policy legacy.

However, on occasion, the Senate has put partisanship aside and debated issues of deep conviction and diverging opinions. This should be one of those times, but it is not. We should find a path forward that enables bipartisan accord as a legislative body. That path always starts when respect trumps partisanship. I regret that is not today, not this week, not this issue, not this President.

Given the fact that we are where we are, I think it is imperative that we fully understand how Iran interprets this agreement. The shoe is on the Iranian foot, and judging by the statements of their leaders, they believe it fits just fine.

We have heard in detail from Secretary Kerry. We have heard from and been lectured by the President. But Members should also know what Iranian President Hasan Ruhani and Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei told the Iranian people after the agreement was finalized. The difference is both pertinent and remarkable. Speaking before his constituency in Tehran, President Ruhani perfectly articulated where the United States began these so-called negotiations and where the United States made enormous concessions. According to him, we did not negotiate at all, we conceded.

It is a paradox of enormous irony that in order to know the truth about this agreement—highly praised by this administration and well-received by a determined minority in this Senate—to learn the unfortunate truth about who negotiated and who conceded, we have to read and understand the remarks of President Ruhani of Iran to get the full picture.

President Ruhani stated that in the beginning, the United States capped the number of centrifuges to 100. Today, Iran is allowed over 6,000. Where original restriction and oversight were set for 20 years, today it is 8. With regard to research and development, the United States abandoned any limits on developing systems for enriching uranium. Instead, Iran is free to develop centrifuges to the highest level they desire—the IR-8. The admin-

istration placed a redline on heavy water production at the Iraq facility. Today the reactor will continue operating and produce heavy water.

We said sanctions would be lifted incrementally. Today they are virtually nonexistent. Soon Iran will receive a windfall of approximately \$100 to \$150 billion for whatever use it wishes—read, terrorism; read, anti-missile defense systems. Of greatest importance, what happened to the inspections regime? This administration said anytime, anywhere, but Iran walked away holding the key to who, how, and when inspectors will get in.

It is not so much what we in the United States know or believe. It is, rather, what Iran believes, in the words of their President and Supreme Leader. Their remarks not only put into absolute focus what the Iranian Government understands as their responsibility in regard to this agreement, but it also puts into perspective which side demanded and which side conceded.

The administration will argue President Ruhani's statements are but a show for the Iranian public; that Iran wants to claim they can become a stable influence in the Middle East. Sure, tell that to Israel. But the question remains, are we voting on an agreement or are we voting on concessions? According to President Ruhani, it is the latter.

Perhaps the proud boasting of President Ruhani is one thing, but the vows of the Ayatollah are quite another. His speech—punctuated by cheers of “Death to America,” “Death to Israel”—vowed that regardless of the deals' approval, Iran would never stop supporting their friends in Palestine, Yemen, Syria, Iraq or Lebanon; the exact places Iran had been found backing terrorist organizations, which led to its listing as a State sponsor of terrorism by the State Department. But I have just listed the concessions and vows that Iran's leaders have made public. What about the ones that will never be revealed—the agreed-upon arrangements between Iran and the United Nations' International Atomic Energy Agency.

Today all Senators should be gravely concerned about these negotiations and agreements. Do we have access? No. Do we have information? No. Do we have transparency? No. Do we know what processes will be allowed? No. Well, actually we do.

Under the agreement's dispute resolution mechanisms, this agreement sets up a tortured path that does not just involve the much publicized 24-day waiting period. After 24 days, any dispute would be referred to a joint commission where there will be a 15-day waiting period. Then the dispute would be referred to the Ministers of Foreign Affairs with another 15-day day waiting period. Finally, the dispute would end up before an advisory board with—

you guessed it—another 15-day waiting period. All of this, of course, can be delayed if the parties agree on an extension for further discussion, which they will.

Instead of resolution, we have an unending series of switchbacks to get to the top of a mountain which in fact we will never see. “The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results.” We have tried IAEA inspections with Iran before, and they failed miserably. It seems nothing short of insane to say that we can trust Iran today.

This deal does more than give Iran the power to self-regulate, filibuster, and avoid inspections. It gives Iran the ability to remain unaccountable and rogue. This debate is not just about what the administration, this body or the American public thinks of an agreement with Iran, this is also very much about what the Iranians think we have and will accept.

I worry that we are looking at this so-called agreement through rose-colored glasses, based on hope and the misguided idea that any deal is better than no deal because the alternative is war. Why do I say “rose-colored glasses”? It is because civilized nations do that—nations such as America. We naturally want to believe that disaster and chaos will not happen but unfortunately they do.

Now, 14 years ago tomorrow, while heading into work I heard the news of the World Trade Center being attacked. My heart fell and my stomach churned because as a member of the Senate Intelligence Committee at that time, I had been repeating over and over again that the oceans no longer protected us and the nature of warfare was dramatically changing.

At the time of the attacks, coming up on 395, I could see black smoke billowing from the Pentagon. I knew the Capitol would be next. If it were not for the heroes of flight 93 who made the declaration “let’s roll” a national rolling cry, my instincts would have been right and the Capitol would have been hit. The probability is I would not be making these remarks today had that happened.

Madam President, my colleagues, everybody watching, close your eyes. Imagine the terrible ramifications had that plane hit the Capitol. Where we sit today would have been rubble. Imagine that happening tomorrow.

Throughout our history, periods of peace, stability, and prosperity have unfortunately been the aberration, not the norm. As a result, we have learned the hard way, as Americans who made the ultimate sacrifice in so many conflicts throughout our history. Around the world, we have witnessed man’s inhumanity to man: the Holocaust, Cambodia, Rwanda, and now with the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria and their savage caliphate threatening almost

indiscriminately against all those who do not subscribe to their Sharia law, and especially to our best ally in the region, the State of Israel.

My colleagues, despite our best efforts, our hope, our optimism, and the siren song, “It can’t happen,” I would only remind you that history tells us that it has happened, and it will happen again unless we have the courage to take off the rose-colored glasses and come to the realization with regard to the consequences of what we are doing or, more aptly put, not doing and whom we are dealing with. Today we are dealing with a State sponsor of terrorism and they will continue. Iran will become a nuclear-armed state.

As we mark the 14th anniversary of the horrific terrorist attacks and loss of over 3,000 Americans on September 11, 2001, I want to make it clear that I do not trust Iran, and I will never support concessions which will allow them to become a nuclear-armed state.

It is my hope to vote yes on the resolution of disapproval. As my good friend and colleague Senator CORNYN emphasized yesterday: Every Senator here should have—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority’s time has expired.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 seconds.

Mr. CORKE. I agree.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ROBERTS. Every Senator should have the opportunity to vote on this issue, given the irony that Iran’s leadership has given that power and privilege to its own Parliament. At least give me and others the privilege today, as a Senator, to cast the most important vote of my 35 years in public service.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. I understand we have 60 minutes under Democratic control. I would ask unanimous consent that up to 7 minutes be available to Senator MERKLEY, up to 7 minutes to Senator MANCHIN, up to 6 minutes to Senator DONNELLY, up to 18 minutes to Senator FRANKEN, and up to 5 minutes to Senator HIRONO, and up to 10 minutes to Senator MARKEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, the United States, our citizens, our President, and I believe every single Member of Congress stand united in our commitment to block Iran from securing a nuclear weapon. The question we are debating is the pathway that is best for ensuring that outcome. Is the international agreement negotiated between Iran and the P5+1 nations the best strategy for blocking Iran’s potential pursuit of a nuclear weapon or is

there some other route that yields better probability, better outcome? That is the issue we are considering.

Over the last month, I have explored the strengths of every argument and counterargument. I have met with policy experts, intelligence analysts, advocates, and the Ambassadors of our partner nations. I have sought and received the counsel of Oregonians on both sides of this issue. Taking all of this into account, this deal is the best available strategy for blocking Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

The plan’s strength is that for 15 years it creates an effective framework for blocking Iran’s three pathways to securing a nuclear weapon: the uranium path, the plutonium path, and the covert path. It blocks the uranium path by requiring Iran to dismantle two-thirds of its centrifuges; more importantly, to reduce its stockpile of enriched uranium by 97 percent; and to limit enrichment of uranium to 3.67 percent—far below the 90 percent required for a nuclear weapon.

It blocks Iran’s plutonium pathway by requiring Iran to pull the core of its Arak reactor and to fill it with concrete, to build any replacement reactor with a design that will not produce weapons-grade plutonium, and to forgo the reprocessing of spent fuel which is essential to the plutonium path. The agreement also blocks a covert path to a bomb by imposing extensive inspections and monitoring. This includes providing onsite inspections anywhere a violation is suspected. Unprecedented procedures have been put in place to guarantee that Iran cannot indefinitely stall these inspections, including setting a maximum number of days for access and number of days that is guaranteed to ensure that we can, with confidence, detect any work with radioactive materials. The result—attested to by 75 nonproliferation experts and diplomats in a recent letter—is that it is “very likely that any future effort by Iran to pursue nuclear weapons, even a clandestine program, would be detected promptly.”

As many have pointed out on the floor today, the agreement is not without shortcomings. It has not sustained the current U.N. ban on Iran’s importation of conventional arms. Iran could acquire conventional arms up to 5 years and missile technology after 8 years.

It does not dictate how Iran can spend the dollars it reclaims from cash assets that are frozen. It does not permanently maintain bright lines on Iran’s nuclear research or nuclear energy program, lifting the 300-kilogram stockpile limit and 3.77 percent enrichment limit after 15 years. These exclusions are trouble.

It is possible, perhaps probable, that Iran will use some of that additional cash and access to conventional arms to increase its support for terrorist

groups. It is possible that Iran will use a nuclear research program and a nuclear energy program as the foundation for a future nuclear weapons program. That is a substantial concern.

For this reason, many have come to this floor and argued the United States, instead of implementing this agreement, should withdraw from it and negotiate a better deal. The prospects for that possibility, however, are slim.

Our P5+1 partners—and I have met with all of their Ambassadors to explore this issue—have committed the good faith of their governments behind this agreement. They believe this is the best path, the best opportunity to stop Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. They plan to honor the deal they have signed on to with or without the United States as long as Iran does as well. Iran has every reason to honor this agreement, even if the United States rejects it because agreement fulfills Iran's goal of lifting the international sanctions and it sets the stage for valuable trade and investment partnerships.

If Iran were to follow this course, it would gain many benefits while leaving the United States at odds with the balance of our partners, undermining, in a dramatic international fashion, American influence with strategic and security consequences throughout a large spectrum. On the other hand, if Iran exits this agreement and responds to its rejection by the United States, our country then is the one that stands in the pathway of a potential diplomatic solution to this incredibly important international security issue. It will be the United States blocking a plan with high confidence of stopping Iran from acquiring a nuclear bomb. Furthermore, the international support for economic sanctions would fray, giving Iran some of the economic relief it is seeking without the burden of intrusive inspections.

In short, this course would shatter diplomacy, impact and diminish American leadership, and shred our economic leverage, increasing reliance on one leftover tool—military options—while at the same time dramatically diminishing our confidence in the actual state of Iran's nuclear program. Less information, more reliance, and less confidence would be a dangerous combination.

The most effective strategy for blocking Iran's access to a nuclear bomb is to utilize this agreement and maximize American participation to hold Iran strictly accountable, not through the first 15 years but through the next decades that follow, where Iran is still completely constrained by its commitment to never develop a nuclear weapon.

After 15 years, Iran will be subject to the deal's requirement that it will never “seek, develop or acquire any nu-

clear weapons.” And Iran will continue to be subject to ongoing intensive monitoring and verification by the International Atomic Energy Agency, or IAEA.

We, the United States, can greatly strengthen this framework. The United States should use a massive intelligence program to back up the plan in the first 15 years and strengthen the IAEA's monitoring after the first 15 years. The United States should lead the international community in defining the boundary that constitutes the difference between a nuclear research program and a nuclear energy program versus a nuclear weapons program. Those bright lines that are diminished are replaced with a commitment that has to be defined, and it is through participation and agreement that the United States can ensure that the international community sustains a clear line and enforces that clear line.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 30 more seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MERKLEY. In conclusion, no foreign policy choice comes with guarantees. The future, whether we approve or reject this deal, is unknowable and carries risks. But this agreement, with its verification and full U.S. participation, offers the best prospect for stopping Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon at any point here forward, and for that reason I will support it.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Mr. President, when I go home to my beautiful State of West Virginia, I have always said that if I can't explain it, I can't vote for it.

When this process began, I was supportive of the diplomatic efforts led by Secretaries Kerry and Moniz. I have always believed that to truly be a superpower, you must engage in superdiplomacy. Whenever I am able, I will choose diplomacy over war because the stakes are so high for West Virginia and our entire country.

In our State of West Virginia, we have one of the highest rates of military service in the Nation, participation-wise. But as I struggled with this decision, I could not ignore the fact that Iran, the country that will benefit most from the sanctions being lifted, refuses to change its 36-year history of sponsoring terrorism.

For me, this deal had to be about more than preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon for the next 10 to 15 years. For me, this deal had to address Iran's terrorist actions. Without doing so, it would reward Iran's 36 years of deplorable behavior and do nothing to prevent its destructive activities.

In fact, even during the negotiating process that we have been watching unfold, it has continued to hold four American hostages, support terrorism around the world, breed anti-American sentiment, and acquire arms from Russia. The continued actions by Iran and its recent activities with Russia have proven to me that when we catch Iran violating the agreement—and I believe we will—I have grave doubts that we will have unified committed partners willing to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I also cannot, in good conscience, agree to Iran receiving up to \$100 billion in funds that everyone knows will be used—at least in some part—to continue funding terrorism and further destabilize the Middle East. Lifting sanctions without ensuring that Iran's sponsorship of terrorism is neutralized is dangerous to regional and American security.

The administration has accepted what I consider to be a false choice—that this is only about nuclear weapons and not terrorism. However, the fact of the matter is that we are concerned about Iran having a bomb because, in large part, it is the world's largest state sponsor of terror. Asking us to set aside the terrorist question is irresponsible and misses the point.

Over the last 36 years, Iran has carried out thousands of acts of terror that have killed thousands of innocent lives, and not just in the Middle East but around the world. They have defied international sanctions and treaties, continued to call for an attempt to violently destroy the State of Israel, bombed diplomatic buildings, and murdered innocent civilians. On top of it all, Iran is directly responsible for the deaths of hundreds of U.S. soldiers. This regime has shown no signs that its deplorable behavior will change, and the deal does nothing to guarantee that behavior change.

The deal places real constraints on Iran's nuclear program for the next 10 to 15 years. After that term, Iran will be able to produce enough enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon in a very short period of time. While I hope its behavior will change in that span, I cannot gamble our security and that of our allies on the hope that Iran will conduct itself differently than it has for the last 36 years. It is because of that belief and a month of thoughtful consideration that I must cast a vote against this deal.

I do not believe that supporting this deal will prevent Iran from eventually acquiring a nuclear weapon or from continuing to be a leading sponsor of terrorism against Americans and our allies around the world. To those who are upset by my deliberations, I will simply say that the decision to pursue diplomacy is every bit as consequential as the decision to pursue war, and in many cases—possibly even this one—

the choice to abandon the first path leads inevitably to the second. I, like most Americans and West Virginians, have already seen too much American sacrifice in the Middle East to push us down the path towards war. However, I don't believe a vote against this deal forces us to abandon the diplomatic path. We must continue to pursue peace but on terms that promise a lasting peace for the United States and our allies.

I met with and spoke to every national security expert I could. I attended every secured briefing that was made available to me. I spoke with representatives of every Middle Eastern country, and most importantly, I listened to the good citizens of West Virginia. I thank all of my constituents who reached out to my office and to the many advisers who took their time to help me reach this decision.

I will continue to listen to my constituents, and I will support a path towards peace and diplomacy over war and aggression. But make no mistake about it. I will vote to use all of our military might to protect our homeland whenever it is threatened, defend our allies whenever they are put in harm's way, and to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

To be a superpower I believe you must possess superdiplomatic skills, and I believe we can use these skills to negotiate a better deal. We need a deal that citizens of West Virginia, our country, and the world know will make us safer.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, as Indiana's Senator, my top priority and most fundamental responsibility is to ensure the security of the people of Indiana and our Nation, as well as the security of our friends and allies, including Israel and the Gulf States. It is through the lens of these solemn obligations that I have carefully reviewed and evaluated the proposed nuclear agreement.

In making this decision, I bring to bear not only my responsibilities as a Senator but as the ranking member of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Strategic Forces, overseeing our Nation's own nuclear arsenal and global nonproliferation efforts, and my convictions as a strong supporter of Israel and my concerns as a Hoosier who has attended the funerals of too many young men and women lost protecting our Nation in this conflict-ridden region.

After exhaustive assessment and careful thought, I determined that despite my questions about Iran's intentions, the most responsible course of action is to give this agreement the opportunity to succeed. It is not the agreement I would have written, but it is the one we have to make a decision

on, and I believe the alternative is much more dangerous to our country and to Israel.

While reasonable people can disagree on the substance of the agreement, we can all agree that a nuclear-armed Iran poses an unacceptable threat to global security and the Iranian leadership should not and cannot be trusted. The question then becomes this: How can we most effectively eliminate Iran's nuclear threat?

This agreement rolls back Iran's nuclear capabilities, shrinks its program, and gives us unprecedented access with the most intrusive inspections and verification regime ever put into place. Iran must get rid of 98 percent of their stockpiled uranium, more than two-thirds of their centrifuges, and the existing core of their heavy water plutonium reactor.

These measures not only give us the opportunity to restrain Iran's nuclear capabilities but also, according to our military leadership, improve the effectiveness of our military option should that one day become necessary. Without this agreement, we risk the worst of both worlds. The united front we have formed with the international community against Iran's nuclear program would break apart, the agreement would dissolve, sanctions relief would flow into Iran from those countries that are no longer willing to hold the line, and Iran is left with tens of thousands of centrifuges capable of producing highly enriched uranium, a heavy water reactor capable of producing weapons-grade plutonium, and a breakout time of just 2 to 3 months.

While I support this agreement, I also recognize that the only true guarantee that Iran will never become a nuclear-armed state is the steadfast resolve of the United States and our allies to do whatever is necessary to stop them and to put in place the policies to make that happen. With or without this deal, the day may come when we are left with no alternative but to take military action to prevent Iran from crossing a nuclear threshold. The burden and danger would, as always, be on the shoulders of our servicemembers, who put their lives on the line for our country.

Indiana is home to the Nation's fourth largest National Guard contingent, with more than 14,000 Hoosiers standing ready to serve their communities and our country. These men and women and the thousands of Hoosiers who serve in the Reserves and on Active Duty across the country and around the world have been called to serve time and time again. They have done so with honor and distinction. They make up the greatest fighting force the world has ever seen, and I have every confidence in their ability to meet any challenge put before them.

If the day does come that I am faced with a vote on whether to authorize

military action against Iran, I owe it to our Armed Forces and to the people of Indiana to have tried all other options to stop Iran before we consider putting our servicemembers into harm's way.

We stand ready to take military action if needed, but we owe it to the young men and women who protect our country on the frontlines—from Terre Haute, Angola, Evansville, and Indianapolis—to at least try to find a peaceful solution. They should be able to expect at least that much from us here in the Senate, and if that solution does not succeed, they stand ready.

While I share the concerns expressed by the agreement's critics about what may happen 10 years or 15 years or 20 years from now, I cannot in good conscience take action that would shift the potential risks of 2026 and 2031 to 2016.

I believe this agreement is, as my predecessor and friend, former U.S. Senator Richard Lugar, recently said, "our best chance to stop an Iranian bomb without another war in the Middle East." I owe Senator Lugar and my other fellow Hoosier, former Congressman Lee Hamilton, a great debt of gratitude for their input and expertise throughout this process.

This deal will not resolve every problem we have with Iran. It must be part of a comprehensive strategy to counter the broader threat Iran poses through their support for terrorists and other proxies across Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Yemen, and elsewhere.

I remain committed to working with my colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle to confront these challenges with a clear, decisive strategy in the Middle East.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express strong support for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, the diplomatic agreement that the United States and our international partners reached with Iran in July. I urge my colleagues to support the agreement and to reject the resolution of disapproval.

This is not a decision I came to lightly. Since the agreement was announced, I have consulted with nuclear and sanctions experts inside and outside the government, Obama administration officials, including Secretary of State John Kerry and Secretary of Energy Ernest Moniz, Ambassadors from the other countries who negotiated alongside of us, our intelligence communities, advocates for Israel on both sides of the issue, my constituents in Minnesota, and, of course, with my colleagues in the Senate.

Many have expressed reservations about the agreement, and I share some of those reservations. It is not a perfect

agreement, but it is a strong one. Many people have said no deal is better than a bad deal, but that doesn't mean that the only deal we can agree to is a perfect deal. The last perfect deal we got was on the deck of the USS *Missouri*. What a cost we had to pay for that, including the only use of a nuclear weapon in war—actually, two weapons.

This agreement is, in my opinion, the most effective, realistic option available to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon anytime in the next 15 years and beyond. Iran must never, ever have a nuclear weapon. And after 15 years, we will still have every option we currently have, up to and including the use of military force, to prevent Iran from getting a bomb. Moreover, while critics have eagerly pointed out what they see as flaws in the deal, I have heard no persuasive arguments that there is a better alternative.

The agreement imposes a series of physical limits on Iran's nuclear program, especially its production of the fissile material it would require to make a bomb. The agreement's verification provisions are extremely strong, with 24/7 monitoring of and unfettered access to Iran's nuclear sites and ongoing surveillance of Iran's nuclear supply chain.

Let me briefly review the central limits on its nuclear program that Iran has agreed to and the verification provisions. Together they are designed to prevent Iran from trying to get a nuclear weapon and to detect them, if they do, with enough time to respond forcefully and effectively.

The agreement will prevent Iran from using weapons-grade plutonium as the fissile material for a nuclear weapon by requiring Iran to redesign and rebuild the Arak nuclear reactor, which, if completed as planned, could have produced enough weapons-grade plutonium for one or two bombs each year. Under the agreement, it won't be able to do that. Iran has to pull out the core of the nuclear reactor and fill it with concrete to destroy it. And Iran can't get any sanctions relief until it does that.

The agreement also significantly reduces and limits Iran's production of uranium which, in its highly enriched form, can also be used in a bomb. Iran currently has about 19,500 centrifuges capable of enriching uranium, and it has stockpiled about 10 tons of low-enriched uranium. Under the agreement, Iran has to go down to about 5,000 first-generation centrifuges for enriching uranium and down to 300 kilograms of low-enriched uranium—a 98-percent reduction. Iran does not get any sanctions relief until it does that.

Right now, it would take Iran about 2 to 3 months to get one weapon's worth of weapons-grade uranium. That is called the breakout time. The longer the breakout time is, of course, the better. This agreement will increase

the breakout time to 1 year for the first decade. Because of the inspections included in the agreement, if Iran tried to cheat at their nuclear facilities and dash for a bomb, we would catch them almost instantaneously and have more than enough time to respond effectively. Iran's nuclear facilities will be subject to 24/7 monitoring and unfettered access by the inspectors of the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA. Limitations on Iran's nuclear facilities and strict verification make it impossible for Iran to dash for a bomb at its known nuclear facilities for the next 15 years.

But the verification provisions are also important for another reason. They make it much more difficult for Iran to be able to go for a bomb in secret as well. Beyond the 24/7 monitoring of and unfettered access to Iran's nuclear sites, international inspectors will also be guaranteed access to any site in Iran that they have suspicions about, including military sites.

Now, a lot has been made about a provision in the agreement for resolving disputes when the IAEA seeks to access suspicious sites in Iran. That process can take up to 24 days. A lot of confusing and misleading things have been said about this. First of all, it is important to again emphasize that there is continuous monitoring at Iran's declared nuclear sites and unique safeguards on Iran's nuclear supply chain. That is not what the 24-day controversy is about.

Where the 24 days come in is in those cases where Iran disputes the IAEA's demand for access to a suspicious, undeclared site. People have expressed concerns that 24 days is too long. Prime Minister Netanyahu has likened this to giving a drug dealer 24-days' notice before you check his premises, saying that is a lot of time for a drug dealer to flush a lot of drugs down the toilet.

But here is the problem for Iran and the problem with this criticism. You can't hide radioactive material such as uranium. It leaves traces behind, and they can be detected for far, far longer than 24 days. One nuclear expert has said:

If Iran were to flush the evidence down the toilet, they'd have a radioactive toilet. And if they were to rip out the toilet, they'd have a radioactive hole in the ground.

Uranium-235 has a half-life of over 700 million years, and the half-life of uranium-238 is over 4 billion years. The IAEA will catch Iran after 24 days.

Now, it is true that there are some activities—related to weapons design, for example—that don't use nuclear materials and are much easier to hide. That is a genuine challenge that inspectors and our intelligence efforts will face. But the fact is that you can move a computer that you are doing design work on in 24 seconds or erase stuff in 24 milliseconds. I am sure it is

actually a lot faster than that. But Iran is still not allowed to conduct those activities under the agreement and will face severe consequences if they get caught.

So the bottom line is that the IAEA's guaranteed access to suspicious sites will help support the verification of the agreement.

Perhaps more importantly, we will also have ongoing surveillance of Iran's nuclear supply chain. That means that in order to make a nuclear weapon in the next 15 years, and even beyond, Iran would have to reconstruct every individual piece of the chain—the mining, the milling, the production of centrifuges, and more—separately and in secret. And it would have to make sure it didn't get caught in any of the steps. This agreement—plus our own comprehensive intelligence efforts—would make it exceedingly unlikely that Iran would be able to get away with any of that. And Iran would therefore risk losing everything it gained from the deal and the reimposition of sanctions, to say nothing of military attack.

We don't have to trust the regime's intentions to understand the reality it would face. Attempting to cheat on this agreement would carry an overwhelming likelihood of getting caught and serious consequences if it does.

We still have work to do to diminish the threat Iran poses to our national security and, of course, to the safety of our allies in the Middle East, beginning with Israel. As sanctions are lifted, the non-nuclear threat to the region may very well grow. We will need to bolster our support to regional counterweights such as Saudi Arabia. And, of course, we will need to maintain our terrorism-related sanctions, which are unaffected by the deal.

We also need to work very closely with Israel, our greatest friend in the region, in order to assure its security. As a Jew, I feel a deep bond with Israel. As a Senator, I have worked very hard to strengthen our country's bond with that nation and to bolster its security, and I will continue to do that. A nuclear-armed Iran would be a truly grave threat to Israel, and so I believe this agreement will contribute to the security of Israel because it is the most effective available means of preventing Iran from becoming nuclear armed, so do a number of very senior Israeli security experts, including some of the former heads of Israel's security services.

There is no doubt in my mind that this deal represents a significant step forward for our own national security.

One concern has been raised about what happens after year 15 when many of the restrictions in the deal expire. Well, there will still be major checks on Iran's nuclear program after that date. Under the deal, Iran will be subject to permanent, specific prohibitions on several of the steps necessary to

build a bomb. Iran's nuclear program will still be subject to heightened monitoring by the IAEA and Iran's nuclear supply chain will still be subject to uniquely intrusive monitoring, which will limit Iran's ability to divert nuclear materials and equipment to a secret program without being detected.

Iran must never, ever have a nuclear weapon. We will still have every option we currently have, up to and including the use of military force, to prevent that from happening.

But we also must begin now to make the case to the world that the danger posed by an Iranian nuclear weapon will not expire in 15 years, and remind Iran that should it begin to take worrisome steps, such as enrichment inconsistent with a peaceful program, we stand ready to intervene.

That said, we don't know what the world will look like in 15 years. As long as this regime holds power, Iran will represent a dangerous threat to our security. But it is possible that by 2031, Iran may no longer be controlled by hardliners determined to harm our interests. More than 60 percent of Iran's population is now under the age of 30. These young Iranians are increasingly well educated and pro American.

We don't know how this tension within Iran will work out. But I think if we reject this agreement, we will lose this opportunity with the people of Iran. If we back out of a deal we have agreed to, we will only embolden the hardliners who insist that America cannot be trusted. We will be doing self-inflicted damage to American global leadership and to the cause of international diplomacy.

What is more, the alternatives that I have heard run the gamut from unrealistic to horrifying. For example, some say that should the Senate reject this agreement, we would be in a position to negotiate a better one. But I have spoken to the Ambassadors or Deputy Chiefs of Mission of each of the five nations who helped broker the deal with us, and they all agree that this simply would not be the case. Instead, these diplomats have told me that we would not be able to come back to the bargaining table at all and that the sanction regimes would likely erode or just fall apart completely, giving Iran's leaders more money and more leverage and diminishing both our moral authority throughout the world and our own leverage. That is just the reality. And of course Iran would be able to move forward on its nuclear program, endangering our interests in the region—especially Israel—and making it far more likely that we will find ourselves engaged in a military conflict there. If Iran cheats on this agreement and we are a part of it, we will have a say in the international response. If we are not a part of this agreement, we will not.

Now, most opponents of the agreement do not seek or want war with

Iran—even if opposition to the agreement makes such a war, in my opinion, more likely—but some of them do. One of my colleagues suggested that we should simply attack Iran now—an exercise he believes would be quick and painless to the United States. In fact, he compared it to Operation Desert Fox, intimating that it would be over and done with in a matter of days. But this is pure fantasy, at least according to what our security and intelligence experts tell us, and it is certainly not the lesson anyone should have learned from the disastrous invasion of Iraq.

The Middle East is an unstable, unpredictable, largely unfriendly region. We know that military undertakings in the region are likely to bring very painful, unpredictable consequences. That is partly why we should give diplomacy a chance. Yet, a number of my colleagues and others were intent on opposing such a diplomatic solution even before the agreement was reached.

In March—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. FRANKEN. I ask unanimous consent for another 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRANKEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

In March, 47 of my Republican colleagues took the unprecedented step of sending a letter to Iran's leaders just as these sensitive negotiations were nearing an accord. It was a clear attempt to undermine American diplomacy and signaled that they would oppose any deal with Iran, no matter what the terms. So it is not surprising that these critics now oppose the finished deal, but it is disappointing that they refuse to acknowledge, let alone take responsibility for the dire consequences that would almost certainly result from killing it.

It is possible that there would not be a war if we reject the agreement, but what seems undeniable is that if we and we alone were to walk away from an agreement that we negotiated alongside our international partners, that would be a severe blow to our standing and our leadership in the world.

Diplomacy requires cooperation and compromise. You don't negotiate with your friends; you negotiate with your enemies.

Indeed, no one who is for this deal has any illusions about the Iranian regime, any more than the American Presidents who made nuclear arms agreements with the Soviet Union had illusions about the nature of the Communist regime there.

For a long time, it looked as if our only options when it came to Iran would be allowing it to have a nuclear weapon or having to bomb the country ourselves. This agreement represents a chance to break out of that no-win sce-

nario. To take the extraordinary step of rejecting it because of clearly unrealistic expectations, because of a hunger to send Americans into another war, or, worst of all, because of petty partisanship would be a terrible mistake.

I therefore urge my colleagues to prevent this resolution of disapproval from moving forward and to vote in support of the agreement.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that we have agreed to with our international partners and with Iran. This agreement, implemented effectively, is the best option we have to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I sit on the Armed Services and Intelligence Committees. We have had numerous hearings. I have engaged with the administration. I have met with our international partners. I have studied the deal itself. I have read the commentary and analyses from all different perspectives. I have asked hard questions. I have reached my conclusions based on the facts before us. This decision was not easy and should not be easy.

Like every Member of this body, I am committed to Israel's security. I am concerned about the alarming statements against Israel and Iran's support for terrorism. These concerns are real and valid.

Nuclear proliferation is one of the most consequential national security matters facing the world. Clearly, a nuclear Iran is unacceptable to all of us. So I would expect that any agreement to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon would be given serious, thoughtful consideration. Yet, there are those in this body and elsewhere who oppose even the idea of a diplomatic solution—at least one negotiated by the Obama administration. They have made clear their intention to oppose the agreement even while the negotiations were taking place.

For the first time I am aware of in U.S. history, dozens of Senators signed an open letter to a foreign government—the government of an adversary, no less—stating that any agreement reached by this administration would be undone. Before the actual ink was put to paper on the agreement, that was their message. Then, within hours of the deal's announcement, the same voices that opposed negotiations in the first place started denouncing it as a bad deal. Some claimed we could get a better deal. Others said that no deal was preferable, despite the fact that Iran was within 2 to 3 months of getting a nuclear bomb. I am fairly certain these people hadn't read the deal before they made such statements at

the very outset. That is not how we should conduct foreign policy. Our national security, the security of Israel, and the stability of the Middle East are too important to turn into campaign ads or political rhetoric.

As we prepare to vote this afternoon, I would ask my colleagues to set politics aside and focus on the facts. The fact is, this agreement is the best option we have to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

First, we reached this agreement with the backing of our international partners, including China and Russia. I, along with some of my colleagues, met with Ambassadors of these countries, and I asked them point-blank: Would you come back to the table to bargain for another agreement if the United States walked away?

They said: No. There already is an agreement. It is the one that Congress should be supporting.

The Ambassador to the United States from the UK also said no.

I would remind my colleagues that after decades of U.S. unilateral sanctions against Iran, it was the weight of international sanctions that forced Iran to the table. We need our partners to make this deal work, and our partners have committed that if we choose this path, they will stand with us, they will be with us.

Second, the terms of this agreement, implemented effectively, cut off Iran's ability to create a bomb. Their uranium stockpiles will be all but eliminated. We will have unprecedented oversight over the entire nuclear supply chain.

The U.S. intelligence community has indicated that it will gain valuable new insights through this agreement. Indeed, with the information that can be garnered through this agreement, our intelligence community will be able to provide information that will enable us to make sure Iran stands up and abides by the provisions of this deal.

We will have veto authority of what goes into Iran and we will know what comes out of Iran.

These unprecedented oversight provisions have the support of arms control experts, nuclear scientists, diplomats, and military and intelligence leaders, all of whom believe this deal will make the difference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Ms. HIRONO. I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Finally, this agreement isn't about trust. The deal requires verification that Iran is cooperating before sanctions can be lifted. If Iran cheats, we can snap back sanctions with international support. We can initiate military operations if we need to. Let me repeat. The deal before us does not prevent the United States from taking military action if needed.

This agreement is not perfect; however, rejecting this deal means risking our international cooperation, our security, and our ability to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Based on the facts before us, this agreement deserves our support. Let's put politics aside. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the resolution before us today. I urge my colleagues to support the agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, for more than half a century, the United States has led global efforts to stop the spread of nuclear weapons. Since the 1970s, the international community has set rules and procedures to prevent these weapons from spreading, particularly to unstable regions plagued by international and civil war.

Today, the world faces precisely this challenge in Iran. A nuclear weapon in the hands of Iran is a very real and dangerous threat not only to Israel and the entire Middle East but to all of humanity.

We are in unanimous agreement that Iran must never become a nuclear weapons state. Iran has given us good reason to be skeptical of its intentions. It has misled the world about its nuclear program, is a state sponsor of terrorism, and is a destabilizing force in the Middle East. With nuclear weapons, the threat posed by Iran would increase exponentially. Because of these factors, we cannot ever trust Iran or ever give it a free pass on its destabilizing activity in the region and around the globe. As we speak today, Iran has the capability to develop a nuclear weapon within 3 months. With the Iran nuclear agreement, that will no longer be possible.

I believe that our negotiators achieved as much as possible and that if the agreement they negotiated is strictly implemented, it can do the job. On the other hand, if we walk away now, our diplomatic coalition will likely fall apart and the prospects for any renewed efforts would not be promising.

Together with many other Senators, I met with the Ambassadors of the five countries that joined in the effort to reach this agreement—Great Britain, France, Germany, China, and Russia. Their message was unified and crystal clear: If the United States walks away right now, we will be on our own and they will not come back to the table.

I acknowledge that the agreement carries risks, but, as recently stated in a letter signed by 29 leading American nuclear scientists, including six Nobel laureates, this agreement contains "more stringent constraints than any previous negotiated nonproliferation framework."

The agreement puts strict limits on Iran's nuclear program for the next 15

years. It reduces Iran's existing nuclear program to a fraction of its current size. It virtually eliminates Iran's plutonium capabilities and reduces its uranium capability by two-thirds. It pushes back the time required before Iran would be capable of building a nuclear bomb from 3 months to more than 1 year.

As I said earlier, this agreement is not based on trust. It imposes the most invasive, stringent, and technologically innovative verification regime ever negotiated. The agreement empowers inspectors to use the most advanced and intrusive methods to monitor Iran's compliance. This verification system will provide an unprecedented amount of reliable information and insight into Iran's nuclear program, ensuring that if Iran ever tries to develop a nuclear weapon, we will find out about it in time to stop them.

After 15 years, under both this agreement and the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, Iran will remain bound never to seek nuclear weapons. In paragraph 3 of the agreement, Iran categorically makes the following binding obligation: "Under no circumstances will Iran ever seek, develop or acquire any nuclear weapons."

Under the agreement, Iran will be required to give the IAEA detailed plans for how it intends to develop nuclear technology for peaceful use. It will remain forever subject to IAEA inspection to verify that it never seeks nuclear weapons or engages in any nuclear weapons-related activities. If the IAEA ever finds anything suspicious—not just in 10 or 15 or 25 or 40 years but forever—then it will be the IAEA's duty to promptly report its suspicions to the world. The IAEA's ability to verify Iran's compliance is the key to this agreement.

It will be critical to provide international inspectors with the support they require to detect, investigate, and respond to any suspicious nuclear activity before Iran has time to cover up the evidence.

With our support, the IAEA can and must aggressively investigate any indication of Iranian nuclear weapons activities and report promptly and unequivocally if Iran cheats. Likewise, we must be prepared to react at any time if the IAEA sounds the alarm.

I supported the tough sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. There are mechanisms in this agreement to snap back sanctions quickly and prevent a Chinese or Russian veto.

Even without nuclear weapons, Iran poses very real risks, particularly to Israel, our closest friend in the region, and to our partners in the Arabian Peninsula. The administration has assured us that it is working closely with regional partners to enhance their security. Congress must be an active, insistent, and bipartisan partner in this

effort, both with this President and his successors.

We must increase our security assistance to Israel to unprecedented levels. I have always been a strong supporter of Israel. When Saddam Hussein was developing nuclear weapons in 1981, I supported Israel's decision to bomb the Osirak reactor. When Israel needed more funding for a missile defense system in 2010, I voted to accelerate the development of the Iron Dome system. When Hamas attacked Israel in 2012, I supported its right to self-defense. We must continue to ensure Israel's qualitative military edge in the region and promptly finalize our new 10-year memorandum of understanding to cement our security assistance commitments. Likewise, we must strengthen our relationships with all of our regional partners. The countries of the Arabian Peninsula require our assistance to counter threats from Iran.

Our cooperation in ballistic missile defense and countering violent extremists through intelligence sharing and interdiction must continue and be enhanced. Over the past 2 months, I have consulted with many stakeholders, groups, advocates, and concerned constituents on both sides of this debate. Without exception, their passion is born of an unwavering desire to secure a lasting peace for the Middle East, Israel, the United States, and the world. This is a passion I share.

The world has come together in a historic way. With the agreement, we gain much, but most importantly, we avoid missing the significant diplomatic opportunity to ensure that Iran never emerges as a nuclear weapons state. With this agreement, we will maintain the international solidarity that will enable us to reimpose sanctions if Iran ever does try to get a nuclear weapon. We will keep and continue to improve all of our capabilities required to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, including a military option.

I thank Secretary Kerry, Secretary Moniz, and the entire U.S. negotiating team for their tireless efforts and service to our country in helping reach this agreement. I also thank President Obama for his leadership and commitment to diplomacy.

I urge the Senate to come together to support this diplomatic effort to prevent Iran from ever getting a nuclear weapon—not just this month or this year but forever. We must be ever-vigilant to ensure that every part of this agreement is verified.

I yield the floor.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, Congress presently has the heavy responsibility to conduct a thorough and rigorous review of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran. After numerous briefings from officials involved in the negotiations, consultation with scientific and diplomatic ex-

perts, meetings with Rhode Islanders, and a great deal of personal reflection, I have decided to support the plan. I do so because it blocks the pathways through which Iran could pursue a nuclear weapon, establishes unprecedented inspections of Iran's nuclear facilities and other sites of concern to the international community, and preserves our ability to respond militarily if necessary. The agreement also ensures the international sanctions regime against Iran can snap back into place if the Iranian Government reneges on its commitments.

This agreement, reached by the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, China, Russia, and Iran, establishes strict and comprehensive monitoring by the International Atomic Energy Agency to verify compliance and prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon. The agreement does not take any options off the table for President Obama, or for future Presidents. It ensures no sanctions relief will be provided unless the Iranian Government undertakes a series of significant steps to satisfy IAEA requirements.

This agreement is the product of a joint effort among six sovereign countries, which working together have more force and effect than separated. I am encouraged that the other countries party to this agreement have committed to enforce this agreement and to ramp up enforcement of other international agreements against Iran's terror activities. I have also heard their warnings that if we walk away from this agreement before even giving it a try, the prospect of further multilateral negotiations yielding any better result is "far-fetched." Joining with other world powers in this important effort bears a price in the United States' ability to negotiate unilaterally. That should be a surprise to no one. Critics of this agreement fail to acknowledge the leverage and strength behind a unified, international effort to block Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, and no one has offered a credible alternative that would lead to a nuclear weapons-free Iran.

This hard-fought bargain is the product of the canny determination of Secretary of State John Kerry, Energy Secretary and nuclear physicist Ernest Moniz, and Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Wendy Sherman, and of many months of hard work on the part of many dedicated American officials. It is also a testament to President Obama's steadfast resolve to reach a diplomatic solution to one of the most pressing security challenges of our time.

As more than 100 former American Ambassadors emphasized in their letter to the President endorsing the agreement, "the most effective way to protect U.S. national security, and that of our allies and friends, is to ensure that

tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more costly and risky alternatives."

This agreement is also supported by more than two dozen leading American scientists, who found the deal to be "technically sound, stringent, and innovative" in its restrictions on Iran's nuclear capabilities and its monitoring and verification of Iran's compliance with the agreement.

By eliminating Iran's ability to gain a nuclear weapons capability for at least a decade, the deal allows the United States and the international community to focus needed energy and resources on other critical challenges Iran poses to the region, such as its support for Hezbollah and Syrian President Bashar Assad, as well as its human rights abuses.

Bilateral cooperation between the United States and Israel will be as important as ever as we go forward. This should include tangible demonstrations of support for Israel through deepened military and intelligence cooperation. President Obama has already declared his intention to provide "unprecedented" levels of military financing and equipment to Israel, on top of the record support already in place.

As former Israeli Deputy National Security Advisor Chuck Freilich has said, "The agreement, a painful compromise, not the one the U.S. or anyone else wanted, but the one it was able to negotiate, serves Israel's security." This conclusion is echoed in the words of officials from our Gulf Cooperation Council partners, like Qatar's Foreign Minister Khalid al-Attiyah, who said "This was the best option among other options," and "we are confident that what they [the negotiators] undertook makes this region safer and more stable."

I appreciate the thoughtful input of the many Rhode Islanders with whom I met and who have reached out to me with opinions on both sides of this issue. It is, of course, a hallmark of our great democracy that we can openly and civilly debate these important questions. So too, I believe that through international engagement we can encourage a freer and more liberal society to emerge from the grip of the ayatollahs. That, with strong multilateral efforts to contain Iran's continuing mischief in the surrounding Middle East, provides the prospect of this becoming an historic turning point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I have been watching this debate as carefully as I possibly can. I think it has been very thoughtful. I think it is interesting that Members of this body have read the same agreement and come to different conclusions. It is not surprising. There are a lot of complications in this. Nobody can really know

exactly how everything is going to turn out. So it does not surprise me that people have come to different conclusions.

I also agree with the Members of this body when they say this is probably one of the most important votes they will ever take. We are talking about a nuclear Iran and how we can potentially prevent that. That, obviously, would be a threat to world peace.

I know that sitting back in Oshkosh, WI, well before I ever became a Senator, I heard Members of parties declare definitively: We cannot allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. Well, the sad fact is, I think this agreement puts it on a path to obtaining that weapon.

I also agree with President Obama in his speech really chastising those of us who don't agree with him when he says this is a pretty simple decision. I think it is a pretty simple decision. I just come at it from a totally different perspective and obviously draw a completely different conclusion from that.

Let me read a couple quotes that have been brought forth by Members of this body during this debate.

First:

Most importantly, this agreement cannot be based on hope or trust. History belies both in our experience with Iran. This deal is not the agreement I have long sought.

Another Senator:

We are legitimizing a vast and expanding nuclear program in Iran. We are, in effect, rewarding years of deception, deceit, and wanton disregard for international law.

Another Senator:

This agreement with the duplicitous and untrustworthy Iranian regime falls short of what I had envisioned.

Yet another:

This deal is not perfect and no one trusts Iran.

In my 4½ years in the Senate, I have been trying to find those areas of agreement. I agree with those comments. But what is kind of surprising about all of those quotes, these are quotes from individual Senators—I won't name them—Senators who are going to vote to approve this awful deal. I think something else we can all agree on is that Iran is our enemy.

Let me read a couple other quotes.

Early this year, after his congregation broke out with a death to America chant, Supreme Leader Ayatollah Khamenei said: Yes, of course. Yes, death to America, because America is the original source of this pressure. Death to America. Death to America.

Then only 2 days ago the Supreme Leader said: I say that you Israelis will not see the coming 25 years. And, God willing, there will not be something named the Zionist regime in the next 25 years.

So I agree that we cannot trust Iran. We cannot trust the Supreme Leader. I agree that Iran is our enemy. So my decision to vote for disapproval of this

deal rests on a very simple premise: Why in the world would we ever enter a deal that will give tens of billions and eventually hundreds of billions of dollars to our enemy, our avowed enemy—an enemy that I have to remind this body was responsible, because of their IEDs, for the killing of 196 troops in Iraq and many more wounded and maimed, a regime that back in the late 1970s took 52 U.S. hostages for 444 days? That regime has not changed its behavior in all these intervening years. They are our enemy. Again, let me point out, why in the world would we ever agree to a deal that will strengthen our enemy's economy and our enemy's military? It seems pretty obvious. I agree with President Obama. This is a simple decision. But I disagree. He thinks it is a good deal. I think it is a very bad deal.

In my remaining time—I want to be respectful of my colleagues—I do want to talk about what this debate and what this vote is actually about. This is not a straight up-or-down vote to approve an international agreement that would be deemed a treaty. This body gave up our ability to deem this a treaty and provide advice and consent when we voted on my amendment to deem it a treaty.

President Obama, on his own authority, his article II powers, said: No, something this important, this consequential is not a treaty, it is an Executive agreement, and I can go it alone. And he basically did until the Senators from Tennessee and Maryland came together and recognized the fact that a key part of this deal is the waiver or lifting of the congressionally imposed sanctions that we put in place—against the President's objection, by the way—in 2012. What this debate is all about is whether President Obama can retain that waiver authority.

Regardless of how this turns out, President Obama, again, has negotiated this deal. He has run to the United Nations Security Council and gotten them to agree to it. The process will be put in place to lift those sanctions from the United Nations that, by the way, were put in place in resolutions that would have required the suspension or halting of the uranium enrichment capability, which is not part of this deal, unfortunately.

So it is extremely important for the American people to understand that we are not debating and we are not going to be voting on the actual deal itself. We are going to be voting on something that has pretty weak involvement, pretty minor involvement, because President Obama has pretty well blocked us, blocked the American people from having a voice on a deal which is so important, so consequential, and which I believe is going to be so damaging to America's long-term interest, a deal which I believe really will put Iran on a path to obtaining a nuclear

weapon. We are going to be lifting the arms embargo. We are already lifting the embargo on ballistic missile technology. And let me reiterate that we are going to be injecting tens of billions and eventually hundreds of billions of dollars to strengthen the economy and the military of our avowed enemy.

It is a simple decision for me, which is why I will vote to disapprove this very bad deal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his comments.

I rise today in opposition to this agreement. I do so because I believe it is bad for our country and bad for the world.

There are very few votes we take here in the Senate that have such a profound effect on our national security and the kind of world our kids and our grandkids are going to inherit as this upcoming vote we will take next week on this nuclear deal.

Over the past couple of months, I have taken the time to read the agreement carefully. I have attended the classified briefings. I have listened to my colleagues. I have talked to a lot of experts on both sides of the issue. I did take my time in coming to a decision because I was hopeful that we would be able to have an agreement that I could support and others could as well.

I have also listened to my constituents back home in Ohio. They have looked at this agreement too. They understand what is at stake. They have strong views on it. My calls and letters and emails are overwhelmingly opposed.

Through the process, what I did was I measured the agreement not based on just some abstract concept I might have, I actually based it on the actual objectives and criteria that were set out by the international community, the United Nations, and the United States of America, our government. I looked at it based on the redlines we had drawn. One of my great concerns about this agreement is that those redlines have not been honored. The broad goal, of course, the biggest redline is that Congress, the Obama administration, the United Nations Security Council—everyone was very clear: Iran must stop and dismantle its nuclear weapons program. That is the most basic redline.

You have to remember that when Congress on a bipartisan basis enacted these crippling sanctions on Iran, it was not just to bring Iran to the table, which was the result, it was actually to get them to abandon their nuclear weapons program. That was the point.

I supported tougher sanctions to give leverage to the Obama administration even though, seriously, they did not

want that leverage. They resisted Congress increasing those sanctions. In fact, they initially opposed any role for Congress in reviewing the agreement.

The Senator from Tennessee is here, the chairman of the committee, and he will tell you they are somehow reluctant even for Congress to have a role here, even to help them to be able to negotiate a better agreement. That was probably an indication of where we were going.

Despite that resistance, serious sanctions were enacted and Iran did come to the table. I had hoped then that with firm U.S. leadership—leading from the front, not from behind—we would be able to bring the international community along to ensure that we did meet the criteria I talked about earlier, longstanding, U.S.-international criteria. Unfortunately, after reviewing the terms of this agreement, it is explicitly clear that these redlines, these objectives, the criteria we have set out, have not been met.

We now have an obligation to reject this deal and begin to restore the consensus, both at home and abroad, that the Iranian Government must be isolated economically and diplomatically until it agrees to the longstanding terms on which the United States and the international community have long insisted. Some will say that is fine, but that is impossible. I respectfully disagree.

I respectfully quote President Obama, who has said repeatedly that no agreement is better than a bad agreement; meaning keeping the sanctions in place is better than a bad agreement. I believe that is where we are. This is a bad agreement.

Among the many serious flaws of this deal is the fact that Iran can continue research and development on more advanced centrifuges and can resume enrichment in 15 years, providing, at best, only temporary relief. Inspections, one of the most important safeguards we have, are not anywhere, anytime, as was talked about by the administration. Under this deal, Iran can delay the inspection of suspected nuclear sites for up to 24 days—and there is even a process to get to those 24 days. If the Iranians cheat, as they have in the past, we would have to employ a convoluted process to convince the international community to restore sanctions, a process I don't think we can rely on.

It is also important to note that other than reimposition of sanctions, the agreement does not specify any clear mechanism to enforce outcomes of the dispute resolution process, nor does it identify penalties for failure to comply. This means that the only realistic preagreed punishment for any violation—no matter how big or how small—is full reimposition of sanctions.

In a way, as I look at this, this is like having the death penalty as the only

punishment for all crimes. I don't think that is realistic. I don't think you are going to get the international community to go along with that. That is why I worry about the compliance and the sanctions.

Given that only a full-blown Iranian violation would likely convince enough countries to reimpose all sanctions, I don't think the agreement provides the concrete tools to address less overt but still subversive forms of Iranian cheating that are designed to test international resolve and establish a new baseline for acceptable behavior. By the way, based on past behavior, this is likely.

In addition, of course, the inspections regime is subject to side deals between the United Nations, the International Atomic Agency, and Iran that none of us are allowed to see. This is contrary, by the way, to the Iran review act that was passed by Congress and was signed into law by the President of the United States. The language of that legislation is pretty clear. It requires the law to transmit to Congress "the agreement as defined in subsection (h)(1) including all related materials and annexes."

Then, when it talks about what that means it means, it says "including annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, guidance, technical or other understandings," and so on and so forth. It is all here. That is in the agreement that we had with the President of the United States because it was part of the review act that he signed into law.

Based on recent press reporting, of course we are also hearing that Iran will be allowed to self-inspect, use its own inspectors and equipment to report on possible military dimensions of past suspected nuclear activity at one of its most secretive and important military facilities at Parchin.

Allowing a country accused of hiding a secret and illegal nuclear weapons program to implement verification measures for a facility where this program is believed to have been hidden certainly undermines the President's claim that the Iran deal "is not built on trust, it is built on verification."

Perhaps, most troubling is that this agreement ends Iran's international isolation without ending the behavior that caused Iran to be isolated in the first place.

As the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism, based on our own State Department analysis, Iran's nuclear program is just one part of a broader strategy that is dangerous and destabilizing. According to some estimates, of course, Iran will receive up to \$150 billion in sanctions relief early in the agreement—by the way, with or without sustained compliance—which will encourage the Iranians to cause trouble, to further support terrorist groups they sponsor.

National Security Advisor Susan Rice acknowledged something that I think is pretty plain. She said:

Iran is sending money to these groups now while they're under sanctions and they'll have more money to do it when sanctions are relieved.

Within 5 years, the agreement lifts the embargo on conventional weapons and lifts the ballistic missile embargo within 8 years—a last-minute concession to Iran in the rush by the administration to get to yes. At a minimum, this deal will ensure that Iran remains a threshold nuclear power but with a new set of tools and more resources to hurt our interests and those of our allies in the region, including Israel.

I believe it is clear that the deal, as currently written, will set up a conventional arms race in the Middle East. The President says the alternative to this deal is war. In fact, a Middle East bristling with arms will increase the risks of war—increase the risks of war because of this deal.

I have been involved in international negotiations. As U.S. Trade Representative, I understand they can be tough. I know both sides have to make concessions, but I also know that does not mean the United States of America concedes on fundamental principles, on the redlines. We have to have the courage to stand behind our legitimate public pronouncements, whether it is with the use of chemical weapons by the Assad regime in Syria, whether it is the violation of both Minsk cease-fire agreements by the Russians and their proxies in eastern Ukraine or our commitment that Iran must stop and dismantle its march toward nuclear weapons. These are all things you negotiate. These are all things you have to be firm on and tough on. It is not easy, but as Americans that is what we do.

There was a speech written that was never given, that was meant to be given on November 23, 1963. It was the day John F. Kennedy was assassinated. He said in that speech about America's role: Our generation, our Nation, by destiny—rather than choice—are the watch guards on the walls of world freedom.

That is who we are. We have to be tough in these negotiations and stand tall. Other countries look to us to be tall, to help build the consensus. That is what we had to do, and I believe we did not do in this what I am sure was a very difficult negotiation.

We have to honor our redlines. If we expect them to be effective in promoting peace and stability, we must lead. In particular, we have to say what we mean and mean what we say if we are going to stop nuclear proliferation. The way this agreement developed I think will encourage other countries who are interested in pursuing nuclear weapons to say: I don't care what the U.N. says. I don't care what the United States says. What I see here

is everything is negotiable. That is the message, I am afraid, this agreement will send.

The administration's position is that the only alternative to this agreement is war. That is what they are saying. As noted, if anything, I think this agreement will further destabilize an already turbulent region, but there is an alternative. The alternative to this bad deal is a better deal. Supporters of this agreement have compared this agreement to Ronald Reagan's arms control negotiations with the Soviets.

I want to just touch on that for a moment because I have heard a lot of that on the floor. I take a very different lesson from that analogy to Ronald Reagan. President Reagan succeeded by raising the pressure, not reducing it. He increased the cost of bad behavior until that behavior changed. He didn't strike a deal unless it fulfilled the core goals he had laid out, his redlines. He didn't want a deal for a deal's sake, and he was patient. At the Reykjavik summit in 1986, Ronald Reagan walked away from what would have been a major nuclear disarmament treaty with the Soviets because he felt the costs to U.S. national security were too high. He was criticized for walking away, but he kept trying. He held firm, and 1 year later he successfully concluded negotiations on the intermediate nuclear forces treaty.

This body must not sign off on an agreement that fails to honor our redlines, that strengthens Iran's destabilizing influence in the region, and does nothing to address the behavior that threatens our allies and our legitimate national security interests in this country.

We should reject this agreement with Iran and tighten those sanctions on a bipartisan basis. The President should then use the leverage that only America possesses to negotiate an international agreement that does meet the longstanding goals of the United Nations, of the international community, of the United States of America, of this Congress, and of the President himself.

We can't afford to get this one wrong, folks. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to get this right. As I noted in the beginning of my remarks, this is about what kind of a world they are going to inherit.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join me in rejecting the deal and pursuing a better way.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, for 23 years as a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I have had the privilege of dealing with major foreign policy and national security issues.

Many of those have been of a momentous nature. This is one of those moments.

I come to the issue of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran as someone who has followed Iran's nuclear ambition for the better part of two decades.

Unlike President Obama's characterization of those who have raised serious questions about the agreement or who have opposed it, I did not vote for the war in Iraq, I opposed it—unlike the Vice President and the Secretary of State who both supported it. My vote against the Iraq war was unpopular at the time, but it was one of the best decisions I have ever made. I have not hesitated to diplomatically negotiate with our adversaries or enemies, as is evidenced, for example, by my vote for the New START treaty with Russia.

I also don't come to the question as someone—unlike some of my Republican colleagues—who reflexively opposes everything the President proposes.

In fact, I have supported President Obama—according to Congressional Quarterly—98 percent of the time in 2013 and 2014. On key policies—ranging from voting for the Affordable Care Act to Wall Street reform, to supporting the President's Supreme Court nominees, defending the administration's actions in the Benghazi tragedy, shepherding within 1 vote for the authorization for use of military force to stop President Assad's use of chemical weapons when I was chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, to so much more—I have been a reliable supporter of the President, but my support is not and has not been driven by party loyalty but rather by principled agreement, not political expediency. When I have disagreed, it is based on principled disagreement.

The issue before the Senate now is whether to vote to approve or disapprove the agreement struck by the President and our P5+1 partners with Iran. This is one of the most serious national security, nuclear nonproliferation arms control issues of our time. It is not an issue of supporting or opposing the President. This issue is much greater and graver than that, and it deserves a vote.

With this agreement, I believe we have now abandoned our long-held policy of preventing nuclear proliferation, and we are now embarked not upon preventing it but on managing it or containing it, which leaves us with a far less desirable, less secure, and less certain world order.

So I am deeply concerned that this is a significant shift in our nonproliferation policy and about what it will mean in terms of a potential arms race in an already dangerous region.

Why does Iran, which has the world's fourth largest proven oil reserves, with 157 billion barrels of crude oil, and the world's second largest proven natural gas reserves, with 1,193 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, need nuclear power for domestic energy?

We know that despite the fact that Iran claims their nuclear program is for peaceful purposes, they have violated the international will, as expressed by various U.N. Security Council resolutions, and by deceit, deception, and delay advanced their program to the point of being a threshold nuclear State.

It is because of these facts and the fact that the world believes Iran was weaponizing its nuclear program at the Parchin military base—as well as developing a covert uranium enrichment facility in Fordow, built deep inside a mountain, raising serious doubts about the peaceful nature of their civilian program—and their sponsorship of state terrorism that the world united against Iran's nuclear program.

So in that context let's remind ourselves of the stated purpose of our negotiations with Iran. Simply put, it was to dismantle significant parts of Iran's illicit nuclear infrastructure to ensure that it would not have nuclear weapons capability at any time. We said we would accommodate Iran's practical national needs but not leave the region and the world facing the threat of a nuclear-armed Iran at a time of its choosing. In essence, we thought the agreement would be roll-back for rollback. You roll back your infrastructure, we roll back our sanctions. At the end of the day, what we appear to have is a roll back of sanctions and Iran only limiting its capability but not dismantling it or rolling back.

What did we get? We get an alarm bell should they decide to violate their commitments and a system for inspections to verify their compliance. That, in my view, is a far cry from dismantling.

Now, while I have many specific concerns about the agreement, my overarching concern is that it requires no dismantling of Iran's nuclear infrastructure and only mothballs that infrastructure for 10 years. Not even one centrifuge will be destroyed under this agreement. Fordow will be repurposed, Arak redesigned. The fact is everyone needs to understand what this agreement does and does not do so they can determine whether providing Iran permanent relief in exchange for short-term promises is a fair trade.

This deal does not require Iran to destroy or fully decommission a single uranium enrichment centrifuge. In fact, over half of Iran's currently operating centrifuges will continue to spin at its Natanz facility. The remainder, including more than 5,000 operating centrifuges and 10,000 not yet functioning, will merely be disconnected and transferred to another hall at Natanz, where they could be quickly reinstalled to enrich uranium.

Yet we, along with our allies, have agreed to lift the sanctions and allow billions of dollars to flow back into

Iran's economy. We lift sanctions, but even during the first 10 years of the agreement Iran will be allowed to continue R&D activity on a range of centrifuges, allowing them to improve their effectiveness over the course of the agreement.

Clearly, the question is: What did we get from this agreement in terms of what we originally sought? We lift sanctions, and at year 8 Iran can actually start manufacturing and testing advanced IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges that enrich up to 15 times the speed of its current models. At year 15, Iran can start enriching uranium beyond 3.67 percent, the level at which we become concerned about fissile material for a bomb. At year 15, Iran will have no limits on its uranium stockpile.

This deal grants Iran permanent sanctions relief in exchange for only temporary—temporary—limitations on its nuclear program. Not a rolling back, not dismantlement, but temporary limits. In fact, at year 10, the U.N. Security Council resolution will disappear, along with the dispute resolution mechanism needed to snap back U.N. sanctions and the 24-day mandatory access provision for suspicious sites in Iran.

The deal enshrines for Iran and, in fact, commits the international community to assisting Iran in developing an industrial-scale nuclear program, complete with industrial-scale enrichment.

Now, while I understand this program will be subject to Iran's obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, I think it fails to appreciate Iran's history of deception in its nuclear program and its violations of the NPT. It will, in the long run, if we believe there is a violation, make it much harder to demonstrate that Iran's program is not in fact being used for peaceful purposes because Iran will have legitimate reasons to have advanced centrifuges and a robust enrichment program. We will then have to demonstrate its intention is dual use and not justified by its industrial nuclear power program.

Within about a year of Iran meeting its initial obligations, Iran will receive sanctions relief to the tune of \$100 billion to \$150 billion, not just in the release of frozen assets that don't amount to that amount, but also in renewed oil sales of another million barrels a day as well as relief from sectoral sanctions in the petrochemical, shipbuilding, shipping, port sectors, gold and other precious metals, and software and automotive sectors.

Iran will also benefit from the removal of designated entities, including major banks, shipping companies, oil and gas firms from the U.S. Treasury list of sanctioned entities. "Of the nearly 650 entities that have been designated by the U.S. Treasury for their role in Iran's nuclear and missile pro-

gram or for being controlled by the government of Iran, more than 67 percent will be delisted within 6 to 12 months," according to testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

For Iran, all this relief comes likely within a year, even though its obligations stretch out for a decade or more. Considering the fact it was President Rouhani who, after conducting its fiscal audit after his election, likely convinced the Ayatollah that Iran's regime could not sustain itself under the sanctions and knew that only a negotiated agreement would get Iran the relief it critically needed to sustain the regime and the revolution, the negotiating leverage was and still is greatly on our side.

However, the JCPOA, in paragraph 26 of the sanctions heading of the agreement, says, "The U.S. Administration, acting consistently with the respective roles of the President and the Congress, will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing sanctions specified in Annex II, that it has ceased applying under this JCPOA."

I repeat: The United States will have to refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the Iran sanctions act that we passed unanimously, which expires next year and was critical in bringing Iran to the table in the first place.

In two hearings I asked Treasury Secretary Lew and Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman whether the United States has the right to reauthorize sanctions to have something to snap back to, and neither would answer the question, saying only it was too early to discuss reauthorization.

But I did get my answer from the Iranian Ambassador to the United Nations who, in a letter dated July 25 of this year, said:

It is clearly spelled out in the JCPOA that both the European Union and the United States will refrain from reintroducing or reimposing the sanctions and restrictive measures lifted under the JCPOA. It is understood that the reintroduction or reimposition, including through extension of the sanctions and restrictive measures will constitute significant nonperformance which would relieve Iran from its commitments in part or in whole.

The administration cannot argue sanctions policy both ways. Either they were effective in getting Iran to the negotiating table or they were not. Sanctions are either a deterrent to breakout or a violation of the agreement or they are not. Frankly, in my view, the overall sanctions relief being provided, given the Iranians' understanding of restrictions on the reauthorization of sanctions, along with the lifting of the arms and missile embargo well before Iranian compliance over years is established, leaves us in a weaker position and, to me, is unacceptable.

If anything is a fantasy, it is the belief that snapback without congress-

sionally mandated sanctions, with EU sanctions gone and companies from around the world doing permissible business in Iran, will have any real effect. As the largest state sponsor of terrorism, Iran—which has exported its revolution to Assad in Syria, the Houthis in Yemen, Hezbollah in Lebanon, directed and supported attacks against American troops in Iraq—will be flush with money not only to invest in their domestic economy but to further pursue their destabilizing hegemonic goals in the region.

If Iran can afford to destabilize the region with an economy staggering under sanctions and rocked by falling oil prices, what will Iran and the Quds Force do when they have a cash infusion of more than 20 percent of their GDP—the equivalent of an infusion of \$3.4 trillion into our economy?

And if there is a fear of war in the region, it will be one fueled by Iran and its proxies, exacerbated by an agreement that allows Iran to possess an industrial-sized nuclear program and enough money in sanctions relief to significantly continue to fund its hegemonic intentions throughout the region.

This brings me to another major concern with the JCPOA, namely the issue of Iran coming clean about the possible military dimension of its program. For well over a decade, the world has been concerned about the secret weaponization efforts conducted at the military base called Parchin. The goal we in the international community have long sought is to know what Iran accomplished at Parchin, not necessarily to get Iran to declare culpability but to determine how far along they were in their nuclear weaponization program so that we know what signatures to look for in the future.

David Albright, a physicist and former nuclear weapons inspector and founder of the Institute for Science and International Security, has said, "Addressing the IAEA's concerns about the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear programs is fundamental to any long-term agreement . . . an agreement that sidesteps the military issue would risk being unverifiable."

The reason he says an agreement that sidesteps the military issues would be unverifiable is because it makes a difference if you are 90 percent down the road in your weaponization efforts or only 10 percent advanced. How far advanced Iran's weaponizing abilities are has a significant impact on what Iran's breakout time to an actual deliverable weapon will be.

The list of scientists the P5+1 wanted the IAEA to interview were rejected outright by Iran. After waiting over 10 years to inspect Parchin, they are now given 3 months to do all of their review and analysis before they must deliver a report in December of this year.

How the inspections and soil and other samples are to be collected are

outlined in two secret agreements the U.S. Congress is not privy to. The answer as to why we cannot see those documents is because they have a confidentiality agreement between the IAEA and Iran which, they say, is customary, but this issue is anything but customary.

Let me quote from an AP story of August 14:

They say the agency will be able to report in December. But that assessment is unlikely to be unequivocal because chances are slim that Iran will present all the evidence the agency wants, or give it the total freedom of movement it needs to follow up the allegations. Still, the report is expected to be approved by the IAEA's board, which includes the United States and other powerful nations that negotiated the July 14 agreement. They do not want to upend their July 14 deal, and will see the December report as closing the books on the issue.

It would seem to me what we are doing is sweeping this critical issue under the rug.

Our willingness to accept this process in Parchin is only exacerbated by the inability to achieve anytime, anywhere inspections, which the administration always held out as one of those essential elements we would insist on and could rely on in any deal. Instead, we have a dispute resolution mechanism that shifts the burden of proof to the United States and its partners to provide sensitive intelligence, possibly revealing our sources and methods by which we collected the information, and allow the Iranians to delay access for nearly a month—a delay that would allow them to remove evidence of a violation, particularly when it comes to centrifuge research and development and weaponization efforts that can be easily hidden and would leave little or no signatures.

The administration suggests that other than Iraq, no country was subjected to anytime, anywhere inspections. But Iran's defiance of the world's position, as recognized in a series of U.N. Security Council resolutions, does not make it any other country. It is their violations of the NPT and the Security Council resolutions that created the necessity for a unique regime and for anytime, anywhere inspections. The willingness to accept these limitations are a dangerous bellwether of our willingness to enforce violations of the agreement as we move forward.

If what President Obama said in his NPR interview of April 7, 2015—"a more relevant fear would be that in year 13, 14, 15 they have advanced centrifuges that enrich uranium fairly rapidly, and at that point breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero"—is true, it seems to me, in essence, this deal, at best, does nothing more than that kick today's problem down the road for 10 to 15 years. At the same time it undermines the arguments and evidence of suspected violations we will need because of the dual-

use nature of their program to convince the Security Council and the international community to take action.

It is erroneous to say this agreement permanently stops Iran from having a nuclear bomb. Let us be clear. What the agreement does is to recommit Iran not to pursue a nuclear bomb—a promise they have already violated in the past. It recommits them to the NPT treaty—an agreement they have already violated in the past. It commits them to a new Security Council resolution outlining their obligations, but they have violated those in the past as well.

So the suggestion of permanence in this case is only possible for so long as Iran complies and performs according to the agreement because the bottom line is, this agreement leaves Iran with the core elements of its robust nuclear infrastructure.

The fact is, success is not a question of Iran's conforming and performing according to the agreement. If that was all that was needed, if Iran had abided by its commitments all along, we wouldn't be faced with this challenge now. The test of success must be, if Iran violates the agreement and attempts to break out, how well will we be positioned to deal with Iran at that point?

Trying to reassemble the sanctions regime, including the time to give countries and companies notice of sanctionable activity, which had been permissible up to then, would take up most of the breakout time, assuming we could even get compliance after significant national and private investments had taken place. That, indeed, would be a fantasy. It would likely leave the next President, upon an Iranian decision to break out, with one of two choices: Accept Iran as a nuclear weapons state or take military action. Neither is desired, especially when Iran will be stronger, economically resurgent, a more consequential actor in the region, and with greater defensive capabilities, such as the S-300 missile defense system being sold to them by Russia.

So the suggestion of permanency in stopping Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon depends on performance. Based on the long history of Iran's broken promises, defiance, and violations, that is hopeful. Significant dismantlement, however, would establish performance up front, and therefore the threat of the capability to develop a nuclear weapon would truly be permanent, and any attempt to rebuild that infrastructure would give the world far more than 1 year's time.

The President and Secretary Kerry have repeatedly said the choice is between this agreement or war. I reject that proposition, as have most witnesses—including past and present administration members involved in this

issue—who have testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and who support the deal but reject the binary choice between the agreement or war. If the P5 had not actually achieved an agreement with Iran, would we be at war with Iran today? I don't believe so.

I believe we can still get a better deal, and here is how: We can disapprove this agreement without rejecting the entire agreement. We should direct the administration to renegotiate by authorizing the continuation of negotiations and the joint plan of action—including Iran's \$700 million-a-month lifeline, which to date has accrued to Iran's benefit to the tune of \$10 billion—and pausing further reductions of purchases of Iranian oil and other sanctions pursuant to the original JPOA. Iran will continue to want such relief as well as avoid a possible military attack, so they are incentivized to come back to the negotiating table.

We can provide specific parameters for the administration to guide their continued negotiations and ensure that a new agreement does not run afoul of Congress. A continuation of talks would allow the reconsideration of just a few but a critical few issues, including the following:

First, the immediate ratification by Iran of the Additional Protocol to ensure that we have a permanent international agreement with Iran for access to suspect sites.

Second, a ban on centrifuge R&D for the duration of the agreement to ensure that Iran won't have the capacity to quickly break out just as the U.N. Security Council resolution and snapback sanctions are off the table.

Third, close the Fordow enrichment facility. The sole purpose of Fordow was to harden Iran's nuclear program to a military attack. We need to close the facility and foreclose Iran's future ability to use this facility. If Iran has nothing to hide, they shouldn't need to put it deep under a mountain.

Fourth, the full resolution of the "possible military dimensions" of Iran's program. We need an arrangement that isn't set to whitewash this issue. Iran and the IAEA must resolve the issue before permanent sanctions relief, and failure of Iran to cooperate with a comprehensive review should result in automatic sanctions snapback.

Fifth, extend the duration of the agreement. One of the single most concerning elements of the deal is its 10- to 15-year sunset of restrictions on Iran's program, with off-ramps starting after year 8. We were promised an agreement of significant duration, and we got less than half of what we are looking for. Iran should have to comply for as long as they deceived the world's position, so at least 20 years.

Sixth, we need agreement now about what penalties will be collectively imposed by P5+1 for Iranian violations,

both small and mid-sized, as well as a clear statement as to the so-called grandfather clause in paragraph 37 of the JCPOA, to ensure that the U.S. position about not shielding contracts entered into legally upon reimposition of sanctions is shared by our allies.

Separately from the agreement but at the same time, we should extend the authorization of the Iran Sanctions Act, which expires in 2016, to ensure that we have an effective snapback option.

We should immediately implement the security measures offered to our partners in the gulf summit at Camp David, while preserving Israel's qualitative military edge.

The President should unequivocally affirm and Congress should endorse a declaration of U.S. policy that we will use all means necessary to prevent Iran from producing enough enriched uranium for a nuclear bomb, as well as building or buying one, both during and after any agreement. After all, that is what Iran is committing to. We should authorize now the means for Israel to address the Iranian threat on their own in the event Iran accelerates its program.

We must send a message to Iran that neither their regional behavior nor nuclear ambitions are permissible. If we push back regionally, they will be less likely to test the limits of our tolerance toward any violation of a nuclear agreement.

The agreement that has been reached failed to achieve the one thing it set out to achieve—it failed to stop Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state at a time of its choosing. In fact, in my view, it authorizes and supports the very roadmap Iran will need to achieve its target.

I know the administration will say that our partners will not follow us, that the sanctions regime will collapse and that they will allow Iran to proceed—as if our allies weren't worried about Iran crossing the nuclear weapons capability threshold anymore. I heard similar arguments from Secretary Kerry when he was chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, as well as from Wendy Sherman, David Cohen, and others, when I was leading the charge to impose new sanctions on Iran. That didn't happen then, and I don't believe it will happen now.

Despite what some of our P5+1 Ambassadors have said in trying to rally support for the agreement—clearly, since they want this deal, they are not going to tell us they are willing to pursue another deal, echoing the administration's admonition that it is a "take it or leave it" proposition—our P5+1 partners will still be worried about Iran's nuclear weapons desire and the capability to achieve it, and the United States is the indispensable partner to ultimately ensure that doesn't happen.

They and the businesses from their countries and elsewhere will truly care

more about their ability to do business in a U.S. economy of \$17 trillion than an Iranian economy of \$415 billion. And the importance of that economic relationship is palpable as we negotiate TTIP, the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership agreement.

At this point, it is important to note that, over history, Congress has rejected outright or demanded changes to more than 200 treaties and international agreements, including 80 that were multilateral.

Whether or not the supporters admit it, this deal is based on hope—hope that when the nuclear sunset clause expires, Iran will have succumbed to the benefits of commerce and global integration; hope that the hardliners will have lost their power and the revolution will end its hegemonic goals; and hope that the regime will allow the Iranian people to decide their fate, unlike the green revolution of 2009. Hope is part of human nature, but unfortunately it is not a national security strategy. The Iranian regime, led by the Ayatollah, wants above all to preserve the regime and its revolution, so it stretches incredulity to believe they signed on to a deal that would in any way weaken the regime or threaten the goals of the revolution.

I understand this deal represents a tradeoff, a hope that things may be different in Iran in 10 to 15 years. Maybe Iran will desist from its nuclear ambitions. Maybe they will stop exporting and supporting terrorism. Maybe they will stop holding innocent Americans hostage. Maybe they will stop burning American flags. Maybe their leadership will stop chanting "Death to America" in the streets of Tehran. Or maybe they won't.

I know that in many respects it would be far easier to support this deal, as it would have been to vote for the war in Iraq at the time. But I didn't choose the easier path then, and I am not going to now. My devotion to principle may once again lead me to an unpopular course, but if Iran is to acquire a nuclear bomb, it will not have my name on it.

It is for these reasons that I will vote for cloture and to disapprove the agreement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, just inquiring—it is my understanding that Senator WARNER and Senator COONS are to speak now. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no order to that effect.

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding that we have agreed to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is under the control of the Democratic leader.

Mr. CORKER. How much time is left? That is really what I was getting at.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. I would say to the Senator from Tennessee through the Chair, it is my understanding that we have two 5-minute segments now. Senator WARNER and Senator COONS each claim 5 minutes.

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding, then, that we will have that and then we move to an alternating session until the time of the vote. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is equally divided time until the vote, after the time allotted for the Democratic leader.

Mr. CORKER. And there is 10 minutes left on the Democratic side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifteen minutes.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. The Senator from Virginia can proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I rise to join my colleagues in speaking on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

While this deal is far from perfect, I believe it is the best option available to us right now for preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon.

I share many of the concerns with this agreement that have been expressed by my colleagues, but the choice I ultimately had to make was between accepting an imperfect deal or facing the serious ramifications throughout the world if Congress rejects a deal that has the support of the international community, including many of our allies.

As I reviewed this agreement, I kept two fundamental questions in mind: No. 1, does this agreement advance the goal of keeping Iran free of nuclear weapons, and No. 2, is there a viable alternative that would be superior to this deal?

As many colleagues before me have outlined, this deal outlines a significant reduction in Iran's fissile material stockpile, reducing their uranium stockpile by 98 percent. It restricts Iran's production capacity and completely removes their ability to produce weapons-grade plutonium. It further limits Iran's research and development activities. These reductions and restrictions on Iran's nuclear infrastructure will extend Iran's break-out time from a matter of months to at least 1 year over the next 15 years.

This agreement also established a verification regime that includes continuous inspections. With the assistance of our intelligence community, verification goes beyond the four corners of this agreement. What this means is that we will have significantly more information about Iran's nuclear program with this deal than we would have without it.

The other major question we have to ask is, Is there a viable alternative to this deal? I have given those opponents numerous opportunities to convince me there was a viable alternative. The conclusion I have reached is that there is not.

I have been a strong supporter of tough international sanctions that helped bring Iran to the negotiating table in the first place. Since I have been in the Senate, I have supported every important piece of sanctions legislation passed by Congress. But during my deliberations, I spoke with representatives of many foreign governments—not the EU or the P5+1 entirely but also those nations, particularly in Asia—about whether they would be willing to uphold sanctions to pressure Iran if we turned this deal down. In virtually every case, the response I got from allies was that if Congress were to reject this deal, the vast international sanctions that we have in place would fall apart. As we saw in the literally dozens of years prior, just U.S. unilateral sanctions alone are not enough.

I have determined that moving forward with this international agreement is our best option now to advance U.S. and world security.

I know we have other Members who want to speak, but let me add a couple of final comments.

While I support this deal, I believe there are additional actions Congress can and should take to strengthen it. I want to make sure that we—the United States—have the ability to respond to any Iranian activities with all means at our disposal.

While the inspections provided in this deal will give us better insight, there is more we can do. I am working with my colleagues—both supporters and opponents of the deal—on efforts to shore up its weaker points. I will work to clarify that Congress retains the ability to pass sanctions against Iran for nonnuclear misbehavior. My hope is that in future legislation, we will spell out that this agreement will not shield foreign companies if sanctions must be reimposed because of Iranian violations. And I will seek more reporting from the administration, including on how Iran uses any funds received through sanctions relief.

Moving forward, I will work with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to ensure Israel's security. I will press the administration and work with my colleagues to ensure that Israel preserves a qualitative military edge. I will look for ways to strengthen our commitments to Israel and support additional efforts to stop Iran from advancing both the nuclear agenda and from other efforts to destabilize the region.

Let me assure you that this agreement is the beginning and not the end of our combined international efforts to keep Iran free—not just today and not just for the next 15 years but forever—from having a nuclear weapon.

Before my colleague from Delaware speaks, I want to thank him for his efforts and many of us who spent a great deal of time the last few weeks of August talking about how we could build upon this agreement to make it stronger. He received assurances from the President and letters. I know that he and I and others are working on how we can even move beyond those assurances to make sure that we can look back on this agreement and recognize that we move not only the issue of peace but the issue of security going forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I would like to thank my colleague from the great State of Virginia and a number of other colleagues who have dedicated a great deal of time to reflecting and to consulting together about what is the wisest and best path forward. The Senator from Maryland who is ably leading the floor debate and is the minority ranking member on the Foreign Relations Committee and my colleague, and the Senator from Colorado, who will speak following me, are among many whom I have closely consulted. As was just remarked upon on the floor by the talented Senator from Virginia, this is a deal with flaws and with challenges that we must work together to address. I am hopeful and eager to find that path with the administration and with my colleagues to ensure that we do everything we can to deploy the full measure of America's military and economic capabilities to ensure the security of Israel and to ensure that this agreement—now that it is clear it will move forward—is fully, thoughtfully, and thoroughly implemented.

I want to rise briefly to address what I understand is now a scheduled cloture vote at 3:45 today. On critical and historic issues such as the nuclear agreement with Iran, I think the American people deserve to know how their individual Members of Congress—whether in the Senate or the House—will vote as their representatives. Over the years that I have served here, there have been far too many issues that were decided by a procedural vote—by a cloture vote—rather than by getting to the substance of the underlying issue. I think the American people deserve better than to have a critical issue such as this complex deal ultimately resolved with a procedural vote.

As we proceed to that vote later today, I wanted to let those who are watching know that is not the end of debate on this issue. If the cloture vote fails, as I believe it will, it means we will simply continue the debate and may take up another vote or several votes next week.

This morning leader REID made a fair offer to Senator MCCONNELL, the majority leader, on this floor to have a

single up-or-down vote by a 60-vote margin, to clearly show the American people how every Member of this Chamber feels about this deal—to allow us to vote on the substance. It is my hope that the majority leader will reconsider and that either today or next week we will have the opportunity to have that up-or-down vote and to let the American people know exactly where each of us stands and then get to the demanding and difficult work of building a bipartisan coalition to deal with the challenges of this deal, to insist on effective deterrence of Iran's nuclear ambitions and to find a path together to joining the international community that is joined in the implementation of this deal.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. President, I would like to speak on the agreement the P5+1 powers reached on Iran's nuclear program.

I was an early cosponsor of the bill that gave Congress an opportunity to evaluate the agreement. Because of that legislation, we have had extensive discussion and debate. This Chamber has a history of voting on critical national security issues at a 60-vote threshold, and I would have preferred an up-or-down vote on the merits. But, as too often happens, politics have prevailed, and this will likely be the only vote we will have on this agreement. So this vote serves as the vote on the substance.

In 2003, Iran was operating approximately 164 centrifuges and had virtually no enriched uranium. By 2009, when the current administration took office, Iran had between 4,000 and 5,000 centrifuges installed.

Over the next few years, Congress passed increasingly tough sanctions that the administration, to its credit, set out to implement. As a member of the banking committee in 2010, I helped write and pass those sanctions.

By 2013, even in the grasp of the toughest international sanctions regime, Iran's nuclear program had raced forward.

The country had 19,000 centrifuges installed, 10 bombs worth of enriched uranium, and 2 to 3 months' breakout time to a bomb.

The harsh reality is that today Iran stands on the threshold of a nuclear weapon.

So we have to weigh the agreement against this set of facts.

Our goal throughout this process has been clear: to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon.

Like many Members of this Chamber, I have undertaken an exhaustive review of the agreement and a lengthy consultation process.

This included briefings from our own national security and intelligence experts, international verification experts, regional experts, former Israeli

military and intelligence officials, and the P5+1 Ambassadors as well as Israel's Ambassador to the United States.

My conclusion is that the JCPOA is more likely to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon than the plausible alternatives. For that reason, I will vote to support the agreement.

It is no surprise to me that there are sincere, heartfelt differences of opinion about the merits of this deal. I have deep concerns about what the shape of Iran's nuclear program could look like beyond the 15 year horizon. But I also believe that implementation of this agreement is the best of bad options.

If Congress rejects this agreement, Iran will receive billions of dollars of sanctions relief and there will be no oversight of its nuclear program. That is an unacceptable result.

Some have argued that the United States could reject this agreement in favor of returning to the negotiating table. But this logic only holds if the international coalition holds, and everything I heard this summer tells me that won't happen.

While this agreement has flaws, it is clearly better than the alternatives. The agreement is the best option for preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon, and it maintains all of our options to respond to a move by Iran to break out to a bomb.

The agreement doesn't eliminate the deep concerns I hold about Iran's horrific acts of terror and its hegemonic pursuits, but all of Iran's malevolent acts would only be more dangerous if backed by a nuclear weapon.

We must also help our closest ally in the region, the State of Israel, defend itself. Let me be clear. The survival of the State of Israel is essential to the security of the Jewish people, and, as far as I am concerned, Israel's survival is essential to our humanity.

For these reasons and for our own security, we cannot allow Iran to acquire a nuclear weapon, and we must be crystal clear that we will use force to prevent it from doing so. In fact, we will have more credibility to use force if this agreement is in place, and we will have more legitimacy when we work to build an international coalition to respond to Iranian cheating.

There are risks to the successful implementation of the agreement, and the President and Congress must now work to make it stronger. I have worked with others in the Senate to push the administration toward that goal.

Since the announcement of the agreement, I have also worked with Senator CARDIN to develop a legislative package to address the accumulated shortcomings of our policies towards Iran and to strengthen the agreement.

Among other measures, our legislation will ensure that we track the resources Iran obtains from sanctions re-

lief and work with our regional partners to counter conventional Iranian threats. It also invests in our intelligence capabilities and provides Israel deterrence to ensure Iran cannot shield covert systems and facilities, no matter how deeply they are buried.

As we implement this agreement, we must set in place a strategy with our partners to ensure that Iran appreciates the consequences of its violations, for the next 15 years and beyond.

My grandparents, John and Halina Klejman, and my mother Susanne Klejman had everyone and everything they knew taken from them in the Holocaust. Yet, as my grandmother always told me, they were the lucky ones—they had the chance to rebuild their shattered lives in a country that accepted them and let them succeed beyond their wildest dreams.

We live in dangerous times, and whether you support the agreement or not, we must develop a cohesive strategy for U.S. policy in the Middle East that addresses the grave security concerns in the region. Separate from Iran's nuclear program, the region is threatened by war, sectarian violence, a terrible refugee crisis, and acts of barbaric brutality that belong to another century. We should seize this opportunity to play a constructive role in addressing these threats.

Our young men and women in the Armed Forces have been asked to sacrifice so much. None of us can have any doubt that, if called upon again, they would rise to any challenge, anywhere in the world. We honor their courage and spirit of sacrifice by exhausting diplomatic options before we turn to military ones. This isn't a sign of weakness but proof of our strength. And it will help us rally our allies to our side if ultimately we need to turn to military action.

Our primary objectives are to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, make sure Israel is safe, and, if possible, avoid another war in the Middle East. This agreement represents a flawed but important step to accomplish those goals. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, it is my understanding that we are now going to have brief comments, alternating between the two sides. We will begin with Senator GARDNER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for his work to get us to this point, the countless hearings he has held, the briefings that we have had to fully understand the fine details and to scrutinize every aspect of the agreement that is now before us. I also wish to thank the ranking member and the Senator from New Jersey for their tireless efforts on the com-

mittee when it comes to the process that is before us.

Make no mistake. There is not a single Member in this body, in the Senate or House of Representatives, or the American public who would complain about the President's initial goals—the goals he laid out as recently as October of 2012, as he began negotiations with Iran.

I quote the President:

Our goal is to get Iran to recognize it needs to give up its nuclear program and abide by the U.N. resolutions that have been in place. . . . But the deal we'll accept is—they end their nuclear program. It's very straightforward.

But the deal we got from the administration is anything but the straightforward ending of a nuclear program. I have listened very carefully to the hearings we have held. I have listened to the classified briefings. I have studied the language of the text—language that says things such as this: "Requests for access pursuant to provisions of this JCPOA will be made in good faith, with due observance of the sovereign rights of Iran, and kept to the minimum necessary to effectively implement the verification responsibilities under this JCPOA."

Senator COLLINS from Maine a couple of days ago said it very well: "Not only will Iran retain its nuclear capability, but also it will be a far richer nation and one that has more conventional weapons and military technology than it possesses today."

This doesn't end the nuclear program as the President stated was his goals. It continues it. It paves a patient pathway to an industrialized nuclear complex in Iran. With the blessings of the world community, a flourishing economy, a lifting of the conventional arms embargo, a lifting of the ballistic missile embargo—and that is a good deal for us?

Over the last several days, I have heard colleague after colleague who are supporting this deal come to the floor to say things such as: This deal is flawed. It is not the best. It needs improvement. Since when did a bad option in the Senate become the only option in the Senate? Since when did second, third, fourth, fifth best for this country become the best for this country?

Several months ago I had the opportunity—as have many colleagues—to visit with Prime Minister Netanyahu to talk about the dance of porcupines created by entering this deal—the nuclear tripwire that will be set up because this does not end Iran's nuclear program. Through this deal, we have given up the golden nuggets of leverage that we had with Iran—our leverage of sanctions that were beginning to work. In fact, in the briefings that we have all attended, analysts have said that our sanctions are eroding support for the regime daily, hurting their economy, devaluing their currency, and

bringing them to the table. Yet the deal that we have allows continued uranium enrichment, repeal of U.N. resolutions, and removal of the Iran nuclear issue from their agenda. That is the benefit of the bargain that the United States is about to enter into.

We heard talk over the past several days about status quo versus hypothetical. Here is the status quo that we will be entering into: a status quo that in 5 years allows conventional arms to resume in Iran, a status quo that will allow ballistic missiles to resume in 8 years and advanced centrifuge research to continue.

As the chairman of the committee stated yesterday, talking about how one IRH centrifuge could replace vast numbers of the current centrifuges they have today, they will be allowed to keep apparently all for radioisotope purposes.

Why do they need ballistic missiles and conventional arms for radiation treatment? We have desanctioned and delisted numerous individuals, people who were the fathers of the Iranian nuclear program, the A.Q. Khan of Iran, delisted, desanctioned under this deal.

Conglomerates of companies like IKO are delisted and desanctioned under this deal. These are a group of companies that were sanctioned in 2003 not because of nuclear arms-related issues but because of their threat to the world financial system. That conglomerate is now desanctioned under the terms of the deal. Sure, the United States gets to sanction them on our own, but as we heard today, yesterday, and the day before, the sanctions the United States has apparently aren't enough, and that is why we have to enter into this deal. Yet we have, as Juan Zarate said, the Sword of Damocles holding over Iran's head with the snapback provisions that apparently are good enough when we do them on our own.

One of the things that hasn't been talked about very much over the past several weeks is a letter that Secretary Kerry sent to every Senator on September 2. I think that was around the same day that enough votes were achieved to block or sustain the President's filibuster.

In the first paragraph of this letter that every Senator received, there are two sentences that I want to make sure everybody here recognizes.

We share the concern expressed by many in Congress regarding Iran's continued support for terrorist and proxy groups throughout the region, its propping up of the Assad regime in Syria, its efforts to undermine the stability of its regional neighbors, and the threat it poses to Israel.

In the very next sentence, Secretary Kerry goes on to say:

We have no illusion that this behavior will change following implementation of the JCPOA.

We have no illusion that Iran's behavior will change. That is the status quo.

The letter goes on to detail what we are going to do once this deal is entered into:

Additional U.S.-GCC working groups are focused on counterterrorism, military preparedness . . . and the goal of building political support for multilateral U.S.-GCC ballistic missile defense (BMD) cooperation.

So we are going to enter into some deals to fight ballistic missiles that this deal allows in 8 years.

The letter goes on to say that we will push back against Iran's arms transfers. Conventional arms embargoes will be lifted in 5 years. The letter then goes on to say that we will work on Iran's Missile Technology Control Regime guidelines about the transfer of sensitive systems, such as ballistic missile technology, and yet this deal allows ballistic missiles in 8 years.

The letter goes on to say:

U.S. support for Israel and our Gulf partners has never been a partisan issue, and we believe these proposals would receive wide bipartisan support.

This is a partisan deal with bipartisan opposition, and I will submit that the only element of bipartisanship on the Senate floor today is the opposition.

I urge my colleagues to vote to invoke cloture. The American people deserve to know where the United States Senate stands and deserves to know where their Members of the Senate stand with the United States.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, in accordance with the law, Congress has been reviewing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action for the past 53 days. I have spent countless hours reading, being briefed and poring over the intelligence. I have diligently worked to make an informed decision, one that weighs risk and considers a future 10, 15, 25 years from now. Without question, this vote is among the most serious I have taken. This vote has monumental and enduring consequences.

Throughout my review of this deal, my questions have been: How does this deal affect the safety and security of the United States? And how does this deal affect the safety, security and viability of Israel?

For all my time in both the House and Senate, I have been an unabashed and unwavering supporter of Israel. I have persistently supported the sanctions that brought Iran to the table. I have been insistent on foreign aid and military assistance to Israel that maintains its qualitative military edge on missile defense. With the horrors of the Holocaust in mind, I have been deeply committed to the need for a Jewish homeland, the State of Israel, and its inherent ability to defend itself, and for the United States to be an unwavering partner in Israel's defense. I have been and always will be committed to those principles.

I took an extensive review of this deal. I took a workman-like approach, covering every aspect of the deal: military, intelligence, diplomatic, economic. I actually read the deal, both the classified and the unclassified annex. I met the U.S. diplomats, nuclear experts and the national security staff who negotiated the deal. I actively participated in every classified and unclassified briefing available to me. I took the additional step of traveling to Vienna to meet with the Director General of the IAEA and his technical staff to evaluate for myself, first hand, the inspection and verification requirements. I have listened to my constituents, including leaders in the Jewish community. I did my homework.

Throughout, I asked the tough questions. And I questioned the answers to those questions. These were my key questions: No. 1, does this agreement block the four pathways to a nuclear bomb: highly enriched uranium at Natanz, highly enriched uranium at Fordow, weapons grade plutonium, and covert attempts to produce fissile material? No. 2, is it verifiable? No. 3, do inspections work to detect overt and covert violations of the agreement? No. 4, what is the impact of a 24-day delay to get an inspection? No. 5, does the IAEA have the capacity to implement the agreement? No. 6, what sanctions will be lifted, when and under what conditions? No. 7, do snapback sanctions really have a snap? No. 8, if we reject this deal, what are the alternatives that would be effective and achievable?

The answer to my first question—does it block the four pathways to a nuclear bomb?—is yes. This deal sufficiently blocks the four pathways to get to a bomb. There is no shortcut to a nuclear bomb. This deal fundamentally addresses that fact.

First, it blocks Iran's ability to have weapons-grade plutonium. The Arak reactor would be redesigned. Spent fuel would be sent out of Iran in perpetuity. Efforts to use Arak for weapons-grade plutonium would be detected.

Second, it drastically cuts Iran's uranium enrichment capabilities by reducing Iran's inventory of active centrifuges at Fordow and Natanz. The deal also monitors the uranium supply chain and procurement channel for 25 years.

Third, it reduces Iran's uranium stockpile below levels needed to make a single bomb. It cuts the uranium stockpile by 98 percent, to 300 kilograms, for 15 years. It puts uranium enrichment of the remaining stockpile at 3.67 percent.

Fourth, by blocking the pathways, it makes it very difficult for Iran to develop a separate covert program.

In answering my second and third questions—is it verifiable? do inspections work to detect overt and covert

violations of the agreement?—I have found that this deal provides sufficient verification and inspection mechanisms. The IAEA has extensive access to Iran's declared nuclear sites, making the detection of violations and a covert program more likely. The IAEA also has direct access to centrifuge manufacturing sites to conduct inspections on short notice. Under Iran's additional protocol, the verification and inspection process has also been scientifically reviewed and validated by the U.S. Department of Energy's nuclear scientists and endorsed by 29 of the Nation's top scientists, including several Nobel prizewinners who described the inspection process as "innovative and stringent."

In answer to my fourth question—what is the impact of a 24-day delay to get inspections?—the IAEA will have daily access to Iran's declared nuclear facilities: Natanz, Arak and Fordo. The 24-day process would apply to undeclared sites only. These would be sites where the IAEA suspects Iran is conducting covert nuclear activities.

In answer to my fifth question—does the IAEA have the capacity to implement the agreement?—I would say, yes. After visiting the IAEA in Vienna and delving into the organization, I believe that it has sufficient expertise to implement this deal. But all nations involved in its funding, including but not limited to the United States, have to be aggressively involved in monitoring the resources of the organization.

In answer to my sixth question—what sanctions will be lifted, when and under what conditions?—the parts of the agreement that would lift sanctions are among its most complicated and controversial elements. I would have preferred a glidepath over a 3-year period, or longer, for sanctions relief. Under the agreement, however, no sanctions will be lifted until Iran takes key steps: limits its uranium enrichment program, resolves issues with possible military dimensions, converts the Arak facility, and allows for proper inspections. And these steps must be certified by the IAEA, which will deliver its key assessment of possible military dimensions on December 15.

When these requirements are met, the U.S. will lift sanctions in key sectors: oil and gas; banking and financial services; insurance related; shipping, ship building and transport; gold and precious metals; software; and people, including international travel visas. That process will take 6 months to 1 year. The sanctions are lifted, not terminated, and can be snapped back, per the agreement.

Which takes us to my seventh question—do snapback sanctions really have a snap? Russia, China, India, and our European partners were very active members of the negotiations with a common interest in Iran not having a nuclear weapon. I believe they would

support a snapback in sanctions if a violation was identified and verified. But the snapback sanctions mechanism, while innovative, is untested.

Finally, I have asked if we reject this deal what the alternatives are that would be effective and achievable. I have considered the alternatives very closely, but in the end, they don't present a more viable option to this deal. The two alternatives are more sanctions or military action.

Some have suggested we reject this deal and impose unilateral sanctions to force Iran back to the table, but maintaining or stepping up sanctions will only work if the sanction coalition holds together. It is unclear if the European Union, Russia, China, India, and others would continue sanctions if Congress rejects this deal. At best, sanctions would be porous or limited to unilateral sanctions by the U.S., but these are the same reasons that the efficacy of the snapback provision is questioned. If you don't think snapback works, enhanced sanctions won't work either.

There are also those who have proposed military action as an alternative to end Iran's nuclear program, but taking military airstrikes against Iran would only set the program back for 3 years. It would not terminate the program. Iran would continue to possess the knowledge of how to build a bomb and could redouble its resolve to obtain a weapon, completely unchecked. Iran would almost certainly use Hezbollah or other proxies to attack Israel or conduct terrorist or cyber attacks against U.S. interests. The military option is always on the table for the United States. We are not afraid to use it. But military action should be the last resort, since it will have only temporary effects versus the longer term effects of this deal.

No deal is perfect, especially one negotiated with the Iranian regime. I have concluded that this Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is the best option available to block Iran from having a nuclear bomb. For these reasons, I will vote in favor of this deal. However, Congress must also reaffirm our commitment to the safety and security of Israel.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, please advise both sides of the time remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Republicans have 11 minutes 20 seconds, Democrats have 5 minutes 5 seconds.

The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, over the past 5 months, we have learned much about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action and the intentions of Iran's ayatollahs. We know the nuclear deal will release billions of dollars to the terrorist-sponsoring Iranian regime. We know Qasem Soleimani and other

terrorists who have killed Americans will be relieved of international sanctions. We know the side deals between the IAEA and Iran—side deals we have yet to see in this Senate—may entrust the Iranian regime to collect its own verification samples at its most secret nuclear facilities, allowing Iran to monitor itself instead of insisting on real, verifiable, and independent inspections.

We know the right to enrich at all, which this administration conceded early on in these negotiations, will trigger an arms race in the Middle East. Just this week, the ambassador from the United Arab Emirates told the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that if this deal goes through, the UAE may no longer abide by its nonproliferation agreements and may begin an enrichment program. I fear Saudi Arabia, Turkey, and other countries may follow suit.

We know the ayatollahs—fresh from the negotiating table at Vienna—continue to lead Quds Day crowds in chants of "Death to America" and issue threats at our president and our people.

And, yes, we know that the deal will begin to expire in a mere 10 to 15 years, unleashing a nuclear-capable Iran on the world, free of international sanctions, with a healthier economy, and without the restraints that American diplomacy has painstakingly cultivated over the past decade.

But, in the end, our vote on the Iran nuclear deal won't turn on any of these particulars. Ultimately, this vote isn't about specific centrifuge numbers or enrichment levels or the exact scope of sanctions relief. No, it is simpler than that.

This vote is about history. It is about the responsibility of this Senate and the greatest Republic in history. It is about where we want the course of history to lead for our children and our grandchildren.

This vote is not about a party or a President. After all, the Iranians chant "Death to America," not "Death to Democrats," not "Death to Republicans," not "Death to our President," but "Death to America." Just this week, the Iranians again labeled America the Great Satan.

So this vote is about empowering an evil, terror-sponsoring regime and continuing this history or seizing the moment to change history. If this deal is approved, in just a few years, Iran may test a nuclear device, as North Korea did in 2006, just 12 years after a similar nuclear agreement. With a rumbling explosion that will shake the Earth, Iran may announce its status as a nuclear power and the opening of a second nuclear age that our Nation has struggled so long to prevent.

If Iran goes nuclear, history will not remember kindly the Senators who supported this nuclear deal. It won't

remember your hand-wringing, your anguished speeches, your brow-furrowing. It won't remember your glib beliefs about the flawed inspection system or unworkable enforcement mechanisms. It won't remember your soft rationalizations that this deal is "better than nothing" or "the only alternative to war."

History will remember your vote and only your vote. It will remember that you opened the gate to Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. It will remember you as the ones who flipped the strategic balance of the Middle East and the world toward the favor of our enemies. And it will remember you, this Senate and this President, as the ones who, when given the chance to stop the world's worst sponsor of terrorism from obtaining the world's worst weapon, blinked when confronted with this evil.

A world menaced by a nuclear-capable Iran is a terrifying prospect. Over the past three decades, Iran has waged a low-intensity war on the United States and our partners. Iran has financed and trained Hezbollah and Hamas terrorists to do its bidding as their proxy. Iran fueled the virulent insurgency whose roadside bombs and suicide attacks devastated Iraq and sadly killed or maimed thousands of American troops. And Iran has sowed unrest throughout the Middle East and propped up Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, creating a crisis that has engulfed the entire region and that is fast spreading beyond its borders and other parts of the world.

Iran has done all of this without nuclear weapons. Should it be allowed to continue enrichment and conduct research and development on nuclear technology—as this deal lets it—the ayatollahs will grow even more brazen, fearless, reckless, and insulated from conventional forms of deterrence and pressure. Upon the expiration of this deal—or its repudiation by the ayatollahs at a time of their choosing—Iran's strategy of terror and intimidation will become nuclearized.

That is the world we may face in a few short years because of your votes. That is the threat we will confront if you bestow your blessing on a nuclear program run by the anti-American, anti-Israel, Jihadist regime in Tehran.

So we should soberly recognize that the context of this vote isn't a debate that is fast coming to a close. The context isn't demagoguery or backroom pressure from a lameduck President, and it isn't the effect of this vote on our political fortunes.

The context for this vote is the broad sweep of history.

In late 1936, Winston Churchill spoke on the years of British appeasement in the face of German rearmament. He observed:

The era of procrastination, of half-measures, of soothing and baffling expedients, of

delays, is coming to a close. In its place we are entering a period of consequences.

Churchill's words are as true today as they were then. We are entering a period of consequences. Because of your vote today, the consequences may well be nuclear. God help us all if they are.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that shortly we will have a chance to vote. I would have preferred the vote to be on the final passage of the resolution with the 60-vote threshold. I regret that was not agreed to.

I will vote what I think is in the best interest of our country, to keep Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state, and our best chance to avoid a military option. I have already indicated that I intend to oppose the agreement and I have given my reasons on the floor and I will not repeat them at this moment.

But I wish to speak about what happens after this vote is over and whatever votes take place next week, with the deadline being next Thursday. At that time, I hope everyone here recognizes that it is important for us to put division aside. I wish to remind some of my colleagues of what happened 14 years ago on a vote with Iraq, the authorization for force. I voted against that resolution. And when that vote was over, Democrats and Republicans, proponents and opponents, joined together to support our troops and our mission under the leadership of President Bush to give America the best chance for its foreign policy to succeed.

So when the votes are over, I hope that Democrats and Republicans, proponents and opponents of the plan will work towards congressional involvement. Working with the President gives us our best opportunity to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state and gives us the least risk of using a military option. I say that because my colleague from Maryland outlined that very clearly. A military option—although we must have that option in our quill—a military option will not solve the problem and it has a lot of collateral consequences.

I hope we can work together, because that is what is in the best interest of the U.S. Senate. That is what is in the best interest of the United States of America.

I look forward to working with Senator CORKER and all members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the U.S. Senate to see how Congress can work together with our President so that we can achieve that goal.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. RUBIO. Mr. President, I will be brief. I know the Senator from Ten-

nessee would like to close on this matter.

I think everything that needs to be said about the details of this deal has already been said. I do want to be recorded for history's purposes, although I know what is going to happen in regards to this if it goes through. Iran will immediately use the money in sanctions relief to begin building up its conventional capabilities. It will establish the most dominant military power in the region outside of the United States, and it will raise the price of us operating in the region. They are going to build anti-access capabilities, rockets capable of destroying our aircraft carriers and ships, continue to build these swift boats, these fast boats that are able to swarm our naval assets so that it will make it harder and harder for U.S. troops to be in the region. They will also work with other terrorist groups in the region to target American service men and women. They may or may not deny that they are involved, but they will target us and raise the price of our presence in the Middle East until they hope to completely pull us out of that region. They will also continue to build long-range missiles capable of reaching the United States. Those are not affected by this deal, and they will continue to build them as they have been doing.

Then, at some point in the near future, when the time is right, they will build a nuclear weapon, and they will do so because at that point they will know that they have become immune, that we will no longer be able to strike their nuclear program, because the price of doing so will be too high.

This is not just the work of imagination; it exists in the world today. It is called North Korea, where a lunatic possesses dozens of nuclear weapons and a long-range rocket that can already reach the United States, and we cannot do anything about it. An attack on North Korea today would result in an attack on Tokyo or Seoul or Guam or Hawaii or California. So the world must now live with a lunatic in possession of nuclear weapons.

This is the goal Iran has as well—to reach a point where they become immune to any sort of credible military threat because the price of a military strike would be too high, and then they become an established nuclear weapons power. Never in the history of the world has such a regime ever possessed weapons so capable of destruction.

Iran is led by a supreme leader who is a radical Shia cleric with an apocalyptic vision of the future. He is not a traditional geopolitical actor who makes decisions on the basis of borders or simply history or because of ambition. He has a religious apocalyptic vision of the future—one that calls for triggering a conflict between the non-Muslim world and the Muslim world, one that he feels especially obligated

to trigger. And he is going to possess nuclear weapons? This is the world that we are on the verge of leaving our children to inherit and perhaps we ourselves will have to share in.

So I want to be recorded for history's purposes if nothing else to say that those of us who opposed this deal understood where it would lead, and we are making a terrible mistake. I fear that the passage of this deal will make it even harder for us to prevent it. I hope there is still time to change our minds.

But here is the good news. Iran may have a Supreme Leader, but America does not. In this Nation, we have a republic, and soon we will have new leaders, perhaps in this chamber but also in the executive branch. I pray on their first day in office they will reverse this deal and reimpose the sanctions and back them up with a credible threat of military force, or history will condemn us for not doing what needed to be done in the world's history.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, a lot has been said about the impact of this agreement. I would like to speak for a moment about the impact of no agreement. What if the Republicans and those who oppose this agreement have their way and this agreement goes away? Iran is still a nuclear threshold state. If you have your way and stop this agreement, the result will be literally leaving in Iran the capacity to build 10 nuclear weapons today. And the timing on that: 2 to 3 months before they have the fissile material for a nuclear weapon—if you have your way and kill this agreement.

That is some holiday surprise, that if we walk away from this agreement, this effort for inspection, Iran could develop a nuclear weapon. That is the reality. If you have your way, there will be no inspectors. Iran will be closed off to the world. How can that possibly make the Middle East safer for Israel or for any other country in the world? How can it make it safer if we as a coalition who have worked so hard to build this agreement fail in the effort?

What I have listened for during the last 3 days of debate is any suggestion from the other side of the aisle about what is the alternative to this agreement. Now, some have been bold enough to say it is military, and we shouldn't wince at the prospect of a military solution. One Senator on the other side of the aisle said 4 days is all we need to take them out; we will take care of Iran. I have heard that before, I say to my friends. I heard it before the invasion of Iraq where we were going to be greeted as liberators, and it would be a matter of weeks before our troops would be coming home. It didn't turn out that way.

What we are trying to do and what the President is trying to do is to start

a diplomatic process to avoid the military option, to avoid a war. That is why I am supporting it. I think it is the right thing to do. I am sorry that the vote we are about to cast here is a procedural vote. Twice, Senator REID has asked Senator MCCONNELL to give us a straight, up-or-down, clean vote on this question of disapproval by a 60-vote margin, and twice Senator MCCONNELL has objected and insisted instead on this procedural vote. We know where everyone stands. Everyone in this chamber has publicly declared where they stand on this matter. That should be the rollcall that we take next. Unfortunately, we are faced with a procedural rollcall.

I will close by saying one word about the Members on this side of the aisle. For 6 weeks I have contacted them—and in fact harassed them—asking them what they were going to do on this important question. For any people who are critical of this Senate, believing it is too superficial and too partisan, I will tell you that on this side of the aisle they took their time, they read the agreements, they were briefed by the intelligence agencies and Department of Defense, and they made up their mind and announced their position publicly. It is a proud moment for this institution because I think that is what we all believe to be our responsibility.

As we close this debate, I ask those who support the agreement to vote no on the cloture motion.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, before I make closing comments, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture vote this afternoon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I wish to begin by thanking the vast majority of this body for the fact that over—for four times since 2010, Members of this body almost unanimously passed sanctions that brought Iran to the table—people on both sides of the aisle. I want to thank people for that.

I want to thank this body for another reason. When we realized that the President was going to negotiate with Iran and do so through what was called a nonbinding political commitment and that he was going to take this agreement directly to the U.N. Security Council—he was not going to cause it to be a treaty, but he was going to cause it to be an agreement that he could execute without our involvement—because of the fact that we brought Iran to the table through the sanctions that we collectively put in place, we rose up and we passed a bill on a 98-to-1 basis that allowed us to go through this process we are going through today.

I want to thank Senator CARDIN, who has been an outstanding ranking member. I want to thank Senator MENENDEZ before him, who was an outstanding chairman and ranking member.

What this agreement said we would do is we would debate. I want to stop there and say that I think we have had a dignified debate. People on both sides of the aisle have handled themselves as Senators, and I am very proud of that.

The other piece of that was that we would vote, that we would let the people of this country know where we stood. We have a bipartisan majority that disapproves of this deal. The most substantial foreign policy people on the Democratic side oppose this deal. Always we have known that yes, we were going to do this under regular order, and under regular order what that means is there is this procedural vote where the Senate decides that debate has ended and we are going to move to a final vote. We are at that juncture, and I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that on a 98-to-1 basis voted to allow us to vote to now vote yes on this cloture motion, to allow the Members of this Senate, who have handled themselves so responsibly, to be able to record on a majority basis where we stand on this issue.

The majority of the people in the Senate believe that this deal that has been negotiated is not in the national interest of this country, will not make our Nation or the Middle East safer, and I hope that all of us are going to have that opportunity to vote after we pass this procedural hurdle. I hope that all Members will vote to allow this to proceed to a final vote within the next few days.

With that, I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Kelly Ayotte, John Thune, Cory Gardner, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Joni Ernst, Tom Cotton, James M. Inhofe, Thad Cochran, Bill Cassidy, Pat Roberts, Johnny Isakson, Jerry Moran, John McCain.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2640, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 58, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 264 Leg.]

YEAS—58

Alexander	Fischer	Paul
Ayotte	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Portman
Blunt	Graham	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Schumer
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Collins	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	
Ernst	Murkowski	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskey	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 58, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion with respect to H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Susan M. Collins, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented

under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Susan M. Collins, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the issue before us is of immense consequence to our country. The American people are entitled to a real voice and to know where their elected Senators stand on this important issue.

Until recently, this was a principle Members of both parties seemed to endorse rather overwhelmingly. In fact, not a single Democrat—not one—voted against the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. We all recall it passed 98 to 1. They told us this was an issue too important for political games.

This is what one Democratic colleague said just last week:

As a caucus that was opposed to games with filibusters over the last four years, I would think it would be really regrettable if we didn't ultimately go to the floor and cast our votes for or against this deal.

But that was last week, apparently. Democratic Senators just voted to filibuster and block the American people from even having a real vote on one of the most consequential foreign policy issues of our time.

It is telling that Democrats would go to such extreme lengths to prevent President Obama from even having to consider legislation on this issue. If the President is so proud of this deal, then he shouldn't be afraid.

We all know the amount of time the administration has spent here asking all of these guys to take a bullet for the team—and, of course, the team is Team Obama. They all wanted to have a say. When it came time to have a say, they said it was more important that the President not have to veto a resolution of disapproval—more important to him than to them.

This is a deal that was designed to go around Congress and the American people from the very start. We all remember the President didn't want to submit it to us at all. It was going to be an executive agreement, it is still an executive agreement, and he didn't want us to have any say at all.

Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN worked together and developed a pro-

posal—overwhelmingly proposed and supported—to give us a chance to weigh in on this important deal.

It would empower Iran to maintain thousands of centrifuges and to become a recognized nuclear-threshold state, forever on the edge of developing a nuclear weapon. That is what is before us.

It would effectively subsidize Hezbollah, Hamas, and the Assad regime in Syria—which, by the way, is now going to apparently include a Russian military base in Syria—by showing tens of billions of dollars on their benefactors in Tehran.

It would leave Iran with an enrichment capability just as the Iranian leadership is again calling for Israel's destruction and praying every day for our destruction. This deal is sure to have many consequences that will last well beyond this administration.

Yet as things presently stand, it would limp along with little or no buy-in or input from Congress or from the American people—who we know overwhelmingly opposed the deal in spite of the President's best efforts to sell it to them. This shouldn't be an acceptable outcome for our friends on the other side, even those who support the deal. I predicted earlier—and I predict again today—we are going to have a raft of new bash-Iran proposals introduced by our friends on the other side, who are going to be born again Iran bashers.

So let me make it clear to all of our colleagues, we have voted, we are going to vote again, but we are voting on the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. We are not going to be taking up bills that have fewer than enough cosponsors to override a Presidential veto. If we want to make a law, as we did with Corker-Cardin, show us enough cosponsors to make a law, but we are not interested in using floor time for get-well efforts over on the other side to try to fool their constituents into thinking: Oh, I really, really was serious about Iran, in spite of the fact that I voted for the deal that you hate.

We only have so much floor time in the Senate. We are going to try to use it on serious proposals that have a chance of becoming law, and my assumption is the President is not going to want to revisit this issue. He got what he wanted. He is not going to want to revisit this issue. So if we want to do anything further about this Iranian regime, bring me a bill with enough cosponsors to override a Presidential veto, and we will take a look at it.

Otherwise, the American people will give us their judgment about the appropriateness of this measure 1 year from November because this is not an ordinary issue. This is an issue with a real shelf life. This is a regime that is still going to be there a year and a half from now.

And, of course, as we know, it is an Executive agreement only. So if, perchance, there is a President of a different party, I would say to our Iranian observers of the debate that it will be looked at anew based upon Iranian behavior between now and then.

As others have said, the Iranian Parliament is apparently going to get to weigh in. I heard the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee say that. I guess they are going to get a vote.

But our friends on the other side want to employ a procedural device, which, as the Democratic leader has pointed out, is commonly used here, but the question is, on what kind of measure is it used?

This is no ordinary measure. This is different.

So we will have another opportunity to see whether we want to move past this procedural device.

The President is proud of the deal. I don't know why he would be reluctant to veto a resolution of disapproval that is put on his desk. He is having press conferences about it. He is bragging about it. He thinks this is really great.

I don't know what they are protecting him from. I would think he would have a veto ceremony and invite all you guys to join him and celebrate. What are you protecting him from?

We will have a chance next week, one more chance, to allow him to say how he feels about the resolution of disapproval. We know how he feels about it already. For the life of me, I can't get why he is reluctant to veto this resolution of disapproval, in effect, underscoring again what a great deal he thinks it is for America.

So we will revisit the issue next week and see if maybe any folks want to change their minds and give us a chance to remove the procedural roadblock and give the President what he has been asking for.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I want to be as respectful of my friend as I need to be, but let's speak reality.

We are in a Congress that is dominated by the Republicans. They control the House by a large margin, and they control the Senate by a large margin.

The legislation that is before this body was proposed, legislated, and brought to us by Republican leadership. It is their legislation, not ours.

I didn't spend all my time in my office visiting with people today; I watched the speeches. It was stunning—the nonreality that is facing my Republican friends. They dwelled, a number of them, on what is going on in the Middle East. Not once—not once—did anyone mention the worst foreign-policy decision ever made by our great country, the invasion of Iraq. It has destabilized that part of the world for a long, long time to come. For what? So

my friends can blame all the problems in the Middle East on the President, but they are blaming the wrong person. We can't take what we have because they want to rewrite history. History is as it is, and people are writing history as it is.

Now the part of history that they are trying to rewrite is history that is taking place in this body. We offered, on two separate occasions, publicly before the American people and in this body: Do you want a vote? We will let you have a vote. Both times it was objected to because in the convoluted reasoning, I guess, of my friend, he thinks that people who are watching all of this have no common sense and can't understand the English language.

We offered to have a vote on this on two separate occasions. It was objected to both times. Now, the inane response is you are filibustering this. I know why there are filibusters because we have had to file cloture more than 600 times because of filibusters by the Republicans. Never in the history of the country has there ever been anything close to it.

Now, what were most of those filibusters on? On motions to proceed. On this legislation that came before this body, we said we don't need a vote on a motion to proceed, go to the bill, go to it. We also said, as part of the agreement, let the leader offer the first amendment, and he did that.

Now, a 60-vote threshold, my friend talks as if: Oh, wowee, where in the world did this come from? Why would they ever consider 60 votes on this?

First, I know it is late in the day. I didn't bring the subject up, but my friend the Republican leader is talking about a world that doesn't exist anymore. And who created this world that doesn't exist anymore? My Republican friends.

This is July 30, 2011, from Senator MCCONNELL:

Now, look, we know that on controversial matters in the Senate, it has for quite some time required 60 votes. So I would say again to my friend, [that is me] it is pretty hard to make a credible case that denying a vote on your own proposal is anything other than a filibuster.

A little while later:

I wish to make clear to the American people Senate Republicans are ready to vote on cloture on the Reid proposal in 30 minutes, in an hour, as soon as we can get our colleagues over to the floor. We are ready to vote. By requiring 60 votes, particularly on a matter of this enormous importance, it is not at all unusual. It is the way the Senate operates.

Another one, a few months later:

Mr. President, I can only quote my good friend [that is me] the majority leader who has repeatedly said, most recently in early 2007, that in the Senate it has always been the case we need 60 votes. This is my good friend the majority leader when he was the leader of this majority in March of 2007, and he said it repeatedly both when he was in the minority or leader of the majority, that it

requires 60 votes certainly on measures that are controversial.

There is no question the measure before this body—using the words of my friend the Republican leader—is something that is important. There is no question that this measure has been controversial. Also, using his words, is this legislation of enormous importance? I think so. At least that is my mind.

Quoting from a little while later:

So who gets to decide who is wasting time around here? None of us have that authority to decide who is wasting time. But the way you make things happen is you get 60 votes at some point, and you move the matter to conclusion, and the best way to do that is to have an open amendment process. That is the way this place used to operate.

And I say “used to operate.” That is my own editorial comment.

Two or three months later:

Madam President, reserving the right to object, what we are talking about is a perpetual debt ceiling grant, in effect, to the President. Matters of this level of controversy always require 60 votes. So I would ask my friend, the majority leader—

Referring to me as the majority leader—

if he would modify his consent request and set the threshold for this vote at 60?

I am not going to be reading these forever, but I will read one more:

Well, as we all know, it takes 60 votes to do everything except the budget process. We anticipate having a vote to proceed to the 20-week Pain-Capable bill sometime before the end of the year as well.

That was just the early part of August of this year.

So, Mr. President, my friend is in a dire situation, and I understand that. The House is in a terrible state of disarray. They do not know what they are going to do. On one hand, what they say they are going to do is—the President can't send the papers to them. So they want to have a vote on that. The papers didn't come to them. And then they turn right around and are going to vote on a resolution of approval. I guess they do not need the papers for that. Then they are going to vote on more sanctions. Then they don't know what they are going to do. It is very unusual, when one party controls both branches of the bicameral legislature, that they do not know how to work together, but obviously they are not working together here. So I understand my friend's frustration. This is a situation where he has lost the vote, and it is a situation where he is simply not in touch with reality as it exists.

So I want to say to everyone within the sound of my voice that the Senate has spoken and has spoken with a clarification voice and declared that the historic agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will stand. That is what this agreement is all about. It is about whether Iran should have a nuclear weapon. And the countries you wouldn't think would be involved in

supporting something such as this—they know the importance of it themselves, and they agreed to go along with this agreement. They helped us negotiate it. China, Russia—they agreed to it. The Senate has spoken with a clarion voice and declared that this historic agreement to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon will stand.

So I say, my fellow Americans—and I say that with all respect for everybody who is out there listening or will read about this—our allies and negotiating partners around the world should know that today's outcome was clear, decisive, and final. There is now no doubt whatsoever that the United States Congress will allow this historic agreement to proceed. Efforts by opponents to derail this agreement were soundly rejected by a margin much larger than anyone thought achievable even a few days ago.

Any future attempts, as my friend is talking about, to relitigate this issue—I guess we will be in a position like with the Affordable Care Act. Are we going to try to repeal it 60 times? Are we going to try to break that record? Any future attempts to relitigate this issue in the Senate will meet the same outcome and will be nothing more than wasted time—time we can't afford to waste with a government shutdown looming in a matter of weeks, more of the disarray of my friends the Republicans. We are not making up closing government. The government was closed 2 years ago for almost 3 weeks. So we take those threats seriously. And I would hope we could get around to doing something about that rather than having wasted cloture motions on something on which we agreed to have a vote. Filibusters are an effort to stop debate. We said when I came in here Tuesday—Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday—if you want more time than that to debate, go ahead and do it. We are not in any way stopping debate, as was done by my Republican colleagues hundreds of times in years past. So this can be relitigated. Let's do it over 60 times to try to break the Affordable Care Act record, if you choose, but this matter is over with. It is something of such importance, but we should move on to something else. We have so much to do in this body—so much to do.

We have our highway situation that is deteriorating. We have hundreds of thousands of bridges that are in a state of disrepair and need refurbishing and some of them need to be replaced. Today I met with the regional transportation authority, someone who represents 80 percent of the population in our State. We are in desperate shape all over Nevada as far as doing something about highways, but we are not doing anything about highways, we are fiddling around on that patching stuff. We had something done, and I was happy to get that done.

We have cyber security issues. As we are here talking right now in this body, we have groups, individuals, and countries trying to hack us—they are not trying; they are doing it. We have not had the ability to get cyber security legislation before this body. It is something we have brought up as an afterthought. We have Senator BURR and Senator FEINSTEIN and the bill they produced. It is not my favorite. I think we could do better than that. But I support their legislation. We have to do something. Let's start someplace doing something that is important for the American people.

So I say to everyone here that it is time we move on to something else. This matter is over. You can continue to relitigate it, but it is going to have the same result.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Democratic leader frequently reminded me when he was the majority leader, the majority leader always gets the last word.

I enjoyed hearing the Democratic leader's history lesson, going back, as I recount—I am sure I will leave some out—to the Iraq war resolution, which he voted for, as did Hillary Clinton, to a recitation of past debates from ObamaCare, to you name it, including complaining about highways, a bill Senator BOXER and I worked on and actually passed that he voted against, which hopefully will soon be in conference, but none of that has anything to do with what is before us today.

The issue before us today is the Iran nuclear agreement. We know how the American people feel about it. They are overwhelmingly opposed to it. We know how the Israelis feel about it. They are overwhelmingly opposed to it. We know our Sunni-Arab allies are now visiting the Russians to talk about arms purchases because they do not trust us anymore. We know the President wanted to transform the Middle East, and, by golly, he has. Our friends don't trust us and our enemies are emboldened.

So the issue is not over. The Democratic leader saying the issue is over doesn't make it over.

This agreement and the foreign policy of this administration is best summed up by Jimmy Carter. A couple of months ago, he was asked to sum up the Obama administration's foreign policy, and this is almost a direct quote. He said he couldn't think of a single place in the world where we are in better shape now than we were when the President came to office. That is Jimmy Carter.

Foreign policy will be a big issue going into 2016, and this agreement is a metaphor for all of the mistakes this President has made. You name the area of the world, and you will see the results. So no amount of saying the issue

is over makes it over. It is still on the floor of the Senate. We will have an opportunity again next week to move past this procedural snag to give all Members of the Senate an opportunity to vote up or down on a resolution of disapproval, which we know is supported on a bipartisan basis.

And I end with this: There is bipartisan opposition to this deal—bipartisan opposition to this deal. Only Democrats support it. So if the President is so proud of it, I can't figure out what these folks over here are protecting him from.

You guys should all be invited down to the veto signing. Break out the champagne, celebrate, take credit for it. You own it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, one last thing. I recognize my friend is going to be next, and I am going to be very short here.

I am glad my friend brought up my vote on Iraq. I have stated on national TV, I have stated every chance I get that the biggest mistake I ever made in my public service was voting for that bill. And I learned it quickly. It was just a matter of a few short months after I voted that I realized I had been misled in voting for that. But that doesn't matter. I voted for it, and, as some say in some circles, I have repented publicly for having done that. So my feeling about the Iraq war has not changed, the mere fact I had voted for that.

I would also say this in closing: I hope the one thing we can agree on here as Democrats and Republicans is that the ability of Iran for the next 15 years to build a nuclear weapon is pretty well taken care of. No one has to agree with that part of my statement, but the one thing I hope we can agree on—I would hope we would work together to make sure we continue, as indicated in the letter Senator Kerry wrote to everybody, all of us, and the Cardin legislation—I hope everyone will take a look at that because, as I said in a statement I gave on Tuesday morning, I have looked at what was suggested in the Kerry letter to make Israel more safe and more secure and some of the suggestions that Senator CARDIN had in his outline. These are things on which I hope we can work together. Put this to one side for the time being. Let's hope in the future we can work together to make sure the only true democracy in that part of the world, this ally of ours, is safe and secure. And we will continue everything we can to make sure they are, I repeat, safe and secure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, there is no question the Israelis need a lot of reinforcement, no question they

need to know for sure we are on their side because this administration has just entered into an agreement that by all objective standards could even threaten their very existence. So I think there is no question the Israelis need every reassurance we can possibly give them.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. Kaine. Mr. President, I want to rise and offer some thoughts on the comments we just heard from the majority leader and from our leader. I want to say a word about process, and I want to say a word about partisanship.

Let me start with a word to all of my colleagues. I respect your position on this deal however you voted. I am not here to stand and name-call or chastise anybody who reaches a different position on this bill than I do because it is a hard matter, and I don't think we serve the body well by challenging folks who reach a different position.

Let me say a word about process. The allegation has been made on the floor in recent days that this vote, including the vote that was just taken, was somehow a procedural blocking of the vote on the deal. That is just not the case.

I was one of the coauthors of the review act that is currently before us, and as we worked on the act in the Foreign Relations Committee, everyone understood that it would take 60 votes to pass either a motion of approval or disapproval. We worked on the act in January and February—months before a framework was on the table. Democrats wanted a 60-vote threshold for a motion of disapproval, but Republicans wanted a 60-vote threshold for a motion of approval, and that was the understanding of everyone in the committee when we cast a 19-to-0 vote to pass this in early April, and it was clearly understood when we cast a 98-to-1 vote on the floor of this body.

A 60-vote threshold was understood. It was so clearly understood that that is the way we do things around here that 47 Members of the Senate put that in a letter to the leaders of Iran. So this is not an unusual thing to ask for a 60-vote threshold. In fact, the Democrats have asked twice in last 3 days: Let's have an up-or-down vote on the motion of disapproval with a 60-vote threshold—and our request for a vote on the merits has been twice blocked by the majority.

I hope we will have a chance to vote on the merits again next week under the 60-vote threshold that we all agreed to, but regardless of whether we do or whether we don't, this is a completely transparent vote because all 100 Members of the Senate have indicated what their position is. I respect everybody's position, but it is very clear, and the clear rule is, under the review act we

just passed, by this vote this deal will now go forward as we agreed it would a few months back.

Partisanship. The majority leader suggested the position that is being taken on this side of the aisle is just to protect the President. I find that insulting. That is basically saying that on this side of the aisle my colleagues didn't do the work to dig into the deal. So let me just say a word about my colleagues—my colleagues in the minority in this body.

This deal was announced on the 15th of July. Did anyone on this side of the aisle run out and take a position on the deal within hours after it was out? Did anyone on this side of the aisle say, yes, I know what I am going to do and I haven't even read the bill. Has this side of the aisle in lockstep all taken exactly the same position with respect to this bill? No.

On this side of the aisle, we haven't approached it in a partisan way. On this side of the aisle, every Member took the time to master the details and make their own decision. Some announced their decision a few days after the deal was announced, some announced their decision 7 weeks after the deal was announced. On this side of the aisle there is a difference of opinion—42 of us support the deal, 4 of us do not support the deal—but we respect each other's opinions, and we have approached it as a matter of conscience.

So I categorically reject the statement and the implication by the majority leader that this is just something over here that is being done casually to protect the President. I would ask my colleagues in the majority: Compare the diversity of opinion and the time it took to reach an opinion and the respect that we have for each other's position—compare that on this side of the aisle with your own track record on this bill, with the speed with which people announced that they were opposing it, some even admitting they were opposing it before they read it.

Contrary to the claim of the majority leader that there is no bipartisan support for this deal, I have to say, Senator John Warner, Republican, 36-year Member of the Senate, chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, wrote with Senator Carl Levin, former chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee, "Why Hawks Should Support the Iran Deal"; Brent Scowcroft, National Security Advisor for two Republican Presidents and general, strongly supports this deal; GEN Colin Powell, Republican, Secretary of State, strongly supports this deal. There is bipartisan support for this deal. It is just that in this body the minority has been willing to have differences of opinion and respect those differences and not approach this in a partisan manner. That is not exactly the case with respect to the other side. I applaud my colleagues for treating this as a matter

of conscience, for reaching the conclusions they reached, even differences of opinion, and respecting each other's views.

Under the terms of the review act, as we agreed to it, we have now taken a vote. Unless the majority will allow us to have a vote on the merits, pursuant to the 60-vote threshold, this vote will stand and the deal will go forward. I hope we can vote on the merits. I hope the majority will agree to let us do what we agreed to do when we passed the review act just a couple of months ago.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. Corker. Mr. President, I was not planning to speak—I know Senator Capito is next in line—but I am really disappointed in my friend from Virginia indicating that somehow people on this side of the aisle did not study this deal, did not spend time understanding the details, and somehow people on this side of the aisle, in a knee-jerk way, made their decision. That is an insult, not something I would expect—not something I would expect to come from my friend on the other side of the aisle.

I have enjoyed so much working with him and I will continue to. I respect him greatly. But, look, I don't want to start tit-for-tatting this. Certainly Senator Feinstein came out immediately in support of this, NANCY PELOSI came out immediately in support of this, and no doubt there were some people on this side of the aisle that did the same. I came out in opposition for this after—after—two Democrats had come out in opposition. So I wish those comments had not been made.

We had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, well attended by people on both sides of the aisle. I just take offense that somehow, because there is bipartisan opposition and only partisan support—that somehow those who support are more bipartisan. Now, I don't know. That is a leap I have not heard.

I have said hundreds of times that if this deal achieved what the President said it was going to achieve, I would be voting for it. If this dismantled Iran's nuclear program, I would be voting for it. If this didn't industrialize their program, I would be voting for it. He said it would end their nuclear program. There would be 100 votes on the floor for that. This is a far cry from that.

So I am sorry to have this kind of conversation on the Senate floor, but I have to say I have sat here listening to the speeches. I think people on both sides of the aisle have thought a great deal about this. I do think there has been extreme pressure. My friends on the other side of the aisle have told me they have never been addressed in such a personal manner by the administration—never. So, yes, there has been

pressure. I understand that, by the way. If the shoe were on the other foot, it would be taking place. I got that.

But, look, I think the debate has been thoughtful. I think, by and large, the vast majority of people on both sides of the aisle have been thoughtful. After the debate we have had, I am discouraged that my friend on the other side of the aisle would indicate that somehow because there is bipartisan opposition—bipartisan opposition—the most informed Members on the other side of the aisle, the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the former ranking member and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, are voting against that—and because we happen to agree with the leading Members on the Democratic side, we are partisan? So I am sorry.

Now, back to the procedure. There is no question—I have said this over and over—I understand regular order, and this bill was drafted under regular order. I got it. I understand that certainly the procedures in this body are that cloture is to end debate, and that takes 60 votes. I got it. It doesn't take but about a week here to understand the importance of cloture.

So I have always known, and I have said this, that a threshold to get us to a place for final passage was going to be 60 votes. But we also passed the bill with 98 votes that said we wanted to vote. One Senator was missing who supported it. It would have been 99 to 1.

So, look, I understand there can be debate about filibuster and all of that, but to say there was some preagreement—I mean, the text of the deal, the text of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act says that we are going to go through regular order. We caught a lot of grief over that as a matter of fact. I am sorry.

A lot of people on our side wanted a privileged motion. We understand the leader on the other side didn't like privileged vehicles because he felt he lost control of the floor. We discussed that thoroughly last January.

So, look, I understand how cloture is used. I understand how cloture is used. I got it. I understand it takes 60 votes, people in here saying, yes, we agree that we should end debate and, yes, we want to move on. I know that hasn't happened today. I understand a lot of times cloture is used as a vote, as you just indicated you believe that it does, but I just want to say, again, there has been no agreement. We understand the threshold. We understand the hurdle. We understand we didn't achieve it today. But to say that Members on this side somehow—because we agree with the leading Members on the other side that this deal doesn't accomplish the goals the President said he wanted to achieve, that that makes us partisan, I am sorry, I disagree.

We had many discussions in our office about the merits of this and the

demerits of this. The fact is, I do think this agreement is fatally flawed. I am despondent over the fact that when we had a boot on the neck of this rogue nation that is the No. 1 exporter of terrorism around the world—when we had a boot on their neck—we gave away our leverage, and in 9 months—in 9 months—they are going to have all their money back, the major sanctions relieved, and no apparent change of behavior. Even Secretary Kerry in his letter to us said he doesn't expect that.

So, look, I am disappointed that we have agreed, that the administration has agreed, and that, unfortunately, a minority of people in this body agree, and they have kept us from being able to send a disapproval to the President to veto. I am disappointed, when an agreement has been agreed to by this the President and by others that allows them to industrialize their nuclear program and gives them incredible—incredible—economic access.

I think maybe the Senator might have responded to some recent comments on the floor. I hope that is the case. But I haven't seen anything but dignity on this floor over the last several days, people being incredibly knowledgeable—which they never would have been without this bill that the Senator from Virginia helped us bring about, crucial, in helping make that occur.

But what has happened here is everybody in this body now knows more about this than they ever would have. Everyone has taken the time, I think, to understand this in great detail. And just because there are a few people who come out quickly on our side and on your side—and on your side—that doesn't diminish the fact that people have arrived at their decisions based on conscience as to whether they support it or not. I am disappointed, on the other hand, that we weren't able to move beyond cloture and to a final vote.

With that, I yield the floor.

My understanding is Senator CAPITO now has the floor.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, could I ask my friend to yield to me for 2 minutes? And I apologize to my colleague, but two of my favorite members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Through the Chair, two of my favorite members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee who have been critically important to us having this debate on foreign policy—Senator Kaine and Senator Corker—they are two Members I deeply respect.

Let me just make this observation. I think Senator Corker is absolutely correct. As a result of Senator Kaine and Senator Corker—and I am proud of the role I played—the Members of the United States Senate have had more information about a major for-

ign policy issue than in the history of this country. We have had the exposure to classified briefings. We have had the incredible opportunity to try to understand the JCPOA and to make our independent judgments on that. So I think this process has worked the way it should work.

I share disappointment that we couldn't go to a vote on the merits with a 60-vote threshold because I think that was what was anticipated, and we all understood it was going to take 60 votes to move this. I think it would have been better if we went directly to that type of a vote rather than what has gone forward. So I just want to underscore that.

The other point I want to underscore—and I agree with Senator Corker and Senator Kaine—is that many Members of the Senate, in a relatively short period of time, made a decision. They didn't think it was a close call, so they made their judgments. In reality, it was a lot more Republicans than Democrats. But that was the case. A lot of Members took a lot of time to try to understand this and really labored on the issue. I know that because I made my official position known just about a week ago, and I know in talking to many colleagues the process they went through.

I don't question the motives of any Member. I think each Member is trying to do what they believe is in the best interests of our country. I know the two Senators—I know them personally. I am just making my own observations. I know that is how they believe also. But I do think the process we set up lent itself to getting the material, waiting for the hearings, listening to the administration make their point, reading the classified documents, trying to understand how the IAEA interacts in the review process—that it was important to understand all of that before drawing a conclusion.

I applaud most Members of the Senate who dove into it in order for that to be the case. I needed to make that point. I can tell you this: With Senator Corker and Senator Kaine, I really feel blessed to serve on the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I think our country is well served by both. I know that we are going to work together to provide our country the strength it needs to deal with the international challenge and to carry out the responsibility of the Senate.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. President, before I start my formal remarks, I would like to make a few comments about what has occurred in terms of the cloture vote and in terms of some of the discussion that we have had most recently.

I wanted to react, first of all, to something the minority leader said in

his remarks. He basically said that we, as Republicans, are trying to rewrite history. He went into a long explanation of why he believed that. It really struck me, with these young folks who are sitting right here in front of us. We are not trying to rewrite history. We are trying to write a future for these young kids that is safer, that is strong, where we as the United States are making agreements that are in their best interests—not just for tomorrow or the next 5 years or 6 years but the next 30, 35, 40 years. I am not interested in rewriting history. But writing history for the future I am interested in.

The other reaction I have is that I am very disappointed in what has happened here, that we can't have a straight up-or-down vote. When I was in the West Virginia Legislature, in the house of delegates, believe it or not, our votes were not taken. They were voice votes, except in very rare occasions when we would have a rollcall. We all know the difference between a voice vote and a rollcall vote. A rollcall vote is a part of history. People see exactly what you are intending and how you are going to vote. On a voice vote, you can almost say: Well, I voted yes or I voted no. Nobody can really pin you down on that.

I was one of the few Republicans in the house of delegates who voted in favor of making every single vote we had a rollcall vote. I am pleased to say, the legislature didn't change it that year but they finally did change it.

As the Senator from Virginia said, everybody knows what everybody is going to do on this vote. I don't understand what the controversy is to move forward over the procedural motions and to then have that vote to have it as a part of history. This is your rollcall vote. This is your voice on this Iran agreement. I hope next week the body changes its mind, we move forward, and we have an affirmative vote on the motion of disapproval.

Today I want to talk, obviously, about these issue because I have deep concerns about them. I believe that this debate should revolve around three key questions. Will this agreement eliminate Iran's path to a nuclear weapon? Will it improve the security situation in the Middle East? Will it make America safer for the young, for us, and for the future generations?

Unfortunately, after much study I have concluded that the answer is no to all of these questions. I do not believe the President's agreement would make America safer or our allies safer. To the contrary, the agreement will provide Iran with the resources to continue to finance terror throughout the Middle East and around the world.

Even if Iran were to comply with this agreement in full, this deal virtually guarantees that Iran will become a nuclear threshold nation with an indus-

trial nuclear program. We know that. It is legitimized in this agreement. Iran is the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism. Everybody has said that in this body. It is acknowledged nationwide. The windfall of cash that will flow to Iran—the signing bonus and the continuing impact of sanctions relief under this deal—will only increase its ability to prop up the Syrian regime, finance Hezbollah, and threaten America's allies such as Israel.

One of the actions you learn when you grow up is that past behavior is a great predictor of future action. Even as its own economy has been hampered by the economic sanctions and the pressure from those sanctions brought Iran to the table, in the name of “our people are suffering”—whether it is food or whether it is economic conditions—what have they been doing? They have been financing terror in their region. Terrorism is a priority for them, even as their own people are suffering.

National Security Advisor Susan Rice agrees. She says: “We should expect that some portion of that money would go to the Iranian military and could potentially be used for the kinds of bad behavior that we have seen in the region up until now.”

That is the National Security Advisor. The President and the Secretary of State have said that the sanctions will snap back into place if Iran violates this agreement. I have been in Washington now for 15 years. I have never seen anything snap anywhere in the Halls of Congress. We know that the current sanctions against Iran cannot be easily snapped back. We know that. It doesn't even pass the sniff test, as we say.

It took more than a decade for the United States, working with our allies, to construct the sanctions that brought Iran to the table. This type of effective sanctions regime cannot be brought back over and over. I have listened to a lot of speeches. A lot of my colleagues on both sides, no matter how they voted, what they believe, have said exactly the same thing. On another note, we need to examine the end of the international restrictions on selling ballistic missile technology to Iran and the end of the conventional arms embargo contained in this agreement.

The Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff told the Senate Armed Services Committee in July that “under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking.” The administration chose to reject this advice. It really surprised many of us who did not know that these were even on the table. We didn't even know they were part of a bargaining chip that anybody was going to play.

The President's agreement would remove all international limitations on

Iran's missile program in 8 years, contradicting early promises from the administration that restrictions would remain in place. Ballistic missiles are not a necessary component of a peaceful nuclear program. Iran's continued efforts to improve this technology should send a clear message to this Chamber of their intentions. In addition, the arms embargo on conventional arms will be lifted in 5 years.

Indeed, Iran's President said last month: “We will buy, sell and develop any weapons we need and we will not ask permission or abide by any resolution for that.”

The end of the arms embargo and ballistic missile restrictions will strengthen Iran's ability to threaten Americans, our allied forces, and our citizens. The President's agreement does not contain the necessary enforcement measures to protect future generations from a nuclear Iran. Any agreement worthy of congressional approval should include rigorous, immediate inspections of suspected nuclear sites.

Senior administration officials publicly called for “anywhere, anyplace”—I heard it repeatedly—inspections. Yet the President's agreement fails to live up to that. Indeed, Iran can block access to suspected nuclear facilities for 24 days or even longer. We have not even seen these side deals. This is part of the discussion. The bill that we passed that said that we were going to have the right to debate this says explicitly in the language that the side agreements were to be turned over to Congress for our inspection before we made this vote.

Finally, those who support ratifying the Iran agreement frequently argue that the only alternative is war. I disagree. I reject that notion. Under that false misguided premise, the American people are being told we should simply accept any deal, regardless of how flawed it may be. When asked if our only option was the agreement or war, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that “we have a range of options.”

The President's agreement does not live up to the administration's prior statements on important items such as inspections, elimination of advanced centrifuges, and ballistic missiles. A better agreement with Iran could be forged from the positions taken by senior administration officials during the negotiation.

A better deal was possible. The American people should accept nothing less. Some argue that we should approve this deal, despite its faults, and then use the threat of separate legislation or tough talk to keep Iran in check. To me that is just seeking cover. Those of us who are going to vote in agreement with this Iran deal are then going to turn around in a week, 10 days or 2 days and say: Let's get tough on Iran on this. Let's make

sure we protect Israel. Let's give more military aid to Israel. All of the rhetoric you are already hearing we can do now. We can do that now by disagreeing with the Iran agreement that the President has put forward. The better course for us is to reject this agreement and reopen negotiations.

I believe that stronger sanctions could also force Iran to accept a better agreement that will improve the security of the Middle East and the world. The danger to the United States, Israel, and other American allies posed by Iran is real. As the current refugee crisis and prior acts of terror clearly demonstrate, instability and violence in the Middle East reverberates into other parts of the world.

I do not believe that the President's agreement reduces that threat of violence or adds to the stability of the region. Instead, the agreement will strengthen Iran's position—you can already tell by their swaggering bravado of rhetoric that we hear—and leave the United States with fewer ways to combat nuclear proliferation. For those reasons, I will vote to reject the President's nuclear agreement with Iran.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I rise today for the 110th time to ask my colleagues to wake up to climate change. Long after today's debate has died down, it will still be looming and threatening. We stand now at the precipice of an environmental catastrophe. The burning of fossil fuels has unleashed a flood of carbon pollution that is pushing the climate system planetwide into conditions that are unprecedented in human history. It has already permanently altered the world that we will leave to future generations. If we keep sleepwalking through this and allow the carbon flood to continue, we will leave even bigger changes and risk absolute catastrophe.

Last month marked the 10th anniversary of Hurricane Katrina. When that storm made landfall in Southeast Louisiana on August 29, 2005, it was a category 3 hurricane. Katrina's 125-mile-per-hour winds pushed a massive storm surge before it that overtopped New Orleans' systems of levees and flooded the city. By the end, Katrina killed an estimated 1,200 people and caused more than \$100 billion in damage. Images of broken levees, flooded streets, and people stranded on their rooftops are seared into our national memory. This natural disaster—compounded by man-made errors—showed how vulnerable we are to major storms and how vigilant we must be in planning for these extreme events.

We can't say that climate change caused Katrina, but we do know that climate change increases the risk posed by future storms. The oceans are

warming, and warmer water temperatures load the dice for more intense storms and heavier rainfall. Meanwhile, sea levels rise on the shores of the Gulf Coast and the Southeastern States. Storm surges riding in on higher seas will push even more floodwater inland. For those who suffered in the devastation of Hurricane Katrina, we owe them to learn from that catastrophe and take to heart the human threat we face from climate change—lost lives, lost property, and scarred communities. But that seems unacceptable to some on the Republican side. That would be admitting to the scale of the problem, would oblige them to offer a solution, and would offend the fossil fuel industry. The polluters' grip on the Republican Party is remorseless.

President Obama went to New Orleans to honor the memory of those lost in Katrina and to hail the city's resurgence. But get this: Before the President's visit, Louisiana Governor and Republican Presidential candidate Bobby Jindal sent a letter to President Obama urging him not to talk about climate change, not to insert what he called "the divisive political agenda of liberal environmental activism." Really? So when is it OK to talk about climate change, and what does Governor Jindal have to say about it? "I'm sure that human activity is having an impact on the climate," he said. "But I would leave it to the scientists to decide how much, what that means, and what are the consequences." Sounds to me like just another version of that Republican climate denial classic, "I'm not a scientist."

OK, Governor. Let's leave it to the scientists. The scientific community has determined that human activity is responsible for just about all of the warming we have observed around the globe since the 1950s.

In 2012, scientists from Louisiana State University and the Southern Climate Impacts Planning Program, which is a consortium of researchers from NOAA, LSU, Texas A&M, and the University of Oklahoma, reported on the risks climate change poses for Louisiana and the Gulf Coast. Through their research, they found the following:

Over the past century, both air and water temperatures have been on the rise across the region.

Rising ocean temperatures heighten hurricane intensity, and recent years have seen a number of large, damaging hurricanes.

In some Gulf Coast locations, local sea level is increasing at over 10 times the global rate, increasing the risk of severe flooding.

Saltwater intrusion from rising sea levels damages wetlands, an important line of coastal defense against storm surge and spawning grounds for commercially valuable fish and shellfish.

I don't need to tell the Presiding Officer the importance of the fish and shellfish industry to the State of Louisiana.

The study's lead author, Hal Needham, said:

Climate change is already taking a toll on the Gulf Coast, but if we act now to become more resilient, we can reduce the risks, save billions in future costs, and preserve a way of life.

I certainly don't need to tell the Presiding Officer about the way of life.

Dr. Needham continues:

The Gulf Coast is one of the first regions to feel the impacts of climate change.

Sea level rise is already an immediate problem for Louisiana, and it is one that is going to get rapidly worse.

This chart comes from the New Orleans Times-Picayune. It shows how sea level rise will inundate the Louisiana coast. This area on the chart is New Orleans. Red areas, such as these, will be lost underneath 1 foot of sea level rise, 2 feet of sea level rise will inundate the orange areas, and the yellow areas will be lost and will disappear under water at 3.3 feet—1 meter—of sea level rise.

According to analysis from the Risky Business Project, mean sea level at Grand Isle, LA, will likely rise up to 2.4 feet by 2050. That takes us over the orange. It will rise up to 5.8 feet by 2100—i.e., at the end of this century. All of the red, all of the orange, all of the yellow, and more will be inundated. The Risky Business Project estimates that by 2030, almost \$20 billion in existing coastal property in Louisiana will likely be below mean sea level. People own that property. That is \$20 billion that will be lost. That is a lot to ask people to pay. By 2050, that number—the value of lost land to sea level rise—increases to between \$33 billion and \$45 billion.

The science is clear. Just look to the scientists at LSU, Tiger scientists. The threat is real. Yet, for Governor Jindal, climate change should not be mentioned. It is inconvenient.

Republican Presidential candidates—except one, the senior Senator from South Carolina—would rather avoid any talk of it. They all protest the President's Clean Power Plan to limit carbon emissions from powerplants, but which of them offers an alternative? None. And, like his fellow candidates, Governor Jindal's stated position is to have no plan.

State and national scientific agencies and experts, local officials around the country, corporate leaders, military professionals, physicians and health care professionals, and faith leaders are all telling us this is a problem and begging us to wake up. Yet, the Republican Presidential candidates and, frankly, the Republican Party here in the Senate have nothing—nothing. They don't even want to talk about it.

The American people are in favor of action. Polling from Stanford University and the New York Times shows that two-thirds of Americans, including half of Republicans, favor government action to reduce global warming,

and two-thirds, including half of Republicans, would be more likely to vote for a candidate who campaigns on fighting climate change. So why doesn't the GOP have a climate plan?

Regular Louisianans are doing their part to rebuild their State's natural defenses. Common Ground Relief, a Lower Ninth Ward-based operation aimed at creating resilient gulf coast communities, has been planting marsh grass and trees—about 10,000 trees every year—in the wetlands and barrier islands along the Louisiana coast. Those natural barriers can absorb some of the power of big storms and take some of the pressure off the new levees. Last July, New Orleans mayor Mitch Landrieu joined Pope Francis at the Vatican to discuss global challenges, including climate change. Mayor Landrieu recalled the memory of Katrina. I will quote him:

We have now become a warning to all the others. Neglected environmental degradation has consequences. The poor are hit the hardest and they suffer the most. The levees broke, the water flooded in, and in the blink of an eye, the Gulf of Mexico surged over the rooftops of a great American city. Thousands of us, many of the most vulnerable who couldn't find a way to evacuate the city, were left behind as if their lives did not have value.

We know that we are loading the dice for more damaging weather with our relentless carbon pollution. To pretend this threat does not exist is to put property at risk, to put communities at risk, and to put American lives at risk. And incidentally, it is also to put our heads in the sand.

Eventually the Republican Party is going to have to break itself free from the clutches of the fossil fuel industry. They are going to have to. They are losing the American people, their own young voters. And they are going to have to rise up to their duty to serve the people of their States and of this country. It is my hope that when they get around to doing that, it won't be too late, but it is time to wake up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The esteemed Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise to add my voice for the bipartisan disapproval of the President's nuclear agreement with Iran that we have been debating all week and that we will continue to debate. I do so in the spirit that resulted in 83 U.S. Senators from both sides of the aisle writing a letter just last year to the President of the United States. This letter hasn't gotten a lot of attention in this debate, and I certainly think it should.

In that spirit, the Senate, in an incredibly bipartisan way—by the way, several of those Senators are still here. There were 41 Democrats, 41 Republicans, and 1 Independent who signed this letter to the President of the United States saying: These are the strategic goals we want in this agree-

ment, these are the goals we should have for the security of the United States, and these are the goals we think will protect America and our allies. None of these have been met in the nuclear agreement we have been debating. This letter says that Iran must dismantle its nuclear weapons program and it must be prevented from ever having a path to a nuclear bomb. It also states that Iran should have no inherent right to enrichment.

I commend my colleagues to reread this letter. The President's nuclear deal clearly does not meet the goals that are laid out in the letter. Nonetheless, it has become clear that a number of Senators on the other side of the aisle are going to vote to support the President's agreement despite having signed that letter. That is going to be a personal decision for them, but if you are a signatory, you ought to take another look at the letter you signed to the President and the American people in 2014.

I will lay out a few of my concerns about the deal. I think many of my colleagues have done a fantastic job this week. I don't want to name names, but there are so many on both sides of the aisle—again, bipartisan—who have raised their concerns about the President's Iranian nuclear deal.

One of the biggest frustrations I think so many of us have seen as we have done our sacred duty in this body—to read the agreement, to understand the details, to go to all of the hearings and briefings, to reach out to experts in the field—as we have raised questions about this agreement, what we don't get is straight talk. What we have been getting, unfortunately, is spin.

I think Senator COATS did a great job yesterday of explaining how this agreement is filled with ambiguities, with language that allows it to mean so many different things to so many different people, including Iranians. Let me provide a few examples that many of us have raised and that I have spoken on the floor about in the past, but I think they are important enough and they bear repeating.

First, Secretary Kerry came and said to us: There is no grandfather clause in this agreement. So we see Europeans rushing now to invest in Iran. The Secretary said there is no grandfather clause. Here is what paragraph 37 of the agreement says:

In such an event that sanctions are reimposed, the provisions in this paragraph would not apply with retroactive effect to contracts signed between any party in Iran or Iranian individuals and entities prior to the date of application.

That sure sounds like a grandfather clause to me, but we are told it is not.

Second, there has been much talk about this snapback provision, but there is no provision in this agreement that says "snap back." We talked

about how we are going to immediately increase sanctions overnight.

I had the opportunity to be a part of the Bush administration's team that was economically isolating Iran. We went around the world to our allies—we had to threaten, in many cases, our European and other allies to divest out of Iran. That is how we got the economic isolation of Iran. It took years to do this. It took years. Yet, this administration is saying: Overnight, despite the fact that European companies are already in Tehran investing, we are going to snapback sanctions overnight. It is not a snap. Divestiture out of Iran is a slog, and it will take years, again. The snapback is a fallacy.

Finally, Senator AYOTTE and others have done a great job of raising questions about a basic scenario that is laid out—very important—with regard to other paragraphs in this agreement. In an important hypothetical, which is actually very likely, we have asked Secretary Kerry and Secretary Lew—a number of us: Let's assume sanctions are lifted. In six to nine months, the economy starts humming, the Annex II sanctions are lifted, is Iran still a sponsor of terrorism—the world's largest sponsor of terrorism—and they commit an act of terror. This body goes to reimpose sanctions; whoever the next President is agrees because of some heinous act of terrorism. What Iran can do is cite either paragraph 26 or paragraph 37 that states: "If sanctions are reinstated, in whole or in part, Iran will treat that as grounds to cease performing its commitments" under the entire agreement.

So what happens? We resanction Iran for a terrorist action that they are likely to take. They say: Hey, we can legally walk. Read paragraph 26. Read paragraph 37. Read our letter to the U.N. Security Council. It is all laid out there. They walk, legally; the sanctions are lifted, they are still the No. 1 sponsor of terrorism in the world, their economy is humming, and they are on the verge of getting a nuclear weapon.

We have asked that question to the administration leaders who negotiated this deal time and time again, and they have never given us an answer as to why that is not a correct reading of this agreement—because it is.

These are just a few examples. Many of my colleagues have done an outstanding job of looking at different parts of this agreement and expressing our concerns, but just as important is what our constituents think. What do Alaskans think? What do the American people think? Like all of my colleagues, I spent my recess back home in Alaska, and I spoke to hundreds of my fellow Alaskans at townhall meetings, roundtable discussions, our State fair.

Remarkably, I did not have one Alaskan come up to me saying: I really think you should support that Iranian

nuclear deal of the President's. Every single interaction I had was in opposition to this agreement, and it was visceral, particularly among Alaska veterans. We are a proud State. We have the largest number of veterans per capita of any State in the Union. But whether they were recent vets from Iraq or Afghanistan or Vietnam vets, they literally would look at me and say: What on Earth are we doing? Help me understand that, Senator SULLIVAN. What are we doing? Visceral.

During this debate this week, even some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—they are not big supporters—are using terms such as “seriously flawed,” “deeply flawed,” “serious concerns,” “falls short in many areas.” Across the country, Americans are overwhelmingly opposed to this deal by a margin of 2 to 1. And the more the public knows about the deal, the more they dislike it. These poll numbers in terms of support are dropping. Right now, the latest poll, 21 percent of Americans—that is it—support this deal.

The people are wise. They elected us to listen, and we should do so. They might not know all the details as some of us do, but they know—they know—I saw it from my constituents—that something is fundamentally wrong with this agreement.

So we have to ask ourselves why. Why? Why are Americans—the more the President and John Kerry talk about this agreement, the more Americans become opposed to it. And why are even the supporters, as we saw this week, so tepid in their support?

Now, all negotiations require compromise. All negotiations require concessions. We all know this. We have negotiated. In fact, many of my colleagues, particularly on the other side, emphasize this. Concessions are part of what we do. They are part of an agreement, but at a certain point, concessions become humiliations. If they are too significant and too frequent, concessions are humiliations. No one likes to be humiliated, but especially proud citizens of a great Nation like the United States do not like to be humiliated.

That is what I believe is going on here. This, I believe, explains the visceral reaction we have seen in opposition to this deal. Americans feel that our concessions not just to any country, but to the world's No. 1 sponsor of terrorism, have gone so far that they are humiliating to our great country. People feel that our concessions have gone so far, it is as if we are treating Iran as an equal, and Iran is not an equal to the United States of America.

I first started to realize this and sense it during a closed briefing with Under Secretary of State Wendy Sherman. She was sent to brief the Senate on the secret side deal between the IAEA and Iran involving the inspection

regime at the Parchin military facility, long suspected as Iran's premier nuclear weapons facility. Senator MCCAIN spoke about this briefing yesterday. For those of us—again, Democrats and Republicans—who went to this briefing, it was pretty remarkable, and I am not saying that in a positive way. It was actually unbelievable to have a senior member of the Obama negotiating team first begin the briefing by telling us she had seen this secret side deal, but she didn't have a copy of it, and she wasn't allowed to have a copy of it because it was just between Iran and the IAEA. So the Iranians had it, they were reading it, but not us. No matter that the President had just signed a law—the Corker-Cardin law—that required the administration to provide this agreement to the Congress. No matter that the United States is a board member of the IAEA—not only a board member; we are the country that came up with the idea of the IAEA. This was an American initiative in the 1950s. Our board member could have demanded this agreement, but we were told it was just between Iran and the IAEA.

This, of course, was an affront to the law, to the American people, but the worst was yet to come. Under Secretary Sherman then actually described the substance of this secret side deal, the essence of which we all know now because it was eventually leaked to the press. Here is the essence of that side deal: Iran will conduct the inspections at the Parchin nuclear facility by themselves, with no one else present. Let me repeat that. No one else is allowed in that facility. Iran will conduct the inspections by itself. They will take air samples. They will take environmental samples. She was literally describing Iranian officials with a camera filming themselves in the facility with no one else there, and they were going to give this film and these samples—whose chain of custody we can't trust—to IAEA officials, who are not allowed in the facility.

Every jaw in that room dropped, every Senator—Democrat, Republican. I remember looking around the room. We couldn't believe it. Heads were shaking. The U.S. Senate was stunned.

After claims by the President that his agreement had the most intrusive inspection regime ever, after being told by the President that his agreement had nothing to do with having to trust Iran—it wasn't about trusting Iran—we are told in a briefing by one of his top negotiators that with regard to the most suspicious nuclear weapons facility site in Iran, the Iranians will inspect themselves.

The AP broke the story, and when they did, they stated that the secret side deal at Parchin will “let the Iranians themselves look for signs of the very activity they deny—past work on nuclear weapons.”

Let me repeat that. This is the AP. The side deal—that we are agreeing to, by the way, in the Senate, or that some of my colleagues are—will “let the Iranians themselves look for signs of the very activity they deny—past work on nuclear weapons.”

This secret side deal is absurd on its face. This secret side deal will let Iran cheat with impunity. This secret side deal is fully and unequivocally based on trusting the Iranians, regardless of what the administration officials say about the deal. And this secret side deal is not just some kind of concession; it is a humiliation. The IAEA has never done this with any country, ever—especially a country that is a serial cheater and continues to be the world's No. 1 sponsor of international terrorism.

For these reasons alone, as Senator PERDUE mentioned yesterday, the Senate should reject the President's deal. It certainly doesn't square with many of the demands in the March 2014 Senate letter from 83 U.S. Senators last year, one of which was: We believe Iran must fully resolve concerns addressed in the United Nations Security Council resolutions, including any military dimensions of its nuclear program. Well, that is not going to happen in Parchin. We believe Iran must also submit to a long-term and intrusive inspection and verification regime—83 Senators said this to the President. That is not going to happen at Parchin either. But these kind of absurd concessions go much further than the Parchin inspection side deal, and they are the driving force for why so many Americans reject this deal so overwhelmingly.

When we agreed to lift sanctions on General Soleimani, the head of the Quds Force, that wasn't a concession, that was a humiliation. Senator ERNST said last night it was a slap in the face to our veterans, many of whom were killed by IEDs supplied by General Soleimani.

When the leader of Russia, one of our so-called international partners, met with General Soleimani recently to discuss arms transfers, that wasn't a concession, that was an outrage.

When the United States, in the President's agreement, states that it wants “a new relationship with Iran” and they don't respond in kind in the agreement but respond by saying “Death to America” in their weekly chants, that is not a concession, that is a humiliation.

When we agree in the agreement to “protect Iran from nuclear security threats, including sabotage”—that is in the agreement—that is not a concession, that is an outrage.

When the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff says that under no circumstances should Iran ever obtain ballistic missiles and only days later the Secretary of State agrees to lift

the ban on ballistic missiles and conventional weapons, that is not a concession, that is an abdication.

When we go into minute detail in this agreement—dozens of pages on our obligations to lift sanctions, including our obligations to literally import Iranian pistachios—that kind of detail—yet we can't get four American hostages released, that is not a concession, that is a humiliation.

Finally, when we give the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism upfront relief and tens of billions of dollars in a signing bonus and we are told by administration officials that certainly Iran is going to use some of those proceeds to conduct terrorism activities against Americans and our allies, that is not a concession, that is a surrender.

It is a culmination of the so-called concessions that give our constituents the sinking feeling that the President's agreement is decidedly not in our interest. That is dangerous for our country, and it is the scope and number of these concessions that solidify the sense that during these negotiations we have slowly and subtly ceded our power to a country that just recently was considered the world's No. 1 pariah state.

When these negotiations began, every country in the world was standing against Iran and international sanctions were crippling them. That is what brought them to the table, as Senator CORKER mentioned earlier today. And guess what. This was due not to the international community's leadership, not to China, not to Russia, not to the European Union, this was due to the leadership of the United States of America, the Members in the Democratic Party and Republican Party of the Congress, and members of the Bush administration and the Obama administration. That is what brought them to the table—American leadership, Congress, and the executive branch working together.

Remarkably, the deal the President and the administration have negotiated has flipped all of this on its head. It is incredible that we are at this point, as if we are treating Iran as an equal, blessed by all the world's great powers. Make no mistake, we are, as Senator CARDIN and others mentioned—this deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and it blesses Iran as a threshold nuclear power.

So the question has to be asked: Why not stick the original goals set out by the Senate just a year ago, in 2014, in the letter to the President to dismantle Iran's nuclear capabilities, to prevent them from having enrichment capability.

Well, according to the President, he has stated, "There is no one who thinks that Iran would or could ever accept that, and the international community does not take that view that

Iran can't have a peaceful nuclear program."

The Congress of the United States and the Senate of the United States thought that just a year ago. So it is remarkable that the President says now there is no way we can get that done. Why not go back to Iran and the P5+1 and get a better deal, one without the serious flaws that so many Members, Democratic and Republican, have stated over the last week?

In a remarkable interview with the *Atlantic Monthly*, Secretary Kerry talks about how, if we sought a better deal, if he went back to Iran and the better deal—a deal, by the way, that 83 Senators said we needed to have—we would be "screwing Iran and the Ayatollah, and we will be confirming the Ayatollah's suspicion that the United States is untrustworthy." That is a quote from the Secretary of State of the United States. In another interview, Secretary Kerry said he would "be embarrassed" to go out and try for a better deal.

What is most remarkable of all is that in attempts to sell this deal to the Congress and the American people, the President and his team no longer emphasized that Iran, the world's biggest sponsor of terrorism, is isolated, is a pariah state, but instead they emphasized that our most important ally in the Middle East, Israel, is, and so, too, is the Congress, and so, too, will be the United States if we don't approve the President's deal.

On August 5, the President stated that "every nation in the world that has commented publicly supports this agreement, except Israel." And U.N. Ambassador Samantha Power, our Ambassador, recently stated, "If we walk away, there is no rewrite of the deal on the table. We would go from a situation in which Iran is isolated to one in which the United States is isolated."

This rhetoric represents a fundamental shift in a world view. We have been debating this Iranian deal for the past week, but we really are debating America's role in the world. There is a world view that is taking hold with this administration, one where America is no longer the leader of the free world but a player as part of an international partnership, one where we don't lead by example but are being led by others, one where we are leading from behind, one where we are embarrassed—that is in the Secretary of State's words—rather than steadfast, and one where we are more worried about "screwing" the head of a pariah state than standing with our most steadfast ally in the region, the nation of Israel.

This kind of deal that we are debating today is what an echo chamber produces. This is what happens when you want a deal too badly, when you will not walk away from the table during negotiations, when your view of Amer-

ica's leadership role in the world is tentative, tepid, and not confident, and this is what happens when you fail to listen to the American people. This is what happens. Right turns wrong, good turns bad, a country that recently was a pariah state, the largest state sponsor of terrorism, is steering the negotiations and welcomed to the community of nations, and top officials in the United States of America are afraid that we will become isolated if we demand a stronger deal that keeps us and our allies safe. This, in effect, is how bad and dangerous policy is made.

I would like to conclude by talking about our role with regard to this agreement. History has shown that on most major foreign policy issues, when the United States of America is most effective and most strong is when the Congress and the Executive are working together. That is the way our Constitution was structured, and that has been America's history since the founding of the Republic. The examples abound from this Chamber. The Louisiana Purchase—something important to you, Mr. President—passed the Senate, bipartisan majority vote 24 to 7; NATO was ratified by bipartisan majority, 82 to 13; the first strategic arms limitations negotiations with the Soviet Union, bipartisan majority, 88 to 2; even something as controversial as relinquishing control of the Panama Canal to Panama, bipartisan majority, 68 to 32.

More recently in 2010, this body voted to further reduce nuclear arms with the Russians, bipartisan majority, 71 to 26.

One common area of agreement is that everybody who has talked about this agreement this week on both sides of the aisle has stated it was one of the most important national security issues facing the United States in a generation, whether and how and to what degree the world's largest sponsor of terrorism is going to obtain a nuclear weapon.

But perhaps for the first time in U.S. history, an agreement that is so grave and important for the national security of our great Nation is going to move forward, not with a bipartisan majority in the U.S. Senate but a partisan minority in both Houses. Such result will undermine America's strength and I believe shows a profound disregard for our constitutional form of government. Even the Iranian Parliament is going to need a majority to pass this agreement, but the world's greatest democracy will not, and I believe that is another humiliation.

Finally, just a few hours ago we saw what has been a theme throughout this entire process—how the administration has been dismissive of the American people, not wanting a role for the American people through their representatives in Congress to weigh in on this deal.

If the President is so proud of this agreement, he shouldn't be directing Democrats to filibuster it. I believe the vote we just took is a sad day for the U.S. Senate. If this deal was good for the country and our allies, I would certainly be gladly supporting it, but it is not, and a bipartisan majority of the Senate knows it. That is why a bipartisan majority of this body is voting against it. We are doing so because it is a bad deal, a deal that will make the world more dangerous, and we are doing so because the American people see that, too, and they are counting on us to protect them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to discuss the agreement reached in July on Iran's nuclear program.

Preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon is one of the most important objectives of our national security policy. I have strongly advocated for and supported the economic sanctions that brought Iran to the negotiating table. While the agreement is by no means perfect, I have concluded it is our best available option to put the brakes on Iran's development of a nuclear weapon, and that is why I support it.

I do this with my eyes wide open to the nature of the Iranian regime, including its human rights abuses, its unjustified detention of American citizens, its threats against Israel, and its destabilizing actions in the region, including its support for terrorist groups.

Over the last several weeks, I have reviewed the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action as agreed to by the P5+1 nations and Iran. I have attended briefings with national security and nuclear experts. I have spoken with Minnesotans who hold strong views on both sides of this issue. Finally, I have met with the Ambassadors from the other five nations involved in these negotiations and asked detailed questions about what their countries and others would do if Congress does not approve the agreement.

After a lot of thought and discussion, I have concluded that an Iran in possession of a nuclear weapon would make an already volatile situation much worse by greatly increasing the danger to Israel and our other allies in the Mideast. If we were to reject this agreement, Iran would be able to continue all of its destabilizing activities while continuing its pursuit of the most destructive weapon in the world.

I have deep respect for those who hold different views on this subject and acknowledge that this was a difficult decision. As I have proven through my votes and my actions since coming to the Senate, I am deeply committed to protecting Israel's security, including full aid funding and support for security measures such as Iron Dome.

In conjunction with my support for this agreement, I will push the administration and my colleagues in Congress for additional assistance to Israel and our other regional allies to strengthen their security. I will also continue to support efforts to combat terrorist groups in the Mideast.

These are the reasons that led to my decision.

First of all, I believe this agreement, while imperfect, curbs Iran's ability to develop a nuclear weapon. Before negotiations began in 2013, we were moving steadily closer to the nightmare scenario of Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon. Even under the pressure of massive economic sanctions, Iran was continuing to build its nuclear infrastructure. It was installing more and more centrifuges, accumulating a stockpile of enriched uranium, and building a reactor capable of producing spent fuel that can be reprocessed into plutonium.

That point deserves to be emphasized. The situation prior to the negotiations was not a good one. We had the strongest sanctions regime in place, and it has brought Iran to the table, but Iran was still on the path to developing a nuclear weapon. We have heard that without the restrictions imposed on its program, Iran could produce a weapon in as little as 2 to 3 months. This negotiated agreement will put the brakes on Iran's development of a nuclear weapon.

As recently noted in an open letter by 29 top American nuclear scientists, including 6 Nobel Laureates, the agreement contains "more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated nonproliferation framework."

Specifically, the agreement requires Iran to first of all give up 98 percent of its stockpile of enriched uranium and not enrich uranium to the levels needed to create nuclear weapons. It would require Iran to disconnect two-thirds of its centrifuges, with restrictions on where and how it can operate the remaining ones. It limits uranium enrichment to a single facility. Fordow, the fortified site that Iran long sought to hide from the world, will be converted into a research facility. The core of Arak, the heavy water reactor, will be removed and filled with cement, rendering it unusable for the production of weapons-grade plutonium.

It will open its nuclear facilities to continuous monitoring and allow stringent inspections of its uranium supply chain. It will permanently commit to never seeking, developing, or acquiring nuclear weapons.

Second, if Iran cheats on this deal, sanctions can be reimposed or, as they say, snapped back. In addition—and this is very important to me—U.S. military options remain on the table, just as they were before the deal. We are not bringing back ships. We have not agreed to do anything to take the

military option off the table. This agreement by no means limits or lessens our country's ability to use force against Iran if it violates this agreement and pursues nuclear weapons.

If Iran attempts to develop a nuclear weapon, the terms of this agreement will have given us more information and more limited targets in the event that military action becomes necessary.

It should also be noted that this agreement does not in any way constrain the ability of future Presidents or Congresses to authorize military force against Iran.

Third, rejecting the agreement would lead to a splintering of the international partnership that has been critical to preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, that has been critical to bringing them to the table, and that has been critical to these economic sanctions. They would not be nearly as effective if we had done them alone.

Some have argued that we should reject this deal so we can return to the negotiating table. Yet, I recently met with the Ambassadors representing the United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and China. Not one of them believed that abandoning this deal would result in a better deal. Instead, it would allow Iran more time to build up its nuclear infrastructure. The countries that have been our partners in this effort would no longer be unified. The sanctions regime would start to fray, splintering the international consensus on Iran and leaving its nuclear program unconstrained.

Finally, this agreement must move in parallel with increased commitment to security assistance for Israel and our other allies in the region. In my view, the most troubling issue with this agreement is that my colleagues has addressed is that sanctions relief Iran will receive after it implements key restrictions on its nuclear program will provide it with additional funds, and a certain portion of those funds could be funneled into Iran's destabilizing activities around the region.

I am deeply committed to the security of our allies and want to ensure that we are taking steps, in parallel with this nuclear agreement, to enhance our allies' ability to defend themselves. I want to see further enhancements of our security assistance to Israel, greater defense cooperation with our Arab allies, and stronger actions to counter Iranian militant activities.

We are in the midst of discussing other initiatives in this Chamber to provide additional assistance and enhance the security of Israel and our allies in the region. I will work with my colleagues and the administration as we move forward. That is how I will end. I call upon the administration and

all of my colleagues to work together to help ensure that this agreement works and to help ensure that we provide the assistance necessary to protect Israel and our allies.

As I said earlier, I have deep respect for people who have different views. We have had a lengthy debate. We have looked at this agreement now for over a month and had time to ask questions of the Energy Secretary and the Secretary of State and anyone we could about this agreement. So the time is now here where I believe this agreement should be approved. And, again, we have different views. I think it is very important, given the heated nature at times of this debate, that we come together when this is over to stand up for Israel, our beacon of democracy in the Mideast, and continue to work together on a bipartisan basis on our Mideastern policy.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I would like to thank the majority leader for scheduling this debate about the agreement struck by the Obama administration and the leaders of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is important to highlight right up front what this deal is. It is nothing more than a political agreement between President Obama and the current leaders of Iran. This deal does not have the support of the American people, nor will it have the consent of their elected representatives here in Congress. At no point in the course of negotiating this deal did the Obama administration seek the advice and consent of the Senate or display any respect for the constitutional limits of the Executive in foreign affairs.

Nevertheless, I am glad the Senate has been debating this agreement because this is how the Senate is supposed to function, on the basis of open and robust deliberation. I hope it is how the Senate will function well into the future on matters of national security and domestic policy.

But if the debate we are trying to have today could be congressional deliberation at its best, the Obama administration's deal with Iran is the product of diplomacy at its worst. As the negotiations neared completion earlier this year, President Obama began building his case for the deal on the specious claim that the only alternative to the deal was war.

This black-or-white setup—the notion that the art of statesmanship is little more than navigating a series of binary either-or propositions—is plainly absurd. It misses the mark. We learned this from the fiasco following the New START treaty in 2010. At that time, President Obama and Secretary Clinton warned that it was the only way to reset the relationship with Russia. But now, 5 years later, we know it was, in fact, the starting point for the

worst era of U.S.-Russia relations since the Cold War. But the Obama administration has repeated this “my way or war” maxim with such faithful devotion and emotional conviction that it appears at some point along the way they began to believe it themselves. They actually started to believe it, even thought it was wrong.

Just look at the facts regarding this deal.

Fact No. 1: The centerpiece of the agreement is the lifting of significant portions of the multilateral financial, energy, and transportation sanctions currently imposed against Iran. Lifting these sanctions—lifting them prior to any meaningful action by Iran in exchange—will immediately give the world's largest supporter of terrorism access to tens of billions of dollars in currently frozen assets. That is just on day one. Welcoming Iran with open arms to the global marketplace will provide untold future riches to Tehran's revolutionary government.

The current sanctions are not perfect, but they are in place for a very good reason: to restrict Iran's access to resources we know its radical leaders will use to acquire nuclear weapons and continue exporting terrorism not only throughout the region but throughout the world. This is not a matter of speculation. It is not a matter of hyperbole. It is exactly what Iran's own leaders have told us in no uncertain terms.

Those sanctions were originally put in place in response to Iran's repeated violations of previous nuclear agreements. It is complete fantasy to believe they can be revived in the future when—not if but when—they cheat on this deal.

Fact No. 2: Nothing in the agreement will prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It won't. Under the terms of this deal, the Iranian Government will be allowed to conduct research on more advanced nuclear centrifuges after only 8 years. After 15 years, there will be no limits whatsoever on their nuclear fuel production—no limits whatsoever. To believe that this deal will stop the Iranian nuclear weapons program requires an act of blind faith. In fact, it requires us to disregard the facts altogether.

Fact No. 3: This agreement will increase Iran's access to conventional weapons and ballistic missiles. It will do this by providing for the removal of the U.N. conventional arms and ballistic missile technology embargo. If this seems out of place in an agreement that was supposed to be about Iran's nuclear weapons program, well, that is because it is. It is entirely out of place for this type of an agreement. It was never supposed to be part of the deal. But you see, in the eleventh-hour negotiations, the Ayatollah demanded it, sensing—rightly—that the Obama administration was unlikely to object.

This deal is not the work of savvy negotiation. No, this deal is the product of desperate capitulation. For years, this administration has been dead set on reaching a deal, any deal with the mullahs in Iran. That is why they got the deal they did, an agreement that fulfills a wish list for the Iranians and the sprawling network of terrorist groups that depend on their largesse, including Hezbollah, Hamas, the Houthis in Yemen, and Bashar al-Assad's tyrannical regime in Syria.

And what does the United States get in exchange? Well, we get a promise from the Ayatollah to abandon Iran's 35-year quest for deliverable nuclear weapons—weapons they crave for the explicit purpose, as they put it, of wiping Israel off the face of the Earth and fulfilling the aspiration of their infamous motto “Death to America.”

Evidently, this is good enough for the Obama administration and for the supporters of this deal, but it is not good enough for the American people—not even close.

In fact, the public opposes the proposed deal by a 2-to-1 margin, but not because they are clamoring for war with Iran. The truth is that most Americans would prefer a diplomatic solution to the problems posed by Iran's apocalyptic, nuclear, ambitious theocracy. But this is not a diplomatic solution. This diplomacy won't solve anything.

I would note that the public's overwhelming opposition to the Iran deal did not catch the Obama administration by surprise. In fact, public opposition to the deal was one of the primary reasons why the administration decided not to submit the agreement to the Senate for ratification as a treaty.

When Secretary Kerry testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee just a few weeks ago, I asked him to explain why the agreement with Iran was not submitted to the Senate as a treaty for ratification—ratification requiring two-thirds of the Members of this body who support it. His answer was, in effect, to say that the deal does not amount to a treaty because it is a multilateral agreement, one that involves more countries than just Iran and the United States.

But the inclusion of multiple parties to an international agreement has absolutely no bearing whatsoever on whether it can be considered a treaty. There is no shortage of examples of this, of examples of multilateral agreements that have been ratified by the Senate, including the Chemical Weapons Convention, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In fact, as I pointed out to Secretary Kerry at the time, the State Department's own Web site provides a definition of the word “treaty” that includes multilateral agreements, which is why I think the more honest and troubling answer was the one that he provided

just 1 day earlier when Congressman REID RIBBLE of Wisconsin asked Secretary Kerry the exact same question: Why does the Obama administration not consider the Iran deal to be a treaty?

This was Secretary Kerry's response to that question asked just 1 day earlier in the other body. Secretary of State John Kerry said as follows:

Well, Congressman, I spent quite a few years trying to get a lot of treaties through the United States Senate, and frankly, it's become physically impossible. That's why. Because you can't pass a treaty anymore.

This is indefensible. Secretary Kerry's appeal to expedience shows an ignorance of—or disdain for—both principle and precedent. The Senate has not lost the ability to ratify a treaty. No, the Senate is perfectly capable of ratifying treaties, as it did 160 times during the George W. Bush administration. It is just reluctant to ratify unpopular treaties and treaties that undermine U.S. interests. There is a distinction between these two types of treaties.

From the Obama administration's perspective, this is a problem with the Senate. But from the perspective of the Constitution, this is the purpose of the Senate, and it is exactly why the framers included the Senate in the treaty-making process.

Article II, section 2 of the Constitution states that the President “shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the senators present concur.”

The sharing of the treaty-making power between the Executive and the Senate is not a quirk, nor is it optional. It is a constitutional command. Both branches are essential. They are essential to this process. Without both branches, you cannot make a treaty and have it take effect.

The Executive is best suited to manage negotiations with foreign nations, but only legislative consent can grant the kind of broad political consensus necessary to ensure that the United States lives up to the terms of an agreement in the long run.

In “The Federalist,” Alexander Hamilton defended the sharing of treaty-making power between the Executive and the Senate. He wrote: “The history of human conduct does not warrant that exalted opinion of human virtue which would make it wise in a nation to commit interests of so delicate and momentous a kind, as those which concern its intercourse with the rest of the world, to the sole disposal of [the] President of the United States.”

Of course, not all international agreements are treaties, and those that aren't do not need legislative consent in order to go into effect. But, historically, agreements that make long-term commitments or include significant changes to the United States' relation-

ship to another country have been considered treaties and have, therefore, been submitted to the Senate for approval.

As I see it, the Iran deal fits both of these categories quite comfortably. The terms of the deal purport to extend well beyond President Obama's remaining time in office. According to the administration's own reckoning, this agreement will fundamentally alter the relationship between the United States and Iran.

People of good faith can disagree about whether the Iran deal should be considered a treaty or merely an executive agreement, though not on the farcical grounds provided by Secretary Kerry.

But this debate is worth having. This is the debate that we should be having. It is worth it for the sake of our national security and for the health of our political institutions, and it is a debate that must include the Senate, just as the Constitution itself requires.

The past few months have been a case study of the dysfunction and the danger that result when the Executive chooses to ignore, instead of engage with, the Senate in order to determine whether an international agreement should be considered a treaty.

The President's go-it-alone approach has become all too familiar in the realm of domestic policy.

President Obama has spent much of the last 6½ years justifying his will-to-power Presidency on the basis of expediency. Constitutional restraints and historical precedent have only slowed—never stopped—the President's routine abuse of power to unilaterally impose his domestic policy preferences on the country. Now, with this Iran deal failing to receive the support of even half of the Senate, the President appears willing to extend his imperial Presidency, even to the area of foreign policy.

We must do everything in our power to stop this Iran agreement from receiving congressional sanction. The facts are clear. This is a bad deal for global security, it is a bad deal for our allies—including, especially, Israel, our strongest ally in the Middle East—and it is a bad deal for the American people. But we must also learn from this experience.

Later this year, the Obama administration will negotiate a major climate change agreement, what will be known as the Paris Protocol. Already the administration has indicated it does not intend to submit the protocol to the Senate for ratification, even though the agreement would call for a significant expansion of the already broad powers of our Federal regulatory regime.

It would empower unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats to seize even more control over the American energy sector and insert themselves ever fur-

ther into the everyday lives of the American people.

On account of its expected size, scope, cause, and effect on the American economy, failure to submit the Paris Protocol to the Senate as a treaty would be an unprecedented and dangerous abuse of Executive power.

Now is the time to make clear to ourselves, to the White House, and to the American people that the Senate understands and plans to defend the centrality of the treaty-making process to the negotiation of international trade agreements and the full and rightful role of the Senate in that important process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Alaska.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I join my colleagues this afternoon in speaking on a joint resolution on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action with Iran.

I wanted to make clear my position on this agreement. We use the term “deal” in the Senate talking about the Iran deal. I almost feel like we need to put it in quotation marks because in my mind a deal is something that has been negotiated in give-and-take, back-and-forth, and there is an agreement that is relatively evenhanded or fair on both sides. I do not believe that this deal is a fair deal. I will support the resolution of disapproval when we have that opportunity for that vote.

This is not where I hoped I would be on this because I do believe—and I do believe strongly—that diplomacy is the way that we solve disagreements around the world. I think that most of us were actually very hopeful when the administration began negotiation some years ago with the aim and with the purpose that Iran would cease its nuclear program and end its progress toward a nuclear weapon.

I believe that our world would be safer if we were able to achieve those goals—without question—and these are goals that the President himself articulated. He stated specifically that this was his aim.

But, unfortunately, this agreement fails to meet those goals. Simply put, this agreement is not in our national interest.

After considerable study and considering the terms of the agreement and the views of experts on both sides, the many closed hearings that we had, the many public hearings that were out there, I have concluded that this is not just a bad deal, but I think this is a sad deal. I think this is a sad time for us because of this deal.

In fact, this is a deal that borders on capitulation and appeasement, a deal that rewards nuclear extortion. Those are pretty tough words, but that is where I feel we are—a deal which is far worse than no deal at all.

I reject, absolutely out of hand, the statement from our President that we

have no choice, that it is either this deal or it is war. That is a false choice, and I think it is wrong to put it that way before the American people.

Certainly, these negotiations were hard. They were very difficult. That is the nature of these negotiations and deliberations.

But other options do exist, and we have been on the floor for several days talking back and forth about them. Well, what else is there? Well, first, there are the sanctions that got Iran to the table in the first place. There are even stronger sanctions that can be imposed. There is continued diplomacy. It is not an apt description to say it is this deal or it is war.

Before I discuss my specific objections to the agreement, I would like to place my views on this agreement in context with my views on international agreements in general. I am certainly not opposed to joining with international partners in making the world a better and a more peaceful place. On issues ranging from the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities to the new START treaty, I have worked with the administration. I have been there.

I approach these issues with an open mind and an open heart, and I have strived to maintain an open mind on this agreement. But quite honestly it is hard, it is really hard, if not impossible, to maintain an open heart when it comes to Iran. Iran is not a country that is open to resetting relations with a world that clearly is seeking peace and a civil society. Before it entered into this agreement, Iran wasn't talking about a reset here, and it has shown no evidence of changing its ways because of where we are with this agreement now.

We hear every day that Iran's senior leaders are leading the chant "Death to America." And they said this before the agreement. One would think maybe now there has been this agreement that tone would change. But no, despite all the efforts of Secretary Kerry and others, they are still chanting "Death to America" today. That hasn't changed.

In fact, just yesterday the Supreme Leader called again for the obliteration of Israel. These are not rabble rousers in the street. These are the leaders in Iran who are calling repeatedly for "Death to America" and to wipe Israel off the map. Say what you will about the reportedly moderate President Rouhani, but the facts speak for themselves.

We have The Washington Post's Tehran correspondent who has been in jail since July of 2014. Iran continues to hold him on trumped-up espionage charges, and he is not alone. Iran also holds an American pastor, a U.S. marine who traveled to Iran to visit family members, and it is believed to hold Robert Levinson, who was kidnapped

from an island off of Iran's coast. Iran continues to persecute Christians and Baha'is in its own country. These are flagrant human rights violations.

The facts do not suggest to me this is a regime that is ready for reform. I am not speaking about human rights violations that occurred at an early time in history. This is here, this is now. These persecutions, these human rights violations, these imprisonments are right here, right now.

If this were not enough to cause one to question whether we can trust Iran to change its ways, consider this. Iran is a key funder of Hamas and Hezbollah, committed to the destruction of the State of Israel. It funds the rockets which are launched into Israel's sovereign territory from Gaza, southern Lebanon from Syria, and these rockets don't just threaten Iran's sworn enemy, the State of Israel. They also endanger civilian populations in the countries from which they are launched by inviting, if not demanding, immediate retaliation from Israel. So one has to ask the question: Is this a nation that is committed to peace and good global citizenship? Hardly. It just is not.

I think we recognize—and the Presiding Officer, in his capacity before coming to the Senate, has been engaged in diplomatic negotiations, and he knows that in diplomacy we often end up negotiating with those who don't share our views, don't share our values. It is important for us to look at what Iran gives the world in return for this agreement. In light of the progress Iran has made in its quest to develop a nuclear weapon, it was imperative to me that an agreement—if we were going to get to an agreement—must not simply arrest Iran's nuclear ambition but require the abandonment of those ambitions. It had to stop those nuclear ambitions. The agreement before us, viewed in absolutely the most favorable light, simply does not accomplish this goal. At best we have pushed the pause button. At best it puts a pause on Iran's final preparations towards becoming a full-fledged nuclear state.

And even then, to regard that pause as meaningful requires me to suspend disbelief. I have to suspend my disbelief that Iran can be trusted to live up to the terms of the agreement. I must believe that even though Iran is not required to fully disclose the military dimensions of its existing nuclear program, the international verification mechanisms are indeed effective. I can't do that.

I must also believe that other nations will be inclined to meaningfully call out Iran on violations and not simply rationalize them away in order to keep up the appearances this deal is working. I don't think that is going to happen.

Each of these assumptions is just a bridge too far. I can't get there. And I

hear from Alaskans, as I know my colleague in the Chair does, when they are asking me: Hey, what happened to these anytime, anywhere inspections this administration was promising? Now they are not there. They are asking about these snapback sanctions. It is a pretty catchy word, but what exactly does it mean? How feasible is it? Is it practicable in its implementation?

And I can't look at them squarely in the eye and say: Sure, you can count on those snapback provisions to come into play. And even if we could get them back in, we know those sanctions would be weaker, would be less effective than what we have now.

Alaskans are also asking: Well, what about these side agreements—these side agreements between Iran and the IAEA—how is it only they know what is going on there?

And we can't go back to our constituents, we can't go back to the good people of the great State of Alaska and say with confidence: Yes, we have these provisions on verification that give us that security; yes, snapback sanctions are practicable; no, there are no side, secret agreements. We can't do that.

Before causing the release of billions of dollars in frozen Iranian assets and allowing sanctions to expire, I need some clear and convincing and unequivocal evidence this agreement will achieve what it set out to achieve. Ideally, I seek Iran's commitment to change its ways, to act as a responsible player on the world stage. It was through sanctions—and we keep hearing this on both sides, whether you support this agreement or do not support this agreement—that Iran was brought to the table in the first place by crippling sanctions. We will lose our leverage with Iran once those sanctions are dialed back. Whether it is 9 months or longer, we lose that leverage. So I am very concerned about where we are with unfreezing assets and releasing sanctions.

Many of us have spoken on the floor here about how Iran will now have billions of dollars to spend creating further chaos in the Middle East or arming Israel's enemies or developing rockets which someday might be used to deliver nuclear weapons. You can count me as one of the skeptics. I do not believe Iran will choose to do good with these newfound sources of revenue. I do not believe that they are going to be putting these resources into rebuilding roads and hospitals and infrastructure. I am that skeptic, and I think I join many here in noting what we have seen even under crippling sanctions, when Iran didn't have access to the frozen resources and funds that will be available to them under the deal, they still found a way to direct and finance acts of terrorism throughout the Middle East. Should we give them more money in their hands to do more mischief? Count me as a skeptic.

As you know, I focus a great deal on the energy issues as the chairman of the energy committee. I am very concerned about the opportunities this agreement affords Iran's oil sector—opportunities that come at the expense of America's energy producers and our overall economy in the near term. The Energy Information Administration here in Washington and the International Energy Agency in Paris estimates that lifting sanctions on Iran could raise Iranian output by some 700,000 barrels per day.

Now, we recognize that production is going to take some time to ramp up and to bring back online—perhaps well into next year and beyond—but it will come. What we do have in place and ready to go is Iran's floating storage facilities. They are ready to go now and to move that oil out onto the market. And these supplies will do what? They will work to push down global oil prices.

We know that will be a good thing for consumers everywhere, but what do we do here in this country? We ban the exports of our oil. In effect, we sanction ourselves. So we are going to let Iran have access to the global oil market, put some 700,000 barrels a day of oil out there, gain new revenues to help their economy, and also do whatever else they may do—create that havoc and chaos and mischief, and fund terrorism.

We are going to see oil tankers filling up at Kharg Island instead of Galveston. They are going to be setting sail for our allies in South Korea, Japan, and elsewhere. Our diplomacy is going to benefit Iranian producers while our antiquated domestic export ban is going to harm American producers.

This misalignment—and I have outlined it in several white papers out there—can be corrected. We can correct it legislatively, and the administration can correct it. And now that the President claims he has his veto-proof margin of support for the Iran deal, I think there is even greater urgency for this Congress to move on this issue. That is another issue, but I think it is important to raise. It is just one of the many issues that I believe demonstrates that Iran is looking at this as a good deal for them. They got the most out of this negotiation and gave the least.

Iran's strategy of nuclear extortion has not been disabled. To the contrary, it has been rewarded. What do they get? What do they get? They get a pathway to nuclear weapons, ICBM program, conventional weapons, sanctions gone, and a stronger economy. It sounds like a pretty good deal for Iran. It sounds like a pretty good deal for Iran but certainly not for the security of this country and not for the security of our allies.

I suspect that many of my colleagues, even some who are voting for this agreement, concur with my con-

clusion that Iran is getting a better deal. We have seen a flurry of comments not only in print but we have certainly heard great discussion on the floor that this agreement is flawed, it is not what we wanted, and it is not what we would have negotiated.

The comments from colleagues supporting this say we have to take it because there is no other option here. The President has said it is this or it is war; there is no other option. If you don't like this plan, what is your plan? Then they say we can't have the administration walk away because American prestige will suffer if Congress forces the administration to walk away from this deal. This is not about American prestige, and this should not be about a President's legacy. This is about our security as a nation.

Just this morning, I met with a family with three young girls in high school from Juneau, AK. They were doing a walk-through of the Capitol, and they came over to my hideaway. We were talking, and I let them know I was finishing the comments on my statement here. We got to talking about this agreement, and they wanted to know my position on it. I said: Quite simply, I cannot support an agreement that fails to make our Nation a safer place, that fails to make the world a safer place.

It has been suggested that this agreement is better than no deal; in other words, that a bad deal is better than no deal at all. I cannot accept this. I cannot accept this, and I don't think this is a situation where we are holding out for the perfect; to use the expression, we can't let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I am not looking for a perfect deal. I am not looking for a perfect deal, but I am demanding one that makes our Nation a safer place—safer with the deal than without—and this agreement doesn't do it. I place the blame firmly with the administration.

The President did not work with this Congress. He did not throughout the course of the negotiations try to align our expectations with the direction he was taking to determine what a good agreement might look like that we could all concur with.

So I am not surprised that this deal remains so unpopular with the American public. There are a bunch of polls out there. The latest one from Pew says only about 20 percent of the American people support this agreement. I do think it is important to note that on this floor we do have a bipartisan majority of Members in who oppose this deal. I understand that is true in the House as well. I think that is important. And I do think it is unfortunate, with the vote we took just hours ago, that we are not able to get to a straight up or down vote on the resolution of disapproval at this point in time. The whole premise of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act—some-

thing that 98 of us agreed voted for, was that we, as the representatives from our respective States around the country, would be able to speak yea or nay to this issue by way of a vote.

The American people want Iran out of the nuclear weapons business—it is pretty simple—and that means dismantlement. The American people want their President to demonstrate backbone in the negotiations, not capitulation, not appeasement—not appeasement of Iran, whose leaders seem to take continued pride in this pattern of unacceptable and often reprehensible behavior. This deal simply does not get us there. That is why I join so many others in opposition.

I thank the Presiding Officer for the privilege of the time on the floor, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise to urge my colleagues to oppose this agreement with Iran. And they are going to have another chance.

Traveling around Wyoming during August and part of September, I talked to hundreds of people. I found four who thought maybe we ought to give this a try—until I asked them this key question. I asked: Do you trust Iran? Now, I have 100 percent of the people saying no.

A contractor who had done business in Iran said that right after he signed the contract over there, the Iranian who was working the negotiations with him said: You do realize that when you sign the contract is when the negotiations begin. That is whom we are working with on this.

Iran's nuclear program is one of the most significant threats facing the United States and the world today. The implications of this deal will have serious consequences for the Middle East and especially our allies in the Middle East.

Russia and China are especially interested in this deal because of how it changes the international playing field. The President was so pleased that Russia signed on. Well, of course they did. They get to sell unlimited arms and technology. They gave up nothing.

Ultimately, this deal will have serious consequences for the national security of the United States. I ask you, Do you trust Iran?

Several of my colleagues said there is no other alternative. That is how it always is with a contract or a treaty or an agreement. You have to vote for or against it. I am very disappointed in our negotiators. I don't think they were negotiators.

I remember the President saying we would be able to have inspections anytime. That is just as believable as when we were going through ObamaCare and he said: If you like your insurance policy, you can keep it. Nobody got to. This is in that same category, except

this is more serious. We are talking about world peace. We are talking about security.

Sanctions brought them to the table. It was leverage. It worked. Then we gave that up so we could sit down and talk to them, and then we didn't leave the table when they wouldn't agree to things that were absolutely needed. What kind of negotiation is that? That is where you trust the Iranians?

Iran's goal is to use its nuclear program to extort its neighbors and threaten its enemies, and it has made it very clear that it considers the United States their No. 1 enemy. We cannot afford to make the kind of strategic blunder that would give Iran a nuclear weapon. We should not give up the advantages we have that were working to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. That is why we should oppose this deal. Again I ask: Do you trust Iran?

President Obama has said that if we don't accept this deal, then the only other option is war with Iran, but this isn't true. I don't think anybody believes that. It is the President's way of trying to convince the American people that his way is the only way—just like ObamaCare—and that is not true.

One of the advantages of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act that was passed out of the Senate committee unanimously is that by requiring the President to submit the deal to Congress for review, both the House and the Senate as well as the public can see what is in the deal—kind of see what is in the deal.

I really object to the other side saying we didn't read that. We read what was available. I reviewed the deal. I have heard the administration's arguments in favor of it, and I don't believe this deal is the best way to prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I don't think it prevents them from getting a nuclear weapon.

I have heard from experts in diplomacy, from experts in arms control and proliferation, from experts in the military, from national security and intelligence experts who say that this deal is not the only way to prevent Iran's nuclear ambitions. Do you trust Iran?

I mentioned that the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act is important because it requires the deal and all its documents to be sent to Congress for review, but I do understand there are separate side agreements between Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency—and so far as I can tell nobody from the United States has looked at those. Those have not been reviewed by Congress because they haven't been submitted for our review. I am told these side agreements deal with the military dimensions of Iran's nuclear program—the parts of Iran's program that will allow them to launch a nuclear weapon against Israel or American forces in the Middle East or even-

tually, with enough work, anywhere in the world, including America. You don't sell someone a weapon whose intent is to kill you. Do you trust Iran?

I am deeply concerned that we don't have all the facts about this deal. We need the facts about Iran's military program—facts about how confident the administration can be that Iran is complying with the rules. We should not move forward with any agreement until we have a full understanding of all of the components that are part of it and are convinced it is a good deal. Do you trust Iran?

Understanding all of the components of this deal isn't just about the documents that were submitted to Congress; it is also about understanding what happens when Iran has the freedom and resources to grab for power and position in the region. Do you trust Iran?

The administration has said this deal is a pathway to security and stability. Unfortunately, this administration has consistently misjudged critical moments in the region—most recently, for not taking the Islamic State seriously and developing a real strategy to defeat it. Agreeing to this deal is yet another example of the administration misjudging the difficult and dangerous situation in the Middle East by believing Iran will not take advantage of the situation to attack our allies and undermine American interests.

There are numerous ways Iran can take advantage of this deal, such as—mentioned frequently—using the huge cash infusion that comes with this deal to support Hezbollah or buying arms from Russia. This agreement is not a pathway to peace or stability. It is Iran's springboard to grow into the Middle East's most dangerous bully.

There is even a little provision in here that any contracts entered into before snapback can't be broken. How many contracts do we think they will hurry up and do if they get the right to do them? They will do every one they need to do—exactly what they want to do. Do you trust Iran?

For more than a decade, the United States and our allies have used sanctions effectively to prevent Iran from achieving its nuclear ambitions. Those sanctions took years to implement and demonstrated the commitment of our international partners to prevent an outcome that would be a disaster. Under this agreement, we would be giving up those sanctions in exchange for the hope that we can trust Iran. It sounds to me like we are giving up the most important tool we have to prevent a nuclear-capable Iran in exchange for nothing. Do you trust Iran?

I urge my colleagues to oppose this deal. It is not the best we can get. We will have another opportunity to vote. It ignores the reality of the complex and dangerous political situation in the Middle East, and it relies on noth-

ing more than hope that Iran will keep its promise, despite all the times Iran has failed to do so in the past. It trades an effective system of sanctions that has worked to prevent Iran's nuclear ambition for nothing. It gives Iran everything it needs to pour money and resources into attacking our allies and making the region more dangerous. I don't trust Iran, and I didn't find anybody in Wyoming who does.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

MORNING BUSINESS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IN ECUADOR

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to call the Senate's attention to a situation I have spoken about previously, which is the ongoing crackdown by the Correa Government on what little remains of the independent media in Ecuador.

One of the things we have come to expect is that the press—and civil society organizations that expose corruption and challenge the officially sanctioned version of reality—are the first casualties in countries whose leaders are determined to remain in power at any cost.

Ecuador is a prime example. In 2013, President Rafael Correa issued a decree granting the government broad powers to intervene in the operations of non-governmental organizations, NGOs, including dissolving groups on the vague grounds that they have “compromised[d] public peace” or have engaged in activities that were not listed when they registered with the government. A modified version of the decree, which maintains broad powers to close down NGOs, was adopted in August 2015.

On September 7, Ecuador's Communications Ministry opened an administrative process to “dissolve” Fundamedios, an organization that monitors freedom of expression in the country. According to information publicly available, the government contends that Fundamedios engaged in political activities by publishing information critical of the government—information that would be protected speech in any democracy.

Every politician knows that unfavorable press attention comes with the territory. Here in the United States we accept it as a necessary reality of a free press. But the Correa Government wants to punish an organization for

publishing news and opinions it doesn't like. Silencing the press, like dismantling an independent judiciary, are hallmarks of dictatorship. History is replete with examples.

Fundamedios, like other independent media and human rights defenders in Ecuador, has been a target of the Correa Government for years. Its members have been subjected to a pattern of harassment and persecution for nothing more than engaging in activities that are protected by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

As long as President Correa is in power it seems that the press and civil society organizations in Ecuador will be under assault. But while any president or prime minister with the backing of the police and the armed forces can wreak havoc on the institutions of democracy, history also provides any number of examples where, in the end, the public's demand for freedom of expression and government accountability prevailed. We are seeing that today in Guatemala, and I have little doubt that the tide will similarly turn against repression in Ecuador.

Ecuador is a country blessed with wonderful people including unique indigenous cultures, with spectacular geography and extraordinary biological diversity, as found in the Galapagos Islands, and with magnificent colonial architecture. It is also a country with a history of military coups and fragile democratic institutions. It is regrettable that as President Correa solidifies his grip on power by silencing his critics, the country is taking on more and more of the characteristics of a police state.

Fundamedios has a few days to defend itself before the Communications Ministry until a final ruling is issued. Let us hope that wisdom will prevail, that the forces of repression in Ecuador will withdraw, that the right of free expression will be reaffirmed, and that Fundamedios will be allowed to continue to operate. There is still time.

BUDGET SCOREKEEPING REPORT

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to submit to the Senate the budget scorekeeping report for September 2015. The report compares current law levels of spending and revenues with the amounts provided in the conference report to accompany S. Con. Res. 11, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016. This information is necessary to determine whether budget points of order lie against pending legislation. It has been prepared by the Republican staff of the

Senate Budget Committee and the Congressional Budget Office, CBO, pursuant to section 308(b) of the Congressional Budget Act.

This is the second report I have made since adoption of the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution on May 5, 2015. My first filing can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on July 9, 2015. The information contained in this report is current through September 8, 2015.

Table 1 gives the amount by which each Senate authorizing committee is below or exceeds its allocation under the budget resolution. This information is used for enforcing committee allocations pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, CBA. For fiscal year 2015, which is still enforced under direction of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013, BBA, Senate authorizing committees have increased direct spending outlays by \$7.8 billion more than the agreed upon spending levels. Over the fiscal year 2016 to 2025 period, which is the entire period covered by S. Con. Res. 11, Senate authorizing committees have spent \$3.1 billion less than the budget resolution calls for.

Table 2 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds the statutory spending limits. This information is used to determine points of order related to the spending caps found in section 312 and section 314 of the CBA. While no appropriations bills have been enacted for fiscal year 2016, subcommittees are charged with permanent and advanced appropriations that first become available in that year.

Table 3 gives the amount by which the Senate Committee on Appropriations is below or exceeds its allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, OCO/GWOT, spending. This separate allocation for OCO/GWOT was established in section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, and is enforced using section 302 of the CBA. No bills providing funds with the OCO/GWOT designation have been enacted thus far for fiscal year 2016.

The budget resolution established two new points of order limiting the use of changes in mandatory programs in appropriations bills, CHIMPS. Tables 4 and 5 show compliance with fiscal year 2016 limits for overall CHIMPS and the Crime Victims Fund CHIMP, respectively. This information is used for determining points of order under section 3103 and section 3104, respectively. No bills have been enacted thus far for fiscal year 2016 that include CHIMPS.

In addition to the tables provided by the Senate Budget Committee Republican staff, I am submitting additional tables from CBO that I will use for enforcement of budget levels agreed to by the Congress.

Because legislation can still be enacted that would have an effect on fiscal year 2015, CBO provided a report for both fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. This information is used to enforce aggregate spending levels in budget resolutions under section 311 of the CBA. CBO's estimates show that current law levels of spending for fiscal year 2015 exceed the amounts in the deemed budget resolution enacted in the BBA by \$8.0 billion in budget authority and \$1.0 billion in outlays. Revenues are \$79.8 billion below the revenue floor for fiscal year 2015 set by the deemed budget resolution. As well, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed for fiscal year 2015, while Social Security revenues are \$170 million above levels in the deemed budget.

For fiscal year 2016, CBO estimates that current law levels are below the budget resolution's allowable budget authority and outlay aggregates by \$886.0 billion and \$526.9 billion, respectively. The allowable spending room will be reduced as appropriations bills for fiscal year 2016 are enacted. Revenues are \$104 million above the level assumed in the budget resolution. Finally, Social Security outlays are at the levels assumed in the budget resolution for fiscal year 2016, while Social Security revenues are \$2 million below assumed levels for the budget year.

CBO's report also provides information needed to enforce the Senate's pay-as-you-go rule. The Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard currently shows deficit reduction of \$2.0 billion over the fiscal year 2015 to 2020 period and \$6.8 billion over the fiscal year 2015 to 2025 period. Over the initial 6-year period, Congress has enacted legislation that would increase revenues by \$3.9 billion and increase outlays by \$1.9 billion. Over the 11-year period, Congress has enacted legislation that would reduce revenues by \$1.6 billion and decrease outlays by \$8.3 billion. The Senate's pay-as-you-go rule is enforced by section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21, the fiscal year 2008 budget resolution.

All years in the accompanying tables are fiscal years.

I ask unanimous consent that this statement and the accompanying tables be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1. SENATE AUTHORIZING COMMITTEES—ENACTED DIRECT SPENDING ABOVE (+) OR BELOW (–) BUDGET RESOLUTIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2015	2016	2016–2020	2016–2025
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry				
Budget Authority	254	0	0	0
Outlays	229	0	0	0
Armed Services				
Budget Authority	–15	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs				
Budget Authority	121	0	0	0
Outlays	121	0	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Energy and Natural Resources				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	–2	0	0	0
Environment and Public Works				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	–3,160
Outlays	0	0	0	–3,160
Finance				
Budget Authority	7,322	5	13	28
Outlays	7,288	5	13	28
Foreign Relations				
Budget Authority	–20	0	0	0
Outlays	–20	0	0	0
Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Judiciary				
Budget Authority	0	0	1	2
Outlays	0	0	1	2
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions				
Budget Authority	3	0	0	0
Outlays	1	0	0	0
Rules and Administration				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Intelligence				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Veterans' Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	150	20	20	20
Indian Affairs				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Small Business				
Budget Authority	0	0	0	0
Outlays	0	0	0	0
Total				
Budget Authority	7,665	5	14	–3,130
Outlays	7,767	25	34	–3,110

TABLE 2. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED REGULAR DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS¹

(Budget authority, in millions of dollars)

	2016	
	Security ²	Nonsecurity ²
Statutory Discretionary Limits	523,091	493,491
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	9
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	41	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	41
Homeland Security	0	9
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	24,678
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	56,217
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	4,400
Current Level Total	41	85,354
Total Enacted Above (+) or Below (–) Statutory Limits	–523,050	–408,137

¹ This table excludes spending pursuant to adjustments to the discretionary spending limits. These adjustments are allowed for certain purposes in section 251(b)(2) of BBEDCA.² Security spending is defined as spending in the National Defense budget function (050) and nonsecurity spending is defined as all other spending.

TABLE 3. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2016	
	BA	OT
OCO/GWOT Allocation ¹	96,287	48,798
Amount Provided by Senate Appropriations Subcommittee		
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0	0
Defense	0	0
Energy and Water Development	0	0
Financial Services and General Government	0	0
Homeland Security	0	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0	0
Legislative Branch	0	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0	0

TABLE 3. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS—Continued
(In millions of dollars)

	2016	
	BA	OT
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0	0
Current Level Total	0	0
Total OCO/GWOT Spending vs. Budget Resolution	-96,287	-48,798

BA = Budget Authority; OT = Outlays

¹ This allocation may be adjusted by the Chairman of the Budget Committee to account for new information, pursuant to section 3102 of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution of the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.TABLE 4. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAMS (CHIMPS)
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2016
CHIMPS Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	19,100
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CHIMPS Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	-19,100

TABLE 5. SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE—ENACTED CHANGES IN MANDATORY SPENDING PROGRAM (CHIMP) TO THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND
(Budget authority, millions of dollars)

	2016
Crime Victims Fund (CVF) CHIMP Limit for Fiscal Year 2016	10,800
Senate Appropriations Subcommittees	
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies	0
Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies	0
Defense	0
Energy and Water Development	0
Financial Services and General Government	0
Homeland Security	0
Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies	0
Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies	0
Legislative Branch	0
Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies	0
State Foreign Operations, and Related Programs	0
Transportation and Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies	0
Current Level Total	0
Total CVF CHIMP Above (+) or Below (–) Budget Resolution	-10,800

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2015.

Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2015 budget and is current through September 8, 2015. This report is

submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014, pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act (Public Law 113-67).

Since our last letter dated July 9, 2015, the Congress has cleared and the President has signed the Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-41). That law affects outlays and revenues for fiscal year 2015.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Keith Hall, *Director*.)

Enclosure.

TABLE 1. SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015
(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution	Current Level ^a	Current Over/Under (–) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,026.4	3,034.4	8.0
Outlays	3,039.6	3,040.7	1.0
Revenues	2,533.4	2,453.6	-79.8
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^b	736.6	736.6	0.0
Social Security Revenues	771.7	771.9	0.2

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.^b Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2015, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015
(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted: ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,533,388
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,877,558	1,802,360	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	508,261	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	- 735,195	- 734,481	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,142,363	1,576,140	2,533,388
Enacted Legislation: ^b			
Lake Hill Administrative Site Affordable Housing Act (P.L. 113-141)	0	- 2	0
Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Resolution, 2014 (P.L. 113-145)	0	75	0
Highway and Transportation Funding Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-159)	0	- 15	2,590
Emergency Afghan Allies Extension Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-160)	5	5	6
Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113-164) ^c	- 4,705	- 180	0
Preventing Sex Trafficking and Strengthening Families Act (P.L. 113-183)	0	10	0
IMPACT Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-185)	22	22	0
Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 113-235)	1,884,271	1,426,085	- 178
An act to amend certain provisions of the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 (P.L. 113-243)	0	0	- 28
Naval Vessel Transfer Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-276)	- 20	- 20	0
Carl Levin and Howard P. "Buck" McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (P.L. 113-291)	- 15	0	0
An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend certain expiring provisions and make technical corrections, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for the treatment of ABLE accounts established under State programs for the care of family members with disabilities, and for other purposes (P.L. 113-295)	160	160	- 81,177
Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-1)	121	121	1
Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114-4)	47,763	27,534	0
Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-10)	7,354	7,329	0
Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (P.L. 114-19)	0	20	0
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114-25)	0	130	0
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-27)	38	7	- 1,051
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-41) ^b	0	0	0
Total, Enacted Legislation	1,934,994	1,461,281	- 79,818
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	- 42,921	3,239	0
Total Current Level ^d	3,034,436	3,040,660	2,453,570
Total Senate Resolution ^e	3,026,439	3,039,624	2,533,388
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	7,997	1,036	n.a.
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	79,818

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during the 2nd session of the 113th Congress but before publication in the Congressional Record of the statement of the allocations and aggregates pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (P.L. 113-67): the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79), the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-89), the Gabriella Miller Kids First Research Act (P.L. 113-94), and the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act (P.L. 113-97).

^b Pursuant to section 403(b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2010, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13, shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. The amounts so designated for 2015, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Veterans' Access to Care through Choice, Accountability, and Transparency Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-146)	- 1,331	6,619	- 42
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114-41)	0	1,147	0
Total, amounts designated pursuant to Sec. 403 of S. Con. Res. 13	- 1,331	7,766	- 42

^c Sections 136 and 137 of the Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2015 (P.L. 113-164) provide \$88 million to respond to the Ebola virus, which is available until September 30, 2015. Section 139 rescinds funds from the Children's Health Insurance Program. Section 147 extended the authorization for the Export-Import Bank of the United States through June 30, 2015.

^d For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the budget resolution does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include there items.

^e Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels printed in the Congressional Record on May 5, 2014, pursuant to section 116 of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2013 (Public Law 113-67):

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Original Senate Resolution:	2,939,993	3,004,163	2,533,388
Revisions:			
Adjustment for Disaster Designated Spending	100	43	0
Adjustment for Overseas Contingency Operations and Disaster Designated Spending	74,995	31,360	0
Adjustment for Emergency Designated Spending	0	75	0
Adjustment for the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015	11,351	3,983	0
Revised Senate Resolution	3,026,439	3,039,624	2,533,388

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, September 10, 2015.
Hon. MIKE ENZI,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The enclosed report shows the effects of Congressional action on the fiscal year 2016 budget and is current through September 8, 2015. This report is

submitted under section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended.

The estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues are consistent with the technical and economic assumptions of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016.

Since our last letter dated July 9, 2015, the Congress has cleared and the President has

signed the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues for fiscal year 2016: Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-40); and Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-41).

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. SUNSHINE
(For Keith Hall, Director.)

Enclosure.

TABLE 1. SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015
(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution ^a	Current Level ^b	Current Level Over/Under (—) Resolution
On-Budget			
Budget Authority	3,032.8	2,146.7	- 886.0
Outlays	3,091.3	2,564.4	- 526.9
Revenues	2,676.0	2,676.1	0.1
Off-Budget			
Social Security Outlays ^c	777.1	777.1	0.0

TABLE 1. SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015—Continued

(In billions of dollars)

	Budget Resolution ^a	Current Level ^b	Current Level Over/Under(—) Resolution
Social Security Revenues	794.0	794.0	0.0

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

^a Excludes \$6,872 million in budget authority and \$344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending that is not yet allocated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations.^b Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.^c Excludes administrative expenses paid from the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund of the Social Security Administration, which are off-budget, but are appropriated annually.

TABLE 2. SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR THE SENATE CURRENT LEVEL REPORT FOR ON-BUDGET SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Previously Enacted ^a			
Revenues	n.a.	n.a.	2,676,733
Permanents and other spending legislation	1,968,496	1,902,345	n.a.
Appropriation legislation	0	500,825	n.a.
Offsetting receipts	— 784,820	— 784,879	n.a.
Total, Previously Enacted	1,183,676	1,618,291	2,676,733
Enacted Legislation:			
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado, to authorize transfers of amounts to carry out the replacement of such medical center, and for other purposes (P.L. 114–25)	0	20	0
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–26)	0	0	5
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–27)	445	175	— 766
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–40)	5	5	0
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41) ^b	0	0	99
Total, Enacted Legislation	450	200	— 662
Entitlements and Mandatories:			
Budget resolution estimates of appropriated entitlements and other mandatory programs	962,619	945,910	0
Total Current Level ^c	2,146,745	2,564,401	2,676,071
Total Senate Resolution ^d	3,032,788	3,091,273	2,675,967
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	104
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	886,043	526,872	n.a.
Memorandum:			
Revenues, 2016–2025:			
Senate Current Level	n.a.	n.a.	32,236,839
Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	32,233,099
Current Level Over Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	3,740
Current Level Under Senate Resolution	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.a. = not applicable; P.L. = Public Law.

^a Includes the following acts that affect budget authority, outlays, or revenues, and were cleared by the Congress during this session, but before the adoption of S. Con. Res. 11, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2016: the Terrorism Risk Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2014 (P.L. 114–1); the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (P.L. 114–4); and the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–10).^b Pursuant to section 403(b) of S. Con. Res. 13, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2010, amounts designated as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13, shall not count for certain budgetary enforcement purposes. The amounts so designated for 2016, which are not included in the current level totals, are as follows:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41)	0	917	0

^c For purposes of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act in the Senate, the resolution, as approved by the Senate, does not include budget authority, outlays, or revenues for off-budget amounts. As a result, current level does not include these items.^d Periodically, the Senate Committee on the Budget revises the budgetary levels in S. Con. Res. 11, pursuant to various provisions of the resolution. The Senate Resolution total below excludes \$6,872 million in budget authority and \$344 million in outlays assumed in S. Con. Res. 11 for disaster-related spending that is not yet allocated to the Senate Committee on Appropriations:

	Budget Authority	Outlays	Revenues
Senate Resolution	3,032,343	3,091,098	2,676,733
Revisions:			
Pursuant to section 4311 of S. Con. Res. 11	445	175	— 766
Revised Senate Resolution	3,032,788	3,091,273	2,675,967

TABLE 3. SUMMARY OF THE SENATE PAY-AS-YOU-GO SCORECARD FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS—1ST SESSION, AS OF SEPTEMBER 8, 2015

(In millions of dollars)

	2015–2020	2015–2025
Beginning Balance ^a	0	0
Enacted Legislation: ^{b c d}		
Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–17) ^c	n.e.	n.e.
Construction Authorization and Choice Improvement Act (P.L. 114–19)	20	20
Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–22)	1	2
Uniting and Strengthening America by Fulfilling Rights and Ensuring Effective Discipline Over Monitoring Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–23)	*	*
An act to extend the authorization to carry out the replacement of the existing medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Denver, Colorado (P.L. 114–25)	150	150
Defending Public Safety Employees' Retirement Act & Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–26)	— 1	5
Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–27)	— 640	— 52
Boys Town Centennial Commemorative Coin Act (P.L. 114–30) ^e	0	0
Steve Gleason Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–40)	13	28
Surface Transportation and Veterans Health Care Choice Improvement Act of 2015 (P.L. 114–41)	— 1,552	— 6,924
Current Balance	— 2,009	— 6,771
Memorandum:		
Changes to Revenues	2015–2020	2015–2025
Changes to Outlays	3,900	— 1,564
	1,891	— 8,335

Source: Congressional Budget Office.

Notes: n.e. = not able to estimate; P.L. = Public Law. * = between — \$500,000 and \$500,000.

^a Pursuant to S. Con. Res. 11, the Senate Pay-As-You-Go Scorecard was reset to zero.^b The amounts shown represent the estimated impact of the public laws on the deficit. Negative numbers indicate an increase in the deficit; positive numbers indicate a decrease in the deficit.^c Excludes off-budget amounts.^d Excludes amounts designated as emergency requirements.

^c P.L. 114-17 could affect direct spending and revenues, but such impacts would depend on future actions of the President that CBO cannot predict. (<http://www.cbo.gov/sites/default/files/cbofiles/attachments/s615.pdf>)

^f P.L. 114-30 will cause a decrease in spending of \$5 million in 2017 and an increase in spending of \$5 million in 2019 for a net impact of zero over the six-year and eleven-year periods.

REMEMBERING SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, in a solemn ceremony today, a new visitor center and museum was opened at the site near Shanksville, PA, where 40 courageous Americans were killed 14 years ago tomorrow attempting to regain control of United Airlines Flight 93 from four hijackers. The 9/11 Commission Report makes it clear that the hijackers intended to crash Flight 93 either into the White House or the U.S. Capitol Building.

Our individual and collective memories of that horrific day remain fresh, and the pain is still very real. But in the minutes, hours, days, and years following the attacks, Americans have showed their amazing propensity for bravery, sacrifice, selflessness, and compassion in an incredible variety of ways.

Today, American men and women in this country and abroad stand at the ready to thwart the plans of those who wish to do us harm. We have an obligation to support them and their families during their missions, as well as when their missions end. Congress has a special obligation to care for those still living with the emotional and medical burdens of the attacks. As we begin to craft a new budget for our country, I will work to ensure full funding for the programs that support the first responders who risked their health in the effort to help others.

Others have said that the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 didn't test the American character; they revealed it. The terrorist attacks were intended to crush the American spirit; instead, they galvanized it to new strengths. We came together as a nation to grieve. We came together as a nation to bury our dead and to care for those who were hurt. We came together as a nation to rebuild. And we came together as a nation to pursue those who were responsible for the attacks and bring them to justice. We have accomplished a great deal with respect to those missions, but we have so much more to do. We must never become complacent. We must never lose our resolve.

We have a larger mission. President John F. Kennedy was on his way to deliver a speech at the Trade Mart in Dallas when he was assassinated on November 22, 1963. He was going to say:

We in this country, in this generation, are—by destiny rather than choice—the watchmen on the walls of world freedom. We ask, therefore, that we may be worthy of our power and responsibility, that we may exercise our strength with wisdom and restraint, and that we may achieve in our time and for all time the ancient vision of “peace on earth, good will toward men.” That must al-

ways be our goal, and the righteousness of our cause must always underlie our strength. For as was written long ago: “except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.”

Being “watchmen on the walls of world freedom” is an awesome responsibility. There are times when the responsibility seems more of a burden than a privilege. There are times when the world's problems seem absolutely intractable and we grow weary of it all. There are times when we as Americans disagree whether or how we should meet that responsibility.

Today, both houses of Congress are involved in a debate about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action—JCPOA—with respect to Iran, a State sponsor of terrorism with nuclear ambitions. We have serious disagreements about whether to support the JCPOA. It is important, as we debate this issue, to remember that no one among us is clairvoyant or has a total grasp of the truth; no ideology or philosophy has a monopoly on wisdom. No party has complete political acumen. And no group has exclusive rights to use the word “patriot”.

If we want to honor the men and women on Flight 93 and on the three other hijacked jets, if we want to honor the people in the World Trade Center and at the Pentagon, if we want to honor the brave first responders who were climbing up the steps of the Twin Towers as people were streaming down the steps, and if we want to honor the service men and women who have given their lives in defense of our Nation, let us remember that what unites us as Americans is far more important than what divides us on particular issues, even an issue as existentially crucial as restraining Iran's worst intentions and lawlessness. We are all Americans, each with the desire to see our families, our communities, and our Nation prosper, and to promote the American ideals of peace and freedom and justice to every corner of the Earth.

About 100 miles east of Shanksville, there is another field consecrated by the blood of Americans who gave “the last full measure of devotion”—Gettysburg. As President Abraham Lincoln said, it is our responsibility to dedicate ourselves “to the unfinished work” which others “have thus far so nobly advanced”. It is our responsibility to dedicate ourselves to the “great task” remaining before us, and that task is “a new birth of freedom”.

As we remember and mourn those who died in the 9/11 attacks and those who have died since that dreadful day 14 years ago serving as “watchmen on the walls of world freedom”, let us meet our awesome responsibility

united, as Americans, all of us patriots in our own way, acknowledging that it is our privilege and it is our destiny.

OBSERVING THE 21ST ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN ACT

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, Sunday, September 13 marks the 21st anniversary of the Violence Against Women Act, VAWA. I have zero tolerance for domestic violence. No woman in this Nation should live in fear for her safety or the safety of her children. These victims need to have access to resources that can provide them with help. That is why I was proud to cosponsor this legislation when it was first enacted in 1994, and I am proud to have fought for every single one of its reauthorizations since.

The far-reaching impact of this legislation cannot be stressed enough. It has impacted the lives of millions of people—playing a crucial role in our communities by providing important services to those who are most vulnerable. Since the original VAWA legislation, millions of women have called the National Domestic Violence hotline who were desperate, who were fearful for their lives. When they called that number, they got help. I know that it saved lives.

As vice chairwoman of the Senate Appropriations Committee and the Commerce, Justice, Science, CJS, Appropriations Subcommittee, I fought to include \$479 million in funding in the fiscal year 2016 CJS bill for the U.S. Department of Justice's Office on Violence Against Women—the highest funding level ever for these programs.

What is it that these programs do? They coordinate community approaches to end violence and sexual assault. They fund victims' services like shelters and a national toll-free crisis hotline. They provide counseling to victims of rape and sexual assault. They help prevent sexual assaults from happening on college campuses. They also fund legal assistance to victims to be able to get court orders to be able to protect themselves from the abuser or from the stalker.

Domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, and stalking are crimes of epidemic proportions, exacting terrible costs on individual lives and our communities. Twenty-five percent of U.S. women report that they have been physically assaulted by an intimate partner during their lifetimes, one in six have been the victims of rape or attempted rape, and the cost of domestic violence exceeds \$8 billion each year. These are numbers and statistics, but they also represent real people.

In my home State of Maryland, VAWA programs have personally impacted people's lives. For example, "Rita" who was married to "Jamie"—who was physically abusive to her, and then sadly to their four-year-old son, and had been arrested on several occasions for dealing drugs—was able to get important legal assistance through a VAWA-funded program.

Rita obtained a protective order against Jamie, pressed criminal charges against him, and he was found guilty of assault. Jamie is now where he belongs, locked behind bars.

The Sexual Assault Legal Institute, SALI, a program of the Maryland Coalition Against Sexual Assault, was able to represent Rita in her divorce proceedings and custody case. Although this case remains ongoing, through VAWA, the SALI program made it possible for Rita to get the important legal services she needed to protect herself and her son.

This story is just one of the many reasons why it is so important that we continue to invest in programs to combat domestic abuse and sexual assault, and help enable victims to rebuild their lives. This is why I want to recognize 21 years of VAWA as law today, and remember the countless number of lives it has impacted throughout the country. VAWA has put into place so many invaluable programs that are effective and relied upon by so many women and their families in Maryland and across the nation. That is the reason why I will continue to fight for it.

REMEMBERING BORIS NEMTSOV

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last night I was honored to pay tribute to a dear friend and personal hero, the late Boris Nemtsov. Boris Nemtsov was the Russian opposition leader, former Deputy Prime Minister, and human rights activist who was murdered in February.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it's a wonderful privilege to introduce a personal hero—whose courage, selflessness and idealism I find awe-inspiring—and ask him to accept an award on behalf of another personal hero, a man of very great courage and selflessness and idealism, Boris Nemtsov.

Vladimir Kara-Murza is deputy leader and co-founder with Boris of the People's Freedom Party. He is the leading coordinator of Open Russia. In the U.S., Vladimir was a prominent and very effective advocate for passage of the Magnitsky Act, which President Obama signed into last December.

Most recently, he has eloquently and persuasively campaigned to expand the act to impose sanctions on those Russian journalists, who are so cowed and corrupted by the Kremlin, they have become indispensable to propagating the lies and atmosphere of hate, fear and violence the regime relies on to maintain power.

Vladimir is a brave, outspoken, and relentless advocate for freedom and democracy in Russia. All of his adult life and even as a boy, he has been a steadfast champion for the rule of law, for justice, for truth, for the dignity of the Russian people. And like others in Russia who place the interests of the Russian people before their own self-interest, he has paid a price for his gallantry and integrity.

In May of this year, he grew very ill and fell into a coma. As has happened to other Putin critics, Vladimir was poisoned in order to intimidate him or worse. His family brought him to the U.S. for treatment this summer, and we are all very relieved and grateful that he is recovering, and able to be with us tonight.

Vladimir, you are an inspiration to the work of this Institute, and to me personally. Your work is crucial to the progress of freedom and justice in the world. You're a credit to your family and your country. You've kept faith with your ideals in confrontation with a cruel and dangerous autocracy.

And you have kept faith—honorably and bravely—with the example of your friend and comrade, Boris Nemtsov, who died a martyr for the rights of people who were taught to hate him but who will one day mourn his death, revere his memory, and despise his murderers.

Boris Nemtsov is a hero of the Russian Federation. He doesn't need a posthumous Gold Star to deserve that distinction. What worth is a decoration from the hands of a tyrant and the sycophants and crooks who surround him? What meaning would it have? He is beyond the calumnies and scorn and cruelty of his enemies now. Freedom salutes Boris. Justice proclaims him a hero. The truth reverts his memory.

Putin could never understand Boris. He could never appreciate how someone could be impervious to threats and slander, to the lure of corruption and the oppression of fear. A man like Putin, who all his life has stood on the wrong side of history, on the wrong side of morality, of goodness, can't comprehend the power of righteousness. He is blind to the supremacy of love. He can't see that all lies are exposed eventually, hate is overcome by love, illicit power decays, while the truth endures forever.

The people who killed Boris and the regime that protects them are the enemies of the Russian people. They rob Russia of its wealth, its hopes, its future. They deny the God-given dignity of the people they misrule. They are thieves and murderers. And they are cowards. They fear justice. They fear truth. They fear a society in which ideals and morality are the foundation of law and order.

Boris wasn't afraid. He knew his enemies. He knew what they were capable of, but he would not be oppressed. He would not be oppressed by unjust laws or by violence and fear. He was a free man, and bravely so. He was accustomed to danger. But he lived for love and justice and truth. He had been threatened repeatedly and demonized by the regime's propaganda apparatus. Yet when his enemies took his life in the shadow of the Kremlin, they found him walking in the open air, enjoying the evening, unafraid.

It was an honor to know him, and among the greatest privileges of my life to call him a friend.

For his courage, for giving the last full measure of devotion to his country and his countrymen, IRI awards the 2015 Freedom Award to the late Boris Nemtsov. May we long find inspiration in his example. May we

take renewed devotion to the cause he died to advance. And may we, too, live unafraid in the open air, for love and justice and truth.

Thank you.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF NIH'S OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise today to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health, which was established on September 10, 1990, to end gender bias in medical research.

It is hard to believe that 25 years ago, women were not included in protocols at the NIH. Faux science said that our reproductive systems got in the way or that we had "raging hormones."

I was here 25 years ago, as a young Senator representing the great State of Maryland. I remember this big "landmark" study coming out. It showed that aspirin could help prevent heart attacks and save lives. Everyone was so excited. A relatively cheap and widely available medication that could improve cardiovascular health—this was a huge discovery.

But then we looked closer at the study, and what did we find? We found that the study tested the effects of aspirin on more than 22,000 men, but zero women. Zero women. This big, landmark study enrolled only men. How could that be? So we took a closer look, and we found that this study—and the exclusion of women from clinical trials—was not an aberration. We found that prior to 1989 clinical trials of new drugs were routinely conducted predominantly on men, even though women consume approximately 80 percent of pharmaceuticals in the United States and make up half the population. To add fuel to the fire, a 1992 report by the U.S. General Accounting Office found that less than half of prescription drugs on the market had been analyzed for gender-related response differences.

So what we had was a system where medical research was done based on male-only clinical trials, which led to the development of diagnoses, preventive measures, and treatments that were commonly used in women, despite never having been studied on women. As you might imagine, this didn't sit well with the women in Congress. It certainly didn't sit well with me.

At that time—in 1990—a lot was going on. George Bush the elder was in the White House. The gulf war was about to begin. The Hubble Space Telescope had just been launched. We didn't have a confirmed NIH Director, and the Human Genome Project had just begun.

There was a lot going on in the world. But the women of Congress knew that we had a real problem to solve. At the time, the Congressional

Caucus for Women's Issues was comprised of myself and then-Representatives Pat Schroeder, Olympia Snowe, Connie Morella, and many others. On Aug. 22, 1990, Pat, Olympia, Connie, and I sent a landmark letter to the Acting Director of NIH, Dr. William Raub, requesting a public meeting to discuss how best to improve Federal research on women's health. We wanted all the key health people there: all 12 NIH Institute Directors, then-HHS Secretary Louis Sullivan, then-Surgeon General Antonia Novello, and the beloved Dr. Ruth Kirschstein.

Let me speak a moment about Dr. Ruth Kirschstein, a woman who provided direction and leadership to NIH through much of the second half of the 20th century. She was a daughter of immigrant parents. She weathered disgraceful prejudice and stereotyping of women and Jews. But that didn't stop her. Thanks to hard work and perseverance, she went on to become a key player in the development of the polio vaccine, the first woman Director of a major Institute at NIH, and a lifelong champion of the importance of basic biomedical research and training programs that provided opportunity to all talented students. The contributions made by Dr. Ruth Kirschstein to the NIH, to women's health, and to better health for all are invaluable.

But back to September 1990. On Sept. 10, 1990, the women of Congress got our meeting. We drove out to the NIH's Bethesda campus—Connie Morella, Olympia Snowe, Pat Schroeder, and BARB all showed up. So did Time magazine and the TV cameras.

And what do you know. President Bush announced Dr. Bernadine Healy as the first female Director of the NIH. Dr. Healy was a friend, a colleague, and an adviser. She was a gifted physician and a brilliant researcher and administrator. She was also a very special advocate for women. She was deeply committed to the advancement of women in science and biomedical research.

It is hard to believe that meeting at NIH happened 25 years ago today. And it marked the official establishment of the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health.

The NIH Office of Research on Women's Health was established to do three things: ensure that women are included in NIH-funded clinical research; set research priorities to address gaps in scientific knowledge; and promote biomedical research careers for women.

Under Dr. Healy, the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health really came alive. She appointed Dr. Vivian Pinn as its first Director. And today the Office works in partnership with NIH's Institutes and Centers to ensure that women's health research is part of the scientific framework at NIH and throughout the scientific community. I am so proud of what they have accomplished over the past 25 years.

Thanks to the Office of Research on Women's Health, the Women's Health Initiative was conducted. I remember when Dr. Healy came to me with the idea for this study. She needed money to get a study underway looking at post-menopausal hormone therapy. I was so proud to work on the Appropriations Committee to get Dr. Healy and NIH the money they needed. I worked hand-in-hand with Senators Kennedy, Harkin, and Specter.

The Women's Health Initiative had groundbreaking findings that led to big changes in hormone replacement treatment protocols. As a result, we have seen significant reductions in breast cancer rates. We have reduced the incidence of breast cancer by 10,000 to 15,000 cases per year. Just think, this study alone—the brainchild of Dr. Healy—has helped save 375,000 lives over the past 25 years.

But the Office of Research on Women's Health has done so much more. Today, more than half of participants in NIH-funded clinical trials are women. The office worked with the National Cancer Institute to develop a vaccine that prevents the transmission of Human Papilloma Virus, HPV, resulting in fewer cervical cancer cases. The office worked with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases on a landmark study which showed that giving the drug AZT to certain HIV-infected women reduced risk of mother-to-child transmission of HIV by two-thirds. The office has supported major advances in knowledge about genetic risk for breast cancer and discovery of BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic risk markers. The office codirects the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers, which develops and evaluates policies to promote recruitment, retention, and sustained advancement of women scientists.

We have come so far over the past 25 years, but we still have a long way to go. There remain striking gender differences in many diseases and conditions, including autoimmune diseases, cancer, cardiovascular diseases, depression and brain disorders, Alzheimer's disease, diabetes, and addictive disorders. We still don't have enough information on the involvement of women in clinical research and trials. We still don't have reliable data on how drugs currently on the market affect women differently than men. And still to this day, women are often prescribed dosages devised for men's average weights and metabolisms.

As you can see, there remains work to be done. But that doesn't mean we can't take a moment to commemorate how far we have come over the past quarter century. I am immensely proud of the work done by the NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health and all those who have worked day-in and day-out to end gender bias in medical research, including Dr. Ruth Kirschstein,

Dr. Bernadine Healy, Dr. Vivian Pinn, and Dr. Janine Clayton, current Director of the office. I very much look forward to what the next 25 years will bring. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING RILEY SLIVKA

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I want to recognize Riley Slivka, of Winifred, MT. Riley is a senior at Winifred High School whose outstanding work in promoting both agriculture and film in Central Montana deserves much recognition.

Through his YouTube channel, Imagistudios, he displays the beauty of the Missouri Breaks region, near Winifred, as well as the ins and outs of running a Montana farm. Here, one can view his short film, *Harvesting Along the Edge* in Central Montana, which provides a comprehensive look at the harvesting season. The short film, with over 21,000 views in just over 2 weeks, has beautiful cinematography and exhibits the heart of Montana's agriculture community and the Winifred region.

Riley has worked all over his family farm, from running the combine to working as a semi-truck driver for harvest. Riley is planning to major in agricultural communications and film. In the spring of 2014, Riley placed ninth in the country in the BPA digital media competition in Anaheim, CA.

I am thrilled to recognize Riley for his contributions in promoting our State's No. 1 industry through film in Montana. •

RECOGNIZING THE HENDERSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE'S 70TH ANNIVERSARY

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize the 70th anniversary of an important entity to Southern Nevada, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce. I am proud to honor this chamber that contributes so much in support of local businesses and Henderson's economy and job market.

Without a doubt, this city's businesses, both small and large, have a great impact on our State's growth. Through the dedication and hard work of the Henderson Chamber of Commerce, Henderson's business community continues to strive and maintain a high quality of life for residents. Even when Nevada's economy took a difficult turn, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce intervened, fighting to help local businesses stay on their feet. It helped owners maneuver through an adverse economic climate with innovation, creativity, and ingenuity. To say this chamber has had a positive impact on Southern Nevada would be an understatement. The strong foundation it has built will be felt for years to come.

Aside from helping local businesses expand and thrive, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce also offers entrepreneurs opportunities in networking, marketing, business development programs, ribbon cutting ceremonies, and career openings. The chamber has 7 members serving on the executive board and 16 others on the board of directors. I am thankful for their leadership and for the great things they are doing for businesses in Southern Nevada.

For the past 70 years, the Henderson Chamber of Commerce has demonstrated absolute dedication to the great State of Nevada and to the Henderson business community. Without the hard work of those that have served this chamber, the city of Henderson would not have demonstrated the excellent growth that we see today. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the Henderson Chamber of Commerce on its 70th anniversary and in thanking it for all it does to press on and find ways to make the Nevada business community the best it can be.●

CONGRATULATING MARIA SHEEHAN

● Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Maria Sheehan on her retirement after serving as president of Truckee Meadows Community College, TMCC, for 7 years. It gives me great pleasure to recognize her years of hard work and commitment to making this institution the best it can be.

Ms. Sheehan began working at TMCC in 2008 and took over the top leadership position at the community college that same year in July in the midst of a tumultuous economic downturn. Her leadership at the institution brought stability, creating a reliable administration and increased opportunity for students. During her career, Ms. Sheehan contributed greatly to the growth of TMCC, adding new buildings to the facility, including the Health Science Center at the Redfield Campus. She led the institution as it opened its Veterans Resource Center, an incredible resource for veterans wanting to go back to school after their service. She also spearheaded the complete renovation of the college's Applied Technology Center, providing students with the technical training and education needed to help grow Nevada's skilled workforce. In addition, student success rates doubled throughout her tenure. No words can adequately thank her for her great contribution to Nevada's students. Her positive legacy will continue on for years to come.

As the husband of a teacher, I understand the important role academic institutions play in enriching the lives of Nevadans. Ensuring students throughout the Silver State are prepared to compete in the 21st century is critical

for the future of our country. The State of Nevada is fortunate to be home to educators like Ms. Sheehan.

I ask my colleagues and all Nevadans to join me in thanking Ms. Sheehan for her dedication to enriching the lives of Nevada's students and in congratulating her on her retirement. She exemplifies the highest standards of leadership and service and should be proud of her long and meaningful career. I wish her well in all of her future endeavors and in her pursuit of volunteering in Central America.●

RECOGNIZING MEREDITH JONES

● Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the outstanding service of Meredith Jones, the president and CEO of the Maine Community Foundation, who is stepping down after 16 years of service. Meredith has greatly strengthened the Foundation through her hard work and dedication, and she has helped Maine citizens immensely.

As a nonprofit that seeks to boost Maine's economy through investing in education, health, and leadership, the Maine Community Foundation has greatly benefited from Meredith's time as president and CEO of the organization. Her work has helped to shape policies that will have a tangible impact on Mainers for years to come.

Meredith dedicated much of her career to public service, working for both the Maine Health Care Association and the Maine Development Foundation before her time at the Maine Community Foundation. With her background in strategic planning, grantmaking, and fund development initiatives, Meredith was more than equipped to take over as president and CEO in January of 2009.

Meredith not only successfully navigated the foundation through the economic downturn of 2008–2009 but also helped the Maine Community foundation reach new heights. During Meredith's time, the foundation made over \$160 million in grants and scholarship awards, as well as increased charitable funds from \$190 million to more than \$420 million. Meredith worked to prioritize downtown revitalization, higher education, and leadership development, all of which will have a tangible impact on Maine's future.

I would like to join the Maine Community Foundation in recognizing and thanking Meredith for her dedication to the great State of Maine. I cannot speak highly enough of Meredith and her successful tenure at the foundation. The State of Maine owes Meredith a great deal for her years of leadership and support, and I wish Meredith all the best in the next chapter of her life.●

RECOGNIZING THE 133RD ANNIVERSARY OF MOUNT ZION AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH

● Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to congratulate and honor Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, SC, for their 133rd anniversary. In 1882, Zion Presbyterian merged with the Central Presbyterian Church on Meeting Street, and a group from Emmanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church purchased the Glebe Street property. They came together to organize a new congregation and named their church the Mount Zion African Methodist Episcopal Church. It was founded under the leadership of Rev. N.B. Sterrett, D.D. Rev. John Taylor is currently the pastor at Mount Zion A.M.E. Mount Zion A.M.E. Church has greatly influenced the community with faith, peace and prayer. Their honorable legacy will forever be appreciated. On September 13, 2015, the Mount Zion A.M.E. Church will celebrate 133 years of remarkable worship. I acknowledge, with pleasure, the church's influence in Charleston, and therefore recognize their growth and success.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting nominations which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The message received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON THE UNITED STATES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001—PM 23

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes

in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 with respect to the terrorist attacks on the United States of September 11, 2001, is to continue in effect for an additional year.

The terrorist threat that led to the declaration on September 14, 2001, of a national emergency continues. For this reason, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect after September 14, 2015, the national emergency with respect to the terrorist threat.

BARACK OBAMA.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 10, 2015.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 5:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bill:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-2764. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Tax Treatment of Identity Protection Services Provided to Data Breach Victims" (Announcement 2015-22) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BARRASSO, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 35. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-139).

S. 248. A bill to clarify the rights of Indians and Indian tribes on Indian lands under the National Labor Relations Act (Rept. No. 114-140).

S. 465. A bill to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe (Rept. No. 114-141).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2021. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

S. 2022. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS (for himself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2023. A bill to ensure greater affordability of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

S. 2024. A bill to expand the boundary of Fort Frederica National Monument in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. WHITEHOUSE:

S. 2025. A bill to promote the protection and conservation of United States ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes ecosystems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. STABENOW (for herself, Mr. PETERS, Mr. KIRK, and Mr. DURBIN):

S. 2026. A bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2027. A bill to increase the penalties for fentanyl trafficking; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAUL (for himself, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. REED):

S. 2028. A bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. LEE):

S. Res. 251. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the congressional review provision of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, because the President failed to transmit the entire agreement as required by such Act, and that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action would only preempt existing Iran sanctions laws as "the supreme Law of the Land" if ratified by the Senate as a treaty with the concurrence of two thirds of the Senators present pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2, of the Con-

stitution or if Congress were to enact new implementing legislation that supersedes the mandatory statutory sanctions that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, purports to supersede; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 255

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 255, a bill to restore the integrity of the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 477

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 477, a bill to terminate Operation Choke Point.

S. 520

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 520, a bill to amend the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act to reauthorize the Act.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to reform the Food for Peace Program, and for other purposes.

S. 540

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 540, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to make loan guarantees and grants to finance certain improvements to school lunch facilities, to train school food service personnel, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 786

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 786, a bill to provide paid and family medical leave benefits to certain individuals, and for other purposes.

S. 890

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 890, a bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide consistent and reliable authority for, and for the funding of, the Land and Water Conservation Fund to maximize the effectiveness of the Fund for future generations, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 942

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 942, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a deduction from the gift tax for gifts made to certain exempt organizations.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) were added as cosponsors of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for

the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, *supra*.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1539

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1539, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to establish a permanent, nationwide summer electronic benefits transfer for children program.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1603

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1603, a bill to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to repeal the Government pension offset and windfall elimination provisions.

S. 1668

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1668, a bill to restore long-standing United States policy that the Wire Act prohibits all forms of Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 1676

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1676, a bill to increase the number of graduate medical education positions treating veterans, to improve the compensation of health care providers, medical directors, and directors of Veterans Integrated Service Networks of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1789

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1789, a bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to

revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1933

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN), the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1933, a bill to establish a comprehensive United States Government policy to encourage the efforts of countries in sub-Saharan Africa to develop an appropriate mix of power solutions, including renewable energy, for more broadly distributed electricity access in order to support poverty reduction, promote development outcomes, and drive economic growth, and for other purposes.

S. 1961

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. NELSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1961, a bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to make improvements to the treatment of the United States territories under the Medicare and Medicaid programs, and for other purposes.

S. 1972

At the request of Mrs. SHAHEEN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1972, a bill to require air carriers to modify certain policies with respect to the use of epinephrine for in-flight emergencies, and for other purposes.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 1996

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1996, a bill to streamline the employer reporting process and strengthen the eligibility verification process for the premium assistance tax credit and cost-sharing subsidy.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the name of the Senator from Vermont

(Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. JOHNSON, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. ERNST, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2021. A bill to prohibit Federal agencies and Federal contractors from requesting that an applicant for employment disclose criminal history record information before the applicant has received a conditional offer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to introduce the Fair Chance to Compete for Jobs Act of 2015 or the Fair Chance Act. This bipartisan bill has the support of Senators JOHNSON, BALDWIN, ERNST, and BROWN, and I thank them for their support. Today, a bipartisan House companion bill to the Fair Chance Act has also been introduced. I thank Congressmen CUMMINGS, ISSA, JACKSON LEE, BLUMENAUER, WATSON COLEMAN, RICHMOND, CONYERS, and SCOTT for their leadership on this issue.

Everyone deserves the dignity of work and the opportunity for a second chance to earn a living. But far too many Americans who return home from behind bars have to disclose convictions on their initial employment application or initial job interview that often serve as insurmountable barriers to employment. This legislation would ensure that people with convictions, who have paid their debt to society and want to turn their lives around, have a fair chance to work.

By encouraging Federal employers to focus on an individual's qualifications and merit, and not solely on past mistakes, the Fair Chance Act would remove burdensome and unnecessary obstacles that prevent formerly incarcerated people from reaching their full potential and contributing to society. It would also help reduce recidivism, combat poverty, and prevent violence in our communities by helping people get back to work.

In the last 30 years, our prison population has exploded. Since 1980, the Federal prison population has grown by nearly 800 percent and our total prison population exceeds more than 2.2 million people. Taxpayers are wasting billions of dollars on overcrowded prisons that crush priceless human potential with lengthy prison terms that have failed to make our communities safer. Yet, more than 90 percent of those sentenced to prison eventually get out and return home. Indeed, over 600,000 people are released from prison each year.

Equally troubling, a high number of Americans living in our communities

have criminal convictions. About 70 million people in the U.S. have been arrested or convicted of a crime. That means, almost one in three adults in the U.S. has a criminal record. In fact, in the Nation's capital alone an estimated 1 in 10 D.C. residents has a criminal record.

The American Bar Association has identified over 44,500 "collateral consequences"—or legal constraints—placed on what individuals with records can do once they have been released from prison. Of those, up to 70 percent are related to employment.

Without a job, it is impossible to provide for oneself and one's family. Yet, thousands of people with criminal convictions reenter society each year without employment. According to a recent New York Times/CBS News/Kaiser Family Foundation poll, men with criminal records account for about 34 percent of all nonworking men between the ages of 25 and 54. In addition, a landmark study by Professor Devah Pager, of Harvard University's Department of Sociology, found that a criminal record reduces the likelihood of a callback or a job offer by nearly 50 percent for men in general. African-American men with criminal records have been 60 percent less likely to receive a callback or job offer than those with criminal records. In the land of opportunity, a criminal conviction should not be a life sentence to unemployment.

Today, a criminal conviction is a modern day scarlet letter that—because of the so-called "War on Drugs"—has had a disproportionate impact on communities of color. For example, African-American men with a conviction are 40 percent less likely to receive an interview. And the likelihood that Latino men with a record will receive an interview or be offered a job is 18 percent smaller than the likelihood for white men.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens benefits public safety. With little hope of obtaining a decent paying job, returning citizens are often left with few options but to return to a life of crime. A 2011 study in the Justice Quarterly concluded that the lack of employment was the single most negative determinant of recidivism. A report by the Bureau of Justice Statistics found that of the over 400,000 state prisoners released in 2005, 67.8 percent of them were re-arrested within 3 years of their release. And 76.6 percent were re-arrested within 5 years of their release.

Creating employment opportunities for our returning citizens also strengthens our economy. Poor job prospects for people with records reduced our nation's gross domestic product in 2008 between \$57 billion and \$65 billion. With an integrated global economy that is becoming more and more competitive, it is imperative that we

encourage sound policy that promotes the gainful employment of Americans.

A formerly incarcerated person—and later President—named Nelson Mandela once said, “For to be free is not merely to cast off one’s chains, but to live in a way that respects and enhances the freedom of others.” The American criminal justice system is predicated on this ideal, the belief that an individual who has committed a crime can, and should be, reformed into a productive member of society over their time of imprisonment. The ideal that, once released from prison, that individual should have the opportunity to enrich himself and his community upon his reentry into society.

The Fair Chance Act would help fix unemployment barriers for formerly incarcerated people and bring America closer to truly being a land of opportunity for all. It would ban the Federal Government—including the executive, legislative, and judicial branches—from requesting criminal history information from applicants until they reach the conditional offer stage. This bill strikes the right balance. It would allow qualified people with criminal records to get their foot in the door and be judged on their own merit. At the same time, the legislation would allow employers to know an individual’s criminal history before the job applicant is hired.

This bill would also prohibit Federal contractors from requesting criminal history information from candidates for positions within the scope of Federal contracts until the conditional offer stage. Companies that do business with the Federal Government and receive Federal funds should espouse good hiring practices. The Fair Chance Act would permit Federal contractors to inquire about criminal history earlier in the application process if a candidate would have access to classified information.

The legislation includes important exceptions for sensitive positions where criminal history inquiries are necessary earlier in the application process. Exceptions are included for positions involving classified information, sensitive national security duties, armed forces, and law enforcement jobs, and for when criminal history information for a job is legally required prior to a conditional offer.

Finally, this bill would require the Department of Labor, U.S. Census Bureau, and Bureau of Justice Statistics to issue a report on the employment statistics of formerly incarcerated individuals. Currently, no comprehensive tracking of data on the employment histories of people with convictions exists. This provision would change that and allow us to better understand the scope of the problem people with convictions face when trying to find a job.

Many of the reforms in this bill have been urged for years. In 2011, then-At-

torney General Eric Holder called for making the Federal Government a model employer. And the White House’s My Brother Keeper’s Initiative has endorsed fair chance reforms. Earlier this year, I was proud to join 26 other Senators in a letter to the President urging an executive order that would ban Federal contractors from asking job applicants about their criminal histories. But more must be done.

States and localities have led the way on providing people with convictions meaningful job opportunities, and the Federal Government must catch up. So far 18 States, including Georgia and Nebraska, and over 100 cities and counties have taken steps to prohibit government agencies from asking job applicants about criminal convictions until later in the process.

Some of the Nation’s largest companies already have fair chance policies. Companies such as Wal-Mart, Target, Starbucks, Koch Industries, Home Depot, and Bed, Bath and Beyond, have reserved the criminal history inquiry until later in the hiring process. These companies know that creating economic opportunity for people with criminal history is not just good policy, it’s good business.

This bipartisan legislation has the support of numerous groups, including the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the National Employment Law Project, the Center for Urban Families, Bend the Arc Jewish Action, and the National Black Prosecutors Association.

We are a nation built on liberty and justice for all. Once a person’s sentence has ended, they should not continue to be forever shackled by their past. That turns the concept of justice upside down. It is contrary to who we are and what we stand for.

President George W. Bush once said that “America is the land of second chance, and when the gates of the prison open, the path ahead should lead to a better life.” But far too often the road back into the community is paved with poverty, hopelessness, and unemployment. When President Obama commuted the offenses of 46 drug offenders earlier this year, he also affirmed that “we have to ensure that as [formerly incarcerated people] do their time and pay back their debt to society, that we are increasing the possibility that they can turn their lives around.”

The ideal that America is a place that values second chances is bipartisan and rooted deeply in our country’s history, and the opportunity to turn one’s life around is a fundamental principle of justice. With the introduction of this important criminal justice reform legislation, we aim to fulfill the promise of our great democracy and

make access to the American Dream real for thousands of Americans who have paid their debts to society.

The Fair Chance Act would give so many Americans a fair chance to obtain Federal jobs or work with Federal contractors. It would improve public safety, boost our economy, and adhere to our shared values of liberty and justice for all. I urge my fellow Senators to join me in supporting this important criminal justice reform bill.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 251—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW PROVISION OF THE IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT REVIEW ACT OF 2015 DOES NOT APPLY TO THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, BECAUSE THE PRESIDENT FAILED TO TRANSMIT THE ENTIRE AGREEMENT AS REQUIRED BY SUCH ACT, AND THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION WOULD ONLY PREEMPT EXISTING IRAN SANCTIONS LAWS AS “THE SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND” IF RATIFIED BY THE SENATE AS A TREATY WITH THE CONCURRENCE OF TWO THIRDS OF THE SENATORS PRESENT PURSUANT TO ARTICLE II, SECTION 2, CLAUSE 2, OF THE CONSTITUTION OR IF CONGRESS WERE TO ENACT NEW IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION THAT SUPERSEDES THE MANDATORY STATUTORY SANCTIONS THAT THE JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION ANNOUNCED ON JULY 14, 2015, PURPORTS TO SUPERSEDE

Mr. JOHNSON (for himself, Mr. TOOMEY, and Mr. LEE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 251

Whereas the United States Government has enacted and enforced multiple statutes and regulations that impose comprehensive sanctions on Iran and on companies and individuals doing business with Iran;

Whereas Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that the President “shall have Power, by and with the Advice and Consent of the Senate, to make Treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur”;

Whereas Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution provides that “This Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land”;

Whereas, on April 28, 2015, 39 Senators voted for Senate Amendment 1150, the purpose of which was “To declare that any agreement reached by the President relating

to the nuclear program of Iran is deemed a treaty that is subject to the advice and consent of the Senate”;

Whereas, according to subsection (a)(1) of section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law as Public Law 114-17 on May 22, 2015, “[n]ot later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran, the President shall transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership the agreement, as defined in subsection (h)(1), including all related materials and annexes”;

Whereas subsection (h)(1) of such section 135 defines the “agreement” that the President “shall” transmit to Congress not later than 5 calendar days after reaching an agreement with Iran to include all “annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future”;

Whereas such section 135 further provides that a 60-day congressional review period will commence upon the President’s transmittal of the agreement, including all annexes, appendices, codicils, side agreements, implementing materials, documents, and guidance, technical or other understandings, and any related agreements, whether entered into or implemented prior to the agreement or to be entered into or implemented in the future;

Whereas, on July 14, 2015, the Secretary of State announced a multilateral agreement with Iran and six other nations, labeled the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), in Annex II of which the United States purports to agree that “[t]he United States commits to cease the application, and to seek such legislative action as may be appropriate to terminate, or modify to effectuate the termination of, all nuclear-related sanctions as specified in Sections 4.1-4.9 below,” and Sections 4.1-4.9 specifies the following United States statutes: “the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 (ISA), as amended by Section 102 of the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (CISADA) and Sections 201-207 and 311 of the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (TRA); CISADA, as amended by Sections 214-216, 222, 224, 311-312, 402-403, and 605 of TRA and Section 1249 of the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA); the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (NDAA), as amended by Sections 503-504 of TRA and Section 1250 of IFCA”;

Whereas the United States statutes specified in sections 4.1 through 4.9 of Annex II, of which the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action purports to provide for United States agreement to “cease the application,” may only be superseded by a Senate-ratified treaty or by new legislation;

Whereas the United States statutes and regulations concerning Iran sanctions include section 2 of CISADA, in which Congress made comprehensive findings of fact concerning Iran, which remain true and accurate today, including that “[t]he illicit nuclear activities of the Government of Iran, combined with its development of unconventional weapons and ballistic missiles and its support for international terrorism, represent a threat to the security of the United States, its strong ally Israel, and other allies of the United States around the world”;

Whereas Congress also found in section 2(10) of CISADA that “[e]conomic sanctions imposed pursuant to the provisions of this Act, the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996, as amended by this Act, and the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and other authorities available to the United States to impose economic sanctions to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons, are necessary to protect the essential security interests of the United States”;

Whereas, based on the above and other similar statutory findings since 1979, the United States enacted ISA, CISADA, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), the IFCA, and the TRA, as well as various preceding statutes that each of the named laws amended over time, and, taken as a whole, those Acts of Congress directed and authorized the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, and Energy, and other Federal agencies, to promulgate and enforce implementing regulations, which they have done under the guidance of multiple executive orders and under close congressional oversight;

Whereas the Department of Justice has prosecuted, or entered into non-prosecution agreements with, corporations and individuals for Iran sanctions violations under this body of law;

Whereas existing legislation includes mandatory sanctions that may only be repealed or amended by law, including CISADA section 104, which provides that the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations to prohibit or restrict correspondent accounts for foreign financial institutions that knowingly engage in a prohibited activity, and TRA section 202, which provides that the President shall impose statutorily prescribed sanctions with respect to persons that own, operate, control, or insure vessels used to transport crude oil from Iran to another country;

Whereas the President’s authority to waive statutorily prescribed sanctions is limited, conditional, and circumscribed by law;

Whereas the period of five days for the President to transmit to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran,” as defined in section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, began to run on July 14, 2015, and by July 19, 2015, the President had transmitted to Congress only part of the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” reached five days earlier;

Whereas the Administration publicly acknowledged on July 22, 2015, that at least two side agreements existed that had not yet been provided to Congress, specifically between the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) and Iran, but has steadfastly refused to provide those agreements;

Whereas such section 135 provides that the President “shall” transmit to Congress any agreement with Iran, “including all related materials and annexes,” defined under such section to include “side agreements”—with no statutory exceptions for either secret or unavailable (to the United States) side agreements—within five days of reaching such an agreement; and

Whereas, as a result, the President has never fully transmitted to Congress the “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran” as defined by such section 135, and specifically did not transmit the full agreement within the timeline mandated by law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the congressional review provision under section 135 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2160e), as added by section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015 (Public Law 114-17), does not apply to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action announced on July 14, 2015, because the President failed to comply with the transmission to Congress provisions of such section 135;

(2) because the President did not transmit to Congress “all related materials and annexes” within five days of reaching agreement with Iran, the statutory congressional review provided for in such section 135 did not occur, at least not in the manner envisioned by the members of Congress who voted for Public Law 114-17;

(3) in light of the President’s failure to submit the entire “agreement with Iran relating to the nuclear program of Iran,” including side agreements, to Congress within five days, the congressional review provision of such section 135 by its own terms was not applicable to the partial agreement that the President submitted to Congress, known as the JCPOA, and therefore in order for the substance of what was submitted to Congress to become “the supreme Law of the Land” pursuant to Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution, it would need to be either treated by the Senate as a treaty “provided two thirds of the Senators present concur” pursuant to Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, or Congress would need to enact new implementing legislation that supersedes the mandatory statutory sanctions that the JCPOA purports to supersede;

(4) the Comprehensive Iran Sanctions, Accountability, and Divestment Act of 2010 (CISADA), section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), the Iran Freedom and Counter-Proliferation Act of 2012 (IFCA), and the Iran Threat Reduction and Syria Human Rights Act of 2012 (TRA) remain “the supreme Law of the Land” unless and until a Senate-ratified treaty or duly enacted statute repeals or otherwise supersedes them and becomes “the supreme Law of the Land” pursuant to Article VI, clause 2 of the Constitution; and

(5) the Senate, which has the power to consent to treaties under Article II, section 2, clause 2 of the Constitution, has not and does not consent to the JCPOA, which is therefore not “the supreme Law of the Land,” and the President therefore has a constitutional duty to ensure that the Iran sanctions laws, including CISADA, section 1245 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81), IFCA, and TRA, continue to be faithfully executed.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2649. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2650. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2651. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2652. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2653. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2654. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2655. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2649. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 14 days after enactment.

SA 2650. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "14 days" and insert "13 days".

SA 2651. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 12 days after enactment.

SA 2652. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of deter-

mining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "12 days" and insert "11 days".

SA 2653. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

This Act shall become effective 10 days after enactment.

SA 2654. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "10 days" and insert "9 days".

SA 2655. Mr. REID submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In the amendment, strike "9" and insert "8".

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: Improving Care Through Patient Access to Their Records."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-7675.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions will meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Biosimilar Implementation: A Progress Report from FDA."

For further information regarding this meeting, please contact Jamie Garden of the committee staff on (202) 224-7675.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Jon Greenert, a military fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of this Congress and for the debate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 188, S. 1461.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1461) to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for outpatient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

S. 1461

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF ENFORCEMENT INSTRUCTION ON SUPERVISION REQUIREMENTS FOR OUTPATIENT THERAPEUTIC SERVICES IN CRITICAL ACCESS AND SMALL RURAL HOSPITALS THROUGH 2015.

Section 1 of Public Law 113-198 is amended—
(1) in the section heading, by inserting "AND 2015" after "2014"; and

(2) by striking "calendar year 2014" and inserting "calendar years 2014 and 2015".

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1461), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS, PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE, AND COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY ACT OF 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 190, S. 1629.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1629) to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1629) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1629

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “District of Columbia Courts, Public Defender Service, and Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORITIES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURTS.

(a) **AUTHORIZATION TO COLLECT DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS FROM EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments

“(a) **COLLECTION OF DEBTS AND ERRONEOUS PAYMENTS MADE TO EMPLOYEES.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY TO COLLECT.**—If the Executive Officer determines that an employee or former employee of the District of Columbia Courts is indebted to the District of Columbia Courts because of an erroneous payment made to or on behalf of the employee or former employee, or any other debt, the Executive Officer may collect the amount of the debt in accordance with this subsection.

“(2) **TIMING OF COLLECTION.**—The Executive Officer may collect a debt from an employee under this subsection in monthly installments or at officially established regular pay period intervals, by deduction in reasonable amounts from the current pay of the employee.

“(3) **SOURCE OF DEDUCTIONS.**—The Executive Officer may make a deduction under

paragraph (2) from any wages, salary, compensation, remuneration for services, or other authorized pay, including incentive pay, back pay, and lump sum leave payments, but not including retirement pay.

“(4) **LIMIT ON AMOUNT.**—In making deductions under paragraph (2) with respect to an employee, the Executive Officer—

“(A) except as provided in subparagraph (B), may not deduct more than 20 percent of the disposable pay of the employee for any period; and

“(B) upon consent of the employee, may deduct more than 20 percent of the disposable pay of the employee for any period.

“(5) **COLLECTIONS AFTER EMPLOYMENT.**—If the employment of an employee ends before the Executive Officer completes the collection of the amount of the employee's debt under this subsection, deductions may be made—

“(A) from later non-periodic government payments of any nature due the former employee, except retirement pay; and

“(B) without regard to the limit under paragraph (4)(A).

“(b) **NOTICE AND HEARING REQUIRED.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), prior to initiating any proceeding under subsection (a) to collect any debt from an individual, the Executive Officer shall provide the individual with—

“(A) written notice, not later than 30 days before the date on which the Executive Officer initiates the proceeding, that informs the individual of—

“(i) the nature and amount of the debt determined by the District of Columbia Courts to be due;

“(ii) the intention of the Courts to initiate a proceeding to collect the debt through deductions from pay; and

“(iii) an explanation of the rights of the individual under this section;

“(B) an opportunity to inspect and copy Court records relating to the debt;

“(C) an opportunity to enter into a written agreement with the Courts, under terms agreeable to the Executive Officer, to establish a schedule for the repayment of the debt; and

“(D) an opportunity for a hearing in accordance with paragraph (2) on the determination of the Courts—

“(i) concerning the existence or amount of the debt; and

“(ii) in the case of an individual whose repayment schedule is established other than by a written agreement under subparagraph (C), concerning the terms of the repayment schedule.

“(2) **PROCEDURES FOR HEARINGS.**—

“(A) **AVAILABILITY OF HEARING UPON REQUEST.**—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Executive Officer shall provide a hearing under this paragraph if an individual, not later than 15 days after the date on which the individual receives a notice under paragraph (1)(A), and in accordance with any procedures that the Executive Officer prescribes, files a petition requesting the hearing.

“(B) **BASIS FOR HEARING.**—A hearing under this paragraph shall be on the written submissions unless the hearing officer determines that the existence or amount of the debt—

“(i) turns on an issue of credibility or veracity; or

“(ii) cannot be resolved by a review of the documentary evidence.

“(C) **STAY OF COLLECTION PROCEEDINGS.**—The timely filing of a petition for a hearing under subparagraph (A) shall stay the com-

mencement of collection proceedings under this section.

“(D) **INDEPENDENT OFFICER.**—An independent hearing officer appointed in accordance with regulations promulgated under subsection (e) shall conduct a hearing under this paragraph.

“(E) **DEADLINE FOR DECISION.**—The hearing officer shall issue a final decision regarding the questions covered by the hearing at the earliest practicable date, and not later than 60 days after the date of the hearing.

“(3) **EXCEPTION.**—Paragraphs (1) and (2) shall not apply to a routine intra-Courts adjustment of pay that is attributable to a clerical or administrative error or delay in processing pay documents that occurred within the 4 pay periods preceding the adjustment or to any adjustment that amounts to not more than \$50, if at the time of the adjustment, or as soon thereafter as practical, the Executive Officer provides the individual—

“(A) written notice of the nature and amount of the adjustment; and

“(B) a point of contact for contesting the adjustment.

“(c) **COMPROMISE.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY TO COMPROMISE CLAIMS.**—The Executive Officer may—

“(A) compromise a claim to collect a debt under this section if the amount involved is not more than \$100,000; and

“(B) suspend or end collection action on a claim described in subparagraph (A) if the Executive Officer determines that—

“(i) no person liable on the claim has the present or prospective ability to pay a significant amount of the claim; or

“(ii) the cost of collecting the claim is likely to be more than the amount recovered.

“(2) **EFFECT OF COMPROMISE.**—A compromise under this subsection shall be final and conclusive unless obtained by fraud, misrepresentation, presenting a false claim, or mutual mistake of fact.

“(3) **NO LIABILITY OF OFFICIAL RESPONSIBLE FOR COMPROMISE.**—An accountable official shall not be liable for an amount paid or for the value of property lost or damaged if the amount or value is not recovered because of a compromise under this subsection.

“(d) **WAIVER OF CLAIM.**—

“(1) **AUTHORITY TO WAIVE CLAIMS.**—Upon application from a person liable on a claim to collect a debt under this section, the Executive Officer may, with written justification, waive the claim if collection would be—

“(A) against equity;

“(B) against good conscience; and

“(C) not in the best interests of the District of Columbia Courts.

“(2) **LIMITATIONS ON AUTHORITY.**—The Executive Officer may not waive a claim under this subsection if the Executive Officer—

“(A) determines that there exists, in connection with the claim, an indication of fraud, misrepresentation, fault, or lack of good faith on the part of the employee, the former employee, or any other person that has an interest in obtaining a waiver of the claim; or

“(B) receives the application for waiver later than 3 years after the later of the date on which the erroneous payment was discovered or the date of enactment of this section, unless the claim involves money owed for Federal health benefits, Federal life insurance, or Federal retirement benefits.

“(3) **DENIAL OF APPLICATION FOR WAIVER.**—A decision by the Executive Officer to deny an application for a waiver under this subsection shall be the final administrative decision of the District government.

“(4) REFUND OF AMOUNTS ALREADY COLLECTED AGAINST CLAIM SUBSEQUENTLY WAIVED.—If the Executive Officer waives a claim against an employee or former employee under this section after the District of Columbia Courts have been reimbursed for the claim in whole or in part, the Executive Officer shall provide the employee or former employee a refund of the amount of the reimbursement upon application for the refund, if the Executive Officer receives the application not later than 2 years after the effective date of the waiver.

“(5) EFFECT ON ACCOUNTS OF COURTS.—In the audit and settlement of accounts of any accountable official, full credit shall be given for any amounts with respect to which collection by the District of Columbia Courts is waived under this subsection.

“(6) VALIDITY OF PAYMENTS.—An erroneous payment or debt, the collection of which is waived under this subsection, shall be a valid payment for all purposes.

“(7) NO EFFECT ON OTHER AUTHORITIES.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to affect the authority of the District of Columbia under any other statute to litigate, settle, compromise, or waive any claim of the District of Columbia.

“(e) REGULATIONS.—The authority of the Executive Officer under this section shall be subject to regulations promulgated by the Joint Committee.”.

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“11-1733. Collection, compromise, and waiver of employee debts and erroneous payments.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply with respect to any erroneous payment made or debt incurred before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO PURCHASE UNIFORMS FOR PERSONNEL.—Section 11-1742(b), District of Columbia Official Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “In carrying out the authority under the preceding sentence, the Executive Officer may purchase uniforms to be worn by nonjudicial employees of the District of Columbia Courts whose responsibilities warrant the wearing of uniforms if the cost of furnishing a uniform to an employee during a year does not exceed the amount applicable for the year under section 5901(a)(1) of title 5, United States Code (relating to the uniform allowance for employees of the Government of the United States).”.

SEC. 3. AUTHORITIES OF COURT SERVICES AND OFFENDER SUPERVISION AGENCY.

(a) AUTHORITY TO DEVELOP AND OPERATE PROGRAMMATIC INCENTIVES FOR SENTENCED OFFENDERS.—Section 11233(b)(2)(F) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(2)(F), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “sanctions” and inserting “sanctions and incentives”.

(b) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—Section 11233(b)(3)(A) of the National Capital Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997 (sec. 24-133(b)(3)(A), D.C. Official Code) is amended to read as follows:

“(A) AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT GIFTS.—The Director may accept, solicit, and use on behalf of the Agency any monetary or nonmonetary gift, donation, bequest, or use of facilities, property, or services for the purpose of aiding or facilitating the work of the Agency.”.

(c) PERMANENT AUTHORITY TO ACCEPT AND USE REIMBURSEMENTS FROM DISTRICT GOVERNMENT.—Section 11233(b)(4) of such Act (sec. 24-133(b)(4)) is amended by striking “During fiscal years 2006 through 2008, the Director” and inserting “The Director”.

SEC. 4. AUTHORITIES OF PUBLIC DEFENDER SERVICE.

(a) ACCEPTANCE AND USE OF SERVICES OF VOLUNTEERS.—Section 307(b) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1607(b), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “the Service may accept public grants and private contributions made to assist it” and inserting “the Service may accept and use public grants, private contributions, and voluntary and uncompensated (gratuitous) services to assist it”.

(b) TREATMENT OF MEMBERS OF BOARD OF TRUSTEES AS EMPLOYEES OF SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(d) of the District of Columbia Court Reform and Criminal Procedure Act of 1970 (sec. 2-1603(d), D.C. Official Code) is amended by striking “employees of the District of Columbia” and inserting “employees of the Service”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the District of Columbia Courts and Justice Technical Corrections Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-274; 112 Stat. 2419).

ORDERS FOR FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015, AND TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m. on Friday, September 11, for a pro forma session, with no business conducted; further, that when the Senate adjourns on September 11, it next convene on Tuesday, September 15 at 1 p.m.; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 6 p.m. equally

divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that notwithstanding the provisions of rule XXII, the cloture motions filed during today's session on the McConnell substitute amendment No. 2640 and H.J. Res. 61 ripen at 6 p.m., Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:02 p.m., adjourned until Friday, September 11, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

UNITED NATIONS

CASSANDRA Q. BUTTS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

BARBARA LEE, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, OF NEW JERSEY, TO BE A REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SEVENTIETH SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE TO BE CONSULAR OFFICERS AND SECRETARIES IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

CHRISTOPHER ALEXANDER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FELEKE ASSEFA, OF VIRGINIA

ANDREA BERTON, OF MINNESOTA

HAROLD BRAYMAN, OF VIRGINIA

CLINTON BREWER, OF GEORGIA

JOSHUA BURKE, OF ILLINOIS

MOHMOUD CHIKH-ALI, OF TEXAS

NATHANIEL DONOHUE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

RACHEL DURAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

PHILIP FINIELLO, OF CALIFORNIA

MARIXELL GARCIA, OF FLORIDA

REINALDO GARCIA, OF VIRGINIA

SUSAN HETTLEMAN, OF NEW YORK

RYAN HOLLOWELL, OF NEW JERSEY

CHRISTIAN KOSCHIL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

MONIKA KROL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSHUA LEIBOWITZ, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HECTOR MALDONADO, OF VIRGINIA

CARLA MENENDEZ MC MANUS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SUZANNE PLATT, OF VIRGINIA

DEVIN RAMBO, OF FLORIDA

JANET ROBERTSON, OF CALIFORNIA

LEON SKARSHINSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

JOSHUA STARTUP, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

SHERISSE STEWARD, OF MARYLAND

SHARI STOUT, OF ILLINOIS

SEAN TIMMINS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

TIPTEN TROIDL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING POLISH HERITAGE DAY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to recognize the fourth annual Polish Heritage Day in Michigan City, Indiana. In honor of this special occasion, a commemorative event, the Polish Heritage Festival, will take place on Sunday, September 13, 2015, at the International Friendship Gardens in Michigan City.

During the inaugural festival in 2012, Michigan City Mayor Ron Meer proclaimed the 15th of September as Polish Heritage Day to honor and recognize the contributions made by Polish-American members of the local community.

The Polish Heritage Festival commences with a Polish-English mass in the Symphony Garden. Festivities continue with a performance by Wesoly Lud, a Polish folk dance ensemble, which includes regional costumes made in Poland. Each dance performance by the Chicago troupe incorporates ornate, custom aprons and headdresses for the ladies and embroidered vests and traditional hats for the men. The event also includes savory Polish food from Cavalier Inn of Hammond and Polish baked confectionaries from Bakers Dozen of South Bend.

A special honor, the Polish Ambassador Award, is presented during the festival to bestow recognition and respect on a deserving individual who has acted as an influential promoter of Polish heritage and culture.

For the past three years, the Polish Heritage Festival has applied proceeds from the event to local scholarships and soup kitchens, and also for the restoration of the Polish Garden at the International Friendship Gardens.

The Polish community has had an immense impact on life in Northwest Indiana, through its religious presence, as in the blessing of baskets prior to the Easter holiday and day-long weddings culminating with polka music and large dinners. Traditional Polish cuisine handed down from generation to generation, including pierogi, kielbasa, and paczki, is popular dining fare within the region due to the vast influence of Polish culture throughout Northwest Indiana.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing the fourth annual Polish Heritage Day in Michigan City, Indiana. Members of the Polish community have played an important role in enhancing the quality of life and culture of Northwest Indiana, and for that, they are to be commended.

HONORING RICH SCHLESIGER

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit this statement to honor the memory of Humboldt County Sheriff's Office Corporal Rich Schlesiger, who passed away on September 7, 2015. A native of Humboldt County, California, Mr. Schlesiger began his law enforcement career in the Siskiyou County Sheriff's Office in 1991. He was hired by the Humboldt County Sheriff's Office as a deputy sheriff in 1995 and worked in the Hoopa area for a year before being reassigned to Main Station Patrol Operations in Eureka.

Mr. Schlesiger served as bailiff for Humboldt County Superior Court beginning in 1999, and become a rotational detective in 2001. In 2005, Mr. Schlesiger was promoted to permanent investigator. Between 2005 and 2013 he investigated several high-profile homicide cases which resulted in successful prosecutions.

In 2013, Mr. Schlesiger accepted a position as Eel River deputy, working with the Bear River Band of Rhonerville Rancheria and the community of Loleta, and earned the respect and gratitude of many of the area's citizens. He was promoted to the rank of sheriff's corporal in 2014. Through his career, Mr. Schlesiger also served with distinction as a SWAT team member.

Mr. Schlesiger was forced to retire due to illness on December 30, 2014, and passed away less than a year afterward. His many contributions to law enforcement and public safety will be remembered for years to come. It is with deep respect that we mourn the passing of Mr. Rich Schlesiger and extend condolences to his family. His presence will be sorely missed.

RECOGNIZING THE DENCO AREA 9-1-1 DISTRICT

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Denco Area 9-1-1 District as they celebrate their 25th Anniversary. Previously known as the Denton County Area Emergency Communication District, Denco was authorized by the Texas Legislature, established in Denton County through local election on August 25, 1987 with the strong support of county and local officials, and commenced operation on August 18, 1990.

Denco established the first emergency response telecommunications system with

9-1-1 service for Denton County. This vital organization has provided ground-breaking service for North Texas citizens by delivering efficient and effective response for those caught in emergency situations. They also have provided annual educational programs to 68,000+ school-aged children regarding the proper use of a 9-1-1 call.

As a leader in emergency assistance, Denco is to be commended for their numerous accomplishments and enhancements to their infrastructure and service capability over the years. They were the first district in Texas to provide a 24/7 response program.

I am honored to join Denco in celebrating this important milestone, a significant achievement in their history as well as an event to be noted and appreciated by the communities they serve. As a worthwhile organization committed to ensuring the safety of Denton County residents, I am proud to represent the Denco Area 9-1-1 District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF AIR FORCE SENIOR AIRMAN JACQY RAMSEY

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and thank Jacqy Ramsey, for his service to our nation in the United States Air Force.

Jacqy enlisted in the Air Force in May 1966 and reported for Basic Military Training (BMT) at Lackland AFB, TX. Following BMT, he completed Pneudraulic Repairman Course and was the Honor Graduate of Aircraft Pneudraulic Repair Tech School. In August 1966 he reported to 36th Troop Carrier Squadron (TAC) at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia.

Senior Airman Ramsey distinguished himself amongst his peers as a Pneudraulics Repairman in the 36 TAC. On 13 February 1967, en route to Pope Air Force Base, North Carolina, the C-130 on which Ramsey was a passenger experienced landing gear failure when the left main landing gear failed to extend. All efforts by the flight and maintenance crews failed to extend the landing gear. He discerned the problem, left his seat, and went to the aid of the flight crew. Due to his experience and knowledge of the gear system, he skillfully released the emergency release handle, lowered the landing gear, and locked it in place. His quick thinking and knowledge allowed the aircraft to make a safe landing.

His personal awards include the National Defense Service Medal, Air Force Outstanding Unit Award, and the Air Force Good Conduct Medal. After receiving an Honorable Discharge from the United States Air Force in May 1972,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Senior Airman Ramsey went on to work for IBM for 30 years.

A handyman and inventor, Senior Airman Ramsey built his own home, is skilled in construction, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical work. He also designed and built from scratch a wood boiler system that heats and provides hot water for his home. To fuel it, he built a large wood splitter that can split logs up to 2 feet in diameter. As a grandfather, he taught his grandsons how to work and drive heavy equipment.

Jacqy excelled while in the Air Force as well as during his career at IBM and I am honored to pay tribute to this Veteran. I know that Jacqy's wife, Arlene; his daughters Amy Manuel, 44; Emilee Haskins, 42; Jackie Sherer, 40; and Bridget Sibley, 40; his grandchildren; Miranda Updegraff, 22; Chandler Manuel, 19; Coleman Manuel, 18; Conner Manuel, 16; Cymon Manuel, 13; Merrit Manuel, 10; Nathanael Haskins, 18; Samuel Haskins, 14; Emma Haskins, 12; Meredith Haskins, 11; Eli Haskins, 6; Ben Haskins, 3; Zachary Sherer, 15; Moriah Sherer, 13; Xander Sherer, 9; Logan Sibley, 15; and Raegan Sibley, 4; and great-grandson Emmett Updegraff, 1, are all proud of Jacqy. I am thankful and proud of all of our Veterans like Jacqy who have selflessly given so much in service to our great nation.

RECOGNIZING THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SIGMA NU'S BETA THETA CHAPTER AT AUBURN UNIVERSITY

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I along with my Alabama colleague, Congressman MIKE ROGERS, rise today to recognize the 125th anniversary of the Beta Theta chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity. The Beta Theta chapter is located on-campus at Auburn University in our home state of Alabama.

Sigma Nu Fraternity was founded on January 1, 1869, on the campus of Virginia Military Institute in Lexington, Virginia. The Beta Theta chapter of Sigma Nu was chartered by the High Council on September 18, 1890, and is the 27th charter granted by the High Council. The chapter has been continuously operating on Auburn's campus since that day.

For the last 125 years, members of Auburn's Sigma Nu fraternity have made a lasting impact on their city, state, and country. Sigma Nu members have served in our nation's military to protect freedom at home and abroad in every war since 1890. Members of the fraternity have been leaders in business, medicine, law, politics, and community service.

The Knights of Sigma Nu Fraternity at Auburn have also made a lasting impact on their campus. From community service to leadership roles in student organizations, Sigma Nu has contributed to the betterment and well-being of Auburn University.

Most importantly, the men of the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Nu have a proud history of upholding their guiding ethical values of love, honor, and truth over the last 125 years.

So Mr. Speaker, Congressman ROGERS and I are proud to recognize the Beta Theta Chapter of Sigma Nu Fraternity, and we look forward to their continued positive impact at Auburn University and throughout our great nation.

RECOGNIZING JIM A. COFFEY

HON. MICHAEL C. BURGESS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jim A. Coffey who is retiring after 30+ years of dedicated public service with the University of North Texas Police Department. Promoted to captain in 2007, Coffey has served within the UNT Police Department in multiple capacities. He is recognized as a consummate law enforcement professional, an event management expert, a public speaker regarding crime prevention and esteemed mentor to aspiring police officers. Coffey is an integral part of the university community and widely known by students and professors for his passion and dedication for his job.

As an alumnus of UNT, Coffey has come full circle, beginning his tenure as a part-time student and transitioning into a full-time staff member in the police department. As he progressed through the ranks from Communications Officer to Support Service Division Captain, he made a positive impact on his colleagues and will leave a lasting legacy on the UNT campus. His résumé boasts numerous awards, honors and positions of leadership, including UNT Police Department Certificate of Merit, UNT Staff Council Chair, Leadership Denton graduate, Officer of the Year in 1988, and Excellence in Public Service Award in 2003.

I and my staff appreciate the assistance and support we have received from Captain Coffey over many years of working with UNT. I am honored to represent him in the U.S. House of Representatives, and I gladly join the UNT administration, faculty and his police department colleagues in celebrating Captain Jim Coffey's excellent service and wishing him well in his future endeavors.

HONORING JEFF PATTISON ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE BUDGET ASSISTANT AT THE NH STATE HOUSE

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Jeff Pattison on his retirement after 32 years in the Office of the Legislative Budget Assistant at the New Hampshire State House, and thank him for the outstanding work he did during his career.

Mr. Pattison's continuous progression within the Legislative Budget Assistant's Office during his time as a public servant exemplifies his

intelligence, positive attitude, and commitment to providing lawmakers with the necessary resources for crafting a budget. The hours he spent volunteering his time as a member of the Laconia Parks and Recreation Commission have also been invaluable, and his leadership will be sorely missed within the Laconia community.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Mr. Pattison on his retirement, and wish him the best on all future endeavors.

RECOGNIZING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF SACRED HEART HOSPITAL IN PENSACOLA, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 100th anniversary of Sacred Heart Hospital in Pensacola, Florida. For a century, the dedicated doctors, nurses, health care professionals, and staff of Sacred Heart have provided world-class services to residents of Northwest Florida, saving countless lives and serving as an integral part of the Northwest Florida community.

Sacred Heart Hospital, which opened its doors on August 31, 1915, is rooted in its founding as a partnership between local citizens and the Daughters of Charity. Its original mission to provide compassionate care to all in the community continues to serve as the hallmark of its success. In the hospital's first location, on Twelfth Avenue, a group of dedicated professionals staffed a 125-bed facility. Despite facing myriad challenges—ranging from hurricanes, a flu epidemic, the Great Depression, and both World Wars—Sacred Heart never wavered in its commitment to excellence, providing unparalleled care to Northwest Florida residents. During the Great Depression, the hospital often served patients who had no other means to cover medical services, and Sacred Heart's school of nursing, located next door to the original facility, trained more than 700 nurses to help serve the community.

In the 1960s, when a growing community brought increased need for expanded health care services, Sacred Heart was there to answer the call. After assiduous planning, Sacred Heart moved to its current location on Ninth Avenue on March 13, 1965. In addition to expanding the hospital's overall capacity, Sacred Heart also built a series of units to provide specialized care to the community. Shortly after opening its new facility, Sacred Heart Children's Hospital was established in 1969, serving as the sole facility in Northwest Florida wholly dedicated to the treatment of infants and children. That same year, the hospital opened a coronary care unit, carrying out its first open heart surgery in 1972, and in the 1980s the hospital expanded further, opening a pediatric intensive care unit, family care centers, the Sacred Heart Surgical Center, and the Ann L. Baroco Center for Breast Health. In subsequent years, the hospital continued to grow, adding a new MRI facility, heart-catheterization facility, outpatient diagnostic center,

outpatient surgery facilities, and the James H. Baroco Cancer Care Center, as well as the new Children's Hospital, Women's Hospital, Regional Heart and Vascular Institute, the Nemours Children's Clinic, and the Sacred Heart Cancer Clinic.

To help mark the growth of the hospital, from its humble beginnings to a truly regional network, the hospital officially renamed itself Sacred Heart Health System in 1996. This change accurately reflects the care that Sacred Heart provides throughout both Northwest Florida and South Alabama. Today, Sacred Heart's health network provides care at all stages of life—from award-winning pediatric services to care at the Haven of Our Lady of Peace nursing home—across eight Gulf Coast counties. Sacred Heart's Pensacola location has continued to grow, most recently adding the Bayou Tower in 2014 to expand the hospital's capacity in Pensacola to 566 beds. In addition, Sacred Heart further expanded to meet the health care needs of Okaloosa and Walton Counties by constructing Sacred Heart on the Emerald Coast—a 58-bed hospital in Destin, Florida—as well as Sacred Heart Hospital on the Gulf—a 19-bed community hospital in Gulf County, in Port St. Joe, Florida. Today, a century after its founding, Sacred Heart has 78 facilities serving hundreds of thousands of residents along 350 miles of the Gulf Coast.

While Sacred Heart Hospital and the community it serves have grown exponentially since it first opened its doors, Sacred Heart's dedication to its patients and commitment to compassionate care have never wavered. Sacred Heart's tremendous success is a testament to the thousands of individuals that have worked tirelessly over the last 100 years to serve Northwest Florida.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize and celebrate the Centennial Anniversary of Sacred Heart Hospital. My wife Vicki and I congratulate all those who have worked at Sacred Heart over the course of its history, and wish Sacred Heart all the best as it continues to serve the Gulf Coast community for the next 100 years and beyond.

HONORING THE LIFE OF MRS.
JUDY KERN FAZIO

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise with my Colleagues, Congressman PETE AGUILAR, Congresswoman KAREN BASS, Congressman XAVIER BECERRA, Congressman AMI BERA, Congresswoman JULIA BROWNLEY, Congressman KEN CALVERT, Congresswoman LOIS CAPPES, Congressman TONY CÁRDENAS, Congresswoman JUDY CHU, Congressman PAUL COOK, Congressman JIM COSTA, Congresswoman SUSAN DAVIS, Congressman JEFF DENHAM, Congressman MARK DESAULNIER, Congresswoman ANNA ESHOO, Congressman SAM FARR, Congressman JOHN GARAMENDI, Congresswoman JANICE HAHN, Congressman MIKE HONDA, Congressman JARED HUFFMAN,

Congressman DUNCAN HUNTER, Congressman DARRELL ISSA, Congressman STEVE KNIGHT, Congressman DOUG LAMALFA, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, Congressman TED LIEU, Congressman ALAN LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman DORIS MATSUI, Congressman KEVIN MCCARTHY, Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK, Congressman JERRY MCNERNEY, Congresswoman GRACE NAPOLITANO, Congressman DEVIN NUNES, Congresswoman NANCY PELOSI, Congressman SCOTT PETERS, Congressman DANA ROHRBACHER, Congresswoman LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, Congressman ED ROYCE, Congressman RAUL RUIZ, Congresswoman LINDA SANCHEZ, Congresswoman LORETTA SÁNCHEZ, Congressman ADAM SCHIFF, Congressman BRAD SHERMAN, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER, Congressman ERIC SWALWELL, Congressman MARK TAKANO, Congressman MIKE THOMPSON, Congresswoman NORMA TORRES, Congressman DAVID VALADAO, Congressman JUAN VARGAS, Congresswoman MIMI WALTERS, and Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, to honor the life of Mrs. Judy Kern Fazio, the wife of former Congressman Vic Fazio, who passed on August 7, 2015. Judy was a very strong woman who managed the home and a career while working in various positions in Washington, DC. We honor Judy's legacy of working in Democratic politics, being a devoted mother, and wife who supported her husband's political pursuits.

A 32-year resident of Arlington, VA, Judy was born November 13, 1943, in St. Louis, MO. The daughter of Mable and Jacob Neidhardt, she moved from Missouri to California as a young girl, and graduated from Sacramento City College. She became active in local Democratic politics, volunteering for Phil Isenberg's Sacramento mayoral race, George McGovern's presidential campaign and eventually, Vic Fazio's State Assembly run where the two first met. They were married in 1983.

Judy went on to work in the California district office for her husband before moving to Washington, DC. She remained active in national politics, working in development and fundraising for the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the Center for National Policy. Before her retirement in 1998, she worked for Arter & Hadden, a Cleveland-based law firm with offices in Washington.

A devoted wife, mother, and grandmother, Judy was also a world traveler and a voracious reader. A consummate hostess, an invitation to the Fazio home meant a great meal, a beautiful home, and a lively conversation. She managed the home and a career, becoming a self-taught gourmet cook while working various positions in Washington, DC.

She is survived by her husband Vic, her children Kevin and Kristie; her stepdaughter Dana; three granddaughters, Kendra Kern, Karly Kern, and Keira Jeske, and her sister Carol Davidson. She was preceded in death by stepdaughter Anne Noel Fazio.

Today, The California Congressional Delegation salutes and honors the extraordinary life of Mrs. Judy Kern Fazio. We join all of Judy's loved ones in celebrating her incredible life. She will be deeply missed.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO PAUL
GOLDENBERG

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Paul I. Goldenberg of La Habra, California, a kind, generous and highly respected man who was a pioneer in the field of television sales and marketing.

The son of Jewish immigrants from Russia and Austria, Paul was born in Los Angeles, California on April 22, 1928. After his graduation from Dorsey High School, Paul began his university studies at the University of California, Los Angeles at the young age of 16, but after two weeks, he decided that college was not for him, and dropped out. After serving in the United States Army as a photographer, he enrolled in a television repair course. In 1952, Paul borrowed \$1000 from a relative to open his very own TV repair shop on the corner of Hollywood Boulevard and Vermont Avenue in Los Angeles.

Mr. Goldenberg expanded his business in 1960 when he opened a store in La Habra, California, selling TVs and other household appliances. Throughout the decades, Paul turned his humble store into the largest single store television retailer in the United States. Through his vision of the future role that television would play, Paul invested heavily into large projection TVs and home video players. It was not long before he became known as the self-proclaimed champion of big screen TV sales, "The King of the Big Screen." Paul was a skilled salesman and marketer who had genuine concern for his customers, and he enjoyed resolving customers' issues, and ensuring that his employees provided top notch customer service.

A generous man, Paul was proud of his philanthropic endeavors, and after his retirement, he dedicated himself even more to his charitable efforts. During his lifetime, he gave over \$20 million to over 173 non-profit and charitable organizations, including the Los Angeles Jewish Home for the Aging, the CHP 11-99 Foundation, and the City of Hope, a comprehensive cancer center in Duarte. Paul awarded college scholarships to Sonora High School students in La Habra and funded annual educational trips to Washington, DC for students at his alma mater, Dorsey High School. Described as a rescuer and a practical psychologist, Paul often lent support and advice to family and friends during their times of tribulation and crisis. A classic film lover since his childhood, he had a great sense of humor, and was an avid storyteller.

Paul passed away on August 13, 2015. He is survived by his son, Douglas Goldenberg, and a granddaughter, Lucy Goldenberg. I ask all members to join me in remembering Paul I. Goldenberg, a captain of his industry, and a man of great virtue and generosity.

RECOGNIZING THE MARSHALL
FAMILY AS THE 2015 OKALOOSA
COUNTY FLORIDA, OUTSTANDING
FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Marshall Family from Baker, Florida, for being selected as the 2015 Okaloosa County, Florida, Outstanding Farm Family of the Year.

Marshall Farms has been a family affair for four generations, and their immense contribution to the Okaloosa County agricultural community is evidenced by their selection as the Outstanding Farm Family of the Year—the second time the family has received this honor. Today, the family's Row-Crop farm, led by James and his son, Nick, covers over 2400 acres and consists of cotton, peanuts, and corn. As leaders in the community in the use of advanced technology, the Marshall family understands the importance of time and efficiency and was among the first to use Precision Agriculture to sample, fertilize, and lime, as well as new Grid Soil Sampling and GPS-guided planting. Though always working to grow their farming operations, the Marshall family also understands the importance of community involvement, as demonstrated by its constant willingness to work with the Extension and Okaloosa County Farm Bureau, sharing agricultural techniques, and providing tours and agricultural awareness days.

The family's involvement in their local community is not limited to their work on their farm. James and Nick support the community through their service to myriad agricultural organizations. James served on the Farm Service Agency (FSA) Committee for 13 years and as past president of committee and past director on the Farm Credit Board. Nick is the current Vice President of the Florida Peanut Producers Association, member of the Okaloosa County Farm Bureau Board, and was a past board member of the Okaloosa County FSA Committee. Nick and his family also are active members of Crosspoint Methodist Church.

Together, James, his wife of 36 years Helen, Nick, and his wife of 6 years Maryann, are pillars of our agriculture community. Nick hopes one day to pass the values instilled in him to his two children, Landon and Emery.

Mr. Speaker, Northwest Florida and our Nation share a proud agricultural tradition built by the hard work of farmers and their families. The Okaloosa County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Marshall's tireless work and their dedication to family and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Marshall family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PORTO
FAMILY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Porto family of Burbank, California, who are being recognized by the Glendale Memorial Hospital Foundation for their contributions to the Dignity Health Glendale Memorial Hospital.

The success of the Porto family stems from humble beginnings in Manzanillo, Cuba. After Fidel Castro's violent revolution erupted in Cuba in the 1950s, Raul Sr. and his wife, Rosa requested permission to leave the country. As they waited for their response, however, Raul Porto Sr. was fired from his job and sentenced to compulsory manual labor. Rosa Porto was also let go from her job, forcing her to find a new way to support herself and their three children; Betty, Raul Jr., and Margarita. Rosa, a talented baker, responded to the challenges facing her by refining her recipes and selling her cakes to friends and neighbors in Cuba, establishing a devoted client base. The Porto family's request to leave the country was eventually approved, and they entered the United States in the early 1960s.

When they stepped off the plane in America, the Portos had next to nothing except their solid work ethic, Rosa's extraordinary baking skills and the hope for a better life. Rosa's reputation as a skilled baker had preceded her and she found her first customer at the airport. While Raul Sr. found work as a mechanic, Rosa baked and sold cakes from their home, until their home could no longer accommodate the demand, and they opened a bakery in the Echo Park area of Los Angeles that quickly flourished. After diligently working two jobs, Raul Sr. joined Rosa at the bakery fulltime. As they were growing up, their three children had learned the business and upon their college graduations, each took on a more specific role—Raul Jr. managing financing and new product development, Betty co-managing the business with her father, and Margarita joining her mother in the cake decorating area.

As the years went on, their business grew in size and menu items, and they now have three branches in the Los Angeles area. With plans to open additional branches throughout Southern California, Porto's Bakery will continue to be family-owned and operated while maintaining the high quality their customers expect, following Rosa's motto, "quality is the number one ingredient."

Porto's Bakery has contributed to the development of the local economy by creating hundreds of local jobs and serving thousands of consumers, and has been generous in giving back to their community by supporting many worthwhile organizations including the Glendale Memorial Hospital Foundation, American Red Cross, Los Angeles Mission College and Union Rescue Mission. The Porto family's success is a clear demonstration that the American Dream is attainable for all.

I hereby ask all Members of Congress to join me in honoring the Porto family for their dedicated service to the community.

IN MEMORIAM OF DANA MAGNESS
CLEMONS

HON. JOHN RATCLIFFE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Speaker, I submit this memorial to honor Dana Denise Magness Clemons, a dedicated and outstanding citizen of Fannin County, Texas, who passed away on April 26, 2015 at the too young age of 37 after bravely battling pancreatic cancer. Although her life was tragically shortened, Dana profoundly impacted so many youth in her community. She committed her career to protecting and serving those who were less fortunate, and she left a legacy of caring and love for the lives she touched.

Dana was born in Sherman, TX on August 10, 1977 to Jerry and Brenda (Brown) Magness. She was a member of the Class of 1995 Sam Rayburn High School and graduated with a degree in Criminal Justice and Sociology from Southeastern Oklahoma State University. Dana married Kevin Clemons on September 12, 2003 in Telephone, TX, and she is the mother of Destynie and Kyler Clemons.

Dana dedicated her enormous energies and talents to helping those in her family and her community. She was a staunch advocate for children in need, and she protected our society's most vulnerable citizens throughout her 12 years of employment with Child Protective Services, Children's Medicaid, and Temporary Aid for Needy Family programs in the State of Texas. While Dana logged many hours investigating reports of abuse or neglect, she encountered dangerous situations. Despite personal risk, she put children's safety and well-being as a top priority. She was honored to receive the Fannin County Children's Advocacy Center's "Team Member of the Year" for her work, a prestigious and well-deserved award.

In December 2013, she joined Adult Probation Services which she felt was her true calling. Due to her illness, she was unable to fully complete her career goals. However, she had a strong impact on those she served.

In addition, Dana had a true giving spirit. If she noticed a special need for a child, she would purchase equipment or shoes so the child could participate in sports or other activities. Many children were benefactors of her anonymous generosity.

Her most important role was that of mother to her two children, Destynie and Kyler. Dana was a wonderful mother who instilled values, virtue, respect and old fashioned manners. Most of all, she taught her children to pray and to trust in God. During her journey with cancer, she modeled how to meet challenges head on, with courage and strong faith.

Dana's heritage includes a family of community servants. While serving with the Texas Farm Bureau, her grandfather, Royce Magness, spent many hours in Washington, DC advocating for American farmers. Dana's father, Jerry Magness, and uncle, David Magness, are County Commissioners in the Great State of Texas. Her mother, Brenda Magness, and grandfather jointly dedicated more than 60 years of service to our Great Nation's Veterans.

So I ask my colleagues to join me today in celebrating the life of Dana Denise Magness Clemons. She left a strong legacy of service and dedication to those in need, and she modeled how to face challenges with courage and faith. God bless her children and her family, and I know her spirit will live on through them.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF AKRON CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

HON. MARCIA L. FUDGE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to congratulate Akron Children's Hospital for 125 years of incredible service to the children, their families, and the communities of Northeast Ohio. Akron Children's has grown from a volunteer nursery begun by a handful of resourceful women into the largest pediatric healthcare system in Northeast Ohio, caring for almost 800,000 patients and families each year.

Thank you to President Bill Considine for more than 35 years of service. President Considine has led Akron Children's through a period of great growth, expanding the hospital's service to twenty-seven Ohio counties.

We live in an interesting and exciting time for health care. Millions of Americans gained access to affordable health insurance during the last year. Yet, although Northeast Ohio is home to some of the best health care systems in the country, if not the world, on this day of celebration we must renew our focus on the most vulnerable among us, our children.

From its humble beginnings as Akron's Day Nursery to its newly constructed critical care tower, Akron Children's Hospital has served Northeast Ohio with the highest standards, earning the distinction of Best Children's Hospital in seven of ten specialties for 2015 by U.S. News and World Report. The Hospital is a pillar in the community, offering more than 100 advocacy, education and outreach programs to strengthen the health and well-being of our children. The recently completed Kay Jewelers Pavilion, which houses a new neonatal intensive care unit, emergency department, outpatient surgery center and special delivery area, increases Akron Children's capacity to provide world-class care and furthers its commitment to the City of Akron and the region.

As Ohio continues to address the unacceptable growth in health disparities across ethnic and racial groups, including the unacceptable infant mortality rate, I look forward to working with Akron Children's Hospital in the years to come.

A TRIBUTE TO NEIGHBORHOOD LEGAL SERVICES OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM B. SCHIFF

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County upon its 50th Anniversary.

Since its inception in 1965, Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County (NLSLA) has provided much-needed free assistance to impoverished individuals throughout the Los Angeles area. Serving more than 100,000 people annually, NLSLA focuses on four key issues: housing, health, equal access to justice, and economic security. The firm encourages a holistic approach, working with attorneys, doctors, and other specialists throughout the Los Angeles area to address those issues that disproportionately affect the poor.

In addition to its standard services, NLSLA's practice areas are sustained by a series of special projects. These projects include the Shriver Housing Project—Los Angeles, The Wellness Center at Historic General Hospital, Kamenir Health Advocacy Fund, Self-Help Centers, Medical Legal Community Partnerships, and the Dickran Tevzian Fellowship Program. Many of these programs have received national recognition.

Under the exceptional leadership of longtime Executive Director Neal Dudovitz and his dedicated staff, NLSLA has become one of the most respected public interest law advocacy groups in California. The organization has made incredible strides towards lessening the consequences of poverty in Los Angeles' low-income communities, both through systemic policy changes and through working with individuals.

Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County has spent the past 50 years advocating for those whose voices may otherwise be lost in the legal system. I ask all members to join me in congratulating Neighborhood Legal Services of Los Angeles County upon its 50th anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. HELEN SULLIVAN

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mrs. Helen Sullivan on being recognized as Agriculturist of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

In an effort to celebrate the agriculture industry that dominates the Central Valley and recognize individuals and organizations within the industry that truly make a difference, the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce hosts a Salute to Agriculture Banquet each year. On September 11, 2015, the Chamber will host its 21st Annual Salute to Agriculture.

Mrs. Sullivan, whose relatives immigrated to the United States from Portugal and Croatia, was born on October 3, 1950 in Hanford, California. Born and raised on a family farm in Hanford, Mrs. Sullivan took over the family business in 1982 with her husband, Patrick. Over the years, Mrs. Sullivan has farmed multiple crops, including cotton, tomatoes, almonds, and walnuts.

In addition to running her farm, Mrs. Sullivan serves as the Board Director for the Kings County Farm Bureau, sits on the board for the Participatory Learning on Agriculture and Nutrition through Technology (PLANT) Foundation, and participates in Citizens for California High Speed Rail Accountability (CCHSRA) and the Burris Park Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Mrs. Helen Sullivan on being honored as Agriculturist of the Year.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE RESPECT FOR NATIVE AMERICANS IN PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Respect for Native Americans in Professional Sports Act of 2015, a bill that would prohibit professional sports leagues that promote or allow a member club or franchise connected with that league to promote the use of the term "Redskins" from receiving an exemption from federal antitrust laws. The name has already been found to be disparaging by the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with its use by the National Football League's (NFL) Washington football team.

On June 18, 2014, the United States Patent and Trademark Office, in a landmark decision (*Blackhorse v. Pro Football, Inc.*), found the name used by the Washington football team to be disparaging to Native Americans and not deserving of trademark protection, and canceled federal trademark protection for the "Redskins" name. This decision was most recently affirmed by a federal district court in July 2015.

The NFL is the nation's largest sports league, generating almost \$10 billion annually. Under current federal law, the NFL is able to negotiate broadcast rights for the entire league instead of separately for each individual team without running afoul of federal antitrust laws. This exemption is a great benefit for smaller market teams, which would otherwise be unable to convince major networks to pay for or broadcast those games nationally and would significantly reduce revenue for these teams. My bill would deny this benefit to the NFL, and any professional sports league that uses the slur "redskins" as a team name or a promotional tool.

Federal antitrust laws should no longer offer substantial benefits to multibillion dollar leagues that profit from a name that has been

officially found to be a racial slur, and is degrading to many Americans. This bill would revoke all federal antitrust exemptions for professional sports leagues that choose to continue to use the offensive and derogatory term "Redskins."

Over 300 tribes and two million Native Americans, as well as religious and human rights organizations, have called on NFL Commissioner Roger Goodell and Daniel Snyder, the Washington football team owner, to change the team's name because it is an insult to indigenous people. In addition, several media outlets around the country no longer print or use the term "Redskins" when referring to the Washington football team because the term is offensive.

I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation.

CONGRESSIONAL MEMORIAL TRIBUTE FOR COL. JAMES LOFTUS FOWLER, USMC OF ALEXANDRIA, VA

HON. WALTER B. JONES

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Marine Colonel James Loftus Fowler, known as father of the Marine Corps Marathon who died on January 20, 2015, at the age of 84.

On September 14, 2015, the Marine Corps Marathon building, located on Marine Corps Base Quantico, VA, will be named Fowler Hall in recognition of the Marine whose "one big idea" helped make "The People's Marathon" an enduring event hosted annually in our nation's capital.

It was in October of 1975 that Colonel Fowler and his superior, Marine General James Ryan, received approval to establish the Marine Corps Reserve Marathon to promote physical fitness and showcase the organizational skills of the U.S. Marine Corps while generating community goodwill.

They intended the Marine Corps Marathon would not only provide an opportunity for runners to qualify for the time-honored event in Boston, but that the Marine Corps Marathon could, over time, improve on the public's perception of military members following the Vietnam War.

While initially under command of the Marine Corps Reserve, the Marathon was reauthorized under the Active Duty Marine Corps in 1978, as it officially became the Marine Corps Marathon. With just under 2,000 runners completing the Marathon during the first two years, the Marine Corps Marathon grew to encompass thousands more runners from across the globe. Each October, Marines and Sailors do us proud by joining together to coordinate the MCM, which has expanded to include a full weekend of events.

Today, the Marine Corps Marathon registers 30,000 participants and is recognized as one of the largest and most-organized marathons in the world.

"I could not have predicted that 30,000 would be running the race," Colonel Fowler

said as he saw the event grow. "I wanted a safe race and one where no one would get lost. There were enough problems to handle. You don't foresee all of the problems but you deal with them the best you can. I think it's been good for the Marine Corps and the participants."

Fowler also believed the Marine Corps should not present prize money "because that changes the nature of the race."

"As Marine Corps Marathon founder, Colonel Fowler will be remembered for his powerful impact and for initiating the unique partnership between the U.S. Marine Corps, the running community and the public at large," said MCM Director Rick Neal.

On Sunday, October 25, the Marine Corps Marathon will celebrate its 40th anniversary in Arlington, VA, and our nation's capital with thousands lining the streets to cheer the participants.

Runners and spectators alike will attend the event to also honor our men and women in uniform both past and present who defend our nation's freedoms.

While "The People's Marathon" will continue to spark personal dedication, patriotism and enthusiasm of its participants for many years to come, the Marine Corps Marathon will continue to echo Colonel Fowler's intent to encourage physical fitness, showcase the United States Marine Corps and generate community spirit throughout this great nation.

IN RECOGNITION OF KAHN, SOARES, AND CONWAY, LLP

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP (KSC) on being recognized as Ag Supporter of the Year by the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce.

In an effort to celebrate the agriculture industry that dominates the Central Valley and recognize individuals and organizations within the industry that truly make a difference, the Lemoore Chamber of Commerce hosts a Salute to Agriculture Banquet each year. On September 11, 2015, the Chamber will host its 21st Annual Salute to Agriculture.

Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP was established 35 three years ago in an effort to provide the agriculture industry with more effective legal representation. The firm, which is based in Hanford, California, is well-known for its work with agriculture-related cases, environmental and water law, labor relations, and legislative representation.

Agriculture is the lifeblood of the Central Valley and the community is very fortunate to have a legal firm with such expertise and dedication at their disposal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Kahn, Soares, and Conway, LLP for their service to the agriculture industry and congratulating them on being honored as Ag Supporter of the Year.

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDRED FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PARIS INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the one hundred fiftieth anniversary of the Paris Independent Schools in Paris, Kentucky. On September 1, 1865, the Paris City Schools opened its doors in the old Bourbon Academy Building, which had been used as a hospital by the Union Army in the Civil War. The first superintendent was Professor Julius Herrick. Records indicate that in 1875 total enrollment was 225 students.

Over the last one hundred and fifty years, the school system has grown in numbers of students, added facilities, organized a Parent Teacher Organization, added libraries, and made numerous educational advancements. Many prominent educators have devoted their careers to educating the children of Paris, Kentucky. A few of the more well-remembered names include Sarah Blanding, who later became dean at the University of Kentucky and Cornell University and President of Vassar College. Blanton Collier taught and coached football and basketball at Paris High School for sixteen years before serving in World War II, becoming head football coach at the University of Kentucky and the Cleveland Browns, and being named as All American coach. Harry Lancaster was an assistant coach at Paris High School before he became an assistant basketball coach at the University of Kentucky under Coach Adolph Rupp, head baseball coach, and athletic director. These are just three of the hundreds of outstanding teachers that have taught the students of Paris.

Paris Independent Schools have been known over the years for high academic achievement, strong music programs, and great athletic teams. They provide well rounded educational opportunities for all students. A strong education is vital in opening doors to young people and providing them hope for a good life. For one hundred and fifty years, Paris Independent Schools have focused on excellence in education. I am honored to commemorate their 150th anniversary and wish them all the best in the future.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF GEISINGER HEALTH SYSTEM

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Geisinger Health System as it celebrates the 100th anniversary of its establishment. Geisinger Health System is an integrated health services organization within my congressional district that is widely admired for

its development of innovative care models and its advances in the use of electronic health records and telemedicine.

Over a century ago, Abigail Geisinger, the organization's founder, made the intentions for her namesake quite clear when she said, "Make my hospital right; make it the best." The fact that the first Geisinger Medical Center opened earlier than expected in order to serve its community in the wake of a typhoid emergency in 1915 is indicative of the very organization Ms. Geisinger envisioned, and that legacy continues to this day.

Due to the dedicated commitment of its employees, the health system has grown from the original medical center in Danville into a physician-led, integrated health services organization that is respected both nationally and worldwide. In fact, Geisinger serves more than 2.6 million residents throughout 44 counties in central, south-central, and northeast Pennsylvania—many of whom live in rural, medically underserved areas.

Comprised of approximately 23,500 employees, a 1,200 member multi-specialty group practice, hospitals, research centers, an alcohol and chemical dependency treatment center, and a health plan, Geisinger provides the Commonwealth with a patient care mission that is second to none. Furthermore, the health system leverages an estimated \$8.9 billion annually, revenue that has positively impacted Pennsylvania's economy, and remains integral to statewide development.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to join Geisinger Health System in commemorating its 100th anniversary, and remain eternally grateful for the many services the organization provides to my constituents. I wish the organization many more successful years to come.

HONORING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE EAST BAY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the 25th anniversary of the East Bay Economic Development Alliance, also known as the East Bay EDA. On October 15, 2015, East Bay EDA will celebrate its many achievements and partnerships that have helped advance the economic vitality of the Bay Area's East Bay region.

East Bay EDA is a cross-sector partnership guided by the expertise, resources, and passion of its public, private, and non-profit leaders, who are focused on regional, sustainable solutions to attract, retain, and grow businesses in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties. Founded in 1990 after a thoughtful and strategic process to create a collaborative approach to economic development opportunities and challenges, East Bay EDA continues today as a strong regional voice for strengthening the economy, building a qualified workforce, and enhancing the high quality of life in the East Bay.

East Bay EDA's unique structure of cross-sector leadership, its development of region-

specific research, its advocacy that benefits business growth and workforce development, and its efforts to champion employer-led engagement for education that leads to careers makes it an impactful organization for strategic business development. International, domestic, and regional businesses depend on East Bay EDA to provide access to business resources, access to investments and incentives, regional marketing, business-to-business connections, leadership introductions, and land use and infrastructure support to help businesses succeed and create quality jobs. East Bay EDA invests in sustainable strategies to build talented and local workforces to meet tomorrow's job opportunities that require strong STEM education foundations.

On a personal note, I salute my friend and colleague, Chairman of the EDA, Supervisor Carson. His dedication to the residents of the East Bay is both commendable and inspirational. Furthermore, as a former entrepreneur, he understands the diverse needs of the business community, which helps to successfully execute the East Bay EDA's mission of making the East Bay a world-recognized location to grow businesses. He has been consistently re-elected as the Chairman for 22 years because of his passion and leadership for business development.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I congratulate East Bay EDA on 25 years of exemplary service as it continues to support the changes in the East Bay economy brought about by technology, environmental stewardship, and global challenges. I wish the East Bay EDA well as it seeks to make the East Bay the premier region for business opportunity, innovation, and the quality of life.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF ALBERT WESS

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. Albert Wess, of Paris, Kentucky. Mr. Wess, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II. Today it is my honor to recognize him before the House of Representatives.

Mr. Wess was born in North Middletown, Kentucky. During World War II he was a member of the United States Army. He served his country as a truck driver in the famous "Red Ball Express". He and his fellow drivers delivered munitions and supplies to the Army front lines in Europe, following General George Patton. They supplied troops fighting in the Battle of the Bulge and the many battles that followed. The brave convoy drivers traveled at night with no lights, making it more difficult for German planes to strafe the convoys and destroy the trucks and supplies.

Mr. Wess worked in the steel mills of Ohio for a time after his military service ended. He then moved back to Bourbon County, where he worked at the Lexington Army Depot for thirty two years. After retirement, he worked

for Wilson's Drug for more than nineteen years. Mr. Jones and his late wife have four children. He continues to be active in his church, Seventh Street Christian Church in Paris.

The bravery of Mr. Wess and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

TRIBUTE TO WILLIAM CLAY FORD, JR.

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a remarkable leader from my home state of Michigan, William Clay Ford, Jr. Mr. Ford is being honored in Detroit on September 10, 2015 by the USC Shoah Foundation Institute with its 2015 Ambassador for Humanity Award. The USC Shoah Foundation Institute says that "The Ambassador for Humanity Award is reserved for individuals who embody the Institute's values and mission to promote tolerance and mutual respect." Bill Ford is undoubtedly such a person, and it is fitting that he receives this honor.

Bill Ford is the Executive Chairman of Ford Motor Company, which was founded by his great-grandfather, Henry Ford. He worked his way up in the company, where he started at the age of 22 as a product planning specialist, and throughout the years he has mastered the complexities of the company and the auto industry. His leadership at Ford has reflected a twofold commitment—to building the world's best automobiles, while at the same time being a strong corporate citizen in the communities where its facilities are located and in society at large. As a lifelong champion of environmental stewardship, Bill Ford has led Ford Motor Company's efforts to develop and broaden the use of new, environmentally-friendly technologies in its vehicles and to lessen the environmental impact of its manufacturing, from increasing the use of post-consumer product in its plastic parts to leading the restoration of the Ford Rouge Center, which the company says is "the world's largest brownfield reclamation project."

Bill Ford's passion for protecting the environment is matched by his commitment to ensuring that our communities are strengthened by the vital educational, healthcare, and cultural institutions which serve them. One of the important efforts that he and Ford Motor Company are involved with is a partnership with the USC Shoah Foundation Institute's IWitness educational program. IWitness provides educators and students with firsthand audio and visual accounts from survivors of and witnesses to the Holocaust as well as genocides in Armenia in the early twentieth century, in Nanjing, China in 1937, in Cambodia in the 1970s, and in Rwanda in 1994. These testimonies enable students to learn

from history in a deeply personal way, and encourage them to act to oppose and prevent future acts of genocide. Thanks to the commitment of Mr. Ford and the Ford Motor Company, the Institute's IWitness program will be expanded to more schools and students throughout Metro Detroit.

When the award was announced, Steven Spielberg, who founded the USC Shoah Foundation Institute, captured so well the importance of the IWitness program and of Bill Ford's leadership when he said, "Reaching people when they're young is the key to changing the world with testimony . . . the commitment of Bill Ford and the Ford Motor Company to support new approaches to learning, to provide scholarships, and to help deserving students attain higher education make him a great ambassador, and I am proud to recognize him for his efforts."

Mr. Speaker, President John F. Kennedy once said "For of those to whom much is given, much is required." Bill Ford, who has committed so much of his time, talents, and financial resources into strengthening our communities in Southeast Michigan, truly exemplifies this spirit. I encourage my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on so deservedly receiving the 2015 Ambassador for Humanity Award from the USC Shoah Foundation Institute.

RECOGNIZING LARRY DALE ON
FOURTEEN YEARS LEADING THE
ORLANDO SANFORD INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND MANY
DECADES OF SERVICE TO COMMUNITY AND COUNTRY

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay recognition to a great friend, dedicated public servant and outstanding community leader: Mr. Larry Dale of Sanford Florida.

Larry is retiring as President and CEO of the Orlando Sanford International Airport this month after 14 years in this leadership position. His work and efforts over the years helped make that airport one of the economic engines in the 7th Congressional District. Since 2001, when Larry took the helm, the airport has significantly improved its operations and expanded services. Orlando Sanford International Airport now serves over 2.2 million passengers a year, with thousands employed. The airport is also consistently in the top 30 busiest airports in the world in terms of total flight operations, recently being awarded the U.S. ANNIES Award for Fastest Growing U.S. Airport in 2014 for facilities serving between 2 million and 5 million passengers.

Mr. Dale has been a leader in the aviation industry during his tenure, advancing national and state issues and establishing Orlando Sanford International Airport as a top innovator in aviation operations and security. In 2010, he was awarded the Florida Department of Transportation Aviation Professional of the Year award.

Larry Dale also served as Mayor of the City of Sanford from 1996 to 2001 after being ac-

tive in community affairs for years. Larry served on the Sanford Port Authority Board of Directors, East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, Seminole Community College Board of Trustees, 18th Circuit Judicial Nominating Commission, Lake Mary Volunteer Fire Department and continues to serve the region on MetroPlan Orlando and the Seminole County Development Advisory Board.

The recipient of the Boy Scouts of America Service Award and the Seminole County Chamber of Commerce Lifetime Achievement Award, Larry has been actively involved in Seminole County affairs for three decades. He has been a successful real estate developer, broker and contractor, civic leader, elected official, airline transportation pilot and certified law enforcement officer.

As Larry Dale retires this month, I know that I am joined by my colleagues from Central Florida in thanking him for his service and wishing him well in the future. Now, he will be able to spend time with his five children, nine grandchildren and his great-grandson hunting, fishing and, of course, flying airplanes.

Mr. Speaker, once again I congratulate Larry Dale on his many accomplishments in his community, the State of Florida, and our nation.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
CAPTAIN MATTHEW ROLAND

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true American hero, Air Force Captain Matthew D. Roland, from Lexington, Kentucky. Captain Roland gave his life in service to his country when he was killed in Afghanistan on August 26, 2015.

Captain Roland graduated in 2006 from Lexington Catholic High School, where he was a member of the National Honor Society and ran cross country. He was recognized as a born leader, motivated and dedicated to all that he did. Roland was also an Eagle Scout. He earned an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy, where he graduated in 2010.

Captain Roland was a special tactics officer at the 23rd Special Tactics Squadron in Afghanistan. He completed the rigorous special tactics training program in 2012, then was a team leader who supervised combat preparedness training for a thirty five member team. He deployed three times in his five years of service, serving in many locations around the world.

Colonel Wolfe Davidson, 24th Special Operations commander, described Roland and fellow hero Forrest as "incredible warriors who not only volunteered to join our nation's Special Operations Forces, but earned their way to the tip of the spear in defense of our nation."

Captain Roland is survived by his parents, retired Air Force Colonel Mark Roland and Barbara Roland, and his sister, Erica.

The tragic loss of this brave man is felt by all who knew him. Along with a grateful nation,

I honor his legacy, embrace his family, and say thank you for his ultimate sacrifice for American freedom.

RECOGNIZING THE CHARLIE
COMPANY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Charlie Company, a unit of the United States Marine Corps Reserves, who this year celebrates the 65th anniversary of the first time they left the United States to fight for our country in Korea. As a Colonel in the Ohio National Guard, I understand and appreciate the dedicated service of the Charlie Company.

The Charlie Company was formed on September 1, 1947 comprised of many World War II Marines who wanted to continue their service. After the Korean war began, the 177 man Company was sent from Fort Hayes in Columbus to Camp Pendleton in California to complete training. By November of 1950, the men were sent out to South Korea.

The Charlie Company faced combat action within two weeks of being in South Korea. One of the toughest battles they fought in was in the mountains of North Korea near the Chosin Reservoir, where they were ambushed and outnumbered by the Chinese Army. After several days, the Marines finally broke free. Five men were killed in action and over 45 Purple Hearts were given to the Company. Members of the Company also earned additional medals such as the Silver Star and Bronze Star.

The Charlie Company has had an incredible history of serving our country bravely in battle and continues to serve today. I am honored to recognize and thank the former and current members of the Charlie Company for the service they provide our nation.

HONORING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF GUGLIELMO WINERY

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, the Santa Clara Valley, or Silicon Valley, is home to many successful businesses that were founded by immigrants. I rise today to recognize one such business, Guglielmo Winery, which is celebrating the ninetieth anniversary of its establishment this year. In 1908, Emilio Guglielmo departed from the small town of Susa, in the Piedmont region of Italy, in search of the American dream. Upon his arrival in San Francisco, Emilio began working at a tannery, and his wife Emilia worked at a French laundry. After fifteen years of hard work, the Guglielmos had set aside enough to purchase fifteen acres in Morgan Hill, where they established their winery. Emilia and Emilio passed the winery down to their son

George W. and his wife Madeline in 1945. Guglielmo Winery is now in its third generation of family ownership—jointly managed by Emilio's grandsons George E., Gene, and Gary—and holds title as the oldest continuously operating family-owned winery in the Santa Clara Valley. On September 12, Guglielmo Winery will celebrate this significant milestone in traditional Guglielmo fashion: with friends, family, and wine. I congratulate them on this significant milestone and wish the Guglielmos many years of fruitful harvests.

HONORING THE LIFE OF EDWIN
GREEN LANE III

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of a public servant from Kentucky's Sixth District, Edwin "Ed" Green Lane III. Mr. Lane was a successful business owner, a member of Lexington's city council, a philanthropist, and a leader in the community.

Ed Lane founded Lane Consultants in 1981, a commercial real estate brokerage based in Lexington. Later he added Lane Communications Group, publisher of several magazines and e-newsletters. Best known of these is The Lane Report, a highly respected magazine for Kentucky business news. He was well known as a strong voice for the business community in Lexington and indeed all across Kentucky.

Councilmember Lane was elected to represent Lexington's 12th District on the Urban County Government Council in 2005. He was known for focusing on sound financial policy and for thoroughly analyzing budget numbers and their long term effect for the city. Councilmember Lane was a strong advocate for his district and brought business expertise and experience to the council. He will be deeply missed in Lexington's government.

In addition to his business and governmental interests, Councilmember Lane served on the boards of numerous business, arts, government, and civic organizations. He gave generously of his time and resources.

Ed Lane loved his work in business and in government. He was an artist, art collector, and photographer. Ed was an avid cook and enjoyed entertaining. He loved gardening, reading, fast cars, and, yes, politics. He always had a strong work ethic and an enthusiasm for life. He was energetic and optimistic in all that he did. Ed fought cancer bravely for over two years ago, only sharing his diagnosis with close family members. He is survived by two daughters, Susan Brett Lane and Katherine Meredith Lane.

Ed Lane was a great American who gave of himself in many ways to better his community and his nation. He will be sorely missed, but the world is a better place because of the impact made by Edwin Green Lane III.

CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the following proclamation:

Whereas, it is the privilege and duty of the American people to commemorate the two hundred and twenty-eighth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Convention; and

Whereas, it is fitting and proper to officially recognize this magnificent document and the anniversary of its creation; and

Whereas, public law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as constitution week;

Now, therefore, I, TOM RICE, by virtue of the authority vested in me as representative of the Seventh District of the state of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 17 through 23, 2015 to be Constitution week and ask our citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787.

IN CELEBRATION OF ALLISON
TRANSMISSION'S CENTENNIAL
ANNIVERSARY

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Allison Transmission in celebration of its 100th anniversary. The company has a rich history in Indianapolis, but its accomplishments can be seen globally. It is my privilege to honor this strong Hoosier company as it celebrates 100 years of excellence.

Since its founding in 1915, Allison Transmission has become the largest manufacturer of fully automatic transmissions and a leader in hybrid-propulsion systems for city buses. The company's heritage traces back to when James Allison, co-founder of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway and part owner of several racing teams, founded the Indianapolis Speedway Team Company.

While at first the company was focused on racecars, the company switched gears after the start of World War I and put all of its resources toward helping the United States military. In 1920, the name was changed to Allison Engineering Company. For its first couple of decades, Allison primarily manufactured engines and service parts for the military, but in 1946 Allison entered the commercial transmission field and would later go on to create the world's first fully automatic transmission. Since then, Allison Transmission has produced over 5 million transmissions and over 1 million fully automatic transmissions.

The company is a leader in innovative technological advancements and is responsible for

multiple groundbreaking inventions. In addition to the world's first fully automatic transmission, one of its most notable inventions is steel-backed bronze bearings, which extend the service life of aircraft engines and were famously used in Charles Lindbergh's Spirit of St. Louis in 1927.

Allison Transmission has strong roots in Indianapolis and its headquarters remains there today. The company now has an international presence with over 2,700 employees, a market presence in more than 80 countries, and approximately 1,400 independent distributor and dealer locations worldwide. Allison transmissions can be found in cities and rural areas across the globe in a wide variety of applications such as buses, trains, cars, trucks, and airplanes.

James Allison founded the company under 5 key values: innovation, quality, integrity, customer focus, and teamwork. These values have led the company to its many achievements and remain evident today through the hard work and dedication of its employees. The company's commitment to providing high-quality services that improve efficiency and make work as easy as possible for their customers is manifested in the unrivaled reliability and durability of their transmissions.

In addition to all of Allison's achievements in the manufacturing world, they also have a robust history of community involvement. As part of their centennial celebration, Allison Transmission will be sponsoring a variety of community activities, including the building of a house for a family in need, sponsoring an essay contest for students at James A. Allison Elementary School in Speedway, and awarding 100 scholarships to local college students. The company has also earned the prestigious Centennial Business Award of the Indiana Historical Society.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana's Fifth Congressional District, I would like to congratulate Allison Transmission on the celebration of its centennial anniversary. I am proud to represent a city that is home to exemplary businesses such as this one. I wish Allison Transmission all the best as it embarks on its next 100 years of excellence.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR.
GEORGE BUCHANAN

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Mr. George Buchanan, of Lexington, Kentucky. Mr. Buchanan, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II.

Mr. Buchanan grew up in Hazel Green on a small subsistence farm. There were three boys in his family, all of whom served in WWII. Following high school, young George got a job in a drugstore, working behind the soda fountain. He was drafted shortly after the Pearl Harbor attack. Because of his drugstore experience he was chosen to be a medic, despite a great fear of the sight of blood and

passing out several times during training. He completed his training and became a surgical technician 861. He was assigned to the 97th QM Battalion, where they packed onto the Aquitania for a very rough North Atlantic crossing.

Mr. Buchanan landed on Omaha Beach just a few days following the D-Day invasion. He and other medics treated the sick and wounded. They also checked the dead, tagged them, and took them to the morgue. They saw hundreds who were shot, burned, and mangled. His unit traveled across Europe, through France, Belgium, Luxembourg, Germany, and Czechoslovakia, continuing to treat the sick and wounded, tagging the dead and taking them to the morgue. They lived in foxholes along the way and showered about once a month when they got a clean change of clothes. During the Battle of the Bulge, the medics were armed for the first time as they were surrounded by German troops. They were thankful to be rescued by General Patton's troops.

Mr. Buchanan never forgot all the death and injury he witnessed in the war. He went on to attend the University of Kentucky, where he met his future wife Margaret. They settled in Lexington and had four children. Buchanan enjoyed a long career with Commonwealth Life Insurance, where he rose to a prominent level and earned numerous awards. He and Margaret were charter members of Crestwood Christian Church where both were very active. Buchanan was also an active member of the YMCA, serving as a board member and a donor. He was awarded the prestigious Red Triangle Award for service by the YMCA. He was able to make a visit back to Normandy in recent years.

After a full and productive life, Mr. Buchanan passed away on July 20, 2015, at the age of 94. The bravery of Mr. Buchanan and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He was truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,096,731,763.19. We've added \$7,524,219,682,850.11 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

CONGRATULATING BATAVIA TOWNSHIP

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Batavia Township on their bicentennial anniversary and celebration.

For 200 years, Batavia Township has stood at the center of Clermont County and has lived up to its motto, "The Heart of Clermont!"

Since its initial survey in 1788 and its incorporation in 1815, Batavia Township has been an industrial leader in Clermont County. From roller coaster production to the manufacturing of food and consumer products, Batavia Township boasts a wide diversity of commerce.

Home to the University of Cincinnati East, a higher education leader in the county, and the Clermont County Airport, a hub of economic activity, the township is central to the region's continued growth.

The township is also home to a wide array of outdoor recreational activities from its new Williamsburg-Batavia Bike Trail to the East Fork State Park, which hosts some of the region's finest rowing competitions and camping options.

I am honored to represent Batavia Township today, an area of the state with a rich history and strong community. Again, I congratulate Batavia Township on this historic milestone, and I wish the township the very best over their next 200 years.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. MIKE BACH

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding Kentuckian and a prominent member of the agriculture industry. Mr. Mike Bach, of Owingsville, Kentucky, served for twenty-eight years as an officer in the United States Army. For four years, he worked as a sales agent for a farm machinery distributor and in 1978 purchased several farms. In 1996 he inherited the family farm in Bath County. Currently Mr. Bach operates B&E Farms along with his wife Mary and son Steven. His farm covers 2,000 acres of beautiful Kentucky farmland in Bath County, where he operates a cow and calf farm and his son Steven raises 1,000 acres of row crops.

In addition to his own farm operation, Mr. Bach is an active leader in Kentucky agriculture. He is past president of the Kentucky Cattlemen's Association and currently serves on the board. He is program chair of the Montgomery County Cattlemen's Association. Bach serves on the board of the Bath County Farm Bureau. Mr. Bach understands the need to educate and encourage the next generation of farmers and as part of that commitment, he serves on the Kentucky 4-H Foundation Board.

Mr. Bach's love of farming and dedication to the agriculture industry in Kentucky were recently recognized by his selection as a member of the Bath County Agriculture Hall of Fame. This honor was well deserved and Bach is a role model to farmers of the future.

In addition to his agriculture interests, Bach is a member of the Association of Officers for the U.S. Army Reserve and is a lifetime member of the National Rifle Association. He enjoys working with old farm equipment.

I am honored today to recognize the accomplishments of Mr. Mike Bach, who has great love for his country and great love for the land. He exemplifies all the men and women across our nation who work hard every day in a job they love—the American Farmer.

"LOVE MOM AND DAD"

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, "Love Mom and Dad," are the words stenciled on a piece of cardboard, attached to a 36-foot-tall beam known as the "Last Column." Mom and Dad are Arnold and Rosemary Roma of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who lost their son, Keith on September 11, 2001. Serving as a make shift memorial, the column was covered with personal messages from first responders who lost loved ones. Arnold, "Dad," retired NYPD and several Port Authority Police officers spray painted "KR FP2" in honor of Keith Roma, son and friend, of Fire Patrol 2.

Presently, the "Last Column" stands as an exhibit at the 9/11 Museum in New York City.

On Christmas Eve 2001 Arnold helped uncover the body of his son from the ruins of the North Tower. The Roma's considered themselves fortunate as they were able to bring their son home for a proper good bye.

Following the attacks on September 11, 2001, we would say "good bye" to 343 New York Firefighters, 72 Law Enforcement Officers, and one New York Fire Patrolman, Keith Roma. As September 11th approaches, we are reminded to express appreciation for the sacrifice paid by these first responders and their families.

Today, in the midst of many conversations regarding the state of law enforcement in our country, we still find ourselves saying "good bye." Those conversations must also include, "Thank you."

HONORING 100 YEARS OF SERVICE OF THE CASCADE FIRE DEPARTMENT

HON. GLENN GROTHMAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Fire Department of Cascade, Wisconsin on 100 years of service to their community. The Cascade Fire Department has a long and proud history of providing

fire protection services to the Village of Cascade, the Town of Lyndon, and the Town of Mitchell.

On September 2, 1915, a group of citizens met in Cascade to discuss the formation of a fire department. This newly formed department started out with just \$681 worth of firefighting equipment. Over the next several years, they acquired more advanced firefighting equipment and learned advanced firefighting practices to make firefighting safer and more effective to make our communities safer.

I am grateful to the members of our local fire departments who put their lives on the line to keep their communities healthy and safe. The towns and villages across America continue to enjoy peace of mind knowing that their own community members are willing to step up and protect their neighbors. I join with the people of Cascade, Lyndon, and Mitchell to offer a heartfelt thank you to the Cascade Fire Department for their service. It is a privilege to represent such fine public safety officers in Congress.

RECOGNITION OF THE 50TH
ANNIVERSARY OF TAYLOR DANCE

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 50th anniversary of the Taylor Dance Program and celebrate its founder, Joy Squire. Since 1966, Joy has made it her life's mission to promote awareness and appreciation of the art of dance across Southeast Michigan.

Joy understands the importance of kindness in instruction, as evidenced by the affection of her hundreds of students from more than 30 metropolitan Detroit communities across generations. From the very first class she taught, Joy has always sought to awaken and promote the creative gifts that exist in each student. She has nurtured the talents of dancers of all ages, even supporting scholarship opportunities for her pupils to attend prestigious dance programs across the country.

It should be no surprise then that Joy has been noted for her excellence by the Downriver Council for the Arts and has been inducted into the Taylor Sports and Recreation Hall of Fame. Her dedication to keeping the Taylor Dance Program a place for high-quality,

affordable dance instruction has led to it being named one of the "premier" dance training centers in the country.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today to honor Joy Squire and the Taylor Dance Program for inspiring generations of students in Southeast Michigan toward reaching their full potential. I thank her for her devotion to the community and wish her many more years of success.

H.J. RES. 64

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 64—Disapproving of the agreement transmitted to Congress by the President on July 19, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran.

First, I would like to commend all the individuals from the Obama Administration and their counterparts across the globe for the tireless work they put into this agreement.

Since the Iranian revolution in 1979, this is the closest our country and the international community have come to signing a peace agreement.

That progress did not come without significant sacrifice of personal and professional time.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

While I commend all those involved and recognize the importance of a comprehensive nuclear agreement with Iran, I do not believe that is what we are getting.

For the past 30 years, the international community has been subjected to Iranian threats and bully behavior.

The international community has had to tolerate Iran's constant threats to destroy the State of Israel, our staunch ally.

For too long, the community of nations has dealt with Iran's funding of terrorism throughout the Middle East and the world.

I am unable to support a deal that would allow the Iranian regime to continue to perpetrate these actions without any repercussions.

It is important to mention that these are not just my beliefs.

Since the announcement in July, my office has received hundreds of contacts from constituents opposing the Iran agreement.

In the month of August, I held townhalls, hosted meetings and conducted constituent visits.

The majority of those interactions affirmed the people in our district do not trust Iran.

The State of Israel should not have to worry about more threats and potentially expanded attacks funded by Iranian petro-dollars.

The United States shouldn't have to provide relief to a regime that continues to call for our destruction and that of our allies.

I believe the delay and dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program is a laudable goal, perhaps one of the most important in the world.

I also believe that we should work to alleviate the pressures and foster the goals of the Iranian people.

The young people in Iran are being held accountable for the actions of an autocratic, religiously motivated panel of leaders.

However, we cannot ignore 30 years of unrelenting threats and condemnable behavior for a decade or less of nuclear concessions.

In Texas, perception is often reality and if you are perceived as a bully, then you'll be treated as one.

We spent too many years bringing Iran to the table through sanctions and diplomatic pressures.

We cannot easily forget the history between the two countries but we can hopefully work towards a better situation.

As long as our friends and allies in the Middle East and around the world feel the threat of Iranian influence, our job as the United States is to hold the regime accountable in every way possible.

It is my hope we work together to block this deal and use its framework to get a better deal.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.J. Res. 64.

WOMEN'S HEALTH
ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. RENEE L. ELLMERS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 10, 2015

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, please remove Member MCSALLY as a cosponsor of H.R. 3443 as she was added inadvertently by my staff when cosponsoring another bill of ours, H.R. 3339.

SENATE—*Friday, September 11, 2015*

The Senate met at 9:30 and 04 seconds a.m., and was called to order by the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia.

—————

**APPOINTMENT OF ACTING
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE**

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2015.
To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID PERDUE, a Senator from the State of Georgia, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PERDUE thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

—————

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. ON
TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015**

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 1 p.m. on Tuesday, September 15, 2015.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 9:30 and 30 seconds a.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 15, 2015, at 1 p.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, September 11, 2015*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Dear Lord, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this anniversary of the 9/11 tragedy, we ask Your blessing of peace upon our Nation and the world. May Your healing presence continue to imbue the lives of those who were personally assaulted on that momentous day, and ease the mourning of those who lost their loved ones.

This is a month laden with important matters of policy both at home and abroad for our Nation. Help the Members of this House to recognize that You are with them in their deliberations. You are the God of us all. Help all to trust that Your will for peace and prosperity among Your children can move the human heart.

And through it all, may all maintain a common respect for the goodwill of those with whom they might disagree.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BUSTOS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. BUSTOS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RESTORING CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE ON THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this week, as we somberly memorialize the tragic attacks of 14 years ago, we can also rejoice in our constitutional values being upheld by a Federal court this week, in that the President's overreach on the Affordable Care Act will be heard under our separation of powers.

The court has confirmed the U.S. House has standing to preserve legal claims on the President's overreach once again, this time, illegally overstepping his bounds on the Affordable Care Act and handing out \$175 billion to insurance companies.

It is very important for the people's voice to be heard on an action that was never voted upon or even seen in the public light of day on the Affordable Care Act and its inability to meet its goals of being affordable. Instead, the price is going up. Rates are going up.

So this action is, indeed, a strike for our constitutional values, the ones we fought for, the ones we memorialized, the ones that are dear to our country.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the anniversary of the September 11 attacks. Fourteen years ago, our Nation faced an unparalleled tragedy that forever changed us.

Today our thoughts and prayers remain with the victims that perished in these attacks in New York City, Washington, D.C., and Pennsylvania on September 11. We mourn with the families of the victims and continue to thank the selfless first responders who rushed to aid those in danger, even if it meant risking their own lives.

As we remember the lives that were lost that day, we must also commemorate the brave men and women of our armed services who have lost their lives trying to protect us from the dangers we still face today.

Today we must stand as more than just Democrats and Republicans but, rather, together, as Americans, who will work to ensure that our Nation never faces an attack like that ever again.

SEPTEMBER 11 AND A NUCLEAR IRAN

(Mr. DENHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, today marks 14 years since September 11, 2001, a day when thousands of Americans lost their lives in a terrorist attack carried out by al Qaeda. On that day, we united as a Nation in response to a tragedy too terrible to fathom.

Today I remain thankful for our first responders, our firefighters, police, and many others who displayed courage and strength in helping out all impacted by the attacks.

This day also reminds us to reflect on the dedication of the men and women in our Armed Forces. Thousands have served honorably in Iraq, Afghanistan, and in the war on terror since September 11. We are thankful for their sacrifice and willingness to stand for American interests across the globe.

We all remember where we were on that fateful day 14 years ago, and we all recognize where we stand today. Our Nation faces greater dangers and higher stakes than ever before.

The threat of a nuclear Iran remains all too real. That is why any deal with Iran or any other country must be verifiable, enforceable, and accountable. Iran has been a chief sponsor of terrorism across the globe. A nuclear Iran is a threat to everyone everywhere.

It is not just about us. It is about our worldwide stability. The safety of the American people is not a partisan priority. It is an American priority.

After closely reviewing the details of the unveiled agreement, it is clear this plan will not adequately deter the threat of a nuclear Iran nor safeguard the well-being of our citizens and national security interests.

I hope that we can all remember, today especially, how crucial it is to protect ourselves, our children, and future generations against this huge threat throughout the globe.

FIRST SERGEANT P. ANDREW MCKENNA

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, last month Rhode Island and the United States lost a hero when First Sergeant P. Andrew McKenna, an Army Green Beret serving in Kabul, Afghanistan, was killed during an attack on a NATO facility. He ran into danger so that the lives of hundreds of his fellow soldiers would be spared and, in doing so, lost his own life.

During his 17 years of service, Sergeant McKenna completed five tours of duty in Afghanistan and one in Iraq. His patriotism, loyalty, and sense of duty embodied all of the best values of Rhode Island and our entire Nation.

I was fortunate to meet Sergeant McKenna just 2 months ago at the Bristol Fourth of July parade, where he was presented with a flag flown over the United States Capitol. I am grateful that I had this opportunity to thank him for his service to our country.

As we mark the 14th anniversary of the September 11 attacks today, it is important to remember there are still nearly 10,000 American troops serving in Afghanistan. We owe them and all of our men and women in uniform our gratitude for the sacrifices they have made so that we can all enjoy freedom and live safely.

My thoughts continue to be with Sergeant McKenna's parents, Carol and Peter, and his entire family during this incredibly difficult time. It is my hope that the heartfelt gratitude of our entire Nation will be a source of comfort to his family.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to mark the 14th anniversary of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, a horrific day that changed our Nation forever, as terrorists killed thousands of innocent people in lower Manhattan, the fields of Pennsylvania, and at the Pentagon. We must never forget that day.

We saw good rise in the face of evil and heroes rise in the face of danger. When the day was over, we learned that thousands of Americans had lost their lives, 700 from my own State. We witnessed neighbors and friends consoling one another and watched as Americans from all walks of life stood united together, side by side.

As America rebounded, we responded to these acts of terrorism with the skill of our military and our first responders. This is a war we continue to fight. It began without provocation, without warning. It was not a war of our own choosing, but it became a war of our priority. It continues today.

It is the solemn duty of every Member of the House to protect the security of our Nation and our citizens. In today's dangerous and chaotic world, we begin to honor that responsibility by pledging never to forget that day 14 years ago.

May God bless those who defend America, and may God continue to bless the United States of America.

14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11

(Ms. PELOSI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, this morning, at 8:46, across America there was a moment of silence and remembrance that, on the morning of September 11, 2001, the world witnessed a horrific attack against our Nation.

The profound, unfathomable casualties shattered our sense of safety. Yet, out of the ashes of the fallen World Trade Center towers, the crushed concrete of the Pentagon, and the burning fields of Pennsylvania, Americans rose united. We comforted strangers. We strengthened community. Hope prevailed over hatred. Resilience defeated fear.

Americans will never forget where we were on that day. We must always remember what happened that day.

President Lincoln once cautioned of the silent artillery of time wearing away at our memories. He was referencing those who had lost their lives in the Civil War.

We pray that the years might ease the pain of the bereaved and that it would be a comfort to them that we will never forget.

Young people born after 9/11 are coming of age in a world that knows that no attack will ever destroy America's ideals of liberty, freedom, and equality of opportunity for all people. Terrorism will never triumph over justice. That is a goal of terrorists: to instill terror, instill fear. They have failed.

We have emerged even more committed to protecting the liberties that have long distinguished our Nation from regimes that rely on divisiveness and hatred.

We honor the thousands of people we lost that day and those we lost to 9/11-related illnesses in the years that followed. We must remember those heroes of 9/11. In remembering them, we must honor our commitments to them, whether it is access to health care for those who were affected by 9/11.

The selfless first responders—firefighters, police officers, and courageous citizens who helped save lives, searched for survivors, and jeopardized their own safety to rescue others—represent the very best of humanity.

May we forever remember the spirit of September 11, 2001, and strive to build a future based on the hope and unity that emerged from the ashes that day. And may we always remember that, on this day, as we discuss this issue, we are walking on sacred ground. May we treat it with dignity and respect.

IRAN DEAL

(Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on this historic day of 9/11, a day in 2001 when terrorists killed thousands of Americans on United States soil and a day in 2012 when terrorists killed four Americans in Benghazi, Libya, I stand today in strong opposition to the Iranian nuclear deal, a deal with Iran, a leading state sponsor of terror.

Every day that goes by another story comes out about why we shouldn't support the deal. The head of Iran's military has said they will never accept the deals restrictions on arms capabilities.

The AP recently uncovered that key verification provisions are buried in a pair of confidential side agreements that Congress doesn't even have that will allow Iran to inspect its own nuclear capabilities.

Just last week the Supreme Leader of Iran changed the rules of the game, saying that Iran will not comply with their side of the deal unless sanctions are lifted and not merely suspended.

This is a deeply flawed deal, and I know we can do better. America is still the most prosperous and powerful country on Earth and the protector of freedom and stability in the world. We must do better for the victims of 9/11 and the victims of Benghazi.

□ 0915

OCEANS AND CLIMATE CHANGE: SEA LEVEL RISE

(Mr. LOWENTHAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, on this very solemn day, where we commemorate those that gave their lives, I rise on behalf of the Safe Climate Caucus to bring to the House another unfortunate new reality. More frequent flooding is going to be occurring now because of climate change.

We are already seeing sea level rise; that is without doubt, and that has resulted in the frequency of nuisance flooding in coastal communities. Cities across America are experiencing nuisance flooding. There is a rise in nuisance flooding between 1960 and the present of up to 900 percent throughout the country. From 300 to 900 percent, it is more often.

When rising sea levels combine with natural climate patterns like this year's El Nino, even higher rates of nuisance flooding will occur.

For example, in my district, nuisance flooding threatens my entire Long Beach Peninsula and the Alamos Bay. Flooding roads mean a loss of work or school days, and eroded beaches can have a negative impact on property values.

Today's floods are tomorrow's high tides. That is why Congress must act on climate change.

GREAT RUN BY THE COON RAPIDS LITTLE LEAGUE TEAM

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, you can't get much more American than Little League baseball, and in that spirit, I want to congratulate the Coon Rapids Little League baseball team for their great run this year.

After winning their district and then emerging victorious at the Minnesota State tournament, Coon Rapids came up just one game short at the Midwest Regional Tournament from making the Little League World Series.

While Coon Rapids didn't make it to Williamsport, Pennsylvania, their deep run had the community abuzz with baseball fever. The dedication of these 11- and 12-year-olds to spend their summers at practices and tournaments is outstanding. The skills that baseball often develops—focus, commitment, and hard work—will surely serve these young players in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the coaches, the parents, the family members, and the players of the Coon Rapids Little League team should be very proud of their tenacity and their effort. I want to congratulate them. They make their community proud.

REMEMBERING 9/11

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, this morning, we had a moment of silence, but we recognize today 14 years of memories. All of us remember where we were when terrorists attacked our Nation 14 years ago, murdering 2,977 of our fellow Americans and shocking the conscience of our country and of the world.

None of us will ever forget the tears, the sorrow, and the loss of that day; but neither will we ever forget the extraordinary acts of heroism, the first responders who rushed headlong into burning towers, the passengers who stormed the cockpit, and the Air National Guard pilot who was prepared to ram her fighter into a hijacked airliner to stop the next attack.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the stories that our children and grandchildren must hear, along with those of the brave men and women who donned our Nation's uniform in the years since, when they ask us to explain what happened on September 11, 2001.

Today, Mr. Speaker, as we mourn the victims of the September 11 attacks and pay tribute to the heroes of that day, we should honor them by renewing the sense of unity we felt that morning and in the weeks and months that followed.

America, Mr. Speaker, is strongest when we stand together in defense of

our common ideals—individual freedom, tolerance, equality, justice—which the perpetrators of those acts found so objectionable and which were the real objects of their attack.

As we gather, Mr. Speaker, to mark this anniversary, let us remember that our greatest rebuttal to those who attacked us, as well as the most fitting tribute to all those we lost, is to keep defending these principles that bind us together as Americans and that will always be the enduring source of our strength.

God bless those who we lost, and we commit to their memory and to their cause.

SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PRO- VIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHER- WISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 412, I call up the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3460

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RE- LATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, prior to January 21, 2017, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and re-

gardless of whether it is legally binding or not.

(c) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People's Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 2 hours, with 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Foreign Affairs or his designee, 30 minutes controlled by the chair of the Committee on Ways and Means or his designee, and 1 hour controlled by the minority leader or her designee.

The gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and to submit extraneous materials on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, which would prohibit the President from waiving Iran sanctions and prevent the implementation of this fatally flawed agreement.

Last night, we spent many hours debating this agreement. We heard from Members on both sides of the aisle, Members who have deep concerns about where we are headed.

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear. This isn't just a bad deal; it is a disastrous deal. It is a disaster for the United States; it is a disaster for our allies and friends in the region, including Israel.

When you think about it, when we think about the letter that we sent—84 percent of us in this House signed a letter asking for four critical things in this negotiation—we got rolled on every one of the four. Iran won on every point.

Iran gets to keep its nuclear infrastructure. The Obama administration collapsed on the issue of verification. We don't have anywhere, anytime inspections in here. We have got self-inspections by the Iranian regime with respect to Parchin, which is the one military site where we know—we know—that the Iranians, because of

1,000 pages of documents, did most of their bomb work.

They say now: No, no, no, we will do the inspections. We will turn that stuff over, but nobody is going into our military sites.

That is the argument they are making.

The sunset clause in this means that key parts of this deal expire at the end of the deal. We have got permanent sanctions relief for the Iranian regime, relief that is going to go into their military, in exchange for temporary constraints on Iran's nuclear program.

The restrictions on Iran's missile program designed to deliver those weapons—now, this came up in the eleventh hour of this negotiation. No one anticipated it being in the agreement. At the eleventh hour, the Russians came forward and, on behalf of the Iranians, said: We want the lifting of the sanctions, international sanctions, that the community has on the ICBM program and on the arms transfers with respect to Iran.

Unbelievably, we ended up getting rolled on this as well. As the Secretary of Defense told Congress, the I in ICBM stands for intercontinental, meaning flying from Iran to the United States. That is why—that is why—we never wanted this lifted.

It also provides resources and legitimacy to the Iranian Revolutionary Guards Corps, the very same organization that has killed 500 U.S. troops in Iraq.

This nuclear deal really needs to be put in a larger context of the administration's Iran policy. It is very dangerous; it is very risky, and I would say it is doomed to fail as a policy, given the fact that we haven't seen any adjustment out of Iran other than a recommitment on the part of the regime in Iran where they say: We are not going to be bound by any of the ballistic missile constraints. We don't intend to follow that, and by the way, we are advancing new ballistic missiles and targeting and putting that into the hands of Hezbollah and into the hands of Hamas.

That is the messaging we have seen this week out of Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and Members, I strongly oppose H.R. 3460 because it is another attempt to derail diplomacy and set the United States on the path to war. H.R. 3460 suspends until January 21, 2017—meaning through the rest of President Obama's term—the authority of the President to waive, suspend, or reduce sanctions pursuant to the Iran nuclear agreement.

This legislation was introduced less than 48 hours ago and has had absolutely no committee process. While the Foreign Affairs Committee has held 30

hearings since the announcement of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action in November 2013, this legislation has never even been a topic of committee discussion.

This is not a serious attempt to legislate. Put simply, it is a political attack on the President of the United States in an attempt to derail a good deal that is in the best interest of our Nation.

The Iran deal represents the cumulative efforts of countless diplomats. After imposing some of the toughest sanctions in history, the P5+1—the U.S., the United Kingdom, Germany, France, Russia, and China—were able to bring Iran to the table and strike a deal that achieves our core strategic objectives.

President Obama and Secretary of State Kerry deserve our respect and thanks for this achievement. They kept together a coalition that forced Iran to make serious concessions in how they operate their domestic nuclear programs.

We did not get everything that we wanted, but we achieved a verifiable deal that is our best hope to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

The details of the deal are commendable. Among other things, Iran will reduce its uranium stockpile by 98 percent and lower its enrichment level below weapon levels. This will increase the "breakout time"—or how long it takes to create a weapon—to 1 year.

In addition, the International Atomic Energy Agency will oversee testing and inspections, and cheating will be severely punished with snapback provisions that reimpose the crippling sanctions that brought Iran to the table.

Unfortunately, it appears that the majority does not understand progress in diplomacy. Those who are trying to undermine this historic agreement are motivated by the same naive approach to negotiation that has paralyzed this Congress. This time, unless they get everything they want, they will not accept a deal that forestalls war and prevents Iran from becoming a nuclear power.

This intransigence may be new in its degree, but it is an old and regretful approach taken by critics of diplomacy. I remember, almost 30 years ago, when a President late in his second term reached out his hand in peace. His attempts to constrain and ultimately reduce nuclear stockpiles were mocked.

□ 0930

I rarely saw eye to eye with that President, but nearly three decades later, I am glad that he stood up when he did. That President was Ronald Reagan. When he signed the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty with Mr. Gorbachev, he faced the same fury we see today. However, 28 months later, the Soviet Union was replaced by

a growing number of free and independent states, and 28 years later, the United States is still standing and remains as strong as ever.

The lesson in all of this is that diplomacy is rarely clean, and it develops in its own time. There are stops and starts. Things move forward, sometimes backwards, and even often sideways; but, repeatedly, we have shown that a step in the direction of peace will be met in kind. Whether a Republican or a Democratic President seeks that peace, Congress has an obligation to support those efforts.

I am proud of our President's efforts to forge a new path with Iran. The Iran deal prevents Iran from developing a bomb, creates a new foundation for further diplomacy, and stands as part of a proud tradition of progress.

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider and oppose H.R. 3460.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just make the point that, with respect to Ronald Reagan, when President Reagan was presented with a bad deal at Reykjavik, while in his negotiations with the Russians, at that point, he walked away from that deal. He pushed away from the deal because, in his mind, we could come back and get a better deal if we stood our ground.

This was not the circumstance with respect to our negotiations with Iran. With the Iranian negotiations, we had four points that this Congress—84 percent of us in a letter to the Secretary of State—laid out. Those points were that it was supposed to be anywhere, anytime inspections; it was supposed to last multiple decades; we were not supposed to lift the sanctions up front but do it over the entirety of the agreement in order to get compliance, to ensure we had compliance; and it was to make certain that those 12 questions that the IAEA had asked were answered.

These were all important because, again, as Reagan pointed out to the Russians—and threw their own expression back to them—he said: There is an old Russian expression, "trust, but verify," and that is what we need to apply to the agreement.

That is the last point I would make here, the verification component of it, when you have side agreements which Congress has not seen and those side agreements, in the case of Parchin—where we have ample evidence of their past bomb work—allow the Iranians to do their own inspections. I mean, I always thought it was going to be international inspectors who did the international inspections, not the Iranians, themselves.

For these reasons, I do not think it is analogous. I think, in fact, we should do what Reagan did at Reykjavik,

which is to push back and say, no, we need a better deal, and we need a deal with verification—trust, but verify.

Mr. SPEAKER, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE), who served our country with distinction as a U.S. Navy SEAL.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, this is not a Democrat or a Republican issue. This is an American issue.

We are talking about Iran and injecting billions of dollars into Iran. The Marine barracks were Iran. At least 500 troops, whom I served with in Iraq, died as a result of Iran. Iran is not our friend. They are our enemy, at least this regime. You cannot say that Hezbollah or Hamas, as surrogates of Iran, would not do the same on 9/11 as what occurred today in 2001.

Let's look at this deal.

General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, said under no circumstances should we give missile technology to Iran; yet, in 5 years, we relax the sanctions for conventional weapons to include missile systems, to include the same missile systems that Iran has given to Hamas directly—at least 1,000 of them—and as many as 10,000 into Israel from Gaza.

In 8 years, we will relax the sanctions on ICBMs. There is only one purpose for an ICBM, and that is to strike America. In 10 years—remember?—part of the deal is dismantle for dismantle. Dismantle the sanctions, and Iran was going to dismantle their nuclear facilities, their capabilities, and their ambitions. In 10 years, the centrifuges that are not dismantled come out. They are upgraded. Then, in 13 years, by experts, Iran will have the capability of having at least 100 nuclear-tipped ICBMs.

How is that in the best interests of America? How is that in the best interests of our allies in the Middle East? How is that in the best interests of America and the world? It is not.

The policy of the United States has been to reduce our stockpiles, to reduce the countries that hold these incredibly destructive weapons—Ukraine and South Africa are examples—SALT I, SALT II, SALT III.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. ZINKE. Lastly, how could anyone vote for a deal in which the full disclosure of documents is not delivered?

No Member of this body has been privy to the secret deal between the International Atomic Energy Agency and Iran. No Member has read this. The verification is so incredibly critical; yet we are willing to cede our sovereignty—no American is on it—for a verification process that is 24 days, and even General Hayden said you can only monitor what you can see.

This is a bad deal. The argument is to take this deal or go to war. I say that this deal promotes war, that it

promotes nuclear proliferation. It is not in the best interests of the United States, and it puts us—Americans—and the world at risk.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action because we cannot allow Iran to have a nuclear weapon, and this is the smartest, most responsible way to prevent that.

Nuclear experts, our own military and intelligence communities, and all five nations that have negotiated with us—countries that have a direct interest in preventing an Iranian bomb—all agree this deal will work. It does it by restricting Iran's nuclear enrichment to nonthreatening levels and by imposing an unprecedented framework of inspections, monitoring, and enforcement—mechanisms that are not built on trust but that are built on distrust and verification.

Is this deal perfect? No. I would prefer a deal that permanently bans all enrichment. However, experts agree that this deal can and will keep Iran's nuclear program in a box for at least the next 15 years.

Now, opponents think we should blow this deal up, walk away, and try for a better deal. With all due respect, I think they are in denial. All of our negotiating partners tell us that that is not going to happen. We would go forward with a much weaker hand, without any, perhaps, sanction partners at all, and with a huge loss of credibility for abandoning our own deal. Blowing this deal up only makes sense if you are prepared to go to war.

I know—and I am distressed to say—that, across the aisle, many think that that is a good idea. I am concerned that, across the aisle, there is an outbreak of Dick Cheney fever and the amnesia that goes with it. They want to take us back to the good old days of the Bush years when unilateralism and militarism made us less safe, not safer.

There is a smarter and more responsible way forward to prevent Iran from having a bomb. Let's give diplomacy and peace a chance. Let's support this agreement.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING).

Mr. HOLDING. I thank the chairman. The chairman has one of the brightest and most insightful foreign policy minds this Congress has ever produced.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the legislation in front of us.

For years, our Nation, in conjunction with partners from across the globe, built up a robust sanctions package against the regime in Tehran for their illegal nuclear work, among other illicit actions and activities. These sanc-

tions worked, Mr. Speaker. Iran's economy crumbled, which forced them to the negotiating table.

The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of that negotiating table was the Obama administration—a group so eager to sign a deal that they gave in to the Iranians at every turn and forgot the true nature and evil of who they were dealing with. To get a deal, the administration walked back many of their initial demands—demands that actually might have made this a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, it is all too clear that this deal must be reworked and rejected. Now, I certainly believe that there is a role for diplomacy, but diplomacy must come from a source of strength, not weakness and capitulation, which is why the legislation before us today is so important.

The waivers built into our sanctions were not meant to be used by any President to force an agreement past Congress and the majority of the American people. The last thing the world—let alone the United States—should be doing right now is relaxing sanctions and giving Iran more money—more money to spread terror, more money to execute civilians, more money to support murderous proxy regimes.

Mr. Speaker, this deal cannot stand, and I urge support for this bill.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today against this measure to restrain President Obama from lifting sanctions and to support the Iran deal—the most important step that we could take to secure the future of this planet by stopping Iran's nuclear program for 15 years.

A nuclear Iran is an unacceptable danger. Iran's support of terror and aggression throughout the world, its stated threats to Israel, and the nuclear arms race they would trigger are the reasons the world's major powers came together to put crushing sanctions on Iran in the first place. Currently, Iran can produce enough material for a nuclear weapon in 2 to 3 months. Under this deal, Iran must take several unprecedented steps that would prevent them from having a nuclear weapon in 15 years.

This deal goes further than any agreement in history by including inspections of Iran's entire uranium enrichment supply chain for up to 25 years. Additionally, Iran will be subject to inspections forever under the additional protocol. It is those crushing economic sanctions that brought Iran to the table to finally accept the nuclear deal.

What is critical to remember is that our terrorism sanctions still remain in place, and if a military strike is necessary, the U.S. will have the time and

intelligence to intervene but without the threat of a nuclear bomb for 15 years. In contrast, without this deal, sanctions will be lifted anyway, and we will be left with nothing but fear, uncertainty, and an unfettered Iran.

Considering the anxiety of recent years, when the prospect of a military strike on Iran felt imminent, this deal is a welcome alternative, and the risks of rejecting it are too great. For the sake of our security, the security of our allies, and our position as a trustworthy global leader, I urge my colleagues to support the deal and to reject this resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, let me just pause to say that I remember the events of 9/11/2001. I want to thank the first responders and those men and women in uniform who have served, our veterans, for what they do to protect us every day.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose the nuclear agreement with Iran. I strongly oppose giving the President the ability to unilaterally lift congressional sanctions. Our allies don't trust us, and our enemies don't fear us. I think we ought to take Iran at its word. Here are some quotes.

During the negotiations, the Ayatollah said this:

"The enemies are talking about the options they have on the table. They should know that the first option on our table is the annihilation of Israel."

□ 0945

The Ayatollah Ali Khamenei said this:

The Iranian people and leadership, with God's help, will increase their defensive capability each day.

Through the Iran deal, we are getting ready to give Iran \$150 billion. They can do a lot of damage with that.

They are the largest state sponsor of terrorism. They are responsible for killing people in Indonesia, in India, and all across the globe.

I chair the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee. They are directly responsible for the AMIA bombings in Buenos Aires in 1994, again in 1996 through their proxy, Hezbollah.

The Ayatollah has said: We will not stop supporting our allies. That is Hamas, that is Hezbollah, and that is other terrorist groups.

They have said in their own words—take them at their word—they will continue to support materially and financially the terrorism groups like in Yemen. There is nothing we can do to stop it.

They have also said that we, Western powers, will not have access to secret military sites or secret nuclear sites,

but, yet, we are going to give them 24 days in this agreement. America, I didn't say 24 hours. I said 24 days' advance notice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Twenty-four days' advance notice before we are going to inspect a site. Are you kidding me?

We are going to allow them to self-regulate. That means they can go out in the desert and get clean dirt and clean air and provide that.

That is like telling a regular drug user that you can bring somebody else's urine and somebody else's hair sample to a drug test.

This is crazy, that we are giving Iran \$150 billion and an opportunity to get a nuclear weapon in 10 years or less, assuming they are going to adhere to every line of the agreement, which nobody that I talk to believes Iran is going to adhere to the agreement. They will have a nuclear weapon.

The immediate concern is \$150 billion in lifted sanctions, money we are giving to Iran so they can continue to fund terrorism around the globe. People will die as a result of this agreement.

\$150 billion can buy a lot of weapons, financial support for terrorist groups to continue attacking our allies and Americans anywhere they are in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly oppose that. As everyone can tell by my passion today, it is time for us to really talk in real terms about what that agreement is.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ).

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, they sound like warmongers, don't they, those Iranian leaders?

And so we sit here today, humbled at the task before us. We sit here as Members of the world's greatest legislative body, debating the future of our country and the future of the world. Because Iran with a nuclear weapon is a threat to the world.

And after months of intense review and passionate conversation with the people I represent and with advisers, with my colleagues, after 19 years on the Armed Services Committee, 17 of those on the committee that deals with nuclear proliferation and nonproliferation, chairing that committee for the Democrats, I believe that diplomacy first is the best path for the United States and our allies.

We stand here to discuss the issues of war and peace, of whether we believe in diplomacy with verification or armed engagement. We sit here and we reflect on all of those that will be affected by our votes: my family, our family, the soldiers, and countless others.

Can we look them directly in the eye and say we did all that we could do? Can we tell them we did not give diplomacy a chance? So don't get me wrong, I am no fan of Iran.

When so many in this Chamber rushed to war in Iraq, I stood up and said no and I said at that time Iran is where we need to keep our focus.

We need to ensure that this deal is implemented, and we need to hold those accountable to implement it correctly. That is our role as Members of Congress. No deal is perfect.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEEHAN).

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Iran deal. I believe the inspections regime is weak. I don't think the Iranians can be trusted, nor can we reasonably assume that Iran will hold up its end of the deal.

A broad swath of sanctions is lifted all at once, and the deal lifts the arms embargo. Iran will further destabilize an already dangerous Middle East by trafficking more weapons and rockets to its terrorist proxies, like Hamas and Hezbollah. Tehran's coffers will be flush with cash to fund Iranian terror around the world.

But Iranian terrorism isn't new. Iran is the leading state sponsor of terrorism. Its support and influence was there in Beirut in 1983, Khobar Towers in 1996, Nairobi in 1998, and on this day, 9/11.

It has been there at suicide bombings on busses, at shopping malls, and pizza shops. It has supported hostage takings and assassinations around the world. And to this we are to look to diplomacy?

U.S. law allows victims of these attacks to sue Iran for damages in U.S. courts. Over the last 15 years, the United States courts have handed down more than 80 judgments against Iran with \$43 billion in damages. Of course, not a penny has been paid.

I know there is disagreement on this overall issue, but surely we can agree that Iran should have to pay out these damages to its victims' families before Iran benefits from U.S. sanctions relief.

So I have introduced the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act. It requires the President to certify that Iran has paid all judgments owed to its victims before U.S. sanctions can be lifted. Our position is: Not 1 cent in sanctions relief for Iran until it pays up to its victims—not 1 cent.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Judiciary Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, what a weighty responsibility to stand on this floor on September 11.

For those of us who were here in this body on that day, there is no more solemn responsibility than the national security of this Nation.

For that reason, I am gratified to my ranking member for being able to serve with him through those very difficult times and to be one of the original members of the new Homeland Security Committee.

I have stayed on both of those committees, who hold in their hands the constitutional privileges and rights, but, also, the national security.

So I rise today with a heavy burden to speak to this very difficult decision. So I start by saying I stand here as a mother, and I will choose to speak to that child in Israel and the child in urban and rural America and the children around the world.

I would ask my colleagues the question: What is our burden and responsibility to those children, that, if we have an opportunity not for peace, but an opportunity to stop a potential nuclear rogue, would we not take that opportunity or would we find all kinds of obstacles?

I rise in opposition to the underlying bill, and I rise today in support of this Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. I thank the President and Secretary Kerry, but I thank, more importantly, Republicans and Democrats and Independents. I thank the negotiators.

Mr. Speaker, what we have is the statement and the agreement signed by Iran that it will never, never become a nuclear power. This agreement creates an enforceable roadmap for dismantling Iran's nuclear program.

Before the interim joint agreement in 2013, Iran went from operating approximately 164 centrifuges to 10,000, and then they went to 19,000. But this agreement brings them down to 6,000. Is that not a standing in the gap against a known actor of terrorism?

And then, of course, we have them at 300-kg enriched uranium, and they are only allowed to enrich 3.67. We have a roadmap for the various entities that contributed to their ability to make a nuclear bomb.

Make no mistake about it. You cannot take away knowledge. Even if you bomb Iran through war, you cannot take away the knowledge. And they will ultimately have the ability to come back again.

Now we have an agreement with the P5+1. This is not Munich, for Munich was a capitulation. No one in this agreement is capitulating to Iran. We are demanding that Iran cease and desist.

Tell American people the truth. This is the best pathway to ensuring the scientist in all. And for those who say that it is a reckless regime or scheme, rather, of inspection, they are wrong. Because the only 24-day process deals with the undeclared and even that has an ultimatum that the sanctions will snap back.

The IAEA inspectors are trained by the United States. The United States will be present on site at the IAEA. Many Members traveled there and got a direct briefing of the intenseness of their inspection process.

America will be on site when they come back with their inspection materials, and we will be at the table. We will also be engaged in the redesign of some of those facilities in Iran for more civilian uses.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, that, if we have the opportunity to save a child from a speeding train, would we not take that opportunity to save a child from a speeding train? I think we would. We need to save the children of this world.

Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee and the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3461, and in strong opposition to H. Res. 412 and H.R. 3460.

I support H.R. 3461 and oppose H.R. 3460 and H. Res. 412 because I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action ("JCPOA") as the best and most realistically attainable means of preventing Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Speaker, more than twenty-five years ago, as a young mother, I first visited Israel and the Holy Land.

I have returned many times since then to the region that gave birth to three of the world's great religions, civilizations, and cultures.

And I have been a passionate supporter of the Mickey Leland Kibbutzim Internship program, which for over 20 years has enabled inner-city high school students who live or study in the 18th Congressional District the opportunity to spend a summer in Israel.

As a Member of Congress and a senior Member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, both of which deal with national security issues, I have had the opportunity to visit many countries in the Middle East.

I have long been committed and engaged in efforts to develop policies that anticipate and respond to new and emerging challenges to the security of our nation and the peace and safety of the world.

The threat to regional stability, world peace, and America's security posed by Iran's possession of a nuclear weapon is one of the greatest challenges now facing the international community.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), negotiated by the P5+1, led by the United States is a response to that challenge.

I have consulted with policy professionals, scientists and other experts, and have reviewed many publications supporting and opposing the agreement.

I have met with and listened intently to supporters and opponents of the JCPOA in my congressional district whose commitment to peace and security is unquestioned and whose counsel on issues relating to Israel's security and America's policies regarding the Middle East I have always valued and will continue to seek.

After this lengthy period of review, consultation, and reflection, I have concluded that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) represents the best and surest means of achieving the goal of preventing the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran, the most rigorous and intrusive in the history of nuclear nonproliferation agreements.

Under the JCPOA, the IAEA will have access to all elements of Iran's nuclear program, including those that have never been subject to inspection.

The JCPOA, for example, requires Iran to permit IAEA inspectors to monitor the entire uranium supply chain which will enable them to detect any diversion of nuclear material.

And, to enhance the number of IAEA eyes and ears on the ground, the JCPOA provides that about 130–150 IAEA inspectors will be deployed.

Additionally, the JCPOA makes applicable to Iran the "Additional Protocol" (AP) to its Comprehensive Safeguards Agreement, which is one of the verification agreements the IAEA uses to investigate allegations of any clandestine nuclear activities in Iran, and which requires Iran to detail all of its nuclear activities, including mining and milling and research and development activities.

I take seriously the concern that has been expressed regarding the 24-day period for resolving disputes over IAEA's requests for access to certain locations.

However, it should be noted that this 24-day period applies only to locations not covered by the comprehensive agreement or the Additional Protocol.

Moreover, I am persuaded by experts, including Energy Secretary Ernest Moniz, a Nobel laureate in physics, that the trace evidence created by activities involving nuclear material remains detectable for months, even years.

Finally, under the JCPOA, intransigence by Iran in permitting IAEA's inspectors access to requested locations can in itself be deemed an act of non-compliance subjecting Iran to the threat of re-imposition of sanctions.

Additionally, the IAEA must be satisfied with this inspection regime with Iran and there must be a major reduction in the stockpile before funds held in escrow are released to Iran.

Critics of the JCPOA are correct in pointing out that the agreement does not condition sanctions relief on Iran's renunciation of its past and present support of terrorist groups like Hezbollah.

That is why I take seriously the concern that Iran may use some of the proceeds of sanction relief, approximately \$56 billion, to support terrorist groups, especially those that are hostile to Israel.

But the best way to respond to this threat is not to reject the JCPOA but to work with our allies and the international community to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The JCPOA makes it easier to confront, deter, and defeat terrorist groups supported by Iran.

Nothing in the JCPOA limits the ability of the United States to exercise all of its authority to sanction Iranian entities for their support for terrorism. President Obama has made clear that he intends to exercise that authority:

"With very limited exceptions, Iran will continue to be denied access to our market—

the world's largest—and we will maintain powerful sanctions targeting Iran's support for groups such as Hizballah, its destabilizing role in Yemen, its backing of the Assad regime, its missile program, and its human rights abuses at home.

"The United States reserves its right to maintain and enforce existing sanctions and even to deploy new sanctions to address those continuing concerns, which we fully intend to do when circumstances warrant."

After discussions with Administration and outside experts, I believe that between the IAEA's inspections (the results of which the United States will continue to have immediate and ongoing access) and our intelligence community's oversight, the necessary verification measures are in place to ensure we can detect any illicit nuclear activity that Iran might attempt to undertake.

Finally, I believe it is important to acknowledge that by preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon, the JCPOA contributes substantially to making the region and the world safer.

But an increase in safety should not be confused with an absence of danger, especially for Israel.

Even with the JCPOA, there will remain actors who are intent on doing harm to Israel.

That is why I strongly support a substantial increase in assistance to Israel to make plain to any of its adversaries that Israel's security is sacrosanct to the United States.

Specifically, I strongly support a new 10-year Memorandum of Understanding with Israel that enhances our strong security relationship.

I also support an increase in missile defense funding so that the United States and Israel can accelerate the co-development of the Arrow-3 and David's Sling defense systems.

And to ensure that Israel retains its qualitative military edge (QME), I support further military enhancements that are now underway.

Mr. Speaker, since its entrance into World War II in 1941, the United States has been the leading force for good, for human dignity, and for peace in every region of the world.

From the establishment of the United Nations, the creation of NATO, the recognition of Israel, the United States has been the world's indispensable nation.

In the words of former President Lyndon Johnson, we support Israel "Because it is right."

And as the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. said, "Israel's right to exist as a state in security is incontestable."

Dr. King believed in the dignity of all humanity and my best hopes are that a non-nuclear Iran, ceasing to foment terrorism, will be the catalyst for a Middle East in which all faiths and all peoples are respected, and which enjoys economic prosperity and cultural diversity.

Simply put, I want peace and security for the people of the United States and its allies, the Middle East, including Israel, and the world.

Mr. Speaker, the JCPOA negotiated by the P5+1, led by the United States, is in keeping with its tradition of global leadership and desire for peace and security for all persons in all nations.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I support the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action

(JCPOA), negotiated by the P5+1 and led by the United States.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 3461, which is a vote for a world in which Iran does not and will not possess any nuclear weapons with which it could threaten neighboring countries in the region, especially our steadfast ally, Israel.

THE IRAN DEAL BENEFITS U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY

AN OPEN LETTER FROM RETIRED GENERALS AND ADMIRALS

On July 14, 2015, after two years of intense international negotiations, an agreement was announced by the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, China and Russia to contain Iran's nuclear program. We, the undersigned retired military officers, support the agreement as the most effective means currently available to prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons.

The international deal blocks the potential pathways to a nuclear bomb, provides for intrusive verification, and strengthens American national security. America and our allies, in the Middle East and around the world, will be safer when this agreement is fully implemented. It is not based on trust; the deal requires verification and tough sanctions for failure to comply.

There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. Military action would be less effective than the deal, assuming it is fully implemented. If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is that stark.

We agree with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Martin Dempsey, who said on July 29, 2015, "[r]elieving the risk of a nuclear conflict with Iran diplomatically is superior than trying to do that militarily."

If at some point it becomes necessary to consider military action against Iran, gathering sufficient international support for such an effort would only be possible if we have first given the diplomatic path a chance. We must exhaust diplomatic options before moving to military ones.

For these reasons, for the security of our Nation, we call upon Congress and the American people to support this agreement.

GEN James "Hoss" Cartwright, U.S. Marine Corps; GEN Joseph P. Hoar, U.S. Marine Corps; GEN Merrill "Tony" McPeak, U.S. Air Force; GEN Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, U.S. Air Force; LGEN Robert G. Gard, Jr., U.S. Army; LGEN Arlen D. Jameson, U.S. Air Force; LGEN Frank Kearney, U.S. Army; LGEN Claudia J. Kennedy, U.S. Army; LGEN Donald L. Kerrick, U.S. Army; LGEN Charles P. Otstott, U.S. Army; LGEN Norman R. Seip, U.S. Air Force; LGEN James M. Thompson, U.S. Army; VADM Kevin P. Green, U.S. Navy; VADM Lee F. Gunn, U.S. Navy; MGEN George Buskirk, U.S. Army; MGEN Paul D. Eaton, U.S. Army; MGEN Marcelite J. Harris, U.S. Air Force; MGEN Frederick H. Lawson, U.S. Army.

GEN William L. Nash, U.S. Army; MGEN Tony Taguba, U.S. Army; RADM John Hutson, U.S. Navy; RADM Malcolm MacKinnon III, U.S. Navy; RADM Edward "Sonny" Masso, U.S. Navy; RADM Joseph Sestak, U.S. Navy; RADM Garland "Gar" P. Wright, U.S. Navy; BGEN John Adams, U.S. Air Force; BGEN Stephen A. Cheney, U.S. Marine Corps; BGEN Patricia "Pat" Foote,

U.S. Army; BGEN Lawrence E. Gillespie, U.S. Army; BGEN John Johns, U.S. Army; BGEN David McGinnis, U.S. Army; BGEN Stephen Xenakis, U.S. Army; RDML James Arden "Jamie" Barnett, Jr., U.S. Navy; RDML Jay A. DeLoach, U.S. Navy; RDML Harold L. Robinson, U.S. Navy; RDML Alan Steinman, U.S. Coast Guard.

THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY,
Washington, DC, August 20, 2015.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR LEADER PELOSI: National leaders and experts in numerous fields—scientific, diplomatic, arms control, military—are increasingly advocating support for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) negotiated between the P5+1 and Iran. They have concluded that support for the JCPOA is in our national interest after carefully evaluating both the specifics of the JCPOA's effectiveness in stopping nuclear weapons development by Iran and the viability of alternative approaches.

In February, I joined Secretary Kerry at the negotiating table as lead technical negotiator for the United States. To help clarify the technical features and safeguards of the JCPOA agreed to and supported by the P5+1, and place these in the context of the choice between approval or disapproval of implementation of the JCPOA that will be before Congress next month, I have compiled and attached to this note a streamlined side-by-side comparison of key elements.

I believe this comparison clearly underscores the conclusions of the U.S. negotiators, the P5+1, and an impressive body of experts: the JCPOA provides significant technical safeguards and disincentives that effectively block Iran's path to a nuclear weapon. It also explicitly enables strong detection and verification measures and timely responses should Iran choose to violate nuclear provisions of the JCPOA. The President, the Congress, and our allies and friends remain united in the determination that Iran will not develop or acquire nuclear weapons. The JCPOA is the best option available.

If you have questions that I can help answer, I would be pleased to do so.

Sincerely,

ERNEST J. MONIZ.

Enclosure.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to take a moment and thank the chairman for his work that has been done for the American public that they have been able to see directly through what this Iran agreement is about.

An interesting thing is happening on this floor as I sit around and listen. I am hearing Republicans and Democrats on the same side. Those that are opposed to it are bipartisan. Those that support this all come from one place.

You know, when I came to Congress, the one thing you are always told is find a committee and stick with that committee because what happens is you get expertise.

If you care about banking, you go to Financial Services, and you get expertise year over year. Taxes, Ways and

Means. When it comes to Foreign Affairs, you get the expertise of something like this.

So you know what? I have listened to those who sit on those committees, and I look to the chairman and the ranking member on the Democratic side.

You know what I heard from both of them? They are in the same position. They are opposed to this agreement. They took their years of expertise, they read through it, they did the hearings, and they came to the same conclusion.

So I wonder, could that happen on the other side of this building, inside the Senate? Because they have committees as well. The same bipartisan conclusion came. It just didn't even come from the committees. The next Democratic leader in the Senate, the number two, is opposed to the Iran agreement.

The American public always asks us for bipartisanship. This has brought us together. But it is not just in this House. It is almost in the majority of houses across America.

You see, in the latest poll, only 21 percent of the American people actually approve the deal and 49 percent oppose. That is more than 2 to 1.

Only 2 percent of Americans are confident that Iran will abide by the agreement. Why? Because they never have before.

□ 1000

Iran has a history of not living up to their promises. It is clear today that, what the President said, he did not achieve.

Mr. Speaker, just in April, President Obama said he will "do what is necessary to prevent Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapon." He said that he will implement this deal "to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon."

He did the opposite. In 13 years, Iran can have a nuclear weapon not just because Iran wants it, but America will say then it is okay. Thirteen years is not that far away.

That is not all that Iran gets in this deal. While we had sanctions on Iran, the only reason they wanted to come to the table—what did they do with their money, even though it was scarce, they didn't have much? They funded terrorism around the world.

What does this deal do? It gives them as much or maybe even more than the bailout that Greece got. What will Iran become? They will become the central bank of terror in the world. That is what we are voting on today.

If you want to know the truth about the deal, you go even further because there are side secret agreements we do not know. On this side of the aisle, we think we should keep with the law. We think when 400 people on this floor voted for the Corker-Cardin bill that said you had to have all agreements, we felt when there were 98 Senators

and only one opposed that you would want to hold to the same agreement.

Why would anybody want to vote on something without having all the facts, especially after you read the reports that maybe Iran can do self-inspection? If that is the case, why don't we bring to the floor and change the Olympic committee and those athletes should be able to test themselves? I look for the Education Committee. Maybe students should grade themselves.

Maybe that is facetious, but this is probably the most important bill you will vote on in your term in Congress. Don't fall to political pressure, because you don't need to. The bipartisanship of the majority of Americans stands opposed.

The expertise in this House that you respect, regardless of what party you are in because you selected those Members to lead those committees, are opposed. If that is not enough, study history. History always repeats itself. Have we not learned that peace without freedom is meaningless?

The President said he would not agree to any bad deal. Well, I believe we can have a better deal. History has shown Chamberlain just wanted peace, but history has shown other times in America where Presidents have stood up and stepped back and got a better agreement.

Ronald Reagan wanted to end the nuclear weapons when it came to the Soviet Union. In the end of Ronald Reagan's second term, he sat in Iceland with Gorbachev. He sat down across the table, and he got almost everything he had asked for, but Gorbachev asked for one more item. He asked that America would end their SDI investment.

Ronald Reagan had a choice. Ronald Reagan said no, but he said: I will do something even better. I will provide you the technology as well, so everyone in the world could be safe.

Gorbachev said no. That is a defining moment not for that man, but for this world, and Ronald Reagan got up and walked away. Some people criticized on a political basis, but I ask you this: Would the Soviet Union have collapsed, would the Berlin Wall have collapsed at the time it did, had Reagan not stood firm and asked and kept his word for a better deal?

Peace without freedom is meaningless. This deal does not bring greater freedom to the world. It brings a nuclear missile race. This is not just about America, Iran, or a few other countries. No country in the Middle East will sit back after this action.

The world will not be safer; we will not be freer, but there is still an opportunity. History has shown, if we are willing to stand up, take a step back, and get a better agreement, we can have peace and freedom.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 13 minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ).

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a proud record, a record as strong as any Member in Congress in supporting Israel. It is because of this support that I back the deal that the President and our allies have negotiated. If I thought that this agreement made the State of Israel more vulnerable, I would not support it, but that is just not the case.

Every security expert I trust, like Colin Powell, supports this deal; and almost every former government official I deeply distrust, like Vice President Dick Cheney, opposes the agreement. This is one of the most detailed international agreements of its kind in memory, and it was no small task of American diplomacy, statesmanship, and good old-fashioned negotiating that brought the deal to reality.

The power and position of the United States as a world leader brought our allies to the table. It achieved an outcome our country working alone could not have achieved. It is not something that the Europeans, the Russians, the Chinese, or even the United Nations could have achieved.

It is not something sanctions alone could achieve and not something that war alone could achieve. The United States, working with our friends and, in some cases, our rivals, brought about this end to Iran's nuclear weapons program with an agreement for verifiable, enforceable, effective curbs on Iran's nuclear ambitions; and it is in Iran's interest to abide by the agreement.

With this one step forward, the U.S. has helped erase our record of international shortsightedness. It gets us back on track as a leader who leverages our economic power, our military power, our powers to persuade and compromise and bring people together.

There are not many times in a person's congressional career or in the course of history, for that matter, where a person can cast a vote literally for war or peace. Voting to support the Iran agreement is a vote to give peace a chance.

Put diplomacy at the top of our agenda, stand up for our men and women in uniform, their families, and our Nation by avoiding war. Let us support a deal that is good for Israel, good for America, good for peace, and good for the world.

Mr. Speaker, Representative YARMUTH and I wrote an op-ed piece for The Hill newspaper entitled "The Iran Nuclear Deal is Good for America and Good for Peace," and I include it for the RECORD.

[From the Hill, July 29, 2015]

IRAN NUKE DEAL IS GOOD FOR AMERICA AND
FOR PEACE

(By Reps. Luis Gutiérrez (D-Ill.) and John
Yarmuth (D-Ky.))

We are both Democrats, but our districts and paths to Congress share little in common. A Catholic city councilman from Chicago and a Jewish journalist from Kentucky, the two of us naturally bring very different viewpoints to our work. But we are in complete agreement on one of the most important issues the U.S. faces—the nuclear agreement with Iran is good for America, crucial for Israel and an important step toward a more peaceful Middle East.

The United States entered into negotiations with one prevailing goal: to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. After months of negotiations, we now have an agreement that will do just that. The deal severely restricts Iran's nuclear program to only energy-grade enrichment, eliminates much of the country's uranium stockpile, retires most centrifuges and gives International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) inspectors more access in Iran than in any country in the world. Most importantly, under this deal, Iran can never have a nuclear weapon.

We recognize that some of our colleagues do not share our enthusiasm for this deal, and we certainly share their mistrust for the Iranian regime. But this agreement is not built on trust. It's built on strict verification and unprecedented enforcement. Iran has agreed to submit to full IAEA inspections throughout its nuclear supply chain, leaving no site off-limits and ensuring the IAEA will have access wherever it needs it, whenever it needs it.

Iran conceded to these terms after the success of crippling international sanctions. Relief from those sanctions will be introduced gradually, only after Iranian compliance is verified. And should leaders fail to comply at any point, those sanctions will automatically snap back into place.

But make no mistake, sanctions were not delaying Iran's march toward a bomb. Sanctions were designed to make that march unbearable and force Iran to the negotiating table, where we could strike a deal that would truly make the world safer.

And it worked. Now, aside from war, we're left with two choices. Either we support the deal and stop Iran from getting a bomb, or we oppose the deal and allow Iran to resume its nuclear path, unchecked and no longer encumbered by the pain of global sanctions.

Whether we like it or not, that is where we find ourselves. The sanctions' effectiveness depended on a coalition that included China and Russia. Should the U.S. unilaterally defeat this agreement, deemed positive by all members of the coalition, China and Russia are unlikely to simply return to business as usual. The formation of the P5+1 negotiating countries—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States, plus Germany—was a unique historical moment. A failure by Congress to recognize the significance of today's moment would undo more than a decade of progress while leaving Iran's nuclear program fully intact.

There is simply no acceptable alternative to this deal. It's why, despite all the criticism, no viable substitute has been offered. No one likes working with enemy nations, but deals like these aren't necessary among friends. It's understandable that much of the apprehension over these negotiations has to do with Iran's history, and certainly, the past must be taken into account—it's also

why there is such high emphasis on verification. But we must not allow history to be the obstacle in working toward a better, more peaceful future.

Some have derided the agreement based on the Americans who remain unjustly imprisoned in Iran. We too had hoped negotiations would have already led to their release and share the urgent need to free them. But here too, the deal provides our best chance. An abrupt severing of ties would give us no means to free the prisoners, but in an improved negotiating climate, we have a real chance to secure their release.

These choices are never easy, but after more than a decade of groundwork, the best and right path is now clear.

To upend this agreement would be not only a setback for our shared goal of a peaceful world, but it would be a major blow to American diplomacy. If we walk away, the future of international relations within the Middle East will be put at risk. China and Russia will have no need to deal with us if they again have the ability to deal with Iran directly. And Iran's nuclear program will resume its growth, free of safeguards from the international community.

The critics are right about one thing. This is not a perfect deal. But no negotiation ends in perfection, and the results of this negotiation are very good. To be certain, it's the best deal available. It's good for the United States, good for our allies—most especially Israel—and it's good for the Middle East. By cautiously and carefully inviting Iran to rejoin the world stage, we can guarantee it plays by the rules and finally ensure regional stability and security for all.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join the bipartisan opposition to the President's nuclear deal with Iran. I didn't arrive at this decision lightly. As a former Marine Corps intelligence officer, I know the difficulty of detecting covert military activity, and I fully expect Iran to cheat.

For years, President Obama has said no deal would be better than a bad deal. Now, as the sun sets on his final term, he has jammed Congress with an agreement riddled with dangerous concessions. No matter the verification arrangements, this deal does not block Iran's pathway to a nuclear weapon. This much, we know.

Rewarding the largest sponsor of international terrorism with billions of dollars and long-range missiles requires Americans to compromise our Nation's security. It is too high a price and one this marine is unwilling to pay.

As sure as Iran will continue chanting "death to America," "death to Israel," I will oppose this agreement, and I will resolve to work on a non-partisan basis to preserve peace by projecting strength.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, a nuclear-armed Iran is certainly unacceptable, and there are two

ways to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon: diplomacy and military force.

As someone who served in combat, I believe our Nation's first choice should always be diplomacy. I say "first choice" because nothing in this deal takes military action off the table, but before we go down that road, we need to give diplomacy a shot, and this deal is the best way forward.

I am not new to the issue. I just finished serving 8 years on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. I have reviewed the intelligence; I have read the classified documents, and I have had numerous briefings with experts from every side of this issue. There is no other deal to be had. It is this, or it is the status quo. Make no mistake, the status quo leaves Iran just a short time away from a bomb.

All of the intelligence clearly points towards the fact that this agreement is far better than doing nothing, better than the status quo. Iran is already a nuclear threshold state. If we reject this deal, Iran will keep getting closer and closer towards the development of their nuclear weapon.

If we accept the deal, we will be able to halt Iran's activities. The IAEA will have enormous access to conduct inspections, and Iran must forever honor the conditions of the nonproliferation treaty or face the consequences.

This deal isn't about trust. I don't trust Iran, and I don't like their leadership, but as it has been pointed out, you don't negotiate peace agreements with those you know, like, and trust.

This deal is about verification. It is about making Iran prove it is not developing a nuclear weapon. It is about keeping America and our allies safe. It is our best and only peaceful path forward. I urge the House to approve the Iran nuclear deal.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KINZINGER).

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the first question is: Does Iran deserve the right to be trusted?

If the answer to that is yes, then I would ask how. Tell me how Iran has earned this right to be trusted. If the answer is no, then obviously, you would have to verify if you don't trust.

If you actually look at the verification in this deal, in many cases, we are finding out from these secret agreements that it is actually Iran verifying for themselves that, in fact, they are going to be nuclear free.

I am a veteran of Iraq, and one of the things that I think is largely forgotten in this debate, even though it has been mentioned a few times, is Iraq is responsible for the death of hundreds if not thousands of American soldiers, both directly and indirectly, through the explosive foreign penetrators they send to Iraq to kill American troops.

The other thing is, Iran in this deal, there is all this talk about Iran cheating, and we know it is in the DNA of

Iran to cheat anyway. They don't even need to cheat. They can follow this deal to the T and become a zero-time breakout nuclear state.

You don't even need to have nuclear weapons to have the same kind of power if you are a zero-time breakout nuclear state. You just need to have the threat to marry a nuclear weapon to an intercontinental ballistic missile—which, by the way, we give Iran the right to have in year eight, ICBMs married up to the tip of a nuclear weapon.

In 5 years, by the way, Iran can now take weapons from Russia, Europe—frankly, the United States if we wanted to sell it to them—because we lift the arms embargo against them.

□ 1015

South Korea and the United Arab Emirates have asked us for the right to enrich or reprocess uranium—friends of the United States—and we told them no because of our dedication to keeping nuclear weapons out of the wrong hands. So we denied our best friends the right to enrich uranium, and we are getting ready to give it to our worst enemy. This deal will, in effect, end the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty for the world, because we can never deny anybody the right to enrich uranium in the future.

With that, I urge the rejection of this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT).

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, by now, I should be used to the wild and spurious charges my Republican colleagues will level at the administration when they know they are about to lose a big battle.

This is an extremely well-conceived arms agreement that does exactly what needs to be done when it comes to preventing Iran from getting a nuclear weapon, if it is enforced. There is not an argument or an objection against it that has not been debunked by actual regional and nuclear experts on both sides of the aisle. And yet not a single Republican in the entire United States Congress is willing to consider the deal's exceptional merits—not a single one. Now, that is politics; that is not policy. Instead, we have spent 2 days watching the Republicans trip over themselves on how best to unanimously disapprove of this deal.

If we disapprove, where does it lead? You heard: either to war or let's go get another deal. That is not going to happen. Everyone has told us that is not going to happen. It is the same neocons that have led us into 15 years of war in the Middle East that now want us to leave the thing open with Iran; don't settle it.

We have seen Secretary Kerry and Secretary Moniz go toe-to-toe with the Iranians for months. Enduring the

through-the-night meetings and countless strained arguments, our diplomats ultimately delivered the most far-reaching nuclear agreement in history. There is nothing that compares with what we have here. That is real leadership.

Of course, we have seen the shameful campaigns of misinformation and vitriol before—ObamaCare. If you were to play the ObamaCare arguments, they are the same ones that you are hearing today: Fear; fear, folks; you are going to lose your doctor; you are going to lose everything. And yet we now have it in place, and 20 million people have more health care. Now we are seeing it again.

A Republican, Teddy Roosevelt, said it best:

Credit goes to the man who is actually in the arena, whose face is marred by dust and sweat and blood; who strives valiantly; who at best knows, in the end, triumph of high achievement, and who at the worst, if he fails, at least fails while daring greatly, so that his place shall not be with these cold and timid souls who know neither victory nor defeat.

The President has gone out on the line. He has listened to this stuff for 2 years and came back with an agreement. You have got experts in Israel, you have got experts around the world saying that this is a good deal. Now, imagine if we were making this agreement 70 years ago with the Japanese. We had been at war with them. We wouldn't have the same arguments.

Vote against this bill.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I want to underscore the point the gentleman from Illinois made a few minutes ago. This deal effectively shreds the bipartisan Non-Proliferation Treaty, a bipartisan accomplishment, an accomplishment that has served to curtail proliferation for 50 years now.

As a consequence of this action, for the first time, we are going to make an exception for Iran, an exception that everyone else is going to demand; and we are going to see an arms race, if this deal goes through, not just in the Middle East, but one that is going to threaten the wider world as well.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. HARTZLER).

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to the President's nuclear agreement with Iran. It is not good for America or her allies.

The administration would have us believe that the only alternative to this deal is war. Those of us saying this is a bad deal are not advocating for war. We are advocating for a better deal, one that effectively prevents Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon now, 15 years from now, and into the future.

Instead of preventing a nuclear weapon-capable Iran, this deal allows Iran to keep its nuclear infrastructure; gives Iran billions of dollars in sanc-

tions relief to promote terrorism and instability throughout the region; does not allow for anytime, anywhere inspections; lifts the arms embargo, allows Iran to acquire intercontinental ballistic missiles; and does nothing to free the four American hostages being held in Iran.

Quite simply, this is a bad deal that aims to solidify a legacy rather than prevent a nuclear weapon-capable state sponsor of terrorism.

I urge my colleagues to reject this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN).

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to compliment all of my colleagues for all the time that everyone has spent going through the classified documents, listening to the hearings, listening to the ambassadors from all the other nations, listening to people on every side of this issue.

The decision that we have to make right here today is what are the consequences, ultimately, of this decision. And the fact is we have learned that Iran is only several weeks away from the possibility of developing a nuclear weapon. Those are the hard, cold facts that we have been told. They haven't, because of the sanctions and the restrictions that are in place. They have enough fissile material to make 8 to 10, maybe as many as 12 nuclear weapons.

So what does this deal do? What makes them give up 98 percent of that fissile material? They won't have enough to build one bomb if this agreement is fully implemented. It makes them get rid of two-thirds of the centrifuges. They will not be able to develop one bomb if this deal is implemented.

If this deal is implemented, we retain the support of the international community, all of whom are committed to seeing to it that Iran does not have a nuclear weapon. And for those who prefer a military option, it is not taken off the table.

We need to remind ourselves that until all of these conditions are met, none of the sanctions are lifted. They can be snapped back in a minute. We have got 24-hour, 7-days-a-week camera inspection. We have unprecedented inspection.

If they violate this agreement, we will know about it. We can snap back the sanctions. And for those who want a military option, that is still on the table.

This agreement gives peace a chance. This agreement gives diplomacy a chance. It is something that we can ill afford. The opposite may very well be something that forces us into another war in the Middle East, costing us trillions in treasury, costing us blood, and creating the prospects of a confrontation that is unimaginable and unacceptable.

We must give diplomacy a chance. That is what this agreement is all about, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK).

Mr. WOMACK. I thank the chairman for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, over the last few days, our Nation has heard from its elected Representatives on the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, affectionately known as the Iran nuclear deal. I stand here today to add my name to the list of Members who recognize what a terrible deal this is and the grave danger a “yes” vote creates for humanity.

It has been said by most that this will be one of the most important votes a Member will cast in his or her term in Congress. I agree.

It has been said by many that it paves the way for a nuclear-armed Iran. I agree.

It has been said by many that lifting of sanctions will further destabilize an already troubled region. I agree.

And it is indisputable, Mr. Speaker, as most have admitted, that Iran is the largest state sponsor of terror. I could go on and on: self-inspections, ballistic missiles, retention of centrifuges, side deals.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a bad deal. It is unconscionable that we would consider anything that leaves a path for Iran to possess a weapon, as this agreement does.

A “yes” vote, Mr. Speaker, will be on the wrong side of history. I urge my colleagues to stand with the American people, defeat the resolution, and stop this very bad deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, with all the rhetoric invoked around this agreement, I am reminded of what President Ronald Reagan—since his name was used just a few moments ago by the leader—told Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in November of 1985 when they discussed the nuclear arms reduction. Go back to history and not have selective history. President Reagan said this: “I bet the hard-liners in both our countries are bleeding when we shake hands.”

If that doesn’t resonate, what will?

And when the United States struck an agreement with the Soviet Union 2 years later to reduce the size of our Nation’s nuclear arsenals, President Reagan received much criticism, including, as conservative columnist George Will put it, for accelerating—listen to this—“the moral disarmament of the West by elevating wishful thinking to the status of political philosophy.”

Almost 30 years later, we see that President Reagan’s actions were not a capitulation to an entrenched enemy,

but instead the underpinnings of a larger strategy that reduced the nuclear threat.

This agreement should not be judged on its ability to curb Iran’s hateful rhetoric or its role in destabilizing the Middle East, because that was never the goal of the agreement.

No agreement can be perfect, but I am not convinced that a better deal—which exists only in the abstract at this point—will materialize if Congress were to reject the one before us.

Rejecting this agreement, Mr. Speaker, would require the world’s largest economies, who are party to this multilateral agreement, to follow our lead and reimpose sanctions.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal. Even many of those who have found a way to justify voting for this deal can see that it is a bad deal. This deal enables Iran more money to fund terror, accumulate more power, and it will lead to a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—and those points aren’t disputable.

This deal authorizes Iran so much control over the inspection process that it is not possible to say that this deal provides the level of verification that even the administration demanded up until a few months ago.

Why do I say that? Because we can’t even see what the inspection procedures are other than that Iran gets to inspect itself. There is not accountability to Iran in this deal.

Mr. Speaker, I am perplexed how one can vote for this deal without knowing what the actual inspection and verification procedures are. We are sacrificing our strength and leverage to the unknown.

What is known is that the statements coming out of Tehran over the past week reinforce that they cannot be trusted, that they will play games, and that their motives are evil and their terrorist activities will continue.

Vote “no” to this deal.

□ 1030

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for doing the work necessary in a bipartisan way to inform the American people, as well as our body, of the concerns here today. So I rise today in strong and bipartisan opposition to the President’s dangerous deal with Iran.

This one-sided deal gives Iran virtually everything it wants, ultimately paving the way for them to develop a nuclear weapon and further destabilize the Middle East. It gives the Iranians billions in sanctions relief that will be

used to finance terrorism. It gives Iran 24 days to cover its tracks before inspectors are allowed in. It even includes secret side deals that the President, Congress, and the American people have not seen.

Meanwhile, four Americans tragically languish in Iranian prisons, including one Michiganian.

Mr. Speaker, at moments like this, party politics must take a backseat to the safety of the American people. I urge my colleagues to stand with our ally, Israel. Stand for security. Stand for peace. Stand for America. Don’t reward Iran for spreading terrorism, abusing human rights, and holding Americans hostage.

Reject this deal, and let’s demand the right one.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA).

Mr. ROKITA. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, a constituent, Ms. Debora Avgerinos, visited me the other day. She owns a restaurant in Brownsburg, Indiana, and she was perplexed about this agreement.

One of the things she mentioned was that in her restaurant OSHA, the EPA, and anyone else from the Federal Government can come and inspect her at any time with no notice. Such is the case with this upside-down administration. Our own Americans can be inspected at any time.

Yet, when it comes to the world’s biggest sponsor of terrorism, we can’t inspect them at all. We have to go through a third party and wait at least 24 days. Common sense turned upside down. Except in this case, Mr. Speaker, it is with grave danger to Americans and grave danger to our friend, Israel.

Now, the President said it is either this deal or war, and, in fact, there is no other deal, and I think that is patently false. In fact, I believe that this deal will, in all likelihood, bring war.

And why do I think that?

Well, we are putting \$150 billion back in the hands of Iranians, and I want to know: Who here thinks that they are going to build hospitals? Who here thinks they are going to use that \$150 billion to help Iranians?

They are going to use it for “death to America.”

Please vote against this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, the Iranian Government has American blood on its hands. It vows to kill as many more U.S. citizens as it can; it is committed to destroying Israel; and it funds, trains, and arms terrorists throughout the Middle East.

This nuclear deal with Iran does not dismantle their program. It rewards

Iran with \$100 billion in cash and frozen assets, and there are no anytime, anywhere inspections. In 5 years, Iran can develop or buy conventional weapons, and in 8 years, it can buy or develop an intercontinental ballistic missile.

Now, some Members here in the House and in the Senate hope that these radical mullahs will abandon their quest to become a military power. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that hope is not a national security strategy, especially against those who wish to kill us.

Mr. Speaker, the best way to protect our homeland and to keep us safe is to reject this deal.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, just over a half a century ago, John F. Kennedy, in an era of difficult engagements with the Soviets, said: "Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate."

President Obama's diplomacy with Iran is grounded in strength and realism, but it is animated by something all too rare in foreign relations: hope. This is a strong deal that represents our best hope for lasting security and peace.

As a veteran, I stand with our President and support this deal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan walked away from a bad deal in Iceland. He walked away, and then he applied pressure; and as a consequence of that pressure, he then got a good deal.

In the case of this administration, they did not walk away from a bad deal during the interim agreement. As a matter of fact, this administration rejected the stronger pressure that this House passed, with a vote of 400-20, and held that bill up in the Senate during its negotiations in the prior Congress and did not give us the leverage we needed for a good deal. But that is still available to us.

Frankly, we all have experience with North Korea. We remember what happened. But Iran won't have to cheat like North Korea did to get close to a bomb, and that is because the essential restrictions on Iran's key bomb-making technology expire. They sunset in 10 to 15 years. After these restrictions expire, Iran will be left with an internationally recognized, industrial-scale nuclear program—and that is what the President concedes. As the President said of his own agreement, in year 13, 14, 15, Iran's breakout times would have shrunk almost down to zero.

A former State Department official testified to the Foreign Affairs Committee that this sunset clause is a disaster. It will enable the leading state sponsor of terrorism to produce enough material for dozens of nuclear weapons, all under the terms of the agreement.

As another expert witness pointed out, the bet that the administration is taking is that in 10 or 15 years, we will have a kinder, gentler Iran. But we are not going to have a kinder, gentler Iran because we are releasing to Iran \$100 billion in immediate sanctions relief. That is the down payment. And Iran is guaranteed in all of this a reconnection to the global economy.

Now, the point I want to make to the Members here is that that does not go to the average Iranian. It is the Quds Forces; it is the IRGC; it is the clerics that took over the major corporations in Iran; they are the ones that are going to receive that \$100 billion, and we already know the impact of that. It is going to solidify the Supreme Leader's grip on power. That is why he did the deal, to keep his revolution intact.

We had the bottom falling out of the price of oil. We had hyperinflation in Iran. We were in the position, had we exerted the additional pressure, to force a real choice between economic collapse and actual compromise on this program rather than what we got.

But, by removing economic sanctions, the President is withdrawing one of our most successful peaceful tools from confronting the regime; and, as a result, 200 retired generals and admirals concluded this agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a terrible deal. This administration has made a lot of mistakes when it comes to foreign policy. This has got to be the worst one because this deal will not stop Iran from getting a bomb. This deal will all but guarantee it.

We went into these negotiations saying that Iran had to eliminate its nuclear program, all of it, full stop. Now, they are saying that was unrealistic, too unreasonable, too pie-in-the-sky.

And we are handing over hundreds of billions of dollars in sanctions relief. So Iran gets billions of dollars in exchange for what? For taking apart some—not all, just some—of its nuclear program?

And then, in 10 or 15 years, all of these limits expire. In other words, they are getting something for essentially nothing. It is a steal. And that is if they don't cheat.

Now, the administration says that this deal will bring about unprecedented transparency. We will get regular access, they say. We will see what Iran is up to, they say. But if the inspectors think something is up, Iran has 24 days to cover its tracks and, in some cases, Iran's own inspectors will get to collect the evidence.

Finally, against all of the advice from our military, we are going to let Iran buy ballistic missiles in just 8

years. Mr. Speaker, you only buy ballistic missiles if you are looking to build a bomb.

I get why Russia and China like this idea. They get another big customer. But I don't, for the life of me, understand why we would ever agree to this.

Mr. Speaker, the President is taking a huge gamble here. He thinks if we make nice with the Iranian regime they will change their ways. Bring them into the global economy, and they will become more like us.

Now, I think the Iranian people, they want democracy, they want freedom. But we are not talking about the Iranian people here. We are talking about an extremist regime that is unaccountable to their own people.

This is a regime that chants "death to America." This is a regime that funds terrorism all around the world. This is a regime that has called for wiping Israel off the map.

I am all for diplomacy, but I'm not for rewarding a rogue regime.

I would also point out that the sanctions we are lifting will let European and Asian companies build up Iran's economy, and they will make the regime even stronger. And should Iran start to cheat—which they have a pretty darn good track record of doing so—it will be that much harder to put back in place the sanctions. Our trading partners, they will feel the pinch, and they won't want to hold this regime accountable.

So I want to stress how fervently I oppose this deal. I know the President may have already lined up enough support to save his deal, but with this vote—with this vote—we need to send a message to both Iran and to the world: The regime may have bamboozled this administration, but the American people know that this is a rotten deal.

And I fear that, because of this deal, the Middle East and the world at large will only become a much, much more dangerous place.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), the ranking member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend, Mr. LEVIN.

Mr. Speaker, this agreement represents the best path to achieving our goal of preventing Iran from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon, and it advances the national security interests of the United States and our allies, including Israel.

Mr. Speaker, for years, the Congress, the President, our European partners, and the international community have imposed a series of tough economic sanctions on Iran with the goal of preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. Those sanctions brought Iran to the negotiating table and I commend President Obama, Secretary Kerry, and the entire team, along with our P5+1 partners, for their

efforts to negotiate an agreement to prevent Iran from building a nuclear weapon.

The question for Members of Congress, who will vote on this agreement, is whether it achieves its stated goals.

After the JCPOA was submitted to Congress on July 19, 2015, I carefully reviewed all of its terms, attended the classified briefings and numerous presentations, and reviewed the transcripts of all the hearings that have been held in both the House and the Senate. I also met with opponents and supporters of the agreement before announcing my decision on July 30, 2015, the day after the final hearings before the Congressional August recess. While I respect the opinions of those on both sides of this issue, I concluded that this agreement advances the national security interests of the United States and all of our allies, including our partner Israel. This agreement is the best path to achieve our goal—that Iran never obtains a nuclear weapon. Indeed, I firmly believe that, should Congress block this agreement, we would undermine that goal, inadvertently weaken and isolate America, and strengthen Iran.

The benefit of any agreement must be measured against the real-world consequences of no agreement. Many forget that when these negotiations began in earnest two years ago, Iran was a threshold nuclear weapons state and remains so until and unless this agreement is implemented. As Prime Minister Netanyahu warned at the United Nations in 2012, Iran was a few months away from having enough highly enriched uranium to produce its first bomb. Today, prior to the implementation of this agreement, it has a nuclear stockpile that, if further enriched, could produce up to 10 bombs. It currently has installed nearly 20,000 centrifuges that could convert that fuel into weapons material. Indeed, many analysts believe that the combination of Iran's nuclear stockpile and its centrifuges would allow it to produce enough weapons-grade nuclear material for a bomb in two months.

In addition, Iran has been enriching some of its nuclear material at its deep underground reactor at Fordow, a very difficult target to hit militarily. Moreover, Iran was in the process of building a heavy-water reactor at Arak, which could generate plutonium to be used for a nuclear weapon. Finally, Iran has been operating for years under an inadequate verification regime that increases the risks of a covert program going undetected.

This agreement blocks all of these paths to acquiring weapons-grade nuclear material and puts in place an inspection system that assures the detection of any violation and future dash to acquire a nuclear weapon. The Interim Agreement has already neutralized Iran's stockpile of highly enriched uranium that Prime Minister Netanyahu highlighted in his speech. This final agreement will significantly scale back the remainder of its program. Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium will be cut from 9,900 kg to 300 kg, and that remainder will be limited to low-enriched uranium that cannot be used for a weapon. In addition, the agreement removes two-thirds of Iran's installed centrifuges. No enrichment activities may be conducted at Fordow for a period of 15 years, and the facility at Arak will be permanently con-

verted to one that does not produce weapons-grade plutonium.

Taken together, these measures will extend the breakout time from about two months to at least a year and put in place layers of verification measures over different timelines, including some that remain in place permanently. It is generally agreed that these measures would allow us to detect any effort by Iran to use its current nuclear facilities—Natanz, Fordow, or Arak—to violate the agreement. The main criticism with respect to verification is that the agreement does not sufficiently guard against an effort by Iran to develop a secret uranium supply chain and enrichment capacity at a covert place. However, the reality is that the agreement permanently puts in place an inspection mechanism that is more rigorous than any previous arms control agreement and more stringent than the current system. The agreement ultimately requires inspections of any suspected Iranian nuclear site with the vote of the United States, Britain, France, Germany, and the European Union. Neither the Chinese nor the Russians can block such inspections in the face of a united Western front. Are we really better off without this verification regime than with it?

In exchange for rolling back its nuclear program and accepting this verification regime, Iran will obtain relief from those sanctions that are tied to its nuclear program. However, that relief will only come after Iran has verifiably reduced its nuclear program as required. Moreover, if Iran backslides on those commitments, the sanctions will snap back into place. The snapback procedure is triggered if the U.S. registers a formal complaint against Iran with the special commission created for that purpose. In addition, those U.S. sanctions that are not related to the Iranian nuclear program will remain in place, including U.S. sanctions related to Iran's human rights violations, support for terrorism, and missile program.

There are some who oppose the agreement because it does not prevent Iran from engaging in adversarial actions throughout the Gulf, the Middle East, and elsewhere. That conduct, however, was never within the scope of these negotiations nor the objective of the international sanctions regime aimed at preventing Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. President Reagan understood the distinction between changing behavior and achieving verifiable limits on weapons programs. He negotiated arms control agreements with the Soviet Union, not because he thought it would change the character of "the Evil Empire" but because limiting their nuclear arsenal was in the national security interests of the U.S. and our allies. That reality is also true today. An Iranian regime with nuclear capability would present a much greater threat to the region than an Iran without one. In fact, today, as a threshold nuclear weapons state, Iran wields more influence than it will under the constraints of this agreement. That is why our focus has appropriately been on reining in the Iranian nuclear program.

The lifting of the sanctions will certainly give Iran additional resources to support its priorities. Given the political dynamic in Iran, some of those additional resources will likely be invested to improve the domestic standard of living. But even if all the resources were used

to support their proxies in the region, respected regional observers agree that they are unlikely to make a significant strategic difference. Moreover, any effort by Iran to increase support for its proxies can be checked by the U.S. and our allies through countermeasures. Finally, it is clear that any alternative agreement opponents seek would also result in the lifting of the sanctions and freeing up these resources.

In my view, opponents of the agreement have failed to demonstrate how we will be in a better position if Congress were to block it. Without an agreement, the Iranians will immediately revert to their status as a threshold nuclear weapons state. In other words, they immediately pose the threat that Prime Minister Netanyahu warned about in his U.N. speech. At the same time, the international consensus we have built for sanctions, which was already starting to fray, would begin to collapse entirely. We would be immediately left with the worst of all worlds—a threshold nuclear weapons state with diminished sanctions and little leverage for the United States.

I disagree with the view that we can force the Iranians back to the negotiating table to get a better deal. All of our European partners have signed on to the current agreement. Consequently, the U.S. would be isolated in its quest to return to negotiations. And in the unlikely event that we somehow returned to negotiations, the critics have not presented a plausible scenario for achieving a better agreement in a world where fewer sanctions means less economic pressure.

The bottom line is that if Congress were to block the agreement and the Iranians were to resume nuclear enrichment activities, the only way to stop them, at least temporarily, would be by military action. That would unleash significant negative consequences that could jeopardize American troops in the region, drag us into another ground war in the Middle East, and trigger unpredictable responses elsewhere. Moreover, the United States would be totally isolated from most of the world, including our Western partners. The folly of that go-it-alone military approach would be compounded by the fact that such action would only deal a temporary setback to an Iranian nuclear program. They would likely respond by putting their nuclear enrichment activities deeper underground and would likely be more determined than ever to build a nuclear arsenal.

We don't have to take that path. This agreement will give us a long period of time to test the Iranians' compliance and assess their intentions. During that period, it will give us a treasure trove of information about the scope and capabilities of the limited Iranian nuclear program. Throughout that period and beyond, we reserve all of our options, including a military option, to respond to any Iranian attempt to break out and produce enough highly enriched material to make a bomb. But we will have two advantages over the situation as it is today—a more comprehensive verification regime to detect any violation and a much longer breakout period in which to respond.

As former Secretary Clinton has indicated, the fact that we have successfully limited the scope of Iran's nuclear program does not mean we have limited its ambitions in the region. We must continue to work with our

friends and allies to constantly contain and confront Iranian aggression in the region. The United States and Israel must always stand together to confront that threat. The fact remains that Iranian support for their terrorist proxy Hezbollah continues to destabilize Lebanon and poses a direct threat to Israel, as does its support for Hamas. We must do all we can to ensure that our ally Israel maintains its qualitative military edge in the region, including providing increased funding for Israel's Arrow anti-ballistic missile and Iron Dome anti-rocket systems. Consideration should also be given to previously denied weapons if a need for such enhanced capabilities arises. We must always remember that some of Iran's leaders have called for the destruction of Israel and we must never forget the awful past that teaches us not to ignore those threats.

The threats Iran poses in the region are real. But all those threats are compounded by an Iran that is a threshold nuclear weapons state. This agreement will roll back the Iranian nuclear program and provide us with greater ability to detect and more time to respond to any future Iranian attempt to build a nuclear weapon.

For all of the reasons given above, I've concluded that this is an historic agreement that should be supported by the Congress.

□ 1045

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself some time as I may consume.

For far too long, we faced the nightmare of Iran with nuclear bombs. Impacted by heavy sanctions, Iran finally agreed to negotiate, led by the United States and five other nations. After agreeing on a framework, which Iran complied with, the parties completed the much-detailed Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

When I issued my statement of support for the JCPOA 6 weeks ago, its fate was uncertain. What decisively turned the tide was the impassioned leadership of the President with Secretaries Kerry and Moniz, combined with a momentous outpouring of support outside the political realm from a vast array of scientific experts, experienced diplomats, key figures from all religious faiths, a wide variety of military leaders, and informed expressions from major former governmental figures of the highest integrity, including Colin Powell and Brent Scowcroft.

It also became increasingly clear that there was no other workable alternative. This point was reinforced by the joint statement yesterday from British Prime Minister Cameron, French President Hollande and German Chancellor Merkel. They said, among other points:

This is not an agreement based on trust or on any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written controls that are verifiable and long-lasting. Iran will have strong incentives not to cheat: The near certainty of getting caught and the consequences that would follow would make this a losing option.

It is now absolutely clear that the JCPOA will go into effect, requiring

the initial set of detailed obligations that Iran must fulfill. It is, therefore, time to go on.

This institution, which has been a major center of attacks on the JCPOA, would hopefully have those who opposed now join with those who supported the agreement and work together to rekindle the kind of overall bipartisanship that Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan urged should apply to key foreign policy issues as they "approached the water's edge."

Surely this kind of rekindled bipartisanship needs to be undertaken in particular to take steps to deepen support for Israel's security, to fight and defeat terrorism, and to rekindle efforts for viable peace negotiations.

I urge my colleagues to vote yes on H.R. 3461, which is a vote of approval for the comprehensive agreement that would prevent Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on H.R. 3460, which would suspend the President's authority to waive sanctions and, in effect, prevent him from implementing the comprehensive agreement.

I close. It is, indeed, time to move on and to take the next steps. Failure to do so but, instead, to perpetuate partisanship will, I strongly believe, be counterproductive for any who try it and for our entire Nation. We can and we must do much better.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Kansas (Ms. JENKINS), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, sanctions are about more than nuclear weapons. They are about the principles and values America holds dear.

Iran continues to hold American prisoners hostage, sponsor terrorism around the world, and American soldiers have died because of the terrorist actions of Iran. And just this week the Iranian Supreme Leader said that Israel will be destroyed within 25 years.

Now, every lawmaker must ask: Are we willing to put \$150 billion into the hands of an Iranian regime who chants "Death to America" and wants to eliminate Israel from the Earth?

We must ask: Are we willing to risk American lives on the promises of a leader who believes those same American lives are worth nothing?

I refuse to sit idly by while this administration leaves the safety, stability, and security of everyone everywhere at the whim of Iran, whose neighbors fear them and allies consist of the Assad regime and Hezbollah. This agreement with Iran would threaten all that we hold dear.

I encourage my colleagues to join the bipartisan opposition against the Iran

deal and, instead, support the security of America above the dangerous desires of Iran.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) who, to put it mildly, is a senior member of our committee.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, my fellow Members, this is a historic occasion for the House and a very emotional time for me because, unfortunately, I have known war. I have known the horrors of war.

And I speak for all of those that have had this horrendous experience to say that we should always give diplomacy a chance before we put any American in harm's way.

I don't think any of us, with any degree of certainty, have any idea whether this agreement is going to hold or if we can contain the criminal, inhumane ambitions of the leadership in Iran.

What we do know is that the international powers not just of China, not just of Russia, but of the United Kingdom, of France, of Germany, and the thinking of the United States of America, truly believe that this is the best possible way to avoid war.

It would seem to me that now is not the time for us to engage in exchanges that separate and bring us apart as a Nation. The rules of the House and the Senate make it abundantly clear that, whether you like it or not, this is going to become the policy of the United States of America. This will not be the policy of President Obama, of Democrats or Republicans, but the policy of our great Nation.

It pains me, as I am about to leave service in this august body, that we have people in this Chamber that have such hatred and disdain for the leadership of this country that they would put this feeling above what is the best policy for the security of this great, beloved Nation of mine.

I know that, if the President of the United States was able to walk on water, there would be people in this Chamber that would say: See, we told you that he couldn't swim.

And so what I am saying—

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANGEL. I don't think I can do that. Because the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) said that China and Russia are supporting this because they want to sell arms to Iran.

I think that was despicable because that includes the United Kingdom, that includes France, that includes Germany, that includes people that are talking about that this is the best way that we are able to do this.

So what I am saying is this: 14 years ago a terrible thing happened to my country, to my city, when terrorists struck on 9/11. And now we have the opportunity to bring our country together the way we did then. Fourteen

years ago, there were no Republicans. There were no Democrats. There were Americans that would say we have to come together.

We are not going to change this agreement. This is the policy of the United States of America—or soon will be. Should we not be saying: What is the enforcement? What are we going to do? What happens if they violate it?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RANGEL. I thank the ranking member.

Are we here to embarrass Presidents, Republicans, and Democrats or are we here to preserve the dignity and the integrity of the United States of America, no matter who is the President?

If ever there was a time for us to come together and support the policy, the time is now.

Thank you so much for giving me this opportunity.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

Mr. Speaker, the oldest trick in the book, if you cannot win a debate on the merits, is to impugn the other person's motives.

People who are opposing this agreement, whether they be Republicans or many of the Democrats who are opposing this agreement, are opposing this agreement because it is a terrible agreement, and there is no other reason.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, this nuclear deal isn't much of a deal at all. It is a gift to the Iranian regime.

For starters, we gave them permanent sanctions relief to the tune of \$150 billion in exchange for temporary enrichment restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, the Ayatollah calls the United States the Great Satan, and just this week he said that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

Imagine the evil that this regime can carry out when they cash in their billions. Under this agreement, Iran will undoubtedly become the central bank of terror.

What is more, with this deal, we shrugged off the opportunity for true "anytime, anywhere" inspections. Instead, we gave Iran an opportunity of at least 24 days to slow-walk investigations of their nuclear sites and conceal signs of noncompliance.

Even worse, under a secretive side deal that was not transmitted here to

Congress, we have learned that Iran will be allowed to self-inspect a key military base.

So to be clear, Members of this body who vote for this agreement will be voting for a deal that they have not seen in full.

Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to tell the Tennesseans that I represent that I voted for an agreement with the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism without knowing every last detail. We cannot and should not leave anything to chance when it comes to the security of America and our allies.

I will be casting my vote on behalf of Tennessee's Sixth District against this dangerous deal, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), another valued member of our committee.

Mr. LEWIS. I thank my friend, the ranking member, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of diplomacy and a pathway to peace.

For many months I thought long and hard about this decision. I attended briefings, read the documents, and met with citizens of my district. I even had a long executive session with myself.

I reflected on the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., when he called upon us to rededicate ourselves to the long and bitter, but beautiful, struggle for a new world. The way of peace is one of those immutable principles.

And after much study, thought, and reflection, I believe that it is a good deal. No, it may not be perfect. But do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

□ 1100

I remember standing on this very floor several years ago and speaking against the war in Iraq. I said it then, and I will say it again today: "War is messy; it is bloody; it destroys the hopes, the aspirations, and the dreams of a people."

The American people—and people around the world—are sick and tired of war and violence. We do not need more bombs, missiles, and guns. When you turn on the news, when you read the newspaper, you see a mass dislocation. Too many people are suffering, and many are desperate for a chance at peace.

I believe in my heart of hearts that this may be the most important vote that we cast during our time in Congress. To put it simply, it is non-violence or nonexistence.

It is my hope that my vote today, along with the votes of others, will be a downpayment for peace towards a world community at peace with itself.

Maybe with this deal, we will send the message that we can lay down the burdens and tools of war. Maybe we can come together as a family of human beings.

Mr. Speaker, we have a moral obligation, a mission, and a mandate to give peace a chance. Give peace a chance.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, later today, we are going to cast two votes. These votes will be amongst the most consequential votes that we will cast—some of us—in our careers.

Our Founding Fathers charged both the President and the Congress with providing for the common defense for good reason. It is the core responsibility of our Federal Government. It is the key to our freedom and for all of our opportunities.

That is why, at the front of the oath every Member takes, it states: "I do solemnly swear that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic."

As we consider this nuclear agreement with Iran, it is our duty to determine whether it will keep America safe.

Sadly, this deal is far worse than anything I could have imagined. Why? It is because the President and his negotiators broke every one of their promises.

Does this deal dismantle Iran's nuclear program or shut off their path to a nuclear weapon as they promised it would? No. Instead, it allows Iran to keep thousands of nuclear centrifuges spinning, as they are today. Within 10 years, in the best case, it allows Iran to achieve a nuclear status.

Was this agreement built on verification? No. It appears a side deal will trust Iran to self-inspect a key site where the regime conducted tests on nuclear detonators. Of course, we haven't seen that actionable side deal, and we don't know if there are any other secret components.

Does this agreement allow inspectors to have anywhere, anytime, 24/7 access as they promised it would? No. Inspectors will have to wait up to 24 days for access to suspicious sites.

Will sanctions snap back? No. The administration admits that nothing at the UN happens in a snap.

Does it shut down Iran's ballistic missile program as they promised it would? No. Actually, the agreement lifts the arms and missile embargoes in 5 and 8 years, respectively, and it allows Iran to build ICBMs capable of delivering a nuclear warhead right here at the United States of America.

Does this agreement affect Iran's status as the world's leading sponsor of terror? Yes, it actually does. It hands Iran billions of dollars to support more of their terrorist activities around that part of the world, and it gives amnesty to the shadow commander responsible

for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq.

This is all without Iran cheating. That is right; this is such a bad deal that the Ayatollah won't even have to cheat to be just steps away from a nuclear weapon.

Today, we are going to cast two votes. These votes are aimed at stopping President Obama from unilaterally lifting sanctions on Iran and ensuring accountability.

My colleagues, in pursuing this deal with Iran, President Obama refused to listen. He ignored the concerns of the American people, national security experts, and a bipartisan majority here in the Congress. Now, he is preparing to try and force this deal over our objections.

Never in our history has something with so many consequences for our national security been rammed through with such little support.

Today is September 11. It is a day for all Americans to come together and for us to keep the oath we swore to our Constitution. Our fight to stop this bad deal, frankly, is just beginning. We will not let the American people down.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader, who, indeed, as she goes to speak, has been our leader on this effort.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his leadership, for the courage it took for him and the humility to listen and to learn what was in this legislation and this agreement. That is something that I commend the Members of the House for doing, to listen and to learn.

Our distinguished Speaker just referenced the oath of office that we take when we become Members of Congress. It is a vow that we make to the American people, to protect and support our Constitution and our responsibility to protect and defend the American people.

Today, Mr. Speaker, we will vote on an agreement to make America safer—indeed, to make the world a safer place—so say the nuclear scientists and the diplomats, so say the military and security leaders of both parties or of no party, so does the faith community beseech us to do.

This morning, Father Conroy offered a prayer to God to “help the Members of this House to recognize that you are with us in our deliberations.” Indeed, as we cast our votes on this historic agreement, we are thankful to God, that God was with us to, again, give us the humility to learn and the courage to act; and for that, we should all be grateful.

It is important to note that support for this agreement, as I have said, comes from both sides of the aisle. More than 100 former diplomats—

Democrats and Republicans and ambassadors, et cetera—wrote:

In our judgment, the agreement deserves congressional support and the opportunity to show it can work. We firmly believe that the most effective way to protect U.S. national security and that of our allies and friends is to ensure that tough-minded diplomacy has a chance to succeed before considering other more risky alternatives.

Thirty-six generals and admirals wrote: “There is no better option to prevent an Iranian nuclear weapon. If the Iranians cheat”—as the Speaker suggested they might—“If the Iranians cheat, our advanced technology, intelligence and the inspections will reveal it, and U.S. military options remain on the table. And if the deal is rejected by America, the Iranians could have a nuclear weapon within a year. The choice is stark.”

What is mysterious to me is that when our colleagues come to the floor and say, under this agreement, Iran can be a nuclear power in 10 or 15 years, so we should reject this agreement, no. Without the agreement, they are a threshold nuclear power right now and can have a weapon within months or a year. It seems to me the choice is clear, as the generals and admirals pointed out.

It is also interesting to note that our distinguished Speaker pointed out some shortcomings, in his view, in the agreement. That is disagreed with by the best nuclear physicist, who wrote to congratulate the President on the agreement. Now, these are Nobel laureates, and these are engineers, nuclear physicists, who work and specialize in nuclear weapons research and development.

They said: “We consider that the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action the United States and its partners negotiated with Iran will advance the cause of peace and security in the Middle East and can serve”—this is really important—“as a guidepost for future non-proliferation agreements.”

They went on to say: “This is an innovative agreement, with much more stringent constraints than any previously negotiated non-proliferation framework.”

That is why they were congratulating the President of the United States.

I mentioned the prayer of Father Conroy this morning. I also, this morning, saw in The Washington Post that the Prime Minister of the U.K., David Cameron; the French President, Francois Hollande; and German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, wrote an op-ed that said: “This is an important moment. It is a crucial opportunity at a time of heightened global uncertainty to show what diplomacy can achieve.”

These heads of state went on to state: “This is not an agreement based on trust or on any assumption about how Iran may look in 10 or 15 years. It is based on detailed, tightly written con-

trols that are verifiable and long-lasting.”

They said: “We condemn in no uncertain terms that Iran does not recognize the existence of the state of Israel and the unacceptable language that Iran’s leaders use about Israel. Israel’s security matters are, and will, remain our key interests, too.”

Prime Minister Cameron, President Hollande, and Chancellor Merkel then said: “We would not have reached the nuclear deal with Iran if we did not think that it removed a threat to the region and the non-proliferation regime as a whole . . . We are confident that the agreement provides the foundation for resolving the conflict on Iran’s nuclear program permanently. That is why we now want to embark on the full implementation of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.”

Today, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of the agreement that enhances our vigilance and strengthens our security.

I just always am fond of quoting a story of Solomon in the Bible. When King David died and Solomon was to become king, he was uncertain as to his ability to be king in terms of his wisdom and the rest. He prayed to God and prayed that God would give him the wisdom because David was such a great king and how could he say to God, I am going to be the king of your people, help me with wisdom?

God came to him in the night, and he said: Solomon, because you did not ask for longevity, because you did not ask for great riches, because you did not ask for vengeance upon your enemies, I will give you more wisdom than anyone has ever had; and you will be renowned for wisdom, the Solomon of wisdom which sprang from humility, the humility to pray for enlightenment, for knowledge, for wisdom, for judgment.

That humility is so essential in the job that we do here. We don’t have foregone conclusions. That is why I am so proud of my Members who spent so much time studying this issue, not only reading the agreement and the classified sections and the rest, but seeking answers, having information, seeking validation from generals and admirals and scientists and leaders of other countries as to what their actions would be should we, unfortunately, reject this, which happily we will not do today.

□ 1115

They had the humility to open their minds to learn, and when they learned, they had the courage to take action where some others of their friends may not have arrived yet because they did not have the benefit of all of this information. Wherever Members come down on this issue, we know one thing—that we have to come together in the end to protect our country and to stop the

proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

I say, mostly of my own experience, that I have had decades of experience in tracking Iran and its nuclear ambitions. I have served longer than anyone—more than two times more than anyone—on the Intelligence Committee, so I know of what I speak. I went to the Intelligence Committee to stop the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and that gave me some judgment as to what the President brought back in this agreement. Still, I was subjected to the harshest scrutiny as to, from my experience, if I thought that this was the best possible route we could achieve.

We mustn't judge agreements by what they don't do but respect them for what they do do; and what this does is to make our country safer, the region safer, and our friends in Israel safer as their own national security experts have attested.

So I thank you, my colleagues. I thank you for listening, for learning, for coming to whatever conclusion you came to, but for understanding that, at the end of the day, we have respect for each other's opinions and a regard for our responsibilities to our people, to the people in the region, to our friend Israel, and also a global responsibility.

I join the nuclear physicist in congratulating President Barack Obama for his great leadership and for giving us this opportunity.

Today, we will not just be making history as the approval of the agreement goes forward. We will be making progress for the cause of peace in the world.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman RYAN.

Mr. Speaker, the Democratic leader just recalled the invocation, that of invoking God's presence, and she said that we had prayed for wisdom, and she called us to act humbly.

So the question is: Are we willing to submit ourselves to the collective wisdom of a majority of this body and to a majority of the other body? I would suggest a majority of this body and a majority of the other body think this is a bad idea.

She also admonished us that we should listen and learn. It is not a bad idea, so let's listen to what is in the bill, itself. The bill, itself, gives \$150 billion in sanctions relief to the Iranian Government.

The question is: What do we expect with \$150 billion? Is it all going to go to pave roads? Is it going to go to build schools in Tehran? Is it going to fix water systems? I do not think so, and neither does President Obama. Listen to his own words.

This is Barack Obama:

Let's stipulate that some of the money will flow to activities that we object to. We have no illusions about the Iranian Government or the significance of the Revolutionary Guard.

Listen to National Security Adviser Susan Rice when she says:

We should expect that some portion of that money would go to the Iranian military and could potentially be used for all kinds of bad behavior that we have seen in the region up until now.

Let's listen to those words. They are clear. They are obvious.

So now think in terms of percentages of \$150 billion. Is it going to be half? Is it going to be a quarter? Is it going to be 10 percent? Is it going to be 1 percent—1 percent of that money—\$1.5 billion? Doing what—funding Hamas? funding Hezbollah? killing Americans? Let's listen and let's learn.

Now, my friend from New York said this is definitely the policy of the United States. Definitely. It is a fait accompli. There is really no reason to have this debate and this discussion. It is all over according to his world view. I don't buy it. I don't buy that for a second. I am not going to lay down here and let the President of the United States run roughshod in his probably—let's think about it. Is this just a bad idea, or is this the worst bill ever? the worst idea ever? I think it wins the "worst idea ever" award.

Mr. Speaker, it was a week ago when it was crazy talk as to the idea that the President of the United States had standing, and it was crazy talk a week ago that the House of Representatives had standing in the courts. Now, do you know what the courts have said? The House has standing.

So, as to the notion that this is all done and that this is just a settled case, it is not. I think we have got to be very, very clear about what is going on, and we need to listen, and we need to learn, and we need to vote "no."

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, our Speaker stood before us a few minutes ago and sounded a somber, serious note. I am sorry the process that we are going through does not reflect that somber, serious attitude. It is sad that it has come to this: a parody of what could have been a week-long, thoughtful, thorough debate about our relationship with Iran, which Republicans, instead, have turned into an incoherent, partisan shouting match. It ignores the reality, the complexity, and the opportunity.

There has been no discussion, for example, about how America seriously mismanaged our relationship with Iran since we helped the British overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and installed the Shah as dictator; how we backed the murderous Saddam

Hussein's war against Iran that cost up to 1 million lives, and we looked the other way when he used poison gas—a real weapon of mass destruction; how we labeled them the "axis of evil" when they were working with us in a post-Taliban Afghanistan. It is amazing that the majority of Iranian people still likes us.

Now, I strongly oppose the current Iranian leadership; but, for years, I have been working for a diplomatic solution with other countries because sanctions only work when other countries join us. Well, they did, and we have an opportunity today to enforce a nonnuclear future for Iran.

The Republican talking point is, somehow, they are going to get \$150 billion. That talking point, however, ignores the reality. Those five powerful countries that joined with us, that help get the agreement, they are going to walk away if America walks away from the sanctions they have imposed on Iran if America walks away from the deal. As multilateral sanctions will dissolve, Iran will get its money anyway and nuclear weapons, if it wants, in a year or two. It will be the United States and Israel that will be isolated, and the world will be less safe.

These are some of the reasons that the major independent experts have said the Iran Nuclear agreement is the best alternative for the United States. Not a perfect agreement, but the best agreement. Let's use all of our time and energy to make this agreement work and to strengthen relationships in the Middle East to avoid more mistakes currently championed by the same people who gave us the disastrous Iraq war.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, this is a horrible deal. In any deal, you never get what you deserve. You get what you negotiate. Let me give you a contrast between what two Presidents say when they talk about deals.

President Obama has told America that it is either this agreement or war. President Reagan said there is no argument over the choice between peace and war, but there is only one guaranteed way you can have peace, and you can have it in a second—surrender.

Now I want you to let your mind drift back to 14 years ago, on a morning very eerily like today, when America awoke, and some Americans were going off to work in the World Trade Center, when some Americans were going off to work at the Pentagon, and when some Americans boarded flights for destinations that they thought they were going to get to. Three thousand Americans said good-bye that morning

to their families and their loved ones, thinking that they would see them again, never knowing that they would never be able to say that again, would never be able to kiss them good-bye, would never be able again to celebrate a birthday or any other meaningful event in their lives because of an act of terrorism.

Flight 93. By the way, it was United Flight 93. Thirty-seven passengers and seven crew members boarded the airplane destined for San Francisco. That is not where the plane landed. That plane is embedded in a smoldering crater in the peaceful countryside of Shanksville, Pennsylvania, because of terrorists. The members of that flight crew and those passengers performed the greatest act of religious sacrifice that you can do. They gave up their lives for the lives of their fellow Americans. They walked away from futures filled with promise and decided it was more important at that moment to sacrifice themselves.

How in the world can we sit in America's House—and I speak to you today not as a Republican but as an American. My friends, as we let our eyes fill with tears over the great loss that day and as our ears pick up on the message from our enemies in the East of "death to Israel," "death to the Great Satan," "death to America," let us resound with long and lost strength and temerity and say: "Listen. Never again. Never again. Never again." Let those words echo forever and ever, not only in your ears but in your hearts. Do not cave in. Do not sacrifice the safety, the security, and the stability of 330 million Americans for the legacy of one man.

That is not who we are. That is not who we have ever been. That is not who we will ever be.

My friends—and I mean, sincerely, my friends—and my fellow Americans, vote against the greatest betrayal we have ever seen in this country. This is not a deal that protects America. It is unenforceable. It is unverifiable. This is just a horrible deal.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I pause for a minute.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, as the last speech indicates, it is hardly by chance that the House Republican leadership has scheduled these votes on 9/11—votes on an agreement to prevent Iran from developing a nuclear weapon—ever.

The justifiable fear of another terrorist attack and the justifiable outrage about the terrorist attack of 9/11 have been exploited before today. They were exploited to justify the disastrous invasion of Iraq. While few Americans today will recall that, actually, after 9/11 there was some early support in Iran against al Qaeda terrorism, few can forget the oft repeated and rather

deceitful warning that promoted the rush to war in Iraq: "We don't want the smoking gun to be a mushroom cloud."

Once again, the specter of this mushroom cloud is being raised with those who would interfere with an international, diplomatic success—an agreement that would avoid putting us on another path to war. The same kind of folks who urged us to rush into Baghdad are the same folks who told us back before we even had this agreement that it wouldn't work and that we ought to begin bombing in Tehran and in the surrounding area. They are the same folks who said that it would only take a few days of bombing and it would all be over. It is the same poor logic that took us into a disaster in Iraq, which cost so many families the ultimate sacrifice and the waste of over \$1 trillion.

□ 1130

This is not a debate about the Twin Towers. It is a debate, though, that would be a twin wrong if we follow the same approach we took the last time.

I have supported sanctions against Iran.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WOMACK). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOGGETT. I have supported them at each opportunity, but this is not about sanctions. It is about a last-ditch effort to undermine a diplomatic victory.

Those who reject this victory are weak on alternatives. They talk about a "secret." The biggest secret is what they would do other than bomb first and ask questions later.

The director of the Mossad, the Israeli CIA, says we are putting in place a verification system, which is second to none and has no precedent.

Ultimately, reason will prevail this week in Congress. The President will be sustained, and families here and in Israel will be safer.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to this debate. I have read this agreement. I heard my colleague from Illinois say something that resonates with me.

We should listen. First and foremost, we should listen to the American people. They are overwhelmingly saying: This is dangerous. Reject this deal. Let's listen to the leaders that say this puts us in more jeopardy of going to war.

We all want peace. There is not a human being in America that wants to go to war. To classify us on this side of the aisle as having a desire to go to war, shame. But you will get peace through strength, and you need to put the American citizens first.

What about our four fellow American citizens that are sitting in an Iranian jail right now and the President said: We tried to negotiate it, but they wouldn't talk to us? Well, then you walk away.

What about the families that are represented in the \$47 billion worth of judgments that have been filed against Iran because they suffered terrorist acts at the hands of Iran and we are going to give \$150 billion to Iran without paying those fellow American citizens, those families who suffered and lost dear loved ones? Stupidity. American citizens always must be first.

Iran has raised no confusion as to what its intention is here. It wants a nuclear weapon. It wants to destroy Israel. It wants to destroy America. Listen to their own words. If you do, we would say we want peace, but it will be on our terms from a position of strength.

Vote "no" on this deal.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. MIKE KELLY is a good man. I like MIKE. I admire him. But I think he did a disservice to the House and to this debate by bringing up the issue of 9/11.

I do thank him for honesty for at least showing that that is what this is all about, having this debate today and this vote today to stir the emotions of the American people.

My emotions are always stirred on this day. Fourteen years ago, I knew people who died that day. My cousin died. My friends died. I don't need to be reminded of that. But it will not cloud my decisionmaking on this important issue.

Today I stand in support of a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. This has been a difficult decision for me, and I know it has been for many of my colleagues as well.

There are those who came out against this deal before you even read it. But for those of you who took the time to read the agreement and came to a different conclusion, you have my deep and profound respect because we both share the same goals.

After carefully studying this agreement, I believe it is important to give diplomacy the opportunity to succeed. The agreement takes important steps to address Iran's nuclear program.

Under this agreement, both the current uranium and plutonium paths to a bomb are addressed and all of Iran's operating uranium enrichment will be centralized into a single facility that is penetrable by U.S. air power.

This agreement does not constrain the United States from bolstering our allies and aggressively pushing back against Iran's other nefarious activities.

There is more we can do and must do, including strengthening Israel, Jordan,

and our other allies in the region. Israel is the only country being threatened with annihilation. I know that. So it needs and deserves a quantitative and qualitative military advantage.

And if this deal doesn't work or Iran's leadership somehow gets the idea that they can attack us or wipe out our friends, the United States and our allies will have the capability, the will, and the power to confront Iran's nuclear program and destroy it.

We have the best military in the world. We have the best intelligence service in the world. America will always be prepared.

The fact is no one here can predict whether Iran will give up its program, not Republicans nor Democrats. If they don't, we have options. But we can do this and give this plan the opportunity to work, and I am prepared to do that.

Now, after all this discussion and talk about bipartisanship, a real profile in courage would be for one of you to support your President, one Republican to stand and support your President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. Thirteen years ago, I stood here in the House of Representatives and I gave the benefit of the doubt to the then-President, and he took us to war. I will give today the benefit of the doubt to your President to take us to peace.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), a distinguished member from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I didn't take an oath of office to defend my President. I took an oath in office to defend my country.

The world is a dangerous place, and nothing makes it more dangerous than a nuclear-armed Iran. This isn't a Republican versus Democrat issue. This is true security versus false security at a critical moment in world history.

I have read the agreement, and I have studied it. You have got to ask yourself three key questions: Does this stop Iranian's nuclear capability for the long term? No. Does it stop the spread of nuclear weapons in the Middle East? No. More importantly, does this make America and our allies like Israel safer? The answer is no. And even supporters believe that to be true. No.

America deserves, Israel deserves, our world deserves, an agreement that dismantles Iran's nuclear capability, not just delays it for a small while at best.

That is why I oppose this agreement. It makes our country and our allies at risk. That is why I support stopping the President, suspending the President, from lifting the sanctions in this agreement.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I have had an opportunity to listen to the debate. Some of the things that are going on, yes, they are heated.

But as we look at this historic agreement—my good friend from New York just asked: Will you stand with your President? I have stood with the President before.

I think it is also important that we take a look at this agreement. This is a historic mistake. This is one that will jeopardize the safety and security of the United States.

And I want to echo that this is a bipartisan opposition. So this is not about left versus right. This is about right versus wrong.

Ultimately, when I tuck my children in bed at night, a 13-year-old, an 11-year-old and an 8-year-old, and I look into the faces of those that are here, these young Americans, and I wonder what type of country they will inherit with a nuclear-armed Iran, for me, that is unacceptable.

Our stated objectives, our goals, were to make sure that Iran never has the ability to achieve a nuclear weapon. And, yet, this agreement, according to BOB MENENDEZ, all but preserves it, a nuclear-armed Iran, one that shouts "death to America." They want to wipe Israel off the face of the map.

In this agreement, the ballistic missile embargo is lifted in 8 years, an arms embargo in 5 years.

My friends, what do you use a ballistic missile for? I would argue it is not to drop leaflets. It is not for humanitarian purposes. It is to have a reign of terror in the United States of America. For me, that is completely unacceptable.

Again, I don't care where you come from, what district you are in, this is about will we be safer. And the answer is simply no.

I believe that this agreement ultimately will be an arms race in the Middle East. We have talked about France. We have talked about the U.K. We have talked about Germany.

Has anybody asked the neighborhood? Has anybody asked Saudi Arabia or the UAE or Egypt or Israel? The answer is no because they are uniformly against this because they know Iran's ultimate goal is to not only devastate that region, but to devastate the United States of America.

This is one of the things that, again, must unite us. This is not about partisanship.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. DOLD. This is not about partisanship. Please hear me. We don't want to bring up 9/11 in the sense that we want to do it on this day, 9/11.

But I do think that it does smack of the idea that we never want to see that dirty bomb that comes into a container ship, that goes into New York, Miami, or Washington, D.C. Because you know what? No one wants to relive what happened on that day 14 years ago.

Yet, if we do not step up in a united front and stop this, my fear is that we will relive that day again. That, for me, is unacceptable. I implore you all, my colleagues, my friends, to stand up against this awful historic mistake.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. TOM PRICE), the distinguished member of the Budget Committee and member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this week Iran's Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, the person with whom President Obama and his administration say they have reached an agreement that we should support, doubled down, once again calling the United States the Great Satan.

And he further declared, after negotiations, there will be nothing left of Israel in 25 years and, until then, jihadi morale will leave not a moment of serenity.

This is the very man that the President of the United States is blindly trusting if we endorse this deal.

Sadly, this administration has folded on every single red line and point of leverage that the United States had.

There are no "anytime, anyplace" inspections. There is no accountability for past Iranian nuclear activities. Conventional armament bans will be lifted. Ballistic missile bans will be lifted.

To put it plainly, Mr. Speaker, this deal paves a shiny yellow brick road for Iran to spread Islamic extremism, death, and destruction around the world, not to mention an unprecedented nuclear arms race across the entire Middle East.

We should have made sure that not a single resource or benefit received by Iran funds Islamic terrorism. We should have made sure that Iran publicly accepts Israel's right to exist, that genocide is unacceptable, that stated goals of wiping entire groups of people and nations off the Earth is unacceptable.

At the very least, we should have made certain that four American hostages, including a Christian pastor being held in Iran, were released. Of course, not a single one of these objectives were achieved.

The administration thought that compelling Iran to renounce nuclear holocaust or Islamic terrorism or genocide were simply far too unreasonable to request.

If this deal goes through, time will surely demonstrate that it will be a shameful stain in the history of the world.

Now, we pray that terrible ramifications do not come to fruition. However, if the past is prologue, this agreement may very well make any further action or concerns voiced by anyone too little, too late.

A nuclear Iran spells nothing but disaster. For safety at home and abroad, this agreement must be rejected.

□ 1145

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), a distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, after listening to this debate, I commend President Obama and Secretary Kerry for their leadership and resolve in crafting the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action reached between the P5+1 nations and Iran. I do so because this is a plan which promotes peace and security, not war or the continuous threat of war.

Yes, no agreement is perfect, and no agreement will fully satisfy everyone, but I can tell you that, for me and the constituents of the Seventh District of Illinois, we say let's give peace a chance. We say let's support the position of our President, but we also say let's support the position of our experts, let's support the position of our allies, let's heed the words of the prophets who say, "Come and let us reason together" or we shall all be "utterly destroyed by the edge of the sword."

Yes, we say let's support the most rational, the most logical, the most comprehensive, and the most effective path to peace that we know. Yes, it is not about supporting the position of any single individual, but it is about supporting what is good for America. It is about supporting what is good to help stabilize our world so that we can exist with the idea that peace is, indeed, possible and war is not inevitable.

Yes, I support the President.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. SMITH), another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to lifting economic sanctions on Iran. Throughout August, I spoke with many Nebraskans all across my district at public meetings. In addition to their frustration over the reach of the Federal Government, the most common concern they shared with me involved the Iran deal.

The ramifications of this agreement will impact not only our country's future, but also, I believe, the stability of the world. I am opposed to this deal and believe Congress must reject it and allow U.S. negotiators to go back to the table.

Permanently lifting economic sanctions on Iran, as this deal does, would allow global financial resources to flow into a country still included on our list of state sponsors of terrorism. Not only does this deal end long-held sanctions, it also lifts arms embargoes, as we have heard.

The conventional weapons embargo ends in 5 years under this agreement, and the ballistic missile ban is lifted in 8 years. We should be mindful of our closest ally in the region, Israel, whose leaders continue to gravely warn us of the dangers of trusting the Iranian regime.

The President has said our options are either accepting this deal or going to war. I think that rhetoric is irresponsible. Economic sanctions have served as one of the most effective peaceful methods of suppressing the Iranian regime. When our national security is on the line, reaching no deal is certainly better than advancing a bad deal.

Congress must stop this bad deal and pursue a stronger agreement which enforces greater accountability measures on Iran and prioritizes the safety of our country and our allies.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, how much time remains for both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan has 6½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 6¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, first, I rise with so many of my colleagues today in remembrance of one of the worst days in our Nation's history. It is a solemn day of remembrance and prayer for those who lost their lives on that fateful day.

As Americans, we must be united as a nation in fighting terrorism, which we know remains a threat every single day in this country. September 11 is a day burned in the hearts and souls of all Americans, and we must work hard together—together—to ensure that we never witness such a horrific tragedy in our homeland ever again.

We all agree, never again. I say that, like my colleague from New York, Mr. CROWLEY, as a woman who lost a cousin in a terrorist act and watched a woman I love never recover from her son's death. We all care.

Congress and this country, as a whole, have a responsibility to work with nations across the world in pursuit of peace. My district is home to

one of the largest populations of Arab Americans in the country who, like so many of us, came to the United States as immigrants. They are among the most patriotic Americans I know. They are proud to be Americans and have made numerous contributions to this great Nation. Today, I ask you to also remember this.

I rise in support of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Like so many, it was not an easy decision, and it was made with the utmost respect for my colleagues and friends on both sides of the aisle. This process has shown me that, no matter what decision one reaches on this issue, almost everyone shares the same concerns, and they have been named and reviewed many times, so I am not going to go over them.

What I do want to say is—and we have said many times—it is not based on trust. It is based on verification. That is the last point I want to address today.

Congressional oversight of the Iran deal will not end with this vote. In fact, it will just be the beginning. This effort must be bipartisan, and I hope it will be divorced from the acrimonious politics that have dominated too much of this discussion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle: let's work together for peace in the Middle East and across the globe.

Senseless politics and inflammatory rhetoric only complicate an already difficult decision. September 11 should be a day that we use to remind us of what binds us together, the values we share, the love of America that every one of us in this institution has, and let's work together to protect this Nation we so dearly love.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), another distinguished member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker and Members, military leaders, national security experts, diplomats, administration officials, Democratic and Republican Members of Congress all agree that sanctions against Iran have worked.

Several years ago, 400 Members of Congress in this body—a huge bipartisan majority—voted to increase sanctions on Iran because they recognized that smart, targeted sanctions would curtail the Iranian economy and help unite the world against the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

Desperate for sanctions relief, Iran came to the negotiation table. I support diplomatic efforts and was hopeful that the President would be able to bring back a good deal. In fact, 365 Representatives—84 percent of the House—sent a letter to the President, saying we could accept a deal that accomplished four things: had a long-lasting deal that ensured that Iran had no pathway to a bomb; that it fully disclosed the military aspects of its program; that we had anytime, anywhere inspections; and that we would address Iran's ballistic missile capabilities and its destabilizing role in the region.

Sadly, none of these principles were met under this deal.

The President has claimed that this deal is the strongest nonproliferation agreement ever negotiated, but that just isn't true. In our nonproliferation agreement with Libya, we demanded that they completely eliminate centrifuges, halt all advanced centrifuge research and development, that they completely eliminate their enriched uranium stockpile, that they give unfettered access to the IAEA, and that they completely eliminate their long-range missile program, and that we also would ratify the strictest safeguards regime, known as the additional protocol.

Under this agreement, Iran doesn't have to do any of this. Will a nuclear Iran make the world a safer place? Instead of giving the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism hundreds of billions of dollars and more intercontinental ballistic missile technology and conventional weapons, we should demand a better deal.

The President should be working with Congress in a bipartisan way because the world deserves a verifiable, enforceable, and accountable agreement that enhances safety, stability, and security.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY).

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of those who do not have a voice today in this debate, and that is the over 500 servicemen and -women who died in Iraq because of the export of vehicle-borne IED technology by Iran, by the brutal terrorist leader Qasem Soleimani who used money from Iran—and he will be getting more money in order to export with the sole purpose to kill American troops—and the thousands who were wounded.

I deployed to this region six times in my military career, and our military is concerned about this administration turning their back on the men and women who died and the strength that they need in order to keep that region safe and secure. This is a slap in the face to those who paid that sacrifice.

Qasem Soleimani is a brutal man. We have studied him throughout my entire

military career. He is exporting terror all over the region and not just in the region. He is responsible for deaths in places like India and Latin America. He is funding money to the Assad regime—over 250,000 dead—Hezbollah and Hamas.

I sat a few weeks ago on the edge of the Gaza Strip, where thousands of rockets were launched last summer, killing innocent civilians in Israel. Israelis have 7 to 30 seconds to run to shelter when these rockets are coming. They are funded and exported by Qasem Soleimani and Iran. We stood up on the northern border near where Hezbollah, funded by Iran, is stockpiling over 100,000 rockets, ready to launch at the Israeli people.

This is a dangerous deal. This is not about a choice between this deal or war. Those of us who served in the military, we want war less than anybody else. We know the price. We want diplomacy. Those sanctions were working. We just cranked them up in the last 18 months.

They are cash-strapped in Iran. They are fighting in between the desires in their different factions of how they are going to use that money to continue to move their nuclear program forward or export terror. We had them exactly where we wanted, and then we gave up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Speaker, if we give them these funds, with the arms embargo and the ICBM embargo, it is going to be a more dangerous military action, and more American lives will be lost. It is not this deal in war. This will deal in, potentially, war.

On behalf of our American troops, I would ask you to please vote against this deal. It is dangerous for the many reasons my colleagues have mentioned, but do it on behalf of those who gave the ultimate sacrifice.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have had a vigorous debate. This agreement is going into effect. As we have debated here this morning, that is a fact. This is the challenge before this body, and that is whether we will try to recapture some real bipartisanship or we essentially will forfeit it.

There is work to be done implementing this agreement. That is acknowledged by all. The question is whether we will join together to try to make it work, an agreement that I support, but I think the same responsibility is incumbent upon those who oppose it; or, as the Speaker says, they have just begun to fight.

□ 1200

That, I think, is the wrong approach, in a very important way—both as to

this agreement but also beyond—because there is work to be done in terms of efforts to reinforce security in the Middle East, especially for Israel. There is work to be done in the Middle East and beyond in terms of fighting terrorism. There is work to be done outside of the Middle East—everywhere—in terms of terrorism.

And so I think it is a deep mistake to leave this moment here, with this agreement going into effect, saying the fight will continue. No. The fight should be with all of us together to make this work and to address the continuing challenges that face this country in the Middle East and beyond.

So I close with everybody else who has worked so hard on this and who has come to a conclusion on our own. But I think the tenor here sometimes is deeply troubling, and I think the Speaker's statement that the fight has just begun—over what? I hope not over the effort to continue the flames of partisanship that sometimes have captured this debate and before.

We all took the pledge. We have a solemn obligation, I think, to work together. And I think it would be a deep mistake to have it forfeited for reasons of political advantage.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that we believe that the President has exceeded his authority in so many ways, that he has stretched the separation of powers on lots of issues; and on most of those issues, I believe we can fix those problems. On most of those issues, whether it is regulations or domestic laws, I believe we in this body, with the next administration, will have with the power and the ability to fix this. This is one where I don't think we can.

I think he has stretched the Constitution, because this should be a treaty. This is an executive agreement. When asked why, they said: Well, we couldn't pass a treaty.

So much for the Constitution that we all swore to uphold.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think the President is going to get the legacy that he thinks he is going to get or that he is hoping he is going to get.

I will insert in the RECORD a letter from 190 former military officers. It says:

This agreement is unverifiable. As military officers, we find it unconscionable that such a windfall could be given to a regime that even the Obama administration has acknowledged will use a portion of such funds to continue to support terrorism.

AUGUST 25, 2015.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER,

Speaker of the House.

HON. NANCY PELOSI,

Minority Leader.

HON. MITCH MCCONNELL,

Majority Leader.

HON. HARRY REID,

Minority Leader.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES BOEHNER AND PELOSI AND SENATORS MCCONNELL AND REID:

As you know, on July 14, 2015, the United States and five other nations announced that a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) has been reached with Iran to prevent it from developing nuclear weapons. In our judgment as former senior military officers, the agreement will not have that effect. Removing sanctions on Iran and releasing billions of dollars to its regime over the next ten years is inimical to the security of Israel and the Middle East. There is no credibility within JCPOA's inspection process or the ability to snap back sanctions once lifted, should Iran violate the agreement. In this and other respects, the JCPOA would threaten the national security and vital interests of the United States and, therefore, should be disapproved by the Congress.

The agreement as constructed does not "cut off every pathway" for Iran to acquire nuclear weapons. To the contrary, it actually provides Iran with a legitimate path to doing that simply by abiding by the deal. JCPOA allows all the infrastructure the Iranians need for a nuclear bomb to be preserved and enhanced. Notably, Iran is allowed to: continue to enrich uranium; develop and test advanced centrifuges; and continue work on its Arak heavy-water plutonium reactor. Collectively, these concessions afford the Iranians, at worst, a ready break-out option and, at best, an incipient nuclear weapons capability a decade from now.

The agreement is unverifiable. Under the terms of the JCPOA and a secret side deal (to which the United States is not privy), the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) will be responsible for inspections under such severe limitations as to prevent them from reliably detecting Iranian cheating. For example, if Iran and the inspectors are unable to reach an accommodation with respect to a given site, the result could be at least a 24-day delay in IAEA access. The agreement also requires inspectors to inform Iran in writing as to the basis for its concerns about an undeclared site, thus further delaying access. Most importantly, these inspections do not allow access to Iranian military facilities, the most likely location of their nuclear weapons development efforts. In the JCPOA process, there is substantial risk of U.S. intelligence being compromised, since the IAEA often relies on our sensitive data with respect to suspicious and/or prohibited activity.

While failing to assure prevention of Iran's nuclear weapons development capabilities, the agreement provides by some estimates \$150 billion dollars or more to Iran in the form of sanctions relief. As military officers, we find it unconscionable that such a wind-fall could be given to a regime that even the Obama administration has acknowledged will use a portion of such funds to continue to support terrorism in Israel, throughout the Middle East and globally, whether directly or through proxies. These actions will be made all the more deadly since the JCPOA will lift international embargoes on Iran's access to advanced conventional weapons and ballistic missile technology.

In summary, this agreement will enable Iran to become far more dangerous, render the Mideast still more unstable and introduce new threats to American interests as well as our allies. In our professional opinion, far from being an alternative to war, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action makes it likely that the war the Iranian regime has waged against us since 1979 will continue, with far higher risks to our national security

interests. Accordingly, we urge the Congress to reject this defective accord.

Sincerely,

Admiral David Architzel, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Stanley R. Arthur, US Navy, Retired; General William Begert, US Air Force, Retired; General J.B. Davis, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Leon A. "Bud" Edney, US Navy, Retired; General Alfred G. Hansen US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Thomas Hayward, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James Hogg, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Jerome Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Timothy J. Keating, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Robert J. Kelly, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Thomas Joseph Lopez, US Navy, Retired; Admiral James A. "Ace" Lyons, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Richard Macke, US Navy, Retired; Admiral Henry Mauz, US Navy, Retired; General Lance Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Admiral Leighton Smith, US Navy, Retired; Admiral William D. Smith, US Navy, Retired; General Louis C. Wagner, Jr., US Army, Retired; Admiral Steve White, US Navy, Retired; General Ronald W. Yates, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Teddy G. Allen, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Edward G. Anderson, III, US Army, Retired; Lieutenant General Marcus A. Anderson, US Air Force, Retired.

Lieutenant General Spence M. Armstrong, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Harold W. Blot, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Bowman, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General William G. "Jerry" Boykin, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward S. Briggs, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Richard E. "Tex" Brown III, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General William J. Campbell, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward Clextion, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Daniel L. Cooper, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral William A. Dougherty, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Brett Dula, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Gordon E. Fornell, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas B. Goslin, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Earl Hailston, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Bernard M. Kauderer, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Timothy A. Kinnan, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral J. B. LaPlante, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Tony Less, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Bennett L. Lewis, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Michael Malone, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral John Mazach, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Thomas McInerney, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Fred McCorkle, US Marine Corps, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert Monroe, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jimmy Pappas, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral J. Theodore Parker, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General Garry L. Parks, US Marine Corps, Retired; Lieutenant General Everett Pratt, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral John Poindexter, US Navy, Retired.

Lieutenant General Clifford "Ted" Rees, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral William Rowden, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Robert F. Schultz, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General E.G. "Buck" Shuler, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant General Hubert "Hugh" G. Smith, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral Edward M. Straw, US Navy, Retired; Lieutenant General David J. Teal, US Air Force, Retired; Vice Admiral D.C. "Deese" Thompson, US Coast Guard, Retired; Lieutenant General William E. Thurman, US Air Force, Retired; Lieutenant Gen-

eral Billy Tomas, US Army, Retired; Vice Admiral John Totushek, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Tuttle, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Jerry Unruh, US Navy, Retired; Vice Admiral Timothy W. Wright, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral William V. Alford, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Major General Thurman E. Anderson, US Army, Retired; Major General Joseph T. Anderson, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip Anselmo, US Navy, Retired; Major General Joe Arbuckle, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James W. Austin, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral John R. Batzler, US Navy, Retired.

Rear Admiral John Bayless, US Navy, Retired; Major General John Bianchi, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Vaux Boecker, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Jerry C. Breast, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bruce B. Bremner, US Navy, Retired; Major General Edward M. Browne, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas F. Brown III, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Lyle Bull, US Navy, Retired; Major General Bobby G. Butcher, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jay A. Campbell, US Navy, Retired; Major General Henry D. Canterbury, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Carroll D. Childers, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Ronald L. Christenson, US Navy, Retired; Major General John R.D. Cleland, US Army, Retired; Major General Richard L. Comer, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Jack Dantone, US Navy, Retired; Major General William B. Davitte, US Air Force, Retired; Major General James D. Delk, US Army, Retired.

Major General Felix Dupre, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Philip A. Dur, US Navy, Retired; Major General Neil L. Eddins, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Paul Engel, US Navy, Retired; Major General Vince Falter, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral James H. Flatley, US Navy, Retired; Major General Bobby O. Floyd, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Paul Fratarangelo, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Veronica "Ronne" Froman, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral R. Byron Fuller, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frank Gallo, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Albert A. Gallotta, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral James Mac Gleim, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert H. Gormley, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral William Gureck, US Navy, Retired; Major General Gary L. Harrell, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Donald Hickman, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey Higginbotham, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General Kent H. Hillhouse, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Tim Hinkle, US Navy, Retired; Major General Victor Joseph Hugo, US Army, Retired; Major General James P. Hunt, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Grady L. Jackson, US Navy, Retired.

Major General William K. James, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral John M. "Carlos" Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Pierce J. Johnson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Steven B. Kantrowitz, US Navy, Retired; Major General Maurice W. Kendall, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Charles R. Kubic, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Frederick L. Lewis, US Navy, Retired; Major General John D. Logeman, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Homer S. Long, Jr., US Army, Retired; Major General Robert M. Marquette, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert B. McClinton, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral W. J. McDaniel, MD, US Navy, Retired; Major General Keith W. Meurlin, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Terrence McKnight, US Navy, Retired;

Major General John F. Miller, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Burton R. Moore, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral David R. Morris, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Ed Nelson, Jr., US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General George W. "Nordie" Norwood, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Everett G. Odgers, US Air Force, Retired.

Rear Admiral Phillip R. Olson, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert S. Owens, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert O. Passmore, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard E. Perraut, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral W.W. Pickavance, Jr., US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral L.F. Picotte, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Thomas J. Porter, US Navy, Retired; Major General H. Douglas Robertson, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral W.J. Ryan, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Norman Saunders, US Coast Guard, Retired; Major General John P. Schoepfner, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Major General Edison E. Scholes, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral Hugh P. Scott, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard Secord, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James M. Seely, US Navy, Retired; Major General Sidney Shachnow, US Army, Retired; Rear Admiral William H. Shawcross, US Navy, Retired; Rear Admiral Bob Shumaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Willie Studer, US Air Force, Retired; Major General Larry Taylor, US Marine Corps, Retired; Rear Admiral Jeremy Taylor, US Navy, Retired; Major General Richard L. Testa, US Air Force, Retired.

Rear Admiral Robert P. Tiernan, US Navy, Retired; Major General Paul E. Vallely, US Army, Retired; Major General Kenneth W. Weir, US Marine Corps, Retired; Major General John Weide, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral James B. Whittaker, US Navy, Retired; Major General Geoffrey P. Wiedeman, Jr., MD, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral H. Denny Wisely, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General John R. Allen, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General John C. Arick, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Loring R. Astorino, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Robert E. Besal, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General William Bloomer, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General George P. Cole, Jr., US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Richard A. Coleman, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General James L. Crouch, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Marianne B. Drew, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Philip M. Drew, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Larry K. Grundhauser, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas W. Honeywill, US Air Force, Retired.

Brigadier General Gary M. Jones, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Stephen Lanning, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Thomas J. Lennon, US Air Force, Retired; Rear Admiral Bobby C. Lee, US Navy, Retired; Brigadier General Robert F. Peksens, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Joe Shaefer, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Graham E. Shirley, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Stanley O. Smith, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General Hugh B. Tant III, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Michael Joseph Tashjian, US Air Force, Retired; Brigadier General William Tiernan, US Marine Corps, Retired; Brigadier General Roger W. Scarce, US Army, Retired; Brigadier General Robert V. Woods, US Air Force, Retired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. This is an agreement that waives the sanctions against terrorism. This is a regime

that funds terrorism. It said nothing about stopping further terrorism. It lifts the bans on conventional weapons so they can arm back up. It lifts the bans on intercontinental ballistic missiles. The only reason you have an ICBM is to put a nuclear weapon on it. It guarantees that Iran becomes a nuclear power, and it gives them \$150 billion upfront to finance it.

About a decade ago, I was in Kuwait in a tank graveyard. I spent the morning walking through acres of destroyed M1 Abrams tanks, Humvees, MRAPs, and they had the same kind of signature blast—a hole ripping right through it, killing whoever was inside, our soldiers.

Then, we went up to Baghdad and met with one of our senior commanders, a great general named Ray Odierno, and we asked: What is killing all of our servicemembers? What is doing this?

EFPs, explosively formed penetrators.

He got one of them that they had confiscated and showed us what it was, a highly sophisticated machine explosive device with wiring on it that said "Made in Iran," brought by a gentleman named Soleimani. And we are lifting the sanctions on them.

This is not a vote for some person's legacy. This is a vote to put yourself on the right side of history. Vote to kill this agreement.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 412, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Passage of H.R. 3461; and

Passage of H.R. 3460.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The re-

maining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

APPROVAL OF JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3461) to approve the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, relating to the nuclear program of Iran, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 162, nays 269, answered "present" 1, not voting 1, as follows:

[Roll No. 493]

YEAS—162

Adams	Fattah	Neal
Aguilar	Foster	Nolan
Bass	Fudge	O'Rourke
Beatty	Gabbard	Pallone
Becerra	Gallego	Pascarell
Bera	Garamendi	Payne
Beyer	Grayson	Pelosi
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Peters
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Hahn	Pocan
Brown (FL)	Heck (WA)	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Higgins	Price (NC)
Bustos	Himes	Quigley
Butterfield	Hinojosa	Rangel
Capps	Honda	Richmond
Capuano	Hoyer	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Huffman	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Jeffries	Rush
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Chu, Judy	Keating	T.
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clay	Kilmer	Schiff
Cleaver	Kind	Schrader
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Slaughter
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Costa	Lawrence	Speier
Courtney	Lee	Swalwell (CA)
Crowley	Levin	Takai
Cuellar	Lewis	Takano
Cummings	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
Davis (CA)	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Titus
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Tonko
DeGette	(NM)	Torres
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
DeLauro	(NM)	Van Hollen
DelBene	Lynch	Veasey
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Dingell	Matsui	Visclosky
Doggett	McCollum	Walz
Doyle, Michael	McDermott	Wasserman
F.	McGovern	Schultz
Duckworth	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Edwards	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Ellison	Moore	Welch
Eshoo	Moulton	Wilson (FL)
Esty	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Farr	Nadler	

NAYS—269

Abraham	Barr	Blum
Aderholt	Barton	Bost
Allen	Benishek	Boustany
Amash	Bilirakis	Boyle, Brendan
Amodel	Bishop (MI)	F.
Ashford	Bishop (UT)	Brady (TX)
Babin	Black	Brat
Barletta	Blackburn	Bridenstine

Brooks (AL) Hudson
 Brooks (IN) Huelskamp
 Buchanan Huizenga (MI)
 Buck Hultgren
 Bucshon Hunter
 Burgess Hurd (TX)
 Byrne Hurt (VA)
 Calvert Israel
 Cárdenas Issa
 Carter (GA) Jenkins (KS)
 Carter (TX) Jenkins (WV)
 Chabot Johnson (OH)
 Chaffetz Johnson, Sam
 Clawson (FL) Jolly
 Coffman Jones
 Cole Jordan
 Collins (GA) Joyce
 Collins (NY) Katko
 Comstock Kelly (MS)
 Conaway Kelly (PA)
 Cook King (IA)
 Costello (PA) King (NY)
 Cramer Kinzinger (IL)
 Crawford Kline
 Crenshaw Knight
 Curberson Labrador
 Curbelo (FL) LaMalfa
 Davis, Rodney Lamborn
 Denham Lance
 Dent Latta
 DeSantis Lieu, Ted
 DesJarlais Lipinski
 Deutch LoBiondo
 Diaz-Balart Long
 Dold Loudermilk
 Donovan Love
 Duffy Lowey
 Duncan (SC) Lucas
 Duncan (TN) Luetkemeyer
 Ellmers (NC) Lummis
 Emmer (MN) MacArthur
 Engel Maloney,
 Farenthold Carolyn
 Fincher Marchant
 Fitzpatrick Marino
 Fleischmann McCarthy
 Fleming McCaul
 Flores McClintock
 Forbes McHenry
 Fortenberry McKinley
 Foxx McMorris
 Frankel (FL) Rodgers
 Franks (AZ) McCally
 Frelinghuysen Meadows
 Garrett Meehan
 Gibbs Meng
 Gibson Messer
 Gohmert Mica
 Goodlatte Miller (FL)
 Gosar Miller (MI)
 Gowdy Moolenaar
 Graham Mooney (WV)
 Granger Mullin
 Graves (GA) Mulvaney
 Graves (LA) Murphy (PA)
 Graves (MO) Napolitano
 Green, Gene Neugebauer
 Griffith Newhouse
 Grothman Noem
 Guinta Norcross
 Guthrie Nugent
 Hanna Nunes
 Hardy Olson
 Harper Palazzo
 Harris Palmer
 Hartzler Paulsen
 Hastings Pearce
 Heck (NV) Perry
 Hensarling Peterson
 Herrera Beutler Pittenger
 Hice, Jody B. Pitts
 Hill Poe (TX)
 Holding Poliquin

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Massie

NOT VOTING—1

Johnson (GA)

□ 1231

Messrs. KELLY of Mississippi,
 AMODEI, ISSA, FLORES, REICHERT,
 CARTER of Georgia, BROOKS of Ala-

bama, Mrs. BLACK of Tennessee, and
 Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER changed
 their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Ms. WILSON of Florida and Mr.
 SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New
 York changed their vote from "nay" to
 "yea."

So the bill was not passed.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on
 the table.

SUSPENSION OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PRO- VIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHER- WISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-
 finished business is the vote on passage
 of the bill (H.R. 3460) to suspend until
 January 21, 2017, the authority of the
 President to waive, suspend, reduce,
 provide relief from, or otherwise limit
 the application of sanctions pursuant
 to an agreement related to the nuclear
 program of Iran, on which the yeas and
 nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The
 question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 247, noes 186,
 as follows:

[Roll No. 494]

AYES—247

Abraham Crawford Guthrie
 Adersholt Crenshaw Hanna
 Allen Culberson Hardy
 Amash Curbelo (FL) Harper
 Amodei Davis, Rodney Harris
 Babin Denham Hartzler
 Barletta Dent Heck (NV)
 Barr DeSantis Hensarling
 Barton DesJarlais Herrera Beutler
 Benishek Diaz-Balart Hice, Jody B.
 Bilirakis Dold Hill
 Bishop (MI) Donovan Holding
 Bishop (UT) Duffy Hudson
 Black Duncan (SC) Huelskamp
 Blackburn Duncan (TN) Huizenga (MI)
 Blum Ellmers (NC) Hultgren
 Bost Emmer (MN) Hunter
 Boustany Farenthold Hurd (TX)
 Brady (TX) Fincher Hurt (VA)
 Brat Fitzpatrick Issa
 Bridenstine Fleischmann Jenkins (KS)
 Brooks (AL) Fleming Jenkins (WV)
 Brooks (IN) Flores Johnson (OH)
 Buchanan Forbes Johnson, Sam
 Buck Fortenberry Jolly
 Bucshon Foxx Jones
 Burgess Franks (AZ) Jordan
 Byrne Frelinghuysen Joyce
 Calvert Garrett Katko
 Carter (GA) Gibbs Kelly (MS)
 Carter (TX) Gibson Kelly (PA)
 Chabot Gohmert King (IA)
 Chaffetz Goodlatte King (NY)
 Clawson (FL) Gosar Kinzinger (IL)
 Coffman Gowdy Kline
 Cole Graham Knight
 Collins (GA) Granger Labrador
 Collins (NY) Graves (GA) LaMalfa
 Comstock Graves (LA) Lamborn
 Conaway Graves (MO) Lance
 Cook Griffith Latta
 Costello (PA) Grothman LoBiondo
 Cramer Guinta Long

Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 Lummis
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Massie
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McCally
 Meadows
 Meehan
 Messer
 Mica
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Moolenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Mulvaney
 Murphy (PA)
 Neugebauer
 Newhouse
 Noem
 Nugent
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palazzo
 Palmer
 Paulsen
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger

Pitts
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Pompeo
 Posey
 Price, Tom
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Ribble
 Rice (SC)
 Rigell
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (AL)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney (FL)
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce
 Russell
 Ryan (WI)
 Salmon
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Scott, David
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Sherman
 Shimkus
 Shuster
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)

NOES—186

Adams
 Aguilar
 Ashford
 Bass
 Beatty
 Becerra
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (FL)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cárdenas
 Carney
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Connolly
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 DeSaulnier
 Drift
 Dingell
 Doggett

Loeb sack
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham
 (NM)
 Luján, Ben Ray
 (NM)
 Lynch
 Maloney,
 Carolyn
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Pascrell
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Peterson
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Rangel
 Rice (NY)
 Richmond
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppersberger
 Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky

Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez
Schrader	Takai	Visclosky
Scott (VA)	Takano	Walz
Scott, David	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman
Serrano	Thompson (MS)	Schultz
Sewell (AL)	Titus	Waters, Maxine
Sherman	Tonko	Watson Coleman
Sinema	Torres	Welch
Sires	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)
Slaughter	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Smith (WA)	Veasey	
Speier	Vela	

□ 1245

Mr. TAKAI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 381

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 381.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 493, I was, unfortunately, detained and missed that rollcall vote. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) to inquire of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday and Tuesday, no votes are expected in the House. On Wednesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Members are advised that, given the shortness of the week due to the Jewish holiday, Members should be prepared for a full legislative day on Friday.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business today.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction

Act of 2015, sponsored by Representative LAMAR SMITH. This bill will ensure that innocent Americans are protected against frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, the House will also consider two measures that respond to the horrific videos released throughout the summer on Planned Parenthood practices. The first is H.R. 3134, sponsored by Representative DIANE BLACK, which places a 1-year moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood while Congress investigates these videos.

Three committees in the House are currently looking into Planned Parenthood activities, funding, and adherence to the law.

The second will be a bill sponsored by Representative TRENT FRANKS, which adds criminal penalties to people who violate the Born Alive Act, for medical providers who fail to provide medical care to a baby who survives the abortion procedure.

Americans are rightfully outraged by what was depicted in these videos, and Congress and the American people have a right to know exactly what is happening.

These two critical bills will ensure that we get all the facts and protect those who cannot protect themselves.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for the information.

I would just observe that we share the view of the—you used the term “horrific” videos. As I understand it, these videos are heavily edited. I don’t want to get into debate about them; we will have that debate next week, but we are certainly concerned about, as the gentleman knows, 97 percent of the health care delivered by Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with the issues raised in the video, edited or not.

We would hope that we could come to an agreement on making sure that those healthcare services that are provided to literally thousands and thousands of women are not interrupted, but I understand that we will have that debate next week.

Mr. Leader, you do not include in your schedule a continuing resolution for the funding of government. As the gentleman knows, we have essentially, as I count it, 5 full legislative days left. We have 8 or 9 days left, but there are many partial days.

We have 5 full legislative days left before the government runs out of authority and funds to continue. As the gentleman knows, I have been urging the majority leader and your side of the aisle to enter into discussions on levels of funding and funding itself.

We suspended the appropriations process approximately in the middle of July when the Interior bill was pulled from the floor. Presumably, it was pulled because there was a possibility of amendments being offered regarding the Confederate battle flag, but notwithstanding that, half the appropria-

tion bills have not been brought to the floor. No appropriation bills have passed the Senate.

I have been urging, for at least 2 months now, that we have discussions. I discussed with Mr. VAN HOLLEN today there have been no discussions between Mr. VAN HOLLEN and Mr. PRICE with reference to a resolution of the funding levels for a CR or the length of term of the CR.

I had an opportunity to talk to Ranking Member NITA LOWEY today of the Appropriations Committee. She informs me that there have been no substantive discussions between herself and Mr. ROGERS and that Mr. ROGERS, in fact, has no indication of what funding levels will be going forward or what a CR would look like or the length of period of time it would be for.

In addition to that, I have discussed with the leader’s office, Leader PELOSI’s office—and I know that neither my office nor Leader PELOSI’s office have been in discussion either with the Speaker’s office or your office in a substantive way with how we might be moving forward on a CR.

I, frankly, thought that this coming week would be the week for us to consider a continuing resolution so that given the very, very short number of days available in September for us to meet, that there would be time for the Senate to receive a continuing resolution for us to consider that and pass it so that we would not, again, confront a crisis of confidence, a crisis in terms of ongoing government operations, but also a crisis of confidence not only in our country, but around the world that the United States of America could manage its finances in a responsible way.

With that said, Mr. Majority Leader, can you share with us some insight? Again, I know that it is not on the schedule, and this is about scheduling, but we have 5 full days and 3 partial days and a ninth day which the Pope is going to be here, and I know we will be having votes on that day, but we have such a minimal time before the government runs out of authority and funding for its operations that it seems to me that it is critical that today or tomorrow or Monday, we decide how we are going to proceed.

I will be pleased to yield to my friend, the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman knows, the fiscal year does end on September 30. As the gentleman knows, we have had this discussion often because our intention was always to solve this problem very early. As history shows, this is the earliest we have ever started the appropriation process for Congress.

I had grave concern during the summer, reading many of the headlines from some on your side of the aisle and over on your side of the aisle in the

Senate, that it was a strategy to make sure the appropriation process would not work.

When votes came to the floor, very strongly, you were able to hold many of your Members. Counterpart with the number two on the Senate side, Senator SCHUMER, his whole strategy for the summer, he was much more effective where none of them came up.

We know the number of days we have left. We are continuing conversations on government funding, and we will inform Members when action is scheduled in the House.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Leader, there are 5 days—full days—left to go. You are right; we have been discussing this for some period of time, but with all due respect to any strategy that we have, you only brought six bills to the floor and passed six bills through this House, and that is only half of the appropriation bills.

The MilCon bill got 255 votes; the Energy and Water, 240; the Legislative Branch, 357; the Commerce, Justice, Science, 242; T-HUD, which we didn't like and, apparently, a lot of your Members didn't like either, 216 votes; and the Defense bill, 278 votes.

There was nothing on our side that stopped the appropriations process from going forward. You chose not to bring six of those bills to the floor. I don't take any blame on our side of the aisle, whatever our strategy might be.

Our strategy has been consistent with, very frankly, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee strategy, and that is to have funding levels on both the defense and nondefense side of the ledger which were rational and reasonable.

I repeat ad nauseam, as you know—and you are tired of hearing me repeat it, I am sure—Mr. ROGERS' comments that the sequester levels given to the Appropriations Committee to meet their responsibilities were ill-conceived and unrealistic. That is Mr. ROGERS' quote, not mine, not our strategy.

That was what the chairman of the Appropriations Committee on your side of the aisle characterizes the funding levels that you have provided the committee for—I don't mean you individually—the House has provided the chairman with to write his bills up.

As a result of being unable to do that, every time you brought a bill to the floor, it has gotten a majority of the votes. Forget about us. We can't control. We have 188 Members. You can pass anything you want.

The appropriations bill process came to a dead halt for two reasons. Number one, it is because there are no negotiations for a well-conceived and realistic alternative to sequester. That is what HAL ROGERS says—not me—your chairman.

I continue to be extraordinarily disappointed that we have not undertaken any discussions—I mentioned Mrs.

LOWEY on the Appropriations Committee, Mr. VAN HOLLEN on the Budget Committee, Leader PELOSI's office, my office—any discussions which have allowed us to come to some agreement so that we might in a bipartisan way move forward.

Now, I understand there are a lot of members on your side of the aisle who won't vote for anything if it funds Planned Parenthood. I get that. They don't come close to making the majority of this House.

□ 1300

Until such time as we start acting with the majority's will prevailing as opposed to a faction's prevailing, I think we are going to be in this gridlock that is undermining the confidence of our country, of our government, and of our international partners.

I would hope that, in the next, perhaps, few days, Mr. Leader—and I am prepared to spend time today, this weekend, Monday, and Tuesday—I know we are not coming back until Wednesday—to try to work with you and with the relevant committees, with the Speaker, and with the leader of my party to try to get us to a point where we can do exactly what you want to do and what we want to do, and that is not have this government by crisis that we have now. This is the third time on an unrelated issue where there has been a problem with funding government as is our responsibility at whatever levels we agree upon. I would hope that we could pursue those discussions. I have been urging that for months now, and we haven't done that.

You also did not mention something that I have discussed with you and discussed with the Speaker that I bring up all the time. As a result of our failure to fund the Export-Import Bank and to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, we are losing jobs, and we have lost a substantial number of jobs already. Speaker BOEHNER indicated in a quote not too long ago that, in fact, there are thousands of jobs on the line that would disappear pretty quickly if the Ex-Im Bank were to disappear.

Essentially, in terms of new loans and new products that could be sold abroad, the Ex-Im Bank has disappeared as of July. I have had discussions with the Speaker, and I think he has been quoted publicly as saying he thought the Ex-Im Bank was, in fact, in some form, going to be considered on the floor this month.

I ask my friend, the majority leader, as it is not on the schedule, but, again, it is not as if we have months to go—we have 5 days to go—before the end of the fiscal year and that funding for the Ex-Im Bank expires. Can the gentleman tell me whether there is any possibility of that being considered within the next 5 or 8—if you want to count 8—legislative days we have left in this month?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank my friend for yielding.

I would not feel these colloquies were complete if I did not get this question. I admire the gentleman's consistency in asking it, but my answer remains just as consistent. There is no action scheduled in the House on Ex-Im.

Mr. HOYER. With that answer, the gentleman can be assured that I will keep asking the question, and I keep asking the question not to vex the majority leader. I keep asking the question because the Speaker and I agree that we are losing jobs. We are putting ourselves in a noncompetitive position with the rest of the world.

By not bringing this up to the floor, Mr. Leader—I haven't counted specifically, but I will bet you, however, that there are over 275 votes on this floor to pass a reauthorization and extension of the Export-Import Bank. The failure to bring it to the floor is not because it doesn't enjoy a majority of support—it does. When it last came to the floor—when Mr. Cantor and I worked on the legislation and brought it to this floor—it got well over 300 votes. Now, I understand there are some in your party who don't like it; but, very frankly, we have got to get over, because some in your party don't like things, that we gridlock the Congress of the United States and make America uncompetitive and undermine confidence in this country.

Yes, Mr. Leader, you are very tolerant, and I will keep asking the question because I think it is critical for our economy, and it is critical to get us off this gridlock where a small minority of the Congress of the United States is holding good policy hostage.

Now, let me also ask you: On October 29, the highway bill will lose its authorization, which we have been extending in very short periods of time. The gentleman knows no Governor, no mayor, no county commissioner, no contractor can possibly plan infrastructure improvements—highways, bridges, sewer systems, whatever—on the basis of 90-day or 60-day extensions of authority and funding.

The gentleman didn't mention it. It is not coming up next week. I understand that we have a longer time—but not a long time—between now and October 29 when the highway bill will expire. As the gentleman, I am sure, knows and agrees, the failure to do that will have a significant adverse effect on jobs for Americans and a significant adverse effect on the infrastructure of this country.

Can the gentleman tell me whether or not he expects a highway bill to come to the floor anytime within the timeframe prior to October 29?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

As the gentleman did mention, the highway program is currently authorized through the end of October. The

relevant committees are at work—I met with them today—developing the best path forward, and I will keep you apprised, as well as the Members, and I expect it to be done before the deadline.

Mr. HOYER. That is good news that the highway bill, at least, will be done before the deadline.

I will tell my friend, like the majority leader, I had a discussion today with Mr. DeFAZIO, who is the ranking Democrat on the relevant committee, Mr. SHUSTER being the chairman. I know they have had some discussions, but I also know that they are not very close to an agreement. I know that neither one of them likes the Senate bill that was sent to us. The majority leader and I had discussions on that. We didn't take that up. I thought that was probably the right thing for the majority leader to do, to not take it up.

Again, the majority leader says he is engaged. I would hope he uses his good office to get us to a place where we can pass a bill in a bipartisan fashion as, during my 34 years, has normally been the case. That extends for a significant period of time—no less than 5 years—at levels that are necessary to meet the infrastructure needs of this country, both from an economic standpoint and a national security standpoint.

I yield to my friend if he wants to say anything further. If not, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2015, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 15, 2015; AND HOUR OF MEETING ON WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 3 p.m. on Tuesday, September 15, 2015; and, further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at noon on Wednesday, September 16, 2015, for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WORLD SUICIDE PREVENTION WEEK

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of National Suicide Prevention Week.

Unfortunately, in the past several years, we have witnessed an increase in suicides among our Active-Duty members of the Armed Forces and our veterans populations.

Prior to my tenure in Congress, I served nearly three decades addressing the mental health needs of individuals who have suffered life-changing disease and disability. This is an issue I remain passionate about, particularly when addressing the mental health of those who place their lives on the line in serving this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I remain confident this body can do right by our servicemembers and veterans. A part of that is advancing the Medical Evaluation Parity for Servicemembers Act, which is intended to improve suicide prevention by instituting a mental health assessment for all new military recruits, which will then be used as a baseline throughout their military careers. This was included in the 2016 National Defense Authorization.

Our dedication to this cause is the least we can do for those who have sacrificed so much for their Nation.

COMMEMORATING THE BRAVE MEN AND WOMEN LOST ON 9/11

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the brave men and women lost on September 11.

Last week, I visited a windswept meadow in Somerset County, Pennsylvania, just outside my district, which, until 14 years ago, had little meaning for this country.

At 10 a.m. that day, the quiet of that field was shattered as 40 Americans successfully thwarted an attack on the Nation's capital. They, like 2,700 other individuals that day, lost their lives as a result of acts of raw evil. Quiet has returned to that field, but, today, there exists at the site a memorial and a new visitor center that opened yesterday.

I visited the site last week, and it amazed me how fresh the memories of that horrible day remain. The remembrances are unforgettable, from the timeline embedded within the walk that follows Flight 93's path—8:46 a.m., 9:03 a.m., 9:37 a.m.—to the words of the passengers from phone calls that were made that day.

Let's draw inspiration from the brave sacrifices made by so many Americans that day; and let's, today, renew the commitment we all felt in the days after September 11 to reinvigorate, heal, and strengthen our Nation.

IRAN DEAL

(Mr. BABIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BABIN. Mr. Speaker, on this day, the 14th anniversary of the terrible attack of 9/11/2001, I rise to strongly oppose the deeply flawed, dangerous, and unacceptable deal that President

Obama has struck with the Islamic Republic of Iran and its leader, Ayatollah Khamenei. To even stand here in the people's House of the greatest nation on Earth and discuss this course of action taken by the President is both shameful and embarrassing for our country.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is the world's leading sponsor of terrorism. They have the blood of thousands of American soldiers on their hands. They lead chants of "death to America," whom they call the Great Satan, and burn our flag in their streets. They declared just last week, with certainty, that Israel, whom they call the Little Satan, will be wiped off the map in no less than 25 years. This plan allows Iran to build a nuclear bomb in no less than 15 years. You do the math.

The President's deal with a terrorist nation allows them to continue their nuclear program and gives them over \$150 billion to fund worldwide terrorism.

A vote for this deal, with all of its dire implications for the future of our children and grandchildren, could well be the most regrettable vote that a Member of Congress will ever take in his career.

FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

(Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of three brave firefighters—Tom Zbyszewski, Andrew Zajac, and Richard Wheeler—who were killed after their vehicle crashed near Twisp, Washington, leaving the men in the path of a raging fire.

Washington State has faced record forest fires this season. Nearly a million acres have burned. There has been a lot of loss, including the lives of these three men.

Tom, the youngest, at 20 years old, was a rising junior at Whitman College, who followed in his parents' footsteps and accepted the call to fight fires during the summer. How he and his colleagues died is really a testament to the type of men that they were—brave and generous, fiercely dedicated to protecting their home, and willing to put their lives at risk to protect it.

My prayers continue to be with their families and all those who have been impacted by these fires. We are eternally grateful for these young men and their service to our beloved State.

You are our heroes. Rest in peace.

□ 1315

JAMES ZADROGA 9/11 HEALTH AND
COMPENSATION REAUTHORIZA-
TION ACT

(Mr. DONOVAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DONOVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to the James Zadroga 9/11 Health and Compensation Reauthorization Act and to call attention to our duty to the heroes who have already sacrificed so much.

As Americans, we have pledged to never forget the terrible events of 9/11. As Americans, we have a duty to never forget those who risked their lives to save others. Well over 1,000 9/11 first responders have been diagnosed with cancer caused by their exposure to toxins at Ground Zero.

Because of the Zadroga Act, over 70,000 9/11 first responders and survivors around the country, including 6,000 in my district, are being monitored for cancer and other Ground Zero-related incidences. Over 7,600 are already receiving treatment.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we honor our commitment to those brave men and women by permanently reauthorizing this important program.

IRAN NUCLEAR DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MACARTHUR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, coincidental to the message or the speech that I am about to give, I am reminded, as so many of you are, that this is September the 11th and 14 years ago terrorists, in an evil, devastating act against our country designed to destroy us as a people, attacked the very fabric of the Nation and killed almost 3,000 innocent Americans.

I pray for their families, and I pray for those who loved those people and still feel the loss within their souls today.

Mr. Speaker, I also believe that one of the best ways we can honor the people who lost their lives that infamous day is to remember that the price of freedom has always been eternal vigilance.

We still face a world where jihad has designs on destroying this, the greatest and freest republic in the history of the world.

And in the name of those we have lost, in the name of those generations still to come, God help us to be vigilant people, as Americans.

Mr. Speaker, the blood, sacrifice, and noble principles of millions of gallant souls across America's history have made this Nation the unipolar super-

power of the entire world. Our international policies now significantly impact the peace and security of the entire human family.

The very first responsibility of this Nation's government and especially its Commander in Chief is to protect America's national security. The only two ways we have to do that is to prevent any enemy or potential enemy from having the intent and capacity to do us harm. We must make sure that, if there is an enemy with the intent to do us harm, that they do not have the capacity to proceed.

The intent of the Islamic Republic of Iran has been crystal clear since they took and held 52 American hostages 444 days at the beginning of their radical revolution those 36 years now ago. They have ever since been waging war on America and their own neighbors.

But the only way the Iranian leaders can ever truly achieve their ultimate goal is to become a nuclear-armed nation.

Consequently, they have proceeded inexorably in that direction both secretly and openly and obviously for decades until America and the Western world came together with resolutions, sanctions, and warnings of military intervention to halt and dismantle this unspeakably dangerous threat. This pressure finally brought Iran to the negotiating table.

But now, instead of increasing and using that pressure, President Barack Obama has completely ignored the original commitment that the sanctions would only be dismantled when Iran's nuclear weapons program was dismantled.

The President blindly accepted whatever deal Iran put on the table and completely forgot who was at the other end of that table.

Mr. Obama then proceeded to capitulate on every redline and minimum requirement that both he and the United Nations had previously required.

The President has now squandered away every form of leverage we had against this theocratic radical regime, which has broken every promise it has ever made to us.

And what did we get in return, Mr. Speaker? We got an insane rope-a-dope, duplicitous, unverifiable, astonishingly unenforceable deal. We got a deal that legitimizes and empowers the most prolific state sponsor of terrorism in the world.

It obligates America to lift all sanctions, lift bans on Iran's imports of weapons and ballistic missile programs. It allows Iran a protected protocol to enrich uranium and research even more advanced centrifuges.

It gives them tens of billions of dollars with which they can continue to spread their terror and destabilizing expansionism throughout the world.

It allows them to continue their human rights abuses, including ille-

gally holding American citizens hostage. And it allows them to keep their entire nuclear infrastructure.

All the while, the Supreme Leader and ultimate authority in Iran is publicly reaffirming his hatred toward the United States and publicly leading throngs of his supporters in shouting "Death to America" and "Death to Israel." Unbelievable.

Mr. Speaker, Bill Clinton made a far better deal than that, and the result was that the police state of North Korea proceeded to develop nuclear weapons only a few years later.

Some of our most loyal allies live under that nuclear threat to this day. Now this deal will place America and our vital ally, Israel, under that same nuclear threat tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, the Iranian mullahs were intently listening when Barack Obama proclaimed before the United Nations that no nation has the right to pick and choose what nations have nuclear weapons. But I remind him that Iran is a nation that has threatened to destroy America and destroy Israel.

These same mullahs were watching as Barack Obama knowingly stood by and idly watched as thousands of innocent civilians in Iraq were either butchered, tortured, raped, beheaded, crucified, or burned alive by ISIS. They then knew they had nothing to fear from Barack Obama.

So the jihadist leaders of Iran came to the nuclear negotiating table with nothing and walked away with everything.

These are the same Iranian mullahs that openly bragged how their bounties and weapons have killed hundreds of American Marines and soldiers on the battlefield, shattering their families in an unbelievable way.

What will these leaders do if they have nuclear weapons? Inexplicably, instead of making sure they never get a nuclear weapon, Barack Obama's politically motivated peace-in-our-time capitulation empowers the most dangerous sponsor of terrorism on this Earth and places them on the path to obtain an entire nuclear arsenal.

Mr. Speaker, unless this Congress or the next President is able to stop this madness, Barack Obama will be on trajectory to be remembered as the father of the Iranian atomic bomb and the one who ultimately nuclearized the entire Middle East, and our children will start down a path that leads through the shadow of nuclear terrorism.

And whatever the costs there might have been to prevent Iran from gaining nuclear weapons will pale in comparison to the costs of dealing with a nuclear-armed Iran. We must not let that happen, Mr. Speaker.

Astonishingly, Democrat Senators are now arrogantly filibustering any attempt for the Senate to reject this inexpressibly dangerous deal.

It is time for the majority leader of the Senate to use the nuclear option in

the Senate rules to bring this inexpressibly dangerous nuclear deal with Iran to the Senate floor and vote on and reject it as the treaty that it actually embodies under the Constitution of the United States. If Republicans do not use the nuclear option in our rules, Iran may some day use their nuclear option against our Nation.

It is September 11, Mr. Speaker. God help us to remember. For the sake of our children and future generations, God help this Congress to reject this treacherous deal and God help us all to focus on the unspeakable importance of the coming elections in America.

I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1461. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for out-patient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015.

S. 1629. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1461. An act to provide for the extension of the enforcement instruction on supervision requirements for out-patient therapeutic services in critical access and small rural hospitals through 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce; in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 1629. An act to revise certain authorities of the District of Columbia courts, the Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia, and the Public Defender Service for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 15, 2015, at 3 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2692. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Processed Raspberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Late Payment and Interest Charges on Past Due Assessments [Document No.: AMS-FV-14-0042] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2693. A letter from the Comptroller, Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter reporting a violation of the Antideficiency Act, as required by 31 U.S.C. 1351, Army case number 13-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2694. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Housing Choice Voucher Program: Streamlining the Portability Process [Docket No.: FR-5453-F-02] (RIN: 2577-AC86) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2695. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2696. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's third quarterly report from the National Telecommunications and Information Administration regarding the Internet Assigned Numbers Authority transition, pursuant to the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015, Pub. L. 113-235; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2697. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements (RIN: 1991-AC02) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2698. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's two Congressional Reports on Alternative Fuel Use by Federal Dual Fueled Vehicles. One report is for FY 2011 and 2012, and the second report is for FY 2013; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2699. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Rules Division, Office of Engineering and Technology, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 15 of the Commission's Rules for Unlicensed Operations in the Television Bands, Repurposed 600 MHz Band, 600 MHz Guard Bands and Duplex Gap, and Channel 37; Amendment of Part 74 of the Commission's Rules for Low Power Auxiliary Stations in the Repurposed 600 MHz band and 600MHz Duplex Gap [ET Docket No.: 14-165]; and Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions [GN Docket No.: 12-268] received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2700. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Russian Sanctions: Addition to the Entity List to Prevent Violations of Russian Industry Sector Sanctions [Docket No.: 150610514-5514-01] (RIN: 0694-AG66) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-083; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2702. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-040; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2703. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-057; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2704. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-081; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2705. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Sec. 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-059; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2706. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-023; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2707. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification, pursuant to Secs. 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, Transmittal No.: DDTC 15-006; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2708. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting six reports pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2709. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2710. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2711. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XE087) received

September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2712. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 9 [Docket No.: 150401329-5659-02] (RIN: 0648-BF00) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2713. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Species: Final Rulemaking To Revise Critical Habitat for Hawaiian Monk Seals [Docket No.: 110207102-5657-03] (RIN: 0648-BA81) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2714. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Revisions to Charter Halibut Fisheries Management in Alaska [Docket No.: 140724618-5506-02] (RIN: 0648-BE41) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2715. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Groupers Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Regulatory Amendment 20 [Docket No.: 140611492-5605-02] (RIN: 0648-BE30) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2716. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure [Docket No.: 150619537-5615-01] (RIN: 0648-XE037) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2717. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery and Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 26; Endangered and Threatened Wildlife; Sea Turtle Conservation [Docket No.: 141125999-5362-02] (RIN: 0648-BE68) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2718. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Na-

tional Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8 [Docket No.: 140214145-5582-02] (RIN: 0648-BD81) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2719. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Federal Bureau of Prisons, transmitting the Bureau's interim rule — Contraband and Inmate Personal Property: Technical Amendment [Docket No.: BOP-1163] (RIN: 1120-AB63) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2720. A letter from the Chairperson, Commission on Care, transmitting an update on the work of the Commission that was established in Sec. 202 of the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2721. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification of the President's ongoing negotiations with the European Union in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership, in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committee on Natural Resources discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3498 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself, Mr. McCAUL, and Mr. PALMER):

H.R. 3490. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the National Computer Forensics Institute, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3491. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount of special pension for Medal of Honor recipients, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOEBBACH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California):

H.R. 3492. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to limit the number of local wage areas allowable within a General Schedule pay locality; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. DONOVAN (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. McCAUL):

H.R. 3493. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Securing the Cities program to enhance the ability of the United States to detect and prevent terrorist attacks and other high consequence events utilizing nuclear or other radiological materials that pose a high risk to homeland security in high-risk urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3494. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide greater clarity for States with respect to excluding providers whose actions a State suspects causes termination of fetuses born alive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3495. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow for greater State flexibility with respect to excluding providers who are involved in abortions; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3496. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 and title 17, United States Code, to provide greater access to in-State television broadcast programming for cable and satellite subscribers in certain counties; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3497. A bill to protect the Nation's law enforcement officers by banning the Five-seveN Pistol and 5.7 x 28mm SS190, SS192, SS195LF, SS196, and SS197 cartridges, testing handguns and ammunition for capability to penetrate body armor, and prohibiting the manufacture, importation, sale, or purchase of such handguns or ammunition by civilians; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3498. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit human cloning; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3499. A bill to amend titles II and XVI of the Social Security Act to provide for treatment of disability rated and certified as total by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs as disability for purposes of such titles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3500. A bill to require the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, to report the Consumer Price Index (CPI-W) using methodology employed in 1980; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3501. A bill to amend chapter 1 of title 23, United States Code, to condition the receipt of certain highway funding by States on the enactment and enforcement by States of certain laws to prevent repeat intoxicated driving; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3502. A bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to improve nutrition in tribal areas, and for other purposes;

to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LOUDERMILK, and Mr. BARLETTA):

H.R. 3503. A bill to require an assessment of fusion center personnel needs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. PERRY, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. YOHIO):

H. Res. 417. A resolution impeaching Regina McCarthy, Administrator of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, for high crimes and misdemeanors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Mr. HASTINGS):

H. Res. 418. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 15, 2015, through September 21, 2015, as "Balance Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

122. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 8, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Older Americans Act of 1965, affirming the Legislature's continuing support for the goals of the act, and to memorialize the United States House of Representatives and the United States Senate to reauthorize the act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

123. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 23, commemorating the 43rd anniversary of the enactment of Title IX, and urging Californians to continue to work together to achieve the goals set by Title IX, as specified; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

124. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of the United States Virgin Islands, relative to Resolution No. 1820 (Bill No. 31-0153), urging the United States Congress to amend Sec. 11 of the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands, 48 U.S.C. 1591, by repealing the requirement that the governor's official residence is "in the Government House" on Saint Thomas and providing for the Legislature of the Virgin Islands to determine the location of the Governor's residence; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

125. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 9, urging the President and Congress of the United States to craft a balanced and workable approach to reduce incentives for and minimize unnecessary patent litigation while ensuring that legitimate patent enforcement rights are protected and maintained; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

126. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 7, requesting that the Congress of the United States of America

further amend the GI Bill of Rights to make benefits available, with all appropriate safeguards, to all veterans for use as startup capital in the establishment of first businesses; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

127. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2, calling upon the President of the United States and the United States Congress to formally and consistently reaffirm the historical truth that the atrocities committed against the Armenian people constituted genocide; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce and Foreign Affairs.

128. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, urging Congress and the President of the United States to reform the short stay admissions criteria for Medicare beneficiaries and to discontinue the two-midnight policy; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 3490.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3491.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3492.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8 of the Constitution states "The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;"

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 3493.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 3494.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—"To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers . . ."

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3495.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3496.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3497.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Art. I § 8.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3498.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3499.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3500.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. LOWEY:

H.R. 3501.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H.R. 3502.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3503.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. FINCHER.

H.R. 140: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 155: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 225: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 266: Mr. BYRNE.

H.R. 292: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 335: Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. LEE, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. CRENSHAW.

H.R. 348: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 467: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 494: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 510: Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 525: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 539: Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. DELAUBRO, and Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 540: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 592: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

- H.R. 662: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 671: Mr. SERRANO.
H.R. 692: Mr. PALMER.
H.R. 702: Mr. GUINTA and Mr. DENT.
H.R. 708: Mr. ROSS and Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 711: Mr. JOYCE.
H.R. 746: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 766: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 793: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 812: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 822: Mr. KIND and Mr. LAMALFA.
H.R. 855: Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 863: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 879: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 911: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 918: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 985: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CRAWFORD.
H.R. 997: Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 999: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1002: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. ELLISON.
H.R. 1061: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 1062: Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 1078: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1100: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1130: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1197: Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 1221: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 1258: Mr. HECK of Washington and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BRAT and Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 1284: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
H.R. 1309: Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 1333: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1340: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 1343: Mr. LAMALFA and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 1356: Mr. HIMES.
H.R. 1383: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.
H.R. 1389: Mr. DESJARLAIS.
H.R. 1391: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 1401: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1416: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 1427: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1460: Mr. HECK of Washington.
H.R. 1475: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1530: Mr. HECK of Nevada.
H.R. 1534: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1550: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1559: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 1567: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 1608: Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 1624: Mr. CARNEY and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 1644: Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BOST, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1655: Mr. TURNER and Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1671: Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 1692: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 1715: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 1769: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 1779: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1784: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.
H.R. 1786: Mr. BEYER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. FARENTHOLD.
H.R. 1801: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.
H.R. 1814: Ms. GABBARD, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, and Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1853: Mr. SCHWEIKERT and Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1854: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
H.R. 1855: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1856: Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 1859: Mr. JOYCE and Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1877: Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 1941: Mr. BRIDENSTINE.
H.R. 1943: Mr. LANGEVIN.
H.R. 1969: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KIND, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. RIGELL.
H.R. 2059: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2067: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2077: Mr. POSEY.
H.R. 2124: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DENT, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2138: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
H.R. 2283: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2293: Mr. HENSARLING and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2303: Mr. MCGOVERN.
H.R. 2400: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 2508: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 2622: Ms. HAHN.
H.R. 2643: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 2646: Mr. REED, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
H.R. 2649: Mr. TIBERI.
H.R. 2660: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2675: Mr. COOK and Mr. MCKINLEY.
H.R. 2697: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2704: Mr. WELCH and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2737: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 2759: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 2850: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2858: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2896: Mr. DUFFY, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 2902: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2903: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. YARMUTH.
H.R. 2964: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 2972: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
H.R. 2976: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 3037: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. MCKINLEY, and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3041: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3060: Mr. COHEN, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 3083: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3084: Ms. DELAULO.
H.R. 3115: Ms. FOX.
H.R. 3118: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3120: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 3134: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 3146: Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 3178: Mr. POLIS and Mrs. BLACKBURN.
H.R. 3179: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 3187: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mr. COFFMAN.
H.R. 3190: Mr. TED LIEU of California and Mr. HIGGINS.
H.R. 3197: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3215: Mr. BABIN, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. PEARCE, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3248: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3251: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3294: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 3311: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3326: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3338: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BERA.
H.R. 3341: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3364: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3371: Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3375: Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3381: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 3418: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3422: Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3423: Mr. McDERMOTT.
H.R. 3429: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 3443: Mr. HARPER and Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3458: Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 3463: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 3466: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 3472: Mr. STEWART.
H.R. 3473: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3488: Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POLIQUIN, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIMPSON.
H.R. 3489: Mr. FATTAH.
H.J. Res. 36: Mr. PETERS.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. FORTENBERRY.
H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. LOFGREN.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. MICA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. COFFMAN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H. Res. 145: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H. Res. 220: Mr. DESANTIS.
H. Res. 294: Mr. WELCH.
H. Res. 343: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mrs. NOEM, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. PETERSON.
H. Res. 346: Mr. DESJARLAIS and Mr. BARR.
H. Res. 361: Ms. GRANGER.
H. Res. 378: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 410: Mr. PERRY.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 381: Mrs. DINGELL.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE NICHOLSON BRIDGE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 100th anniversary of the completion of the Nicholson Bridge, also known as the Tunkhannock Creek Viaduct. Located in Nicholson, Pennsylvania, which I currently represent, the structure has continually served as a vital piece of infrastructure, providing my constituents with efficient transportation throughout Pennsylvania and New York.

Led by the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad, construction of the Tunkhannock Creek Viaduct commenced in 1912. Its completion, dedication, and opening for use took place on November 6, 1915. This engineering marvel was an integral piece of a larger project known as the Clarks Summit-Hallstead Cutoff, engineered in order to shorten the rail line between Scranton, Pennsylvania and Binghamton, New York. The Clarks-Summit Hallstead Cutoff proved to be a huge success, exponentially reducing travel time and subsequently improving transportation efficiency. The bridge's role in this effort was particularly helpful to the residents of Nicholson, a rural town tucked away between Wyoming County and the Endless Mountains of Northeastern Pennsylvania.

In 1975, the America Society of Civil Engineers designated the Nicholson Bridge as a National Historic Civil Engineering Landmark due to the bridge's significant contribution to the development of the United States, and to the field of Civil Engineering. Furthermore, as of 1977, this structural feat was listed on the National Register of Historic Places—an honor attributable to its architectural, engineering, and transportation significance.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize the Nicholson Bridge as it celebrates its 100th anniversary. I know that I speak on behalf of a proud community when I say that I am eternally grateful for this engineering wonder, and I look forward to the structure's preservation over the years to come.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION'S CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to an important occasion: Constitution Week. This week is set aside to allow Americans to reflect on their responsibilities under the Constitution and encourage us to study our founding document.

This significant designation was made official by President Dwight D. Eisenhower on August 2, 1956 at the urging of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution (DAR). The patriotic celebrations that accompany this week are essential for maintaining reverence for this inspirational charter.

Since our country's inception, we have endured as a society committed to securing and protecting the basic rights of all citizens. While our founding document has been amended throughout our nation's lifetime, the basic rights ratified 228 years ago remain intact today. This body, at the most fundamental level, retains its foremost responsibility of protecting these rights. After all, we are all members of the "People's House." May we never forget where our authority derives.

We have remained a country committed to freedoms through many trials and triumphs over the years. Countless of our fellow citizens have sacrificed their lives in honor of that pledge. From the Continentals who first defended the freshly formed Union, to those who are currently serving in harm's way around the globe; these men and women allow us to enjoy our sacred homeland in peace.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a special mention about the work being done by the Ecor Rouge Chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution in Baldwin County, Alabama, to bring attention to our nation's most important governing document during Constitution Week.

So on this Constitution Week, I encourage all Americans to set aside time to read our nation's Constitution and reflect on the many sacrifices made throughout history to protect this document and our freedoms.

HONORING THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF BROWNSVILLE

HON. FILEMON VELA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the important and meaningful work that

the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville has carried out in the lower Rio Grande Valley over the past four decades.

Since 1974, the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville (CDCB), a 501(c)(3) community housing development organization, has been successfully working to utilize collaborative partnerships that create sustainable communities across the Rio Grande Valley. The partnerships have helped ensure quality education, model financing, efficient home design, and superior construction.

CDCB is the largest non-profit producer of single family housing in Texas. In 2014, CDCB built 125-plus homes, assisted 178 families, created 375 jobs, and added \$4.6 million to the local economy as well as \$2.5 million in additional tax revenue.

One of the CDCB's latest housing development projects, known as La Hacienda Casitas in Harlingen, Texas, was designed and constructed with the help of local contractors, non-profits, and businesses. This project adopted new construction designs that will work to mitigate flooding and erosion that all too often plague the area. La Hacienda Casitas is a model for housing programs across the nation.

For more than 10 years, CDCB's YouthBuild program has been opening doors for 16- to 24-year-olds in Brownsville, Texas, helping them develop life skills and prepare for future careers. By providing opportunities in construction, community service, education and leadership development, the YouthBuild program is preparing students to excel and adapt to diverse workforce opportunities in their communities.

The RAPIDO Project, a pioneering \$2 million project funded by federal and state post-Hurricane Dolly funds, is a new approach to traditional disaster recovery housing. This project will help those who have lost their homes move into new ones in a matter of weeks, rather than living in a Federal Emergency Management Administration (FEMA) trailer for an unknown period of time. The RAPIDO Project brings together architects, urban planners, developers and project managers, from throughout the state, in an effort to help redefine disaster recovery housing that is affordable and efficient.

In 2015, the CDCB was awarded the Energy Star Certified Homes Market Leader Award for 80 homes they built last year. The organization received the Maxwell Award of Excellence and the Federal Home Loan Bank System Community Partnership Award. CDCB has also been recognized with the State of Texas Housing Finance Special Achievement Award, and in 2013 the organization was awarded the Highest Cumulative kW Savings Award by American Electric Power Texas.

In July 2013, CDCB became a member of the national Neighborworks Network, an organization focused on supporting housing organizations in bettering their communities.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

During the past 40 years, the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville has helped many families in the Rio Grande Valley achieve the American dream of owning a home. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to recognize the Community Development Corporation of Brownsville, led by Nick Mitchell-Bennett, for outstanding, innovative, and important work in the Lower Rio Grande Valley.

IN HONOR OF MS. DURELL
DECKER AGHA

HON. SAM FARR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of Durell Decker Agha, a wonderful woman and dear friend who died yesterday at the all too young age of 73. Durell was a lifelong resident of the Monterey Peninsula and active in local community and business activities.

Born Jan. 31, 1942, Durell grew up, as I did, in Carmel, attending Sunset School and Carmel High School. I remember Durell's family, the Deckers, fondly. They were always involved in lots of community and neighborhood activities. They liked hosting class parties for Durell and her friends at their home in the country. Durell's father and mother owned a grocery store so food was always plentiful to snack on at their house. Durell's brother Paget was a popular community activist. One of the kindest acts by Durell's Dad was his offer to drive us both up to Salem, Oregon to begin our freshman year in college at Willamette University. The home town kids at Willamette—Durell, myself and another Peninsula kid, Hillary Teague—always checked in with each other. We were each other's family away from home.

After her first year at Willamette, Durell came back to the Monterey area for a short time, before heading off to Europe to travel and attend the University of Bordeaux in France. After a year and a half abroad, she returned to California and finished college at UCLA, earning a bachelor's degree in history, with a concentration in Middle East studies.

Following graduation, she worked at Fourtané Jewelers in Carmel, where she was introduced to Nader Agha, shortly after he immigrated to the Monterey area from Syria. The two married in 1965. While their marriage lasted 17 years, they maintained a lifelong partnership that included running various businesses and managing properties together.

Durell was very proud of her children and loved them dearly. She shared great love and rapport with her grandchildren, sharing books of antiquity with Kaden and gardening with Jasmine. Her family will always remember her very giving and supportive ways, as she always put others before herself. Durell enjoyed reading, antiquing with friends and family, and jewelry. She had a deep love for the Carmel area and its history, which showed in her book and photography collections.

She is survived by many family members, including three children, Mahir Agha of Carmel

Valley, Sumaya Agha of Carmel, and Laith Agha of Carmel; two grandchildren; sister-in-law Holly Decker; niece Kyle Holton; and close family members Nader Agha, Nadia Agha and Fadia Alhawach.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the whole House in sharing our deepest condolences to Durell's family and friends. She was a bright light in so many lives, including my own. We will all miss her terribly.

APPROVE THE JOINT
COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, today I voted for the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. I did so because the world is approximately 90 days away from Iran obtaining a nuclear weapon, and this agreement is the most effective way of stopping that effort dead in its tracks.

After years of sanctions and then direct negotiations, the United States and its partners, the P5+1, have produced a plan with unprecedented concessions from Iran, together with the most rigorous inspections, restrictions and verifications regimen ever negotiated.

The agreement will reduce the number of Iran's centrifuges by two-thirds; prevent Iran from producing weapons-grade plutonium; and eliminate 98 percent of Iran's stockpile of enriched uranium. It grants the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) access to Iran's nuclear program so that compliance is ensured, including notification to the agency of plans to construct new nuclear facilities. No facility—declared or undeclared—will be off limits. Decades of essential monitoring measures are included in the agreement that allow the IAEA to enforce these terms.

The United States can unilaterally resume the U.N. Security Council sanctions if there is any violation by Iran of its commitments in the next ten years, and there can be no veto from Russia or China.

This agreement is without precedent, and so is the current instability in the Middle East, undoubtedly fueled by the actions of Iran. It has the support of the entire United Nations, including the European Union, Russia, and China.

Experts from all aspects of our defense, diplomatic, and scientific communities support the agreement, including 36 top officials in the U.S. military, 29 of our nation's leading scientists and engineers, 100 former ambassadors and diplomats, and more than 4,000 Catholic religious women.

The agreement has the support of more than 400 American Rabbis, as well as former top officials of the Israeli security forces, Mossad Chief Efraim Halevy and former Shin Bet Director Ami Ayalon.

Our nation's most prominent nuclear scientists and engineers described their support for the agreement in a recent letter to President Obama, saying it is "technically sound," "stringent" and "innovative."

And in their open letter to Congress, Catholic Sisters from across our country called on

us to "risk on the side of peace" by supporting the JCPOA.

No definitive alternative has been put forth by those who oppose the agreement. Furthermore, should the United States abandon the agreement, our country would be viewed as feckless, a nation whose word cannot be trusted and our international partners would no longer commit to sanctions.

For Israel, the only democracy in the Middle East, this, in my view, is an existential moment. By eliminating the possibility of Iran developing a nuclear weapon, Israel's security is enhanced and so is the stabilization of the region by removing the threat of a nuclear Iran.

For all these reasons and more, I support this agreement and risk on the side of peace by voting for the JCPOA.

OPPOSITION TO IRAN DEAL

HON. STEVE ISRAEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong opposition to the Iran deal that was reached in July 2015 and make known my opposition to the resolution of approval before the House today.

I must say, however, that as a leading opponent of the Iran deal, I am deeply disturbed by the last minute decision of House Republican leadership to inject irresponsible partisan politics into the upcoming vote. House Republicans are, once again, playing political football with the safety and security of Israel, this time by straying from their original plan of an up or down vote on the deal and forcing an irresponsible three-bill gimmick on the House of Representatives.

With that being said, even though I was skeptical of the negotiations and interim agreement, I tried to get to a position where I could support the final deal. I took my time to understand every word of the final deal, I read the classified materials, spoke to the President, met with administration officials, security experts, and constituents. I listened carefully to every analysis and opinion on both sides of this issue.

This is one of the most profound foreign policy decisions I will have to make in Congress, second only to going to war with Iraq. And despite some positive elements in the deal, the totality has compelled me to oppose it. I came to this decision after an intense analysis of the details and merits of this deal and remain concerned about three major components.

First of all, I believe Iran is highly likely to exploit ambiguities in the agreement. They are unlikely to engage in massive violations, but will perform a series of "small-cheats", and they will not face punitive measures for it.

Secondly, the lifting of the arms embargo will create additional pathways for Iran to supply the ruthless terrorist organizations, Hamas and Hezbollah, with the means to increase their weapons stockpiles. Iran continues to be one of the leading state-sponsors of terrorism, and I doubt that will change any time soon. They have smuggled illicit weapons to Hezbollah, and we can only deduce what will

happen in five years once the conventional weapons embargo is lifted.

Finally, this agreement lends international legitimacy to Iran's enrichment capacity in fifteen years.

With that being said, now that it is clear this deal will move forward, it is imperative that both Democrats and Republicans in Congress, both supporters and opponents to this deal, join with the Administration and work together to focus on the road ahead.

We must reaffirm our commitment to continue and strengthen the many facets of joint cooperation between the U.S. and Israel. We can do this by signing another 10-year Memorandum of Understanding for FMF for Israel and ensuring their Qualitative Military Edge in such a chaotic region.

We can continue and accelerate cooperation on missile defense programs such as Arrow-3 and David's Sling, and provide additional resources for Israel to field additional Iron Dome batteries.

And we can continue to enhance our cooperation in order to detect and deter terrorist tunnels that plague Israel's borders.

As Iran continues to spew vitriol toward Israel and call for her ultimate destruction, we are reminded that this nation is not to be trusted.

Congress will play a pivotal role in the implementation of this deal and to that end I will continue to use every tool in my toolbox to ensure Iran never acquires a nuclear weapon. And I will continue to ensure that America and our greatest ally, Israel, can continue to thrive in peace and security.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT DR. TOURILA

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to celebrate Dr. James Tourila of St. Cloud for receiving a Veterans' Voices Legacy Award. I was proud to nominate Dr. Tourila for this award for his impressive work on behalf of veterans.

Jim achieved the rank of Sergeant in the United States Army and was deployed to Korea from 1975 to 1976. After retiring from the Army, Jim graduated from Bemidji State University and went on to get his Master's Degree and PhD in psychology. From there, Jim moved to St. Cloud where he worked as a psychologist at the St. Cloud VA Medical Center for twenty years. Jim currently practices at the Central Minnesota Counseling Center in St. Cloud.

Jim has supported Minnesota's veterans in more ways than one. He is an enthusiastic hot air balloon pilot which led to the creation of Freedom Flight, Inc. to honor veterans who never made it home. Jim has also served as director of the St. Cloud Honor Flight, which has flown more than a thousand veterans from around the state of Minnesota to see the National Monuments in D.C. Jim has been elected as the VFW National Surgeon General twice and is currently serving his eighth year as the Minnesota VFW State Surgeon.

Minnesota is so proud of Jim and I am happy to be able to celebrate all of his efforts today. His years of hard work have bettered the lives of hundreds of veterans, and because of that, there is no one more deserving of this award.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF EBBY HALLIDAY ACERS

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of an outstanding citizen and entrepreneur, Ebby Halliday Acers. She passed away on the evening of September 8th surrounded by friends and family at the age of 104.

Ebby was learning tools of her trade before she was 10 years old, selling skin ointment house to house as a child in Kansas. It wasn't long before she had a firm grasp on the importance of customer service. During the Great Depression she supported her family by selling merchandise and, due to her success, she was transferred to Dallas, Texas, as a department manager at the W.A. Green Store in 1938. While words can't begin to portray the profound and long lasting positive impact she had on North Texas in the business sector and local communities, she will be greatly missed.

In 1945 Ebby Halliday Realtors was founded. Over the years, this once-developing business turned into the 10th largest independently owned residential real estate services company in the nation, and the largest in Texas. The company was involved in approximately 19,200 real estate transactions with 1,700 sales associates in 2014. On top of Ebby's business accomplishments, she was very involved in the community. She was a devoted volunteer, educator, supporter of foster children, and wonderful leader.

In 2014, Ebby's Place, which houses a new women's center, and The Ebby House, which is a community for young women to transition out of foster care due to age, were announced. While Ebby didn't have any children, she cared for and helped educate the children of the community. She was involved in many different foundations and organizations such as the Thanksgiving Square foundation, St. Paul Medical foundation, The Dallas County Community College District foundation, Alexis de Tocqueville Society for United Way, State Fair of Texas, and many more.

While her community work spoke for itself, she also received much praise and recognition from multiple associations, the city of Dallas, and the state of Texas. She received the Distinguished Service Award from the National Association of Realtors, was inducted into the Dallas Business Hall of Fame, and earned the Regional Entrepreneur of the Year Award from Ernst & Young. Business and community work weren't her only passions; she always spoke wonders of her husband Maurice Acers. They met by chance on a local business trip; Maurice was a lawyer and former FBI agent.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to celebrate the life of the incredible Ebby Halliday Acers. I ask

all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in celebrating her remarkable life and service to North Texas and the country.

TRIBUTE TO LUCILLE ALBRIGHT

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate a very special Iowan—Lucille Albright on the celebration of her 106th birthday on Monday, September 14th.

Lucille has lived a wonderful life and her friends and family are very quick to share some of the collective stories and memories that have made up her 106 years. Stories like the time she went on a double date with a friend whose date was future U.S. President Ronald Reagan. They have told me memories of her bus trips to take in a baseball game or visit the raceway and casino near Des Moines. And, her friends and family have noted her strong faith and active membership of Westminster Presbyterian Church in Beavertown.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Lucille's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Lucille has lived through nineteen United States Presidents and twenty-three Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Lucille in the United States Congress because she is a shining example of Iowa values. I know that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating her on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her much health and happiness on this very special occasion.

MOZELLE ADAMSON

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Mozelle Adamson.

Mozelle was born May 4, 1934 in Temple, TX to Charles and Rosa Kelly. She graduated from Lampasas High School in 1952 where she was a twirler, drum major and queen of the Future Homemakers Association. After high school Mozelle lived in Waco with her sister and attended business school before marrying Dean Adamson January 4, 1957. Together they raised three children: Mike, Pat, and Brenda. They lived in Killeen where Mozelle was a homemaker to the family while Dean worked in the automotive and real estate industries.

Mozelle was an active member of her community where she served on the Metroplex

Hospital Foundation board for many years and was an avid supporter of the Killeen Jr. Livestock Show, Children's Rehabilitation Center in Belton, the Republican Party, Vive Les Arts, and was a member of the Beta Sigma Phi sorority. Mozelle also attended church with her family at the Youngsport Church of Christ.

Family and friends were Mozelle's passion and delight, leaving a lasting impression on all who's lives she touched. A true lady in every sense of the word, Mozelle loved to travel and spend time with her family. Mozelle spent countless weekends with her friends and family at area lakes Buchanan, Belton, and Inks where she enjoyed fishing and boating.

Mozelle is preceded in death by her parents, husband, and her brothers, Archie Kelly and Charles Kelly, and sister Katherine Jenkins.

Mozelle is survived by her son Mike and wife Cindy Adamson of Killeen, son Pat Adamson of Belton, and daughter Brenda Gonyea and husband Mike of Killeen, ten grandchildren, and one great-granddaughter.

Her pallbearers were Kim Kelly, Mark Kelly, Lan Kelly, Chuck Jenkins, Kelly Joe Jenkins, and Butch Kelly. Honorary pallbearers were Gerald Skidmore Jr. and Richard Dean Littlefield.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION NO.
1508

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1508 by King of Uvalde. This resolution expresses support for the use of sound science to study and regulate modern agricultural technologies, as well as supporting opposition to legislative or regulatory action that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the technologies.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, A sustainable agricultural system is crucial to the continued production of food, feed, and fiber to meet both domestic and global demand; and

Whereas, In the United States, the agriculture and food production industries employ precision farming equipment, crop protection chemistries, genetic engineering or enhancement, agricultural nutrients, and other modern technologies; such advanced practices protect the safety of the public and reduce environmental impact while expanding yields, improving profitability, and ensuring an abundant and affordable food supply; and

Whereas, Agricultural pests present significant dangers to the industry and to global supplies of the products they attack; accordingly, the environmental risks of forgoing advances in agricultural technologies that protect crops are severe; excessive regulation may scuttle or discourage the use of agricultural chemicals that could improve human welfare; and

Whereas, Crop protection is among the most studied and highly regulated of all in-

dustries, at both the state and federal levels; the use of sound science should be the bedrock of our nation's regulatory scheme for the agriculture and food production industries, as these industries are critical to the economic vitality of Texas and the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express support for the use of sound science to study and regulate such modern agricultural technologies as crop protection chemistries, genetically engineered or enhanced traits, and nutrients; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives express opposition to legislative or regulatory action at any level that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the use of modern agricultural technologies; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regrettably was not present on September 10, 2015 to vote in Roll Call vote numbers 491 and 492. Had I been present, I would have voted no on H. Res. 412, providing for consideration of H. Res. 411, H.R. 3461, and H.R. 3460, and no on H. Res. 411, finding that the President has not complied with section 2 of the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES
AWARD RECIPIENT SHELBY
MARIE HADLEY

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Shelby Marie Hadley of Rice for receiving a Veterans' Voice "On the Rise" Award.

Serving in the Minnesota Army National Guard as an Air Traffic Controller, Shelby was deployed to Bosnia in 2003 and to Iraq in 2008.

Shelby has not only served her country abroad, but here at home as well. She is very active with the St. Cloud area veterans and her community as a whole. She spends time working with various organizations including the Wounded Warrior Project and Big Brothers Big Sisters of Central Minnesota.

In addition to her volunteer work, Shelby has taken her story to the stage and performed in Telling: Minnesota 2015 at the Guth-

rie Theatre, where she shared the story of her military service. Shelby has a bachelor's degree from St. Cloud State University and is set to complete her MBA program this month.

I would like to thank Shelby for all that she has contributed to her country and community. Your hard work has not gone unnoticed and this award is well-deserved. Good job and keep up the excellent work.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM MARINO

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 490 I was unable to be present to vote due to a personal family matter.

Had I been present, I would have voted yea.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1215 BY
CAPRIGLIONE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Transportation Security Administration currently excludes concealed handgun licenses (CHL) from its list of valid forms of identification, causing an inconvenience for the agency as well as for many travelers; and

Whereas, Acquiring a CHL from the Texas Department of Public Safety is a rigorous procedure that requires applicants to submit to a criminal history background check and provide a valid driver's license or identification card and residential and employment information; these measures ensure that CHL holders are law-abiding citizens whose identities have been verified; and

Whereas, A CHL is such a trusted proof of identification that it is accepted for voter registration and many other governmental processes; and

Whereas, Permitting the use of CHLs as valid forms of identification would help advance the TSA's mission of safeguarding our national transportation system and protecting the American public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licenses as valid forms of identification; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION
NO. 1215

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1215 by Capriglione. This resolution petitions Congress to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licensees as valid forms of identification.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, The Transportation Security Administration currently excludes concealed handgun licenses (CHL) from its list of valid forms of identification, causing an inconvenience for the agency as well as for many travelers; and

Whereas, Acquiring a CHL from the Texas Department of Public Safety is a rigorous procedure that requires applicants to submit to a criminal history background check and provide a valid driver's license or identification card and residential and employment information; these measures ensure that CHL holders are law-abiding citizens whose identities have been verified; and

Whereas, A CHL is such a trusted proof of identification that it is accepted for voter registration and many other governmental processes; and

Whereas, Permitting the use of CHLs as valid forms of identification would help advance the TSA's mission of safeguarding our national transportation system and protecting the American public: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby urge the Congress of the United States to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licenses as valid forms of identification; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the Texas House of Representatives forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the administrator of the Transportation Security Administration, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES
AWARD RECIPIENT RALPH DONAIS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ralph Donais of Elk River for receiving a Veterans' Voices Legacy Award.

Ralph served in the Marine Corps from 1964 to 1994 and retired as an Aviation Avionics Chief. During his service, Ralph fought

for our country while being deployed for two tours in Vietnam. Ralph's efforts earned him the Meritorious Service Medal along with numerous other awards.

Ralph's commitment to his country and his fellow veterans did not end once he returned to Elk River. Ralph has been involved in the United Veterans Legislative Council of Minnesota and served as chair of the council as well. He also spends time at the Minnesota Capitol to inform and educate legislators as well as testifying in committees regarding issues important to the veterans community.

Additionally, Ralph is a member of many organizations including the Marine Corps League, and the Fleet Reserve Association. Another organization that Ralph is involved with is the Enlisted Association where he has served as Chapter President. Elk River's Beyond the Yellow Ribbon program, which lends a helping hand to veterans and members of our military before, during and after deployments, was started by Ralph and he remains an active member.

Ralph's involvement in his community extends beyond his work with veterans. He lends his vocal talents by serving on the Board of Directors of the North Star Boys Choir and as a member of the St. Andrew Choir.

I would like to congratulate Ralph for receiving this award, but I would also like to commend him for all that he has done for his country and the Elk River community. It takes an extraordinary person to accomplish all that he has, and I am proud to recognize him here today.

65TH ANNIVERSARY OF
OPERATION CHROMITE

HON. TOM REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday, September 15, will mark the 65th anniversary of Operation Chromite, better known as the Incheon Landing. This decisive invasion and the battle which ensued marked a key turning point at the outset of the Korean War in 1950.

My father, Thomas W. Reed, was a veteran of the Korean War, serving as an ammunition officer with the U.S. Army's 45th and 25th Infantry Divisions. He fought alongside brave South Korean soldiers who were struggling to save their homeland from the onslaught of communism.

For 65 years since, the United States and the Republic of Korea have continued to stand shoulder to shoulder in strength and solidarity to defend freedom, democracy, market capitalism, human rights and the rule of law on the Korean Peninsula. Indeed, our alliance, which was forged on the battlefield, has become a "blood alliance."

I had the privilege of visiting South Korea in April 2011 and the trip left a lasting impression. It was particularly meaningful for me to have been able to visit the Korean War Memorial and Exhibition in Seoul, to lay a wreath and to pray and reflect. My visit served as a humbling and sobering reminder of the cost of freedom that was paid 65 years ago through

the service and sacrifice of all Korean War veterans.

I also witnessed firsthand economic prosperity and industrial prowess in Korea that never could have been imagined when my father was there in the 1950's.

Today, Korea ranks as the world's thirteenth-largest economy, the sixth-largest trading partner of the United States, the fifth-largest market for agricultural goods, and the third-largest destination for U.S. foreign direct investment in the Asia-Pacific region. Bilateral trade between our two nations averages about \$80 billion each year, further cemented by the U.S.-Korea Free Trade Agreement.

In the 23rd congressional district of New York, which I am privileged to represent, farmers, small business owners, and larger firms are already benefiting from the KORUS FTA. Of note, there are more than 140 family-owned wineries in the area around my hometown, and several of them are enjoying increased exports due to tariff eliminations.

My district is also home to Corning Incorporated, which launched a joint venture with Samsung in 1995 to form Samsung Corning Precision Materials. SCPM is now a global leader in the development and supply of LCD glass substrates.

For so many reasons, Korea constitutes one of America's greatest foreign policy success stories in the post-World War II era. Korea is not only an indispensable ally and friend but serves as the linchpin of regional peace and stability in Northeast Asia.

To this end, Korean President Park Geun-hye will be visiting Washington in mid-October. Her visit is a timely and meaningful one, and I offer my expression of welcome and support for a productive and successful trip.

I recall President Park's Address to a Joint Meeting of the Congress on May 8, 2013 when she eloquently stated that "our chorus of freedom and peace, of future and hope, has not ceased to resonate over the last 60 years and will not cease to go on."

I further applaud and support President Park's vision and goals as articulated in her Dresden Address in March of last year on South-North reunification, including a proposal to create an International Peace Park at the DMZ. In addition, the Northeast Asia Peace and Cooperation Initiative (NAPCI) will be an important means to promoting regional peace and prosperity through a trust-building process.

In the post-KORUS FTA implementation era, there are several ways we can continue to enhance our bilateral economic relationship. First, I have supported the Partner with Korea Act, authored by my friend and colleague, PETER ROSKAM, to provide up to 15,000 temporary professional visas for Korean nationals. Second, I support the renewal of the U.S.-Korea Civilian Nuclear Energy Agreement which was signed on June 15, 2015. Third, I support Korea's Creative Economy action plan to enhance mutual competitiveness in the global marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, the U.S.-Korea alliance is at its strongest ever and yet our alliance will continue to be tested as was evidenced in light of recent North Korean provocations. It is important we remain ever vigilant and resolute in our alliance to counter any and all threats that

could lead to instability on the Korean Peninsula. In the Congress, I will do all I can to support and defend our great ally and friend—the Republic of Korea—and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

HONORING HELEN BURNS
JACKSON

HON. DANNY K. DAVIS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Mrs. Helen Burns Jackson, the mother of Reverend Jesse Louis Jackson. Rev. Jackson often spoke of his love, his appreciation and close relationship with his mother and my heart goes out to him and the entire Jackson and Burns families. Of course, Mrs. Jackson was, on her part, justly proud of her sons. In her family and her life she leaves a mighty legacy for all of America. The entire Jackson and Burns families are in my prayers in this time of bereavement.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1605 BY
FAIRCLOTH

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing is a problem with serious economic, environmental, and security implications; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing accounts for economic losses of billions of dollars per year globally, and millions of those lost dollars result from poaching in the Gulf of Mexico; such activity is largely conducted by foreign fleets at the expense of United States fishermen, coastal communities, and the sustainability of global fish stocks; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing is of particular consequence in Texas, where the Gulf Coast waters supply seafood for the American public and support the hospitality industry, tourism-related businesses, and the vibrant recreational and commercial fishing industry; not only does illegal fishing result in economic losses to the Texas fishing industry and other coastal businesses, but it also is a threat to the sustainability of our fisheries and to the Texas Gulf Coast ecosystem; and

Whereas, The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the United States Coast Guard are to be commended for their partnership in investigating and apprehending foreign vessels engaged in illegal activity along the Texas-Mexico border; and

Whereas, Foreign nationals fishing illegally in U.S. waters compete for local stock, and they disregard state and federal laws on catch limits; when they sell their fish in the United States, they can flood the market with a cheaper product; moreover, they often use banned longline netting that imperils marine mammals and sea turtles; and

Whereas, Vessels involved with illegal fishing are also associated with, other crimes, including drug trafficking, human trafficking, and illegal immigration, and the incursion by these foreign fishing vessels into U.S. waters constitutes a violation of our sovereignty; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing, to the long-term conservation of Texas marine resources, and to the protection of the Texas Gulf Coast fishing and coastal communities; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives hereby respectfully urge the United States Congress to take action to protect our coastal borders and to end illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING HARKLESS H.
HUTCHINGS

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Harkless H. Hutchings, who passed away on August 1, 2015 at the age of 98. As a Colonel in the Ohio National Guard, I appreciate his dedicated service to his country during World War II.

Harkless was born in Rhodell, West Virginia on July 31, 1917. He attended Byrd-Prillerman High School in Amigo, West Virginia. Throughout his life, he attended many high school reunions to reacquaint with old friends.

Harkless began his service in World War II in the Army and later went into the Air Force. He fought bravely in the Pacific Islands throughout World War II. Harkless tragically stepped on a landmine causing him to lose 80 percent of his hearing and sustain severe injuries to his feet. Harkless was sent to a special hospital in Arizona to treat his injuries. During his time in Arizona, he met many famous film stars of his era, including Clark Gable, Bette Davis and Joan Crawford.

Harkless lived an extraordinary life of service to his community and country.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

HON. CHARLES W. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill and the underlying Iran nuclear agreement.

Despite entering these negotiations from a position of strength, the deal before us fails to

achieve the goal of preventing Iran's capacity to develop a nuclear weapon. It simply contains or manages Iran's nuclear program.

By agreeing to a lax enforcement and inspection regime and fanciful, unrealistic "snap back" sanctions, the Administration has accepted that Iran should remain one year away from a nuclear bomb. I am not prepared to accept that.

The sanctions relief will provide Iran with billions of dollars—funds that will bolster the Revolutionary Guard and non-state militant groups.

This deal ends the conventional arms embargo and the prohibition on ballistic missile technology. Not only will this result in conventional arms flowing to groups like Hezbollah, it concedes the delivery system for a nuclear bomb.

This agreement will provide Iran with a nuclear infrastructure, a missile delivery system, and the funds to pay for it all.

By the way, the "I" in "ICBM" means "intercontinental." I don't believe that New Zealand and Mexico are the intended targets. The target would be us.

This deal cripples and shatters our current notion of nuclear non-proliferation. If Iran can enrich uranium, which they can do under this agreement, their Gulf Arab neighbors will likely do the same.

I do not want a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—a region of state instability and irrational non-state actors. And how will deterrence work under this scenario? I don't want to find out.

We should not reward the Ayatollahs with billions of dollars and sophisticated weapons in exchange for temporary and unenforceable nuclear restrictions.

Mr. Speaker, I have always supported a diplomatic solution to the Iran nuclear issue, but this is a dangerously weak agreement, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

TEXAS ADOPTED HOUSE
RESOLUTION NO. 1835

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1835 by Capriglione. This resolution expresses support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Many airports, especially those in congested urban areas, are near or over their capacities, and such inadequate infrastructure causes long delays, reduced customer service, negative impacts on the economy, and bottlenecks throughout our entire national air transportation system; and

Whereas, Implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) would help make air travel even safer and more convenient and environmentally friendly by enhancing the efficiency of airports and airspace procedures; and

Whereas, The long list of airport improvements encompassed in NextGen includes performance-based navigation flight procedures, improved surface management systems, reduced aircraft exhaust emissions, and technology upgrades that bolster all-weather access to airports; and

Whereas, Airport operators must be involved in the development of NextGen capabilities in and around their airports from inception to execution to ensure noise and other environmental factors that affect their communities are appropriately considered; and

Whereas, The latest Future Airport Capacity Task study prepared by the FAA indicates that many of the nation's busiest airports, including George Bush International Airport in Houston, will require new runways to meet projected capacity needs in the coming years even with NextGen, and these findings highlight the critical importance of taking all reasonable steps to reduce airport congestion; and

Whereas, Airports across the nation are ready to work with the FAA, industry partners, the communities they serve, and the U.S. Congress to implement NextGen in order to equip our air transportation system to meet the demands of the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration, to the president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT MEGAN ALLEN

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Megan Allen of Ramsey for receiving a Veterans' Voices "On the Rise" Award.

At the age of seventeen, Megan enlisted in the Army National Guard and went on to serve two tours of duty in Iraq. Her twelve years of service in the National Guard has had a huge impact on Megan and inspired her to work to better her community. Megan currently spends an enormous amount of time volunteering for multiple organizations throughout the Twin Cities and metro areas striving to better the lives of the homeless communities and children in the area.

Among many non-profits Megan works with, she is most passionate about Girls on the Run, a program that promotes self-confidence and healthy choices for young girls. But this isn't the only program she helps. Megan also supports the Beyond the Line Yellow Ribbon Network, which lends a helping hand to veterans and members of our military before, during and after deployments.

I thank Megan for everything that she has done and continues to do for her community. Minnesota is a better place because of Megan, and she is truly deserving of this award.

RECOGNIZING ISALIAH CASINTAHAN

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to congratulate Isaliah Casintahan on his essay, "The Day that Launched a Better Future," published in the 70th Anniversary of the End of World War II program for recognition of the Japanese surrender documents signing on the deck of the USS *Missouri*, I was honored to be a member of the Bipartisan Congressional Delegation led by Congressman RANDY FORBES and Congressman JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut to Pearl Harbor.

September 2, 2015, commemorates the 70th Anniversary to the end of hostilities between the United States and Japan. Over the past decades, Japan and America have built a strong relationship of trust and continue to work together to ensure a more peaceful world. Congratulations to Isaliah for discussing the history of this important relationship between our two nations.

BATTLESHIP MISSOURI MEMORIAL'S SEPTEMBER 2ND ESSAY CONTEST WINNER: ISALIAH CASINTAHAN, JAMES CAMPBELL HIGH SCHOOL "THE DAY THAT LAUNCHED A BETTER FUTURE"

On December 7, 1941, Pearl Harbor was taken by surprise as hundreds of Japanese planes attacked the area. "A date which will live in infamy," as said by President Franklin Roosevelt in the wake of the attack. Following the tragedies of Pearl Harbor, the war continued where in August, 1945, the United States dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki; the first and last instances of nuclear weapons in war. About a month later, the war was brought to an official end when "Japanese officials (had) signed the act of unconditional surrender," aboard the USS *Missouri*, anchored at Tokyo Bay. The ship now sits moored in Pearl Harbor, facing the USS *Arizona*, as one of the bookends of that war. This year commemorates the 70th Anniversary to the end of hostilities, and though 70 years have passed, it is still of great relevance today. As peace was made on September 2, 1945, it is indeed "the day that launched a better future" between our nations.

But what exactly does an 'better future' entail for us? What has it meant for our nations? In past times, friction and distrust were present as our countries were at war, or dealing with the traumas thereafter. Both of our nations suffered from a great deal of losses as we endured the consequences of war. The attack on Pearl Harbor took the lives of over 2,500 people and wounded as many as 1,000 others. The bombing of Hiroshima "wiped out 90 percent of the city and immediately killed 80,000 people," thousands later dying of radiation exposure. The 'better future' that we live in today is a world no longer at war, but one enduring the peace between us.

Since the end of World War II, the United States and Japan have relied on each other

as allies to recover from the repercussions of war. Over the past decades, we have worked together in order to mend the once frayed relationship between our nations and have built a stronger foundation for peace. For example, after Japan's defeat the United States "led the Allies in the occupation and rehabilitation of the Japanese state. Between 1945 and 1952, the U.S. occupying forces, led by General Douglas A. MacArthur, enacted widespread military, political, economic, and social reforms." These reforms improved economy by setting democratic standards to help those in poverty and implemented a new constitution that would improve the social and political systems by the same standards. Though some changes were reverted back after the Americans left, most are still in effect and support the peace between our nations today.

In addition our nations trust has been heavily reinforced since peace was rooted between us 70 years ago. Our trust for one another continues to evidently grow, as in recent news, the United States and Japan have proposed a new military agreement, in which Japan's military will have a more active role in global defense, bringing our nations closer. The proposal would allow Japan, "To defend regional allies that come under attack, a change that means Japanese missile defense systems could be used to intercept any weapons launched toward the United States." In other words, Japan could be taking part in aiding our defense. This is a big jump in Japan's military relations, as their military powers were limited under the new constitution implemented after World War II. It is found in Article 9 of their constitution that, "renounces war and prohibits Japan from maintaining the war potential." Though changes were already made so that Japan could maintain their defense, the new proposal demonstrates the ample amount of trust that our nations now share and how our nations are moving forward through mutual respect.

In conclusion, since the end of World War II, our nations today have secured a strong relationship that has brought us into better days. The day that has launched us into our future, September 2, 1945, has allowed our nations to endure peace, no longer a World at War. The site of Pearl Harbor where we faced sorrowful losses, and the site of the USS *Missouri*, where we established peace, remind us why we must safeguard our peace, free from the tragedies of war.

COMMEMORATING THE SMITHSONIAN ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH CENTER'S 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center as it celebrates its fiftieth anniversary this year.

Since 1965, SERC has been the nation's leading research center for understanding coastal zones and the environmental issues they face. With coastal zones home to more than 70% of the world's people, SERC has been at the forefront of monitoring and studying these zones' unique ecosystems and the different factors that affect their health.

While their main research focuses on the areas of climate change, invasive species, biodiversity, land use, and pollution, SERC personnel are also involved in preparing the next generation of environmental scientists. Over the years, SERC has provided learning opportunities for students from kindergarten all the way through the post-doctoral level, partnering with over 150 colleges and universities to conduct professional training and a variety of hands-on experiences in the field.

Headquartered on the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland's Fifth District, SERC encompasses more than 2,650 acres of land and twelve miles of protected shoreline. The scientists at SERC use this shoreline as a natural laboratory and model for long-term ecological research to study the way terrestrial, aquatic, and atmospheric components interact in complex ecosystems.

In 2009, I was a proud cosponsor of legislation that authorized a \$41 million expansion and renovation of SERC's Mathias Laboratory, the Smithsonian's first LEED-Platinum building. This sustainable research lab provides a larger space and more flexibility for scientists to explore cutting edge research in an environmentally responsible way. I had the privilege of attending the ribbon cutting ceremony for the lab's reopening last year.

I am proud to celebrate this anniversary and ask that my colleagues join me in commending the Smithsonian Environmental Research Center for its contributions to our understanding of coastal environments and climate change—and saluting those who continue to carry out its important mission.

POLICE SHOOTINGS

HON. MICHAEL G. FITZPATRICK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, over the last several weeks we've seen a disturbing rash of violence against law enforcement officers around our nation.

Our nation's Blue Line—the first responders, local, state, federal police and law enforcement professionals—often represent the height of both heroism and humility. Each day they leave their families with the possibility that they might not return home—as happened to my great-uncle Philip who was killed in the line of duty in New York City.

Today, each of us can understand that events across our nation have brought about a period of great tension. And, while there is a conversation that we can have as Americans about law enforcement in 2015, the shared objective cannot be realized if we allow hate, demagoguery or violence to dehumanize any person—least of all those officers who serve our communities.

Together, we can address the challenges our nation faces head on—without partisanship, division or hate. But that will take leadership—including leadership from the President who cannot, nor should not, remain silent in the wake of these attacks.

I stand with our nation's Blue Line and we can overcome our challenges together.

TEXAS HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1605

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to make it known that the Texas House of Representatives through Robert Haney, the Chief Clerk of the House, has adopted House Resolution No. 1605 by Faircloth. This resolution expresses a commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing and urges Congress to end illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters.

And that's just the way it is.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing is a problem with serious economic, environmental, and security implications; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing accounts for economic losses of billions of dollars per year globally, and millions of those lost dollars result from poaching in the Gulf of Mexico; such activity is largely conducted by foreign fleets at the expense of United States fishermen, coastal communities, and the sustainability of global fish stocks; and

Whereas, Illegal fishing is of particular consequence in Texas, where the Gulf Coast waters supply seafood for the American public and support the hospitality industry, tourism-related businesses, and the vibrant recreational and commercial fishing industry; not only does illegal fishing result in economic losses to the Texas fishing industry and other coastal businesses, but it also is a threat to the sustainability of our fisheries and to the Texas Gulf Coast ecosystem; and

Whereas, The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the United States Coast Guard are to be commended for their partnership in investigating and apprehending foreign vessels engaged in illegal activity along the Texas-Mexico border; and

Whereas, Foreign nationals fishing illegally in U.S. waters compete for local stock, and they disregard state and federal laws on catch limits; when they sell their fish in the United States, they can flood the market with a cheaper product; moreover, they often use banned longline netting that imperils marine mammals and sea turtles; and

Whereas, Vessels involved with illegal fishing are also associated with other crimes, including drug trafficking, human trafficking, and illegal immigration, and the incursion by these foreign fishing vessels into U.S. waters constitutes a violation of our sovereignty; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its commitment to the elimination of illegal fishing, to the long-term conservation of Texas marine resources, and to the protection of the Texas Gulf Coast fishing and coastal communities; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives hereby respectfully urge the United States Congress to take action to protect our coastal borders and to end illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing in our sovereign waters; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress,

and to all members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,085,083,623.06. We've added \$7,524,208,034,709.98 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT SCOTT GLEW

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Scott Glew of Elk River for receiving a Veterans' Voices "On the Rise" Award.

Scott spent eight years in the Minnesota Army National Guard and was deployed to Iraq. Scott strongly believes that if we encourage students across the country to become more informed and active citizens, we can improve the future of our country. To act on this, Scott decided to begin his career as a social studies teacher following his service to our country.

Scott has not let his passion for education stop at the classroom door. He is an active leader within his school district and serves on the Board of Directors for both the Minnesota Council for History Education and the Minnesota Council for the Social Studies. Additionally, Scott is currently in graduate school at the University of Minnesota researching citizenship and peace.

I admire Scott for everything that he has done to better this country and his community. He is the exact type of person who should be teaching because he is the epitome of an excellent role model. I thank him for his service and for helping educate Minnesota's children. Scott—well done and keep up the amazing work.

LT. CALVIN SPANN

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Lieutenant Calvin Spann, who

passed away this last Sunday, September 6, 2015 at his home in Allen, Texas.

Lt. Spann was born on November 28, 1924 and grew up in Rutherford, NJ. While growing up near the local Teterboro Airport, he was inspired to fly. He learned about the physics of flying while a student at Rutherford High School, and at eighteen he volunteered for the U.S. Army Air Corps in the heat of World War II to pursue his dream of flying.

It was in 1943 at Tuskegee, Alabama that Lt. Spann started his aviation cadet training. Not only did he withstand a brutal and rigorous training program, he overcame a selective quota system at a time when all branches of the U.S. Armed Services were segregated. He was determined and focused to earn his wings. Soon after, he was promoted to the rank of Lieutenant.

He was sent to Italy as a replacement combat pilot and joined hundreds of other black men that would comprise the famed Tuskegee Airmen. Created in 1940, the all-black flying unit was a result of Public Law 18, which established civilian pilot training programs at 166 colleges and universities across the country. This law eventually led to the expansion of the Army Air Corps.

Lt. Spann was a member of the elite 100th Fighter Squadron, part of the 332nd Fighter Group and piloted the powerful P-51 Mustang. His service as a fighter pilot included 26 combat missions over Nazi controlled Germany. He participated in the longest bomber escort mission in the 15th Air Force history: a 1,600-mile, round trip mission, from Ramitelli, Italy, to Berlin with the objective of destroying the Daimler-Benz manufacturing plant.

As public opinion toward the Tuskegee Airman changed, Lt. Spann's accomplishments finally came to light. The discrimination he faced during training contrasted greatly with the praise he received from the bombers, whom he escorted. Through his service and the prestige of the Tuskegee Airmen, Lt. Spann was proud to have played a part in President Harry Truman's decision in 1948 to abolish segregation in all branches of the U.S. military.

Lt. Spann returned home as a decorated war veteran. He received the Air Medal, the Presidential Unit Citation, the World War II Victory Medal, the American Campaign Ribbon, and the European/African/Middle Eastern Campaign Ribbon for his honorable and courageous service.

After leaving active duty in 1946, Lt. Spann wanted to become a commercial pilot. However, he was confronted with racial discrimination in the airline industry and never received his chance to fly again. It wasn't until 1963 that the U.S. Supreme Court ordered major commercial airlines to hire African-American pilots. Lt. Spann was inducted into the New Jersey Aviation Hall of Fame at Teterboro Airport in 2006. In 2007, he was among the Tuskegee Airmen who were collectively given the Congressional Gold Medal by President George W. Bush.

It is an honor for me to represent the 9th Congressional District of New Jersey, which includes Lt. Spann's hometown of Rutherford. He leaves a legacy that is truly a story of his times, a story of heroism and courage even in the face of his own countrymen who tried to

keep him out of the air. In the end, Lt. Calvin Spann became a fighter pilot who defended our nation in its ultimate struggle, truly the epitome of our 'greatest generation.'

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the life achievements of individuals such as Lt. Calvin Spann.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Lt. Spann's family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing the life of Lieutenant Calvin Spann.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1835 BY CAPRIGLIONE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Many airports, especially those in congested urban areas, are near or over their capacities, and such inadequate infrastructure causes long delays, reduced customer service, negative impacts on the economy, and bottlenecks throughout our entire national air transportation system; and

Whereas, Implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) would help make air travel even safer and more convenient and environmentally friendly by enhancing the efficiency of airports and airspace procedures; and

Whereas, The long list of airport improvements encompassed in NextGen includes performance-based navigation flight procedures, improved surface management systems, reduced aircraft exhaust emissions, and technology upgrades that bolster all-weather access to airports; and

Whereas, Airport operators must be involved in the development of NextGen capabilities in and around their airports from inception to execution to ensure noise and other environmental factors that affect their communities are appropriately considered; and

Whereas, The latest Future Airport Capacity Task study prepared by the FAA indicates that many of the nation's busiest airports, including George Bush International Airport in Houston, will require new runways to meet projected capacity needs in the coming years even with NextGen, and these findings highlight the critical importance of taking all reasonable steps to reduce airport congestion; and

Whereas, Airports across the nation are ready to work with the FAA, industry partners, the communities they serve, and the U.S. Congress to implement NextGen in order to equip our air transportation system to meet the demands of the 21st century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express its support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to hold the administrator of the Federal Aviation Administra-

tion, to the president of the Senate and speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING VETERANS' VOICES AWARD RECIPIENT BOB DETTMER

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate State Representative, and former colleague of mine, Bob Dettmer of Forest Lake for being named a recipient of the Veterans' Voices Legacy Award.

Bob served his country in the United States Army Reserve and is a 25-year veteran. He was a Military Intelligence Warrant Officer and served on active duty in both "Operation Enduring Freedom" and "Operation Iraqi Freedom."

In addition to his military service, Bob has served as a teacher and head wrestling coach at Forest Lake High School for 34 years.

In 2006, Bob was elected to the Minnesota State House of Representatives, where he is currently serving as the Chair of the Veterans Affairs Division. He has also worked tirelessly on several veterans' bills.

Outside of his work representing his district in the Minnesota Legislature, Bob serves on the Board of Directors for STARBASE and is a co-chair of the Childhood Obesity Working Group as well as the Military Action Group.

Bob has dedicated his entire life to serving his country and those around him. It is an honor to know him and to have worked with him. Bob states that he is working towards making Minnesota even more "veteran friendly" and I would say that he is well on his way to accomplishing this goal. This award is well deserved.

HOUSE RESOLUTION NO. 1508 BY KING OF UVALDE

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution as a memorial.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, A sustainable agricultural system is crucial to the continued production of food, feed, and fiber to meet both domestic and global demand; and

Whereas, In the United States, the agriculture and food production industries employ precision farming equipment, crop protection chemistries, genetic engineering or enhancement, agricultural nutrients, and other modern technologies; such advanced practices protect the safety of the public and reduce environmental impact while expanding yields, improving profitability, and ensuring an abundant and affordable food supply; and

Whereas, Agricultural pests present significant dangers to the industry and to global supplies of the products they attack; accordingly, the environmental risks of forgoing advances in agricultural technologies that protect crops are severe; excessive regulation may scuttle or discourage the use of agricultural chemicals that could improve human welfare; and

Whereas, Crop protection is among the most studied and highly regulated of all industries, at both the state and federal levels; the use of sound science should be the bedrock of our nation's regulatory scheme for the agriculture and food production industries, as these industries are critical to the economic vitality of Texas and the United States; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas Legislature hereby express support for the use of sound science to study and regulate such modern agricultural technologies as crop protection chemistries, genetically engineered or enhanced traits, and nutrients; and, be it further

Resolved, That the Texas House of Representatives express opposition to legislative or regulatory action at any level that may result in unnecessary restrictions on the use of modern agricultural technologies; and, be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk forward official copies of this resolution to the president of the United States, to the president of the Senate and the speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, and to all the members of the Texas delegation to Congress with the request that this resolution be entered in the Congressional Record as a memorial to the Congress of the United States of America.

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE 14TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEPTEMBER 11TH, 2001

HON. SHEILA JACKSON LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 11, 2015

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in recognizing and commemorating the 14th anniversary of the attacks on our homeland on September 11, 2001.

The years that have passed since that day have not dimmed my memory or diminished my resolve to see an end to terrorism not only in the United States, but around the world.

As a Member of Congress and a senior Member of the Committees on Homeland Security and the Judiciary, both of which deal with national security issues, I have long been committed and engaged in efforts to develop policies that anticipate and respond to new and emerging challenges to the security of our nation and the peace and safety of the world.

On Tuesday of this week the House Committee on Homeland Security held a full committee hearing in New York City at "Ground Zero," which is now the home of the National September 11 Memorial and Museum.

I will never forget that day.

Today, September 11, 2015 is the 14th anniversary of the attacks that killed 2,977 men, women and children.

I stood on the East Front steps of the Capitol on September 11, 2001, along with 150

members of the House of Representatives and sang "God Bless America."

September 11, 2001 remains a tragedy that defines our nation's history, but the final chapter will be written by those who are charged with keeping our nation and its people safe while preserving the way of life that terrorists seek to change.

I visited the site of the World Trade Center Towers in the aftermath of the attacks and grieved over the deaths of so many of our men, women, and children.

I want to thank and commend the work of our first responder community on that day and every day since September 11 for their efforts to protect their communities and our nation from acts of terrorism.

I watched as thousands of first responders, construction workers, and volunteers worked to recover the remains of the dead, and removed the tons of debris, while placing their own lives and health at risk.

The men and women who worked at "Ground Zero" were called by a sense of duty to help in our nation's greatest time of need since the bombing of Pearl Harbor.

There is unfinished work for those first responders who were injured or suffered illnesses during and after the September 11, 2001 attacks.

September 11 will forever remain a part of our national memory and for those who serve in Congress a clarion call to be vigilant against those who would do our nation harm.

To respond to the medical needs of the thousands of people who became ill from exposure to the toxic environment at Ground Zero, Congress passed the James Zadroga September 11 Care Act (9/11 Care Act), which provides rescue and recover workers with health care to treat the conditions that resulted from their exposure to toxic dust after the terror attack.

The 9/11 Care Act will expire in October 2016.

I urge my Colleagues on the Committee to join me in seeking reauthorization of the 9/11 Care Act this year.

Under the leadership of President Obama, Bin Laden was found and killed.

President Obama was given a daunting task—after the reckless decision to invade Iraq without provocation.

This single decision to engage in a war of choice and not necessity resulted in the situation that we see in the Middle East with ISIL and the massive displacement of people seeking safety from a war zone that covers Syria and Iraq's borders.

Today, this nation faces new threats from terrorists.

We also have the benefit of first responder professionals who guard us, protect us, and watch over us against those who would seek to do us harm.

The men and women who serve our communities as law enforcement officers, firefighters, EMT's, nurses, doctors, and dozens of other professionals that train to be ready to detect, deter, and defend against another September 11.

I have introduced the "Families of Responders Identification of Emergency Needs in Designated Situations" called the "FRIENDS Act," to bring a measure of peace to those who will

be called to the front lines in our nation's fight against terrorism and terrorists acts at home.

I thank the staff of the Homeland Security Committee and the first responder organizations for their assistance in improving the bill.

The FRIENDS Act would result in the first report ever produced on the state of family support planning for the families of first responders.

Federal family support planning is important to homeland security because this area of continuity of operations planning addresses the health and safety needs of first responder families during terrorist attacks or incidents as well as other emergencies.

When first responders are called to duty—whether it is September 11, 2001 or to protect and serve during Hurricanes Katrina, Rita, or Sandy or other emergencies—they should not be concerned about the safety needs of their families.

I look forward to the opportunity for each member of the House to cast a vote in favor of first responder families by supporting passage of the FRIENDS Act.

But today let us remember those who perished on this awful day 14 years ago, and rededicate ourselves to honoring their sacrifice by doing all we can to protect our homeland and all who dwell peaceably therein.

FIRST RESPONDERS KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

Of the 2,977 victims killed in the September 11 attacks, 411 were emergency workers in New York City who responded to the World Trade Center. This included:

Fire Department of New York (FDNY): Chief Peter J. Ganci, Jr., 54, the highest ranking uniformed fire officer in the department; First Deputy Fire Commissioner William M. Feehan, 72; Marshal Ronald Paul Bucca, 47; Chaplain Mychal Judge, 68.

Battalion 1: Chief Matthew Lancelot Ryan, 54; Lt. Paul Thomas Mitchell, 46.

Battalion 2: Chief William McGovern, 49; Chief Richard Prunty, 57; Faustino Apostol, Jr., 55.

Battalion 4: Lt. Thomas O'Hagan, 43.

Battalion 6: Chief John P. Williamson, 46.

Battalion 7: Chief Orio Palmer, 45; Lt. Stephen G. Harrell, 44; Lt. Philip Scott Petti, 43.

Battalion 8: Chief Thomas Patrick DeAngelis, 51; Thomas McCann, 45.

Battalion 9: Chief Dennis Lawrence Devlin, 51; Chief Edward F. Geraghty, 45; Lt. Charles William Garbarini, 44; Carl Asaro, 39; Alan D. Feinberg, 48.

Battalion 11: Chief John M. Paolillo, 51.

Battalion 12: Chief Frederick Claude Scheffold, Jr., 57.

Battalion 22: Lt. Charles Joseph Margiotta, 44.

Battalion 43: Lt. Geoffrey E. Guja, 49.

Battalion 47: Lt. Anthony Jovic, 39.

Battalion 48: Chief Joseph Grzelak, 52; Michael Leopoldo Bocchino, 45.

Battalion 49: Chief John Moran, 42.

Battalion 50: Chief Lawrence T. Stack, 58.

Battalion 57: Chief Dennis Cross, 60; Chief Joseph Ross Marchbanks, Jr., 47.

Division 1: Capt. Joseph D. Farrelly, 47; Capt. Thomas Moody, 45.

Division 11: Capt. Timothy M. Stackpole, 42.

Division 15: Chief Thomas Theodore Haskell, Jr., 37; Capt. Martin J. Egan, Jr., 36; Capt. William O'Keefe, 48.

Engine 1: Lt. Andrew Desperito, 43; Michael T. Weinberg, 34.

Engine 4: Calixto Anaya, Jr., 35; James C. Riches, 29; Thomas G. Schoales, 27; Paul A. Tegtmeyer, 41.

Engine 5: Manuel Del Valle, Jr., 32.
 Engine 6: Paul Beyer, 37; Thomas Holohan, 36; William R. Johnston, 31.
 Engine 8: Robert Parro, 35.
 Engine 10: Lt. Gregg Arthur Atlas, 44; Jeffrey Olsen, 31.
 Engine 21: Capt. William Francis Burke, Jr., 46.
 Engine 22: Thomas Anthony Casoria, 29; Michael J. Elferis, 27; Vincent D. Kane, 37; Martin E. McWilliams, 35.
 Engine 23: Robert McPadden, 30; James Nicholas Pappageorge, 29; Hector Luis Tirado, Jr., 30; Mark P. Whitford, 31.
 Engine 26: Capt. Thomas Farino, 37; Dana R. Hannon, 29.
 Engine 29: Michael Ragusa, 29.
 Engine 33: Lt. Kevin Pfeifer, 42; David Arce, 36; Michael Boyle, 37; Robert Evans, 36; Keithroy Marcellus Maynard, 30.
 Engine 37: John Giordano, 47.
 Engine 40: Lt. John F. Ginley, 37; Kevin Bracken, 37; Michael D. D'Auria, 25; Bruce Gary, 51; Steven Mercado, 38.
 Engine 50: Robert W. Spear, Jr., 30.
 Engine 54: Paul John Gill, 34; Jose Guadalupe, 37; Christopher Santora, 23.
 Engine 55: Lt. Peter L. Freund, 45; Robert Lane, 28; Christopher Mozzillo, 27; Stephen P. Russell, 40.
 Engine 58: Lt. Robert B. Nagel, 55.
 Engine 74: Ruben D. Correa, 44.
 Engine 201: Lt. Paul Richard Martini, 37; Gregory Joseph Buck, 37; Christopher Pickford, 32; John Albert Schardt, 34.
 Engine 205: Lt. Robert Francis Wallace, 43.
 Engine 207: Karl Henry Joseph, 25; Shawn Edward Powell, 32; Kevin O. Reilly, 28.
 Engine 214: Lt. Carl John Bedigian, 35; John Joseph Florio, 33; Michael Edward Roberts, 31; Kenneth Thomas Watson, 39.
 Engine 216: Daniel Suhr, 37.
 Engine 217: Lt. Kenneth Phelan, 41; Steven Coakley, 36; Philip T. Hayes, 67; Neil Joseph Leavy, 34.
 Engine 219: John Chipura, 39.
 Engine 226: Brian McAleese, 36; David Paul De Rubbio, 38; Stanley S. Smagala, Jr., 36.
 Engine 230: Lt. Brian G. Ahearn, 43; Frank Bonomo, 42; Michael Scott Carlo, 34; Jeffrey Stark, 30; Eugene Whelan, 31; Edward James White III, 30.
 Engine 235: Lt. Steven Bates, 42; Nicholas Paul Chiofalo, 39; Francis Esposito, 32; Lee S. Fehling, 28; Lawrence G. Veling, 44.
 Engine 238: Lt. Glenn E. Wilkinson, 46.
 Engine 279: Ronnie Lee Henderson, 52; Anthony Rodriguez, 36.
 Engine 285: Raymond R. York, 45.
 Engine 320: Capt. James J. Corrigan, 60.
 Haz-Mat 1: Lt. John A. Crisci, 48; Dennis M. Carey, 51; Martin N. DeMeo, 47; Thomas Gardner, 39; Jonathan R. Hohmann, 48; Dennis Scauso, 46; Kevin Joseph Smith, 47.
 Ladder 2: Capt. Frederick III, Jr., 49; Michael J. Clarke, 27; George DiPasquale, 33; Denis P. Germain, 33; Daniel Edward Harlin, 41; Carl Molinaro, 32; Dennis Michael Mulligan, 32.
 Ladder 3: Capt. Patrick J. Brown, 48; Lt. Kevin W. Donnelly, 43; Michael Carroll, 39; James Raymond Coyle, 26; Gerard Dewan, 35; Jeffrey John Giordano, 45; Joseph Maloney, 45; John Kevin McAvoy, 47; Timothy Patrick McSweeney, 37; Joseph J. Ogren, 30; Steven John Olson, 38.
 Ladder 4: Capt. David Terence Wooley, 54; Lt. Daniel O'Callaghan, 42; Joseph Angelini, Jr., 38; Peter Brennan, 30; Michael E. Brennan, 27; Michael Haub, 34; Michael F. Lynch, 33; Samuel Oitice, 45; John James Tipping II, 33.
 Ladder 5: Lt. Vincent Francis Giammona, 40; Lt. Michael Warchola, 51; Louis Arena, 32;

Andrew Brunn, 28; Thomas Hannafin, 36; Paul Hanlon Keating, 38; John A. Santore, 49; Gregory Thomas Saucedo, 31.
 Ladder 7: Capt. Vernon Allan Richard, 53; George Cain, 35; Robert Joseph Foti, 42; Richard Muldowney Jr., 40; Charles Mendez, 38; Vincent Princiotta, 39.
 Ladder 8: Lt. Vincent Gerard Halloran, 43.
 Ladder 9: Gerard Baptiste, 35; John P. Tierney, 27; Jeffrey P. Walz, 37.
 Ladder 10: Sean Patrick Tallon, 26.
 Ladder 11: Lt. Michael Quilty, 42; Michael F. Cammarata, 22; Edward James Day, 45; John F. Heffernan, 37; Richard John Kelly, Jr., 50; Robert King, Jr., 36; Matthew Rogan, 37.
 Ladder 12: Angel L. Juarbe, Jr., 35; Michael D. Mullan, 34.
 Ladder 13: Capt. Walter G. Hynes, 46; Thomas Hetzel, 33; Dennis McHugh, 34; Thomas E. Sabella, 44; Gregory Stajk, 46.
 Ladder 15: Lt. Joseph Gerard Leavey, 45; Richard Lanard Allen, 30; Arthur Thaddeus Barry, 35; Thomas W. Kelly, 50; Scott Kopytko, 32; Scott Larsen, 35; Douglas E. Oelschlager, 36; Eric T. Olsen, 41.
 Ladder 16: Lt. Raymond E. Murphy, 46; Robert Curatolo, 31.
 Ladder 20: Capt. John R. Fischer, 46; John Patrick Burnside, 36; James Michael Gray, 34; Sean S. Hanley, 35; David Laforge, 50; Robert Thomas Linnane, 33; Robert D. McMahon, 35.
 Ladder 21: Gerald T. Atwood, 38; Gerard Duffy, 53; Keith Glascoe, 38; Joseph Henry, 25; William E. Krukowski, 36; Benjamin Suarez, 34.
 Ladder 24: Capt. Daniel J. Brethel, 43; Stephen Elliot Belson, 51.
 Ladder 25: Lt. Glenn C. Perry, 41; Matthew Barnes, 37; John Michael Collins, 42; Kenneth Kumpel, 42; Robert Minara, 54; Joseph Rivelli, 43; Paul G. Ruback, 50.
 Ladder 27: John Marshall, 35.
 Ladder 35: Capt. Frank Callahan, 51; James Andrew Giberson, 43; Vincent S. Morello, 34; Michael Otten, 42; Michael Roberts, 30.
 Ladder 38: Joseph Spor, Jr., 35.
 Ladder 42: Peter Alexander Bielfeld, 44.
 Ladder 101: Lt. Joseph Gullickson, 37; Patrick Byrne, 39; Salvatore B. Calabro, 38; Brian Cannizzaro, 30; Thomas J. Kennedy, 36; Joseph Maffeo, 31; Terence A. McShane, 37.
 Ladder 105: Capt. Vincent Brunton, 43; Thomas Richard Kelly, 39; Henry Alfred Miller, Jr., 51; Dennis O'Berg, 28; Frank Anthony Palombo, 46.
 Ladder 111: Lt. Christopher P. Sullivan, 39.
 Ladder 118: Lt. Robert M. Regan, 48; Joseph Agnello, 35; Vernon Paul Cherry, 49; Scott Matthew Davidson, 33; Leon Smith, Jr., 48; Peter Anthony Vega, 36.
 Ladder 131: Christian Michael Otto Regenhart, 28.
 Ladder 132: Andrew Jordan, 36; Michael Kiefer, 25; Thomas Mingione, 34; John T. Vigiano II, 36; Sergio Villanueva, 33.
 Ladder 136: Michael Joseph Cawley, 32.
 Ladder 166: William X. Wren, 61.
 Rescue 1: Capt. Terence S. Hatton, 41; Lt. Dennis Mojica, 50; Joseph Angelini, Sr., 63; Gary Geidel, 44; William Henry, 49; Kenneth Joseph Marino, 40; Michael Montesi, 39; Gerard Terence Nevins, 46; Patrick J. O'Keefe, 44; Brian Edward Sweeney, 29; David M. Weiss, 41.
 Rescue 2: Lt. Peter C. Martin, 43; William David Lake, 44; Daniel F. Libretti, 43; John Napolitano, 32; Kevin O'Rourke, 44; Lincoln Quappe, 38; Edward Rall, 44.
 Rescue 3: Christopher Joseph Blackwell, 42; Thomas Foley, 32; Thomas Gambino, Jr., 48; Raymond Meisenheimer, 46; Donald J. Regan, 47; Gerard Patrick Schrang, 45.

Rescue 4: Capt. Brian Hickey, 47; Lt. Kevin Dowdell, 46; Terrence Patrick Farrell, 45; William J. Mahoney, 37; Peter Allen Nelson, 42; Durrell V. Pearsall, 34.
 Rescue 5: Capt. Louis Joseph Modafferi, 45; Lt. Harvey Harrell, 49; John P. Bergin, 39; Carl Vincent Bini, 44; Michael Curtis Fiore, 46; Andre G. Fletcher, 37; Douglas Charles Miller, 34; Jeffrey Matthew Palazzo, 33; Nicholas P. Rossomando, 35; Allan Tarasiewicz, 45.
 Special Operations: Chief Raymond Mathew Downey, 63; Capt. Patrick J. Waters, 44; Lt. Timothy Higgins, 43; Lt. Michael Thomas Russo, Sr., 44.
 Squad 1: Capt. James M. Amato, 43; Lt. Edward A. D'Atri, 38; Lt. Michael Esposito, 41; Lt. Michael N. Fodor, 53; Brian Bilcher, 37; Gary Box, 37; Thomas M. Butler, 37; Peter Carroll, 42; Robert Cordice, 28; David J. Fontana, 37; Matthew David Garvey, 37; Stephen Gerard Siller, 34.
 Squad 18: Lt. William E. McGinn, 43; Eric Allen, 44; Andrew Fredricks, 40; David Halderman, 40; Timothy Haskell, 34; Manuel Mojica, 37; Lawrence Virgilio, 38.
 Squad 41: Lt. Michael K. Healey, 42; Thomas Patrick Cullen III, 31; Robert Hamilton, 43; Michael J. Lyons, 32; Gregory Sikorsky, 34; R. Bruce Van Hine, 48.
 Squad 252: Tarel Coleman, 32; Thomas Kuveikis, 48; Peter J. Langone, 41; Patrick Lyons, 34; Kevin Prior, 28.
 Squad 288: Lt. Ronald T. Kerwin, 42; Ronnie E. Gies, 43; Joseph Hunter, 31; Jonathan Lee Ielpi, 29; Adam David Rand, 30; Timothy Matthew Welty, 34.
 EMS Battalion 49: Paramedic Carlos R. Lillo, 37.
 EMS Battalion 57: Paramedic Ricardo J. Quinn, 40.
 Port Authority Police Department: Supt. Ferdinand V. Morrone, 63; Chief James A. Romito, 51; Lt. Robert D. Cirri; Insp. Anthony P. Infante, Jr., 47; Capt. Kathy Nancy Mazza, 46; Sgt. Robert M. Kaulfers, 49; Donald James McIntyre, 38; Walter Arthur McNeil, 53; Joseph Michael Navas, 44; James Nelson, 40; Alfonse J. Niedermeyer, 40; James Wendell Parham, 32; Dominick A. Pezzulo, 36; Antonio J. Rodrigues, 35; Richard Rodriguez, 31; Bruce Albert Reynolds, 41; Christopher C. Amoroso, 29; Maurice V. Barry, 48; Clinton Davis, Sr., 38; Donald A. Foreman, 53; Gregg J. Froehner, 46; Uhuru Gongu Houston, 32; George G. Howard, 44; Thomas E. Gorman; Stephen Huczko, Jr., 44; Paul William Jurgens, 47; Liam Callahan, 44; Paul Laszczynski, 49; David Prudencio Lemagne, 27; John Joseph Lennon, Jr., 44; John Dennis Levi, 50; James Francis Lynch, 47; John P. Skala, 31; Walwyn W. Stuart, Jr., 28; Kenneth F. Tietjen, 31; Nathaniel Webb; Michael T. Wholey; Sirius, K-9.
 New York City Police Department: Sgt. Timothy A. Roy, Sr., 36; Sgt. John Gerard Coughlin, 43; Sgt. Rodney C. Gillis, 33; Sgt. Michael S. Curtin, 45; Det. Joseph V. Vigiano, 34; Det. Claude Daniel Richards, 46; Moira Ann Smith, 38; Ramon Suarez, 45; Paul Talty, 40; Santos Valentin, Jr., 39; Walter E. Weaver, 30; Ronald Philip Kloefer, 39; Thomas M. Langone, 39; James Patrick Leahy, 38; Brian Grady McDonnell, 38; John William Perry, 38; Glen Kerrin Pettit, 30; John D'Allara, 47; Vincent Danz, 38; Jerome M. P. Dominguez, 37; Stephen P. Driscoll, 38; Mark Joseph Ellis, 26; Robert Fazio, Jr., 41.
 Private emergency medical services: Keith Fairben, 24—a paramedic who worked for the New York Presbyterian Hospital; Richard Pearlman, 18—an EMT who worked for the Forest Hills Volunteer Ambulance; Mario Santoro, 28—a paramedic who worked for the

September 11, 2015

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS, Vol. 161, Pt. 10

14151

New York Presbyterian Medical Center; Yamel Merino, 24—an EMT for Metrocare/Montefiore Medical Center for three years; Mohammad Salman Hamdani, 23—a part-time FDNY Certified EMT and also a mem-

ber of the New York City Police Department Cadet Corps for three years; Marc Sullins, 30—an EMT who worked with Cabrini Medical Center; Mark Schwartz, 50—an EMT who worked for Hunter Ambulance; Jeff Simpson,

38—an EMT who worked for the Dumfries-Triangle Rescue Squad, and also an employee for Oracle Corporation.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 15, 2015

The House met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ROONEY of Florida).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 15, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS J. ROONEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Creator God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

In this moment of prayer, please bless the Members of the people's House as they meet with their respective constituents. We acknowledge that many of our citizens observe a new year, a celebration of Your creation of man and woman.

May we all do our part in Your creation, preserving all You have given us for the benefit of all Your children, bringing into reality peace and justice, especially among those whose life experience is devoid of these things.

And as the Members return in the coming days, grant them a surfeit of wisdom, patience, and goodwill as they face the most pressing issues of these days. May their efforts issue forth in solutions benefiting all and neglecting none.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Repub-

lic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the House stands adjourned until noon tomorrow for morning-hour debate.

There was no objection.

Thereupon (at 3 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, September 16, 2015, at noon for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2722. A letter from the Acting Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's affirmation of interim rule as final rule — Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin [Docket No.: APHIS-2014-0023] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2723. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8395] received September 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2724. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility (Stafford County, NH, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] [Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8397] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2725. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Standardizing Method of Payment for FHA Insurance Claims [Docket No.: FR-5805-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AJ26) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2726. A letter from the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received September 2, 2015, pur-

suant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2727. A letter from the Deputy Director, ODRM, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities Research Endowments [Docket No.: NIH-2007-0931] (RIN: 0925-AA61) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2728. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Associated Revisions [EPA-R08-OAR-2014-0370; FRL-9930-71-Region 8] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2729. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule on Substituted Cyclosiloxane; Removal [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2015-0220; FRL-9932-56] (RIN: 2070-AB27) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2730. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, and 2010 SO₂ NAAQS [EPA-R05-OAR-2014-0704; FRL-9933-62-Region 5] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2731. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO₂ Revision for Walsh and Kelly [EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0380; FRL-9933-65-Region 5] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2732. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Tetraethylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0214; FRL-9933-35] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2733. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0506; FRL-9930-04] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

2734. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Propylene glycol monomethyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0143; FRL-9932-06] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2735. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0114; FRL-9931-18] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2736. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona; Phased Discontinuation of Stage II Vapor Recovery Program [EPA-R09-OAR-2014-0256; FRL-9927-14-Region 9] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2737. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: Changes to Georgia Fuel Rule and Other Miscellaneous Rules [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0161; FRL-9933-32-Region 4] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2738. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather River Air Quality Management District; Correction [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0164; FRL-9933-50-Region 9] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2739. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska; Transportation Conformity State Implementation Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0447; FRL-9933-43-Region 10] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2740. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Attainment Demonstration for the Dallas/Fort Worth 1997 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 Ozone Standard [EPA-R06-OAR-2012-0098; FRL-9931-78-Region 6] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2741. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS

[EPA-R06-OAR-2013-0808; FRL-9932-50-Region 6] received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's Major final rule — Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0602; FRL-9930-65-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AR33) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2743. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; Correction [EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0817; FRL-9933-76-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ93) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2744. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program [EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0796; EPA-R01-OAR-2014-0862; A-1-FRL-9933-92-Region 1] received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2745. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units [EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0495; EPA-HQ-OAR-2013-0603; FRL-9930-66-OAR] (RIN: 2060-AQ91) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2746. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "United States Tobacco Product Exports That Do Not Conform to Tobacco Product Standards", pursuant to Sec. 801(p)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2747. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Patient Navigator Outreach and Chronic Disease Prevention Program, Fiscal Years 2008-2012", pursuant to Pub. L. 109-18, the Patient Navigator Outreach and Chronic Disease Prevention Act and amended by Pub. L. 111-148, the Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2748. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's report entitled "Pre-market Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices — FY 2013", pursuant to Sec. 302 of the Food and Drug Administration

Amendments Act, and Sec. 515A(a)(3) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2749. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Update to List of Countries Where Persons in the United States May Request Department of Defense Assistance in Obtaining Priority Delivery of Contracts [Docket No.: 150720623-5623-01] (RIN: 0694-AG68) received September 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2750. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List [Docket No.: 150604505-5505-01] (RIN: 0694-AG65) received September 4, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2751. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to License Exception Availability for Consumer Communications Deceives and Licensing Policy for Civil Telecommunications-related Items Such as Infrastructure Regarding Sudan; Correction [Docket No.: 150720622-5622-01] (RIN: 0694-AG63) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2752. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2753. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2754. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2755. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Default Investment Fund received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2756. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Criminal Restitution Orders received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2757. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-84; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 4] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2758. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; EPEAT Items [FAC 2005-84; FAR Case 2013-016; Item I; Docket 2013-0016, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM71) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2759. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's guide — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-84; Small Entity Compliance Guide [Docket No.: FAR 2015-0051, Sequence No.: 4] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2760. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Technical Amendments [FAC 2005-84; Item II; Docket No.: 2015-0052; Sequence No.: 3] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2761. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's draft and section-by-section analysis of a bill entitled, the "National Park Service Centennial Act"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2762. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources in the Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Region; Framework Amendment [Docket No.: 140819687-5583-02] (RIN: 0648-BE40) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2763. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fishery by Non-Rockfish Program Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Western and Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 140918791-4999-02] (RIN: 0648-XE099) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2764. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Operations, NOAA Fish-

eries Service, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Takes of Marine Mammals Incidental to Specified Activities; U.S. Navy Training and Testing Activities in the Mariana Islands Training and Testing Study Area [Docket No.: 140211133-5621-01] (RIN: 0648-BD69) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2765. A letter from the Secretary, Judicial Conference of the United States, transmitting a Judicial Conference determination that former United States District Judge Mark E. Fuller (M.D. Ala.) has engaged in conduct for which consideration of impeachment may be warranted, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 355(b)(1); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2766. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, James River; Newport News, VA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0701] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2767. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Indian River Bay; Millsboro, Delaware [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0563] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2768. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0646] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2769. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0705] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2770. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Carly's Crossing; Outer Harbor, Gallagher Beach, Buffalo, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0717] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2771. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Whiskey Island Paddleboard Festival and Race; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0716] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2772. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone, Swim Around Charleston; Charleston, SC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0276] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2773. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Suncoast Super Boat Grand Prix; Gulf of Mexico, Sarasota, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0216] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2774. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; TriMet Tilikum Crossing Bridge Fireworks Display, Willamette River, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0510] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2775. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-2048; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-015-AD; Amendment 39-18230; AD 2015-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2776. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1744; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-016-AD; Amendment 39-18231; AD 2015-16-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2777. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, Office of Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: NASA Capitalization Threshold (NFS Case 2015-N004) (RIN: 2700-AE23) received September 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2778. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy, Office of the General Counsel (O2REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Animals on VA Property (RIN: 2900-A039) received September 2, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2779. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Application of the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act [Notice 2015-58] received September 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2780. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of tax liability (Rev. Proc. 2015-42) received September 1, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2781. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Report to Congress on "Small Rural Hospital Improvement Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2013", pursuant to Sec. 1820(g)(3)(F)(ii)(I) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona (for himself, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. ROUZER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SALMON, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. OLSON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. PITTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. PEARCE, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. BABIN, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CONAWAY, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KNIGHT, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. YODER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LONG, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 3504. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3505. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve the management and administration of the security clearance processes throughout the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3506. A bill to enable State and local promotion of natural gas, flexible fuel, and high-efficiency motor vehicle fleets; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 3507. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 99 West 2nd Street in Fond du Lac, Wisconsin, as the "Lieutenant Colonel James 'Maggie' Megellas Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, and Mr. BEYER):

H.R. 3508. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow an annual elective surcharge in lieu of estate tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3509. A bill to authorize any office of the Federal Government which owns or operates a parking area for the use of its employees to install, construct, operate, and maintain a battery recharging station in the area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3510. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to develop a cybersecurity strategy for the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. LOWEY (for herself and Mr. CRENSHAW):

H. Res. 419. A resolution recognizing the importance of frontline health workers toward accelerating progress on global health and saving the lives of women and children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. FRANKS of Arizona:

H.R. 3504.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has authority to extend protection to born-alive abortion survivors under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3505.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3506.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. GROTHMAN:

H.R. 3507.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 3508.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 3509.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. RICHMOND:

H.R. 3510.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is introduced pursuant to the powers granted to Congress under the General Welfare Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 1), the Commerce Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 3), and the Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 Sec. 8 Cl. 18).

Further, this statement of constitutional authority is made for the sole purpose of compliance with clause 7 of Rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives and shall have no bearing on judicial review of the accompanying bill.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 140: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 265: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 307: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 410: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 470: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.

H.R. 546: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 664: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 692: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 702: Mr. PERRY and Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 721: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COSTA, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 816: Mr. SANFORD and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 820: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN.

H.R. 918: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 953: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 973: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 985: Mr. LAMBORN and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1062: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1148: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1188: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1192: Mr. FORBES and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 1197: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina and Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1388: Mr. TROTT.

H.R. 1428: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1475: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 1523: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1608: Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois.

H.R. 1611: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.

H.R. 1644: Mr. FLEISCHMANN and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1786: Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. FARR, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 1834: Mr. NUGENT.
 H.R. 1901: Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. ADERHOLT.
 H.R. 2013: Mr. HIGGINS.
 H.R. 2023: Mr. LOEBSACK and Mr. ASHFORD.
 H.R. 2043: Mr. HUFFMAN and Ms. GRAHAM.
 H.R. 2061: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2063: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 2096: Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 2121: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HIMES, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H.R. 2191: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 2205: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H.R. 2315: Mr. HECK of Washington.
 H.R. 2318: Mr. CLAY.
 H.R. 2429: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 2494: Mr. PETERS and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 2508: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 2515: Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. PETERSON.
 H.R. 2516: Mr. WELCH.
 H.R. 2530: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 2646: Ms. LEE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. LONG, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 2716: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
 H.R. 2752: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 2759: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2847: Mr. PAULSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2940: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2973: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 2994: Mr. BEYER.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
 H.R. 3151: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3167: Mr. RIBBLE.
 H.R. 3188: Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 3241: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H.R. 3296: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3302: Mr. GOSAR.
 H.R. 3310: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. COFFMAN.
 H.R. 3314: Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. JONES, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 3326: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 3327: Mr. REED.
 H.R. 3406: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 3407: Mr. KING of Iowa.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. MCCAUL.
 H.R. 3498: Mr. LIPINSKI.
 H.J. Res. 47: Mr. TED LIEU of California.
 H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. ESHOO.
 H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H. Res. 12: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 289: Mr. POCAN.
 H. Res. 402: Mrs. LOWEY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. UPTON

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Energy and Commerce in H.R. 3134 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

25. The SPEAKER presented a petition of District 6 City Councilman Don Zimmerman, Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to repeal 42 U.S.C. 418(f) which mandates participation of local government employees in Social Security; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 15, 2015

The Senate met at 1 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Gracious God, the center of our joy, we thank You for all the blessings we receive daily as gifts from You. Though we don't deserve them, Your mercies provide for all our needs.

Help our lawmakers this day to move from simply knowing about You into a vital relationship based on faith in the unfolding of Your loving providence. Inspire them to rely on Your love as they seek to live faithfully.

As You cleanse our hearts and keep us clean, birth within us all a burning desire to flee from all habitual and willful sin.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). The majority leader is recognized.

REMEMBERING STATE TROOPER JOSEPH PONDER

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, Joseph Ponder was proud to be a Kentucky State police trooper. "He was eager and just absolutely loved his job," is how a State police spokesman described him.

Ponder tragically lost his life in the line of duty this week. We are thinking of that 31-year-old Rineyville native today in the Senate. We are praying for his family and for his friends.

I know his fellow officers in the law enforcement community feel the loss and so do Kentuckians whom he worked every day to protect. So I ask the entire Senate community to join me in honoring Trooper Ponder.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, on a different matter, as the Senate con-

tinues debating President Obama's deal with Iran today, I think it is appropriate to consider a quote from the President himself. Here is what he said:

I believe Congress owes the American people a final up-or-down vote. We need courage. You know, in the end, this debate is about far more than politics.

When it comes to the Iran deal, you would have to say the President is right. After all, do Senators think it is right for the world's leading sponsor of terror to be able to maintain an American-recognized nuclear program? Do Senators think it is right that this deal would effectively subsidize Hezbollah, Hamas, and Bashar al-Assad by channeling literally billions of dollars to their benefactors in Tehran? Do Senators approve of a deal that would leave Iran with an enrichment capability just as the Iranian leadership is again calling for Israel's destruction and praying for ours as well? It is hard to see how Senators could agree with these things.

Many Democratic colleagues, including the top Democrats on the Foreign Affairs Committees in both Houses of Congress who are among the most familiar with the President's deal with Iran, have already come out in opposition. A strong bipartisan majority of the House of Representatives voted to reject the deal. A strong bipartisan majority of the Senate would vote to reject it as well, if only Democratic Senators would stop blocking the American people from even having a final vote on one of the most consequential foreign policy issues of our time.

Democratic Senators will have a chance to vote on behalf of their constituents later today. Perhaps they will consider the President's words I quoted earlier. It is from a 2010 speech about ObamaCare. If the President was so insistent on "courage" and a "final up-or-down vote" back then on ObamaCare, how can he justify blocking a vote now on an issue of such immense magnitude as the Iran deal? It is part of a larger retreat to campaigning instead of engaging on this important issue, ad hominem attacks instead of serious debate, campaign one-liners instead of intellectual arguments, and simply ignoring reality when it becomes inconvenient. That is why you see the President claiming "strong support of lawmakers and citizens" for his Iran deal.

Well, here is what the Washington Post's Fact Checker had to say about that:

Any way you slice it, it is difficult to support the claim that there is "strong support" for the Iran deal among lawmakers and citi-

zens. This is clearly a case of winning ugly, in the face of minority support among lawmakers and increasing opposition among American citizens.

The White House certainly did better than many analysts expected, since enough Democrats supported the agreement to prevent a final Senate vote on the merits. And Obama avoided a veto fight. But that's different than having "strong support" for the deal.

That is the Washington Post Fact Checker.

So if Democrats share the President's determination to "win ugly" on this important issue, then they have sufficient numbers to do that, apparently, but I would remind my colleagues of something. This debate should not be about a President who will leave office in 16 months. It should be about where our country will be in 16 years.

Consider this advice from an editorial that appeared in Bloomberg last month:

Tactics aside, it would be far better to win this fight fairly. The pact is not a treaty: A future President and Congress might overturn it, arguing that it was sealed without proper consideration. And history often looks with disgust at causes built on fear, especially if they go awry.

This is an important moment for the Democratic Party, but more importantly it is an important moment for our country. Let's stand up for the people we represent. Let's allow them to vote on what is one of the most consequential foreign policy issues of our age.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend the Republican leader, among other things, said he wanted an intellectual argument. The outline he just gave has nothing to do with intellectual credibility.

The agreement that was finalized last week dealt with one subject and one subject only: whether Iran should have a nuclear weapon, and that answer was resoundingly no. That is what it was all about. All the other rhetoric my Republican friend talked about is not in keeping with what the agreement is all about. He tried to make the agreement that was finalized into something it isn't. I would suggest in the future, realistically, the Republican leader should be factual on what the agreement is between Iran and China, Russia, Great Britain, Germany,

France, and the United States because what he just outlined has nothing to do with what the actual facts are.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it comes as no surprise to anyone watching the Senate that the Republican leader and I disagree on many things, but I was very glad to hear the Republican leader say last week that he believes any government funding bill must be clean and that using the appropriations process as a vehicle to attack women's health is, as he said, "an exercise in futility."

I am sure not everyone on his side of the aisle agrees with him, but there is no doubt it is the right thing to do. I agree that any budget deal must be clean; that is, no riders—nothing with Planned Parenthood, nothing with repealing what the Environmental Protection Agency has done, no repealing what the Dodd-Frank bill put into effect to stop us from having another Wall Street meltdown, no riders dealing with immigration—just a clean continuing resolution for a short period of time to allow us to do a more full and more complete deal in the very near future.

I agree any budget bill must be clean. I say that again. I am glad to see the Republican leader coming around to that. Democrats will not support a continuing resolution that has all these riders on it and especially a Planned Parenthood rider that was talked about so much in the House.

I read in the paper today that there are 32 Republicans in the House who have signed a letter to the Speaker saying they are not going to vote for anything unless it defunds Planned Parenthood. That is a nonstarter and the Republican leader rightly has acknowledged that. I am glad the Republican leader wants a clean continuing resolution instead of one that attacks women's health.

I am disappointed by his refusal at this stage to negotiate with the White House or any Democrats in the House or in the Senate dealing with the budget. We have a looming government shutdown. It is right before our eyes. The Republican leader has already wasted far too much time dithering and doing nothing on that. We know from experience 2 years ago that the Republicans actually did shut down the government for almost 3 weeks. For months, we have overheard them calling for bipartisan budget negotiations. We have 9 session days left before the government shuts down. Now is the time to sit down—Democrats, Republicans, getting the White House involved—and negotiate a bipartisan funding measure for the rest of the year, but by the look of this week's schedule, the Republican leader doesn't seem to be in any hurry to avoid a shutdown. That is truly unfortunate.

The Republican leader has not scheduled any budget votes today. Instead, the Senate will waste precious time on another failed vote. And then what comes next? What is the Republican leader's plan for the rest of the week? Political show votes on abortion that have nothing to do with keeping the Federal Government open. There is no reason why we can't pass a bipartisan funding measure as soon as possible—this week, even. But that depends on the Republican leader's willingness to sit down and negotiate, and sooner rather than later. Then, Congress can move on to our next budget priority: reversing sequestration and its harmful cuts.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today, September 15, marks the beginning of Hispanic Heritage Month, a celebration that dates back to 1968.

This month also includes the anniversary of independence for many Latin American countries. Hispanic Heritage Month is an opportunity for us as a nation to recognize, celebrate, and honor the history, culture, and contributions of America's Latino community.

We see those contributions in all facets of our society, from the battlefields to the boardrooms and from the classrooms to the halls of government. Every segment of American life has been enriched by Latinos and their proud culture. Without the contributions made by generations of Latinos, Nevada and the United States would not be what we are today.

In Nevada, Hispanic influence and history is everywhere. Consider the name of my State and the name of our most famous city. "Nevada" means snow covered. "Las Vegas" means the meadows. Las Vegas, one of the most famous cities in the world, has a Hispanic name. Today, more than one-quarter of Nevada's population is Hispanic.

Nationally, Latino Americans number nearly 60 million and are expected to make up to 60 percent of the population growth in coming decades. America's future depends on a strong and prosperous Hispanic population.

That is why Democrats have fought hard for policies to protect Hispanic families and strengthen Hispanic communities. We passed the Affordable Care Act, which allows millions of Latinos to have access to affordable health care. Because of the Affordable Care Act, 4.2 million previously uninsured Latinos now have health insurance. An estimated 8.8 million Latinos are newly covered for expanded preventive services, with no cost-sharing, including mammograms, colonoscopy screenings, and immunization vaccines under the Affordable Care Act.

Democrats also passed the bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform bill

out of the Senate a couple years ago. That legislation, which House Republicans refused to consider, even though it would have passed overwhelmingly—all Democrats would have voted for it and enough Republicans would have voted for it to be an overwhelming victory—but it didn't happen. The Republicans refused to consider something that protected families, reduced the deficit, and strengthened our national security.

We also supported President Obama's Executive actions, which, as we speak, are protecting immigrant families from the threat of deportation and taking criminals off the streets. Meanwhile, Republicans are doing everything in their power to undermine Hispanic families. A person need only watch 5 minutes of a Republican Presidential debate to see how Republicans really feel about America's Latino communities. Republicans are clamoring to amend the Constitution to repeal birthright citizenship. Republicans want to roll back President Obama's Executive actions that are keeping families together and preventing DREAMers from being deported.

Republicans are constantly attacking the Affordable Care Act, which has covered 4.2 million previously uninsured Latinos with health insurance. Republicans refuse to boost the minimum wage, blocking millions of Latino families from earning a livable wage.

These are the priorities of the Republican Party—a Republican Party that has abandoned Latino families. We as Democrats will do everything in our power to stop the Republican attack on these families. Democrats will continue to fight for Latino families to help them tackle the challenges they face every day.

Today, as we celebrate the first day of Hispanic Heritage Month, we honor the many incredible contributions Latino Americans make every day to our Nation. We also recommit ourselves to protecting Hispanic families and communities from the likes of Donald Trump and the Republican Party and treating them with dignity and respect because a prosperous America needs a strong and thriving Hispanic community.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt

employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2641 (to amend amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2642 (to amend amendment No. 2641), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2643 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2644 (to amend amendment No. 2643), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2645, to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2646 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2645), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2647 (to amend amendment No. 2646), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 6 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged equally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, as you know, today we are going to have a number of speakers coming down to talk about the deal that has been negotiated between the P5+1 countries—China, Russia, Great Britain, Germany, France, and the United States—and Iran. What is before us today is something called a resolution of disapproval. I know the procedures we deal with sometimes here on the Senate floor can be very confusing to the public. We are going through a process where we are trying to seek cloture. Cloture is a vote where people decide whether they are going to end debate on a topic and move toward the final vote, to cast their vote on the substance of what is before us.

We had a similar type of vote before we left on Thursday. We had 58 Senators—a bipartisan majority—who wanted to move to a final vote. As a matter of fact, we had Senators from both sides of the aisle on the floor for some time debating the issue. It was one of the most sober, respectful debates we have had since I have been in the Senate. But a minority of the Senators voted not to end the debate. In other words, that is what the general

public believes is a filibuster. And it kept us from being able to move to a final vote.

Because there has been some confusion, what I thought I would do is lay out what exactly is happening here and how we got to this process.

Under our form of government, when the President enters into an international agreement, he decides as to whether that is going to be a treaty, which, as we know, requires a two-thirds approval by the Senate, or whether it is something called a congressional-executive agreement, which is a little bit lower threshold, or whether it is just a pure executive agreement, in other words, the President himself has the ability, if he so decides, to enter into an executive agreement. One of the problems with an executive agreement is that it doesn't live beyond that President's term.

When you invoke an executive agreement, what you are really doing is bypassing the buy-in of Congress. As a matter of fact, last week on the floor, I thought Senator FLAKE made one of the most salient points that have been made; that is, since the President and his team decided to cut out Congress and to attempt to do an executive agreement, they made no attempt whatsoever to get the buy-in of Congress. That is why we have ended up in the situation we are in.

When I realized that the President, through this process, was going to enter into this agreement solely by himself—an executive agreement, which he has the ability to do—but that he was also going to use something called a national security waiver to do so—again, this gets a little complicated, and foreign policy can sometimes be complicated. Congress, on four different occasions, passed overwhelmingly in this body and overwhelmingly in the House of Representatives something that puts sanctions in place on Iran to try to bring them to the negotiating table. We did it four times.

I have to say that in almost every instance, the administration pushed back against us putting sanctions in place. They said, "Oh, the other countries won't be with us, and this will create problems." What happened as a result of us saying "No, we are going to sanction Iran; we are going to do what we can to bring them to the table to end their nuclear program" was that the other countries fell in line. They put in place similar sanctions to the ones Congress put in place.

When we passed those four sets of sanctions, we gave the President something that is common, and that is called a national security waiver, where, if a crisis came up, he had the ability to waive those sanctions if he thought it was in our country's national interest.

So when he decided to enter into an executive agreement around these negotiations with Iran and bypass Congress, what he also decided he was going to do is to use his national security waiver to waive the sanctions Congress put in place.

Some of us on this side of the aisle realized that was very problematic, that because we brought Congress to the table and because we put the sanctions in place, we thought it was inappropriate for the President to use the national security waiver.

By the way, we realize now that he was going to put a national security waiver in place for 8½ years and come to Congress 8½ years down the road to waive those sanctions permanently. That would have been long after the essence of this deal was done and over.

So we were able to work with the other side of the aisle and pass a bill that has put us in the position we are in today, and that is allowing Congress to weigh in before those congressionally mandated sanctions are waived. Of course, if those sanctions are not waived, then, in essence, the Iranian deal cannot go forward under the terms that have been laid out.

A lot of people have said: Well, Congress gave away authority. They enabled the President to do this without entering into a treaty.

That is totally untrue. The President has the ability to decide to enter into an international arrangement through an executive arrangement, as he has done, if he so chooses. Now, again, the problem with that is, it doesn't stand the test of time because the next President can come in and alter that.

As a matter of fact, this is the first time I can remember that Congress has taken back authority from the President because what we really did was said: Mr. President, no, you cannot go forward with this deal until we have all of the information, both classified and unclassified, and it is paused for 60 days while we go through this review process, which we know ends—it is debatable because we don't have all the materials, but they would say it ends this week.

So this process wouldn't even be occurring if Congress hadn't taken back the authority that we took back from the President, put this pause in place, and given ourselves the ability to either approve or disapprove—disapprove in this case because many people believe the President squandered this opportunity. Here we had brought this rogue nation to the table, had a boot on its neck, its economy was suffering, and here we have this rogue nation that somehow has ended up in a situation where the President and others have negotiated to allow them not to end their program, which is what was said in the beginning.

By the way, let me just say that had the President held to what he said on

the front end, which was that we are going to end Iran's nuclear program, what we would be having today is almost unanimous support for this agreement. But instead they squandered that opportunity—squandered it—and instead have agreed to allow them to industrialize their program and a whole host of other things that had nothing to do with the nuclear file.

Let me go back to the process. The President decided he was going to go straight to the United Nations. Congress said: No, you are not going to do that. You are going to come to us, and we are going to decide whether we approve or disapprove.

So we have a lot of people out there. Some, I guess, just don't understand. Some, I think, do understand, but they are trying to somehow or another create this narrative that Congress is enabling the President. The fact is, we would have liked to have had more of a say in this. I would have liked for this to have been a treaty. But since the President determines whether these are treaties or executive agreements—and he decided in this case it was an executive agreement—again, what Congress has done is said no and taken back a degree of authority.

Unfortunately, what is happening is we have a minority of 42 Senators who have decided they are not going to allow an up-or-down vote. That is what has happened.

What was dismaying to me was that during August the minority leader decided he was going to filibuster. I have a lot of respect—I think people know we have worked closely together in trying to make the Senate work here. But I was very disappointed that somehow or another this was going to take on sort of a Tammy Wynette feel to it, if you will, that, you know, "We are going to stand by our man. We are not going to cause him to have to veto a resolution of disapproval." Somehow or another, instead of this being the sober, serious debate we thought it was going to be where a majority of Senators were going to be able to express themselves, in order to protect the President from having to veto something that the majority of the Senate in a bipartisan way disapproves of, somehow or another, we have this process underway.

I do wish to say to the leader of the Senate that I appreciate very much the fact that up until this point, what he has agreed to do and has done is he has filled the tree—again, another term that I am sure sounds very unusual to people who are watching the Senate floor and don't understand the process. What he has done is he has said: No—up until this point anyway—we are not going to have a bunch of amendments that are tough for people to vote on; we are going to keep the debate to one topic, and that is the resolution of disapproval. That is what this is for.

So tonight, in a second effort, beginning at 6 o'clock this evening, we are going to have a vote. The vote is going to be about whether—I mean, this is what the essence of it is—it is about whether we should end the debate and move to final passage. I think plenty of people have had their say. Others are going to be coming to the floor today to talk about the merits of this deal and the demerits of this deal. But I would hope, again, that the minority, which seems intent on trying to keep the President from getting a resolution of disapproval, which the majority of people in this body believe should be the case—in order to keep him from having to veto the will of the Senate, a minority of people here are keeping that vote from taking place.

I close by thanking my friends on the other side of the aisle for two things. I actually want to thank everybody in this body. Since 2010, four times the Senate has weighed in to put crippling sanctions on Iran. Those sanctions brought them to the table. That was something which was done in spite of the fact that the administration was pushing back.

Secondly, this body, with a vote of 98 to 1, passed the Iranian review act—in short, now called Corker-Cardin. We passed that on a 98-to-1 basis knowing that the President was issuing a veto threat up to 1½ hours before the committee vote took place. When they realized they were going to be crushed—I hate to use that word—overwhelmed in that committee vote, they lifted their veto threat about 1½ hours before that took place.

But, again, on a 98-to-1 basis, this body said: No, we want to weigh in. We want to have the right to approve or disapprove. We want to pause. We want to see all of the documents.

By the way, we have had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee—12—and all kinds of other one-on-one briefings. So we have had plenty of time to look at this. As a matter of fact, the American people know more about this deal than they ever would have had that process not been put in place. Again, it was put in place because the President decided he wasn't going to cause this to be a treaty; he wasn't going to ask for us to weigh in; he wasn't going to ask us on behalf of the American people to approve it; he was going to do it himself and go directly to the U.N. Security Council. As a matter of fact, he has done that. As a matter of fact, they moved the implementation date back so we could have our chance of weighing in in this way. Certainly, we would love to have much greater power and authority over this.

So thank you to everyone here for putting the sanctions in place. Thank you for allowing us to weigh in.

Let me remind people that if the President had achieved the goals he set out to end Iran's nuclear program—in

other cases, he said dismantle Iran's nuclear program—what would be happening on the floor today is there would be an overwhelming, I would say unanimous vote in support of what the President did. But what is happening is we have a bipartisan majority that opposes this. And even those people who have come out in support of this have done so tepidly. They have talked about all the problems in the agreement. As a matter of fact, now there is a huge push to try to come up with a Middle East policy because we know we have none to push back against what is in this agreement.

I am going to have more to say, but I realize my good friend Senator HOEVEN is here. I wish I had known 4 minutes ago he was here. I have gone 4 minutes into his time, and I yield the floor.

But I want to remind people in closing: Had the President done what he said the goal of the negotiation was—to end their program—we would have unanimous support. Instead, we have a bipartisan majority that opposes this bill, and we have a minority that has kept us, once, from being able to vote up or down. I hope with tonight's vote that will not be the case. I hope we will have the opportunity to send a resolution of disapproval to the President. I know he has said he would veto that, but I think it is important for us and the will of the body and the will of the country to be heard, and for it to reach the President's desk.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. President, I rise to voice my opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement and my support for the resolution of disapproval.

Although there are many arguments related to President Obama's agreement with Iran, I would like to focus on the subject of sanctions. I think it is important to consider why we sanctioned Iran, what happens to our sanctions if the deal is implemented, and the prospects for snapping back sanctions in the future.

First, we imposed sanctions because we wanted to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. Again, I want to emphasize that. We imposed sanctions because we wanted to dismantle Iran's nuclear program. As Secretary Kerry said in December of 2013, we imposed sanctions "because we knew that it would hopefully help Iran dismantle its nuclear program. That was the whole point of the [sanctions] regime."

These were very serious and are very serious sanctions. According to the Treasury Department, sanctions reduced Iranian oil exports by 60 percent—by 60 percent—from 2.5 million barrels per day in 2012 to just over 1 million barrels per day in 2015. In 2014 alone, the Treasury Department believes Iran lost \$40 billion in oil revenue. Sanctions also blocked Iran from

accessing most of its billions in foreign currency reserves. In short, Iran's economy today is 15 to 20 percent smaller than it was projected to be back in 2012.

We know these sanctions were having the desired effect because Iran decided to negotiate. The mullahs in Iran would not have come to the bargaining table if they are not feeling the effect of our sanctions. The opportunity to dismantle Iran's nuclear program was in sight, but then we let Iran off the hook. We agreed to a negotiations process that gave Iran room to maneuver.

Instead of boxing them in with relentless economic pressure, we offered sanctions relief in return for mothballing Iran's nuclear infrastructure for a few years. The end result is that the deal undermines the whole point of the sanctions regime. We instituted sanctions to pressure Iran to dismantle its nuclear program, but this agreement provides sanctions relief and leaves the nuclear program intact.

The terms of the agreement will give Iran access to more than \$100 billion located in frozen bank accounts. Some estimates put that figure even higher. The windfall Iran expects to receive from foreign investments will strengthen Iran's economy even further.

But let us focus on the initial more than \$100 billion in sanctions relief, which is an enormous number. It is equivalent to 25 percent of Iran's annual gross domestic product. For perspective, one quarter of U.S. GDP would amount to more than \$4 trillion. So you can see what a huge sum this is to Iran and how much it means to Iran and their economy and, ultimately, to their military. One analyst even pointed out that \$100 billion for Iran in 2015 is roughly equivalent to the investment the United States made across Europe over the 4-year Marshall Plan to rehabilitate Europe after World War II. So you realize what a huge impact this will have, what a huge benefit it is for Iran, for its economy, and for its military.

In short, handing Iran \$100 billion gives the mullahs incredible flexibility. It is hard to imagine that Iran won't divert billions of these funds to Hezbollah in Lebanon, along with a billion or two for Yemen, and another billion or two or more for operations in Iraq and Syria.

Remember, Iran is the No. 1 state sponsor of terror in the world today. This agreement will provide Iran with money to spend on its aggressive agenda across the Middle East. So one thing is clear—one thing is clear—the world's foremost state sponsor of terror and one of the worst violators of human rights on Earth will receive a huge windfall of cash.

It is also clear Iran's economy and its military would be strengthened. As I said previously, Iran's economy today

is 20 percent smaller than it would have been without 4 years of sanctions. Four years from now, without sanctions, Iran's economy will be larger and the regime will have not only more financial strength but also more flexibility to carry out its agenda.

That flexibility will come at a very opportune time for them. Five years into this agreement, the conventional arms embargo will end, per the agreement, and it should be clear to all of us that Iran will then have the money, the resources to buy arms at that point. Three years later, or a total of 8 years after the agreement is implemented, the ballistic missile embargo will be lifted. So in 5 years they can buy conventional weapons and within 8 years they can buy advanced missile technology. And restrictions on Iran's nuclear program will begin to disappear a few years later.

Iran's leaders are probably very pleased with that timing. First, they get sanctions relief, allowing them to grow their economy. That growth will create the investment capital for conventional arms purchases, which the deal permits in 5 years. By then they will be ready to acquire advanced ballistic missile technology—ballistic missiles the agreement allows Iran to purchase in 8 years.

In fact, because their nuclear program will remain intact, at that point Iran could opt out of the deal, finish developing a nuclear weapon, and mount it on a ballistic missile. In short, the President's Iran agreement actually allows Iran a path to finance and develop an advanced nuclear weapon.

Further, the agreement is not only bad on its merits, it is a strategic mistake. It hurts our long-standing Middle East alliances and positions Iran to be the dominant power in the Middle East. We know what Iran will do from a position of strength. It destabilizes Yemen, Syria, and Iraq, foments terrorism against Israel, and opens the door for countries such as Russia and China to meddle in regional politics. Even if Iran never developed a nuclear weapon, the agreement will position Iran to further undermine regional security for years to come. Leaving its nuclear infrastructure in place only makes things worse.

What if Iran violates the agreement? It is interesting to note that many supporters of the deal have argued we must approve the agreement because our allies are already lifting their sanctions and that our sanctions will not be successful on their own. Yet these same supporters of the agreement believe sanctions could somehow be reimposed if Iran cheats on the deal.

Unfortunately, the procedures in the agreement make snapping back sanctions very difficult. Under the terms of the deal, it would take months to establish Iranian violations of the agree-

ment and put new sanctions back in place. Suppose Iran begins to cheat on the deal in a year or two. Under the terms of the agreement, it would take months to establish that Iran had violated the agreement and approve those new sanctions. That is hardly enough of a threat to keep Iran from cheating, but more importantly, the deal permits Iran to withdraw from the agreement if sanctions are reimposed. So snapping back sanctions would effectively kill the deal. Remember, they could kill the deal after they have already gotten more than \$100 billion.

The agreement makes it in Iran's interest to cheat on the deal knowing sanctions either won't be imposed or will allow them to pocket the \$100 billion in sanctions relief, jump-starting their nuclear program, before any kind of sanctions are reimposed. For this reason, I believe if the agreement goes into effect, it will very likely die slowly from a thousand Iranian cuts, leaving behind a richer and nuclear-powered Iran.

Voting to support the deal essentially means putting faith in Iran. It means believing that Iran will allow the inspections to occur. It means believing that Iran does not have any nuclear facilities that we are unaware of. It means believing that Iran will keep its nuclear infrastructure without attempting to build a nuclear weapon.

I don't believe any of these things. Why? Because over the last 15 years Iran has blocked inspections, revealed the existence of secret nuclear sites only when forced to, and pushed for a nuclear weapon even when claiming they only wanted a peaceful program.

But it doesn't have to be this way. We could seek a stronger agreement. We could make it clear that Iran does not have the right to nuclear weapons and cannot be allowed to obtain them. We could return to our original goal, which was the dismantlement of Iran's nuclear program, instead of negotiating away the leverage that sanctions created.

For these reasons, I cannot support the President's agreement with Iran. Instead, I favor immediate additional sanctions to pressure Iran to dismantle its nuclear program, which was the objective when the negotiations began.

We should not let Iran off the hook. We should not throw away the leverage we developed in recent years through these sanctions. It takes time for sanctions to work, but the relief is immediate when sanctions are lifted. We need to keep our sanctions, keep the pressure on, and get a deal that actually dismantles Iran's nuclear program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum but also request that the time be equally divided.

I yield to the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. It is my understanding that we are equally dividing the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time is equally divided, but quorum calls are not equally divided unless requested.

Mr. HOEVEN. I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum call be equally divided.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HOEVEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I have an inquiry relative to the remaining time.

I am not understanding what the quorum call time is doing relative to the splitting of time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By precedent, quorum calls are charged to the side that requests the quorum call, unless there is a request that the quorum call be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. CORKER. And my understanding was that request was made and granted; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, that request was made and granted in this particular request, but it only applies to the particular request unless it is made on the next quorum call request or unless the unanimous consent would apply to all quorum calls.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I know the public is greatly confused by cloture motions, and I will say, even as the person in charge of the bill, I am confused also, but I will let that stand, and I thank the Chair.

I know the next speaker we are hoping to hear from will be Senator CORNYN at 2 p.m., Senator SCOTT at 2:20, Senator BLUNT at 2:30, and then Senator HELLER at 3 o'clock. I hope they will be down soon, and I will let the time be accruing against both sides by suggesting the absence of a quorum.

I ask unanimous consent that during the period of time there is a quorum call, it be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, last week we experienced what I would

think was a dark day in the history of the United States Senate where, on one of the most important national security issues that has confronted the country in the last 25 years—and perhaps longer—our friends across the aisle, led by the minority leader, decided to filibuster the resolution of disapproval on the President's nuclear deal with Iran.

So everybody understands what that means. Rather than cast a vote either in favor or against the resolution of disapproval, Democrats banded together and decided not to have a vote. Presumably they did that for two reasons: One is they didn't want the personal accountability associated with having to cast a vote for or against disapproval because they know at some point Iran is going to continue its pattern of misbehavior and people might come back and say: Why did you vote for this deal when in fact all the evidence pointed toward how bad a deal it was?

The second reason I believe our Democratic friends decided to filibuster the vote on the resolution of disapproval is they simply wanted to protect the President because they knew that had the resolution of disapproval passed, the President had threatened to veto the legislation. Having done so under that circumstance, the President would in fact own this bad deal.

As I said, it is a sad day when a political party decides to put partisan concerns ahead of the national security interests of the United States. This is especially true in light of the fact that we voted just a short time earlier to provide a mechanism for there to be that up-or-down vote following debate and review. It also had the effect of freeing the President's ability to lift sanctions on Iran during that timeframe.

This legislation, negotiated by the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee, was called the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act. This was not a partisan product, nor should any of this debate be a partisan activity. It didn't sneak through the Chamber in the dark of night. It wasn't the product of closed-door negotiations by one political party against another. Rather, it was a product of bipartisan concern over the President's deal with Iran and was specifically designed to make sure Congress had possession of all the relevant documents that laid out this agreement between the President and the Iranian regime. It would ensure a process by which the American people could be informed—and the Senate itself debate—through their elected representatives, whether this deal was a good deal or a bad deal in terms of the national security interests of the American people.

Most significantly, that legislation which sets up that process passed over-

whelmingly—as a matter of fact, I think it was nearly unanimously—with not one Democrat in the Chamber voting against that legislation.

So having voted for legislation to create a process by which there would be transparency and accountability, and rather than partisanship the national security interests of the country would be elevated, our Democratic friends, listening to the White House, including the President of the United States, decided to block that very vote they had earlier agreed to have.

Ironically, the same day the minority leader and his colleagues blocked the up-or-down vote on the resolution, he lambasted Republicans on this side of the aisle for “slowing down the legislation,” and suggested we ought to move on to other matters. We could be well on our way to finishing this resolution and moving on to other pieces of legislation that we need to consider if in fact our Democratic friends would, consistent with their earlier vote, just allow us to have an up-or-down vote on the resolution of disapproval, but I think what our Democratic friends began to realize is this is an enormously unpopular agreement between the President and the Ayatollah in Tehran. As a matter of fact, only 21 percent of the American people have said they want to see this deal be turned into a reality. Many of them are concerned, as am I, that rather than a traditional treaty process that requires two-thirds vote of the United States Senate, this has somehow become more of a political document rather than a legal document, binding only this President and the Iranian regime, under some circumstances, during the remainder of the 16 months or so of President Obama's Presidency.

Almost 80 percent of the country has said they are not sold on the deal. Their voices deserve to be heard, and Members of Congress and the Senate should be on record whether they are listening to the American people or whether they are listening to the siren song of the White House and a President who is focused on his legacy, to the detriment of the national security of the United States.

Even supporters of this deal were some of its biggest critics. Yet these are some of the same people who voted to filibuster an up-or-down vote on this resolution of disapproval. Many of them made the case as well as or better than I could; that an agreement made with a theocratic regime that continues to call the United States the Great Satan and threatens the very existence of our friend and ally in the region, Israel—there should be real reason for pause and certainly debate and an up-or-down vote.

Here is just one example. The junior Senator from New Jersey, as a prelude to his announcement that he would vote against the resolution of disapproval, said:

With this deal, we are legitimizing a vast and expanding nuclear program in Iran. We are in effect rewarding years of deception, deceit, and wanton disregard for international law. . . .

That is the junior Senator from New Jersey on September 3, 2015. Does that sound like somebody who is for this deal or against this deal? Well, miraculously, this is from a Senator who voted not just for the deal but voted to even prohibit us from having an up-or-down vote in the Senate. I couldn't agree with these comments more. Our colleague clearly understands the nature of the regime and the pattern of troubling behavior characterized by outright deception. Last week, although headlines emphasized the support of several of our Democratic colleagues for the President's deal, it was clear that many of them harbored deep reservations—and those reservations are entirely justified.

Here is a comment of the senior Senator from Oregon, who said:

This agreement with the duplicitous and untrustworthy Iranian regime falls short of what I had envisioned. . . .

This statement was made on September 8, 2015, by somebody who said they were going to vote against the resolution of disapproval but in fact filibustered our ability to have an up-or-down vote on the resolution itself, and I couldn't agree with the statement quoted from the senior Senator from Oregon any more. This is not exactly a resounding endorsement.

Then there is the senior Senator from Connecticut, who said, on September 8, before he announced his agreement with the President's nuclear deal:

This is not the agreement I would have accepted at the negotiating table. . . .

I presume by saying that, that means he would have rejected it. But yet, again, deferring to the President and deferring to the leadership of the Democratic leader in the Senate, not only did the Senator who made that statement indicate his approval of the deal, this Senator voted to block an up-or-down vote on the deal in the Senate—in other words, participated in the filibuster of this vote.

(Mr. SCOTT assumed the Chair.)

This debate is one the American people deserve to hear. I know the press, as they typically do, likes to keep score and move on to other things, but this is one the American people deserve to hear, and it is one they have demanded—and, frankly, from what they know so far, they don't like this deal. Twenty-one percent have said they approve of it.

Rather than listen to their constituents, our friends across the aisle have decided to essentially block a vote that prevents the kind of accountability our constituents deserve and move on to other issues. But with the future security of our country hanging in the bal-

ance, we can't just move on, and we can't disregard the will of our own constituents or what common sense or our own investigation and inquiry tell us; that this deal is an unenforceable deal. It ignores the fact that Iran remains the primary state sponsor of international terrorism. It releases about \$100 billion of money that is going to help finance that proxy war against the United States and our allies that has been going on since 1979, when the Iranian regime came into power.

Then there is the bogus verification process. First of all, under the agreement, 24 days' notice along with various—the appeals process, which is a process that only Rube Goldberg would have been able to devise. And then there is the self-monitoring process. It is sort of like a selfie stick that the Iranian regime is going to carry around, where they conduct their own test on their military sites, and then they turn that over to the IAEA—the International Atomic Energy Agency—at the front gate because the so-called independent monitoring agency will not even have access to the military sites where breakouts in violation of this agreement are most likely. It is hardly one that gives you confidence that is going to be conducted with any sort of integrity. Then there is the dramatic change in U.S. policy.

When Prime Minister Netanyahu spoke to a joint session of Congress a couple of months ago, he said it used to be U.S. policy to deny Iran a nuclear weapon, but this agreement, as he correctly points out, paves the way to a nuclear weapon. Again, this is not a rational actor on the international stage. This is an extremist regime—a theocratic regime—driven by a desire to wipe Israel off the map and to conduct this proxy war against the United States and our allies as the primary sponsor of international terrorism. But then there is the final insult to injury. Just as our Democratic colleagues filibustered the opportunity to have any real accountability with an up-or-down vote in the Senate, we learned that the Supreme Leader in Iran has insisted that the Iranian Parliament have the final vote and say-so on the deal in Iran.

Try to fix that picture in your mind. The Iranian regime—the main, principal state sponsor of international terrorism, a theocratic regime determined to wipe Israel off the map and conduct war against what they call the Great Satan, the United States—will have a chance for an up-or-down vote, but our Democratic colleagues have blocked an up-or-down vote in the U.S. Senate. That ought to be deeply troubling to anyone who cares about the Senate and any sort of sense of democratic accountability.

It is beyond irresponsible for our Democratic colleagues to again deny the Senate the very same thing the

Ayatollah has said the Iranian Parliament will have a chance to do—especially when they all supported this process by which an up-or-down vote would be facilitated.

Later today my colleagues and I will have another opportunity to move this bill closer to an up-or-down vote on the merits of the President's agreement with Iran. I hope the same senders who clearly supported a thorough review of this deal will join me in moving this bill forward so the American people can get the sort of debate they deserve about the No. 1 national security threat affecting this generation of Americans, and the American people can get the kind of accountability they deserve when it comes from their elected officials casting a vote on their behalf on such an important agreement.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PORTMAN). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I watched in absolute amazement as the Obama administration attempted to justify what is clearly a misguided gamble and a bad deal with Iran. We saw the signs of how bad this deal was almost immediately, as during the same speech in which he announced the deal, the President threatened to veto any legislation that opposed it. I have been a business owner. When you lead with threats, you typically are covering for a very bad deal, because when you are building support for your product—in this case the Iran deal—you don't tell the folks you are talking to who disagree with you that they are crazy. That is simply something you don't do when you have confidence in the deal.

If you are leading with threats, you are showing your hand. The President is trying to bluff by holding a 2, a 5, an 8, and a 10, and we didn't even bring a fifth card to the table. I use a poker reference because that is exactly what the President of the United States is doing—gambling with our security, gambling with Israel's security, and, frankly, gambling with the future of the Middle East. He was also gambling that his National Security Advisor, Susan Rice, would not admit that the Iranian Government would use resources from lifting the sanctions to fund terrorists, but as we saw on CNN with Wolf Blitzer, she did. He was gambling that his own Press Secretary would not tell us that we should trust the Iranian Government because they would use "common sense" and use sanctions relief to help their economy and to help the Iranian people, but he did—even though we have seen no signs whatsoever previously that the Iranian Government cares about actually helping the Iranian people, and their horrific record on human rights has only worsened in recent years.

The President is gambling that he could use international pressure to

convince people he was on the right side of the issue, along with Russia and China, and by bringing the deal to the United Nations before the U.S. Congress, that would somehow show Congress the deal was acceptable—another bad gamble, but it didn't work. The longer we have to study the deal, the worse the deal gets. The longer the American people have to learn about the deal, the stronger their opposition becomes to the deal.

There is not much good news as we look at this deal, as we look at the polling information 2 to 1 in opposition to the deal, the American people. Yet the President refers to those on the opposite side of the deal as crazies—referring to the American people, the vast majority of those folks around our country, so many of us, almost unanimously on the Republican side and even some good friends on the left.

As I said earlier, the President gambles with our security, and we have seen how bad his hand truly is. As I suggested, he has a 2, a 5, an 8, and a 10—a 2 because Iran will be able to double their oil exports and therefore double their oil revenues, increasing by more than 1 million barrels a day—in other words, \$15 to \$20 billion of additional revenue to fund nefarious behavior in the Middle East. That is more terrorism in the Middle East; a 5 because, without any question, in year 5 of the deal they gain access to more weapons as the weapons embargo is lifted; an 8 because in year 8 of the deal Iran will be able to purchase ballistic missiles; and a 10—yes, a 10—because in year 10 Iran can begin installing advanced centrifuges for enriching uranium. Simply put, this deal legitimizes Iran's nuclear program and guarantees a timeline for Iran to secure the bomb.

If Congress signs off on this deal, we can all take a big red pen and mark on our calendars almost the exact day that Iran will have a nuclear weapon. This isn't a Republican or Democratic issue. Just listen to some of the quotes from my friends on the other side of the aisle: "The JCPOA, or Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, legitimizes Iran's nuclear program."

Another quote: "Whether or not the supporters of the agreement admit it, this deal is based on 'hope'—hope is a part of human nature, but unfortunately it is not a national security strategy."

And, finally, "To me, the very real risk that Iran will not moderate and will, instead, use the agreement to pursue its nefarious goal is too great."

In what the administration would call an exchange for this, we see the economic sanctions will be lifted, arms embargoes will be lifted, and Iran will have more money and more dangerous weapons to route to groups like Hezbollah and insurgents in Iraq—both groups responsible for the deaths of many American soldiers. That is not a

gamble; that is the wrong direction at the wrong time, the wrong deal, and absolutely, positively, unequivocally not in the best interests of this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am glad to be here and hear the comments from my friend from South Carolina, Senator SCOTT. It made me glad that I get to sit by him on the Senate floor and hear the reasons—and they are good and they have been repeated many times—about why this is not a way forward for the United States. It is not a way forward for the Middle East. In fact, Senator SCOTT did a great job talking about what was in the deal, but what wasn't in the deal was what the President said would be there when the negotiations started.

When the negotiations started, the administration said Iran would never be allowed to have nuclear weapons, that we would find out everything Iran had ever done to try to develop nuclear weapons, that we would have anywhere, anytime inspections, and the sanctions would only be lifted when real progress was made in those first three areas. That was the framework. That was what we were negotiating for. None of those things happened. None of those things are in this agreement.

I think the question that you, I, and others in the Senate are hearing from people, when we are home and when we are talking to people about this agreement is, Is the Congress giving away its power? How is it possible that something like this could happen and the majority of the Congress couldn't do anything to stop it? Of course, the other question is, Is the President giving away the power of the United States of America to lead?

I think it is as clear from this agreement as it is so many other things that leading from behind doesn't work. A view that the United States of America is just any other country in the world is not a view that leads to a peaceful, more stable world. In fact, our friends don't trust us and our enemies aren't afraid of us in a world where there is vast agreement there are more potential bad things that could happen from more potential places than any time ever before. That is not just Republicans; that is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that is the Director of National Intelligence, and that is the head of the CIA. They all come up with that same conclusion.

We look at the President's foreign policy, that this is just one symptom of—remember the redline in Syria that if the Syrians do this, we are going to do that? The Syrians did what we said we wouldn't allow them to do. Basically, we didn't do much of anything. In fact, what happens is that when the United States of America takes that kind of position and does not move for-

ward, Assad is emboldened. I think the latest number of Syrians who have been killed by Assad is now around 250,000 people, from chemical weapons to barrel bombs, to every way they can think of to massacre their own population—a population that has been displaced in the millions, both inside and now outside the country—so an emboldened Assad. Putin looked at this. Before you know it, Putin took control of Crimea, and Putin has Russian troops in Ukraine. And this week Putin put Russian troops and tanks in Syria.

Every American President since President Truman—I am standing at one of the desks President Truman used as a Senator on the floor, and it has his name carved in it. In 1946 President Truman did whatever was necessary to force the Soviets out of Iran. Every other President until now has done whatever was necessary to keep the Russian influence in the Middle East to a minimum. The Russians are building a base and unloading equipment right now. Why are things happening now? Because they think they can get away with it. That is the Russian reset. The Chinese—the Asian pivot—are building an island on an atoll in the South China Sea that is within striking range of the Philippines. Why? Because they think they can get away with it.

The more we look at the consequences of the agreement, the more we wonder about it. Why aren't we able to stop it? No future administration is bound by it. For weeks now on this floor and around the country, people have talked about the destabilizing impact this agreement will have on the Middle East and the world, and the only administration that is bound by it is this one. It is not a treaty. If it were a treaty, as it should be, we would be voting in the Senate on a treaty and two-thirds of the Senators would have to approve the treaty and the next administration would be bound by it as well.

When Presidential candidates say "I will reverse this the first day," they absolutely can reverse it the first day. What kind of policy is that to put in place, a policy that has this kind of destabilizing effect without even a sense that the United States for the long term is committed to it?

I am sure the President believes that by the time he leaves, every other President would surely want to keep this agreement. But I don't know how one could listen to this debate and think that. It does dramatically change the Middle East. Neighboring countries don't trust Iran, and they will want to have whatever weapons Iran has.

Senator SCOTT just made the point—and made it well—that you can circle the date on the calendar of when Iran is likely to have a nuclear weapon if

this agreement goes forward, and more importantly, the hope that maybe the government would change—it might, but that won't keep the neighbors from deciding they have to defend themselves.

As if the 1994 agreement with North Korea wasn't bad enough—they had a missile announcement today, I believe, and said they have a better delivery system for the weapon they were never going to have—we have truly let the nuclear genie out of the bottle here. Their neighbors will believe they will have to have a weapon when Iran has one, and they also all believe Iran will cheat.

Even though Iran is theoretically on a 12-month clock, it might not be 12 months from the day they say: We are now going into full weapons mode and 12 months from now we will have one. So even if Iran were to change its mind, we will have three or four countries in a very short period of time, in my view, that will have nuclear weapons and nuclear weapons capability that don't have it right now.

We met with Secretary of State John Kerry at the Munich Security Conference in 2014—a conference a handful of Senators normally go to, and I went to that conference that year. John Kerry said: We will be able to know everything the Iranians are doing. We will be able to monitor this with such detail that there is no way they will be able to do anything we don't know about.

At the time, I said to Secretary Kerry: Even if that is true—and I said I don't believe that will be true—you won't be able to contain enrichment. Once you let Iran do this, other countries that are perfectly happy with where they are right now will feel as if they have to do the same thing. There are well over one dozen countries that have nuclear power that don't do what we are about to allow Iran to do. We have been able to control this because the world has understood that it needed to be controlled, but we are now at the beginning of letting this get out of control.

What is the vote all about? It is not a treaty. Why are we voting at all if it doesn't bind the next administration? Why are we having a debate if the administration would like to have the Congress involved in about 2023? That was another great comment that was often made before the law was passed to allow us to do what we are doing today. They said: Well, Congress will eventually have to be involved because eventually they will decide whether to extend the sanctions regime.

By the way, the one that went into effect in 2013 is on the books until 2023. So the ideal day for the Congress to be involved was about 7 years after the administration left office. That would have been the involvement we would have had if Congress had not stepped

up and said: We are going to insist that we get involved.

In 2006 Congress took back some of the authority—this is not the first Congress to lose authority to the President—the President had, and we put into law the sanctions that had been imposed by the President at that time. We made them not just President Bush's idea but a law. I was there when that was negotiated, and one of the things we did when we negotiated that was to insist that that be codified and become the pattern—and it did—for all the sanctions to follow.

But the pattern that Congress followed was also a pattern that had been followed since World War II, which is, here is what we are going to do and here is what we believe the President and the country should do, but we are going to give the President national security waiver authority. That is the authority the President has decided to use without congressional approval, without changing the law. He has decided he is going to waive these sanctions and the Congress could weigh in again in about 2023—if the President had totally had his way.

What are we doing here? The President of the United States is about to prop up the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. That is an arguable point. Nobody argues that Iran is not the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world. They clearly look stronger at the end of this deal than they did at the beginning because they are stronger.

The President of the United States is about to release billions of dollars that the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world can use for terrorist causes, with the support of a minority of the Congress—not only a minority of the Congress, but that minority happens to all be on one side. There is nothing like this in the post-war history of the country where the country stepped forward in this way on this big of an issue. Not only is a majority against it, but a bipartisan majority is opposed to it. A partisan minority is blocking the Congress from even having a vote while a bipartisan majority wants to vote, and they want to vote to disapprove this deal. Even then the President could still veto the disapproval, but the President doesn't want to do that. The President doesn't want this on his desk.

I think I read the stories the other day when we for the first time couldn't get the 60 Senators necessary to have the vote. The White House announcement was something like this: The congressional vote today ensured that the President's Iranian deal would go forward. The whole time, my concern about this process is that by not stopping it, somehow it would look as if the Congress was for it. We may not be able to stop it, but I can guarantee that Congress is not for it, and any-

body who has been paying attention knows that.

A question I think we can ask ourselves: Would Congress and the country be better off without this poor substitute for overseeing a meaningful foreign policy? This is clearly not producing the kind of result a democracy should produce in foreign policy. I think one could argue that it is a weak response. But why did it have to happen?

I cosponsored the initial bill that required Congress to approve the deal, but, of course, a piece of legislation has to be signed by the President. Senator CORKER and Senator CARDIN finally came up with a piece of legislation that the President would sign, but it was almost always guaranteed to ensure that the debate would go forward. So would we have been better off without it? I have had people ask me: What are you guys doing? Why can't you get the foreign policy of the country under some control?

I have wondered several times whether we would have been better off going forward without it. As I have thought about that, it does seem to me that the Corker-Cardin bill has produced a number of things, and one of those is that we have 60 days of debate that we wouldn't have had otherwise. When would the Congress have gotten to weigh in? Eight years from now. We would have had the debate 8 years from now. We have had 60 days of debate. Well over 50 percent of the people in the country are opposed to going forward with this deal. Only about 21 percent are for going forward.

This process has produced bipartisan opposition to a bad deal. Senator CARDIN, a top Democrat on the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Senator MENENDEZ, the other most knowledgeable Democrat on foreign affairs, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator MANCHIN voted with the 54 Republicans. So 58 Senators don't want this to happen, and 60 percent of the House of Representatives are opposing this agreement. The White House would have liked to have Congress have a say almost a decade from now.

We have had our say, and we should have our vote. We should be allowed to put this bill on the President's desk, and if he wants to veto it and defend that veto, that is how this process should work.

I hope there is still a chance that two more of our colleagues will step forward and say: While I am going to be on the other side of the final vote, I think the Congress should vote. We had 98 Members vote for this bill that said Congress should vote to either approve or disapprove this agreement. Let's have that vote, and let's have that vote today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I agree with the distinguished Senator from Missouri in every respect, and I hope we get our wish to have that meaningful vote later on today.

I thought I would take a few moments to explore a history lesson. Edmond Burke once famously said: "Those who don't know history are destined to repeat it." I think most people agree with that statement, which is why we find so many variations of that quote. One of my favorite variations is by Mark Twain: "History doesn't always repeat itself, but it does rhyme."

I think the history of events leading up to World War II is an appropriate period for examination during today's Iran debate, and I believe it is important to explore the question of whether the disastrous history of the Munich Agreement can be instructive to Americans and even to our allies during the current debate. Munich has been cited numerous times in opinion pieces about the Iran agreement, and it has been mentioned on both sides of the debate in this Chamber. Furthermore, we have been cautioned, even scolded by various opinion-makers around the country that we dare not make comparisons between Munich and the current situation. In this view, even uttering the words "Neville Chamberlain" or "Munich" brings to mind such painful memories from the dark past that we simply should not go there. I do not agree. If history does rhyme, perhaps it is helpful to examine history and look for parallels today.

For those who may not have recently studied the years leading up to World War II, let's review the Munich Agreement. In September of 1938, Hitler's aggression was fully underway. In his sights at the moment was Czechoslovakia. Leaders met in Munich, Germany, in an ostensible effort to avoid war. Those leaders were Adolf Hitler himself, French Prime Minister Edouard Daladier, Italian dictator Benito Mussolini, and Britain's Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain. The agreement they announced with much fanfare at the end of September 1938 was that Nazi Germany would be given control of the German-speaking portion of Czechoslovakia, known by some as the Sudetenland. In return, Hitler agreed to stop his advance and to not make war. Against the backdrop of all of Germany's aggression to date, of its violations of the Versailles treaty, the Fuhrer gave his solemn assurance in writing that there would be no more expansionist activity.

We all know that upon his return to London, Chamberlain announced triumphantly that there would be "peace for our time." The bold headline across the top of the Daily Express displayed the word "peace" with an exclamation point.

Of course, a number of wise people immediately saw the false dream for

what it was. Soon after, Winston Churchill rose in passionate opposition on the floor of Commons. He first made it clear that he held the opponents of the agreement in high personal regard, as many of my colleagues have also done already during this debate. Then he launched into a scathing denunciation of the bad deal, characterizing it as a total and unmitigated defeat for Britain and France, not to mention a betrayal of defenseless Czechoslovakia. He went on to predict correctly that rather than preventing war, the Munich accord would assure war.

Sadly, for millions and millions around the globe, Winston Churchill was correct and Neville Chamberlain was tragically mistaken. Within months, Hitler was at it again, annexing the rest of Czechoslovakia and setting his sights on Poland and beyond.

I think it is appropriate to ask ourselves: What would Churchill have said about today's debate? And what would Chamberlain be saying if he could speak to us today?

Let's look at the parallels. At Munich, Britain and France abandoned a steadfast ally. Similarly, today's agreement has been reached over the strenuous objections of Israel, our most reliable partner in the Middle East. I must emphasize that this opposition comes not only from the current Prime Minister and his Likud governing majority, but also from his opponents in previous elections—from virtually every point on Israel's political spectrum, from labor and from center-left voices. Here is the near unanimous outcry from our Israeli friends: Iran poses an existential threat to Israel, and this bad deal makes matters worse. It makes us less safe. It makes our friends, our neighbors less safe.

As the whole world watched, the Munich agreement sent a chilling message to the rest of Europe and to the rest of the world about what could now be expected from France and England. Today, our Sunni Arab friends in the Middle East are mystified and dismayed by this Iran deal. Understandably, their public reaction has been guarded and even muted. Most are hedging their bets, but make no mistake, this is not the strong anti-proliferation nuclear agreement they had hoped for.

This current deal and the Munich deal are also similar when we consider the history and behavior of the parties to the agreements. Like Hitler, the current Iranian regime has repeatedly demonstrated that they have evil motivations and that they cannot be trusted. Consider the most recent activities and pronouncements of the Iranian Supreme Leader and his team.

This deal has been made with a regime that still leads cheers saying "Death to America" and believes in the destruction of the Jewish State. The

mullahs, the ayatollahs, and the people in charge of Iran have shown no indication that they are trustworthy. Ayatollah Khamenei last month published a new book that once again makes it explicit that it is Iran's foreign policy to obliterate the State of Israel. Just last week, he called America the Great Satan and said Israel would not exist in 25 years. Israel would not exist in 25 years, according to the other party to this agreement.

Under this agreement, embargoes on arms and ballistic missiles will be lifted in 5 and 8 years respectively, allowing the biggest exporter of terrorism to build up conventional weapons. And have we forgotten the fact that Iran has been cooperating with North Korea on ballistic missiles for years?

Of course, the scene in 1938 is not entirely similar with that of today, as has been pointed out. Seventy-seven years ago, Nazi Germany at least gave lip service to leaving the rest of the world alone. Wise people knew this to be a lie, but at least the Nazi dictator signed such a promise. Today, the Iranian dictatorship makes no pretense of abandoning its goal: the complete elimination of Israel from the map. And this bad deal gives them the wherewithal to do just that: a \$100-billion stimulus. The lifting of sanctions, which the United States and our eager European allies have agreed to, will expand Iran's gross domestic product by roughly one-fifth, not to mention relief from sanctions on deadly conventional weapons and ballistic missiles.

In 1938, Chamberlain said, "Peace for our time." We may wish he had been correct, but such an outcome was so unlikely, the deal so risky and ill-advised, that it was merely a wish, albeit a dangerous and deadly wish.

In 2015, Secretary John Kerry has called the current deal "a plan to ensure that Iran does not ever possess or acquire a nuclear weapon." Did my colleagues hear that: Not just for our time or for a decade, but never, according to the distinguished Secretary of State.

President Obama says this agreement marks "one more chapter in this pursuit of a safer, more helpful, and more hopeful world." Such statements have a familiar and troubling ring. Such words could have been uttered in 1938. And I wonder if Mr. Chamberlain's followers ever said, in defense of the Prime Minister's action: This isn't a very good deal, but what other agreement is out there? What other choice do we have? I am willing to bet some people actually said that. The other choice might have been to stand up against a murderous bully, to stand by a friend.

This resolution of disapproval is not just an opportunity to sound off. It has not been about sending a message. This procedure was designed, as the distinguished Senator from Missouri said before me, as the only way to prevent a

bad Iran deal from actually going into effect. We always realized it would take a bipartisan majority to succeed. There are currently 58 Democrats and Republicans who are willing to say officially to the President: Start over and get our Nation a better deal. We, frankly, need nine more courageous Senators to step forward and say no to this deal. We are told the die is now cast, that the votes simply are not there. But I will say to my colleagues today, there is still time to do better for the American people. The doubts have repeatedly been expressed by Senators who have said they will nevertheless vote with the President.

Senator BOOKER, in announcing that he will support the President, said: We are legitimizing Iran's nuclear program and rewarding years of bad behavior. Yet, he will vote to support the President.

Senator COONS: I am troubled and deeply concerned.

Senator BENNET: None of us knows . . . and I have deep concerns.

Senator WYDEN: It is a big problem, having to deal with Iranian leadership that wants a nuclear enrichment program.

Senator PETERS: Enrichment of uranium is a stark departure from America's nonproliferation policies. Indeed it is. Senator PETERS goes on to say: The agreement could set a dangerous precedent.

We need these Senators to change their vote and to vote for the resolution of disapproval.

Senator BLUMENTHAL said: Not the agreement I have sought.

Senator MERKLEY said: Significant shortcomings.

According to Senator GILLIBRAND: Legitimate and serious concerns are there.

Senator FRANKEN acknowledges it isn't a perfect agreement.

Alan Dershowitz, a Harvard law professor emeritus and expert on the Middle East—and hardly a neo-con—summed up the President's deal with Iran in his book, "The Case Against the Iran Deal." He said this:

Hope is different from 'faith,' though neither is an appropriate basis on which to 'roll the dice' on a nuclear deal that might well threaten the security of the world.

"That may well threaten the security of the world," according to Professor Dershowitz.

He goes on to say:

The deal as currently written will not prevent Iran from obtaining nuclear weapons. In all probability, it will merely postpone the catastrophe for about a decade, while legitimizing its occurrence. This is not an outcome we can live with.

I appreciate people such as Alan Dershowitz having the courage to write a book and explain chapter and verse, page by page, the legitimate reasons why this threatens the security of the world and why America should not be willing to live with this deal.

I say we should heed the warnings of people such as Alan Dershowitz. We should heed the warnings of history. There is still time to reject this ill-advised agreement. There is still time to get a better result for our people, to get a better result for our future.

Thank you, Mr. President.

Seeing no other speakers, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I do have concerns as well. Typically we reward people for a change of behavior; that is good behavior, going from bad to good—not static, old, bad behavior. The concern I have is with Iran. We have seen no change in behavior. The same battles are happening in Yemen as they are leading a coup. The same issues are happening in Syria where Russia and Iran are working together to prop up Bashar al-Assad. They are causing trouble in Bahrain. There is the same behavior in Lebanon with Hezbollah. There has been no change in behavior. Yet, the administration is determined to make an aggressive nuclear deal to change the status quo on our sanctions on Iran based on the hope of some future new good behavior when we have seen no present change in the behavior of Iran.

This doesn't line up with some of the statements from our own administration. For instance, in November of 2013, Secretary Kerry said that "there is no inherent right to enrich. . . . We do not recognize a right to enrich."

In December 2013, President Obama said, "we know [fully that] they don't need to have an underground, fortified facility like Fordow in order to have a peaceful nuclear program."

At the same time, in December of 2013, President Obama said, "They don't need some of the advanced centrifuges that they currently possess in order to have a limited, peaceful nuclear program."

But under this deal, not only are we giving them the right to enrich, not only are we allowing them to have fortified underground bunkers, we are also allowing them to have advanced centrifuges that the President has stated there is actually no reason for them to have, unless they are not using them for peaceful purposes.

I have heard over and over again for the last several days in this Chamber the conversation: If someone has a better deal, you should propose it, but this is the best deal that has been proposed.

Well, let me just throw a few ideas out there as a better deal for a proposal.

First, why don't we do this as a proposal: Why don't we actually have the opportunity to read the agreement? We would like to be able to see it. No one in this Chamber has seen all aspects of this agreement. No one in the House has seen all aspects of the agreement. It is not that we will not read it, we can't read it, because even the administration has said they have not read the entire agreement.

Now, I will state that we don't allow secret side deals between a bank and a car dealer when one is buying a used car. We certainly don't allow secret side deals that no one can see between the U.N. and Iran. I am astounded that this body is OK with signing off on an agreement that absolutely no one has read in its entirety. In fact, the administration has said they haven't even seen it.

The White House wants to have it both ways. They don't want to turn over the documents which the statute requires, but they also want to keep the part of the law that says Congress has only 60 days to review it. They want to say that by the end of this week it is done—but, no, we are not ever going to turn the documents over that the statute requires.

How about this for a different idea of what we can do for an agreement: They don't keep the advanced centrifuges. Since even the President has said there is no peaceful purpose for those centrifuges, if we are going to have a good, solid agreement, they do not keep the advanced centrifuges. Not only do they keep them, they keep them in cascade, they keep them running, they keep them spinning. There is no change in behavior on those centrifuges other than the promise that they won't put uranium in them.

How about this for an idea for a better agreement: We have onsite inspections that would actually allow Americans on the inspection team.

How about this for a better agreement: We don't lift the ban on missile testing and research on Iran which allows Iran to start missile testing and R&D again on ballistic missiles. We don't lift the ban on conventional weapons sales to Iran, which will allow Iran to start buying large supplies of conventional weapons and surface-to-air defense systems.

How about this change for a better agreement: Iran turns over their previous military dimensions of their nuclear program. They stated over and over again they don't have a nuclear weapons program or ambitions. What would be the problem, then, in inspecting their research facilities and their technology if nothing existed?

How about this for a better agreement: We don't agree to defend Iran in case in some future time they are attacked in their nuclear facilities by Israel. I think that is absolutely absurd to have in this agreement.

How about this: We at least allow Iran the opportunity to publicly acknowledge that Israel has the right to exist—and they currently don't acknowledge that Israel even has the right to exist—or we get our American hostages back, since we are lifting the sanctions on the individuals who personally killed hundreds of American soldiers. Those sanctions are lifted. Why can't we have our American hostages back?

Here is one simple idea: Why don't we have the same nuclear agreement with Iran that we had with Libya? When we negotiated the agreement with Libya years ago, their program actually ended. They actually turned their centrifuges over. They turned their nuclear material over. They allowed anytime inspections. While this administration continues to say over and over again that what we are asking for is not possible, it was actually done by the last administration in Libya.

This is not asking for something new or radical or different. This is asking for something enforceable and clear. Why can't we have the same nuclear agreement with Iran that we made with Libya and actually stop Iran from advancing toward a nuclear weapon?

I am convinced we can do better—we must, for the security of the Nation as a whole.

With that, I yield back.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, a few hours from now the Senate will vote again on the Iranian deal. I think it is pretty well known that no votes will change. It is very unfortunate that that is the case. But it will give our colleagues, hopefully—they may have contemplated how bad a deal this is and possibly change, but obviously we know the likelihood of that is unlikely.

The virtues of this legislation have been emphasized by my friends on the other side of the aisle. Those of us who have grave and serious concerns have also been articulated. But I think it is well to point out that this will be the first major agreement or treaty in history that is voted on on strict party lines. Not one single Senator on this side of the aisle will be voting in favor—not one—a degree of partisanship concerning an issue of the greatest importance, in my view, of any treaty

or agreement since that agreement Neville Chamberlain made with Adolph Hitler in Munich in 1938. So that part of it, in my view, is a failure on the part of the President of the United States.

I know many of us, including myself, were willing to listen and consider any agreement that was verifiable and enforceable that would have prevented the Iranians from acquiring nuclear weapons. In fact, it was stated by the Secretary of State that the object of this agreement was that Iran would never have nuclear capability. Now we all know it is a matter of time. Whether it is 1 month or 10 years or 15 years, whatever, we don't know. They notoriously cheat. That is one thing we do know. So the fact is that we went from preventing Iran from having a nuclear capability—and they came to the table not because of renewed zeal for that but because their economy was so badly hurt because of the sanctions which had been imposed on them and which after this deal can never be reimposed. Let's be frank and candid with our colleagues and with the American people.

So here we are faced with an agreement that should have been a treaty. I know of no observers of the Constitution, both known as liberal interpreters and conservatives, who interpret the Constitution who agree that this is anything but a treaty of transcendent importance, and we, of course, are treating it as an "agreement." Well, the bad news, I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who will be voting for this, is the next President of the United States can repeal this, can negate it. That would not have been the case if it was a treaty because then it would have been ratified by the Constitution and the Congress, specifically the Senate.

So, in the short term, apparently the President and his minions have succeeded. In the long term, this will cause a grave threat to the security of the United States of America.

I say to my colleagues, you know, this is an agreement that we are discussing, and I will talk about the failings of it as I see them, but far more importantly, the President of the United States and the Secretary of State treat this as if it were in a vacuum. It is not in a vacuum. You cannot consider this agreement unless you look at what is happening in the entire world today.

REFUGEE CRISIS AND AMERICAN LEADERSHIP

Mr. President, according to anyone who is an expert on national security, including people such as Henry Kissinger, Madeleine Albright, Brent Scowcroft, and the list goes on and on, the world has never been in more turmoil than it is today. That does not take a great deal of intelligence or study; all you have to do is watch television or read a newspaper. The United

Nations head of refugees has said: There have never been more refugees in the world since World War II than there are today. You can't turn on the television without seeing the terrible plight of these refugees who have had to flee their country because of the brutality and genocide committed by Bashar Assad. You can't do that without seeing it.

Some in the media and some of my friends on the liberal side treat this as if it were a hurricane, an earthquake, a natural disaster that just sort of happened. It did not just happen, and it did not have to happen. What has happened with these refugees is a direct result of the failed, feckless policies of this administration in general and this President in particular.

This is the President of the United States who overruled his national security team when they said that we should arm and equip and train the Free Syrian Army to go in there and fight against Bashar Assad. This is the same President who said: It is not a matter of when, it is a matter of whether Bashar Assad leaves office. This is the same President of the United States who announced to the world that Bashar Assad had crossed the redline and we were going to retaliate—only, of course, to hear that the President decided not to.

I tell my colleagues, you cannot overstate the impact the President's decision had after he warned Bashar Assad, after he said that if they crossed the redline we would act and we did not. I am not sure many Americans are aware that the Saudis had aircraft on the runways ready to join in those attacks and they found out on CNN. Is it an accident that we have seen the Saudis visiting Moscow? Is it an accident that for the first time in its history we see the Saudis buying Russian equipment? Is it astonishing to our colleagues and friends that the Saudis have taken it upon themselves, along with UAE and other Gulf States, to intervene in Yemen against the Houthis, who are Iranian-backed, Iranian-trained, Iranian-equipped? No, it is not an accident. None of these things have happened by accident.

Now we see a nation called Syria with over 230,000 killed and millions in refugee status. The surrounding countries, particularly the small ones, particularly Jordan and Lebanon, are literally overwhelmed with refugees. Today, I tell my colleagues, there are more Syrian children in school in Lebanon than there are Lebanese children in Lebanon. When you look at the size of the influx of the refugees into those two countries, some wonder in some ways how they have maintained their stability.

All of it did not have to happen. It did not have to happen.

The President of the United States decided to withdraw every single one of

our combat troops in Iraq, saying at the time: We are leaving a prosperous, free, democratic Iraq. Does anybody believe that? Of course, so many of us argued: Please, leave a sustaining force behind—which they could have. Any one who says we couldn't have is lying. I don't use that word casually because LINDSEY GRAHAM and JOHN MCCAIN were in Baghdad when Maliki said: OK. He said: OK. I will keep troops. I will keep American troops. How many? How many and what mission?

That answer never came from this administration until the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee that it was down to 3,500—in his words, it cascaded down to 3,500.

So now here we are with the greatest humanitarian crisis, again, since World War II, 70 years ago. Here we are with this situation, and Americans' hearts are going out to these people. Can any of us who saw the picture of the drowned little baby on the beach ever forget that? It did not have to happen. It was because this President and this administration and its minions refused to exercise American leadership when we refused to arm and equip and train the Free Syrian Army, overruling his then-Secretary of Defense, Panetta; overruling his then-Secretary of State, Clinton; overruling his Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, GEN David Petraeus. It is well known that they all recommended arming the Free Syrian Army. At that time, Bashar Assad was in serious jeopardy. So what happened? The Iranians—the same Iranians we are concluding this deal with—called in 5,000 Hezbollah, had Soleimani in charge of the Iranian Revolutionary Guard while tens of thousands have been slaughtered—well, 230,000 is one estimate—with barrel bombing.

Do you know what barrel bombing is? It is a huge cylinder. It is filled with explosives and shrapnel. They drop it. It explodes, and it spreads shrapnel everywhere. It is a terrible weapon. It is a terrible weapon. Bashar Assad has been using it continuously. Who is giving him that stuff to use? The Iranians. The Iranians are the ones who are doing it.

It is the Iranians who are supporting the Shiite militias in Baghdad. It is the Iranians who are supporting the Houthis, who have taken over a great part of Yemen and would have taken over all of it if it had been up to us as we sat by and watched. The Saudis and UAE have decided to go in because they could not afford to have—look at where Yemen is on the map—they could not afford to have Yemen under the control of the Iranians.

So here we are. So here we are. Now the news of the last few days is—guess what. The Russians are now building bases—a serious military buildup in Syria. Why? Because they have to prop

up Bashar al-Assad. This misguided, delusional administration thinks that only they can attack ISIS and not attack Bashar al-Assad and his killing machine.

My friends, in the name of human decency, in the name of the tradition of the United States of America helping those who are being slaughtered, we should tell Bashar al-Assad: You cannot fly those helicopters and those planes anymore and drop these terrible weapons. We are going to shoot you down if you do it. We are going to establish a free—safe zone on the Turkish border. We are going to have the refugees go there, and we are going to feed them, we are going to clothe them, and we are going to take care of them. And don't you fly an airplane over here or we are going to shoot it down.

That is the message we should have to Bashar al-Assad. And now, what is happening now? The Russians have decided they are going to intervene militarily on the side of Bashar al-Assad.

Now, my friends, it has been Vladimir Putin's practice and ambition to expand the "near abroad." That means moving into Ukraine, taking Crimea in violation of the Budapest agreement, it means putting huge pressure on the Baltics, and it means propaganda campaigns and other pressures that are even on countries such as Sweden and Norway in the Arctic. All these things Vladimir Putin is doing is sort of an expanding influence from Russia.

Now, my dear friends, you see him leapfrogging over to Syria to maintain his base on the Mediterranean and that is a somewhat radical departure. But not to worry, my friends, the Secretary of State called the Foreign Minister, Lavrov—the old Stalinite apparatchik that he is—and expressed his concern. So the American Government expressed their concern. Well, that ought to pretty well take care of it.

Meanwhile, what about China? In the last day or two, there was a meeting, and a Chinese admiral, sitting between an American admiral and another admiral, stated: "The South China Sea belongs to China."

A few days ago, the President of the United States went to Alaska to rename a mountain. I guess that is a reason for a trip. I will leave that to others to judge. So he goes to Alaska and guess what happened. By coincidence—by sheer coincidence—for the first time in history, five Chinese warships showed up off the coast of Alaska, penetrating the 12-mile zone—the first time in history. Now, I am sure that was just a coincidence that the President of the United States happened to be in Alaska at the time that these Chinese ships showed up off the coast of Alaska. Every time we turn around, we are seeing nations react to a lack of American leadership.

And so we are going to, of course, now vote—not to approve this agree-

ment, because if it was a straight up-or-down vote, it would be a disapproval. It would be a significant disapproval, as a matter of fact—just not 60. I believe it is 57 or 58 Senators who will vote that they do not want to have the sanctions relieved that have been imposed by the Congress.

It is a sad day. It is a sad day. Just as briefly as possible—because we have been over all of these before—there is no doubt there are almost no enforcement and verification procedures. In fact, again, this is for the first time I think that the Senate of the United States is being asked to approve of an arms control agreement—which is basically what this is when you get right down to it—without knowing the verification procedures. It is a deal between the IAEA and Iran. I still don't get it how anybody can support an agreement that we don't know the most vital elements of. That is still beyond me.

Obviously, in the place where we found most of—some of their real secret activity buried in a mountain, that inspection will be conducted by the Iranians themselves. Remarkable.

Of course, the past nuclear activities, so-called PMD, one of the requirements—one of the interesting aspects of this is to see what was said at the time in the beginning and what actually happened, such as the Secretary of State saying: We must know what their previous military activities were. We must know that because otherwise we cannot—guess what. We are not going to know that. Particularly, though, the aspect of verification bothers me about as much as anything else.

So now we have the Iranian Revolutionary Guard sustaining the Shia militias in Iraq. We have the Iranians funding Hezbollah, which is now the major problem for the Bashar al-Assad regime. We now have the Iranians supporting the Houthis, who, as I mentioned, are trained and equipped by the Iranians in an attempt to take over Yemen. The Iranians are now providing weapons to the Taliban in Afghanistan.

If they are doing all those things, and they are not changing their behavior, what in the world do you think they are going to do with \$100 billion? Spend it on growing poppy, maybe building a YMCA? Of course not. They are going to continue their activities of supporting terrorist organizations throughout the Middle East with another \$100 billion. This is what troubles me more than anything else. Has anyone in this body seen any indication of a change in Iranian behavior? If so, I would be more than eager to grasp that straw because everything I have seen—and the statements in just as short a time as 2 or 3 days ago—the grand Ayatollah says in 25 years Israel will no longer exist.

Is that the background, is that the atmosphere of some kind of agreement

of this nature, where they are going to get \$100 billion? It is confounding, and it can only be explained by this incredible delusion on the part of the President and the Secretary of State—whom he has had for the last 6½ years—that if we somehow get an agreement with the Iranians, there will be an arrangement in the Middle East, and Iran and the United States will be partners against radical Islam—yada, yada, yada. That is impossible in light of Iranians' stated ambitions, and of course the Israelis—of course the Israelis are deeply disturbed.

All I can say is this is not a good day. This is not a good day. This is a day when votes are taken—again, for the second time—on one of the most impactful situations in the history of this country post-World War II; that is, that this agreement will allow the Iranians, to a degree of latitude and a degree of capability, to spread their terror and their acts of terror throughout the Middle East in a far more effective fashion.

Yes, we are war weary. Yes, Americans don't want to be involved. Yes, we know all of those things, even though it is 1 percent of the American population who actually serves in the military, but the fact is that sooner or later, as a result of this, the United States of America, unfortunately, will have to be engaged militarily.

I hate to make that prediction, but I have been a student of what is going on in the Middle East for a long period of time. I have seen Iranian behavior, and I have watched what they have done—not just the rhetoric but their behavior. They are propping up a guy who has killed 230,000 of his country's men and women and driven millions into exile. Now we are feeling the effects of it in Europe and soon in the United States of America.

It is shameful—it is shameful—that we allowed this guy to slaughter so many hundreds of thousands of people. And who supported them, who backed them, and who bailed them out when the President of the United States said: Oh, it is not a matter of whether Bashar al-Assad leaves, it is a matter of when. The President of the United States said: It is time for Bashar al-Assad to leave. Bashar al-Assad will be in office after this President of the United States. So it is not a good day.

There have been other times in our country—there was a good book that was written about America before World War II called "While America Slept." There was another great book by a professor at Texas A&M about how unready we were prior to the Korean conflict. We thought we were never going to be in another war, and we were totally unprepared when North Korea attacked South Korea.

Now here we are—with blame on both sides of the aisle—continuing to cut our military, continuing to reduce our

capabilities, and continuing to reach a point where the retiring Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army says we can no longer adequately defend the Nation against some of its threats, and, to cap it off, we are now going to see an agreement which will unleash the furies of Hell.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO DENA MORRIS

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment to thank an important member of our staff. Her name is Dena Morris, and she is with me on the floor today. Dena has worked for me for 12 years. The last 8 years she served as my legislative director, and she is going to be leaving soon for a new professional opportunity.

When she first told me the news, my first reaction was: "Say it ain't so," but Dena had an offer she could not refuse. Next week, Dena Morris will join the U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as the Agency's Washington Director. Her new position, I have to admit, is a perfect fit. It will allow her to combine her exceptional management skills, her deep understanding of public policy, and her strong commitment to public service in ways that will benefit America's families and businesses.

I already know Dena is going to do well because she has done so much for me, for the people of Illinois, and for our Nation.

There is one thing that really tells you a lot about Dena's commitment to public service and the public good. Dena Morris came to me 12 years ago. She left a K Street law firm and came to the Senate to work as a staffer. She took a substantial pay cut to do it. She started in my office as a legislative assistant handling education issues. Her portfolio quickly expanded to include public health and then all of the health care issues. By 2007, it was clear to me she was the right person to direct all the legislative activity in my office. Even with all the promotions and the new titles, Dena still earns less today than what she earned at that law firm she left 12 years ago.

So when I hear my fellow Senators come to the floor and talk down our staffs and talk about denying them basic things such as health care coverage, I think about Dena and the hundreds just like her who make the Senate work. They do it not for the money, not for the benefits but because they want to leave a mark. Dena has done that. You see, instead of making mountains of money, Dena chose to help and to help the Senate make history. For that I am ever grateful.

It will take too long to recite all the things she has worked on, but I can list a few: the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act—it was the economic stimulus that was initiated by the Obama administration to bring Amer-

ica out of the great recession after the 2008 economic crisis—her work on the Affordable Care Act, which has brought affordable, reliable health care to 16 million Americans, including 800,000 people in my State of Illinois, and reduces the national deficit. Dena was my legislative director when Congress passed the first Wall Street reform act in 7 years. She helped steer legislation to cut the cost of student loans, to help save the American automobile industry, and to give the FDA, at long last, the authority to regulate tobacco.

Her contributions extend beyond the historic laws that she has helped to pass. Probably her greatest contribution, from a very selfish point of view, is that Dena Morris assembled my team. She took the time to bring together an extraordinary group of bright, committed public servants, just like herself, who reflected my values, her values, and her work ethic.

Lots of people think about Sunday morning as a time to kick back and relax. My staff, and Dena knows this personally, lives in fear of Sunday morning because that is when I have the time to leisurely go through the newspapers, to watch television, and to get on my cell phone and e-mail my staff about all the new ideas I have for the coming week. It is a drill Dena knows well and which she handles with skill and does so effectively. I think it is her daily yoga practice that helps her maintain her even keel.

I want to thank her husband Peter Rogoff, who has joined us. He is a former longtime Hill staffer, and I want to give special thanks to their kids, Niles, now in high school, and Lulu.

It was about a year after Dena joined my staff that she brought Niles and Lulu to the office for a take-your-children-to-work day. They were about 6 and 4 years old at the time. So I met with all these kids from my staff members, and I said: Do you have any questions? Niles raised his hand, and he looked at me and he said: How come my mom has to work so late?

It was a funny moment, an embarrassing moment in a way, but I think Niles and Lulu know now what the answer is. It is because their mom cares so much about what she does and cares so much about the people she can help.

That is a bit of a story of Dena Morris' career. When she worked for that K Street law firm, she specialized in advancing legal and civil rights for people with disabilities and their families. She started that work just 3 years after the Americans with Disabilities Act became law. She was on the leading edge of one of America's great civil rights struggles.

Two other things worth mentioning: Dena's first job in Washington, before the law firm, was working as an intern for her home State Senator, Dick Lugar of Indiana. It was an unpaid internship, as most of them are. So to

pay the rent Dena had to work five nights a week on Capitol Hill at another unique Washington institution—the Hawk and Dove—which happens to be a local popular Capitol Hill watering hole.

Finally, Dena is one of six children. Her dad is a Baptist minister. In her whole family of origin—parents and siblings—Dena Morris is the only Democrat. She is a brave woman, and she tells me they do not really talk a lot about politics at family gatherings. Her parents may not share her politics, but I know they share our pride in the work she has done for America.

I have no doubt she will continue to use her talent and her energies to move our Nation forward.

Dena, thank you for your service.

SYRIAN HUMANITARIAN CRISIS

Mr. President, I listened to my friend, the Senator from Arizona, Senator McCAIN, and this is the second time I have heard him on the floor talking about the tragedy, the humanitarian crisis associated with Syria. I couldn't agree more.

I also take note of that heart-breaking photograph of that 3-year-old boy who drowned as his family tried to escape Syria, ultimately bound for Canada. In the crossing of a body of water, their boat capsized, and the mother and two children were lost, and the lifeless body of that infant washed up on the shore.

When I think back, and people ask, what do you remember about the Vietnam War, I remember a lot of things, but the image I remember is a photograph of a little girl stripped naked, burned with napalm, running down the road screaming. I can't get that out of my mind. Vietnam—I think of that photo.

When I think of Syria, and what is going on with this humanitarian crisis, I think of the photo of that little boy. It is heartbreaking. I get emotional thinking about little kids who I love in my family facing that kind of tragedy.

There are two things I would like to say. I think it is fundamentally unfair to blame the Syrian crisis on this President. This is a crisis which reflects the Arab Spring, it reflects changes in the Middle East that have been going on for 30 years plus, and no country has really come up with a good solution to stop the bloodshed and killing in Syria.

I am sorry my colleague from Arizona is not here, but I would acknowledge and remind him there was a time when the President came to us and said: I want to do something. President Obama said: I want to do something about chemical weapons in Syria. The Senator from Arizona—and I might add the Senator from South Carolina—joined us in the Foreign Relations Committee in moving this issue forward to give the President the authority to do something to stop the use of

chemical weapons in Syria, and it died before it came to the floor because there was no support—no support on the floor from the Republican majority in the House or the Senate.

So to say this President has not taken action, he has. And you cannot overlook the fact the United States of America, through the generosity of its taxpayers and the leadership of this President, leads the world in humanitarian relief in Syria. We believe we have invested almost \$4 billion—more than any other nation on Earth—for these poor people who are suffering there.

Can we do more? Should we have done more? Of course, in hindsight, things look so much clearer. I pushed for—and this administration is working on something the Senator from Arizona has also endorsed—a humanitarian safe zone. There ought to be a piece of Syria where people can go for medical care and know they are not going to be killed by these barrel bombs and attacks. I know the administration is working on that with Turkey. It has gone very slowly. I wish the pace would pick up.

A friend of mine, Dr. Sahloul in Chicago, a Syrian American, has made a dozen trips to Syria, to Lebanon, to Jordan giving free medical treatment to the Syrian refugees, and he tells the story in graphic terms—and many times brings back heartbreaking photographs—of what these barrel bombs are doing. I hope we can find some diplomatic or military solution in Syria.

In the meantime, here is the question we must ask ourselves: What will we do about these millions of refugees? We will give money, of course, to our allies that are creating camps for them. I visited one of those camps in Turkey, and I have to say I was really a great admirer of the leadership of that country in accepting at this one camp 10,000 people—one camp. And there are many more, hundreds of thousands all over the Middle East, fleeing out of that region. So now what will we do about the refugees?

The Senator from Arizona reminded us last week these are refugees, not migrants. They are the people who are victims of war who are fleeing with their families.

On Friday I was in Chicago and met with four of these Syrian families who are now refugees in the United States. They told heartbreaking stories of losing members of their families and fleeing from one city to another in Syria without any success, then finally leaving, going to refugee camps and trying to come to the United States. Even after they applied for refugee status, it took this one family over 14 months to make it here to this country.

We have a rich history in the United States of being there for refugees. We can point with some pride to the fact that when Cuba was going through its

upheaval back in the 1950s and 1960s we accepted Cuban refugees who have become a major part of America today. In fact, the three Hispanic Members of the United States Senate are all Cuban Americans. At least two of them were the product of that exodus—the product of a refugee status that brought their families to the United States. They are making great contributions for the States they represent.

We did the same thing in the Soviet Union. When the Jewish population there was facing persecution, we stood up and said: We will accept them as refugees. Thousands and thousands of Soviet Jews came to the United States and have become an important part of America today.

The list goes on: Somalians, Bosnians, the Hmong population out of Vietnam. So we have a rich history of responding to these humanitarian crises. We need to do it again. What the administration has proposed is modest—10,000—too modest, as far as I am concerned. I believe we should be prepared to accept 100,000—100,000 Syrian refugees.

Yes, each and every one of them needs to be carefully checked and vetted so we know we are not inviting someone in who is a danger to the United States. The people I have met in Chicago—the refugees there—are just desperate people trying to find a roof over their head, trying to find some little work to do to keep what remains of their family together. Each and every one of them said something interesting. All four of them said they couldn't believe how welcoming America was, how friendly people in America were to the refugees and their families. Mr. President, that is who we are. That is what America is about. We shouldn't be afraid when people who are desperate for some refuge find our shores and ask: May we come and join you?

I have already had friends in Illinois calling my wife and asking: What can we do? Can we adopt a Syrian family of refugees to help them get started in the United States? I think that story can be replicated over and over again, thousands and thousands of times.

So I would say to my friend from Arizona, yes, it is outrageous, the death, the violence, the circumstances in Syria which has forced so many millions of people to move and many of them to lose their lives in the process. And it is heartbreaking to read the stories as they desperately try to find some safe place to live with their families and are rejected by countries, some in Europe, that want no part of them. I want America to do its part so that when the future generations look back and ask our generation: What did you do when you faced the greatest humanitarian crisis of your time at this moment in history, I want them to be able to point with pride to the fact that we

carried on the great American tradition of opening up this country to refugees who are looking for a safe place to live with their families.

Mr. President, we are in the midst of debating again—again—the Iran agreement, an agreement that was brokered by the President with five other nations—an agreement to accomplish two things: The agreement was to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon and, secondly, it was to create a safe enough environment that the United States does not have to commit military forces or go to war again in the Middle East.

I voted for it, and 41 other Democrats joined me. We had this vote last week. It was historic and widely reported. At the end of the vote, Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader, stood up and said: We are going to do it again. We are going to do it again next week—today—Tuesday night.

I don't know why we are going through a replay of this. There is a suggestion he may do another vote in another few days. Members of the Senate have stood up to a person and announced where they stand on this issue. Nobody is trying to run away from this issue. It is a challenging issue and a historic vote, and we are all on the record. We are there.

I don't know why we have these repeat roll calls. I don't know why we are going through this again, but that is Senator MCCONNELL's choice. One would think he might want to spend some time on the floor of the Senate dealing with some other issues, but he sticks with this one.

What happened over in the House of Representatives is hard to describe. We came together because of a statute passed by the House and the Senate calling for a vote of disapproval of the Iran treaty. Now, it has been rejected—that vote of disapproval—here in the Senate. The House never took it up. The House, instead, had three separate votes, never going to the issue of disapproval. They had three separate votes on separate issues. The one they passed that might be sent our way is hard to believe.

You see, what the House of Representatives said is that we will not lift any sanctions on Iran until we have a new President in January 2017. Think about that for a second. Here is what we know. We know that Iran has fissile material capable of building ten nuclear weapons. We know that. We also know that Iran has the capacity within 2 or 3 months—2 or 3 months—to create this nuclear weapon. We know that from our intelligence, and we know it from the pronouncements of Prime Minister Netanyahu of Israel.

With the knowledge of that capability in Iran—to build a nuclear weapon, which would be a disaster in the Middle East—the House Republicans have said they want to put off any ef-

fort to stop the Iranians until we have a new President 17 months from now, which is more than enough time, I might add, for the Iranians, should they choose, to build a nuclear weapon. How does that make Israel any safer? How does that make the world any safer?

Here is what we know. With this Iran agreement, within weeks the Iranians will start dismantling their centrifuges. They will start the process guaranteed by this treaty that will result in closing down a nuclear reactor that produces plutonium which can be used for weapons. They will start inviting inspectors into their country.

There has been a lot said by the Senator from Arizona and others about the track record of Iran. I agree with many things he said. They are not to be trusted. That is why verification is part of this agreement. If there were no inspectors, it would be a foolish venture, but with these inspectors, we are on the ground inspecting Iran on a daily basis, through the IAEA, international inspectors sponsored by the United Nations. Are these inspectors good? I can say that many years ago when we voted on the invasion of Iraq, when the Bush-Cheney administration told us there were weapons of mass destruction, these inspectors told us there were none—after we had invaded, after the war had started. It turns out the inspectors were right and the Bush-Cheney administration was wrong. They have a good track record, and I am glad they are going to be on the scene to verify this agreement.

But the question now is, How many more times will Senator MCCONNELL want us to vote on this same issue? As leader, he can decide to do it over and over. Is this part of a debate prep for some of the Republican Senators running for President? They come to the floor and make their speeches or hear speeches and get to cast a vote before the CNN debate this week? I hope that is not it. We have made ourselves clear where we stand on this issue, each and every one of us. We cast our votes. We will do it again today. Now it is time for the Senate to move on.

Looming just ahead of us in a matter of days is the potential of another government shutdown. The same tea party Republicans who shut down this government 2 years ago have vowed to do it again over a different issue. Somehow they believe that come October 1, if we start shutting down the agencies of our Federal Government, they will have made a political point. They are right. They will make a point that the majority in the House and the Senate—the Republican majority—cannot govern, cannot manage the budget of the United States to keep our government agencies open. I think they make that point 2 years ago; I don't know why they want to remind the American people of it again.

So instead of voting repeatedly on the same measure, on the Iran agreement—where we already have a record vote—I would commend to the Republican leader: Take up the issues of the day. Some are compelling. There is cyber security for the safety of the United States. There is a transportation bill in the House of Representatives. We passed it, and it is time for the House to do the same. Let's fund our government. Let's not face a government shutdown.

I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSE. Mr. President, as many of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, have noted, today's vote on the President's deal with Iran is one of significant consequence. The American people deserve an up-or-down vote on the deal itself.

I spent the day sitting on the floor of the Senate, listening to my colleagues debate the technicalities of the President's Iranian nuclear deal. This has been a lawyerly dispute, with arguments all over the map. I, like the vast majority of the American people, believe that this is a terrible deal.

It has blown up the sanctions regime that brought Iran to the table. It floods Tehran's coffers with more than \$100 billion that will almost certainly finance the killing of innocents around the world. The verification efforts place all of the burden on the United States and our allies, leaving Iran free to delay, disrupt, and deny inspections. The deal even allows Iran to advance its ballistic missile programs and to stockpile uranium. It is simply a bad deal and the American people know it.

I went to Embassy Row and stood before the old Iranian Embassy to the United States, a building which was abandoned on April 7, 1980. And what the American people understand—and what Washington, DC, does not seem to understand—is that the technicalities of this deal, though important, are not the central question.

The central question is this: Why was that embassy abandoned April 7, 1980?

It is because in 1979 there was an Islamic revolution in Tehran, and the mullahs that came to power are theocratic hardliners that believe they have a divine mandate. Their divine mandate is to export Islamic law and tyranny across the Middle East, across North Africa, and beyond. The tyrants who rule Iran today believe they have a divine mandate to annihilate Israel.

For 36 years we have had a bipartisan consensus in our country that the world's largest state sponsor of terror should never be allowed to become a nuclear-threshold state.

Sadly, the administration has abandoned that bipartisan consensus in the fanciful, imaginary dream that they are going to transform Iran's theocratic hardliners into moderates that will no longer oppress religious minorities, women, homosexuals, and others

within their country. The administration believes that the Iranian regime will no longer try to spread destabilization and fund terrorism across their region and across the globe. And this presents dire, but foreseeable consequences.

The administration's deal with Iran will set off a nuclear arms race in the Middle East—one of the world's most volatile regions. Billions of dollars in sanctions relief will be available to the Iranian Revolutionary Guard and its terrorist proxies to spill innocent blood and destabilize Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Yemen and elsewhere. Either of these developments is serious enough on its own. Taken together, we have an unacceptably high probability for regional conflicts that could quickly spiral into nuclear events. We have to take this seriously; but, as the outcome of this vote is likely to demonstrate, we are not.

The American people are more serious than Washington DC. The American people aspire to a day when that old and crumbling embassy is reopened, but not by the ruling theocratic mullahs. Instead, we can only accept a nation that believes in human flourishing and in the dignity of their own people, a government that repudiates the goal of annihilating Israel and the spreading their Islamic revolution across the Middle East.

I am grateful that the American people are more serious than Washington DC, but, it is not too late. I urge you to vote against the President's deal with Iran.

It is not in our national security interest, and it is surely not in the interest of our friends in that most dangerous region on the face of the earth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I came to the floor having spoken at great length last week outlining why I thought this agreement was something that ought to be fully debated and fully understood not only by Members of the Senate but by the American people. We had that debate. We were promised from the very beginning and it was enacted into law that Congress would be provided with all materials talked about and agreed upon before we had a vote to determine whether we would support approval or disapproval of this. We had a vote Thursday, which was procedural, to give us the opportunity to register our yes and no, our yea and nay. The American people deserve to know on the record where we stand on this. There have been arguments made on both sides of this issue.

Personally, I think a close examination of this raises serious questions—so serious that it is not something someone can come to the floor and simply say: Well, that is over, that is done, and let's move on. There are more important things ahead. It is hard for me

to understand what is more important than getting this right.

I think the issues I laid out last week on Thursday before the vote are issues that still need consideration. But the real reason we are back here—thank you, Senator MCCONNELL, for giving us another opportunity—is because we fell two votes short of the opportunity to even take a vote. We took a vote on a procedural measure—a measure which, as we all know, you can go home and hide behind. I don't understand why my 42 Democratic colleagues were afraid to put their names on a yes-or-no vote proposition so that everyone knows exactly where we stand and nobody can go home and make an excuse as to why they are for or why they are against it. It goes all the way back to the Scriptures: Let your yea be yea and your nay be nay. That has always been what I have believed to be the right way here in the United States Senate as well as the United States Congress so that when we go home, the people we represent know exactly where we stand.

I think what we are witnessing today in terms of the debates that will be taking place tomorrow in terms of the Presidential nomination process is the public partly frustrated—frustrated in many ways, but I think part is the fact that there is a lot of procedural gobbledygook out there that elected Members can hide behind and not have a direct clarification of exactly where they stand on any particular issue.

The purpose for delay was to hopefully give our Members the opportunity to go home and listen to their constituents about how they feel about this, and perhaps we could have had two of the minority group who voted to block us from going forward—we won the majority vote 58 to 42 on a bipartisan basis, including four Democrats, all of whom have significant foreign policy experience, some having more than the rest of us. So it was a bipartisan effort to move to this process, and we came up two short. We were hoping that over the weekend—I was assuming that many of my colleagues were receiving the same kinds of calls and input from their constituents as I was. Mine was running 10 to 1 against this agreement. The more we disclosed from this agreement, the more the American people learned about this agreement, the more concerned they were, and hopefully they expressed those concerns to their Senators who went home over the weekend having blocked us from this vote.

At the very least, we are pleading that we could have a vote so that our yes is yes and our no is no, so that we reach the threshold by which we will buy a little bit of time to hopefully expose more of this very flawed and I think fatally flawed agreement, more time for the American people to express their wishes.

We are not talking about a normal process of moving legislation through

the Senate; we are talking about a process, a negotiation that will have enormous consequences for the future, enormous impact on the national safety of this country, enormous impact on the world in terms of a rogue nation now having the pathway to development of a nuclear weapons capability and weapons, unimpeded after this period of time expires.

The very first thing people ought to understand is that coming down to the floor—or listening to the President of the United States say that this prevents Iran from having nuclear weapons or nuclear weapons capability is false. It is absolutely wrong. This provides a pathway for them to get it. It just defers, but it legitimizes their becoming a nuclear-armed nation. This rogue nation, which is seething terrorism throughout the Middle East and cries "Death to America" and extinction to Israel, will have the wealth because of the release of well over \$100 billion, will have the capabilities because even under this agreement their nuclear processing research and development goes forward—with our assistance. It is in the agreement, with our assistance.

So this is not something we can simply say: Oh well, we had the vote, you guys came up short, and we will cease all debate because it is over. It was over for the President of the United States when he declared it an agreement, not a treaty. If ever something as consequential as this should fall under being a treaty and not an agreement, it is this agreement. Yet it was declared an executive agreement. The President obviously knew what he was doing because he has had a lot of practice basically saying: I can bypass the Congress, I can bypass the Constitution by simply declaring it an executive agreement, an executive order, whatever.

In declaring this, it put us in a terrible position. Thankfully, we were able to secure and vote into law, on a vote of 98 to 1, signed by the President of the United States, an agreement that would allow us to play a role in this and to look at the agreement and anything connected with this agreement before we made a decision and the opportunity to vote on approval or disapproval.

Well, all that has been denied, and the President now only says it is over. The minority leader on Thursday said: It is over. Get over it. We are moving on. Other things need to be done. We just heard that again from one of my colleagues here, the second in command on the Democrat's side. Let's move forward. Moving forward is a violation of the law. That will be tested in courts. But it is very hard to understand how the administration and the 42 who voted for this could ignore the very language they voted for, the very language they agreed on, the very language that allowed us to go forward

and understanding what this agreement says.

Let me quote from the law which was signed by the President of the United States, in nearly unanimous agreement by the U.S. Congress:

TRANSMISSION TO CONGRESS OF NUCLEAR AGREEMENTS WITH IRAN AND VERIFICATION ASSESSMENT WITH RESPECT TO SUCH AGREEMENTS

The President shall—

Not the President might, not the President could if he wants to or not if he doesn't want to—

transmit to the appropriate congressional committees and leadership . . . the agreement, as defined. . . . including all related materials and annexes . . . and any additional materials related thereto.

Including all related materials and annexes—including appendices, including codicils, including side agreements.

We have been told—we have learned that there are two secret agreements that have been made between Iran and the inspection agency. We have not been allowed to see those agreements despite our pleas. We have been told by Secretary of State: They don't matter. Don't worry about it. It doesn't directly affect you.

Who possibly could enter into any contractual agreement, any binding agreement with the adversary and not require access to the side agreements? Who would lease a car, who would buy a house, who would enter into any contractual arrangement with someone who said: Oh, by the way, there is some secret stuff here, but I can't let you see what it is. But don't worry—it really won't affect this.

I can't conceive of anybody.

This doesn't take an Ivy League law school graduate or someone serving in the Congress who looks through this legislation and helps write this legislation to have people understand that this alone ought to be reason not to vote for this agreement until they have access to that material—as required by the law they voted on.

So how can a Member come down to this floor and simply say: I know everything about this agreement, I like what it does, and I am voting for it. That is their privilege. That is their right. If they want to go home and explain that to their people, that is their right to do so. But how can they go home and explain to the people: I voted for something without knowing exactly everything that is in it. And by the way, yeah, I voted for the opportunity to know that, it is in the law, but the President said, "Well, I am going to ignore that."

We have heard that from this President too many times, over and over and over: I am going to bypass Congress. I am going to game this thing so it goes my way and not your way. No input whatsoever.

Here we stand. Why again? Because some of us—many of us—58 of us don't

want to simply throw up our hands and say: OK, you have got us. Let's move on. What is next? Big deal. Not a lot of consequence here, but we will worry about that later.

We are simply saying that we don't think it is over. The actions by the majority leader here have given us an opportunity to take another shot at this. Yogi Berra said, "It ain't over till it's over." And I think John Belushi in "Animal House" said: It's over? No, it ain't over. It's not over.

So it is not over. We have a vote coming up this evening. This vote this evening will give the American people the opportunity to understand that this motion to this agreement is going to be killed through a procedural motion without those who oppose it—even though they are in a minority but having the procedural right to do so under the Senate rules by leaving us two votes short of getting to that particular point.

What are they afraid of? You come down here and you tell people: This is a good agreement, but I don't want to put my name on it. This is a good agreement, but we can't keep talking about it. This is a good agreement, trust me, but, yeah, the side agreements—it is too bad we had to do that, but, you know, I guess we are not going to have access to that.

I was surprised by what the previous speaker, the Senator from Illinois, said about the inspection agreement. Who could possibly agree to an agreement—concede to an agreement that, yes, we will have inspections, but you get to exclude the facility that did all of the nuclear research over the last decade. We are exempted—we need an exemption from that. And we gave it to them. Also, by the way, we are not going to let you look at any of our military facilities to see whether we have had any militarization of this process. Oh, by the way, if under the agreement you think we are cheating at some other facilities around or places where you want to have some inspections, we will think about that. If we disagree, we will go through a Byzantine process to get to the point where the clock starts running, and then we have 24 days to try to figure all of this out. And some will say this goes on much longer.

Having said everything I have said, having done everything I possibly can do, I am here to ask my colleagues—those who think this is a good deal—I am here basically just asking one thing even though I have major reservations. I am not even asking them to change their vote. I am asking them to give us the opportunity to have a vote. Give us an opportunity so that we can hold our heads high and go home and say: This is exactly how I came down on this, and here is my yes or here is my no.

Isn't that what the American people sent us here to do? We wonder why they are skeptical, why 70 percent of

the people think they can't trust Congress on probably the most consequential, historic vote any of us in this body will have in our lifetime, with untold consequences—which I am going to be talking about sometime later this week—for the future of the world, let alone for the future of America. How can we hide behind a procedural motion so that we don't have a full declaration of where the majority of this body and where the outstanding majority of the American people stand on this agreement?

I am pleading to my colleagues, have the courage to stand up for what you believe in and give us a vote. Don't hide behind a procedural motion. Any one of us has the capability of going home and confusing the heck out of our constituents by saying: Oh, well, there were problems with the agreement, and I think we can probably fix it, but this wasn't the right time to do it, and we needed to move forward. By the way, the end of the fiscal year is coming up, and we have other important business to do. Or, it is irresponsible for Senator MCCONNELL to require another vote or more debate on this.

They want to run from this debate as fast as they can because the American public—I can only speak for my own constituents, but I see the polls also. There is heavy opposition to this—10 to 1 in my State, at least what has been sent to me through all the means of receiving messages from people these days.

I am going to end here. I see Senator CORKER on the floor, who is totally responsible for this language, which was illegally violated. It uses the word "shall" and it includes the words "side agreements" and anything related to this. We owe it to the American people to understand every possible consequence of this agreement and then make our decision, which will go down in history. However Members vote, they will carry that. We will see what this rogue Iran regime will do with it.

All I know is they are cheering in the streets of Tehran. They are declaring this a victory that did not cross any one of their objections and crossed every one of our redlines.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Indiana, who served as Ambassador to Germany, who has been so diligent in the pursuit of truth and knowledge relative to this agreement and obviously is very concerned about its implications. He has been a stalwart. He is leaving the Senate at the end of this congressional term. We all are indebted to him for his tremendous concerns for our Nation's national security and the efforts of diplomacy to try to resolve the problems we have.

I know we have another speaker coming to floor in just one moment, but

really because of what the Senator just said, I want to reiterate one more time as to why we are where we are.

Four times since 2010, the Senate overwhelmingly, working with the House, put in place sanctions on Iran—four times. That was met with tremendous pushback from the administration, which did not want to see those sanctions put in place by Congress. But those sets of sanctions are the very things that brought Iran to the table. The administration, along with Russia, China, Great Britain, France, and Germany, began negotiations with Iran because of the sanctions we overwhelmingly put in place in this body. Once they were about to reach a conclusion, the administration decided that instead of giving this to us in the form of a treaty—which is their choice. It is their choice under our form of government. I know we have a lot of people in our country who are very upset about this, but, in fact, it is their choice. They could have presented it as a congressional-executive agreement, which does live beyond that, but they decided instead that they were going to do it as an executive agreement and totally bypass Congress. That was their purpose. As a matter of fact, I wrote a letter to the President, and they responded very quickly: Yes, our plan is to bypass Congress and go directly to the U.N. Security Council. We are going to do this as an executive agreement. That obviously met with a lot of resistance here, but it is their choice. But the problem with that, of course, is that it only lasts while they are in office, and then the next Executive can change.

Because all of us had brought Iran to the table and because the administration had planned to use a national security waiver to waive our sanctions—the ones that brought them to the table—we resisted. We began on our side of the aisle, saying: No, we want a voice in this. We brought them to the table. This is the biggest foreign policy issue that is going to occur while we are here, in all likelihood.

We began pushing on this side of the aisle, and eventually we were able to get some support on this side of the aisle. Eventually we passed 98 to 1 a bill called the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which, by the way, took back power from the President, basically saying: You cannot implement this for a 60-day period after it ends. You have to give us the materials. We have to be able to go through all the materials. Of course, we haven't gotten all of the materials. Then we have the right to disapprove or approve. But there is going to be a pause on behalf of the American people, we are going to go through this in detail, and then we are going to vote.

That was actually a taking back of power from the administration which kept them from immediately being able to implement. We are in that pe-

riod of time now. The administration has said the clock ends on Thursday. We are having this vote, but everybody has said in this body that this is a vote of conscience. Everybody has said that.

By the way, I would add that overwhelming support for sanctions, overwhelming support for review—there would be an overwhelming vote of approval had the administration done what they said they were going to do when they began these negotiations, which was to end Iran's nuclear program. Had they done that, we would be seeing a totally different outcome here. There would be 100 people here voting in support of an agreement. But what they did was they squandered that opportunity—squandered it. Instead, with U.S. approval, Iran will be industrializing its nuclear program. Research and development will take place. All Iran has to do is adhere to the agreement, and it will be an advanced nuclear country.

Again, if they had just done what they said, we would be supporting them. So now here we are. The American people have difficulty. We are in a process right now. In the Senate, we have something called cloture. When both sides of the aisle feel as though the debate has ended, we invoke cloture and then we move to the final vote. We have had plenty of debate.

By the way, in the Foreign Relations Committee, we have had 12 hearings, not to count the informal meetings that have taken place. Every Senator in this body probably knows more about this nuclear deal than any international arrangement that has been agreed to in recent times. I mean, people have gone through it tooth and comb. So what is happening now is that we have a bipartisan majority that opposes this deal. What has happened—it is unfortunate, but Senator REID—I don't know whether he saw this as a contest between himself and the majority. I don't know what happened. But in August, he decided he wanted to mount a filibuster. It is our understanding that the administration supported that filibuster. They wanted the Senate to block us from being able to vote our conscience.

This next vote is not a vote of conscience. It is not. It is a demonstration of 42 Senators—at least that is what happened last time—42 Senators—a minority—refusing to let the majority, a bipartisan majority—the 2 most knowledgeable Democrats on foreign policy issues oppose this agreement. What they are doing is blocking us from having that vote of conscience. It has taken on a little bit of a Tammy Wynette kind of tone to me. It appears to me that this is about standing by their man. It is not about allowing us to vote our conscience.

So, yes, people are upset. Almost unanimous support for sanctions to bring them to the table. Only one Sen-

ator disagreeing with our ability to weigh in. Now we are at a point where it is time to weigh in, and the minority leader, my friend from Nevada, has organized, with the administration's support, a filibuster, which is, by the way, put in place to make sure there is enough debate. We know there has been enough debate. But instead of allowing debate to end, tonight it appears. I hope there are some consciences in this body that say: Wait a minute, this is wrong.

By the way, I know people say: Well, this is just the way the Senate operates. I will tell you this: I have voted for enough things I disagree strongly with to make the Senate work to be able to make this appeal to my friends. Look, 98 of us voted to allow us to vote up or down on whether we agree with the substance of this deal. It is totally inappropriate, from my perspective, that a minority of Senators, all on one side of the aisle—definitely a partisan act, a very partisan act—appear intended to keep the President from getting a message of disapproval from the Senate. It appears to me that what they are going to do is do it again.

I want to say to my friends on the other side of the aisle that our leader here has honored the request of the body—at least up until now. He has honored the request to be about a resolution of approval or disapproval. In this case, since a majority disapprove, it is a resolution of disapproval, but what we have seen him do is fill the tree. A lot of people don't know what that means, so I will explain. We could have had a lot of amendments—and up until this point we haven't had these amendments—that would have been pretty tough votes to make that are related to this arrangement, but not about the disapproval itself.

What our leader has done—in order to keep the debate civil, sober, and focused on what we are here at hand about—he has actually filled the tree and kept those amendments from coming in place.

We will have another vote at 6 p.m. We will keep it open for a couple of hours because it is a Jewish holiday, and we want to make sure that all of our colleagues can get back here and have the opportunity to register their vote.

I ask my friends on the other side of the aisle: Is this really in keeping with the spirit of what we have done?

I have had friends say: Well, we have known all along that it would take 60 votes. It doesn't take but a week here to understand that a cloture vote has to be overcome, and in the Senate that takes 60 votes. My friend from Virginia keeps saying: Well, we all know it takes 60 votes. Look, I understand. The American people understand that it takes 60 votes to move beyond cloture to get to a final vote, which, by the way, is an up-or-down vote at 51.

So the American people understand what is happening: 42 Senators on the other side of the aisle, my friends, after voting 98 to 1 that we could weigh in, have decided that what they are going to do is keep us from being able to vote the majority, up or down, because they know if we do, a bipartisan majority—the two most knowledgeable Democrats on foreign policy disapprove it, making it 58 votes—would be able to send to the President the feelings of this body, and that is the majority believes that this deal should be disapproved and that the administration has squandered the opportunity that we helped create because they did not end the nuclear program. Instead what they have done with this deal was to basically legitimize it.

As the Presiding Officer mentioned the other day, we are going to be helping them with technology. They will continue with research and development. We have lifted the ballistic-missile ban, the conventional ban, and we are going to agree to let them begin testing missiles immediately.

As our Presiding Officer mentioned the other day: What do they need ICBMs for? Think about it. What do they need them for?

I know it is time for Senator MORAN to speak on the floor, so I will close with this: The American people know they have no practical need for this program—none. They have one nuclear plant. They could buy and enrich uranium much cheaper. We know this is about one thing, and that is them being a nuclear state, and, in essence, we are agreeing to the industrialization of their program.

With that, I yield the floor to Senator MORAN.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MORAN. Madam President, I appreciate the remarks of my esteemed colleague of Tennessee, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has the knowledge and relationships in the Senate to make the case he just made.

I wish to just briefly address what I see as terrible flaws in this agreement which was negotiated by the Obama administration with other countries and with Iran.

I have previously outlined my objections on the Senate floor. I will restate that I strongly oppose the agreement and would hope that the Senate, on behalf of the American people, our national security, and peace around the globe, would make the same decision that I have made, which is that this agreement results in less stability, a greater likelihood of war, and a nuclear Iran—a country that is capable of delivering nuclear devices across its border, shouts “Death to America.” We are acquiescing by the action the Senate has taken to date that this agreement will take effect.

I can't imagine a more significant vote that Members of the Senate will take than this one, certainly in the arena of national security, national defense, and international relations. This agreement concedes too much and secures too little.

I serve on the banking committee. This is the committee that, because of our oversight over the Treasury Department, is responsible for legislation dealing with sanctions. I have participated in the debate in the committee and on the Senate floor about the sanctions that Congress has put in place against Iran. In my view, my colleagues and I—and I can certainly speak for myself—did not vote to put sanctions in place for the purposes of causing Iran to negotiate a path to nuclear capabilities. I voted for sanctions time and time again. I voted to increase them, encouraged by my letters and comments on the Senate floor, in my conversations with administration officials, and with my colleagues in the Senate that we tighten the sanctions. I didn't ask that the sanctions be tightened. I didn't encourage the administration to be more forceful in their enforcement for purposes of creating a setting in which Iran could negotiate a way out of the sanctions for the purpose of developing nuclear capabilities. Those sanctions were put in place for the purpose of keeping Iran from becoming a nuclear power. Instead those sanctions have been the excuse by which this administration has negotiated a deal that is bad for the United States, bad for our European and worldwide allies, and particularly bad for our allies in the Middle East.

One would think that any agreement that was negotiated would dismantle Iran's nuclear capabilities. This agreement does not do that. One would assume that any agreement negotiated would prohibit the dollars from flowing—particularly billions of dollars to Iran—until they had complied with the terms of the agreement. But, no, this agreement allows the dollars to flow nearly from the beginning.

Iran will become a legitimized and enriched nuclear power, and they will become a wealthier, nuclear-capable country that supports terrorism in the Middle East and around the globe. As they have clearly stated, they will continue their effort to terrorize the world and end our way of life in the West as we know it with their continual chants of “Death to America.”

As perhaps an issue that ought to be raised, one would think the administration would negotiate the release of Americans held captive in Iran as part of this agreement, but, no, they said that was extraneous. Yet, they negotiated issues related not only to nuclear capability but other weapons allowing Iran to increase its weaponization outside the nuclear arena.

I wish to now talk about the process. I came to the Senate following an elec-

tion in 2010, and the frustration I immediately experienced was that this place was doing next to nothing. For most of my life, I have been encouraged when Congress wasn't at work because I thought my constituents were safer in the absence of congressional activity, but I came to the Senate with the intention of having a Senate that would work for the purpose of undoing many of the things that have happened over a long period of time that, in my view, are damaging to our freedoms and liberties and damaging to our ability to live the American dream.

I learned in a matter of a few weeks of my arrival in the Senate, and after taking the oath of office, that in this place the plan was to do nothing. We have seen that time and time again. My reaction to that was: I want to go out and see if we can get a Republican majority in which we have different leadership of the Senate, in which the goal is to have a Senate that functions, and the opportunity is for every Senator, Republican and Democrat, to present their ideas on behalf of their constituents and make the case to the rest of us that those ideas are worthy of our support.

The goal, in part, for a change in the majority of the Senate was to have a functioning Senate in which every Senator, Republican or Democrat, had the chance to present their ideas. I thought, as a result of a change in the majority, that when we all, Republicans and Democrats, had the opportunity to present those ideas on behalf of our constituents, we would see a change in the attitude and approach of the way the Senate operates.

For much of my early life, what I discovered about America's Congress—about the Senate and the House—was that there were Senators who didn't care who the President was or what party the President belonged to. There were Republican Senators who would disagree with a Republican President and Democratic Senators who would disagree with a Democratic President. Somehow over time, the political nature of our country has changed, and it seems to me we put the party of our President above the well-being of our Nation. That is dangerous.

I oppose this agreement not because it was negotiated by a Democratic President. I oppose this agreement because it is wrong, and it is bad for America. I thought the Senate—once the opportunities for all of us to present our ideas was available—would once again see the days in which it was not about party affiliation, but about the idea of presenting the best course and direction our country should go. Unfortunately, it seems to me, that the Iran agreement is the poster child for a Senate that is once again bogged down in support of a President on an agreement that is unworthy of that support.

Our country desperately needs men and women who serve in public office

whose decisions are made not because they are pressured by a President, not because their President shares their party and political affiliation. Decisions need to be made here that benefit Americans today but, more importantly, Americans in the future. What seems to me to be missing in my efforts to change the nature of the Senate is that we are still mired in the circumstance in which—in the absence of 60 votes—the Senate's will on behalf of the American people cannot be expressed.

The point I guess I failed to understand is when new leadership came into play that was open and receptive to Democratic and Republican Senators presenting their thoughts, amendments being offered, bills being considered, most of my Democrat colleagues would find that appealing because we all came here to do something we believe in, not to play a political game. Unfortunately, that does not seem, to me, to be the case today.

This is the opportunity for us to change course and return the Senate to the day in which it was deliberative and in which Senators spoke on behalf of the well-being of the country as compared to the well-being of a President. It is very discouraging to me. We worked hard to make certain that the Senate became a place different than it was, and unfortunately we see in this circumstance it doesn't appear to be much different than it was a year ago.

I have been a supporter of the rules that allow for a filibuster, that require 60 votes for the Senate to advance an issue. I always thought that protected the minority—people who have different points of view, people who come to Washington, DC, and may not be in the majority and may feel as if they would be run over in the absence of their ability to protect their constituents, their ideas, and 60 votes was designed to protect the minority viewpoints in this country.

This becomes the moment, in my view, in which we can look at what has transpired on the debate on Iran and reach the conclusion that the 60-vote rule is damaging to the future of our country because it is damaging to the ability of the Senate to work the will of the American people and to make decisions that advance a cause different from one's political party and political philosophy.

In my view, the time has come for us to consider this issue of how the filibuster works. It is because this issue is so important and the outcome of this debate so valuable to the future of our country and the security of the world that in this case, we need to move forward with a majority vote to allow this agreement to be rejected.

This agreement is not worthy of the protection it is being given by a minority of Senators. It is supported—the rejection of this treaty—this agreement;

it should be a treaty—the rejection of this agreement is opposed by a majority of Republican and Democratic Senators. Yet we will never have the opportunity—unless a couple of our colleagues decide to do what is right this evening—for the American people to see where we stand on this issue.

These are serious times. Nothing is easy in the world. It is always difficult to know what the right answers are, but the path the Senate is on today and the path the Senate took last Thursday is a terrible mistake for the future of our country and the security of our citizens. I urge the Senate to allow consideration of this agreement, and I urge the Senate to reject this agreement for the good of America.

I yield the floor to the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Madam President, I echo the feelings of my friend and colleague from the State of Kansas. He speaks with emotion and he speaks with a heartfelt sense of concern that many of us have with regard to this proposed agreement by the President.

I rise to speak about the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, or the JCPOA, between the United States, Great Britain, France, China, Russia, Germany, and the Islamic Republic of Iran. Much has been said about the agreement over the past weeks and months. My colleagues have addressed a great number of concerns and deficiencies about the deal and many outside experts have testified before multiple committees of Congress explaining their views as well.

In addressing these concerns, I wish to ask just a few simple questions: Do we believe that with this agreement the United States and our allies are safer today than we were 1 year ago and will we be safer when the nuclear limitations expire in 10 years? The answers to these questions are very important. They will dictate what we decide in one of the most important votes we will cast in the 114th Congress.

After closely examining the agreement, the following can be concluded: Upon verification by the IAEA—the International Atomic Energy Agency—of Iranian compliance, supposedly within a few months if Iran is in compliance, they will, after payment of their obligations, receive around \$56 billion that were frozen in overseas accounts. Further revenue will be generated because the European Union has agreed to lift its ban on the import of Iranian oil, thereby providing Iran with billions more in revenue with which to repair its oilfields and begin to repair its battered economy.

According to the Wall Street Journal, Iran's Deputy Petroleum Minister recently stated that his country's oil exports would reach 2.3 million barrels a day, compared with around 1.2 mil-

lion barrels per day today. Iran would also gain access to 50 million barrels of oil which have been held offshore, and economists estimate that Iran's economy will grow up to 9 percent in the year after the implementation of the agreement.

This verification that we talk about by the IAEA will be accomplished through protocols that Members of the Senate have not seen in writing and that the administration has not—nor will they—agreed to provide to us. This is in direct contravention to the Iran review act, which the President signed into law, agreeing to provide all documents and side agreements and, according to reports, will unbelievably allow the Iranians to provide their own inspections of their military work on nuclear sites to the IAEA.

A robust inspection of a regime requires an anytime, anywhere inspection policy. Unfortunately, under the idea of managed access, as found in this agreement, if the IAEA requests access to an undeclared location, under this agreement Iran can delay access to the facility for 2 weeks or longer with the outlined multistep process for undeclared locations.

U.S. sanctions against foreign firms for dealing with Iran in the oil and financial sectors, which have been the most effective sanctions enacted against Iran, will be suspended upon implementation of this agreement. Sanctions prohibiting U.S. firms from conducting business with Iran will remain in place, but with a large carve-out for non-U.S. entities that are owned or controlled by U.S. companies. Some sanctions will also be lifted against Iran's Revolutionary Guard, the entity that actually runs the military aspects of Iran's nuclear program. Furthermore, the agreement requires the United States to make certain that U.S. State and local governments comply with sanctions relief contravening their own sanctions placed on Iran.

Now, this proposal, the JCPOA, also commits the P5+1—that working group of countries—to work to strengthen Iran's ability to protect against and respond to nuclear security threats, including sabotage, which we can presume would mean from even our allies who feel deeply threatened by this agreement which transforms Iran—a terrorist State—into a breakout nuclear power and still a terrorist State.

In year 5 of the agreement, Iran will be removed from the United Nations arms embargo. Yet as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, GEN Martin Dempsey, told the Senate Armed Services Committee in August: "Under no circumstances should we relieve pressure on Iran relative to ballistic missile capabilities and arms trafficking."

In year 8 of the agreement, Iran will be removed from the United Nations ballistic missile embargo.

Now, in July of this year, Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter confirmed to

me in a hearing that under this deal, he could not rule out Iran acquiring, within 10 years, an intercontinental ballistic missile that could hit the United States. This means Iran would have the capability of producing a nuclear weapon that could reach U.S. soil in a decade.

These comments come after Gen. Paul Selva, now the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, told me during a separate hearing that Iran remains the leading State sponsor of terrorism, and resources gained in sanctions relief under the nuclear deal could be used by Iran to continue sponsoring terrorism.

Under the agreement, the United States agreed to allow the nuclear-related equipment to remain in Iran under lock and key, and Iran will be allowed to continue researching IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, and IR-8 centrifuges. Iran will also be allowed to begin testing IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges in cascades of 30 at year 8 of the agreement. After 8 years, many of the research-and-development restrictions are removed and Iran will begin to manufacture advanced centrifuges. All R&D restrictions end at 10 years.

Finally, after 10 years, Iran will be free of the restrictions on enrichment and could become a nuclear threshold State—legally, under international law—only postponing the inevitable nuclearization of Iran.

So with these facts established, I am left with what appears to me to be the undeniable answers to my questions: The United States and our Middle Eastern allies are absolutely not safer today than we were 1 year ago, and we will all be left unquestionably less safe when this agreement ends in 10 years. I, therefore, oppose this deal. It is an agreement that will reward a violent terrorist regime. Instead of stopping the Iranians from ever obtaining a nuclear weapon, it merely delays it. This deal is shortsighted and dangerous for our security.

Just a few days ago I was talking with my 8-year-old grandson. He asked me what I was working on in the Senate. I told him about the President's proposed deal with Iran. I told him what we were giving them. I told him about the money, the lifting of the sanctions, the access to weapons and, soon, the ability to make a very bad bomb. After all of this, he looked at me and he simply asked: "What do we get out of it?" If this third grader can see how bad this deal is, so should we.

In conclusion, I urge my fellow Senators to vote not only to allow us to debate this issue but to vote in opposition to the President's deal with Iran. It is truly wrong for the United States and for the world. If my grandson understood that we truly are getting a bad deal—one that we should reject—most certainly we should understand as well.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKEER. Madam President, I am moved by the comments of my friend. He told me the story regarding the discussion with his 8-year-old grandson.

I wish to reiterate that had the President and those he designated to negotiate done what they said they were going to do—and that was to end Iran's nuclear program, something we all celebrated—and if the good Senator could say to his grandson that is what we got out of the deal, what we would have here today is unanimous support of approval.

This body was so involved in bringing Iran to the table. It is unbelievable the way—in these days and times, since 2010, four times the Senate has voted almost unanimously to put sanctions in place to bring Iran to the table. It is also hard to believe the administration took the one issue that has caused us to almost have unanimity which, let's face it, is rare in these times—the one issue where we have had almost unanimity is to bring it to the table by passing sanctions and then give us a right to weigh in. They were trying to go around Congress by going directly to the U.N. Security Council. But what they did on an issue that the American people are solidly behind—and that is Iran not having nuclear weapons—what they did was squander—squander—the one opportunity for this body to act in unison; that is, to approve what they have done.

As the Senator just mentioned, what they have agreed to—what the partisan minority Senators on the other side of the aisle will not even allow us to vote on—vote our disapproval where a bipartisan majority disapproves—what they have agreed to, literally, is, with U.S. approval, Iran can industrialize their nuclear program, can develop long-range missiles, can be involved in research and development, which makes the IR-1 centrifuges, where all the focus has been, look like antiques compared to what they are going to be—what they are developing right now, and we are allowing them to do that. Again, this is in a country that has no need for a nuclear program—none.

I mean, there is no practical need for the pain they have put their citizens through for the past several years under these crushing sanctions that brought them to the table that we put in place—no reason for that. They want to be a threshold nuclear country, and our government—our officials—has agreed to that. They have agreed to that at a time when we have no Middle East policy—none. We are watching on television refugees from countries that are the result of the fact that we have no Middle East policy. In that vacuum, this Nation—this administration, without this being disapproved and sent back—this Nation is going to agree to

the industrialization of the No. 1 state sponsor of terror, which is propping up the regime that is causing all of these refugees to be flooding into Europe and other places.

With that, I see Senator CASSIDY of Louisiana who has been such a stalwart on national security issues, and I will yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. I thank the chairman of the committee.

Madam President, the challenge in speaking after so many others have on this agreement is that almost every angle has been addressed. But the advantage is that I have been able to learn what others have to say and perhaps introduce new ideas.

I am actually struck that Democrats and Republicans agree. We all agree that the Iranian agreement is flawed, that it does not achieve the objectives originally defined by President Obama, and everyone is worried that the Iranians will use a portion of the \$50 to \$100 billion they receive as a result of this agreement to advance the cause of terrorism.

What we do not agree on is whether or not the administration could have and can get a better deal. Ironically, Republicans have more faith in the President than the President's fellow Democrats do. Republicans think that if Barack Obama and John Kerry called them back up—showed leadership among our allies—that we can do better and Democrats think not. I continue to have more faith in the President and Secretary Kerry than my Democratic colleagues because typically the stronger party in a negotiation gets the better deal. It seems as if the United States and our allies were the stronger parties.

Iran's economy is in terrible shape. The regime's survival is threatened by dissatisfaction with 25 years of a corrupt bureaucratic autocracy, with economic mismanagement. Iran needs to get \$130 per barrel of oil to meet the government's obligations, and oil is far below that. Iran's trading partners are limited, and aside from this, the Iranian people want freedom. There is discontent with the regime.

But far from the stronger party prevailing, this agreement concedes on the very goals that it sought to achieve. We pursued this agreement with the intention of ridding Iran of its nuclear program. Instead we have agreed to lift sanctions that have crippled Iran's economy and give immediate access to \$60 billion, essentially bailing out a struggling regime. It is fair to ask: In return for what?

According to the President and my colleagues who support this deal, we get the opportunity not to go to war, and all Iran had to do was simply agree to continue developing and running their nuclear program in a peaceful

manner. But to quote Leon Wieseltier, a Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institute:

This agreement was designed to prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons. If it does not prevent Iran from acquiring nuclear weapons—and it seems uncontroversial to suggest that it does not guarantee such an outcome—then it does not solve the problem that it was designed to solve. And if it does not solve the problem that it was designed to solve, then it is itself not an alternative, is it? The status is still quo.

How can it be the claim that this Iranian agreement protects the American people from the dangers of war when we are also told that the United States must provide more military support to our allies in the region because of this deal increasing the likelihood of war?

Secretary Kerry acknowledged in a September 2 letter that, indeed, war is more likely: “Iran’s continued support for terrorist and proxy groups throughout the region, its propping up of the Assad regime in Syria, its efforts to undermine the stability of its regional neighbors, and the threat it poses to Israel” are real concerns. He goes on to say, “We have no illusion that this behavior will change following the implementation of the JCPOA.”

Why are we willingly, I ask, legitimizing a nuclear program of a country that we feel this way about or, worse yet, why are we willingly agreeing to lift sanctions, which gives Iran billions of dollars and an improved economy and therefore the extra resources with which they can buy and distribute conventional weapons, which Iran can now buy legally? Regarding the purpose of the conventional weapons, in the final hours of negotiations, the lifting of the embargo against the sale of conventional weapons and missiles was added to this deal. In just 5 years we lift the embargo against conventional weapons, and in 8 years we lift the embargo against ballistic missiles. Secretary Kerry has declared that this provision is a win. The terrible thing about this deal is that it is full of wins such as this. Iran’s interest is advanced, and the rest of the world is less safe.

This does not add up. We have the administration claiming that the regime is weak underneath our sanctions—and for that reason Rouhani was able to persuade Khamenei to come to the table for negotiations—yet stating that Iran’s opposition to lifting the arms embargo was too strong to resist. The country cannot be too strong and too weak at the same time.

Furthermore, knowing that the Iranians have cheated on numerous previous nuclear agreements, why don’t we have a stronger mechanism with which to punish them should they cheat? All this deal puts in place is the snapback. The hope is that reimposing sanctions on Iran will once more cripple their economy. The same sanctions that have been implemented over many years are expected to somehow imme-

diately return to full strength. What is to say that countries such as Russia or China, which were initially reluctant to impose the sanctions on Iran, would agree to snap back should Iran cheat? Especially considering how much stronger Iran will be once their economy is given the chance to rebound, it seems more likely that these countries believe the economic advantages of lifting sanctions on Iran far outweigh the implications of a nuclear Iran.

It has been stated one way or another by others, but I will discuss something that has not been discussed in relation to the Iranian agreement but which I am surprised is not of greater concern to Democrats. In its environmental impact statement issued in February 2014, the State Department estimated that the Keystone XL Pipeline, which would ultimately carry 830,000 barrels of oil daily, could increase emissions of heat-trapping greenhouse gases by 1.3 to 27.4 million metric tons annually. Based on these calculations, President Obama has denied Americans a chance to expand our energy independence and to in turn create 40,000 direct jobs and many more indirect. If this deal goes through—the Iranian deal—the Iranian oil minister stated that Iran could send 500,000 barrels of oil per day to the market immediately upon easing the sanctions and up to 1 million barrels of oil per day within 6 months. According to an estimate by a DC think tank, if Iran increases their oil production by this much, it will release 156 million more metric tons of carbon dioxide per day. Wait a second. If we build the Keystone XL Pipeline, we may have 1.3 million metric tons. We can’t do that because of greenhouse gases. But the Iranian agreement, which the President said has to occur, will increase greenhouse gas emissions by as much as 156 million metric tons—over 100 times more.

If climate change is the greatest threat to the United States, even greater than a nuclear Iran, it seems as though the President has said he is willing to accept that danger in order to give the Iranians this deal.

Well, I return to where I started. I ask my Democratic Senate colleagues not to have such low expectations of the President and to demand a better deal for the American people. I stand by the assertion that the alternative to this bad deal is not war, but a better deal.

I am confident that our Nation can stand from a position of power and negotiate the deal we set out to achieve.

Thank you, Madam President.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RISCH. Madam President, I am here to make a few remarks about the proposed agreement between the United States—our participation in the agreement with the Government of Iran. I am going to speak briefly because we have been through this. I just want to underscore a few points that are very important to me as to why I am going to be voting the way I am voting.

I think, first of all, one of the things you always want to do when you are entering into an agreement is weigh whom it is you are making an agreement with. I always told clients when I was practicing law that more important than the words on the paper were the people whose signatures appeared at the bottom. I think, in this particular instance, we could not have a worse situation than what we have.

The Iranians have shown us what they are made of for decades. We all know what they are made of. This is not going to be a good time as we go forward. Generally, when people make an agreement, and people make agreements every day, they agree on an objective and then both cooperate as they move forward toward that objective. That is not going to happen here. We have seen before the Iranians operate under similar circumstances. They cheat, to begin with, on a regular basis. But just as importantly, they will stiff-arm, they will drag their feet, they will misinterpret, they will challenge, they will do everything possible to avoid meeting the objective of the agreement.

How did all of this start? You remember when this whole thing started, everyone was cheering about what a wonderful thing this is, and we are going to go forward with this, but we do not trust them, and no agreement is better than a bad agreement. Well, what has happened since then? There is not anybody saying this is a good agreement. This is a bad agreement. So why did we not stick with the proposition that no agreement was better than a bad agreement? Now the mantra that people are talking about is, well, it is not perfect.

I would urge that with what we are dealing, the people we are dealing with, and because of the consequences for America, for the world, for the Middle East, it needs to be perfect, and it is nowhere near perfect. I want to underscore a couple things in that regard.

The other thing we started out with was that the President promised us that we are going to have inspections anytime, anyplace. Nothing could be further from the truth now that this agreement has been put on the table. This is not an anytime, anyplace agreement. Indeed, the procedures—if you wade through the difficult and complex procedures for how you get to an inspection when there is suspicion or

even when there is not suspicion, if you are just doing it to check, it is going to be very difficult to do that. In addition to that, there are places in Iran that are off limits. No American will ever set foot in there. No IAEA inspector will ever set foot in there.

So why anyone would make this kind of agreement is beyond me. I am talking about Parchin. Parchin is a place where they have done the kind of work in the past that we want to stop. Indeed, by getting in there, by going through it, by inspecting it and doing an analysis, we would be able to tell what they did so we could expect what they would do in the future—and they will. In addition to that, the most likely place in Iran for bad things to happen is at Parchin. No one can get in Parchin. Why would the Iranians insist on a provision in this agreement that no one can get into Parchin? There is only one reason: They intend to cheat and they intend to do it at Parchin. They have gotten away with a lot of things at Parchin in the past, so they want to protect it.

All of these things argue for no agreement being better than a bad agreement, which this is.

Let me talk about a couple of the things. There has been a lot of time spent on them, but this situation regarding the money is just—I don't understand how people can talk about signing on to this agreement, when you are talking about what is going to happen with the money that is going to be freed up for Iran. There is \$150 billion that is going to be freed up. Now, you will get people who say: Well, it is not that much because they owe this. It is dedicated here, what have you. So let's just take the 50 billion that everybody believes—I think they say 54 billion, but let's take \$50 billion—\$50 billion. In Iran this is not small change. Here in the United States, obviously, it would be a much smaller amount. But the statistics, when you compare what \$50 billion means to the regime in Iran, it is very substantial.

What does Iran do with its money when it gets money? Since the sanctions have been on, their economy has been ratcheting down and down. Life has become much more difficult there from an economic standpoint. The government has very little money to operate. But every country has national priorities. Every single country on the face of this Earth has national priorities. The only way can you judge it is how they have spent their money in the past. During this period of time, while they were in very difficult financial straits, they had the ability to fund and to finance the worst enemies America has, the worst enemies the world has—terrorists. They have funded Hamas, they have funded the Houthis, they have funded Hezbollah, and others. Every problem we have in the world with terrorism has Iran's fingerprints on it.

They have been able to fund that even when they were in difficult financial straits. What do you think is going to happen when they get this windfall of \$50 billion? Those organizations are going to become flush with cash. They are going to be able to do things they have not been able to do in the past. If you go to the hospitals here in America where our veterans are lying with missing limbs—arms and legs—almost all of them, almost all of them were caused by a device that Iran either made or financed. That is where this money is going to go. How can you go to bed at night saying, well, yes, I agreed to this because it is going to be a wonderful thing for the world, when you have actually put money in the hands of these terrorists who are going to hurt America's best who go out into the field? It boggles my mind. When you are sitting at the negotiating table, why did someone not say: Hey, if we catch any of this money going to terrorists, all bets are off, and we are going to pull back everything.

It is not just the \$50 billion. More important than that is Iran will now have a continuous cashflow because they are going to be able to sell their oil, and they are going to be able to generate substantial amounts of money. So it is not just the \$50 billion. This money thing is a real problem. It absolutely boggles my mind that—I don't know how anybody who supports this is going to look these Americans in the eye who are hurt by these devices that are made and that are financed by Iran. It is going to go on. It is going to continue. This money is going to be used for that. That alone, to me, is sufficient reason not to vote for this. It should be sent back, saying: Look, we need a specific agreement that this money is going to be used for domestic purposes for you to help the people of Iran—the people who want to do good things—and not sent off to foreign terrorists who are going to use that money to kill Americans and to kill other people.

I wish to talk for a second about the secret agreements that are incorporated into this. Who—who—would sign a contract or an agreement where you incorporated two agreements made by two third parties, you don't know what is in them—you will never know what is in them unless things go south and go south badly—but you will have agreed to that. Whatever happens as a result of these secret agreements—whatever happens as a result of these secret agreements—we are going to have to abide by it because we will have entered into this.

Nobody enters into a contract to buy a bicycle where they have secret agreements. You wouldn't buy a consumer product for your home if at the bottom line it said: By the way, there are two agreements between so and so and so and so. Neither of them is a part of

this, but by buying this and signing this contract, you are agreeing to whatever is in there.

I don't understand that. No American has seen it. We get fairly good information in the Intelligence Committee, and we have had closed hearings on this. We have dragged in everybody. The closest I have come to is Wendy Sherman. She was the No. 2 negotiator behind John Kerry. John Kerry has not seen these agreements—and everybody tells you what is in these agreements. I cross-examined them:

How do you know what is in these agreements?

Well, that is what we were told.

Well, how do you know it if you haven't seen it?

Well, the Iranians tell us what is in there, and the IAEA tells us what is in there. So we are willing to accept that.

But no American has seen it. Wendy Sherman admitted she was in a room with a number of people when the agreements were there, and they were being waved around, but she did not read those agreements. She cannot tell us what is in those agreements. She tried to tell us what is in those agreements. Others tried to tell us what is in those agreements, but nobody knows because they will not let us see what is in those agreements.

Why is that? Do you think there are things in those agreements that show this is a good deal?

They are hiding stuff. There are bad things in there for America. Yet people are willing to sign on to this and to endorse, to adopt, and to ratify two secret agreements that no American has ever seen or can vouch for what is in those two secret agreements.

One of the things that is included in there that they have admitted is how Parchin gets inspected or, rather, isn't inspected. If they are willing to admit that in those secret agreements there is a provision that says Parchin will never be inspected, can you imagine what the rest of the matters are that are in those agreements? It is outrageous for someone to adopt, on behalf of the American people, provisions that they don't know what they are.

Let me just say that I come back to where I started; that is, we need to have a full appreciation of whom we are dealing with. While this is going on, while the Senate is debating this, and while the American Congress is debating this, the leaders of Iran proudly stand, beat their chests, and say: We promise you that Israel will not exist in 25 years.

I don't believe much of what they say, but what I do believe is, because of the way they have acted, because of their history, that they will do everything they possibly can to make that promise come true.

This is whom we are dealing with. They are going to try to eliminate our closest ally in the world over the next

25 years. This is whom we are dealing with. And we are willing to get in bed with these people and throw Israel under the bus? It is fantastic. It just does not make sense, but that is whom we are dealing with. They are promising, while all this is going on, that they will see that Israel does not exist in 25 years.

Well, it has been all over the media that the people who were supporting this are looking for a legacy. I promise you that the people who support this are going to get a legacy, but it is not going to be the legacy they want. When this thing goes south, the media and every American is going to be looking for the people who did this, who supported it, and who ratified it through this Congress.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am back to the floor a second time to speak very briefly in favor of the nuclear agreement with Iran. I don't clearly understand why we are here again.

When I was sworn into the House, I remember that one of the things people told me was a phrase that said that politics stops at the water's edge. The idea was we reserve our deep political, partisan disagreements for domestic issues, and we don't hesitate to disagree—often vociferously—with each other on issues of national security that regard our relations with other countries, but we do that based on policy grounds. We don't do that in order to try to score political advantage with one another, because when you are playing pure politics with international relations, you are really playing with the security of this country.

There is absolutely no reason to have this vote today other than a desire on behalf of the majority party in the Senate to try to gain some perceived political advantage over the minority party or over the President.

We know exactly what is going to happen. There aren't the votes for this resolution of disapproval to proceed past the Senate. There weren't the votes last week. There will not be the votes this week. We know this agreement is going to go into effect and we, frankly, have a lot of work to do. We have a lot of work to do to keep the government open and operating. We have a lot of work to do to implement this agreement. I will mention in a few moments that we have a lot more work to do in the Middle East to try to secure those who are running from terror and violence.

This is a waste of our time tonight. This is just about politics. This is just about trying to gain political advantage over an issue that is fundamental to the security of this country and to our allies.

I continue to support this agreement for a very simple reason. I just think it is the best way, taking a look at the options in front of us, to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. I know there are others who are hopeful—by the moderates achieving a victory within Iran's political power structure—that there will be a willingness to try to come to the table and figure out some other very meddlesome issues in the region, but that is not why I support this.

I support this because I believe we have negotiated an agreement that is going to make it much less likely for Iran to get a nuclear weapon than if we were to reject the agreement. We are dramatically reducing the number of centrifuges; the quality of the enriched material will be greatly reduced from 20 percent down to 3 percent; we essentially eliminate their stockpiles, reducing their stockpile materials by about 97 percent; we get intrusive, unprecedented inspections on the entirety of the supply chain, so if they try to cheat—and they may try to cheat—we will have a much better chance of catching it with inspectors on the ground than if we rejected this agreement and had no inspectors on the ground.

Then, importantly—and I think especially for many of my more hawkish Republican friends—we preserve the military option and make it much more effective and credible under this agreement. It is much more effective because we are going to have eyes on the program and on the supply chain so that if we did catch Iran cheating with those inspections, we would have more information than we would if we didn't have any inspectors on the ground. It is more credible because we will do it in the context of an international agreement, meaning that if we do have to strike militarily, we will have our partners, our international partners, by our side—which we frankly would not have if they all asked us to sign this agreement to try to put us on a diplomatic path to divorce Iran from a nuclear weapon—we alone refused and then asked them for help in a military endeavor, they wouldn't go with us and, thus, we would be on our own. We have just the last 10 years to see what unilateral, U.S. military action in the Middle East looks like. We are better off when we have partners.

But this has always been a choice between one set of consequences flowing from the adoption of the agreement versus a set of consequences flowing from the rejection of the agreement. I have heard very little realistic talk from the opponents of this deal about what their conception of a realistic alternative would be because most serious foreign policy thinkers are of one mind when it comes to what will happen if Congress were to reject this deal—and we are not going to. We knew that last week.

But what we know is that Iran's nuclear program would start back up. I don't think they would rush to a bomb—very few people do—but they would start their nuclear program back up, have more centrifuges spinning, and more stockpiled material piling up.

The inspectors would get kicked out. I don't think there is any way they would allow for inspectors to remain in the country if it wasn't in the context of a deal. The sanctions would probably fray at first because the Russians and Chinese would not walk away, but they would—over time—fall apart. The military option, as I mentioned, would get harder because we wouldn't have as much knowledge of their program, and we would have to go it alone with Israel, potentially, but probably not with our international partners who would feel badly burned by this rejection.

Finally, U.S. credibility as an honest, diplomatic, negotiating partner would be greatly damaged if—with the unanimous support of the Security Council, the unanimous support of the P5+1—the Senate and Congress decided to walk away from this deal.

This idea that there is a magical, better deal on the table is just fiction, plain and simple. There is no way to go back to the negotiating table if Congress were to reject this deal. The Iranians will not come back to the negotiating table. Our P5+1 partners have told us to our face that they will not come back to the table. So you are left, at that point, with an isolated Iran with a nuclear program restarting, with sanctions fraying, and with U.S. credibility damaged. I have no idea how that makes this country or that makes our allies in the Middle East any safer.

I have listened to all of the arguments against it, and I listened to Senator RISCH—who is a good friend—just make his secret agreement argument again. But it is amazing to me, having had so much attention over this AP article a few weeks ago on this supposed secret agreement between the IAEA and Iran, that there has been not even a whisper from opponents about the article this week correcting the AP story talking about how, in fact, the IAEA—according to this report—is going to have direct access to Parchin and is going to be able to take samples under the agreement they have with Iran.

There is a lot of talk about the first article, but the second article that corrects the record, nary a whisper from folks who oppose this deal. The reality is that this secret agreement you talk about, this agreement between the IAEA and Iran as to how they inspect Iran's nuclear program is nothing new because the IAEA has this with every single country they inspect. It is the foundation of the IAEA's inspection regime, the idea that they could only

have credibility—they can only have credibility if they don't disclose the secrets of the countries that participate in the program. The IAEA could not function if it weren't for these agreements.

Now, we all sat in a room and were briefed on this agreement, so there is not a single Senator who cannot say they don't know what is in this agreement. There is not a single Senator who could say the AP story was correct. There is not a single Senator, if they were sitting in those briefings, who can say they were surprised by what we heard this week. The argument, especially after reporting that we have seen this week, just doesn't wash any longer.

But as I said at the outset, the imperative to move beyond this argument is not just because we shouldn't be playing politics with an issue of this import but also because we have to come together on other issues that are vital to the stability of the region.

SYRIAN REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. President, I just came back from a Syrian refugee camp with Senator PETERS: 80,000 people living in this camp with 250 of them getting on a bus every day and going back to Syria. Why? Because they have been sitting in this camp in abysmal, unconscionable conditions, for 2 years, 3 years, 4 years, and they have no hope, no hope of ever getting out. So they are going back to Syria. They are taking their kids and almost accepting the potential for death because the conditions in these camps gets worse and worse and their hope just atrophies away. Those who aren't just going back to live in Syria, as we know, are pouring into Europe by the tens of thousands.

When we were in the region, our partners in the Middle East told us two things. Our Arab partners in the Middle East said: Get this agreement done. It is vital to the security of the region. To a person, every single individual we met with in Qatar, in UAE, in Iraq, and Jordan said: Get this deal done.

Second, they said: Step up to the plate and do more when it comes to solving this humanitarian disaster. Take refugees—like we are—in Jordan, Iraq, and Turkey. Make sure that the World Food Programme doesn't run out of money, as it is about to. Think about that, 1 million refugees in Jordan are about to lose their food benefits because the United States and some of our partners refuse to put up money to continue to operate the program. And guess what. When they do not get funding from the World Food Programme, they go to see who else is offering them sustenance, and often it is the extremist groups we are trying to fight. When you stop funding the World Food Programme, you push thousands of individuals into the very arms of the groups we are attempting to take out, degrade, and destroy in

the region. It is unconscionable that we are not feeding people in the Middle East who have fled violence, but it is terrible national security strategy to push them into the arms of the extremists.

What we should be debating today is an emergency appropriations bill to allow for refugees to come to this country, as has been in the best traditions of America, and to fund humanitarian assistance so that people don't starve and die or get pushed back into Syria to be killed by Assad and others. But instead we are having another vote—another vote—on the Iran nuclear agreement when we know the outcome is predestined.

We have some really important stuff to talk about here, and we need to move on from this debate so we can start to build on the credibility we have already grown by virtue of negotiating this agreement in the region.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MURPHY. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to ask the Senator from Connecticut a question through the Chair.

First, let me thank the Senator for raising this issue. I have said—and I think my colleague may share the feeling—that this may be the greatest humanitarian crisis of our time, and other generations will ask us: What did you do in the midst of the Syrian humanitarian crisis?

I met with four Syrian families in Chicago who are now refugees. They made it, and they have these horrible stories of what they went through. But when we look back at the past and what we have done in America for Cuban refugees, and I believe at least one of our colleagues here was a Cuban refugee—his family was when they came to this country; refugees from the Soviet Union, Jewish people suffering from persecution and wanting to escape; refugees from Somalia; the Hmong people from Vietnam; and Bosnians who made it to the United States, it seems to me that in the sweep of modern history—since World War II, I would add quickly—that we have really established ourselves as caring for refugees, not only feeding them but accepting them, after careful vetting, in the United States.

So I ask the Senator from Connecticut, when we hear what is happening in Europe, is he struck by the fact there are some countries opening their arms in extraordinary ways and others, sadly, going in the opposite direction with these refugees? I am sure the Senator has been struck by that as well.

Mr. MURPHY. I say to Senator DURBIN, I come from Connecticut, one of the Thirteen Original Colonies. We are proud of our role as part of the foundation, the fabric of America, and our

State's motto is "He who transplants sustains." This Nation's existence is predicated on people coming here fleeing persecution, sometimes violence, and finding a home. It represents the best of America's traditions. Some 190,000 Vietnamese came here, and 180,000 from the Balkan countries came here just a decade ago.

The Senator is right—this isn't easy because we have to go through a substantial vetting process to make sure we are not bringing anyone here who even sniffs of potential violence or connection to terrorist groups. I was sitting in those Syrian refugee camps 2 weeks ago, and I was looking at 8-year-old kids digging ditches through the sand so the feces running out of their house has a place to go. Those little kids aren't terrorists.

We can figure this out. We are going to need some additional resources to do it. I thank the Senator for taking such a lead in the caucus, and I am hopeful we will be able to move on to that debate in the Foreign Relations Committee and in the Appropriations Committee after today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I notice a discussion taking place. I wish to speak for approximately 10 minutes prior to the vote, assuming that is acceptable to the minority.

Mr. DURBIN. I would advise the Senator from Tennessee that all time remaining is on our side of the aisle, but I would yield half of it—5 of the next 10 minutes—to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. I thank the Senator very much. I will be very brief. I made these points earlier today, but I would just like to remind people as to why we are having this vote this evening.

Almost unanimously, on four different occasions since 2010, Congress passed sanctions. Both sides of the aisle strongly supported sanctions being imposed upon Iran to bring them to the negotiating table. That was something which was very strongly bipartisan.

When it came time to bring them to the table and begin negotiations, the President declared the goal was to end their nuclear program, and they began negotiations. And by the way, we celebrated that goal. I think there would be unanimous support for the agreement had that goal been achieved. But the President then declared that instead of bringing this as a treaty, which typically would be the case for an international agreement, or bringing it as a congressional-executive agreement, he was going to call this an executive agreement so that only he would be involved in it.

That being known to this body, again in a very strong, bipartisan way—98 to

1—we voted for the first time since I have been here to take power away from the President and to keep him from invoking the national security waivers he had with the sanctions and to say: No, we want 60 days to go through this deal and we want the right to approve or disapprove and to vote our conscience.

Let me say one more time that had the President achieved his goal, we would have unanimous support here supporting the deal itself. We would all be supportive of ending their program. But the administration squandered that opportunity and instead has agreed to the industrialization of their program, their development of intercontinental ballistic missiles, their development of even faster centrifuges to ensure they are a nuclear threshold state.

What the public may not understand is taking place here now—we have had a debate. We had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee. We have had all kinds of Senators debating. As a matter of fact, Senators know more about the Iran deal than probably any international agreement in modern history. It has been studied and debated.

So the minority, 42 Senators—I might say a partisan minority because they are all Democrats—a bipartisan 58 Senators—the 2 Senators who know more about foreign policy issues than any other Senators on the Democratic side oppose this deal. And now, in keeping with the Iran review act, the majority, a bipartisan majority, is wishing to have the opportunity to vote on the substance of the deal.

What is happening is my friend the minority leader, who is here, began saying in August that he wanted to filibuster this, and my understanding is the administration has supported that. So what we have now is a partisan minority of people who are keeping the spirit of the Iran review act from coming into play by blocking our ability to actually vote up or down. That is what is happening. I want to make sure the American people understand that. I know Members of this body understand that.

I want to close with this. Our majority leader, on every occasion where there has been an opportunity for this to devolve into something that was partisan and there was concern on the other side of the aisle about certain things that were occurring, at every point, the majority leader has acquiesced and agreed for things to progress in a way that the minority would feel that this was not a partisan effort.

I wish to also point out that the majority leader, when we brought this resolution of disapproval to the floor, filled the tree. He filled the tree. My friends on the other side of the aisle did not want a bunch of amendments; they wanted only to vote on a resolu-

tion of approval or disapproval. In this case, since there is a bipartisan majority in support of disapproval, that is what we are hoping to vote on. But, unfortunately, what is happening again, it appears tonight based on the spirit, although I hope something changes—just last week, 42 Senators blocked the ability of the Senate to end debate and actually vote on the substance of the deal. I hope that changes. I hope tonight at least two Senators on the other side of the aisle will give us the ability to express ourselves on the substance of the deal and not block a bipartisan majority of Members who want to express themselves through a vote of disapproval.

I yield the floor, and I thank the Senator for the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee is my friend. I respect him. I have said so on the floor and have said so privately among my colleagues. For the record, I want to make it clear, though, that Senator REID and the Democrats said there will be no cloture necessary on the motion to proceed, no motion to proceed vote necessary last week on the floor to go to this measure. We had an opportunity to obstruct, to block, whatever you want to say, and we did not do it because we believed that what we had heard repeatedly—that this would be a 60-vote final passage—would ultimately be the standard. There is nothing in the statute that brings us to this measure that in any way eliminates the 60-vote requirement. It is just not there. There is nothing that does that.

When my colleague's side discovered they did not have 60 votes, which was the beginning of last week, they changed the standard and said: We want a majority vote, and anything less than that is a filibuster. So that was a Republican decision based on the fact that now 42 Democratic Senators see this issue differently.

I would just say this: We have had 8 weeks on this issue, and we should have taken 8 weeks on this issue. It is that important. And every Senator should stand up and say where they stand on this issue, and every Senator has stood up and announced where they stand on this issue. This has not been glossed over. We have not made light of it. People aren't trying to find some sneaky way to avoid responsibility. Each person is on the record. You know where I stand, I know where you stand, and that goes for every one of our colleagues.

So what are we doing tonight? Why are we going through a replay of what we did last week, and now with the threat of amendments? Now we are going to have a run of amendments. They won't be on the Iran agreement per se, on the adoption of the agreement, which was the underlying stat-

ute. They could be on something else. We are just discovering what they could be.

To say we haven't taken the time and dealt with this in a bipartisan way, dealt with it in a serious way, allowed open debate—we have done it, and we have cooperated in doing it. My colleague doesn't like the result. I happen to believe it is a result that really reflects where we should be as a nation.

I support the President. I believe we ought to have two goals here: Stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon and stop America from going to another war in the Middle East. That is what I want achieved, and I think we can achieve it through this agreement. But it is subject to inspection, it is subject to reports, and if the Iranians decide they want to breach this agreement, then we start back on the sanctions. We are back where we started from.

I would say to the Senator from Tennessee, having, as he has, faced these conscience votes on the floor about war and about the deaths associated with them, I conclude: First try diplomacy. If diplomacy does not work, then you have to pursue whatever is necessary for national security. But I believe we have said—42 out of 46 Democratic Senators—we support diplomacy first.

To argue that this is somehow partisan because four Senators see it differently—I think there may be some partisanship in the fact that not a single Republican Member of the House or Senate supports the President's position—not one. I think there may be some partisanship in the fact that 47 Republican Senators, on March 9, 2015, sent a letter to the Ayatollah in Iran and said, basically, stop negotiating with the United States of America. There is no point in it. That has never ever, ever happened in diplomatic history—that 47 Republican Senators would prejudge a matter under negotiation with the President of the United States. But they did. So the fact that all 47 voted against this agreement is no surprise. They announced in March they were against the agreement no matter what it said. I think that is the reality of what we face today.

I don't know why we are going to keep repeating these votes over and over. There are a lot of things we should take up. We have nine legislative days left until this fiscal year ends and we end up closing down the government. I think it is time for us to move on to important issues that should command the attention of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I am going to proceed under my leader time.

I want to start by congratulating the chairman of the Foreign Relations

Committee for an incredible job in giving the Senate an opportunity to actually express itself on what the President has described as an executive agreement.

It is an executive agreement. I think it is important for everybody to understand that the next President of the United States is going to take a new look at this because it doesn't have the force of law of a treaty. But the President didn't want us to have anything to do with it at all. And the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CORKER, skillfully negotiated with the other side to give us an opportunity, as elected representatives of the American people, to actually express our views on his unilateral action with the Iranian Government. We proceeded, as the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, in a manner that respected the process and gave the Senate an opportunity to vote on that deal only, even though technically it was open for amendment. Yet we have been denied the opportunity to get an up-or-down vote on the agreement on which the Corker-Cardin bill gave us an opportunity to express ourselves.

So I congratulate the Senator from Tennessee. It has been an extraordinary legislative performance. The Senator from Tennessee, as we all know, is someone who admires and respects and is willing to talk to the other side, and frequently good things come about as a result of it. But we are where we are.

This evening, Senate Democrats will have one more opportunity to do the right thing and end their blockade of a vote on the President's deal with Iran. We know that a strong, bipartisan majority of the Senate would vote to reject it. But Democratic leaders are determined to do anything they can to prevent that vote from happening because Democrats know the deal is indefensible—indeffensible—on the merits.

The President's Iran deal would allow the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism to retain thousands of centrifuges, to enrich uranium, to conduct their research and development programs for advanced centrifuges, and to reap a multibillion-dollar cash windfall which would help it fund terrorist groups like Hezbollah.

Here is what the Iranian Defense Minister said just last week:

I officially declare that under no circumstances will we refrain from providing material and moral support to Hezbollah, or to any other group of the resistance to the U.S. and Israel. We say this loud and clear.

That is the Iranian Defense Minister.

The assault on Israel and the assault on the United States continues unabated. In other words, President Obama's Iran deal would likely entrench Iran's nuclear capabilities, essentially help subsidize terrorism, and threaten Israel—for what? For what? It is not as if the Iranian regime is about

to change its behavior. The Supreme Leader crows that change “will never happen” as he rails against the Great Satan—that is us—and promises Israel's demise. The scary thing about this is that he is serious. He really means it. The scarier thing is that the President's deal could empower his regime.

This is a gravely serious matter. The American people deserve to know where their respective Senators stand on the President's deal.

Democrats seem to think they can end the discussion by blocking an up-or-down vote, then turn around and pretend they care deeply about Israel and human rights. Well, if they vote again to deny the American people a final vote, they will have a chance to test the theory.

I will file an amendment that would prevent the President from lifting sanctions until Iran meets two simple benchmarks: It must formally recognize Israel's right to exist, and it must release the American citizens being held in Iranian custody.

Let me say that again. If cloture is not invoked, I will file an amendment that would prevent the President from lifting sanctions until Iran meets two simple benchmarks: It must formally recognize Israel's right to exist, and it must release American citizens being held in Iranian custody.

The President has so far resisted linking his deal—a deal that fails to end Iran's enrichment program, while leaving it as an American-recognized nuclear threshold state—to other aspects of Iran's conduct, but linkage is appropriate, and in this negotiation it would have been wise to have linkage.

Indeed, Senators say they understand the importance of standing up for an ally such as Israel in a dangerous region, and the Senate voted unanimously just a few months ago in calling for Iranian leaders to release these Americans.

Here is what one American prisoner—this is an American prisoner in Iran, one of ours—wrote earlier this year:

As a fellow American and combat veteran, I am writing to bring to your attention my situation and that of a long list of my fellow Americans. For nearly three and a half years, I have been falsely imprisoned and treated inhumanely. . . . While I am thankful that the State Department and the Obama administration has called for my release and that of my fellow Americans, there has been no serious response to this blatant and ongoing mistreatment. . . .

My strong preference is for our Democratic friends to simply allow an up-or-down vote on the President's Iran deal. I don't know what they are protecting him from. He is proud of this deal. As I suggested last week, he could have a ceremony down there while he vetoed the resolution of disapproval. He has convinced them to protect him from what he is bragging about. But if they are determined to

make that impossible, then at the very least we should be able to provide some protection to Israel and long-overdue relief to Americans who have languished in Iranian custody for years.

So let me just say this. Either way, this debate will continue. This is an issue with a very, very long shelf life. It will be before the American people for the next year and a half and will certainly be a factor in their determination of whom they want to lead our country as President in the next election.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is hard for me to comprehend how my Republican colleagues with a straight face can talk about “Let's have an up-or-down vote on this.” We agreed to allow Republicans to have an up-or-down vote. I asked consent on this floor on two separate occasions, and I make the same request now. We are willing to have a 60-vote threshold. That is an agreement we made, and we are happy to do it. But for my friends now to say “We want an up-or-down vote,” up-or-down votes on the magical number of 60 is what they created. We didn't draft this legislation. It was brought through committee to this floor. They thought they had—they, the Republicans, thought everything was fine until they realized they didn't have enough votes and suddenly they changed direction dramatically. Fifty votes wasn't good enough for trying to raise the minimum wage. Certainly a simple majority wasn't enough to do anything about the overwhelming debt that faces the American people. It is not credit cards, it is student debt. No, we couldn't debate that; we had to have 60 votes. Equal pay for men and women? No, we are not going to allow that to happen; what we want is to have 60 votes. That is the reason we had to file cloture more than 600 times, because the rule had been established by my Republican friend, the Republican leader, during the entire Obama administration that that is the rule.

Here is what he said—and I have read on this floor all the multitude of statements he has given saying it would be 60 votes: We are not interested in using floor time for get-well efforts. We only have so much time on the Senate floor. If this isn't a get-well issue, I don't know what would be. We had debate that took place over a long period of time with this issue. It was debated during the August recess, it was debated all last week on the floor, and the decision was made that the measures brought before this body did not get enough votes. It didn't get 60 votes. That is the threshold. We have agreed to have that vote, and suddenly the rules are suddenly attempting to be changed here, and they are not going to be changed.

It is a situation where I wonder if the Republican leader has bothered to look

at the calendar. We have 8 days now until we are at the end of the fiscal year—8 days. We have 32 Republicans who have written to the Speaker saying: We are not going to allow a bill to pass unless we get rid of Planned Parenthood—health care for women. We have had statements of people running for President over here who are saying there will be nothing done on paying the government's bills unless we do something about Planned Parenthood. Other people have made statements that they want riders dealing with EPA and on and on.

Now, it would be different—maybe we wouldn't be as concerned, except you did it once. You did it once. They closed the government for almost 3 weeks. Two years ago, the government was actually shut down for almost 3 weeks.

We have staring us in the face the debt ceiling, which is going to be upon us quickly. But, no, we are told that what we are going to deal with next after this: We are going to do something that everyone knows has no chance of passing, and that is something dealing with abortion. I guess they want to do that before the Pope gets here. But it is not going to change the Pope, how he feels about the fact that Republicans have ignored poor people in America. It is not going to change the Pope, how he feels about what is happening to our great world that we live in, that we know, dealing with climate change. Republicans have denied that climate change exists. So they can have a fake vote on abortion. It is not going to change how Pope Francis feels about what is happening, and it is all being directed towards the Republicans, and he doesn't need—everyone knows what the problems are.

So we can be threatened all we need to be threatened. The Republican leader has threatened us: We lost, and we are going to make you suffer. Just like we lost ObamaCare.

We had over 600 votes to get rid of that. We may have more than that to get rid of this agreement.

They have magnified this agreement. They have this agreement—oh, it is doing all kinds of things. The purpose of this agreement, everyone knows, is to stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon, and that is what it does. That is the sole purpose of this agreement. And it is an agreement that is so important. It is so important that we got Russia, we got China, and the others, our allies—Germany, France—to sign off on this, and Great Britain. To think, after all the years of negotiating this through all of our friends and allies, including the good work that has been done in this regarding Russia and China, to think that suddenly it is going to be back the way it was. Every one of these countries said: If you don't move forward on this agreement, we are through. Sanctions are gone.

So this is not an intelligent debate because my friend the Republican leader is trying to change the rules he developed. He created these rules. He created the 60-vote threshold. We tried to change that hundreds of times, but no.

Let's also remind everybody that we did not filibuster this bill. We let the Republicans go to this bill. We let them go to the bill. We let them go to the bill. There was no motion to proceed. And people watching may say: What is that? Well, what the Republicans did time and time again, even on measures they wanted passed, they would make us file a motion to proceed and have cloture on that. That ate up a week's period of time. In their mind, that was really tasty because it was good, because it stopped Obama from moving his program ahead. Anything to stall for time. Well, the 60-vote threshold was created by the Republicans. That is the rule of this body, and we are sticking by the rules of this body. It was created by the Republicans.

So we can be—I repeat—threatened all my friend the Republican leader wants to threaten us. Whatever he wants to do, he has a right to do that. We are not going to be stalling for time. If he wants to tear down a tree—remember the tree? Remember, Reid was the bad guy; he filled the tree. I can't number the times my friend the Republican leader has filled the tree—something he said would never happen. He said bills wouldn't come to this body unless there were hearings and they were reported out of committee. Of course, that is not true. Being majority leader is not as easy as giving speeches.

What is going on tonight is a charade by the Republicans to try to change the rules in the middle of the game. The Republicans have lost. They have lost this measure. We should move on to something else. It should be the budget. It shouldn't be abortion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I do want to clarify, the bill specifically states regular order. It is not the rule of the Senate that final votes are on 60 votes. They are on a majority vote. I don't want anybody in the Senate or certainly the public to think that somehow we have a rule that bills pass on 60 votes. That is not the case. That has been a tradition on major issues, but that is not the rule. The bill specifically states we will settle under regular order, which means when cloture is invoked—which hopefully will happen tonight—we will have a simple majority vote, up or down.

Mr. REID. Could I ask my friend a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORKER. If it is brief. I know people have a meeting to go to.

Mr. REID. Do you think this Iran issue is a major issue?

Mr. CORKER. It is a major issue.

Mr. REID. You answered your own question.

Mr. CORKER. I am hoping we are going to be able to vote our conscience on this major issue by getting cloture invoked.

I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call with respect to the cloture motions on amendment No. 2640 and H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Bob Corker, Steve Daines, David Perdue, Tom Cotton, Susan M. Collins, Deb Fischer, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, Ron Johnson, Cory Gardner, Marco Rubio, Lamar Alexander, James M. Inhofe, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2640, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 265 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Ernst	Murkowski
Ayotte	Fischer	Perdue
Barrasso	Flake	Portman
Blunt	Gardner	Risch
Boozman	Grassley	Roberts
Burr	Hatch	Rounds
Capito	Heller	Rubio
Cardin	Hoeven	Sasse
Cassidy	Inhofe	Schumer
Coats	Isakson	Scott
Cochran	Johnson	Sessions
Collins	Kirk	Shelby
Corker	Lankford	Sullivan
Cornyn	Lee	Thune
Cotton	Manchin	Tillis
Crapo	McCain	Toomey
Cruz	McConnell	Vitter
Daines	Menendez	Wicker
Enzi	Moran	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Blumenthal	Boxer
Bennet	Booker	Brown

Cantwell	Kaine	Reed
Carper	King	Reid
Casey	Klobuchar	Sanders
Coons	Leahy	Schatz
Donnelly	Markey	Shaheen
Durbin	McCaskill	Stabenow
Feinstein	Merkley	Tester
Franken	Mikulski	Udall
Gillibrand	Murphy	Warner
Heinrich	Murray	Warren
Heitkamp	Nelson	Whitehouse
Hirono	Peters	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Graham Paul

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the cloture motion with respect to H.J. Res. 61 be withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to commit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2643

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2643.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2641

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2641.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2656 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment that is at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2656 to amendment No. 2640.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran)

Strike line 3 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under subsection (a) shall not apply if the Islamic Republic of Iran—

(1) has released Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, Saeed Abedini, and Amir Hekmati to the custody of the United States; and

(2) formally recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

(d) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People’s Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2657 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2656

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2657 to amendment No. 2656.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

AMENDMENT NO. 2658

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2658 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.”

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2659 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2658

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2659 to amendment No. 2658.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “2” and insert “3”.

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2660

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit with instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit the joint resolution to the Foreign Relations Committee with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2660.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran)

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) **SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.**—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding.

(c) **EXCEPTION.**—The prohibitions under subsection (a) shall not apply if the Islamic Republic of Iran—

(1) has released Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, Saeed Abedini, and Amir Hekmati to the custody of the United States; and

(2) formally recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

(d) **JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.**—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People’s Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

This act shall take effect 4 days after the date of enactment.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2661

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2661 to the instructions of the motion to commit H.J. Res. 61.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

On page 3, line 22, strike “4” and insert “5”.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2662 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2661

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2662 to amendment No. 2661.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2656.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2656.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate

applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum calls under these cloture motions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING VERMONT'S SEVENTH GENERATION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to call the Senate’s attention today to yet another outstanding Vermont business: Seventh Generation. Seventh Generation unveiled its line of environmentally friendly consumer household products more than 25 years ago. Today it has expanded to become one of the dominant businesses in this continuously emerging market.

I have visited Seventh Generation many times, and I am consistently impressed with how the company continues to find new ways of expanding its business and offering Americans affordable and more sustainable alternatives to standard household products.

Since 2011, Seventh Generation has seen its business grow year after year and has unveiled some 100 new products in the last 4 years alone. President and CEO John Repogle has reinvigorated the company, further defining its purpose and leadership in the competitive marketplace.

Seventh Generation has long been a company that fosters the business principles and ideals that so many Vermonters value: to make products locally, to keep it sustainable, to leave no footprint, and make products accessible. From its Burlington offices that overlook the shores of Lake Champlain to the shelves of the retail giants now promoting its products, Seventh Generation is yet another Vermont company leading the way in corporate responsibility.

I ask unanimous consent that the August 27, 2015, article from the Burlington Free Press entitled “Seventh Generation: ‘Bursting at the seams’” be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington Free Press,
Aug. 27, 2015]

SEVENTH GENERATION: 'BURSTING AT THE SEAMS'

(By Dan D'Ambrosio)

Seventh Generation in Burlington has been on a tear since John Replogle took over as president and CEO in 2011. Sales are up more than 60 percent, from about \$150 million when Replogle arrived to about \$250 million projected for this year. Annual growth is in the "low double digits," says Replogle.

That's a lot of toilet tissue made from recycled paper and natural, cold-water laundry detergent, not to mention the dozens of other products in Seventh Generation's expanded line of "green" disinfectants, dishwashing and hand soaps, surface cleaners, diapers and baby wipes and feminine hygiene products. Seventh Generation has added about 100 new products under Replogle.

The company today dominates the market for natural cleaning products, according to Replogle, who says the other leaders in the industry are Method and Mrs. Meyers Clean Day.

"Adding our sales together we have a half-billion dollar business," said Replogle. "I would love to see the three brands grow to a billion dollars over the next few years."

In typical Reploglian fashion, Replogle declines to criticize his two closest competitors in any way, going so far as to refer to them as "frenemies." And he points out that the three brands together have less than a 5 percent share in any category they sell in, leaving a long way to go before they begin to threaten the Procter & Gambles of the world.

"What they're trying to do is very much in the spirit of what we're trying to do," Replogle said. "Use fewer ingredients, be less toxic, be more sustainable in manufacturing and packaging. So there's a lot of commonality among our brands."

A REALLY SMART DUDE

Replogle, 49, is the former president of Guinness in the United States and United Kingdom. From there he went to Unilever, where he ran the North American skin care business, with brands including Dove, Ponds, Caress and Lever 2000. Next, in 2006, Replogle took the helm at Burt's Bees, bringing the quirky natural skin care company to the masses.

"We launched at Target, CVS and Walgreen's," Replogle said. "We built a national brand. I put great people on the team, and gave them a lot of freedom. We set up core values and principles to run the company and we invested behind it, and it took off."

Which is a pretty good description of what Replogle has done at Seventh Generation. Alan Newman, founder of Magic Hat Brewing Co., launched the original Seventh Generation catalog business more than 25 years ago. Newman has been watching Replogle from his latest perch in the Maltex Building on Pine Street, where Newman is running a new craft beer company for The Boston Beer Co., a.k.a. Samuel Adams. Newman likes what he sees on the waterfront, where Seventh Generation is headquartered at Main Street Landing.

"John's a really smart dude who knows how to bring focus to an organization, who knows how to re-enthuse the mission," Newman said. "From what I can tell from the outside, he's a really good delegator and manager."

In Newman's estimation, Seventh Generation had largely lost sight of its mission four years ago when Replogle took over.

"I did not pay a lot of attention to Seventh Generation, but whenever I did they were scattered all over the place," Newman said. "They didn't seem to have any mission left." Sales were also flat, Replogle said.

"I just knew this company stood for something greater and that it needed leadership," Replogle said. "The company was at a crossroads. We were very nearly at the end of our rope frankly."

Replogle began drawing that rope in by putting a laser focus on what Seventh Generation stands for—natural, sustainable, environmentally sensitive cleaning products, the only segment of the retail category showing significant growth.

"We're really in tune with the consumer today," Replogle said. "The millennial consumer in particular, people trying to avoid chemicals, who are more conscious about not only what's in their product but also the practices of the company itself. More and more young consumers are understanding the company behind their product matters. We're winning with those consumers."

A PIONEER BRAND

As an example of a best manufacturing practice at Seventh Generation, Replogle points to the fact that the company contracts all of its manufacturing to about 22 factories across the nation. "You will always have the most sustainable footprint on a dispersed model," Replogle said. "If we can manufacture closer to the market, we'll do a lot better. A lot of companies have one large-scale manufacturing site. Then you have to ship everything in and ship the products out." Second, Replogle said, Seventh Generation continues to innovate.

"We've upgraded every product in our portfolio in the last four years," he said. "Every product has been improved in some material way. We never stop and we're innovating into new spaces. Plus, we've taken our brand from a few categories into several categories. We're not only in dish soap and laundry detergent, we're in hand wash, diapers and wipes and feminine care. We've gone across all the categories."

Target has taken notice. Spokeswoman Erica Julkowski said Seventh Generation is one of a "handful of vendors" the giant retailer works with closely to "ideate and develop products." "Seventh Generation is a pioneer brand in natural cleaning and has been a valued partner to Target by providing ongoing innovation and thought leadership," Julkowski said in an email. "Through Seventh Generation's deep understanding of the natural cleaning industry, they continue to provide expert knowledge on the market and insight into up-and-coming products that might resonate with the Target guest."

In Seventh Generation's soothing offices overlooking Lake Champlain—all earth tones and wood paneling with an open center staircase festooned with greenery and the company's principles emblazoned on dangling wooden signs—John Fitzgerald is working on a shelf layout for Target. The products are dish soaps and detergents.

In the computer-generated "plan-o-gram" on his big screen, Fitzgerald proposes a display layout of not only Seventh Generation's products, but also of Method's and Mrs. Meyer's offerings, as well as giants like Cascade and Finish. Finally, Fitzgerald proposes shelf positions for Target's own house brands, all based on data collected by a third party.

"Our goal is to be objective, to share the facts and give them a recommendation," Replogle said. "Our goal isn't to convince them our way is the right way."

Nevertheless, working so closely with Target is a pretty good relationship builder, Replogle adds.

BORN HERE, STAYING HERE

Seventh Generation is bursting at the seams at Main Street Landing, with most of its approximately 140 employees working in Burlington. Replogle plans on adding another 15 employees to the staff by the end of the year.

"We have maximized our space in here," he said. "Growth is a wonderful thing, but right now we're fully utilized in this building."

That doesn't mean, however, that Seventh Generation is going anywhere.

"Burlington is our long-term home," Replogle said. "We were born here, we're growing up here and will remain here. No question. We're committed to that."

Seventh Generation has a small office in Toronto, and a satellite office in Raleigh, North Carolina, where Replogle lived as CEO of Burt's Bees, and where his family still lives.

When he was recruited to run Seventh Generation, Replogle and his wife decided against uprooting their four children, so he has been commuting, returning to his home in Raleigh every other week.

A native of Boston and a graduate of Dartmouth and Harvard, Replogle feels he has the best of both worlds, maintaining his life in Raleigh and returning to New England for more than a visit. Replogle said it's going to feel even better when his daughter starts at Dartmouth as a freshman this fall.

"She'll be right down the road as well," he said.

Replogle expects to open an office in California soon, and earlier this year he launched the business in China with an office in Hangzhou.

"There's demand for our products over there," Replogle said. "We're in Japan, Hong Kong, of course mainland China. We're in Korea, Vietnam, Australia. That's been growing over the last five years."

Replogle said Seventh Generation will also be in Europe within three years.

"How we get there we're still working on right now," he said. "Whether it's a direct model where we create Seventh Generation Europe or whether we partner into that market we haven't determined yet."

THE LATEST VENTURE

Seventh Generation's office in Raleigh is home to the company's venture arm, with nine employees who look for new business opportunities beyond natural cleaning products.

"We created Seventh Generation Ventures about three years ago with the idea of partnering with like-minded companies and helping them accelerate their growth," Replogle said.

The acquisitions began with Bobble, a filtered water bottle company Seventh Generation bought in 2013. The plastic water bottle features a replaceable charcoal filter, and sells for \$10, with a new filter that costs about \$3. It's marketed as a way to reduce disposable water bottle use.

Next, Seventh Generation Ventures picked up Presse, a travel coffee mug with built-in French press, which is being marketed under the Bobble name. Call it a K-Cup killer.

"This is our answer to Keurig," said Replogle, holding a stainless steel Presse in his hand. "We looked for mission-aligned companies like this that are trying to solve a problem like, end the incredible waste of single-serve water bottles or, end the incredible waste of K-Cups."

Seventh Generation Ventures was boosted considerably by a \$30 million investment last September from former Vice President Al Gore's investment fund, the London-based Generation Investment Management LLP. Seventh Generation returned to private ownership about 15 years ago after a brief flirtation with being a publicly owned company.

The company's nine board members own about 70 percent of the company, Replogle said, with new shareholders periodically invited in, and existing shareholders offered an exit. The \$30 million from Gore's foundation was mostly used to retire existing shareholders who wanted to exit.

"There's a long list of investors and companies that would love to put their money into Seventh Generation," Replogle said. "We're pretty fortunate. We have a good thing happening right now." Seventh Generation is also debt-free.

"John has re-energized the business," Alan Newman said. "He has them on clear objectives. He's done the things that you do to be successful in business."

SAWTOOTH NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the enactment of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Jerry Peak Wilderness Additions Act and congratulate my Idaho congressional delegation colleagues Representative MICHAEL K. SIMPSON and Senator JAMES E. RISCH on this important achievement.

Enactment of this legislation, also called the SNRA Plus, was accomplished due to significant hard work, led by Representative SIMPSON. Representative SIMPSON's determination to work through the many challenges that arose during the near decade of this collaborative effort has given Idaho a homegrown solution to sustaining this treasured area of Idaho.

Senator RISCH's work in shepherding this legislation through the Senate, including through the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources on which he serves, is also commendable. Senator RISCH fought through many challenges in his pursuit of getting this needed legislation over the finish line.

A number of other individuals deserve acknowledgement for their considerable efforts to develop a hard-sought consensus that will be of lasting benefit. John Revier and Lindsay Slater of Representative SIMPSON's staff dedicated immeasurable time and extensive know-how to developing the legislation to reach this milestone. Custer and Blaine County Commissioners also did an outstanding job in this collaborative effort. The SNRA Plus is a win for Idaho and an example of how local governments and interests can achieve solutions to some of the most persistent public lands issues we face today.

Following the enactment of this important legislation, the focus must now shift to the hard work of successful implementation that will require commitment from the various Federal

agencies and all of the affected interests. Again, I commend Representative SIMPSON, Senator RISCH and the other stakeholders for their important work that will make a lasting difference in our great State.

RECOGNIZING THE 90TH ANNIVERSARY OF U.S. PROBATION AND PRETRIAL SERVICES

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, in March of 1925, President Calvin Coolidge signed into law the Probation Act, making that sentencing option available in the Federal courts. Six months later, on September 22, the first Federal probation officers were appointed, taking on the crucial dual task of promoting rehabilitation and protecting public safety. On this 90th anniversary, we pay our respects to the probation officers who serve the public, helping to keep our communities safe.

The advent of probation at the Federal level was driven by the success and spread of probation by individual States. Between 1909 and 1925, some 34 bills were introduced to establish a Federal probation law. President Coolidge, who as Governor of Massachusetts was familiar with probation at the State level, provided key support for the law's final passage.

A significant impetus for the law's eventual enactment was the fact that the National Prohibition Act of 1919 made Federal criminals out of many non-violent, otherwise law-abiding Americans. Under the auspices of the U.S. Courts, Probation and Pretrial Services has been operating a Federal re-entry court since 2008, along with programs aimed at addiction recovery.

Among those first Federal probation officers was George Grover, who, 20 years before the Probation Act became the first state-authorized probation officer in Maine, serving Cumberland County. Mr. Grover was a vigorous advocate of probation as an alternative to incarceration. Allowing a non-violent offender, under rigorous supervision, to remain at home and in the community, on the job and supporting a family, Mr. Grover often said, "Gives a man a chance to try again."

Probation officers are important members of the law enforcement community. Together with pretrial services and other law enforcement agencies, they help individuals become productive, responsible, and law-abiding citizens.

Balancing corrections and rehabilitation with safeguarding the public is difficult and, far too often, dangerous. On this 90th anniversary, we pay our respects to the probation officers who have lost their lives or been assaulted in the line of duty. In particular, I salute the men and women of Probation and Pretrial Services in Maine and across the country for their dedication to the public they serve.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish to recognize the 90th anniversary of the U.S. Probation System in Maine, for their dedication to ensuring the criminal justice system operates effectively and the public remains safe. Two events will be held in recognition, scheduled for September 21, 2015 and September 25, 2015, to commemorate 90 years of hard work and success.

Signed into law by President Calvin Coolidge in 1925, the Probation Act altered the outlook of our judicial system. The act empowered courts to suspend a sentence and place worthy defendants into the probation system. Under predetermined conditions and irrefutable terms, low-level offenders have the opportunity to stay with their families and remain employed, while giving back to the community. For 90 years, this important piece of legislation has helped change and enhance lives, while keeping communities safe.

Implementing probation services as a Federal law was a long and arduous process, and required significant effort at the State level. Maine has been a leader in supporting probation services since the early 1900s. In fact, Maine is home to George Grover, one of the first federally appointed—unpaid—State probation officers. He was appointed 90 years ago, on September 22, 1925, and served the communities and courts of Maine diligently.

The U.S. Probation and Pretrial Services of Maine are dedicated to the betterment of the entire State. Helping to change lives, keeping families together, allowing defendants to stay on the job and give back, are just a few of the benefits this system regularly achieves. The U.S. Probation System is also committed to addressing and combating the serious concern of drug addiction in Maine. Through re-entry courts and treatment services, the probation system is helping low-level offenders turn their lives around and earn a fresh start.

I applaud the U.S. Probation and Pretrial System in Maine for their dedicated service to communities and bettering lives throughout Maine. I would like to join the U.S. District Court of Maine in highlighting the success and hard work that has been demonstrated over the last 90 years.

TRIBUTE TO TERRY BOSTON

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I wish to take this moment for the Senate to recognize and honor the work of Terry Boston, who has contributed a lifetime of service to ensure that electricity in America is available reliably and at a reasonable price.

By the end of the year, Mr. Boston will retire from the role of president and chief executive officer of PJM, a position he has held since 2008. PJM is a world-class institution that oversees

the largest power grid in North America and employs over 600 people in Audubon, PA. PJM performs the critical function of keeping the lights on 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for over 51 million people in all or portions of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and the District of Columbia.

In addition to his work at PJM, Mr. Boston serves as president of the Association of Edison Illuminating Companies, Inc., and was the immediate past president of the GO 15, an association of the world's largest power grid operators. Mr. Boston was recently elected to the National Academy of Engineering, one of the highest professional honors accorded an engineer, and is a member of the board for the Electric Power Research Institute.

Prior to joining PJM, Mr. Boston was the executive vice president of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nation's largest public power provider. In his 35 years at TVA, Mr. Boston directed divisions in transmission and power operations, pricing, contracts, and electric system reliability.

Mr. Boston is a past chair of the North American Transmission Forum, dedicated to excellence in performance and sharing industry best practices. He also was one of the eight industry experts selected to direct the North American Reliability Corporation investigation of the August 2003 Northeast-Midwest blackout.

Terry Boston is one of the most qualified engineers and leaders in the electric industry. I wish him well in his future endeavors.

REMEMBERING WAYNE TOWNSEND

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today, I wish to recognize and honor the extraordinary service of Wayne Townsend, a lifelong Hoosier who spent 23 years in the Indiana State legislature and was the 1984 Democratic nominee for Governor.

Wayne passed away on July 3, 2015, at the age of 89. A native of Grant County, Wayne dedicated his life to Indiana and embodied the true definition of a public servant.

Throughout his legislative career, Wayne was a tireless advocate for Hoosier public schools and helped lead the effort to pass the School Reorganization Act of 1959 and its reauthorization in 1965. He also was a strong advocate for equal rights.

Throughout his political career, Wayne remained humble and caring. He served as a role model to all Hoosiers and tirelessly fought to improve the lives of millions.

I had the privilege of meeting Wayne on several occasions. His dedication to public service inspired me to create the Wayne Townsend Legislative Program

in his honor. The Townsend Program affords college students and recent graduates the opportunity to serve Indiana by working in our Washington, DC, office for a semester. Wayne has been an important mentor to me during my own legislative career, and his legacy continues to motivate me today.

Born on May 1, 1926, on his family's farm in Grant County, the youngest of six children, Wayne graduated from Jefferson Township High School and went on to study agriculture at Purdue University. He joined the Army during the Korean War and served in the Counterintelligence Corps. In 1951, Wayne started his own farming business, which he eventually grew from 225 acres to 2,500 acres. He was elected to the Indiana General Assembly in 1958 at 32 years old and elected to the Indiana Senate in 1970. During his legislative career, Wayne was a member of the house ways and means committee and the senate finance committee.

Outside of politics, Wayne was a loving husband, father, and grandfather. He married Helen Hardin, his college sweetheart, in 1953, and they had five children together: Jay, Mark, Lisa, Steve, and Alan. All five of their children went to Blackford High School and graduated from Purdue University. He was also a proud grandfather to 18 grandchildren.

Wayne continued to play a prominent role in Indiana after his time in the state legislature. He was president of the Grant County Purdue Agricultural Alumni Association and a director of the Purdue Agricultural Alumni Association. Wayne also continued his involvement in education, serving as a trustee for Earlham College for 8 years and a trustee for Purdue University for 15 years. In 2007 he received the Frank O'Bannon Public Service Award, and in 2014 he received Purdue University's highest honor, the Order of the Griffin.

Wayne will be deeply missed by all Hoosiers. His integrity, tireless efforts, and strong leadership helped to make Indiana a better place, and we will always be grateful for his service. May God welcome him home and bring comfort to his family and friends.

REMEMBERING LIEUTENANT CALVIN SPANN

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, I wish to celebrate the remarkable life and accomplishments of a great American and New Jerseyan, Lieutenant Calvin Spann. As a boy in Rutherford, NJ, Calvin was amazed by the miracle of flight, watching as planes took off from nearby Teterboro Airport. This early passion for aviation, coupled with a determination to prove that as an African American he was as capable as anyone to fly a plane, would eventually motivate him to take a courageous risk as a young man. Lieutenant Spann

enlisted in the Army Air Forces at a time when all branches of the U.S. military were still segregated. He left home behind when he was assigned by the Army to attend Flight Training School at Tuskegee University in Alabama.

In earning his wings at Tuskegee and serving in Europe during World War II as a member of the 100th Fighter Squadron and 332nd Fighter Group, Lieutenant Spann proved not only that he could fly but that he could do it with unusual bravery and skill. Lieutenant Spann flew 26 missions during the war, including what was at the time the longest bomber escort mission in history. Lieutenant Spann received numerous awards for his military service, including—much too late—a Congressional Gold Medal in 2006. The distinction with which Lieutenant Spann and his fellow Tuskegee Airmen served paved the way for President Truman to desegregate the U.S. military in 1948.

Lieutenant Spann, unfortunately, returned home at a time in which racial discrimination still outweighed his distinguished military service. Trying to build flight hours in an effort to remain a pilot, he was denied access to planes at Teterboro, and commercial airlines would not hire him simply because of his race. With characteristic resilience, he earned a living for himself and his family as a factory supervisor, sales representative, restaurant owner, and real estate broker. Fifty years later, he was inducted into the New Jersey Aviation Hall of Fame.

Lieutenant Spann pushed against a system that held all Americans back by denying some individuals the ability to contribute their talent and passion simply because of their identity. The United States of America is a better, stronger country because of Lieutenant Spann. For having the courage to pursue his dreams in the face of tremendous obstacles and at great risk to himself, Lieutenant Spann deserves our deepest respect and gratitude. May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ALLISON TRANSMISSION

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. President, today I recognize the 100th anniversary of Allison Transmission, a company that traces its history back to the founding of the Indianapolis Speedway Team Co. in 1915. As a co-founder of the Indianapolis Motor Speedway and part owner of several racing teams, James A. Allison established a machine shop on Main Street in Speedway, IN. Allison's initial focus was racing. However, in 1917 when the United States entered World War I, Allison shifted focus to produce parts and tooling for Liberty engines used by many Allied airplanes in the war.

After a brief return to racing at the war's end in late 1918 and a win at the

1919 Indianapolis 500, Allison continued to focus on engineering aircraft and marine products. When James Allison died in 1928, General Motors bought the company. Shortly before the start of World War II, aircraft engines became the Allison Division's focus. Later, as part of GM, Allison Transmission developed the first cross-drive hydraulic unit for the M-41 Patton tank. Since then the company has made transmissions for most of the U.S. military's armored and tactical wheeled vehicles.

Further development of transmissions for buses, automatics for trucks and buses, hydraulically controlled trucks and buses, and transmissions with electronic controls were developed by Allison from the 1950s through the 1990s. GM sold Allison Transmission in 2007 to a pair of private equity firms, and in March 2012, Allison Transmission Holdings Inc. became a public company with its shares trading on the New York Stock Exchange.

Today, Allison Transmission, a company founded on the values of innovation and Hoosier hard work, continues to deliver quality products and reliable services with a current focus on fuel economy. Headquartered in Indianapolis, Allison Transmission is the world's largest manufacturer of fully automatic commercial-duty transmissions and a leader in hybrid-propulsion systems. Today, vehicles powered by an Allison fully automatic transmission can be found on every continent doing everything from transporting school children, fighting fires, and unlocking oil beneath the earth's surface. Allison Transmission currently has approximately 2,700 employees and a presence in more than 80 countries, including manufacturing facilities in the United States, Hungary, and India.

On behalf of the citizens of Indiana, I would like to congratulate Allison Transmission on 100 years of success. As a multinational company that grew out of a humble machine shop in Speedway, IN, Allison Transmission has served as an economic and community anchor for the greater Indianapolis area and beyond.

On this special occasion, we congratulate Allison Transmission on 100 years of excellence in innovation and service, and honor the generations of Hoosiers who have devoted their careers to manufacturing excellence under the Allison Transmission brand. We are proud that Allison Transmission calls Indiana home, and we wish them continued success for many years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH CASEY

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate Mr. Joseph M.

Casey for his years of renowned service to the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transit Authority, SEPTA, and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. On September 30, 2015, Mr. Casey will retire as general manager of SEPTA.

Mr. Casey has worked in the transportation sector for over 30 years. His efforts have helped propel SEPTA, the sixth largest transit system in the Nation, to new heights in an era of great change and innovation within the transportation industry. Joe has been at the forefront of this innovation, leading the charge to transform SEPTA from a dependable transportation service to a nationwide leader and trailblazer in public transportation.

During his tenure as general manager of SEPTA, Mr. Casey demonstrated a steadfast dedication to customer service, infrastructural innovation, and business integrity.

Mr. Casey is committed to the principle of putting the customer first. He established SEPTA's first customer service division, which worked endlessly to ensure customer service was the cornerstone of SEPTA and its employees. Mr. Casey's "Four Cs" of customer service—cleanliness, convenience, courtesy, and communication—quickly became doctrine engrained in the daily operations of the authority. Mr. Casey's unwavering dedication to customer service helped propel SEPTA to record ridership numbers and mold SEPTA into the authority it is today.

Mr. Casey not only helped SEPTA become a more advanced and innovative authority, he worked tirelessly to improve the entire transportation infrastructure of Southeastern Pennsylvania. He supervised the attainment of 120 new Silverliner V rail cars and 700 hybrid buses, which were major improvements to SEPTA's operation. Mr. Casey also testified before the U.S. and Pennsylvania House and Senate committees regarding infrastructure and the need for investment. His testimonies helped lead to the passage of Act 89 in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, which provides necessary funding for critical infrastructural advancements for both rail and highway projects.

Mr. Casey's reputation of integrity and character is reflected in his commitment to economic, environmental, and social sustainability. His dedication to sustainability resulted in SEPTA earning awards such as the 2012 American Public Transportation Association Outstanding Public Transportation System and the Gold Sustainability Recognition. These awards highlight the bright and successful tenure of Mr. Joe Casey as general manager of SEPTA.

After his retirement, Mr. Casey will apply his transportation expertise as chair of the transportation committee tasked with planning and coordinating

transportation logistics for the 2016 Democratic National Convention in Philadelphia.

I want to once more congratulate Joe Casey on his career as an innovative and honorable leader of SEPTA. His efforts and accomplishments have helped Pennsylvania grow and prosper. I wish him the best of luck and a happy and healthy retirement.●

TRIBUTE TO MAJOR GENERAL WALTER ZINK

• Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise to recognize one of my Nebraska constituents, MG Walter Zink. For the last 45 years of Major General Zink's professional career, he has served our country, its military, and the great State of Nebraska. His work has spanned many areas of public service, and I wish to recognize Major General Zink and his family as he moves on to the next stage of retirement.

As a young man from Sterling, NE, Major General Zink felt the call to public service early. He enlisted in the Nebraska Army National Guard in 1970 after completing his undergraduate course work at Nebraska Wesleyan University. Major General Zink received his commission as an infantry officer through the Nebraska Military Academy in June of 1972. He spent 4 years drilling as a young officer in the 134th Infantry Battalion while he completed his law degree at the University of Nebraska College of Law. Major General Zink went on to serve as a staff judge advocate at the brigade and State headquarters level before being selected as the Nebraska assistant adjutant general for the Army. Major General Zink retired in 2008 after becoming commander of the U.S. Army North's Operational Command Post One.

Working in the legal community as an attorney, Major General Zink specialized in worker's compensation practices and tort law, while also donning the uniform on weekends to assist soldiers and the Nebraska National Guard with legal issues.

After he left the service, Zink continued to work for the State of Nebraska. Serving as State chair of the Nebraska Committee for Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve for over 5 years, Major General Zink has been an advocate for Nebraska servicemembers and their employers. His leadership helped to strengthen employer knowledge regarding the value of military experience in the workplace. Under Zink's watch, 11 Nebraska employers finished in the top 30 finalists for the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award. The Burt County Sheriff's Office and Electrical Contractors, Inc., also took home the Defense Department's highest honor for employers in support of National Guard and Reserve employees.

In 2009, Major General Zink ran for office and won a position with the Airport Authority. Throughout his 6-year term, he worked to strengthen economic prosperity for the community of Lincoln. Additionally, Major General Zink served the governor of Nebraska and the State's National Guard by working as a member of the adjutant general selection committee. Major General Zink has also agreed to sit on my Service Academy Selection Board, where he recommended Nebraska students for a congressional nomination to our Nation's service academies.

I would like to thank Walt, Carol, and the Zink family for their many years of public service. Please join me in recognizing this Nebraskan as he takes this next step in his journey.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Pate, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 1:03 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bill, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3460. An act to suspend until January 21, 2017, the authority of the President to waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, September 15, 2015, he had signed the following enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

S. 2035. A bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by a lapse in appropriations.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 15, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill:

S. 1359. An act to allow manufacturers to meet warranty and labeling requirements for consumer products by displaying the terms of warranties on Internet websites, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2765. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9929-61) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2766. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Dimethomorph; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9932-26-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2767. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Cyprodinil; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9930-04) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2768. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Oxathiapiprolin; Pesticide Tolerances" (FRL No. 9931-18-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2769. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Propylene glycol monomethyl ether; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9932-06-OCSP) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2770. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Tetraethylene Glycol; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 9933-35) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2771. A communication from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and

Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Gypsy Moth Generally Infested Areas; Additions in Minnesota, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin" (Docket No. APHIS-2014-0023) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-2772. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a violation of the Antideficiency Act that involved fiscal year 2011 Operation and Maintenance, Army, funds, and was assigned Army case number 13-08; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2773. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral David A. Dunaway, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2774. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William M. Faulkner, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2775. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark F. Ramsay, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2776. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Theodore C. Nicholas, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2777. A communication from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Douglas J. Robb, United States Air Force, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2778. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for monthly basic pay increases for members of the uniformed services for 2016; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2779. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Fiscal Year 2014 Inventory of Contracted Services"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2780. A communication from the Assistant to the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards" ((RIN7100-AE22) (12 CFR Part 208)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2781. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Final Flood Elevation Determinations" ((44 CFR Part 67) (Docket No.

FEMA-2015-0001)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2782. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Ukraine that was originally declared in Executive Order 13660 of March 6, 2014; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2783. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to persons undermining democratic processes or institutions in Zimbabwe that was declared in Executive Order 13288 of March 6, 2003; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2784. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Update to List of Countries Where Persons in the United States May Request Department of Defense Assistance in Obtaining Priority Delivery of Contracts" (RIN0694-AG68) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2785. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was originally declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2786. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2787. A communication from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of Housing-Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Housing Administration (FHA): Standardizing Method of Payment for FHA Insurance Claim" (RIN2502-AJ26) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2788. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Suspension of Community Eligibility" ((44 CFR Part 64) (Docket No. FEMA-2015-0001)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2789. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Addition of Certain Persons to the Entity List" (RIN0694-AG65) received during adjournment

of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2790. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to License Exception Availability for Consumer Communications Devices and Licensing Policy for Civil Telecommunication-related Items Such as Infrastructure Regarding Sudan: Correction" (RIN0694-AG63) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2791. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include August 7, 2015 Extension of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222" (RIN0694-AG71) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2792. A communication from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a notification of the President's intent to exempt all military personnel accounts from sequester for fiscal year 2016, if sequester is necessary; to the Committee on the Budget.

EC-2793. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Michigan; Michigan State Board Requirements" (FRL No. 9933-11-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2794. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Missouri; 2013 Missouri State Implementation Plan for the 2008 Lead Standard" (FRL No. 9933-09-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2795. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; New Mexico; Revisions to the New Source Review (NSR) State Implementation Plan (SIP) for Albuquerque-Bernalillo County; Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Permitting" (FRL No. 9931-35-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2796. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Illinois; Disapproval of State Board Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2006

PM2.5 and 2008 Ozone NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932-97-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2797. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Michigan: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision" (FRL No. 9933-29-Region 5) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2798. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for Secondary Aluminum Production" ((RIN2060-AQ40) (FRL No. 9932-44-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2799. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Partial Approval and Disapproval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nebraska; Revision to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 and 2006 Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards and the Revocation of the PM10 Annual Standard and Adoption of the 24hr PM2.5 Standard." (FRL No. 9933-04-Region 7) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 26, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2800. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Arizona; Phased Discontinuation of State II Vapor Recovery Program" (FRL No. 9927-14-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2801. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia; Changes to Georgia Fuel Rule and Other Miscellaneous Rules" (FRL No. 9933-32-Region 4) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2802. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Attainment Demonstration for the Dallas/Fort Worth 8-Hour Ozone Nonattainment Area; Determination of Attainment of the 1997 Ozone Standard" (FRL No. 9931-78-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2803. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Alaska; Transportation Conformity State Implementation Plan" (FRL No. 9933-43-Region 10) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2804. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Infrastructure Requirements for the 1997 Ozone and the 1997 and 2006 PM_{2.5} NAAQS" (FRL No. 9932-50-Region 6) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2805. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Feather River Air Quality Management District; Correction" (FRL No. 9933-50-Region 9) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2806. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Indiana; SO₂ Revision for Walsh and Kelly" (FRL No. 9933-65-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2807. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Infrastructure SIP Requirements for the 2008 Ozone, 2010 NO₂, and 2010 SO₂ NAAQS" (FRL No. 9933-62-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2808. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Utah; Motor Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance and Associated Provisions." (FRL No. 9930-71-Region 8) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2809. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Significant New Use Rule on Substituted Cyclosiloxane; Removal" ((RIN2070-AB27) (FRL No. 9932-56)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2810. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Secretary of the Army's recommendation to authorize the Central Everglades

Planning Project, Florida; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2811. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements" (RIN1991-AC02) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2812. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the progress made in licensing and constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2813. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting proposed legislation entitled "National Park Service Centennial Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2814. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "2014/2015 Economic Dispatch and Technological Change"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2815. A communication from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, two reports entitled "Alternative Fuel Use by Federal Dual Fueled Vehicles, Fiscal Years 2011 and 2012" and "Alternative Fuel Use by Federal Dual Fueled Vehicles, Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1090. A bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-142).

S. 1580. A bill to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates (Rept. No. 114-143).

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment with a preamble:

S. Res. 252. An original resolution expressing the sense of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate relating to easing the burden of Federal tax compliance on small businesses.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1400. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to direct the task force of the Office of Veterans Business Development to provide access to and manage the distribution of excess or surplus property to veteran-owned small businesses.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, without amendment:

S. 1756. A bill to help small businesses take advantage of energy efficiency.

S. 1857. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide for expanded participation in the microloan program, and for other purposes.

By Mr. VITTER, from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1866. A bill to establish the veterans' business outreach center program, to improve the programs for veterans of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2029. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNET (for himself, Mr. BURR, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. HATCH):

S. 2030. A bill to allow the sponsor of an application for the approval of a targeted drug to rely upon data and information with respect to such sponsor's previously approved targeted drugs; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. BARRASSO (for himself, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2031. A bill to reduce temporarily the royalty required to be paid for sodium produced on Federal lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. HOEVEN (for himself and Mr. HEINRICH):

S. 2032. A bill to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself and Ms. MIKULSKI):

S. 2033. A bill to provide that 6 of the 12 weeks of parental leave made available to a Federal employee shall be paid leave, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. TOOMEY:

S. 2034. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. REID, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mrs. SHAHEEN, and Mr. WARNER):

S. 2035. A bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by a lapse in appropriations; read the first time.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2036. A bill to suspend the current compensation packages for the chief executive officers of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and for other purposes; considered and passed.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER:

S. Res. 252. An original resolution expressing the sense of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate

relating to easing the burden of Federal tax compliance on small businesses; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KAINE):

S. Res. 253. A resolution welcoming King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain on their official visit to the United States, including visits to Miami and St. Augustine, Florida; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 254. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. Res. 255. A resolution designating the week beginning September 14, 2015, as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week; considered and agreed to.

By Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BOOKER):

S. Res. 256. A resolution designating September 2015 as "School Bus Safety Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 271

At the request of Mr. REID, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 271, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to permit certain retired members of the uniformed services who have a service-connected disability to receive both disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability and either retired pay by reason of their years of military service or Combat-Related Special Compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 275

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 275, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of home as a site of care for infusion therapy under the Medicare program.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 370

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 370, a bill to require breast density reporting to physicians and patients by facilities that perform mammograms, and for other purposes.

S. 481

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 481, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to drug scheduling recommendations by the Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with respect to registration of manufacturers and distributors seeking to conduct clinical testing, and for other purposes.

S. 490

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 490, a bill to achieve domestic energy independence by empowering States to control the development and production of all forms of energy on all available Federal land.

S. 525

At the request of Mr. COONS, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 525, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2151 et seq.) to reform the Food for Peace Program, and for other purposes.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 590

At the request of Mrs. MCCASKILL, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 590, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act to combat campus sexual violence, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 662

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 662, a bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to ensure fairness in the establishment of certain rates and fees under sections 114 and 115 of such title, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 709

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 709, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the amendments made by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act which disqualify expenses for over-the-counter drugs under health savings accounts and health flexible spending arrangements.

S. 774

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 774, a bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 979

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 979, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to repeal the requirement for reduction of survivor annuities under the Survivor Benefit Plan by veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation, and for other purposes.

S. 1090

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1090, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to

receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1122

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1122, a bill to provide that chapter 1 of title 9 of the United States Code, relating to the enforcement of arbitration agreements, shall not apply to enrollment agreements made between students and certain institutions of higher education, and to prohibit limitations on the ability of students to pursue claims against certain institutions of higher education.

S. 1458

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to amend the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 to ensure scientific transparency in the development of environmental regulations and for other purposes.

S. 1519

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1519, a bill to amend the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 to address slowdowns, strikes, and lock-outs occurring at ports in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1617

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1617, a bill to prevent Hizballah and associated entities from gaining access to international financial and other institutions, and for other purposes.

S. 1715

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1715, a bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the arrival of the Pilgrims.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) were added as cosponsors of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge char-

acterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1795

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1795, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for major disasters declared in any of calendar years 2012 through 2015, to make certain tax relief provisions permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1798, a bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and mental health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1957

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1957, a bill to require the Attorney General to provide State officials with access to criminal history information with respect to certain financial service providers required to undergo State criminal background checks, and for other purposes.

S. 1987

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1987, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act relating to lead-based paint renovation and remodeling activities.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr.

COATS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2028

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Ms. HIRONO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 217, a resolution designating October 8, 2015, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day".

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN:

S. 2029. A bill for the relief of Shirley Constantino Tan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, today I am reintroducing a bill for the private relief of Shirley Constantino Tan. Ms. Tan is a Filipina national living in Pacifica, CA. She is the proud mother of 19 year old U.S. citizen twin boys, Jashley and Joriene, and the spouse of Jay Mercado, a naturalized U.S. citizen.

I believe Ms. Tan merits Congress' special consideration for this extraordinary form of relief because I believe her removal from the United States would cause undue hardship for her and her family. She faces deportation to the Philippines, which would separate her from her family and jeopardize her safety.

Ms. Tan experienced horrific violence in the Philippines before she left to come to the United States. When she was only 14 years old, her cousin murdered her mother and her sister and shot Shirley in the head. While the cousin who committed the murders was eventually prosecuted, he received a short jail sentence. Fearing for her safety, Ms. Tan fled the Philippines just before her cousin was due to be released from jail. She entered the U.S. legally on a visitor's visa in 1989.

Ms. Tan's current deportation order is the result of negligent counsel. Shirley applied for asylum in 1995. While her case appeal was pending at the Board of Immigration Appeals, her attorney failed to submit a brief to support her case. As a result, the case was dismissed, and the Board of Immigration Appeals granted Shirley voluntary departure from the United States.

Shirley never received notice that the Board of Immigration Appeals granted her voluntary departure. Shirley's attorney moved offices, did not

receive the order, and ultimately never informed her of the order. As a result, Shirley did not depart the United States and the grant of voluntary departure automatically became a deportation order. She learned about the deportation order for the first time on January 28, 2009, when Immigration and Customs Enforcement agents took her into immigration custody.

Because of her attorney's negligent actions, Ms. Tan was denied the opportunity to present her case in U.S. immigration proceedings. Shirley later filed a complaint with the State Bar of California against her former attorney. She is not the first person to file such a complaint against this attorney.

On February 4, 2015, Shirley's spouse, Jay, a U.S. Citizen, filed an approved spousal petition on her behalf. On August 20, 2015, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services denied Shirley's application due to the fact that Shirley still had a final order or removal. Shirley must go back to the immigration court and ask for the court to terminate her case and then reapply with United States Immigration and Citizenship Services. Shirley is now again faced with deportation while she seeks to close her case before the Immigration Judge.

In addition to the hardship that would come to Ms. Tan if she is deported, Shirley's deportation would be a serious hardship to her two U.S. citizen children, Jashley and Joriene, who are minors.

Joriene is a sophomore at Stanford University and is pre-Med in Human Biology. Jashley is a sophomore at Chapman University and plans to declare his Business major in spring. In addition to his studies, Jashley is involved in Stanford's Filipino-American Student Union. Ms. Tan no longer runs her in-home daycare and is a stay-at-home mom.

If Ms. Tan were forced to leave the United States, her family has expressed that they would go with Shirley to the Philippines or try to find a third country where the entire family could relocate. This would mean that Jashley and Joriene would have to leave behind their education and the only home they know in the United States.

I do not believe it is in our Nation's best interest to force this family, with two U.S. citizen children, to make the choice between being separated and relocating to a country where they may face safety concerns or other serious hardships.

Ms. Tan and her family are involved in their community in Pacifica and own their own home. The family attends Good Shepherd Catholic Church, volunteering at the church and the Mother Theresa of Calcutta's Daughters of Charity. Shirley has the support of dozens of members of her community who shared with me the family's spirit of commitment to their community.

Enactment of the legislation I am introducing on behalf of Ms. Tan today will enable this entire family to continue their lives in California and make positive contributions to their community.

I ask my colleagues to support this private bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2029

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENT STATUS FOR SHIRLEY CONSTANTINO TAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subsections (a) and (b) of section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1151), Shirley Constantino Tan shall be eligible for issuance of an immigrant visa or for adjustment of status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence upon filing an application for issuance of an immigrant visa under section 204 of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1154) or for adjustment of status to lawful permanent resident.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Shirley Constantino Tan enters the United States before the filing deadline specified in subsection (c), she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall, if otherwise eligible, be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1255) as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.—Subsections (a) and (b) shall apply only if the application for issuance of an immigrant visa or the application for adjustment of status is filed with appropriate fees within 2 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) REDUCTION OF IMMIGRANT VISA NUMBER.—Upon the granting of an immigrant visa or permanent residence to Shirley Constantino Tan, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one, during the current or next following fiscal year, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(a)) or, if applicable, the total number of immigrant visas that are made available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 202(e) of such Act (8 U.S.C. 1152(e)).

(e) PAYGO.—The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled "Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation" for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 252—EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP OF THE SENATE RELATING TO EASING THE BURDEN OF FEDERAL TAX COMPLIANCE ON SMALL BUSINESSES

Mr. VITTER submitted the following resolution; from the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship; which was placed on the calendar:

S. RES. 252

Whereas American small businesses face major obstacles complying with their Federal tax obligations;

Whereas the complexity of the Federal tax code unfairly penalizes small businesses;

Whereas such complexity requires small business owners to spend significant amounts of time, money, and resources complying with their tax obligations and less time operating their business;

Whereas Congress has exacerbated these challenges for America's small businesses by failing to update the tax code in a manner that properly reflects current circumstances;

Whereas tax policy should also promote increased savings by American citizens to be able to afford the costs of living deeper into old age;

Whereas employee stock ownership plans help small businesses offer economic incentives to employees and help employees save more for their retirements via investments in their employing companies;

Whereas tax policy should support small businesses in providing benefit packages to their employees to be competitive with larger employers for the best talent;

Whereas the successful research and development tax credit has been used to incentivize private firms to invest in research and development, and private investment leads to spillover effects that can have a broad public good through the creation of new products, the development of new processes, and the launching of new industries;

Whereas while the research and development tax credit is essential for our innovators, it is not accessible to many small businesses and startups—per the Government Accountability Office, over half of the credit goes to firms with \$1,000,000,000 or more in receipts;

Whereas, according to the Congressional Research Service, numerous commercially successful innovations originated in small, fledgling firms that could not access the research and development credit;

Whereas, if Congress made the research and development tax credit more available to small businesses and startups, thousands of innovative small firms could claim the credit, boosting their capacity to invest in innovation and job creation; and

Whereas prudent changes to the structure of the Federal tax code would ease the burden of tax compliance, allowing small businesses to put more money back into their business, community, and the economy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship that the Senate should enact the following:

TITLE I—SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM **SEC. 101. EXPANSION OF CASH ACCOUNTING THRESHOLD.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (3) of section 448(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “\$5,000,000” in the text and in the heading and inserting “\$25,000,000”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 448(c) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking “\$5,000,000” each place it appears in the text and in the heading of paragraph (1) and inserting “\$25,000,000”, and

(B) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4) INFLATION ADJUSTMENT.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2015, the dollar amount contained in subsection (b)(3) and paragraph (1) of this subsection shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(A) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(B) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, by substituting ‘calendar year 2014’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

If any amount as adjusted under this subparagraph is not a multiple of \$100,000, such amount shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.”.

(b) EXEMPTION FROM INVENTORY REQUIREMENT.—Section 471 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (d) and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

“(c) SECTION NOT TO APPLY TO CERTAIN CASH METHOD TAXPAYERS.—If a taxpayer—

“(1) would otherwise be required to use inventories under this section for any taxable year, but

“(2) the taxpayer meets the gross receipts test of section 448(b) for the taxable year and is eligible and elects to use the cash receipts and disbursements method of accounting for the taxable year,

then the requirement to use inventories shall not apply to the taxpayer for the taxable year.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE AND SPECIAL RULE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

(2) CHANGE IN METHOD OF ACCOUNTING.—In the case of any taxpayer changing the taxpayer’s method of accounting for any taxable year under the amendments made by this section—

(A) such change shall be treated as initiated by the taxpayer; and

(B) such change shall be treated as made with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury.

SEC. 102. MODIFICATION OF SAFE HARBOR FOR EXPENSING OF ACQUISITION OR PRODUCTION COSTS OF TANGIBLE PROPERTY.

(a) REQUIREMENT TO MODIFY SAFE HARBOR.—The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, modify Treasury Regulations section 1.263(a)–1(f) by—

(1) increasing the amount of the de minimis safe harbor for taxpayers without applicable financial statements from \$500 to \$2,500,

(2) requiring adequate records showing the dollar amount being expensed in lieu of accounting procedures in place at the beginning of the taxable year, and

(3) modifying the definition of applicable financial statement to include reviewed financial statements.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The modifications required by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 103. REMOVAL OF COMPUTER EQUIPMENT FROM LISTED PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 280F(d)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “and” at the end of clause (iii) and by striking clause (iv).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 280F(d)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (B) and by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 104. DEDUCTION FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS IN COMPUTING SELF-EMPLOYMENT TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (4) of section 162(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2010, or after December 31, 2010” and inserting “for taxable years beginning before January 1, 2015.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 105. MODIFICATION OF RULES RELATING TO THE TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIPS AND S CORPORATIONS.

(a) NO TERMINATION OF PARTNERSHIP ON SALE OR EXCHANGE OF ASSETS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 708(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “only if” and all that follows and inserting “only if no part of any business, financial operation, or venture of the partnership continues to be carried on by any of its partners in a partnership.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(A) Section 168(i)(7)(B) of such Code is amended by striking the last sentence.

(B) Section 743(e) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4).

(C) Section 774 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (c).

(b) NO TERMINATION OF S CORPORATION STATUS DUE TO EXCESSIVE PASSIVE INVESTMENT INCOME.—Paragraph (3) of section 1362(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(D) TERMINATION.—This paragraph shall not apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this subparagraph.”.

TITLE II—PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE

SEC. 201. INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS FOR CERTAIN PROVISIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“SEC. 7529. INFLATION ADJUSTMENTS.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of any taxable year beginning in a calendar year after 2015, each of the specified dollar amounts shall be increased by an amount equal to—

“(1) such dollar amount, multiplied by

“(2) the cost-of-living adjustment determined under section 1(f)(3) for the calendar year in which the taxable year begins, determined by substituting ‘calendar year 2014’ for ‘calendar year 1992’ in subparagraph (B) thereof.

“(b) SPECIFIED DOLLAR AMOUNTS.—For purposes of subsection (a), the specified dollar amounts are—

“(1) the \$50,000 amount in section 79(a)(1),

“(2) each of the \$5,250 amounts in section 127(a)(2),

“(3) each of the \$500 amounts in paragraphs (11)(A), (11)(B), and (12) of section 170(f),

“(4) the \$5,000 amount in section 170(f)(11)(C),

“(5) the \$10,000,000 amount in section 263A(b)(2),

“(6) each of the dollar amounts in section 274(b)(1),

“(7) each of the \$400 amounts in section 274(j),

“(8) the \$1,600 amount in section 274(j)(2)(B),

“(9) the \$10,000,000 amount in section 1202(b)(1),

“(10) each of the \$50,000,000 amounts in section 1202(d)(1),

“(11) the \$50,000 amount in section 1244(b)(1), and

“(12) the \$1,000,000 in section 1244(c)(3)(A).

“(c) ROUNDING.—

“(1) Any increase determined under paragraph (5), (9), or (10) of subsection (b) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100,000.

“(2) Any increase determined under paragraph (1), (4), (11), or (12) of subsection (b) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$1,000.

“(3) Any increase determined under paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$500.

“(4) Any increase determined under paragraph (3), (7), or (8) of subsection (b) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$100.

“(5) Any increase determined under paragraph (6) of subsection (b) shall be rounded to the nearest multiple of \$5.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1202(b)(3) of such Code is amended by striking “paragraph (1)(A) shall be applied by substituting ‘\$5,000,000’ for ‘\$10,000,000’” and inserting “the amount under paragraph (1)(A) shall be 50 percent of such dollar amount (determined without regard to this paragraph)”.

(2) Section 1244(b)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “\$100,000” and inserting “200 percent of the amount under paragraph (1)”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“Sec. 7529. Inflation adjustments.”.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 202. REPORT ON IMPROVEMENTS TO CUSTOMER SERVICE.

Not later than June 30, 2016, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship of the Senate, the Committee on Finance of the Senate, and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives a report detailing specific ways to improve customer service to small businesses, including objectively measurable goals for how to reduce response times.

SEC. 203. RETURN DUE DATE MODIFICATIONS.

(a) NEW DUE DATE FOR PARTNERSHIP FORM 1065, S CORPORATION FORM 1120S, AND C CORPORATION FORM 1120.—

(1) PARTNERSHIPS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 6072 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(f) RETURNS OF PARTNERSHIPS.—Returns of partnerships under section 6031 made on the basis of the calendar year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of March following the close of the calendar year, and such returns made on the basis of a fiscal year shall be filed on or before the 15th day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 6072(a) of such Code is amended by striking “6017, or 6031” and inserting “or 6017”.

(2) S CORPORATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—So much of subsection (b) of 6072 of such Code as precedes the second sentence thereof is amended to read as follows:

“(b) RETURNS OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS.—Returns of S corporations under sections 6012 and 6037 made on the basis of the calendar year shall be filed on or before the 31st day of March following the close of the calendar year, and such returns made on the basis of a fiscal year shall be filed on or before the last day of the third month following the close of the fiscal year.”.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 1362(b) of such Code is amended—

(I) by striking “15th” each place it appears and inserting “last”;

(II) by striking “2½” each place it appears and inserting “3”;

(III) by striking “2 months and 15 days” in paragraph (4) and inserting “3 months”.

(ii) Section 1362(d)(1)(C)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “15th” and inserting “last”.

(iii) Section 1362(d)(1)(C)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “such 15th day” and inserting “the last day of the 3d month thereof”.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO C CORPORATIONS.—

(A) Section 170(a)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking “third month” and inserting “4th month”.

(B) Section 563 of such Code is amended by striking “third month” each place it appears and inserting “4th month”.

(C) Section 1354(d)(1)(B)(i) of such Code is amended by striking “3d month” and inserting “4th month”.

(D) Subsection (a) and (c) of section 6167 of such Code are each amended by striking “third month” and inserting “4th month”.

(E) Section 6425(a)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “third month” and inserting “4th month”.

(F) Subsections (b)(2)(A), (g)(3), and (h)(1) of section 6655 of such Code are each amended by striking “3rd month” and inserting “4th month”.

(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

(b) MODIFICATION OF DUE DATES BY REGULATION.—In the case of returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2013, the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate shall modify appropriate regulations to provide as follows:

(1) The maximum extension for the returns of partnerships filing Form 1065 shall be a 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(2) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts and estates filing Form 1041 shall be a 5½-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(3) The maximum extension for the returns of employee benefit plans filing Form 5500 shall be an automatic 3½-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(4) The maximum extension for the Forms 990 (series) returns of organizations exempt from income tax shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(5) The maximum extension for the returns of organizations exempt from income tax that are required to file Form 4720 returns of excise taxes shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(6) The maximum extension for the returns of trusts required to file Form 5227 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(7) The maximum extension for the returns of Black Lung Benefit Trusts required to file Form 6069 returns of excise taxes shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(8) The maximum extension for a taxpayer required to file Form 8870 shall be an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(9) The due date of Form 3520-A, Annual Information Return of a Foreign Trust with a United States Owner, shall be the 15th day of the 4th month after the close of the trust's taxable year, and the maximum extension shall be a 6-month period beginning on such day.

(10) The due date of FinCEN Form 114 (relating to Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts) shall be April 15 with a maximum extension for a 6-month period ending on October 15, and with provision for an extension under rules similar to the rules of 26 C.F.R. 1.6081-5. For any taxpayer required to file such form for the first time, the Secretary of the Treasury may waive any penalty for failure to timely request or file an extension.

(11) Taxpayers filing Form 3520, Annual Return to Report Transactions with Foreign Trusts and Receipt of Certain Foreign Gifts, shall be allowed to extend the time for filing such form separately from the income tax return of the taxpayer, for an automatic 6-month period beginning on the due date for filing the return (without regard to any extensions).

(c) CORPORATIONS PERMITTED STATUTORY AUTOMATIC 6-MONTH EXTENSION OF INCOME TAX RETURNS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6081(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “3 months” and inserting “6 months”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to returns for taxable years beginning after December 31, 2015.

TITLE III—PROVISIONS RELATED TO START-UP BUSINESSES

SEC. 301. REDUCTION IN HOLDING PERIOD FOR QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 1202(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “3 years”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Paragraph (2) of section 1202(b) of such Code is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “3 years”.

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 1202(g)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “3 years”.

(3) Subparagraph (C) of section 1202(h)(2) of such Code is amended by striking “5-year” and inserting “3-year”.

(4) Subparagraph (A) of section 1202(j)(1) of such Code is amended by striking “5 years” and inserting “3 years”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to stock

issued after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 302. EXTENSION OF ROLLOVER PERIOD FOR QUALIFIED SMALL BUSINESS STOCK.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of section 1045(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “60-day period” and inserting “1-year period”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Paragraph (3) of section 1045(b) of such Code is amended by striking “60-day period” and inserting “1-year period”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—PROMOTION AND EXPANSION OF PRIVATE EMPLOYEE OWNERSHIP

SEC. 401. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Promotion and Expansion of Private Employee Ownership Act of 2015”.

SEC. 402. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) on January 1, 1998—nearly 25 years after the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 was enacted and the employee stock ownership plan (hereafter in this section referred to as an “ESOP”) was created—employees were first permitted to be owners of subchapter S corporations pursuant to the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-188);

(2) with the passage of the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-34), Congress designed incentives to encourage businesses to become ESOP-owned S corporations;

(3) since that time, several thousand companies have become ESOP-owned S corporations, creating an ownership interest for several million Americans in companies in every State in the country, in industries ranging from heavy manufacturing to technology development to services;

(4) while estimates show that 40 percent of working Americans have no formal retirement account at all, every United States worker who is an employee-owner of an S corporation company through an ESOP has a valuable qualified retirement savings account;

(5) recent studies have shown that employees of ESOP-owned S corporations enjoy greater job stability than employees of comparable companies;

(6) studies also show that employee-owners of S corporation ESOP companies have amassed meaningful retirement savings through their S ESOP accounts that will give them the means to retire with dignity;

(7) under the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) and the regulations promulgated by the Administrator of the Small Business Administration, a small business concern that was eligible under the Small Business Act for the numerous preferences of the Act is denied treatment as a small business concern after an ESOP acquires more than 49 percent of the business, even if the number of employees, the revenue of the small business concern, and the racial, gender, or other criteria used under the Act to determine whether the small business concern is eligible for benefits under the Act remain the same, solely because of the acquisition by the ESOP; and

(8) it is the goal of Congress to both preserve and foster employee ownership of S corporations through ESOPs.

SEC. 403. DEFERRAL OF TAX FOR CERTAIN SALES OF EMPLOYER STOCK TO EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLAN SPONSORED BY S CORPORATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (A) of section 1042(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code

of 1986 is amended by striking “domestic C corporation” and inserting “domestic corporation”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to sales after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 404. DEPARTMENT OF TREASURY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE OFFICE.

(a) **ESTABLISHMENT REQUIRED.**—Before the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Treasury shall establish the S Corporation Employee Ownership Assistance Office to foster increased employee ownership of S corporations.

(b) **DUTIES OF THE OFFICE.**—The S Corporation Employee Ownership Assistance Office shall provide—

(1) education and outreach to inform companies and individuals about the possibilities and benefits of employee ownership of S corporations; and

(2) technical assistance to assist S corporations in sponsoring employee stock ownership plans.

SEC. 405. SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 47 as section 48; and

(2) by inserting after section 46 the following:

“SEC. 47. EMPLOYEE STOCK OWNERSHIP PLANS.

“(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘ESOP’ means an employee stock ownership plan, as defined in section 4975(e)(7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended; and

“(2) the term ‘ESOP business concern’ means a business concern that was a small business concern eligible for a loan, preference, or other program under this Act before the date on which more than 49 percent of the business concern was acquired by an ESOP.

“(b) **CONTINUED ELIGIBILITY.**—In determining whether an ESOP business concern qualifies as a small business concern for purposes of a loan, preference, or other program under this Act, each ESOP participant shall be treated as directly owning his or her proportionate share of the stock in the ESOP business concern owned by the ESOP.”

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on January 1 of the first calendar year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SENATE RESOLUTION 253—WELCOMING KING FELIPE VI AND QUEEN LETIZIA OF SPAIN ON THEIR OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES, INCLUDING VISITS TO MIAMI AND ST. AUGUSTINE, FLORIDA

Mr. NELSON (for himself, Mr. RUBIO, and Mr. KAINE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 253

Whereas King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain are visiting St. Augustine, Florida to celebrate the 450th Commemoration of the city and to participate in the annual United States-Spain Council forum;

Whereas Spanish explorer Ponce de León landed on the east coast of Florida in 1513 and named the land he discovered La Florida;

Whereas St. Augustine was founded by Spanish admiral Pedro Menéndez de Avilés on September 8, 1565;

Whereas St. Augustine is the oldest continuously occupied European settlement in the United States;

Whereas the United States-Spain Council serves an important purpose in bringing the United States and Spain closer through trade, investment, education, and culture, as well as by fostering military cooperation between the 2 countries;

Whereas the United States-Spain Council is holding its annual forum in St. Augustine from September 18–20, 2015;

Whereas the people and Governments of the United States and Spain have both benefited from strong economic and cultural ties;

Whereas Spain has played a special role in the history and culture of St. Augustine and Florida; and

Whereas King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia met with President Barack Obama on September 15, 2015, for their first official visit to the White House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) welcomes King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain during their visit to the United States; and

(2) expresses its appreciation for the efforts of King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia to strengthen the bonds between the people and Governments of the United States and Spain.

SENATE RESOLUTION 254—RECOGNIZING HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND CELEBRATING THE HERITAGE AND CULTURE OF LATINOS IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMMENSE CONTRIBUTIONS OF LATINOS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. FRANKEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. REED, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 254

Whereas the United States celebrates Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2015, through October 15, 2015;

Whereas the United States Census Bureau estimates the Hispanic population in the United States at more than 55,000,000 people, making Hispanic Americans 17.4 percent of the population of the United States and the largest racial or ethnic minority group in the United States;

Whereas there were 1,000,000 or more Latino residents in Puerto Rico and each of the following 8 States in 2014: Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York, and Texas;

Whereas Latinos grew the United States population by more than 1,150,000 people between July 1, 2013, and July 1, 2014, accounting for nearly ½ of all population growth during this period;

Whereas the Latino population in the United States is projected to grow to 105,550,000 by 2050, at which point the Latino

population will comprise more than 25 percent of the total population of the United States;

Whereas the Latino population in the United States is currently the third largest worldwide, exceeding the population in every Latin American and Caribbean country except for Mexico and Brazil;

Whereas there were 12,200,000 Latino family households in the United States and more than 17,900,000 Latino children under the age of 18 in 2014, representing approximately ¼ of the total Latino population in the United States;

Whereas more than 1 in 4 public school students in the United States is Latino, and the share of Latino students is expected to rise to nearly 30 percent in the next decade;

Whereas 19 percent of all college students between the ages of 18 and 24 years old are Latino, making Latinos the largest racial or ethnic minority group on college campuses in the United States, including both 2-year community colleges and 4-year colleges and universities;

Whereas a record 11,200,000 Latinos voted in the 2012 Presidential election, representing a record 8.4 percent of the electorate in the United States;

Whereas an estimated 28,500,000 Latinos will be eligible to vote in the 2016 Presidential election, and the number of eligible Latino voters is expected to rise to 40,000,000 by 2030, accounting for 40 percent of the growth in the eligible electorate in the United States over the next 15 years;

Whereas more than 2,000 Latino citizens currently turn 18 and become eligible to vote every day, and an estimated 1,000,000 Latino citizens will turn 18 and become eligible to vote every year by 2024;

Whereas the annual purchasing power of Hispanic Americans was an estimated \$1,300,000,000,000 in 2014, larger than the economy of all but 15 countries in the world;

Whereas there are more than 3,200,000 Hispanic-owned firms in the United States, supporting millions of employees nationwide and contributing more than \$468,000,000,000 in revenue to the economy of the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-owned businesses represent the fastest growing segment of small businesses in the United States, with Latino entrepreneurs starting businesses at more than twice the national rate;

Whereas, as of August 2015, more than 26,000,000 Latino workers represented 16.6 percent of the total civilian labor force in the United States, and the Latino share of the labor force is expected to grow to 19.1 percent by 2022, with the Latino population accounting for more than 40 percent of the increase in employment in the United States over the next 5 years;

Whereas Latinos have the highest labor force participation rate of any racial or ethnic group at 65.6 percent, compared to 62.6 percent overall;

Whereas there were 270,000 Latino elementary and middle school teachers, 75,000 Latino chief executives of businesses, 63,000 Latino lawyers, and 64,000 Latino physicians and surgeons contributing to the United States through their professions in 2014;

Whereas Hispanic Americans serve in all branches of the United States Armed Forces and have bravely fought in every war in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of July 31, 2015, more than 164,000 Hispanic active duty service members served with distinction in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas, as of August 31, 2015, approximately 284,000 Latinos have served in overseas contingency operations since September 11, 2001, including more than 8,500 Latinos currently serving in operations in Iraq and Afghanistan;

Whereas, as of September 2015, at least 675 United States Armed Forces fatalities in Iraq and Afghanistan were Hispanic;

Whereas an estimated 200,000 Latinos were mobilized for World War I and approximately 500,000 Latinos served during World War II;

Whereas more than 80,000 Latinos served in the Vietnam War, representing 5.5 percent of individuals who made the ultimate sacrifice for the United States in the conflict, even though Latinos comprised only 4.5 percent of the population of the United States at the time;

Whereas approximately 148,000 Hispanic soldiers served in the Korean War, including Puerto Rico's 65th Infantry Regiment known as the "Borinqueneers", the only active-duty segregated Latino military unit in the history of the United States;

Whereas, as of September 2015, there are an estimated 1,500,000 living Latino veterans of the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas 61 Hispanic Americans have received the Congressional Medal of Honor, the highest award for valor in action against an enemy force that can be bestowed on an individual serving in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas Hispanic Americans are dedicated public servants, holding posts at the highest levels of government, including 1 seat on the Supreme Court of the United States, 3 seats in the Senate, 34 seats in the House of Representatives, and 3 seats in the Cabinet; and

Whereas Hispanic Americans harbor a deep commitment to family and community, an enduring work ethic, and a perseverance to succeed and contribute to society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the celebration of Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15, 2015, through October 15, 2015;

(2) esteems the integral role of Latinos and the manifold heritage of Latinos in the economy, culture, and identity of the United States; and

(3) urges the people of the United States to observe Hispanic Heritage Month with appropriate programs and activities that celebrate the contributions of Latinos to life in the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 255—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 14, 2015, AS NATIONAL HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BOOKER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. COONS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. KAINE, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. UDALL, Mr. WARNER, and Ms. WARREN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 255

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are degree-granting institutions that have a full-time equivalent undergraduate enrollment of at least 25 percent Hispanic students;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions play an important role in educating many underprivileged students and helping those students attain their full potential through higher education;

Whereas more than 400 Hispanic-Serving Institutions operate in the United States;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions represent just 12 percent of all nonprofit institutions of higher education, yet serve nearly 60 percent of all Hispanic undergraduate students, enrolling more than 1,700,000 Hispanic undergraduate students in 2013;

Whereas the number of "emerging Hispanic-Serving Institutions", defined as institutions that do not yet meet the threshold of 25 percent Hispanic enrollment but serve a Hispanic student population of between 15 and 24 percent, grew to nearly 300 colleges and universities in 2013;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are located in 21 States and Puerto Rico, and emerging Hispanic-Serving Institutions are located in 29 States and Washington, DC;

Whereas Hispanic-Serving Institutions are actively involved in stabilizing and improving the communities in which the institutions are located;

Whereas celebrating the vast contributions of Hispanic-Serving Institutions to the United States strengthens the culture of the United States; and

Whereas the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions deserve national recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the achievements and goals of Hispanic-Serving Institutions across the United States;

(2) designates the week beginning September 14, 2015, as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week; and

(3) calls on the people of the United States and interested groups to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, activities, and programs to demonstrate support for Hispanic-Serving Institutions.

SENATE RESOLUTION 256—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2015 AS "SCHOOL BUS SAFETY MONTH"

Mrs. FISCHER (for herself and Mr. BOOKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 256

Whereas approximately 480,000 public and private school buses carry 26,000,000 children to and from school every weekday in the United States;

Whereas America's 480,000 public and private school buses comprise the largest mass transportation fleet in the Nation;

Whereas during the school year, school buses make more than 55,000,000 passenger trips daily and students ride these school buses 10,000,000,000 times per year as the Nation's fleet travels over 5,600,000,000 miles per school year;

Whereas school buses are designed to be safer than passenger vehicles and are 13 times safer than other modes of school transportation, and 44 times safer than vehicles driven by teenagers;

Whereas in an average year, about 25 school children are killed in school bus accidents, with one-third of these children struck by their own school buses in loading/unloading zones, one-third struck by motorists who fail to stop for school buses, and one-third killed as they approach or depart a school bus stop;

Whereas The Child Safety Network, celebrating 27 years of national public service, has collaborated with the National PTA and the school bus industry to create public service announcements to reduce distracted driving near school buses, increase ridership, and provide free resources to school districts in order to increase driver safety training, provide free technology for tracking school buses, reduce on-board bullying, and educate students; and

Whereas the adoption of School Bus Safety Month will allow broadcast and digital media and social networking industries to make commitments to disseminate public service announcements designed to save children's lives by making motorists aware of school bus safety issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate designates September 2015 as "School Bus Safety Month".

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2656. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORKER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2657. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2656 submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORKER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, and Mr. CRUZ) to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2658. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2659. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2658 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2660. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2661. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2660 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

SA 2662. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2661 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2660 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, supra.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2656. Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr.

BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORKER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, and Mr. CRUZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike line 3 and all that follows and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under subsection (a) shall not apply if the Islamic Republic of Iran—

(1) has released Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, Saeed Abedini, and Amir Hekmati to the custody of the United States; and

(2) formally recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

(d) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People’s Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

SA 2657. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2656

submitted by Mr. MCCONNELL (for himself, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. RUBIO, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. LEE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. VITTER, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. KIRK, Mr. MORAN, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORKER, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. TILLIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, and Mr. CRUZ) to the amendment SA 2640 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2658. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 2 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2659. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2658 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “2” and insert “3”

SA 2660. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. REMOVAL OF AUTHORITY TO WAIVE, SUSPEND, REDUCE, PROVIDE RELIEF FROM, OR OTHERWISE LIMIT THE APPLICATION OF SANCTIONS PURSUANT TO AN AGREEMENT RELATED TO THE NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF IRAN.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may not—

(1) waive, suspend, reduce, provide relief from, or otherwise limit the application of sanctions described in subsection (b) or refrain from applying any such sanctions; or

(2) remove a foreign person listed in Attachment 3 or Attachment 4 to Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action from the list of specially designated nationals and blocked persons maintained by the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of the Treasury.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—The sanctions described in this subsection are—

(1) the sanctions described in sections 4 through 7.9 of Annex II of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action; and

(2) the sanctions described in any other agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran that includes the United States, commits the United States to take action, or pursuant to which the United States commits or otherwise agrees to take action, regardless of the form it takes, whether a political commitment or otherwise, and regardless of whether it is legally binding.

(c) EXCEPTION.—The prohibitions under subsection (a) shall not apply if the Islamic Republic of Iran—

(1) has released Jason Rezaian, Robert Levinson, Saeed Abedini, and Amir Hekmati to the custody of the United States; and

(2) formally recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

(d) JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION DEFINED.—In this section, the term “Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action” means the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, signed at Vienna on July 14, 2015, by Iran and by the People’s Republic of China, France, Germany, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States, with the High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy, and all implementing materials and agreements related to the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action.

This act shall take effect 4 days after the date of enactment.

SA 2661. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2660 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

On page 3, line 22, strike “4” and insert “5”

SA 2662. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2661 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2660 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. MORAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 15, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EQUITY IN GOVERNMENT COMPENSATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 2036, introduced earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2036) to suspend the current compensation packages for the chief executive officers of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2036) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2036

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Equity in Government Compensation Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) DIRECTOR.—The term "Director" means the Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency.

(2) ENTERPRISE.—The term "enterprise" means—

(A) the Federal National Mortgage Association and any affiliate thereof; and

(B) the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation and any affiliate thereof.

SEC. 3. REASONABLE PAY FOR CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS.

(a) SUSPENSION OF CURRENT COMPENSATION PACKAGE AND LIMITATION.—The Director shall suspend the compensation packages approved for 2015 for the chief executive officers of each enterprise and, in lieu of such packages, subject to the limitation under subsection (b), establish the compensation and benefits for each such chief executive officer at the same level in effect for such officer as of January 1, 2015, and such compensation and benefits may not thereafter be increased.

(b) LIMITATION ON BONUSES.—Subsection (a) shall not be construed to affect the applicability of section 16 of the STOCK Act (12 U.S.C. 4518a) to the chief executive officer of each enterprise.

(c) APPLICABILITY.—Subsection (a) shall only apply to a chief executive officer of an enterprise if the enterprise is in conservator-

ship or receivership pursuant to section 1367 of the Federal Housing Enterprises Financial Safety and Soundness Act of 1992 (12 U.S.C. 4617).

SEC. 4. FANNIE AND FREDDIE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICERS NOT FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.

Any chief executive officer affected by any provision under section 3 shall not be considered a Federal employee.

NATIONAL DIRECT SUPPORT PROFESSIONALS RECOGNITION WEEK

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 245 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 245) designating the week beginning September 13, 2015, as "National Direct Support Professionals Recognition Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 245) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of August 5, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

RESOLUTIONS SUBMITTED TODAY

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 254, S. Res. 255, and S. Res. 256.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME—S. 2035 AND H.R. 36

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the

desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time en bloc.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2035) to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by a lapse in appropriations.

A bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, September 16; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, and that the majority control the first half and the Democrats control the final half; that following morning business, the Senate then resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 12:30 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that the Senate recess from 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. to allow for the weekly conference meetings; finally, that the filing deadline for all first-degree amendments be at 2:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:43 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

THE JUDICIARY

REBECCA GOODGAME EBINGER, OF IOWA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF IOWA, VICE JAMES E. GRITZNER, RETIRED.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED

WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. ELIZABETH L. TRAIN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

VICE ADM. FRANK C. PANDOLFE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. RAQUEL C. BONO

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be vice admiral

REAR ADM. DAVID C. JOHNSON

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C.,

SECTION 601, AND FOR APPOINTMENT AS A SENIOR MEMBER OF THE MILITARY STAFF COMMITTEE OF THE UNITED NATIONS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 711:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. KENNETH F. MCKENZIE, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS TO THE GRADE OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. WILLIAM D. BEYDLER

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

H.R. 3460

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I voted against H.R. 3460. I regret that this bill was brought to the floor without even a discussion, let alone a markup, in the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Had it been marked up in the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I would have offered an amendment to strike the date so that the President's authority to waive sanctions was either eliminated entirely or eliminated for three years or five years. Unfortunately the text of the bill implies that the next president will be more capable of making decisions regarding Iran than the current president. I have disagreed with President Obama on Iran policy, but I think it is absurd to assume that the next president will make better policy, especially when we have no idea who that individual will be.

TRIBUTE TO MR. RICHARD
BERELLE ASH

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Mr. Richard Berelle Ash is celebrating thirty (30) years of serving others in the Georgia Department of Community Health; and

Whereas, Mr. Ash retires this year, he has served as an Operations Manager, Property Officer, Fleet Manager and Records Manager for the state of Georgia and he has provided stellar leadership and service throughout the state; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man is an ambassador of goodwill; as a pastor and community advocate, he has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and has been a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Mr. Ash is a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared his time and talent to promote community development around the state of Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Richard Berelle Ash as he celebrates thirty years of service and to salute him as he retires from the Georgia Department of Community Health; A true Man of Excellence; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 30, 2015 as Mr. Richard Berelle Ash Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 30th day of July, 2015.

STATEMENT RECOGNIZING TRAIN HEROES

HON. AMI BERA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to commend the bravery of three young men with ties to Sacramento County. While on a train to Paris, childhood friends Alek Skarlatos, Anthony Sadler, and Spencer Stone sprang into action to stop a man storming through their cabin carrying an automatic weapon and a box cutter. Their quick action saved the people onboard that train and their bravery has inspired our country.

As we recognize their heroism, the incident is also a reminder that terrorist threats are everywhere. These three men took bold action to protect others from harm and I commend the sacrifice they were willing to make to protect those around them.

The three met while attending Freedom Christian School in Fair Oaks. Sadler and Stone attended Del Campo High School and were active in their community. Skarlatos moved to Oregon, but the trio stayed in touch. They were on a European vacation when the gunman burst into their cabin.

As an Oregon Army National Guardsman, Army Spc. Alek Skarlatos had recently returned from Afghanistan. He was first to sound the alarm, telling his friends, "let's go" as they moved to subdue the gunman.

Anthony Sadler, a senior at Sacramento State University, said his first instinct was to help and he rushed toward the man.

And Airman 1st Class Spencer Stone of the U.S. Air Force was the first to get to the gunman. He was slashed while trying to disarm the man. As a trained Emergency Medical Technician, his injury didn't stop him from administering care to some of the passengers who had been wounded. Stone has been nominated for the Airman's Medal, the Air Force's highest non-combat award.

These men were faced with a dangerous threat and in that moment chose to act. It is a testament to their bravery and their service to their country. It is my pleasure to formally recognize the actions they took to save others.

The parade in their honor will be held on September 11, 2015 in Sacramento. It's a fitting date to welcome them home and honor their heroism. The story of these three men is a reminder that everyone can be a hero. Thank you Alek, Anthony, and Spencer: you have made your hometown proud and inspired our country.

TRIBUTE TO MR. HUGH FLOYD WILLIAMS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Mr. Hugh Floyd Williams is celebrating forty (40) years of serving others in the Peace Corps as a volunteer for two years (1974–1976) and with the State Department for thirty-eight years (1977–2015); and

Whereas, Mr. Williams retired this year with the rank of Minister-Counselor from the State Department wherein under his guidance as a Foreign Service Officer, he has provided stellar leadership on an international level, he has enhanced the lives of many in Sierra Leone, Europe, Asia, Hong Kong, Canada, Malaysia, India, Indonesia, Belgium, Jamaica and the Americas; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man is an ambassador of goodwill; he has given hope to the hopeless, fed the hungry and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Mr. Williams is a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared his time and talent to promote diplomacy around the world representing our great nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Hugh Floyd Williams as he celebrates forty years in service and to salute him as he retires from the State Department; A true Man of Excellence; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 23, 2015 as Mr. Hugh Floyd Williams Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 23rd day of July, 2015.

HONORING THE PERMIAN BASIN HONOR FLIGHT

HON. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 93 Veterans from West Texas who will be visiting our Washington D.C. this week, sponsored by the Permian Basin Honor Flight. On behalf of a grateful state and nation, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The Veterans on this Honor Flight are: Clint Adams, Alberto Alavartez Jr., Clark Bagley, Joe Banks, Michael Barker, Victor Barros, James Bedingfield, Carlton Blackwell, Herbert Blankingship, James Block, Grady Blocker, Wilbur Boone, Thomas Bostick Sr., Raymond Boswell, Harold Brenner, Wendell Brown, Billy

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

Brown, Mike Brown, Dr. Joseph Bruner, Daniel Bullen, Robert Cole, Jennifer Conkin, Richard Cortez, Doyle Dewayne Dobbs, Ernest Elkins, Ronald Emmons, Robert Fields, Daniel Fischer, Richard Galloway, Wade Gamblin, Ralph Gillette, John Graves, Eldon Griffiths, Michael Henderson, Gary Hokerk, Wayne Hokerk, Rex Holland, Timothy Humpherys, Billy Hunte, Joe Jackson, Roger Johnston, Herman Jones, Bobby Kizer, Charles Linebarger, Teresa Lopez, Delfin Lopez, Michael Lopez, Raymond Lusk, Darcy Maloney, Robert Middaugh, Scott Morris Sr., Scott Morris Jr., Ira Overton, Carlos Padilla, Salvatore Pagano, Preston Parrott, Newton Peterson, Julian Pressey, T.J. Price, Donald Price, Emil Raschke, Edward Reel, Winifred Richmond, Sifredo Rodriguez, Frank Rodriguez, Pedro Ruiz, Richardo Saldana, Thomas Salgado, Erene Sanchez, Simon Sanchez, Jerry Sides, Georgia Simcik, Claude Smith, Melvin Smith, Tommy Smith, Steve Stone, Rachel Stout, William Sudduth, Bobby Jean Swinney, William Tapley, Leslie Tidwell, Charl Trantham, Veron Trent, Teddy Trogdon, Henry Tuck, Randy Vest, Orlando Villanueva, Donald Waldrop, Gary Watkins, Mark Webb, David Whitten, Grady Wilkerson, Robert Williamson, William Wrenn.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled to have the opportunity to meet these brave men and women who exemplify the best of our country. Their sacrifice and commitment to the duty to our nation can never be fully repaid, and I hope that when they visit our nation's monuments in Washington D.C., the gratitude and respect we have for them will truly be reflected.

Colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and their families for their exemplary dedication and service to this great nation. I would also like to extend a special thank you to the local communities, all of the volunteers, and Mr. Jeremy West and Mr. John West for their extensive work in organizing this Honor Flight. This trip would not have been possible without all the financial and emotional support of the people who have put in so much hard work and personal time to make sure this trip could be possible.

TRIBUTE TO THE WEBB-HUDSON FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, the Webb-Hudson family lineage has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the Webb-Hudson Family has produced many well respected citizens, and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Webb-Hudson family are pillars of strength that have touched the lives of many; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Webb-Hudson family such as Former Lithonia Mayor Marcia Hunter, Former Lithonia Police Chief Jerome Woods, former Lithonia Councilperson Barbara Lester, Rockdale County Sheriff Deputy A.G. Giles,

DeKalb County Court Clerk Drucilla Woods and Mrs. LaVerne Woods Baker for they are some of our most honorable citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world and we take pride in knowing that families such as the Webb-Hudson family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other through their family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Webb-Hudson family; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 11, 2015 as Webb-Hudson Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 11th day of July, 2015.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD CAMPBELL

HON. JOHN R. MOOLENAAR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Owosso Argus-Press editor and chairman Richard Campbell in recognition of his lifetime of contributions to Owosso, Shiawassee County and our great state.

A 1946 Owosso High School Graduate, Richard attended the University of Michigan and was commissioned as an officer in the U.S. Marine Corps. Richard's 20 years in the Marines included serving as a platoon commander during the Korean War, leading a battalion of Marines to Vietnam in 1966, and touring as a senior press officer of the Military Assistance Command-Vietnam.

After retiring as a colonel in 1972, Campbell returned to the family business in Owosso and started work at the Argus-Press. At the paper, he worked in advertising and news, before being named editor in 1973. Richard was known for his great attention to detail, his enthusiasm for pursuing stories, and the way he cared about his staff. He dedicated over 40 years to the Argus-Press and, though he attempted several times to retire, he always came back to the office and the work that he loved.

In addition to his work as editor of the Argus-Press, Richard served as president of the Michigan Press Association, the Michigan Associated Press Editorial Association, and the University Press Club of Michigan. He was also a dedicated member of the Society of Professional Journalists (Sigma Delta Chi) and the National Press Club in Washington, DC.

On behalf of the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan, I am honored today to recognize Richard Campbell for his lifetime of service to our country and community.

TRIBUTE TO THE SHEPHERD FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, during the mid-1800's, the union of Mr. and Mrs. Marshall Shepherd in South Carolina began the Shepherd family lineage; since that time, the Shepherd family has blessed us with descendants across the country who have helped to shape and mold our nation; and

Whereas, today we honor all of the matriarchs and patriarchs of the Shepherd family, who are pillars of strength in our community. The Shepherd family helped to build and support Poplar Springs Baptist Church in Ellenwood, Georgia over one hundred forty-one years ago and continue to support this great institution today; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, I am honored to have many members of the Shepherd family who are some of our most productive and community involved citizens; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world, and I take pride in knowing that families such as the Shepherd family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other by meeting at this year's family reunion in Georgia's Fourth Congressional District; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Shepherd Family; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim, September 13, 2015 as The Shepherd Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 13th day of September, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 375TH AN- NIVERSARY OF THE TOWN OF MARSHFIELD

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 375th Anniversary of the town of Marshfield, Massachusetts, a beautiful coastal haven on the state's historic South Shore.

While the town was officially incorporated as a separate town from Plimoth Plantation in 1640, the area that is Marshfield today has been inhabited by Native American tribes, including the Wampanoag Tribe, for thousands of years. When early English settlers came to the area known as Missacautucket by the Wampanoag, they found roads already well-established by the tribe—some of which are still in use today.

Established as part of the 'New Colony of New Plimoth in New England' in 1620, this

small colony grew from being predominantly cattle farmers to including commercial fishing, salt marsh haying and shipbuilding by the start of the 19th century.

Marshfield and its residents retain a storied place in our nation's history. Many of the town's colonists fought in several early American wars, including taking an early stance against the British on December 19, 1773—years before the official start of the Revolutionary War. At midnight, the Marshfield Patriots confiscated tea from the old Ordinary in the town as a protest against the Crown and a display of solidarity with those who took part in the Boston Tea Party, which took place only three days prior.

Perhaps Marshfield's most famous son is Daniel Webster, the former Senator and Secretary of State in the years leading up to the American Civil War. Though a national figure, this gifted orator and celebrated statesman was known in his time as "the Farmer of Marshfield".

Since its historic beginnings, Marshfield has grown into a vibrant and active community of over 25,000 residents. Today, the town attracts visitors from all over the country as a popular summer destination. This scenic town is also known for hosting an annual agricultural fair, attracting crowds from all over the region.

Mr. Speaker, the 375th Anniversary of Marshfield is an opportunity both to reflect on the significance of this prominent town and look ahead to its future as a pillar of the South Shore. Marshfield's past embodies the richness of American history and the indomitable spirit of the American people. May this historic Massachusetts town flourish for many years to come.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE RAYMOND L. BRAMUCCI

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Ms. DeLAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest respect and the heaviest of hearts that I rise today to pay tribute to my good friend and outstanding political leader, Raymond L. Bramucci. His passing marks the end of an era and leaves a legacy of public service to which we should all strive.

Born in Ludlow, Massachusetts, Ray's story is one so many children of immigrants share. His success was built on hard work and community service. One of four children of an Italian butcher who lost everything during the Great Depression, Ray worked a variety of factory jobs as a boy to help his family survive. He dropped out of high school at age 17 and entered the United States Air Force where he served for four years with honor and distinction.

After finishing his service in the Air Force, Ray moved to New York City where he joined the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union. Rising through the ranks, he became a senior director widely respected for championing fair play by both workers and employers. This commitment to balance earned Ray

a distinguished reputation among all those he worked with.

Senator Bill Bradley chose Ray to lead his New Jersey office, a post he held for more than twenty years before he was tapped by then Governor Jim Florio to serve as Commissioner of New Jersey's Department of Labor. His political acumen and policy prowess once again earned him the respect and admiration of all those who worked with him. As Commissioner, Ray left an indelible mark on public policy with one of his signature achievements—the passage of the Workforce Development Partnership Act, which trained unemployed workers in high-tech, emerging trades.

Ray later served as the Executive Director of the Scion Hall University Institute on Work, a not-for-profit organization advocating workplace equity. He was also an arbitrator on the New Jersey Board of Mediation, a Special Advisor to the President of Montclair State University, and an adjunct professor of political science at Rutgers University. Ray ascended to the national stage in 1998 when then President Bill Clinton asked him to serve as Assistant Secretary of Labor at the United States Department of Labor. He oversaw the administration of national Youth Opportunity grants and became a driving force in employment and training nationwide. He also supervised job training across the country, including more than 100 Job Corps Centers.

Even after his service at the United States Department of Labor concluded, Ray remained active as a consultant on worker training, labor issues, conflict resolution and arbitration for public and private sector clients. Throughout his life, Ray demonstrated a unique commitment to public service. He fought hard for policies that strengthened the American workforce in immeasurable and innumerable ways.

On a more personal note, I will always be grateful to Ray for his friendship, support, and guidance. He was not only a good friend but, like for so many others, a mentor. I am honored to stand today to pay tribute to Raymond L. Bramucci for his many contributions to our nation and to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, Sue; his sons, Michael and Dante; as well as his many family, friends, and colleagues. I consider myself fortunate to have called him my friend and he will be deeply missed by all of those fortunate enough to have known him.

COMMEMORATING THE KATYN FOREST MASSACRE

HON. ALBIO SIRE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. SIRE. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the tragic events that took place on September 11th, 2001, we pause to remember all those that innocently lost their lives on that day.

We also come together to remember two other tragic events that devastated the Polish-American community. I stand with the Polish people today at the Katyn 1940 Monument as they commemorate the 75th anniversary of the

Katyn Forest Massacre, and the 5th anniversary of the tragic airplane crash that killed 96 people, including the Polish President and other top Polish officials. The Monument, located in Jersey City, is a symbol of the important history of the Polish-American community in New Jersey and the sacrifices of their ancestors.

The Katyn Forest Massacre occurred during World War II in April and May of 1940 while Poland was fighting a war on two fronts. The Soviet secret police brutally killed over 20,000 Poles whose bodies were later recovered in a mass grave at Katyn. Tragically, five years ago as a delegation of Polish officials were traveling to Katyn to commemorate the massacre, their plane unexpectedly crashed in western Russia, killing all aboard.

The Polish people throughout the course of history have been unwavering in their resilience and patriotism in the face of adversity. Their courage is admirable and inspiring, and on this day we stand in solidarity as they commemorate these occasions of great loss.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. KARLA A. HUTCHINSON-SKEETE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, in the Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, there are many individuals who are called to contribute to the needs of our community through leadership and service; and

Whereas, Mrs. Karla A. Hutchinson-Skeete has answered that call by giving of herself as an educator at Edward L. Bouie, Sr., Elementary Traditional Theme School, and as a beloved wife, daughter and friend; and

Whereas, Mrs. Skeete has been chosen as the 2015 Teacher of the Year, representing Edward L. Bouie, Sr., Elementary Traditional Theme School; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents for the betterment of our community and our nation through her tireless works, motivational speeches, performance through dance and words of wisdom; and

Whereas, Mrs. Skeete is a virtuous woman, a courageous woman and a fearless leader who has shared her vision and passion to help ensure that our children receive an education that is relevant not only for today, but well into the future, as she truly understands that our children are the future; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Karla A. Hutchinson-Skeete for her leadership and service to our District and in recognition of this singular honor as 2015 Teacher of the Year at Edward L. Bouie, Sr., Traditional Theme Elementary School; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 21, 2015 as Mrs. Karla A. Hutchinson-Skeete Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 21st day of August, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF CANDIDO DE
GUERRA CAMERO

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the extraordinary achievements of the legendary percussionist and innovator of Afro-Cuban Jazz, Candido Camero. Popularly known as Candido, Mr. Camero has literally changed music on a world-wide scale. A jazz artist that has performed and recorded with a long list of distinguished figures across a dizzying array of genres, he holds the distinction of being the most recorded percussionist in the history of Jazz. "Candido" is truly the percussion colossus of Modern Jazz and popular music.

On September 17, 2015, National Endowment for the Arts Jazz Master Candido will be honored this year by the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation (CBCF) at the 30th Annual Jazz Forum and Concert, during the 45th Annual Legislative Conference (ALC). Dubbed "The Man with A Thousand Fingers," Candido was the first musician to play two or more congas simultaneously, while tuning the drums to add melodic interest to rhythmic complexity. His innovations paved the way for future percussionists in Latin jazz, pop, rock, mambo, salsa and world music. For his many contributions to the development of music, Candido is truly deserving of the 2015 CBCF Jazz Legacy Award.

Candido de Guerra Camero was born on April 22nd, 1921 in Havana, Cuba. He started playing congas and bongos as a young child, and competed in neighborhood parades known as comparsas. His earliest gigs were with the CMQ Radio Orchestra for six years, and later with the famed Tropicana nightclub for eight years. In 1946 he appeared in a musical revue called Tidbits at the Plymouth Theater on Broadway, playing backup for the Cuban dance team, Carmen and Rolando. He made his first U.S. recording with the famed Afro-Cuban bandleader Machito in 1948 on the tune, El Rey Del Mambo, and worked with trumpeter Dizzy Gillespie to record three albums, Afro (1954), Gillespiana (1960) and The Melody Lingers On (1966). Candido also appeared on the Ed Sullivan and Jackie Gleason shows.

Gillespie introduced Candido to legendary pianist, bandleader, composer and educator, Dr. Billy Taylor. He played with Taylor from 1953 to 1954. They recorded The Billy Trio with Candido: A seminal, Latin jazz LP which spotlighted Camero's amazing and revolutionary conga and bongo playing. Dr. Taylor wrote that, "he had not heard anyone who even approaches the wonderful balance between jazz and Cuban elements that Candido demonstrates." Candido also worked and recorded with Stan Kenton, Tito Puente, Grant Green, Elvin Jones, Wes Montgomery, Tony Bennett, Art Blakey and Randy Weston. In 1979, Candido wrote "Jingo" for the West African percussionist Olatunji and his Dancin' and Prancin' LP for the Salsoul Latin-disco label.

Candido recorded over fifteen recordings as a leader, including "The Volcanic" (1956),

"Conga Soul" (1962), "Thousand Finger Man" (1969), "Brujeras de Candido: Candido's Latin McGuffa's Dust" (1971), "The Conga Kings," with percussionists Giovanni Hidalgo and Patato Valdes (2000), and "The Master" (2014). He was named an NEA Jazz Master in 2008, and was featured in the 2009 PBS documentary, Latin Music USA.

Candido Camero is a living national jazz treasure, and I encourage my colleagues to honor his tremendous contributions to Jazz.

HONORING CAPTAIN KRISTEN
GRIEST OF ORANGE, CONNECTICUT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding member of our military and recent U.S. Army Ranger School graduate, Captain Kristen Marie Griest. A native of Orange, Connecticut, Captain Griest recently became one of the first women to complete the 62-day combat leadership course—shattering a gender ceiling as she joins the ranks of our country's most elite Army members. Though she will not yet be able to serve in the 75th Ranger Regiment, her hometown community and her state could not be more proud of her accomplishment.

A graduate of Amity Regional High School in Woodbridge, Connecticut, Kristen Griest was known as a quiet leader and a tough competitor, always pushing herself to succeed. A track and softball star in high school, she entered the United States Military Academy at West Point in the fall of 2007. Following her graduation, Kristen went on to serve in the military police because, as her brother, Chief Warrant Officer 2 Michael Griest, an Army aviator himself, said "it was the closest she could come at the time to serving in combat." She was deployed to Afghanistan in 2013 as a military police officer and upon her return took up the challenge of Ranger School.

With courses including phases at Fort Benning in Georgia, on the mountains of northern Georgia, and in the Florida Panhandle swamps in and around Eglin Air Force Base, The U.S. Army's Ranger School is considered one of the military's most difficult courses physically and mentally. Critics of allowing women into the military's most elite units had used the argument that no woman has demonstrated she can keep up with men by passing Ranger School. Along with fellow graduate, 1st Lieutenant Shayne Haver of Copperas Cove, Texas, Kristen has successfully challenged such notions, demonstrating that women should be allowed the same opportunities as their male counterparts to join our military's elite forces.

Kristen recently received her black and gold Ranger tab along with her fellow Rangers, but will return to her previous unit instead of joining her male colleagues in the 75th Ranger Regiment. Perhaps soon we will see that ceiling shattered as well. Today, I am proud to stand today to join her parents, Thomas and Laura; her brother, Michael; her many family

and friends, as well as the community of Orange and the State of Connecticut in extending my sincere congratulations to Captain Kristen Marie Griest on the outstanding accomplishment of successfully completing the rigorous training at the U.S. Army Ranger School. She exemplifies the very best of our military and our nation.

TRIBUTE TO MS. FELECIA B.
PRINCE

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, twenty-seven years ago a virtuous woman of God accepted her calling to serve in the Internal Revenue Service in Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, Ms. Felecia B. Prince began her career with the I.R.S. as a Taxpayer Telephone Operator in 1988 and today retires as a Revenue Officer; and

Whereas, this phenomenal woman has shared her time and talents, giving the citizens of our District a friend to help those in need, a fearless leader and a servant to all who wants to insure that the system works for everyone; and

Whereas, Ms. Felecia B. Prince is a cornerstone in our community that has enhanced the lives of thousands for the betterment of our District and Nation; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Ms. Felecia B. Prince on her retirement from the Internal Revenue Service and to wish her well in her new endeavors; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 31, 2015 as Ms. Felecia B. Prince Day in the 4th Congressional District. Proclaimed, this 31st day of July, 2015.

RECOGNIZING RITA SCARDACI

HON. MIKE THOMPSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rita Scardaci, who has had a distinguished career working in the public health profession in Northern California. She will be retiring from her position as the Director of Health Services in Sonoma County after a decade of service.

Ms. Scardaci is a lifelong resident of Northern California, where she has given back to the community as a leader and pioneer in health services. She is a Registered Nurse, and has a degree in Public Health and Nursing, certification as a Health Education Specialist, and a Masters of Public Health. She has used her degrees to better the health of the residents of Santa Cruz County, and most recently Sonoma County through her work with the Health Services Department. Ms.

Scardaci is an instructor at both University of California Santa Cruz and San Jose State University. She is a founding member of the California State Rural Health Association and sits on the board of the California Endowment and Sonoma-Mendocino-Lake County United Way, as well as three different health boards in Sonoma County.

Ms. Scardaci's additional community involvement includes: member and past President of the County Health Executives Association of California; Commissioner Sonoma First Five, an organization charged with promoting, supporting and improving the early development of children from the prenatal stage through five years of age; member Santa Rosa Family Medicine Residency Consortium Board of Directors; Past President and Board Member at the California Telehealth Telemedicine Center, which works to achieve the fully optimized use of telehealth and other technology enabled health care services.

Mr. Speaker, Rita Scardaci is a beloved and vitally important member of the community and it is appropriate that we acknowledge her today.

TRIBUTE TO WILBERT V. PAYNES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Mr. Wilbert V. Paynes is celebrating forty-two (42) years of serving others in the United States Army Corps of Engineers. He currently serves as Director of the United States Army Corps of Engineers Deep Draft Navigation Planning Center of Expertise and as Chief for the Planning and Policy Division for the South Atlantic Division of the United States Army Corps of Engineers located in Atlanta, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mr. Paynes retires this year as a Director for the United States Corps of Engineers; wherein under his guidance as a Director, he has provided stellar leadership on an international level and has enhanced the lives of many in the Southeastern United States, Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man is an ambassador of goodwill; he has managed projects, educated colleagues, and directed several major water resource feasibility studies; and

Whereas, Mr. Paynes is a man of compassion, a fearless leader, a servant to all and a visionary who has shared his time and talent to promote the best in Civil Engineering on behalf of the United States Corps of Engineers; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mr. Wilbert V. Paynes as he celebrates forty-two years in service and to salute him as he retires from the United States Corps of Engineers; A true Man of Excellence; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim October 2, 2015 as Mr. Wilbert V. Paynes Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 2nd day of October, 2015.

HONORING BERNARD SWEENEY, SBA DISTRICT DIRECTOR, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to Bernard Sweeney who recently retired as the United States Small Business Administration's Connecticut District Director. In a career of federal service that spanned more than three decades, Bernie demonstrated a remarkable commitment to public service. Bernie's federal service included serving as Chief of Staff to the Under Secretary at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Special Assistant to the Secretary at HUD, and Staff Assistant to the President of the United States at the White House. However, it was his work at the SBA that left an indelible mark on our state and region.

Bernie began his career with the SBA in the Connecticut District Office in 1987 as Acting Assistant District Director for Business Development. During his tenure with the SBA, he served as a Team Leader for Marketing and Outreach, a Loan Officer, and Business Development Specialist. Prior to being named the Connecticut District Director in 2005, Bernie was the Branch Manager in the Springfield, Massachusetts SBA Branch Office.

As District Director of the SBA's Connecticut District Office, Bernie oversaw the delivery of agency programs for the state of Connecticut, including financial assistance, management counseling, and business development. He was responsible for directing the activities of 10 permanent SBA employees, the administration of a business loan portfolio, oversight of the Connecticut Small Business Development Center (SBDC) network, including its 15 locations around the state, the coordination of 7 chapters of the Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE) and 3 Women's Business Centers (WBC) serving all of Connecticut. Bernie worked tirelessly to ensure that the district staff reached out to the underserved communities in Connecticut and that the SBA training programs reached these communities. He also helped to establish the three Hispanic Chambers of Commerce by offering both technical and financial assistance.

I would be remiss if I did not extend a special note of thanks to Bernie for all of the help and guidance he provided to myself and my staff over the last decade. From coordinating informational briefings to immediately responding to storm and fire damage in various communities, Bernie was always just a phone call away. He was always ready to assist in whatever ways the agency could provide. He was a remarkable resource for all of us.

For his many invaluable contributions to our small businesses, to our communities, and our state, I am honored to stand today to pay tribute to Bernard Sweeney. His is a legacy of

public service to which we should all strive. I extend my very best wishes to Bernie, his wife, Sandy, and their son, Zack, for many more years of health and happiness as he enjoys his retirement.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. NETTIE J. ROBBINS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, one hundred years ago a virtuous woman of God, Nettie J. Ford was born in Midway, Alabama on August 4, 1915 to Mr. Hanson and Mrs. Lottie Ford; and

Whereas, she was raised up in Midway, Alabama and married Rev. Aaron Robbins in 1932 and their union has blessed our district and nation with fourteen children and a host of grand, great and great-great grandchildren; and

Whereas, this phenomenal Proverbs 31 woman has shared her time and talents as a wife, mother and friend, becoming a Georgia citizen of great worth, a fearless leader and a servant to all by always advancing the lives of others; and

Whereas, Mrs. Robbins has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; and

Whereas, Mrs. Robbins is celebrating a remarkable milestone, her 100th Birthday; her family and friends are pausing to acknowledge a woman who has been revered by many and a pillar of her community; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and extend well wishes to Mrs. Robbins on her birthday and recognize her for an exemplary life that has been an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 4, 2015 as Mrs. Nettie J. Robbins Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 4th day of August, 2015.

IN RECOGNITION OF GARY BARTZ

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the extraordinary achievements of legendary saxophonist and educator Gary Bartz. A highly-talented instrumentalist, vocalist, composer, and leader—Mr. Bartz's long career deserves our applause.

Mr. Bartz started playing at an early age with Art Blakey at his father's jazz club in his hometown of Baltimore, MD. Fifty-seven years later, he is an international sensation, earning a Grammy Award in 2005 for his and McCoy Tyner's "Illuminations." Over the course of his career, he has recorded over 40 solo albums and made guest appearances on over 200 more.

Gary Bartz first came to New York in 1958, at just 17 years old, to attend the Julliard Conservatory of Music. He remembers those days fondly, saying, "It was a very good time for the music in New York, at the end of what had been the be-bop era. Charlie Parker had passed away three years previously but Miles' group was in its heyday, Monk was down at the Five Spot, and Ornette Coleman was just coming to town. Things were fresh." He spent much of his time drinking Coca-Cola in the all-ages "peanut gallery" at Birdland, where he enjoyed a marathon bill of performers. Reflecting on his musical youth, he has said, "If I didn't have money to get in, I'd help somebody carry a drum to work my way in."

From 1962–64, Mr. Bartz participated in Charles Mingus' Workshop and began practicing regularly with fellow members of the horn section, including Eric Dolphy. By the mid '60s, the alto saxophonist, still in his early 20s, began performing throughout the city with the Max Roach/Abbey Lincoln Group, and quickly established himself as the most promising alto voice since Cannonball Adderley.

With the splash of his New York debut solidly behind him, Mr. Bartz joined Art Blakey's Jazz Messengers. The young saxophonist's parents owned a club in Baltimore called the North End Lounge. When his father hired Blakey for a gig, Mr. Bartz grabbed the opportunity to fill a sax player vacancy in the band. After his performance that night, he was officially hired to join the Jazz Messengers. In 1965, he would make his recording debut on Blakey's "Soulfinger" album.

In 1968, Mr. Bartz began an association with McCoy Tyner, which included participating in Tyner's classic "Expansions" and "Extensions" albums. Work with McCoy proved especially significant for Mr. Bartz because of the bandleader's strong connection to John Coltrane. During his first two years with Tyner, Mr. Bartz was also touring with Max Roach and taking some time out to record on Max's Atlantic Records release, "Members Don't Get Weary." "With Max, there was that bond with Charlie Parker," declares Bartz. "Charlie Parker is why I play the alto saxophone."

Mr. Bartz began working with Miles Davis in 1970, his first experience playing electric music. It also reaffirmed his yen for an even stronger connection to Coltrane. In addition to working with Miles in the early '70s—including playing the historic Isle of Wight Festival in August, 1970—Mr. Bartz was busy fronting his own NTU Troop ensemble. The group got its name from the Bantu language: NTU means unity in all things, time and space, living and dead, seen and unseen.

Outside the Troop, Mr. Bartz had been recording as a group leader since 1968, and continued to do so throughout the '70s, during which time he released such acclaimed albums as, "Another Earth," "Home," "Music Is My Sanctuary" and "Love Affair." By the late '70s, he was doing studio work in Los Angeles with Norman Connors and Phyllis Hyman. In 1988, after a nine-year break between solo releases, Mr. Bartz began recording what music columnist Gene Kalbacher described as "Vital ear-opening sides," on such albums as "Monsoon," "West 42nd Street," "There Goes The Neighborhood," and "Shadows."

Mr. Bartz followed those impressive works in 1995 with the release of his debut Atlantic

album "The Red and Orange Poems," a self-described musical mystery novel and just one of his brilliantly conceived concept albums. Back when he masterminded the much-touted "I've Known Rivers" album, based on the poetry of Langston Hughes, his concepts would be twenty years ahead of those held by some of today's jazz/hip hop and acid jazz combos. So it continues with "The Blues Chronicles: Tales of Life," a testimonial to a steadfast belief in the power of music to soothe, challenge, spark a crowd to complete ecstasy, or move one person to think. It adds up to a shoe box full of musical snapshots from a life lived and played with passion and stirred—with both joy and sadness—by the blues.

Mr. Bartz's release "Live at the Jazz Standard Volume 1—Soulstice" is the first of a series of recordings documenting his legendary, non-stop style, live performances. This initial release on his own OYO label bares testimony to Bartz's continuing growth as a composer, group leader, and a master of both the alto and soprano saxophones. A quartet session recorded in 1998, was followed by "Live at the Jazz Standard, Volume 2" released in 2000, which features Mr. Bartz's exciting Sextet. His follow-up release "Soprano Stories" features Mr. Bartz exclusively performing on the soprano saxophone in a studio quartet setting.

His follow-up album to the highly acclaimed "Volume 1 of the Coltrane Files, Toa of a Music Warrior," will be released in 2015, along with his album honoring Woody Shaw entitled "Two MF's."

When he is not on the road or preparing new music, Mr. Bartz serves as a professor in the Jazz Studies Department of the Oberlin Conservatory of Music.

Mr. Bartz performs at the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation's Annual Legislative Conference Jazz Concert on September 17, 2015. On that occasion, I will be presenting him with the Foundation's Jazz Legacy Award. Next month, he will be honored with the BNY Mellon Jazz 2015 Living Legacy Award in a special ceremony at the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts on Friday, October 16, 2015.

Gary Bartz is an extraordinary musician that has made a remarkable contribution to Jazz music and world culture. For these reasons, I urge you to join me in congratulating him for these awards and his lifetime of outstanding accomplishments.

TRIBUTE TO MRS. IVORY C. SHEPHERD

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, reaching the age of 88 years is a remarkable milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Ivory C. Shepherd was born on November 26, 1927 and today she is celebrating that milestone; and

Whereas, Mrs. Shepherd has been blessed with a long, happy life, devoted to God and credits it all to the Will of God; she is the First

Lady Emeritus of Greater Travelers Rest Baptist Church and is a Spiritual and Prayer Matriarch that has spread the gospel since the days of her youth; and

Whereas, Mrs. Shepherd is celebrating her 88th Birthday with her family members, church members and friends here in Georgia, she celebrates a life of blessings; as a Mother, Wife, Grandmother, Great Grandmother, friend, community servant and leader; and

Whereas, the Lord has been her Shepherd throughout her life and she prays daily as she leads a blessed life by example: an advocate, faithful matriarch and a community leader; and

Whereas, we are honored that she is celebrating the milestone of her 88th birthday in Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Mrs. Ivory C. Shepherd for an exemplary life that has been and continues to be an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim November 26, 2015 as Mrs. Ivory C. Shepherd Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 26th day of November, 2015.

LOOKING BACK: YOUNG WOMAN'S LETTER TO HER MOTHER LOST ON SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

HON. JOHN B. LARSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, as we remember those we lost 14 years ago, I submit one of the most poignant expressions I've seen since that grave day. Written by Anjunelly Jean-Pierre as a letter to her mother, whose life was lost on 9/11, this moving tribute both shows how inspiring her mom was to her and how her memory will be everlasting.

LETTERS TO THE LOST

(Collected by Sheila Weller)

On a clear day 10 years ago, nearly 3,000 people died. They were the sisters, brothers, boyfriends and mothers of young women who mourn them still—and who write intimate messages to them here.

Dear Mommy, last night I made a whole chicken with vegetables for dinner. You would have been proud.

My children, Brianna, seven, and Elijah, eight—the children you never met—loved it.

When I cook, I remember the meals you made. I was the only kid who had manicotti for lunch on the first-grade school trip. Everyone else had a turkey or peanut-butter-and-jelly sandwich, but you were then the housekeeper for an Italian family, so you learned to make things they liked. Eventually your cooking talent landed you—an immigrant from the Dominican Republic with an elementary school education who had to learn English from scratch—a chef's job at Cantor Fitzgerald, on the 105th floor of the World Trade Center.

In the summer of 2001, I was planning to join the military. And then September 11 happened. It took me years to come to terms with the fact that you were gone. I actually kept your phone number in my cell phone

until 2009! I had to keep you "alive" so that I myself could survive.

But after you died, I tapped into the passion for cooking you'd instilled in me. I went to culinary school, then was a sous-chef on Emeril Lagasse's show *Emeril Green*. Now I have my own catering business. The meal my clients like best is the Dominican rice-and-peas dish you made me as comfort food. I guess the love and heritage comes through.

I wish you could see your grandchildren. Brianna looks so much like I did at her age. As for Elijah, he has your perfectionism. I remember you said, "Children should have names that are strong and great in meaning." I gave Brianna her middle name, Maxima, in honor of you. And to keep your spirit alive, every Friday night we have tea and a relaxing talk about life, just like you and I did, to mark the end of a long week of work and school.

Being a single mom running a one-person business hasn't always been easy. I sometimes find myself driving boxes of cheesecakes and pound cakes to a customer and then dashing off to pick up the kids at school. But you, too, were a single mom, one

who'd conquered so many challenges. You've remained my guiding force. And you always will be.

Anjunelly Jean-Pierre, 29, of Dumfries, Virginia, lost her mother, Maxima. Today she is a mom and owner of Max & Jax Café.

TRIBUTE TO THE STEWART-RONEY FAMILY

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 15, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, the Stewart-Roney family lineage has blessed us with descendants that have helped to shape our nation; and

Whereas, the Stewart-Roney Family has produced many well respected citizens, and the patriarchs and matriarchs of the Stewart-

Roney family are pillars of strength that have touched the lives of many; and

Whereas, in our beloved Fourth Congressional District of Georgia, we are honored to have members of the Stewart-Roney family for they are some of our most honorable citizens in our District; and

Whereas, family is one of the most honored and cherished institutions in the world and we take pride in knowing that families such as the Stewart-Roney family have set aside this time to fellowship with each other, honor one another and to pass along history to each other through their family reunion in DeKalb County, Georgia; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize the Stewart-Roney family; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim July 17, 2015 as Stewart-Roney Family Reunion Day in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 17th day of July, 2015.

SENATE—Wednesday, September 16, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

God of grace and love, You guard our lives with Your peace. Help us to not attempt to build a relationship with You on the basis of our merit and goodness.

Give our lawmakers the wisdom to make Your grace the foundation for their living. May Your righteousness that comes from faith energize them to dare more boldly, attempting to accomplish great things for Your glory. Lord, grant that their childlike trust in You will free them to serve others, inspired by Your love.

Oh God, You are our help and hope. Thank You for Your gifts of liberty and grace, unconditional love, and generous mercy.

We pray in Your marvelous Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, in one week Congress will host one of the world's great faith leaders, His Holiness Pope Francis. Every Member of Congress is looking forward to the Pope's historic address.

Since beginning his papacy, Pope Francis has been admired for his humility and honesty. Rather than shirk responsibility from important and controversial global challenges, he has confronted them. While he and I don't agree on everything, his statements on climate change, immigration reform, and income inequality have challenged world leaders, and that is an understatement.

Yesterday His Holiness and the Vatican stated their support for the nuclear

agreement with Iran. A spokesperson for His Holiness told the International Atomic Energy Agency that this agreement "will be a definitive step toward greater stability and security in the region." That is certainly the truth.

Supporting the nuclear agreement between the permanent five members of the U.N. Security Council, Germany, and Iran is the best way to ensure that Iran does not get a nuclear weapon. That is what the agreement is all about. That is why last week the Senate clearly stated the agreement will stand. No matter how you talk about all these other things, the agreement is to stop Iran from getting a nuclear weapon. That is what it is all about.

Last night the Senate again rejected the Republican attempt to derail the nuclear agreement. Now for the second time, the Republican leader is refusing to accept the reality that, in fact, it is going to go forward. He is doubling down and committing the Senate to vote on other issues.

We have seen this strategy before. It never works, whether it was with homeland security, ObamaCare or all the other issues. All it does is waste time that we cannot afford.

When the Republican leader tried this approach on homeland security, remember what JOHN MCCAIN, the Senator from Arizona, said: It was the "definition of insanity." What he was talking about was what Albert Einstein said, that if you keep doing the same thing over and over, knowing you will get the same result, it is insanity.

Today a news report described the Republican leader's strategy as "the second kick of a mule," and said "it's not working."

It is unbelievable what the Republican leader is trying to do. We have 7 working days before a shutdown of the government. Why? Because we won't have any money. The Senate will take no votes today. If the Republican leader has his way, all the Senate will do this week is take yet another failed vote on Iran. At this rate the Senate will end this week with nothing to show for our time but two failed votes—nothing dealing with the most important issue facing this country, and that is, how to fund the government.

We have seen Republicans manufacture crises before. This one truly is embarrassing. The government runs out of money in a matter of days. Republicans have no plans to avoid a shutdown, and we have almost twoscore of Republicans in the House who said they will vote for nothing unless it defunds women's health care. We have

a number of Senators saying if there is nothing in this to stop the funding of Planned Parenthood, they will vote against it.

The government runs out of money in just a few days. To do nothing, with no plans to avoid a shutdown, when we are standing around waiting for something to be done on the budget is unwise and wrong, and it is an insult to the American people.

Last Thursday's vote is not going to change. Last night's vote will not change. The Republicans lost those votes. What are their future plans? They will not prevent President Obama and his administration from implementing the Iran agreement.

There is precious little time left before a government shutdown. It is time for the Republican leader to get serious about keeping the Federal Government open and funded. Are we just talking about something that is nonexistent as a problem? Two years ago the government was shut down for almost a month. I think it was 21 days that the government was shut down. It is very disturbing.

In 1 week, as I have indicated, the Pope will be here, and it is time that we make sure that we follow some of the advice and counsel that he has given us.

NOMINATION OF GAYLE SMITH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the goodwill and humanitarian efforts of the United States are needed all across the world. Victims of civil wars, disease outbreaks, and natural disasters depend on the aid and compassion of the American people. To our credit, we try our best to help as much as possible.

Take one example. The Syrian refugee crisis is the worst humanitarian crisis since World War II. Four million Syrians are now refugees because of the country's civil war, and thousands and thousands are fleeing to any place they can go. Most of them are winding up in Europe to escape the violence.

There are almost another 8 million who are internally displaced within war-ravaged Syria. A lot of them are in cities and can't go anywhere. If they try to leave, they get killed. Tragically, 5½ million of these poor individuals are children. The United States is trying to help. We are the single largest donor of humanitarian aid to the Syrian crisis. There is not a close second.

The U.S. Agency for International Development, known as USAID, is one of the principal organizations by which the United States administers civilian

foreign aid. This Agency plays an essential role in administering our Nation's foreign policy. Yet, while all these events continue to unfold before the world's eyes, Senate Republicans are blocking the next Administrator from taking her place.

Gayle Smith was nominated by President Obama 5 months ago. We had hearings weeks and weeks ago—now into months. It was right to nominate her. She is an experienced leader in administering international humanitarian assistance and global development, serving on the National Security Council at the White House.

During her time at the White House, Gayle Smith has worked on major typhoons in Asia, the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, and ongoing conflicts in Syria and Iraq. She has extensive experience in African affairs, both from her time at the National Security Council and from her work as a journalist covering international affairs for more than two decades. During her time as a journalist, she spent time in active war zones and other conflicts.

Gayle Smith's credentials are impeccable, and her hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee in June reflected that. In September she was voted out unanimously in a voice vote. Yet here we are post-June—that is an understatement. Her nomination was reported favorably, and we still have no confirmed Administrator.

With all the news accounts we watch every day of these thousands and thousands of lost people, the United States is being hampered in its ability to help because we don't have anyone running the Agency. It is just the latest example of Republican obstruction for obstruction's sake.

According to the Congressional Research Service, the current Republican Congress has confirmed far fewer nominees than any Congress in memory. Why?

What are Republicans accomplishing by preventing a qualified nominee such as Gayle Smith from leading the U.S. Agency for International Development? They are doing it, and in so doing they are undermining U.S. foreign policy. They are undoing decades of admirable American humanitarian efforts. But even more unsettling is that Republicans are impeding our ability to assist those around the world who need help.

It is time for the Republican leader and his Senators to change course and stop this blockade of the President's nominations.

I look forward to the Senate Republicans releasing their obstruction on the Gayle Smith nomination and working with Democrats to confirm her as the next Administrator of USAID immediately. All the Republican leader has to do is bring it to the floor. We will vote on it. If someone doesn't want to vote for her, don't vote for her. But

it is really wrong to have our great country at a time of this huge humanitarian crisis having no one leading the Agency that does more to alleviate the problems these people face than anyone we have in our government.

Would the chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will be in a period of morning business for 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the final half.

The Senator from South Dakota.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—S. 2035 AND H.R. 36

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I understand that there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2035) to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by a lapse in appropriations.

A bill (H.R. 36) to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mr. THUNE. In order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceeding, en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, back in May, Congress passed and the President signed legislation guaranteeing Congress the chance to take an up-or-down vote on any nuclear deal with Iran. It was widely debated here in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Votes were held, and in the Senate, 98 Senators on both sides of the aisle agreed that we should pass legislation requiring that Congress have a voice—and through Congress the American people have a voice—in something that is so important to America's national security interests.

Yet here we are 4 months later, and the same Democrats who voted for that at the time and joined Republicans—98 Senators voted for the American people to have their voice heard on this—these same Democrats have now chosen

to stifle the voices of the American people by refusing to allow an up-or-down vote on the President's nuclear agreement. Twice now, when we attempted to move to a final vote on the deal, only four Democrats broke ranks with their colleagues and stood up to the President. That is a deeply disappointing result, especially given the stakes on this agreement.

I would have to say that in some ways I suppose if you are trying to protect your President from having to make a decision about whether to sign or veto this legislation—maybe they were pushed into that position by the administration—but the fact is, this is something that was voted on in the Senate, in the House of Representatives, overwhelmingly supported, and sent to the President. The President of the United States reluctantly signed it into law, but the understanding was from that point forward that when this was actually brought to the floor of the Senate, there would be an open debate and there would be a vote. All that I think is simply expected by the American people is an opportunity to be heard from, in the form of an up-or-down vote, through their representatives in the Senate.

I would think that even if Democrats in the Senate object to the vote that we would have on a resolution of disapproval and want to support the President's position, that they would allow it to be voted on and let it go to the President. If the President is so proud of this deal—and clearly he is—why would he not then want the opportunity to veto a resolution of disapproval coming from Congress on this?

I think, clearly, Democrats in the Senate are doing their best to try and protect the President from having to make that decision, notwithstanding the President's assertions that this is a wonderful deal for our country, a wonderful deal for our allies. Of course, the facts tell an entirely different story. A nuclear-armed Iran is a direct threat to the security of the United States and our allies in the Middle East, and the American people deserved that chance to have their voices heard.

I wish to take just a moment to read some of the statements that have been made by Iran's Supreme Leader over the past few weeks. This is directly from the Twitter feed of the Ayatollah Khamenei. Speaking to Israel, he said: "You will not see the next 25 years." That is the Supreme Leader of Iran speaking to Israel. He adds: "God willing," there will be nothing of the "Zionist regime" in the next 25 years. Again, this is coming directly from the Twitter feed of the Iranian Supreme Leader.

Of the United States, he says something he has said before: "U.S. is the Great Satan." That is exactly as I said coming directly from the Supreme

Leader, the Ayatollah Khamenei, in Iran.

So I challenge my colleagues in the Senate to reflect on those statements. Think about them. Not only do they demonstrate Iran's hostility toward the United States and Israel, but they demonstrate another key point when it comes to this agreement; that is, Iran is playing the long game.

President Obama and Secretary Kerry may be thinking in terms of the next few months, may be thinking about their own legacy, but the Iranian regime is thinking in terms of years and decades. While this deal may slow down Iran in the near term, in the long term it legitimizes Iran's nuclear enrichment and drastically shortens its breakout period for a bomb.

Under this agreement, in 10 years, Iran will transition from its current IR-1 centrifuges—which is about, they say, 1960s technology—to the large-scale production of IR-2m centrifuges, which are four or five times faster than what Iran has today. In addition, this deal gives Iran the option of building still more advanced IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges down the road, which are 15 times faster at enriching uranium. In other words, without once violating this agreement in a decade, Iran will have reduced its breakout period for a bomb from a few months to a few weeks. This agreement also allows Iran to keep its fortified nuclear facilities, and it gives Iran access to conventional weapons and ballistic missiles capable of delivering a warhead far beyond Iran's borders.

Plus, under this agreement, Iran will have full access to international markets and the materials and technical components it needs to build a bomb, material that right now it can only access through black-market channels. Iran is playing the long game, and in the long term this is a very good deal for Iran.

Let's be clear about Iran's intentions regarding its nuclear program. Iran is not simply interested in pursuing a nuclear enrichment program for its civilian energy needs. Iran is interested in building a bomb. Make no mistake about it, if Iran were only interested in producing electricity, it wouldn't need a nuclear enrichment program.

Look at other countries that use nuclear power to produce electricity. Sweden, for example, currently has 10 functioning nuclear powerplants, but it does not have a domestic nuclear enrichment program. Finland has four nuclear powerplants, but it does not conduct its own nuclear enrichment. Ukraine, which voluntarily gave up its post-Soviet nuclear arsenal in the 1990s, has 15 nuclear powerplants. It does not conduct its own nuclear enrichment. Mexico, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Spain, Switzerland, and South Africa—all these countries have nuclear powerplants, but none of these

countries conducts its own nuclear enrichment and none of these countries needs to conduct its own enrichment because the fuel can easily be obtained in the world market, where there is actually a surplus of enriched uranium. No one worries that these countries are on the verge of building a bomb because their intentions are clear. They are only interested in the electricity they can obtain from nuclear power, and for this they don't need to enrich their own uranium.

Another striking example can be seen on the Korean Peninsula. South Korea, a thriving democracy, has 23 operating nuclear powerplants. Yet it does not have a commercial enrichment program or even a spent fuel reprocessing facility. North Korea, on the other hand, chose to pursue an undisclosed illicit nuclear enrichment program, and North Korea has produced a nuclear bomb.

Based on Iran's behavior, is Iran trying to be more like South Korea, with its multitude of powerplants and no enrichment capabilities, or North Korea, which fails to provide its population with electricity but still built a nuclear bomb. If Iran wants a peaceful, civilian, nuclear energy program, it does not need to be enriching uranium.

Plain and simple, the only reason Iran needs a nuclear enrichment program is if it is interested in developing a nuclear weapon. If Iran wanted to silence all of its critics, if it wanted to prove that it is operating in good faith, it could halt its nuclear enrichment facility at Fordow and halt its domestic enrichment program altogether.

If President Obama had reached a deal that would accomplish this, the Senate would not have sought a vote upon a resolution of disapproval. Instead, Republicans and Democrats alike would have been supporting the agreement praising the success of the negotiations, but that is not what happened. Instead, the President agreed to a deal that validates Iran's enrichment program, allows it to maintain its nuclear facilities, and explicitly permits Iran to continue researching and manufacturing advanced centrifuges. In other words, in a few short years, this deal gives Iran everything it would need for the speedy development of a nuclear weapon.

If Iran genuinely wants a peaceful nuclear energy program, it can put everyone's concerns to rest and dismantle its uranium enrichment structure. Short of that, Iran is telegraphing to the world that it wants a nuclear bomb.

Mr. President, I wish to shift gears for just a moment and address an assertion that Secretary Kerry has made numerous times throughout this debate.

As we all know, one of the major points of contention surrounding this deal is the side agreements between

Iran and the International Atomic Energy Agency, or the IAEA, that remain a secret. The nuclear deal grants inspections at Iran's known nuclear sites, but the details of these inspections are being kept secret between the IAEA and Iran. Secretary Kerry has asserted that keeping these side agreements secret is standard practice for the IAEA, but is that really the case? Are private agreements between Iran and host countries the norm?

I wanted to find out. So last week I sat down with the former Deputy Director of the IAEA, Olli Heinonen, and discussed the policies and procedures of the IAEA with him at length. Mr. Heinonen is an expert on this topic, having served with the IAEA for 27 years and personally inspected, I might add, sites in Iran in the past. He was able to tell me that keeping side agreements a secret is not standard for the IAEA. It is an exception that has periodically been used to protect proprietary information for commercial reasons.

Let me repeat that. In contrast to what Secretary Kerry is claiming, refusing to disclose these side agreements is not the IAEA's normal procedure; it is an exception. When commercially sensitive information is not at risk, the IAEA's practice is to make the details of the agreements public.

So then why is the IAEA keeping its side agreements with Iran a secret? So far as we know, no proprietary concerns exist, which leads to the inevitable conclusion that these agreements have been kept a secret because they outline a weak inspections regime that would be unlikely to stand up to scrutiny, and the limited information that has been leaked so far backs up this conclusion. According to leaked documents made available to the Associated Press, the side agreements with the IAEA allow Iran to collect its own samples, with cameras recording the process. Iran will then deliver these samples to the IAEA to be tested for radioactive material.

If that is true, there is reason to be deeply concerned because a process such as that would give Iran the opportunity to hide its nuclear activities from the IAEA. It is like having the fox guard the hen house.

One of the agreements made by Secretary Kerry when the discussion of the 24-day waiting period for inspections of undisclosed sites came up was that traces of radioactive material could not be hidden in 24 days. That was the Secretary's argument. Samples taken from surfaces, where activities involving radioactive materials have taken place, will still have radioactive traces after the materials themselves are taken away. That has been the argument that has been made by Secretary Kerry. The Secretary is right about that. Traces of radioactive material do remain, but what the Secretary

doesn't mention is that those traces can be hidden. If tabletops, floors or walls are painted over with certain materials—not just once but several times—samples taken from their surfaces will not reveal radioactive material, and that makes allowing Iran to take its own samples very dangerous, even if cameras are present.

If inspections are intrusive enough—meaning actual human IAEA inspectors are walking through a facility looking not only for illicit activity but for signs of someone trying to cover up such activity—it is pretty easy to identify newly painted surfaces and to know that something is amiss. That is the difference between actual inspections by the IAEA and having Iran collect samples and having cameras cover it.

If, as reports suggest, the IAEA has agreed to allow monitoring by camera instead of sending inspectors into the facilities, it will be very difficult for the IAEA to pick up on efforts to hide illicit activities, such as repainting surfaces. If the IAEA's secret side deals allow Iran to conduct its own inspections, then it is no wonder Iran wants to keep such deals a secret.

Given the possibility that these secret side deals significantly weaken the inspections regime authorized by this agreement, it is imperative that the contents of these deals be made public. In addition, if these agreements are not made known, the IAEA will be setting a dangerous precedent that could undermine its credibility moving forward. If Iran gets off the hook on inspections and the IAEA allows this, what happens next time there is a rogue regime pursuing an illicit nuclear program? Well, I will tell you what is going to happen. That nation will ask for the same inspections deal Iran got.

If the White House is serious on any level about preventing future nuclear proliferation, it needs to consider very carefully what it is doing right now because right now the White House is establishing a precedent that if a country is belligerent enough and hostile enough and pursues a nuclear program in violation of international agreements, eventually the international community will validate that country's nuclear program and possibly even allow the country to conduct its own inspections. That is an incredibly dangerous precedent to set.

I understand that Senators have different ideological foundations from which we form our views and that sometimes political pressures come into play when Senators are looking at legislation, but it is very unfortunate that so many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose to ignore the text of this agreement and cast their vote on ideological grounds.

The truth is that this agreement will provide a hostile nation which has an

expressed hatred of the United States and Israel with a clear path to a nuclear bomb, and I am deeply disappointed that Senate Democrats could not even allow a vote on a deal of this magnitude—a deal that will shape the situation in the Middle East for years to come.

As we move forward, Republicans will do everything we can to protect our country and our allies from the worst consequences of this agreement, starting with Leader MCCONNELL's amendment to require a show of good faith from Tehran before congressional sanctions are lifted. I hope Democrats will join us. They still have that chance. I really do hope they will. This is that important. It is important to America's national security interests. It is important to our allies in that region of the world.

This agreement is a bad agreement. It needs to be rejected. At a minimum, it needs to at least be voted on by the people's elected representatives of this country—something 98 Senators agreed to do just 4 months ago, and now all of a sudden, because the President evidently doesn't want to have to deal with a decision about whether to veto this resolution of disapproval, Democrats have dug in here in the Senate and are preventing the very thing 98 of us as Senators voted to allow to happen just 4 months ago. That is wrong. The American people deserve better.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. President, I rise to address this issue the Senator from South Dakota has been speaking on as well. I am extremely disappointed and frustrated, as the Senator from South Dakota is and many of us are, that 42 of our Democratic colleagues would choose to block the Senate from even being able to consider and have an up-or-down vote on whether we should proceed with this incredibly important, in my view, extremely dangerous deal with Iran despite the fact, as has been observed, that 98 Senators voted to create this very mechanism—a mechanism by which we could consider whether Congress wanted to pass a resolution of disapproval to prevent this dangerous deal from going forward. Nevertheless, they subsequently voted not to allow the Senate—and it is mystifying. We know what the outcome would be. We know there is a bipartisan majority in the Senate that opposes the deal, as there is a bipartisan majority in the House that opposes the deal, as there is a bipartisan majority across America that opposes the deal. But somehow we have to I guess pretend that is not the case and avoid a vote that would clearly manifest that bipartisan majority here in the Senate.

If we did have that vote and we passed the resolution of disapproval—it has passed the House—it would go to

the President, and he would veto it. He has made that clear. And those of us who disapprove of this deal don't have enough votes to override the President's veto. So in the end the President would still get his way.

But somehow we have to hide from the fact that there is a clear bipartisan majority in both Houses of Congress that reflects the wishes of the American people about this. That is pretty frustrating and pretty surprising and strange, that my Democratic colleagues who say they are all for this deal nevertheless are afraid to acknowledge where the consensus really is.

Well, I want to talk a bit about the specifics of the deal, but mostly I want to talk about the context of entering into a deal with a regime like the Iranian regime. There are a few things we should bear in mind when we are entering into negotiations with any other country, but first and foremost, let's remember that this isn't an agreement with Switzerland; this isn't an agreement with Canada; this is an agreement with the regime in Iran.

The first point I would make about this regime is to remember how hostile they have been to the United States. Thirty-six years ago, radical Islamists in Tehran overran the U.S. Embassy, stormed the compound, and took 52 American hostages and held them for 444 days. And I would argue that our relationship with Iran has not improved a whole lot since then. They are still holding American hostages today. They have killed over 500 American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan. They regularly call for "Death to America." They call us the Great Satan. This is a very hostile regime indeed.

The second point we should keep in mind is the consistent, demonstrated aggressive nature and the regional ambitions of this regime. This is, after all, the world's No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism. They actively support Hezbollah. They actively support the Assad regime as he massacres his own people. And when the government in Yemen was cooperating with the United States—cooperating with us in attacking and killing terrorists who were trying to kill Americans—during the midst of the negotiations, the Iranian regime decided that was unacceptable, so they essentially overthrew the Government in Yemen and launched a civil war, which rages to this day. Of course, they continue to consistently threaten the very existence of Israel. That has been a consistent message from this regime.

The third point I would make is how fundamentally untrustworthy this regime is. They are currently in violation of over 20 international agreements; yet we think they are going to comply with this one? It escapes me why we think that history isn't going to repeat itself. Even during the negotiations, they were caught trying to

buy nuclear parts. That is a violation of their own commitments. They were recently caught again using Hezbollah to supply arms to Assad in violation of agreements to which they committed. The bottom line is very clear: This regime in Iran cannot be trusted.

Maybe the fourth point I want to make is the most important in some ways. It seems to me, in my experience in business and in life, in order to successfully complete a deal of almost any kind, to reach an agreement, it starts with a meeting of the minds. It starts with an agreement about a desired outcome. That is true in business, in multinational organizations, and it is true in negotiations we engage in here in Congress. The starting point is agreeing on a fundamental objective, and when two parties reach that agreement, then you can document it. You can draft the legal documents that then manifest and bring that agreement about. In my view—and I think this is a widely shared view—the Iranian regime has not decided to abandon their pursuit of nuclear weapons, and that makes all the difference in the world.

I will take a contrasting point that I think is worth thinking about—the case of Muammar Qadhafi. We can probably all agree that Muammar Qadhafi was a very bad guy, probably a human being with no redeeming qualities at all. But after the United States went into Iraq and when our government presented him with the evidence we had about the Libyan weapon of mass destruction program, Muammar Qadhafi came to a conclusion. His conclusion was that it was in his interest to abandon his pursuit of weapons of mass destruction because he was afraid of what we would do to him if he didn't. He didn't become a good guy; he made a rational analysis of his situation and decided it was in his best interest. His ability to hold on to power would be enhanced if he gave up those programs, so he did. We reached an agreement, it was documented, and there is every reason to believe that would have succeeded because he had decided it was in his interest to make that agreement.

I don't think the Iranian Government has in any way come to the conclusion that they have to give up the pursuit of nuclear weapons. They have been at it for decades, and the very conditions they insisted on in this agreement, in my view, make it clear they have every intention of continuing to pursue nuclear weapons.

To summarize these points, when you are dealing with a country that is extremely hostile to the United States and our allies, that is aggressively seeking to dominate that region, that has demonstrated by its actions that it is completely untrustworthy, and that shows no evidence of having actually decided to abandon the pursuit of nu-

clear weapons, given those aspects, the reality we face, it is very difficult to complete an acceptable negotiation to ensure that country will be nuclear-free. At a minimum, you would need an absolutely bulletproof, airtight agreement in order to be successful.

Instead, what do we have? We have an agreement where we give many tens, maybe over \$100 billion virtually up front, which Iran will certainly use, at least in part, to fund their terrorist activities. The agreement allows them to retain an industrial-scale uranium enrichment program. You don't need any uranium enrichment to have peaceful nuclear energy. There is a very dubious inspection and verification process which allows up to 24 days before inspectors can get to certain sites. The whole deal is temporary. After Iran gets its money, Iran can walk away with the deal with 35 days' notice at any time. There is a little process they have to go through that is 30 days long, and then they can give 35 days' notice and just walk away. That is codified in the agreement. Of course, I think it is extremely dangerous for Israel and diminishes the ability of Israel to defend itself, and I think it is very likely to lead to nuclear proliferation throughout the Middle East.

Those are plenty of reasons, in my view, to oppose this deal, but those are the parts we know about. What is truly amazing, what is absolutely shocking to me is that we don't have all the documents. I don't know how anyone can support a deal when they know they haven't seen some of the important documents that are part of the deal, but we know that is the case.

There are two documents, negotiated apparently between the IAEA—which is responsible for enforcement of essential parts of this agreement—and Iran, that not only has Congress not seen, the administration hasn't even seen. Secretary Kerry has not seen them. Our negotiators haven't seen them. Nobody has.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an additional 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOOMEY. I thank the Chair.

So it is shocking to me that we would proceed and that people would support an agreement when they know there are essential parts of enforcement and discovery about the previous military dimensions that are unknown to us.

There is another point I need to make, and I will close with this. We had the minority leader, the Democratic leader, who was here last time we had this vote saying: This is over. You guys need to accept it, deal with it. This deal is going forward, and there is nothing you can do about it. It is done.

I strongly disagree with that. This is not over. We are not finished with this. The reason we are not finished with this is because the President made a conscious decision. His decision was not to treat this as a treaty, not to respect the constitutional requirement to get two-thirds of the Senate to support this, and had he brought us in early on, we might very well have been able to get there. Instead, he decided to circumvent the Constitution, the Congress, the United States Senate, and the will of the American people. So the result is that if the President goes forward with this, which it certainly looks as though he will, this deal will not be binding on the United States past this administration. That is by virtue of the decision the President made. The President could have gone a different way, but he didn't, so the deal can be undone by the next President. And with bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress, that is entirely plausible.

There is another consideration, and that is that the President will be doing so in violation of the law. The law—the Corker-Cardin legislation—clearly and unambiguously requires the President to turn over all documents to Congress before the 60-day window even begins, and only after that is he permitted to lift the sanctions. But the President has not given all the documents to Congress. In fact, he hasn't even gotten all the documents himself. This is a clear, explicit violation of the law we all passed.

I know the administration says: But it is customary for the IAEA to enter into these secret negotiations. As the Senator from South Dakota indicated a little while ago, it is not at all clear that it is customary, but more importantly, that doesn't matter. The law of the United States of America is more important than whatever is customary between the IAEA and other parties.

So I think this is a very dangerous deal. I am very disappointed that we don't have a chance to have a clean up-or-down vote on this as we should have. But it is important for companies thinking about doing business with Iran and countries around the world to realize this is a deal between the current administration and Iran and it does not necessarily succeed this administration. No. 2, if the President goes ahead and lifts sanctions, he will be doing it in violation of the law he signed.

This is not over, and we should not be giving up.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Mr. President, I rise to speak today on another topic,

and that is the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. Senator CANTWELL is going to be here shortly, and I thank her for her strong leadership. We will also be hearing at some point from Senator McCASKILL and Senator HEITKAMP. This has been a bipartisan effort. I thank the other Senators who have joined in this fight—Senator GRAM and Senator KIRK.

The reason I am here today is to say that America needs to be a country that exports, a country that thinks, that invents, that builds things, and that exports to the world. When 95 percent of the world's customers live outside of our borders, there is literally a world of opportunity out there for U.S. businesses. We simply can't afford to pass this up.

We know there are about 85 credit export agencies in over 60 other countries. So all of these other countries, over 60 countries—major developed nations—have an Ex-Im type bank. Our businesses in the United States are competing against companies in those countries, so when they are bidding against each other for a contract, the companies in the other countries can say: Well, I may not be a huge business, I am a small business, but I know I can get financing from my country's bank—whether they are in Germany or whether they are in China.

Do you know what our companies have to say right now? Well, the Ex-Im Bank's charter has lapsed. We can't get financing.

And if you don't think their competitors know this—their competitors know it. We have already heard that they have lost contracts because of this shortsightedness of letting the Ex-Im Bank lapse. So they are competing against these foreign businesses that are backed by other countries' credit export programs, and they often also receive government subsidies. So why, I ask, would we want to make it harder for our own companies to compete across the globe and create jobs right here at home?

In 2014, the Ex-Im Bank provided support for \$27 billion worth of U.S. exports. That sounds like a lot, but in the same year—are you ready for this?—China financed more than double that amount, \$58 billion. So their Ex-Im type bank financed \$58 billion, ours only did \$27 billion, and now we are not doing anything. South Korea and Germany have already provided more support for their exports than we have in the United States of America.

So if we don't get this done and reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, countries like China are going to eat our lunch. That is why I am urging my colleagues to include the reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank in the spending bills we must pass to keep the government open and running. If we want to level the playing field for our businesses, we need to have the U.S. Ex-Im Bank open and running too. This is about jobs.

In June I led a meeting of the Steering and Outreach Committee on the importance of the Ex-Im Bank. Several of my colleagues were at that meeting, too, and I will tell you what we heard. We heard from small business owners from all over the country. They did not mince words. Frankly, they were furious and frustrated after watching some Members of Congress throw up roadblock after roadblock and refuse to do the commonsense thing—reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank. These small business owners, like the many small business owners I have met in my State, told me the Ex-Im Bank is essential for their ability to export. Many of these smaller businesses don't have an expert on every country in the world. They rely on the Ex-Im Bank to help them with that expertise, to get the financing. And what do they get now? This is what they get. This is what is on the Web site right now of the Ex-Im Bank:

Due to a lapse in EXIM Bank's authority, as of July 1, 2015, the Bank is unable to process applications or engage in new business or other activities. For more information, please click here.

Then you click here, and it says:

To Customers and Stakeholders of the Export-Import Bank of the United States:—

This is the United States of America. It says—

Due to a lapse in our authority, as of midnight on June 30th the Export-Import Bank of the United States ceased processing new applications or engaging in new business.

Last week, Congress adjourned for their August recess without reauthorizing EXIM. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives return to Washington on September 8th. This means that EXIM will focus on the management of our \$107 billion portfolio . . .

But they cannot do anything new.

Guess who else is reading that. Our foreign competitors, companies and countries all over the world. They are able to show the people for whom they are bidding: Look what happens when you go to the Ex-Im type financing site in the United States. Guess what it says. It says: Sorry, we are lapsed; we can't do anything.

That is what these companies from other countries are seeing.

We heard from Boyle Energy Services in New Hampshire, Air Tractor in Texas, the Orbital Sciences Corporation in Virginia, and FirmGreen in California. Most were headed up by Republican CEOs. They all said the same thing—that Ex-Im Bank has been critical in building their businesses and supporting their ability to export all over the world. Many of them told us they would lose business, not be able to enter into contracts, and may even have to lay off workers if they lose the support of the Ex-Im Bank. And now it is not just the possibility of having to lay off workers; that is actually happening in our country due to this problem with the Ex-Im Bank.

At the end of June when the Ex-Im Bank expired, there were nearly 200

transactions totaling over \$9 billion in financing pending. Letting the Ex-Im Bank's charter lapse meant lost contracts and layoffs. It means European and Chinese workers will be doing the jobs Americans are now doing.

My colleagues, I don't think we can wait any longer. I will put in the RECORD the evidence from my own State and what it has meant in my own State.

Every year I visit all 87 counties in Minnesota and I meet with all kinds of small business owners. One thing that I find over and over is that these small businesses are exporting and many are using the Ex-Im Bank to provide them with the expertise they need to enter new markets all over the world and the vital loans, loan guarantees or credit insurance they need to access these markets.

The list of Minnesota companies that have told me of their strong support for the Ex-Im Bank is long. Let me share a few examples.

I have met with the people at Balzer—an agricultural equipment manufacturer based in Mountain Lake—a town of 2,000. They told me that they have grown their exports to about 15 percent of total sales with the help of the Ex-Im Bank. They export from Canada to Kazakhstan—from Japan to Australia—and now South Africa too.

With the help of the Ex-Im Bank, Superior Industries in Morris has been able to export to Canada, Australia, Russia, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, and Brazil.

I have heard from the Trade Acceptance Group in Edina which provides credit insurance to businesses that export. They rely on the Ex-Im Bank. I heard from Fastenal and Miller Ingenuity, both from Winona. They told me how the Ex-Im Bank helped them reach new markets in Mexico, Indonesia, and Africa. And the list goes on.

The Ex-Im Bank was helping these small businesses from all over Minnesota and all over the country compete and export globally. These are success stories and we need more of them. There are success stories like this in every State. And these are the stories we want to hear—not stories about losing jobs and business opportunities to Europe and China.

I have given speeches on this before. We cannot wait any longer. We need to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank now.

I will end with this, as I see Senator CANTWELL, our great leader on this, is in the Chamber. The Ex-Im Bank has been reauthorized 16 times in its 81-year history, every time with broad bipartisan majorities, and Ex-Im has the support this year. The Senate has voted twice with bipartisan support to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank, and over 250 House Members have cosponsored bills supporting the Ex-Im Bank.

The time is here. It is time to stop playing procedural games, get this reauthorized so our great U.S. companies

no longer have to go to a Web site that says: Due to a lapse of authority, the Export-Import Bank of the United States is unable to process applications or engage in new business.

We are all about new business in this country. That is what we have always been all about. So it is time to change that Web site, and we do it by reauthorizing Ex-Im.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Minnesota for her work and her leadership position in the Senate and for focusing on economic policy and constantly doing the research and legwork on how our economy is moving forward and what key essentials we need to move forward. The fact that she is here this morning to speak about the Export-Import Bank and the fact that the lapse of the Bank itself is causing us great economic challenge—I certainly very much appreciate everything she is doing. She comes from a State that has businesses that are exporters. Minnesota has a lot of exporters, so she knows this is causing a big challenge.

I know my colleague Senator HETKAMP, who is an original sponsor of this legislation, is speaking out on this issue as well. I think Senator McCASKILL may be joining us this morning.

I don't know if the American people know, but many of our colleagues know that the Export-Import Bank is tooled to help U.S. manufacturers export products overseas by financing the deals—not really financing them so much as basically helping private banks finance them when the banks won't take all the risk. The program works just like the SBA—the Small Business Administration—does to help small businesses with bank financing. This helps businesses that are trying to export their products overseas get financing where these developing countries may not have banks to do that. So it has expired, which means it is cutting off economic opportunity here in the United States to grow jobs.

When we think about it, with 90 percent of consumers living outside of the United States, the biggest economic opportunity for our country is to sell those consumers products that the United States of America makes. But we have to have financing for developing countries.

There are 478 Ex-Im Bank guarantees and credit insurance policies worth \$3.2 billion set to expire October 1. If we don't quickly reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, that money will be lost. And those are programs that are already underway. As this shows, there are 116 pending deals—deals we could do, deals we could get approved. That would be basically \$9.3 billion in revenue to those companies, and obviously

companies could grow their economic bottom line.

In my visits with companies in the State of Washington, I have seen that a lot of businesses are looking at maybe 20 percent of their revenues coming from overseas markets, so having the Ex-Im Bank helps them reach new market opportunities. Every time I talk to them—what happens if this program goes away and you can't get financing? Most of them will say: That 20 percent of our business will result in layoffs—those people who are associated with that business.

So right now what we need to do is to help these businesses that are in their fourth quarter have the certainty and guarantee that we are going to compete on the playing field of what is called a global economy. If you are not interested in that, if you think we are just going to make U.S. products and sell them to U.S. people, I guess that could be your strategy. I think it is a wrongheaded strategy.

So we are here today to talk about how this is impacting small businesses, big businesses, and what we need to do to get this reauthorized.

Why are we here this morning? Because yesterday we heard news from a major manufacturer that basically talked specifically about what is going to happen. It is not that the Koch brothers are going to win or the Heritage Foundation is going to win; it is that companies such as GE and others are going to ship their jobs overseas so they can get financing for the manufactured products they make. So what happened? GE basically has said it has been forced to move 500 jobs from the U.S. to France, China, and Hungary. Why? Why are they moving jobs overseas? Because they still have a credit agency. France has one and is willing to provide export financing as a major component of wind turbines that would otherwise have been built in the United States. Altogether, GE has \$11 billion in contracts that require export credit agency support. So they are going to meet customer demand.

I worked in business for 5 years. I know what it is like to build and ship a product to meet customer demand. They cannot sit around and wait for Congress to stop catering to special interests to get their customer applications filled. They either do it or they lose business. And that is what is happening today—the American economy is losing business because people here are playing politics with an important tool that helps U.S. manufacturers.

GE isn't the only one. Boeing is also facing job loss. On July 31, Boeing announced that it had lost a contract for communications satellite ABS-8, which will provide service to millions of people in the Asia-Pacific region. We know this is important business, satellite communication. Think about the developing world in places such as the

Pacific islands, Indonesia, the Philippines, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea. This company specifically cited Ex-Im's lapse as the reason they did something else besides going with a U.S. manufacturer. These satellites will still be launched. There will be massive growth in the middle class of Asia that demands it, and they will continue to get a product. It just won't be from a U.S. manufacturer. Why? Because we have chosen to let the Export-Import Bank fail.

All in all, this Export-Import Bank is on track to support 58,000 fewer jobs in 2015—jobs that, if they were able to operate, they would be able to continue. So the fact is that Boeing and GE may be hurting, but they will come up with strategies that work well for them because that is what you do when you are a big company—you figure out how to compete. But the small businesses in America that might be the job engine of growth for the future are not so easily able to move their company or move overseas to get the financing. For example, since 2007 Export-Import Bank has supported more than 230 business exporters in the State of Washington. Two thirds of those are small businesses. So these companies aren't going to be able to all of a sudden stop what they are doing, go to France or go to another country, and start a manufacturing facility just to get credit agency support. The damage that is being done to small businesses in America right now is acute, and we need to make sure we get this export agency reauthorized.

An example of this: My colleague Senator MERKLEY and I visited Bob's Red Mill. I think that about everybody in America, if they don't know Bob's Red Mill, knows they have bought a product from Bob's Red Mill when they have gone and bought oatmeal or grains. It has grown their export revenue about 35 percent since they started working with the Export-Import Bank in 2012. Think about that: Those consumers—90 percent outside of the United States—want to basically consume more products like Bob's Red Mill, a great product. I personally think these are the kinds of things the United States ought to be focusing on. We are still number one in agriculture. We still should be focused on shipping agriculture products to developing markets around the world. This is one of the biggest and easiest opportunities, feeding the world with a product like Bob's Red Mill. But no, no, no. Bob's Red Mill will lose business because they will not have an export authority. I doubt that Bob at his age—a great man, a very vibrant guy at 80—some years old—is going to start a business somewhere else in Europe or in Africa just to export to that market and try to get the financing.

Texas-based Air Tractor will lose up to 25 percent of their sales because the

Export-Import Bank is stopping. Pennsylvania-based Precision Custom Components, which manufactures parts for the nuclear industry, says it has over 100 jobs linked to their ability to service people with export-import financing.

This is a loss of real jobs. When people talk about what we are dealing with in our fiscal crisis—the fact that people are talking about shutting down Government—to me, if you want to be a good fiscal steward, then reinstitute the Export-Import Bank.

In 2014 alone, Export-Import Bank paid \$675 million into our Treasury. That is deficit reduction. In fact, in the previous 5 years, it had generated somewhere around \$5 billion in deficit reduction. Not only are we taking away a key tool, where are you going to plug the hole in our budget from the hundreds of millions of dollars this year—to say nothing of next year and the next year—that you don't have from killing the Export-Import Bank? People need to realize, these people—small businesses, big organizations seeking financing—have to pay a fee. That fee generates revenue. That revenue is used to pay down the Federal deficit. Not only do we create jobs and not only do we reach market access, we actually have a government program that is helping us pay down the Federal deficit.

Why would you not want to reinstitute that? The good news is that the Senate voted to do that. From what I hear, there are enough people in the House of Representatives. People have continued to hold this program hostage because people are anxious about the politics of the Heritage Foundation, the Koch brothers, or people sending out emails or challenging them when in reality you just need to stand up and speak for the fact that you want U.S. job creation, and you believe that U.S. manufacturers making and building a product and selling it overseas is a winning economic strategy for the United States of America. It is. To boot, it pays down the deficit. We know that American businesses are obviously working hard to try to communicate this. Everybody from the manufacturers association to individual workforce organizations is trying to express this. I know my colleague Senator HEITKAMP has been working very hard on this on the banking committee.

With just a short period of time left before whatever this proposal is to shut down the government, which I certainly don't support, we have to say to our colleagues that you either have to get this on the highway bill—which it is as part of a package that we passed out of the Senate—and get either the package that was passed here in the Senate passed by the House or come up with another vehicle that gets this done, as my colleague from Minnesota

just suggested, on the continuing resolution or some other bill so that we actually know we are giving American businesses the opportunity to continue to compete.

I hope we will get a long-term solution here. The fact that we have sent this message around the United States and the world—that there is no longer financing available—has really hurt our competitive opportunity at a time when America needs to embrace the fact that there is so much business in these developing middle-class markets around the globe.

You can sit here and trade away our opportunity to compete by saying I don't want U.S. job creation or deficit reduction. Instead, I want to ship jobs overseas. I don't get the strategy. I don't get what someone thinks is smart about allowing U.S. jobs to be shipped overseas just because they can't get financing here. If the market were willing to take those risks without some of the security put forth here, obviously people would want to see that. But that is not happening because if you are selling grain silos like we are to African nations, there is no bank there that is financing that deal. If you are selling product to Asian countries that are just developing, whether it is seafood or whether it is grain like Bob's Red Mill, they are not always able to get financing. This is a way for the United States to win. All we have to do is embrace this and make sure that we pass the Export-Import Bank as soon as possible.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democrats have 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to thank my colleague from Washington for taking the floor and supporting the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. She has been diligent in coming to Congress and explaining that this agency not only facilitates exports from the United States, which creates jobs and helps businesses here, but it also generates a surplus for the Treasury. What is wrong with that picture? Why would the Republicans be so opposed to an agency that helps American businesses, large and small, export more goods and doesn't cost the Federal Government any money? Why do they want to kill this agency? Why do they want to kill these jobs? I don't understand it.

We had a vote on the floor of the Senate a few weeks ago on the Transportation bill to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and it passed. We sent it over to the House of Representatives which, sadly, has become the graveyard for big issues, important issues when it comes to the future of America. I hope it changes. I hope they will listen to business leaders—that Republicans in

the House will listen to business leaders and not just Boeing aircraft. Of course I am interested in that. It is headquartered in Chicago and is a major employer in the United States, but large and small companies alike feel the same. Export-Import Bank gives our companies in America the ability to finance export deals so they can compete with other countries.

When we decide—or at least some in the Senate decide—to take the United States out of the export business, who is going to step in? Who will take over and create the jobs? Sadly, our competitors, China. They are not waiting around for their legislature, whatever it may be, to give permission for them to dramatically increase exports. They are on the road to do that. I support what the Senator from Washington said.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, on the floor we are going to return in a few minutes to the debate on the Iran agreement. This agreement, of course, has been in the works for a long time. President Obama set out to create a set of sanctions, punishment against Iran to force them to come to the table and to negotiate with us and other nations so they would not develop a nuclear weapon. The President invested a lot of capital in it, and it worked. Congress imposed sanctions. The President imposed sanctions.

The day came when the negotiations started, and we weren't sitting alone at the table. It is an amazing alliance of nations trying to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon. It included China, Russia, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the European Union. They all joined us in the sanctions, and many others too. But they joined us at the negotiating table, and they worked with us until we reached an agreement. That agreement didn't rely on trusting the Iranians. No. It relied on inspectors, real inspectors from the United Nations who have a sterling reputation. It was those inspectors who warned us before we invaded Iraq that there were no weapons of mass destruction. The Bush-Cheney administration paid no attention. We paid a heavy price for that dereliction of duty.

Now these inspectors are in place—will be when this agreement moves forward. We can not only find out what is going on in Iran when it comes to nuclear weapons, we can make sure we discourage them from ever violating this treaty or agreement. Should they violate it, automatically the sanctions will snap back. In fact, it takes only the vote of the United States in the Security Council of the United Nations for all of the sanctions to come back on Iran if they break the treaty. Inspectors, snapback on sanctions, and I hope it results in what we want to see: No.

1, stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon, and No. 2, avoid the United States from going to war again in the Middle East. Those are our two goals.

Those who oppose this agreement come to the floor and say: Stop it. Don't do it. Walk away from it. It is nothing but bad.

Every single Republican in the House and Senate—every single one of them—has come out against this agreement. Not one is supporting it. It shouldn't surprise us.

On March 9, 2015, 47 Republican Senators sent a letter to the Ayatollah Khamenei. Do you know what they said? Don't negotiate with the United States of America. Don't negotiate with this President or other nations. Whatever you do is going to be subject to congressional review. There is no guarantee we will support it. Even if it is supported by Congress, there is no guarantee that any future President would enforce this agreement.

You may even hear it tonight in the Republican Presidential candidate debate. Isn't it interesting that this was the first time in the history of the United States, the very first time that a group of Senators intervened in a Presidential negotiation in national security—the first time that has ever happened. And 47 Republican Senators, including every Member of the leadership, signed that letter. What would happen if 47 Democrats had sent a letter to Saddam Hussein prior to the invasion of Iraq saying: Don't pay any attention to President Bush. What do you think the reaction of Vice President Cheney would have been? He would have had us all up on charges—treason. That is exactly what happened here. There was a letter from 47 Republican Senators saying: Don't negotiate with the United States. The President ignored it. The negotiations continued.

The agreement is before us. There was a key vote last week, a critical vote. Every single Member of the Senate has publicly declared where they stand on this agreement. After some 8 weeks of deliberation and debate, the vote took place last week, but it wasn't enough for Senator MCCONNELL. He demanded that we replay the vote last night. We did, with the same result.

I don't know how many times he is going to bring this before us, but may I suggest to the Republican leader there are some items that he might consider moving to. We are 8 legislative days away from shutting down the Government of the United States. Should we be discussing that? Most Americans would say so. Most Americans think it is embarrassing that the U.S. Government would shut down because a willful group—a small minority—is determined to get that done. Too many people suffer when that happens. We have to do everything we can to keep this government open.

Let's get beyond this debate. We have already established what the vote is,

and the Republicans didn't come up with the 60 votes necessary to move forward. That is the story. They don't like the ending, but that is the ending. Let's move forward in a responsible way to do two things—first, to make sure that Iran lives up to this agreement and do everything in our power to enforce it, and second, get on with the business of government. Let's fund this government. Let's not become a nation that people look at and say: Who is in charge here if a Republican Congress would shut down a government for a second time, as they did a couple of years ago? Who is in charge? Let's get into that issue and let's do it in a responsible and a bipartisan way.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

REAUTHORIZATION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I rise to talk about something very important to small businesses in Missouri. Ironically, tonight there is going to be a debate at the Ronald Reagan Presidential Library. I hear a lot of talk from my friends on the other side of the aisle about small businesses, but here we are today confronting the failure and the job losses associated with our not embracing the Export-Import Bank. President Eisenhower, President Ford, President Reagan, President George Bush—both President George Bushes.

This was not controversial, and it is really easy to understand why. The Export-Import Bank has never been controversial. This is a credit agency. There are 60 other credit agencies around the world that support companies in their countries—60 around the world. It is not a level playing field in the global economy if America decides to no longer support our manufacturing economy and the small businesses associated with that by removing this important tool for exports. It is real jobs. This is not fairytale stuff, and this is not crony capitalism. This is an analysis of risks done by a credit agency and that credit agency, when it analyzes the risk, can keep track of it. We can figure out if in fact they are taking good risks or if in fact it is scratching somebody's back by virtue of the fact that \$7 billion has been put in our Treasury after the Bank has covered its expenses.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULIVAN). All time for morning business has expired.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak in morning business for a couple more minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. MCCASKILL. In 2014 this credit agency that all the other countries in

the world have access to put \$674 million in the U.S. Treasury.

Let me count off here. It creates jobs, supports manufacturing, and adds money into our Treasury. What is the problem?

My staff and I have met with nearly 100 companies in Missouri, and 90 percent of Ex-Im's work directly supports small businesses. I will say that again: 90 percent supports small businesses.

I will give a couple of examples. There is a small company in Joplin, MO. These kids started it in their garage. They build skateboard parks. They now have a manufacturing facility, and they are manufacturing skateboard parks which are exported around the world. They can't go to their local community bank to help their customer in Indonesia. They need what other countries have—a credit agency that analyzes risk on a global basis.

I toured a small Kansas City company now run by the third generation of the same family. They rely on Ex-Im Bank to help them manage their risk of extending credit in foreign markets. Sixty percent of their sales are exports. Do we want to shutter this company? Is that what we want to do? Do we want them to have to cut their employee base by 60 percent because they can no longer export?

There is a St. Louis company that makes cutting-edge play equipment for children and uses the insurance from Ex-Im Bank to work with customers in South America, Australia, and beyond. There is another small St. Louis manufacturer that was founded as a family-owned company in 1951 that sells electrical components to Saudi Arabia, Brazil, and Thailand. They depend on Ex-Im Bank.

What is going on in this place? How has this become controversial? This was never been controversial, and there is one representative that is in a key position in the House of Representatives that is shutting this whole thing down. The American people ought to be outraged. We can vote on Iran as many times as you guys want us to if it makes everybody feel better. I have no problem with that. It was a tough decision for me. I made up my mind. But to be wasting time on political posturing when these jobs—and I have real examples of contracts that aren't going through now because Ex-Im is not there.

I plead with my friends on the other side of the aisle: Make time in your busy schedule of scoring political points on the Iranian agreement to reauthorize Export-Import Bank. Jobs in my State depend on it. Yes, we have unemployment down to 5 percent in this country, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't still focus on jobs every day in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor and ask for the help of all my Republican colleagues to help us get Ex-Im Bank

across the finish line so small businesses in this country do not suffer at the hands of global competition that figures out that this ought to be easy.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2656 (to amendment No. 2640), to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2657 (to amendment No. 2656), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2658 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2659 (to amendment No. 2658), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2660, to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2661 (to the instructions) amendment No. 2660), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2662 (to amendment No. 2661), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the agreement before us. I find in this line of work that repetition is sometimes useful. I know my friend from Illinois mentioned how we ought to be focused on something else, but I think all of us understand that there is an assumed deadline on this topic, which is set for tomorrow.

I say to my friends on both sides of the aisle that the likelihood is that after tomorrow we will move on to the other types of business that we need to deal with. But this is not, as my friend

from Missouri mentioned, an issue of political points. The issue with Iran is one of the most significant, if not the most significant, foreign policy issue that we will likely deal with while we are here in the Senate. I think it is important, while this is before us, to spend as much time as possible talking about this issue, focusing on this issue, debating this issue, and making sure that everyone understands what the contents of this Iranian deal are.

I will walk through it, if I could for a few moments, and lay out why we are where we are today.

I know the Presiding Officer is new here and brings a wealth of national security experience from previous posts that he had with the State Department prior to serving here. But what brought us here really was this body acting almost in a unanimous way to put sanctions in place four times since 2010. We worked with the House of Representatives to put sanctions in place because we knew that Iran was doing things, such as nuclear development, that were going to be damaging to the world. So we sanctioned and punished them. We put crippling sanctions on their economy, and we did that collectively.

This is something that very few people on either side of the aisle objected to. We acted in unison. It was the crippling sanctions that we put together that really brought Iran to the table. Let's face it. Their economy and standard of living were causing people in Iran to become restless, and so finally Iran said: OK, it is time to talk.

When these talks began, our President stated that what we would do in these talks was to end Iran's nuclear program. And just for what it is worth, I think people on both sides of the aisle celebrated that goal—ending Iran's nuclear program.

I might remind people who may be just tuning into this that Iran has 19,000 centrifuges right now, and 10,000 of those are operating. They built underground bunkers at a place called Fordow. It is hard to get to it. It is hard to take those out with munitions, if you will. They built a plutonium facility called Arak.

By the way, much of this was done in a clandestine way. All of it was done violating U.N. Security Council resolutions.

I will say everyone here understands fully that Iran has zero practical need for any of this. Iran has one nuclear facility. Everyone knows that it would be so much cheaper for them to just purchase enriched uranium to fuel that one facility. But they say: No, we want to be leaders in medical isotopes. For what it is worth, if Iran really wanted to develop the expertise around medical isotopes, they would have 500 centrifuges. So we all know that the purpose of this program has not been for civilian purposes. It has been to cause them to be a threshold nuclear coun-

try. We know that. Everyone knows that. They know that, we know that, and every country involved in the discussions with Iran knows that.

First of all, we know what their goals are. So when the President says that in these negotiations what we are going to do is end Iran's nuclear program, I think most people in this body would celebrate that. So he began the discussions, and as he started moving along, it became very apparent to those of us paying attention that what he planned to do was to enter into what is called an executive agreement.

Now, for people who don't do what we do on a daily basis, there are three ways that the President can enter into an international agreement. One way is through a treaty that requires a two-thirds approval by this body. A treaty is interesting because it binds future Presidents, and it binds future Congresses. But the President decided that was not the route he was going to take.

There is a second route he could have taken, and that is called a congressional-executive Agreement. While it is not as strong as a treaty, it does create a law that is binding on future Presidents and future Congresses. The President decided he was not going to go that route.

The President decided that he was going to do this unilaterally, through what is called an Executive agreement. As we know, an Executive agreement is something the President can do, if he chooses, on his own. The problem with it is that it doesn't survive his Presidency. Another President can do something very different.

In this case, however, as everybody has analyzed this deal, everyone understands that we lose all of our leverage over the next 9 months and give it away. When people in this body began to realize that we brought Iran to the table—or at least played a heavy role in bringing them to the table—and that the President was going to use what is called a national security waiver to waive away all the congressional sanctions so that he could enter into this Executive agreement without ever talking to us, we achieved something else that was very important. As a matter of fact, this is the first time this has happened since I have been in the Senate, and there are a lot of misunderstandings about it. For the first time in Congress since I have been in the Senate—on a strongly bipartisan basis—we took power back from the President. We said: Mr. President, we know that you can enter into Executive agreements, but in this particular case, since we put the sanctions in place that brought them to the table—by the way, over your objections—we want a chance to go through this agreement in detail, and we want the right to either approve or disapprove. But you have to present us with this, and it has to sit before us for 60 days,

which it will have done as of tomorrow, and we want the right to weigh in as to whether we believe the substance of this deal is good for our Nation.

We had 98 Senators in this body vote for this. One of the Senators who was absent supported it, and that makes it 99. It is pretty remarkable that on a bipartisan basis 99 Senators said: No, we want this to lie before us because we believe this is one of the biggest foreign policy issues we are going to deal with, we believe that this is a vote of conscience, and we believe that every Senator and every House Member—which is unusual with these kind of agreements—should weigh in and be able to voice their opinion.

So we have gone through the deal, and what is fascinating about it is—I hate to be pejorative, but we had almost unanimity on putting sanctions in place to bring them to the table. We had almost unanimity on the fact that we should be able to weigh in. It is my strong belief that in lieu of the President achieving the deal that he did or the goals that he stated to end Iran's nuclear program, obviously, we have done anything but that.

So what has happened is we have totally squandered an opportunity to unite this Nation, and others, around ending their program. Instead, our Nation, with other “great nations” have agreed to allow Iran not only to not end their program but to industrialize it. We have agreed to let them develop intercontinental ballistic missiles so they can deliver a nuclear weapon. We agreed to let them do research and development.

Right now they are using the old IR-1 centrifuges, which are like antiques, but we are going to allow them to do research and development on the IR-2s, IR-4s, IR-6s, and IR-8s, which we know are multiple times faster. We have lifted the conventional weapons embargo and the ballistic weapons embargo, for some reason, just throwing it in for good measure. We are allowing them, for the first time, to begin testing.

So what has happened is now in this body, there is some tepid support—I see my friend from Michigan, I have other friends, and I haven't heard anybody come out and say this is a great agreement. What they are saying—not necessarily the Senator from Michigan but others—is, well, we are where we are. We are where we are.

This is not a very good agreement. It is flawed. Even though Congress, 200 times, has sent international agreements back to the executive branch—200 times—in this case: We are where we are. And our friends in Russia—by the way, has anybody seen what our friends in Russia are doing in Syria right now? Yes, they are really good friends. Has anybody seen what China is doing right now in the South China Sea? They are building their third airstrip, claiming territory that for thou-

sands of years has belonged to other countries from the standpoint of territorial waters. People are saying—our friends and allies—what will we do about our friends and allies?

So here is where we are. I could go on and on. I just cannot believe that our great Nation, with “our friends” from Great Britain, Germany, and France and “our friends” from China and Russia, squandered—squandered—an opportunity, had a rogue nation with a boot on its neck—a boot on its neck—we squandered the opportunity. Now, with our approval, they can industrialize their program. As a matter of fact, they don't have to violate the terms of this deal. They can just honor the terms of this deal. Their economy will flourish. By the way, it is hard for me to believe this, but I think most people understand that we are giving them back \$100 billion. We are going to do that over the next 9 months. We are lifting the major sanctions that have crippled them. We are doing that without us even asking them to do much. From that point on, by the way, the leverage shifts from us to them.

We are very concerned about what they are doing in Syria. By the way, they have doubled down on that since the agreement was reached with the nuclear file. We are very concerned about what they are doing with Hezbollah in Lebanon. We are very concerned about what they are doing with Hamas, allowing rockets to be fired into Israel. We are very concerned about what they are doing in Lebanon with the Houthis. We are very concerned about what they are doing in Bahrain with thousands of men and women in uniform trying to keep the strait open. We are very concerned about that, but in 9 months, if we express our concerns, what are they going to do? They are going to say: We have all of our money, you have lifted all the sanctions, and if you press back against us for terrorism or human rights or violations in this agreement that are minor, we are just going to start a nuclear program again. So it is kind of unbelievable that we have ended up in this place.

What is happening on the floor now, just to explain to the American people, we have a process in the Senate which says that at the end of debate—by the way, we have had a lot of debate on this. We have had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee alone. The Presiding Officer serves on the Committee on Armed Services and they have had hearings. The Intelligence Committee has had hearings. We have had hearings as a body. We have had personal meetings. As a matter of fact, I would say this body knows more about this international agreement than any international agreement in modern times. As a matter of fact, thanks to us pushing back against this administration, the American peo-

ple know more about this agreement than any agreement in modern times. It is amazing. Thank goodness we passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act; otherwise, none of this would be known—none of this.

So where we are today is we all said this was one of the biggest foreign policy issues to come before us; we want the American people to know where we stand on the substance of the deal. So for people tuning in, here is the way the Senate works.

When a vote comes before us—and right now, since there is a strong bipartisan majority of people who oppose this deal—as a matter of fact, the two most knowledgeable Democrats on foreign policy issues, the ranking member and the former chairman and ranking member, who know more about foreign policy than any Democrat in this body—both oppose this deal. So on a strong bipartisan majority, we have a group of people who think we can do better. Just like the 200-plus times we have sent agreements back to say do better, we are saying we think we can do better.

So here is what is happening. When a bill comes or a vote comes before the Senate, we have these rules, and there is a rule that says there is a cloture vote. What cloture means is that people say: OK. We have heard enough about this. We believe it is time to take a vote.

I just heard the Senator from Illinois say we have been talking about this way too long. It is time to move beyond it. He left out a minor detail; that is, it takes 60 Members of the Senate to say we have heard enough about it. It is time to vote. But what is happening is that we have 42 Members of one party who are in the minority—42 Senators who are saying: No, we are not going to allow this to move to a final vote. We are not going to do it.

We know it is not about debate. We know—as a matter of fact, the second highest officer on the Democratic side says we need to move on to other business. It is time to move on to other business, and what we need to do is invoke cloture and let's vote. But let me tell my colleagues what is really happening here. It has sort of taken on—I have said this several times—it has taken on kind of a Tammy Wynette kind of flavor: Let's stand by our man. Let's stand by our man. We don't want the President to have to deal with a resolution of disapproval; we want to protect him from that. We don't want to embarrass him, that there is a bipartisan—by the way, the smartest, most well-versed, deeply informed on policy Member on his side of the aisle is agreeing with the vast majority of the Senate—58 Senators—saying this is not good for our Nation because this does not end the program. By the way, if this ended the program, do we know what would be happening? We would

have 100 Senators saying: Let's vote to approve this. This is outstanding. The President achieved his stated goal. But since that isn't the case, what we want to do is send a resolution of disapproval to the President. But we have 42 Senators on the one hand saying let's move on and let's deal with funding government but on the other hand are not agreeing to a final vote.

So we have one more chance. I just want to say this. We have a lot of partisanship that happens here. Let's face it, we do. I get it. It happens. I am going to have to say in this case, the majority leader has allowed me to work with my friends on the other side of the aisle. He has allowed me to move this through in an appropriate way. At every juncture—when my friends on the other side of the aisle felt as though something was occurring that was adding unnecessary temper or maybe something was getting out of line and we needed to alter our course of action—at every juncture, the majority leader said: Senator CORKER, if you think this is the best way of moving ahead to keep the bipartisanship that I have had with Senator CARDIN and Senator MENENDEZ and so many others, have at it.

I just want to remind people that as we entered this debate—as we know, there are all kinds of inflammatory amendments that could be added to this debate—the leader filled the tree. Now, for people out in the listening audience, fill the tree, what does that mean. What he did was he kept any inflammatory amendments from being offered. The only thing that is before us—I know he has filed an amendment now. After two times, the minority will not let us move to a final vote. I know there is going to be one that is tough—I don't know if it is that tough or not—to vote on this Thursday, but the fact is that the purpose has been for us to move to a final vote. Forty-two Senators will not allow us to have that vote of conscience. I want to say again to those listening in, the process vote of any debate is not a vote of conscience. That is not a vote of conscience. The vote of conscience is, when we take the final vote, do we believe that this Iran deal—the President's Iran deal—is something that is good for our country, will create stability in the region, and certainly will keep them from getting a nuclear weapon. Fifty-eight of us don't think so. Actually, I have to believe, from listening to the comments of many of my friends when they talk about how flawed it is, I think there is actually a whole lot of concern, even though sometimes—and I understand when you have a President of your own party, sometimes it is hard to go against the President. I get that. I understand the pressures that come to play when that happens.

But where we are, I say to the American people and to my fellow Senators,

is we want to move to a final vote, an up-or-down vote, which, by the way, by the rules of the Senate, is a majority vote. We want to move to that. We have 42 Senators who are keeping us from that. What I hope is going to happen over the course of the next 24 hours is that a couple Senators, a few, will say: Look, we did vote 98 to 1 to register our feelings about the substance of this most important agreement. We did. We really did do that. Maybe it is appropriate that we, on behalf of the American people, not get stuck on this procedural issue, this cloture vote. We have debated this plenty, so let's go ahead and move to a final vote. That is what I hope is going to happen.

I am thankful, though—I do want to say one more time—I thank people on both sides of the aisle for having the gumption to buck the administration and to put in place four tranches of sanctions to get them to the table. I thank both sides of the aisle—by the way, led by Senators MENENDEZ and KIRK, led by the two of them, one Democrat and one Republican—we did that together. I thank people on both sides of the aisle for putting us in the position to actually have the documents, to know what this deal is about, to have this debate, to be able to weigh in.

I want to say one more time that had the President done what he said he would do—and that is negotiate to end the program—we would have 100 people supporting it, but he didn't. We all know that. Everyone knows that is not what has happened. We have agreed to industrialize their program, let them do research and development, let them create delivery mechanisms to make sure they can send these nuclear warheads they are going to be on the verge of developing a long way across the oceans to places such as America and other places. I don't know why we did that, but we did.

So now we just want a chance to vote yes or no. Do we believe this is an agreement that will stand the test of time? Is it something that is good for our country? Do we believe this is something that if Iran wishes to, will keep them from developing a nuclear weapon?

I look forward to the comments of my friend from Michigan, and I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

MS. STABENOW. Mr. President, first of all, let me agree with the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee that, in fact, we did come together on strong sanctions against Iran that has brought us to this situation on a bipartisan basis. We did come together on the process that would create legislatively a way for us to make a decision. That was done on a bipartisan basis. What I regret is, at this point, even though we are fol-

lowing through on the legislative process we adopted, it now has become so partisan. That is not good for America, it is not good for Israel, and it is not good for, frankly, the world to see this happen.

So while agreeing on part of what the distinguished chairman said, I have to disagree on many things, although I am not going to take my time to go into them now. But certainly the process we are using is no different than any other major bill—health care reform, financial services reform—and it was set up in what we passed. So we can try to make it into some partisan issue now. The reality is we have all thoughtfully taken a position. We have voted. Everyone knows everyone's position. So now we are just in the process right now, unfortunately, I believe, of politics, which does not help us move forward for our country or for our allies.

AMENDMENT NO. 2656

MR. PRESIDENT, I wish to speak to an issue I am deeply concerned about, which is the next vote we are going to have on Thursday, and speak to a very important young man who is an American hero and who is caught in the politics of what is happening right now.

AMIR HEKMATI from Flint, MI, is an American hero. He served his country as a marine between 2001 and 2005 in Iraq and Afghanistan. He served with valor. He served with honor. He was awarded the Combat Action Ribbon and the Good Conduct Medal. But this morning, Amir woke up in an Iranian prison. He has been in that prison for 4 years and 19 days. During that time, Amir has been tortured. The prison is notorious for its deplorable conditions. While he has been there, his father, in Flint, MI, has been battling terminal brain cancer.

The Iranian Government is playing politics with Amir Hekmati's life. Unfortunately, though, now, today, the Senate Republican leader is also playing politics with Amir's life. The imprisonment of this veteran, this American hero, is being used by the Senate majority leader in a transparent effort to score some cheap political points, in my judgment, and it is appalling. No American should ever be used in this way—none of us. This is a young man whose parents are desperately worried about his safety, who have been waking up every day for the last 1,479 days hoping this would be the day they would learn their son Amir would be freed. How does it show respect to Amir's mom and dad to use their son's plight and possibly even threaten the negotiations that are going on now in order to make a partisan political point and jeopardize his release?

We have had a rigorous debate on the international Iran agreement, and I know from talking to colleagues and being in many meetings that those on our side have been very thoughtful and

thorough—and certainly the chairman has as well—in coming to our positions in a highly charged, difficult, and very complicated situation. I spent many weeks in classified briefings, meetings with nuclear experts, meetings with the Ambassadors, and personally calling each of those involved in the negotiations in the P5+1 countries, meeting with constituents in Michigan who feel very passionately about this issue on both sides, and I have made my decision—the decision I believe is best for America, for Israel, and for our allies. I did not make my decision on the day the agreement was announced, before I had ever read it, or even before it was announced—regrettably, as many Republican colleagues in the House and Senate did.

We have had a vote in the Senate. We have now had two votes on this issue. Today or tomorrow we will have a third vote, not because the majority leader is expecting a different result—we have all taken our positions—but because he wants to score political points and bring in as part of that vote four American hostages and what is happening to them. Those political points will be scored at the expense of Amir Hekmati from Flint, MI, who has served his country honorably.

Mr. President, I have gotten to know the Hekmati family, and I know how much their son's freedom means to them. Any of us who have children can understand what they are going through. I have personally talked with the President and other officials at the highest levels of our government who are working tirelessly to secure Amir Hekmati's release and return him to his loving family, along with the other Americans held hostage.

This is a diplomatic mission. It is a humanitarian mission. Yet the majority leader is on a political mission that is not going to help. He wants to interfere with and disrupt the international nuclear agreement with Iran. I understand that. I understand his and others' position. But they are willing to use Amir and other American hostages in the process, and that is wrong. This political stunt by the majority leader does not help bring Amir home. It doesn't help bring the other three Americans home. It just adds more politics to the situation.

What is very disturbing to me, after always having bipartisan support—one of the things I could always say to my constituents was that when it comes to the issues around Israel and the Middle East, we have always been together on a bipartisan basis—until now and what has happened over the last few months.

Unfortunately, what is happening on this debate and the vote we will have tomorrow—bringing the American hostages into this debate on Iran is not the first time we are seeing partisan politics interjected into this debate. I still will never forget the 47 Republican

Senators who wrote a letter to the Supreme Leader in Iran—our enemy, the Ayatollah—to tell him not to pay any attention to the President of the United States.

I have to say that if it were reversed and if there were 47 Democrats, everything would have halted in this Chamber. There would have been impeachment hearings. We would have been called traitors. It would have gone on and on. It is shocking to me. If this had happened—when we were debating going into Iraq, if we had written a letter to Saddam Hussein saying “Don't listen to the President of the United States” or anybody else, for that matter, any other President, that would have been a national crisis and there would have been outrage. Yet, somehow, 47 Republican Senators can write to the Ayatollah in the middle of an international negotiation that was difficult at best, when we know that Iran is within 3 months of having a nuclear weapon right now, by the way, that we should all be concerned about. I know we are, except some of us act as if we can go back to renegotiate something, which will take years, when they are going to have enough materials within 3 months.

In the middle of all that, almost half of this Chamber writes to the people who are funding terrorism and who are our opponents and enemies in terms of the Ayatollah, saying: Hey, by the way, the President of the United States—don't listen to him. Don't listen to him.

Interestingly, Senator COTTON said in that letter that of course it will take 60 votes to pass anything in the Senate—which, of course, it does and which, of course, we are debating now. And folks are acting as though it doesn't. But the Ayatollah was sent a letter that said it would take 60 votes, so whoever wrote him might want to check in with him.

So here we are now. We have seen the ultimate politics of Members in this body writing to our enemies and saying: Don't listen to the President of the United States. And now we are in a situation, after voting twice on a serious, difficult, emotional, controversial issue where there are serious, thoughtful people on both sides—because the vote is not going the way the majority wants, now they bring in the four hostages and Amir.

There is a tradition in our country when it comes to issues of national security and the lives of men and women who serve in America. This quote was coined by a former Michigan Senator, Arthur Vandenberg: “Politics stops at the water's edge.”

This picture we are very proud of. It is right outside here in the Reception Room. Very few U.S. Senators have their portraits painted on the wall in the Reception Room, and I am very proud one of those is a former Republican Senator from west Michigan, Sen-

ator Arthur Vandenberg. He was a great nemesis of President FDR. He hated the New Deal. He went after President Roosevelt at every turn on his domestic agenda. But as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, when we were being attacked at Pearl Harbor and World War II was happening, he stepped up and said, “Politics stops at the water's edge.”

For over 70 years, that was the way the United States of America acted. That is the way the Senate operated. We have lost that, and I am deeply concerned—not as a Democrat but as an American—about where we find ourselves today on matters of such seriousness, international threats to our country. We can debate them. We can have differences. If someone loses the vote, it becomes time to come back together and find a way to move forward to keep America strong. There are many opportunities for us to do that, many opportunities on this agreement to make it stronger, to focus on the nonnuclear sanctions and other things that we need to do together against Iran, to focus on bringing our heroic Americans home. But this is not the way to do it. This is not the way to do it.

So I stand today to object to what I view as a political stunt, and the vote tomorrow is deeply concerning to me and to people in Michigan who want to bring Amir Hekmati home. This is not politics; this is somebody's life. It is about the future national defense of our country and our allies and the world.

The vote is the vote. We have taken our positions. It is time to come back together as Americans.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I want to thank my colleague from Michigan for pointing something out today that I haven't heard before, which is that this vote we are going to have tomorrow, which is a revote on the Iran nuclear agreement, adding a couple of pieces regarding hostages and sanctions regarding Israel, is actually a dangerous vote, and I agree with her completely that it is a political vote.

If you ask the people on the street what they think of Congress, we just are not thought of very well because the people see through this. They see through the politics of this.

You know, we have already voted on this agreement. My friend Senator CORKER, my chairman—I serve on that committee. I am very proud to serve with him. He says: Well, all we want is a vote on the agreement. We gave them a vote. We wanted an up-or-down vote on the agreement. Senator REID asked for that twice, for a 60-vote threshold. Oh, no. Suddenly, even though Senator MCCONNELL has said over the years

that every single important vote is a 60-vote threshold, suddenly—this is an important vote. How well I remember a vote cast here on climate change legislation where we got—counting the people who weren't here who said they were for it—56 votes. We fell four votes short. Wouldn't it have been nice if I had gone to the floor and said: This is outrageous. This is outrageous. Let's have a 51-vote threshold.

Well, we knew we needed 60. We didn't play games. We didn't play games with it. That is what we have here. We are playing games with an agreement which already has been voted on, and we had enough people voting in favor of the agreement, if I can say, to derail the Republican plan.

Now derailing this agreement, in my view, means war. And I see my friend on the floor here from Arkansas, and he was the one person who said it. Let's just essentially, he said, bomb this thing away. Well, he is honest about it. Other people say: Oh, just go back and get another agreement. That is code word for "no agreement." That is code word for "war."

We have spoken out on this very clearly, and it isn't as if we don't have other issues we need to deal with. The fact is, enough Senators said they support the agreement to derail the effort to stop it. Grow up, accept the fact, and move on. Use it in your campaigns just as we will use it in our campaigns.

I do not think the people in this country want another war in the Middle East, and I feel very strongly that this is a conscience vote. So bring it up 10 times. I am not going to change my vote, especially when I see playing politics has become the way my Republican friends are dealing with this most sober issue.

As you look on the horizon, we know there are a couple of real problems facing us. The budget runs out in 14 days. Are we going to have a government shutdown because some people don't think women should have the right to choose? Are we? I don't know, but we have 14 days to deal with it. Why aren't we dealing with it? We voted on the Iran agreement. It is not going to change. It is just politics as usual. People are sick of it.

Mr. President, let's take a look at the Republican budget. The proposed Senate Republican budget would cut over one-half billion dollars from the Environmental Protection Agency's budget. I just came from a hearing—a very important and good hearing—where we looked at a horrible tragedy that happened in Colorado. EPA went in there, at the request of the State, to check whether this old mine that hadn't been cleaned up in generations caused a risk of a blowout. And when they started to do their testing, there was a blowout. EPA was devastated with that.

What our committee looked at is how are we going to move forward. Well, we

are not going to move forward, I say to my friends, when we cut one-half billion dollars out of the EPA budget that could be used to clean up these mines. When there is a devastating blowout, horrible chemicals, such as cyanide and lead, get into drinking water supplies and it destroys communities. Why would we want to have a budget that cuts so much from the Environmental Protection Agency that 80 percent of the people support? It is so popular. Congress is so unpopular; the EPA is popular. People want a clean environment.

In all my years in office, no one has come up to me and said: The air is too clean. The water is too clean. They say the opposite. They say: You know what. My kid has asthma, clean up the air or they say: I am worried that I can't drink the water. I have to purify it.

So instead of revoting on something we already voted on—and every Member, it is not like anyone was hiding. We all came out. We were either for the agreement or against it. I have to say my colleagues were wonderful in explaining their positions, and I was proud, but I am not proud to see us now go right back to the same thing.

When we have all of these problems facing us, the Republican budget cuts \$400 million from community health centers, preventing 620 new clinics from opening and keeping 2.6 million Americans from getting preventive and lifesaving care—that is right, 400 million from community health centers.

How about the HOME Program, the Nation's primary affordable housing program? It would be practically eliminated with a 93-percent cut. This means a loss in production of about 40,000 affordable housing units across the country.

The Centers for Disease Control, we know how important they are when we have an epidemic looming. It would be slashed by the Republican budget by \$245 million, hurting our efforts to protect communities from diseases such as Ebola and the measles. We all thought the measles were gone. It came back in California and thank God for the CDC for helping us when we needed them.

Then there is the Export-Import Bank. We extended its life and attached it to the Transportation bill, which is great, but the Export-Import Bank expired 78 days ago. And the Transportation bill that I worked so closely on with Leader MCCONNELL, Senator INHOFE, Senator DURBIN, and others—it is stuck in the House of Representatives. I don't know what to think about what they are doing over there, but they need to get going and get that Transportation bill into conference so we can do this. This is a bipartisan bill. But instead of pushing and working on that, we are revoting on an issue we already voted on.

The Ex-Im Bank has real consequences. GE, General Electric, an-

nounced it will shift 500 jobs overseas because of the Bank's closure. So anyone who tells you it doesn't have an impact, they are wrong; it does have an impact. Five-hundred families are suffering because the Ex-Im Bank—which we did the right thing in the Senate—is stuck in the Transportation bill in the House. They have yet to mark their bill, and I hope they will.

Then we have the debt ceiling, something Ronald Reagan warned us about over and over again: Don't play politics with the debt ceiling. I remind everybody, when Bill Clinton was President, we balanced the budget. I was here. That shows you how long I have been around. I didn't have these gray hairs then.

So in those years we balanced the budget, created a surplus. And then what happened after Bill Clinton? Immediately, we had this humongous tax cut for the rich, and we had huge deficits under Republican President George W. Bush. Thank God, President Obama has cut that deficit in half, but we still have a debt. That is because two wars were put on the credit card and there were these tax cuts to the rich, which caused huge deficits, so the debt kept climbing up. Now we have to raise the debt ceiling to accommodate the past spending of this Congress.

President Reagan was right: Don't play politics with the debt—even thinking you will hurts our economy. The last time we played these games it cost us a fortune, and it caused huge uncertainty in the markets.

So we have the budget crisis, we have a Republican budget with huge cuts to programs we need, such as the Centers for Disease Control; we have a transportation bill, the authority for which runs out in October. We have all of these things. Yet what are we doing today? We are voting again on Iran. No one, in my view, is going to change their mind.

I was thinking maybe some of my Republican friends might come over to our side in favor of the agreement since Colin Powell is for the agreement, Richard Lugar is for the agreement, John Warner is for the agreement, and Brent Scowcroft is for the agreement—these are all leading Republican voices—and others, many others. I don't see that happening.

For those people who say it has been partisan, it has been partisan. Several Democrats joined Republicans against the agreement. Not one Republican—not one—despite all the leadership on their side outside the Senate—joined us, so the partisanship has been coming from the other side of the aisle. We are voting again on Iran, so maybe I thought next week we could take up some of these serious issues that I just outlined, these pressing, pressing issues: the budget, the debt ceiling, the Ex-Im Bank, all these incredibly important issues that we are facing. But,

no, next week the majority leader has decided to take up abortion—abortion.

What we are going to be faced with is a bill that says to a woman: You cannot have an abortion after a certain period of time. It is a ban—no exception for the health of the women. I wish to talk a little bit about that today.

The bill, as it is coming forward, is extreme. It is a direct attack on women, on doctors, and on the law of the land called *Roe v. Wade*. It is unconstitutional because it offers no health exception. It bans abortion at a certain point in pregnancy, with no exception, no health exception: no help for a woman facing cancer, no help for a woman facing kidney failure, no help for a woman facing blood clots or other tragic complications during their pregnancy. This is a war on women, and that is what they are going to do. They are not going to the debt ceiling, they are not going to the budget, which must be fixed, and they are not going to Ex-Im, even though jobs are leaving the country.

This bill they are taking up next week will revictimize survivors of rape and incest by assuming they are lying, forcing women to go through multiple medical visits to prove they have been victimized. It would throw doctors in jail for up to 5 years for helping a woman after a certain point in her pregnancy, when that doctor knows she risks paralysis, infertility, a woman who has cancer whose life would actually be in danger if that pregnancy is continued.

But don't take it from me, take it from the women who have had to have these abortions, women who desperately wanted a child, such as Thais from California, who learned at the 20-week ultrasound there were multiple tragedies facing her baby's heart and lungs. The baby had no diaphragm, which means her baby would have suffocated to death once outside the womb. You would force that woman to go through a pregnancy, not to mention the impact on the baby.

Then there is Emily from South Carolina, a 26-year-old mother of two girls. During her third pregnancy, she suddenly had extreme health symptoms, including blurred vision and intense abdominal pain. After testing, she was diagnosed with preeclampsia, which posed a serious threat to her health. Under this bill, she could not have been spared the risks to her health.

So when we say there is a war on women, we mean it. We are not just saying words. Frankly, I am confused with everything else facing us. We had such a bipartisan breakthrough on the Transportation bill. I was so proud to work with the majority leader, so proud of the product that came out of that. I was proud to work with the Democrats and Republicans on the Environment and Public Works Com-

mittee—every one of whom was involved and supported the deal that went through. As a matter of fact, we had a majority of both caucuses. Why can't we build on that bipartisanship? Why do we have to go back to the usual corners? It is sad and unnecessary.

But, you know what, we are going to be voting on Iran, so I am going to tell you why I am backing the deal. If you have to go through it again, I am going to go through it again.

The key points of this agreement: No. 1, it cuts off the uranium pathway to a bomb; No. 2, it cuts off the plutonium pathway to a bomb; and, No. 3, it uses the most intrusive inspections regime ever negotiated. When people say: Oh, but they have 24 days to stall if somebody wants to look at their program, let's be clear, not one party in the world who is a party to a nuclear agreement has any deadline, even the United States. If there is a suspicion of a program being hidden, you can stall it off—but not this one. You have to let them in, in 24 days, or they are in breach. There is a mechanism to require Iran to provide the IAEA with access to those suspicious sites—that 24 day-limit that is not present in any other agreement. It requires the Iranians to disclose their past nuclear activities before they receive a penny of sanctions relief, and the United States and our allies have the ability to snap back multilateral sanctions.

The bill that is going to come before us for another vote talks about how we cannot lift sanctions in this deal until certain conditions are met. But it ignores the fact that there is a whole other set of sanctions that are in place for Iran's terrorist activities, and those sanctions are not touched. Don't conflate the two and confuse people. There are sanctions for their non-nuclear activities, which include their horrific support of terrorism; and then there are sanctions for their nuclear activities, which we will be lifting if they agree and carry out the terms of this agreement, particularly since they will not have one penny lifted until they disclose every bit of their past activities.

So let us see what else I can share with my colleagues as to why I support this deal. I have to say, at a time when Congress is not trusted and has the worst approval rating—I am so embarrassed by that—I have come to the point where I look at third parties to make my case. So, 29 of our Nation's top nuclear scientists, including 6 Nobel laureates, say this is a good deal; 60 bipartisan national security leaders say this is a good deal; over 100 former U.S. ambassadors say this is a good deal; three dozen retired U.S. generals and admirals say this is a good deal; 340 U.S. rabbis say this is a good deal; and 53 Christian leaders and the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops—and we are going to be seeing the Pope here next week—say this is a good deal.

So the religious leadership on the side of this deal, for the most part, is overwhelming because our religious people who lead us here want peace in the world. They do not want to see an escalation of war. We see what war brings. We lost, in the Iraq war, more than 4,000 of our people.

I ask unanimous consent for 1 more minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, this is what our allies are saying:

If the U.S. were to walk away from this deal, international unity would disintegrate, the hardliners in Iran would be strengthened, and we would lose the most effective path to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon.

That is a direct quote from Philip Hammond, the UK's foreign secretary. He speaks for all of our partners in this—100 nations who support this deal—100 nations who support this deal.

Why would we want to stand with the hardliners in Iran? I know my colleagues wrote to them. And they are partners with them, make no mistake—the hardliners here and the hardliners in Iran.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mrs. BOXER. But I believe if you are a moderate person, support this deal.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I feel at times as if I have exhausted my words against the nuclear deal with Iran. I have inveighed against the wickedness of the Ayatollahs, their responsibility for the deaths of hundreds of American troops in Iraq and Afghanistan, their support for terror, and their attacks on Israel and other American allies. It is the height of folly, weakness, and credulity to give Iran tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief and put them on the path to nuclear weapons.

Indeed, I feel as if I can say nothing more than I have already said. But, fortunately, the Democrats who support the Iran nuclear deal have supplied cogent arguments against the deal. Thus, rather than speak myself, I will simply let the Democrats speak in their own astonishing words.

Here are the Democrats on the expiration of the deal.

I remain extremely concerned that after 15 years, the restrictions on how much uranium Iran can enrich and to what level expire and Iran will once again return to its current status as a nuclear threshold state with a breakout time of just a couple of months, if not weeks. It is disconcerting that Iran can achieve this status without breaking the rules or bending the agreement. To be clear, in fifteen years, Iran will be allowed to be a legitimized threshold nuclear state. . . . My fear is that 15 years from now, America and the world will face an Iran that sees its enrichment power as legitimized, that is wealthier and more economically powerful,

and an Iran that is fortified with new weapons and air defenses as embargoes on conventional arms and ballistic missiles expire five and eight years from now.

That was Senator PETERS.

I acknowledge that legitimate concerns have been raised about Iranian activities after the first 10 years of the agreement, sometimes referred to as the "out years." During this time, Iran's breakout time could shrink substantially.

Senator REED of Rhode Island.

When key restraints begin to expire in 10 to 15 years—a blink of an eye to a country that measures its history in millennia—our country will still have to deal with an Iranian leadership that wants to build an industrial-scale nuclear enrichment program. That's a big problem.

Senator WYDEN.

None of us knows what lies 10 or 15 years on the horizon. I have deep concerns about what the shape of Iran's nuclear program could look like beyond this horizon. . . .

Senator BENNET.

And here are the Democrats on Iran's financing of terrorism:

Iran will be disruptive in the Middle East and fund terrorist activities. This regime will continue to deny Israel's right to exist. The Quds Force will still be listed as a terrorist organization, and Iran will continue to exacerbate tensions with allies in the region.

Senator GILLIBRAND.

Let's be clear, Iran is a sponsor of terrorism and an abuser of human rights. This deal doesn't change that.

Senator HEITKAMP.

It is certainly possible, perhaps probable, that Iran will use its additional resources and access to conventional arms to increase its support for terrorist groups.

Senator MERKLEY.

I do share concerns about parts of the agreement, including how Iran could use funds from sanctions relief to continue funding Hezbollah and other terrorists around the world. It is clear they have been funding these activities despite crippling sanctions. And we are right to be concerned that additional funds from sanctions relief, or any other sources from other countries if this agreement is not approved, could be used to continue these outrageous activities.

Senator STABENOW.

Here are the Democrats on Iran's continued nuclear activities and enrichment:

With this deal, we are legitimizing a vast and expanding nuclear program in Iran. We are in effect rewarding years of their deception, deceit, and wanton disregard for international law by allowing them to potentially have a domestic nuclear enrichment program at levels beyond what is necessary for a peaceful civil nuclear program.

Senator BOOKER.

It is certainly possible that Iran will use its nuclear research or nuclear energy program to provide a foundation for a future nuclear weapon program.

Senator MERKLEY.

Here are the Democrats on Iran's adherence to the deal:

Iran is a bad and dangerous actor. We all agree on that.

Senator BOXER.

Critics insist America cannot trust Iran. I agree . . . I still have serious doubts about their government.

Senator CARPER.

We need not, and indeed should not, trust the Iranian regime. Implementation of this agreement may be challenging and we need to be prepared for the possibility that Iran will violate the agreement.

Senator CASEY.

When Iranian extremist leaders chant "Death to America" and "Death to Israel," the first question we have is, "How in the world can we trust them to live up to an agreement?" The answer is: We cannot.

Senator STABENOW.

Even under the deal, we should expect that Iran will cheat when it can, particularly at the margins; that it will continue or even ramp up its destabilizing activities and sponsorship of terrorism with the additional resources provided by increased sanctions relief; that it will seek to break out if the opportunity presents itself after 15 years when specialized inspections fade and many limits on its nuclear program are lifted.

Senator BOOKER.

Iran has misled us in the past when it comes to their nuclear program.

Senator MARKEY.

What a condemnation of Iran, what an indictment of this nuclear deal with Iran. But this indictment comes from the supporters of the deal. Despite their own words, these Democrats have chosen to give Iran billions of dollars that will be used to fund terror and war and ultimately put Iran on the path to nuclear weapons.

So let there be no mistake for history about the consequences of these Democrats' choice: When Iran detonates a nuclear device, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran launches a missile capable of hitting the United States, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran kills more Americans, as it has in Iraq and Afghanistan, Lebanon, Saudi Arabia, and elsewhere, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran imprisons American hostages, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran attacks Israel through Hezbollah's missiles or Hamas's tunnels, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran kills Jews around the world in places like Argentina and Bulgaria, these Democrats will bear responsibility. When Iran massacres its own citizens, these Democrats will bear responsibility.

President Obama and these 42 Democrats bear a direct political, moral, and personal responsibility for the coming crimes and outrages of Iran's ayatollahs. There will be grave consequences for them and for all of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

CELEBRATING 25 YEARS OF SUCCESS FROM THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH ON WOMEN'S HEALTH AT THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 242 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 242) celebrating 25 years of success from the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

AMENDMENT NO. 2663

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 2663 to the resolution and ask that it be reported by number.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI] proposes an amendment numbered 2663.

The amendment is as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the resolving clause)

On page 4, line 1, strike "it is the sense of the Senate that" and insert "the Senate".

On page 4, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 5, line 23, and insert the following:

(1) commends ORWH for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women worldwide and expresses that ORWH must remain intact for this and future generations;

(2) recognizes that there remain striking sex and gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which ORWH should continue to focus;

(3) encourages ORWH to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers sex as a biological variable across the research spectrum; and

(4) encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve ORWH on all matters related to the influence of sex and gender on health, especially those matters pertaining to the consideration of sex as a biological variable in research with vertebrate animals and humans.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment (No. 2663) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further debate on the resolution?

If not, the question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution (S. Res. 242), as amended, was agreed to.

Ms. MIKULSKI. I further ask unanimous consent that the Mikulski-Colins amendment to the preamble be agreed to; the preamble, as amended, be agreed to; the title amendment be

agreed to; and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2664) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the preamble)

In the eighteenth whereas clause, strike “CDC” and insert “Centers for Disease Control and Prevention”.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. RES. 242

Whereas, on September 10, 1990, the Office of Research on Women's Health (in this resolution referred to as “ORWH”) was established at the National Institutes of Health (in this resolution referred to as “NIH”) to—

(1) ensure that women were included in NIH-funded clinical research;

(2) set research priorities to address gaps in scientific knowledge; and

(3) promote biomedical research careers for women;

Whereas ORWH was established in law by the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-43; 107 Stat. 122) and implemented the law requiring researchers to include women in NIH-funded tests of new drugs and other clinical trials;

Whereas today, more than ½ of the participants in NIH-funded clinical trials are women, enabling the development of clinical approaches to prevention, diagnosis, or treatment appropriate for women;

Whereas, in 2015, ORWH, with enthusiastic support from NIH leadership, announced that, beginning in January 2016, NIH-funded scientists must account for the possible role of sex as a biological variable in vertebrate animal and human studies;

Whereas ORWH, along with NIH leadership, enhances awareness of the need to adhere to principles of rigor and transparency, including the need to publish sex-specific results to inform the treatment of women, men, boys, and girls;

Whereas over the past 25 years, ORWH has helped expand research on women's health beyond its roots in reproductive health to include—

(1) the study of the health of women across the life-spans of women; and

(2) biomedical and behavioral research from cells to selves;

Whereas by studying both sexes, ORWH is leading the scientific community to make discoveries headed toward treatments that are more personalized for both women and men;

Whereas today, ORWH communicates through programs and policies that sex and gender affect health, wellness, and how diseases progress;

Whereas turning discovery into health for all, the NIH motto, means studying both females and males across the biomedical research continuum;

Whereas the ORWH Specialized Centers of Research on Sex Differences program supports established scientists who do basic, clinical, and translational research with a sex and gender focus;

Whereas all NIH Institutes and Centers fund and encourage scientists at universities across the Nation to conduct research on the health of women and on sex and gender influences;

Whereas over the past 25 years, ORWH has established several career-enhancement initiatives for women in biomedicine, including the Building Interdisciplinary Research Careers in Women's Health program that connects junior faculty with mentors who share interests in women's health research;

Whereas ORWH co-directs the NIH Working Group on Women in Biomedical Careers, which develops and evaluates policies to promote the recruitment, retention, and sustained advancement of women scientists;

Whereas the Women's Health Initiative (in this resolution referred to as “WHI”) marked the first long-term study of its kind and resulted in a wealth of information so that women and their physicians can make more informed decisions regarding postmenopausal hormone therapy;

Whereas WHI reduced the incidence of breast cancer by 10,000 to 15,000 cases per year, and the overall health care savings far exceeded the WHI investment;

Whereas ORWH supported the National Cancer Institute's development of a vaccine that prevents the transmission of Human Papilloma Virus, resulting in a decrease in the number of cases of cervical cancer;

Whereas, in 1994, ORWH co-sponsored with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases a landmark study, the results of which showed that giving the drug AZT to HIV-infected women with little or no prior antiretroviral therapy reduced the risk of mother-to-child transmission of HIV by %;

Whereas according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, perinatal HIV infections in the United States have dropped by more than 90 percent;

Whereas ORWH co-funded a large clinical study of the genetic and environmental risk factors for ischemic stroke, which identified a strong relationship between the number of cigarettes smoked per day and the probability of ischemic stroke in young women, prompting the targeting of smoking as a preventable and modifiable risk factor for cerebrovascular disease in young women; and

Whereas over the past 25 years, ORWH has contributed support toward major advances in knowledge about the genetic risk for breast cancer, and discovery of the BRCA1 and BRCA2 genetic risk markers has enabled better-informed genetic counseling and treatment for members of families that carry mutant alleles: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) commends ORWH for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women worldwide and expresses that ORWH must remain intact for this and future generations;

(2) recognizes that there remain striking sex and gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which ORWH should continue to focus;

(3) encourages ORWH to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers sex as a biological variable across the research spectrum; and

(4) encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve ORWH on all matters related to the influence of sex and gender on health, especially those matters pertaining to the consideration of sex as a biological variable in research with vertebrate animals and humans.

The amendment (No. 2665) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To amend the title)

Amend the title so as to read: “A resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.”.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I think the parliamentary choreography does not show what we just did.

We are now, through a resolution co-sponsored by Senator COLLINS and me, cosponsored by all the women of the Senate on both sides of the aisle, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

Twenty-five years ago, on September 10, 1990, the Office of Research on Women's Health was established at NIH. It ensured that women were included in NIH-funded research protocols. It set research priorities, scientific peer review and scientific knowledge, and it promoted medical research.

There were two outcomes that I am so proud of—No. 1, what we have done to improve women's health, and No. 2, we showed that a process of working on a bipartisan basis actually worked.

This is not to tell old war stories about legislative issues. Twenty-five years ago women were not included in the protocols at NIH. There were many reasons given, most of them not scientifically reliable or accurate. Working together, Senator Nancy Kassebaum and I—the only two women in the Senate at the time—joined hands with the House—Congresswoman Pat Schroeder, Connie Morella, and Senator Olympia Snowe—and we worked together to get legislation passed to get women included in the protocols, scientifically appropriate, and to establish the office of women's health. We worked then with Senator Tom Harkin and Arlen Specter here and Senator Ted Kennedy and Senator Kassebaum to get it done. These roll-calls of people who are no longer with us in this institution and some who passed by showed we got it done. It was modest in money, big in dreams. I will give one outcome of what they did.

George Bush the elder appointed Dr. Bernadine Healy to be head of NIH. Dr. Healy led a scientific study on hormone replacement. She was able to get the money because of Tom Harkin, Arlen Specter, and all of us, all working together. I was an appropriator as well who helped and assisted, Senator Kennedy, Senator Nancy Kassebaum—now, of course, Baker. And guess what. This is the outcome: Because of that hormone replacement study, medical practice was changed because of the excessive use of hormones in inappropriate situations. As a result, it is estimated by public health epidemiologists that we save 15,000 lives a year. Because of the hormone replacement study, breast cancer rates went down 12 percent.

So when they say: Can't you guys and gals work together? When we do, we save lives. We save lives. It is estimated that over 600 lives were saved because of this one study alone, and more will happen every year. So when we get it together, yes, we save lives, hundreds of thousands at a time.

So I commemorate the great work of the Office of Research on Women's Health, and I want to once again, joining with my dear friend and esteemed colleague Senator COLLINS, show that when we work together, we can really make a change—a change that improves the lives of the American people, and women all over this country thank this body for the leadership we have provided.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with my friend and colleague, the Dean of the Senate women, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, in sponsoring this resolution to commemorate the 25th anniversary of NIH's Office of Research on Women's Health. This office has improved and saved the lives of countless women not only in our country but worldwide. It has been a great success.

Our resolution, as Senator MIKULSKI mentioned, is cosponsored by every single one of the women serving in the Senate today. I always point out that just as the men of the Senate span the ideological spectrum, so do the women of the Senate. But we have come together to endorse this resolution because each and every one of us recognizes the critical, lifesaving work that has been done by this office at NIH.

As the Senator from Maryland has pointed out, this was a collaborative effort among women—including my former colleague, Olympia Snowe—in both the House and the Senate 25 years ago to redress the fact that so many clinical trials that were being conducted by NIH or through NIH funding excluded women. I remember one on heart disease that was called Mr. Fit. Mr. Fit. Not a single woman was included in this groundbreaking study despite the fact that women die of heart disease more than any other disease and despite the fact that women react differently than men do to different therapies, to different drugs.

Our resolution commends the office for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women. It recognizes that there remain striking gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which this office should continue to focus. It also encourages the office to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers gender as a biological variable across the spectrum of research projects that we are doing. And it encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve the Office of Research on Women's Health on all matters related to the influence of gender on health, especially those pertaining to the consideration of gender as a biological variable in research with humans.

I am delighted that we have now been able to clear the obstacles to the adop-

tion of this resolution and that it has been approved without dissent. As my colleague has indicated, it is an example of a development that was taken 25 years ago in response to a real problem of women being excluded from clinical trials, from health care research, and we have made a difference with this office. That is why I am proud to join with my friend the senior Senator from Maryland, the Dean of the women of the Senate, in sponsoring this legislation with each of our female colleagues serving the United States as Members of this great body.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:38 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SCOTT).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

BAN ON DOMESTIC OIL EXPORTS

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, there is a proposal that is going to be made before the House of Representatives and before the Senate. That proposal will lift the ban on the exportation of American oil—oil that is drilled for here in the United States. The oil industry wants to have this ban lifted. You have to go back in history 40 years, to 1975, in order to find why that ban on exported oil is on the books. In 1975 we were at the height of the first oil embargo from OPEC. We were importing 30 to 35 percent of the oil we consumed in the United States. A ban was put in place for us to export our own oil if we were importing 30 to 35 percent of the oil that we were consuming in America. It put us at a big disadvantage if we took that approach to our own oil.

Today the United States imports 25 to 30 percent of all the oil which we consume. Mark Twain used to say that history doesn't repeat itself, but it does tend to rhyme. Today is a lot like 1975 in terms of the amount of oil that we import into our country. Right now we import 5 million barrels of oil a day. We import oil from Iraq, we import oil from Venezuela, and we import oil from the Persian Gulf in order to fuel our economy. Now the oil industry says: Let's start selling the oil we have and drill for in the United States out in the open market. Why does the oil industry want to do that? Because when oil is drilled for in the United States, the price that is set is set in Oklahoma. Cushing, OK, is where the price is set. On average that price is \$3 to \$6 less expensive per barrel than the oil

that is on the open market. That is called the Brent crude price. But it is the world price. That is not our price. Our price is \$3 to \$6 less.

The oil industry in America wants to get our oil out in the open market so they can sell it to other countries. What countries? First in line would be China. After that, most likely, are other Asian nations. That makes a lot of sense for oil companies. It does not make any sense for American consumers. By keeping the ban in place, Barclays Bank estimated that all that oil here put pressure on prices and lowered prices for consumers by \$11 billion last year. You can see it when you look at the price at the pump when you go to fill up.

This year Barclays Bank estimates that there will be a \$10 billion reduction in cost for consumers. You can see it at the pump. You can see the price coming down. The pressure works for consumers. The oil industry does not like that. They want to get that oil out of America. They want to get a higher price on the global market.

As to national security, does it really make any sense for the United States to be sending young men and women over to the Middle East in uniform, into that highly unstable part of our planet in order to ensure that this stability leads to huge ships with oil in it coming from the Middle East into America, while simultaneously having the oil industry saying let's export our own oil that we already have? It makes no sense. As long as we are exporting young men and women over to the Middle East to fight, to protect ourselves, we should not be exporting our own oil domestically. It makes no sense whatsoever.

Our own Department of Energy says that our production in America is going to peak in the year 2020—peak—and then decline for the next 20 years. We import 5 million barrels a day. Our oil production will peak in the year 2020 and then start to decline, and the oil industry wants to start exporting our own oil. Many of the advocates of that say: You wouldn't have a ban on any other product being exported from the United States. That is probably right. We don't have a ban on the export of widgets or watches. But on the other hand, we don't fight wars over widgets. We don't fight wars over watches.

Oil is different. Oil has been at the center for 50 years of this powerful geopolitical battle that the United States has been drawn into in the Middle East. Let's not kid ourselves. We are living it every day, looking at the lead stories on every television network in our country—every day.

In terms of what we lose, the domestic refining industry is totally opposed to this. The oil refining industry of the United States is totally opposed to

exportation. Why? Because they are investing in the construction of new refineries here to refine American oil here in refineries that are constructed and employing hundreds of thousands of people within our own country. The refining industry opposes it. It would be a \$9 billion loss and a reduction by 1.6 million barrels of oil per day that could be refined in the United States. The shipbuilding industry is opposed to it.

We are seeing a 40-percent increase in the amount of shipbuilding in America. Here is what is happening. The oil is produced in the oil patches. It is put on ships, and it is sent to Pennsylvania, sent to New Jersey, sent to other parts of America. You need ships to do that. Then that oil gets refined in Pennsylvania, and it gets refined in other parts of the country. That would end this incredible shipbuilding boom that we have seen.

Where will these exports go? We are not like Russia. We are not like Saudi Arabia. We don't have state-run oil companies. We are capitalists. Capitalists go for the highest price no matter where it is. You put the oil out on the open seas, and our companies will head toward the highest price.

Who is going to pay the highest price? China is going to pay the highest price. Other countries that are wealthy are going to pay the highest price. We can't pretend that it is going to go to where the geopolitical needs of the Secretary of State or Secretary of Defense are going to go. That is not how capitalism works. You go towards the highest price. That is the fiduciary responsibility that you have as a CEO of a company. That does not get mixed up within our society. The hand on the tiller of those ships is heading towards the highest price.

Who benefits? The oil companies will benefit. There are estimates that by 2025, they will be making an extra \$30 billion a year in profits—per year. It makes sense for the oil companies.

Who are the losers? Our consumers are going to be big losers. Our national security is a big loser. We are exporting our strength, our oil, even as we need 5 million extra barrels a day. Our domestic refiners are big losers. Our U.S. shipbuilding industry is a big loser, and our environment is a big loser.

Can you imagine it? The Pope is arriving next week, and he is going to talk about the role that human beings are playing in the dangerous warming of our planet. What the oil industry wants us to do is to continue to engage in expanded fracking of oil on our own soil, even though we haven't fully figured out how to contain the methane that comes out of that fracking, and then put it on ships and send it around the world. Where are the benefits for the American people? Our environment takes all of the risks, and the oil goes

out to the open seas with the benefit to the oil companies. It makes no sense at all.

Within 10 years, they are making an extra \$30 billion every single year from that additional profit that they get by selling it overseas, rather than keeping it here and keeping the pressure on lowering the price for consumers here in our country.

Many times you hear them saying: We really should be able to drill off the coastline of the United States, all the way up to Maine, down to Florida, from San Diego up to the top of Alaska—right off the coastline. What about the fishing industry? It could endanger it. What about tourism on those beaches if this is spilled? It could endanger it. But they say: We must do it in order to ensure that we have the oil that we need here in the United States.

You can't have it both ways. You can't say that we have enough oil that we can export it out of our country, and simultaneously say that we must drill off of our coastlines in dangerous conditions because we don't need the oil because we can export it. You can't have it both ways. No one is allowed to do that.

There is a pretty high contradiction coefficient in the argument made by the oil industry. We need to have this debate. The American people must know that they are going to run the risk of being tipped upside down at gasoline stations all across the country and having money shaken out of their pockets as they fill up their tanks because the oil industry just wants more.

So national security—let us know when we have produced the extra 5 million barrels a day here. Let us know when they have the evidence that proves that the Department of Energy is wrong and our production doesn't start to go down after 2020. Let us know when they have invested in the safeguards that ensure that methane does not come up from the fracking wells. Let us know when we put as a priority those American young men and women that we are sending over there into the Middle East. It makes no sense. It is a bad policy. They had it right in 1975. We are still importing about the same amount of oil as we were back then. We don't want to invoke the first law of holes, which is, when you end one, stop digging. We want to make sure that we abide by that rule, that we guarantee that we start to come out of that hole, that we use American oil here first before we sell it overseas and hurt consumers, the environment, and our national security.

This is the beginning of a very important debate in our country. I am looking forward to it. I think the American people are going to rise up and realize that this is very dangerous for them on so many different levels that it will be rejected on the floor of the Senate before this entire process has ended.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, yesterday evening our Democratic friends across the aisle, led by the minority leader, again refused to allow the Senate to cast an up-or-down vote on a resolution that would make clear that the Senate disapproves of President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran. It is clear that there is, in fact, a bipartisan majority of both Houses that disapproves, but, using a procedural tool—the filibuster—our Democratic friends are trying to deny the American people an opportunity to cast a vote on this bad deal through their elected representatives and indeed I would suggest to also avoid the accountability that goes along with this because this movie will not end well.

They are the No. 1 state sponsor of international terrorism. This deal gives them \$100 billion to continue to finance terrorist attacks and proxy war against the United States and our allies. This has a phony inspection regime because it requires the United States to ask 24 days ahead of time to be able to inspect various sites. Indeed, we found out that on some of their military sites, the International Atomic Energy Agency—the IAEA—will not even be allowed to access those military sites but, rather, the Iranians will do their own inspection and then turn over their samples to the IAEA waiting dutifully at the gate of these military compounds where we know there is nuclear activity taking place.

So this is really a lousy deal. I mean, assuming that we could somehow deny Iran a nuclear weapon, which used to be American policy, I think we would find a huge consensus. But, in fact, this also changes American policy. Rather than denying them a nuclear weapon, it would literally pave the way, essentially giving them a free hand in 10 to 12 years from now.

We just observed the 14th anniversary of 9/11, September 11, 2001. It was only 14 years ago that we had a terrorist attack on our own soil. One of those airplanes was heading toward the U.S. Capitol, one hit the Pentagon, and of course two hit the World Trade Center in New York City. So the idea of paving the way for Iran to get a nuclear weapon in 10 or 12 years—when put in that context, that is certainly not very long. That means the nations in the Middle East are going to begin to arm themselves because they are not stupid. They realize a nuclear Iran is a threat to the region. Sunni countries, such as Saudi Arabia and others, will begin a nuclear arms race. Instead of suicide vests and improvised explosive devices, the prospect of a nuclear confrontation in the Middle East ought to send chills up and down anybody's spine. Yet that is exactly what our Democratic friends have embraced, along with the President.

The irony is that in trying to shield President Obama from having to veto the resolution of disapproval, our Democratic friends have also thrown away a chance to improve the legitimacy of this deal by allowing an up-or-down vote. Why in the world would they feel the pressure to protect the President from something he is proud of, which is this Iranian nuclear deal? It doesn't make much sense. This deal on its own merits is indefensible.

Thankfully, there is a small silver lining because this is not legally binding beyond the Presidency of Barack Obama. This is not a legal document or a treaty; it is a political agreement. I hope the next President understands that he or she will have complete freedom to tear this deal up and negotiate a better deal and keep the pressure on Iran and deny them a nuclear weapon.

We have seen this happen before with issues such as ObamaCare and Dodd-Frank. If the shoe were on the other foot, were Republicans to try to jam through legislation such as this on a controversial topic on a purely partisan basis, it wouldn't have much staying power because you would not have built the sort of political consensus that would give it staying power. So the controversy continues.

We have already spent a lot of time on this debate discussing and highlighting the weaknesses of this deal and the danger it poses for U.S. and world security. Those weaknesses, as I pointed out yesterday, have been highlighted by the deal's supporters. I mean, the statements that were made by some of the Senators who voted for this deal seemed to be completely at odds with their vote to filibuster the resolution of disapproval. So they are clearly nervous about this deal, as they should be.

The fact is that, rather than making this a bipartisan consensus and making it purely a partisan matter—they will own the negative consequences of this deal because Iran's leaders, at the same time they have been negotiating this deal, have been shouting "Death to America" and saying that Israel will not even be on the map in 25 years. So the chances, I would think, of this deal turning out very badly—all of that responsibility will be in the laps of those who filibustered this deal.

I pointed out that Iran is not giving up or disavowing its role as a foremost state sponsor of terrorism. In fact, all one has to do is go to the State Department's Web site, which is John Kerry's department. Secretary Kerry negotiated this deal. Right there on their Web site is pointed out Iran's role as a major sponsor of international terrorism, its ties to and funding of Hezbollah and Hezbollah's efforts to attack American interests in the Middle East, as well as Syria, Lebanon, Libya, and Iraq. All of this is very well documented. Almost all of the mischief, vi-

olence, killing, and threats to the security of that entire Middle East region have Iran's fingerprints all over it.

As a result of some of the documents that were uncovered when Osama bin Laden was killed, we found out even more information. There was a story—I believe it was in the Wall Street Journal yesterday—about records of open cooperation between Al Qaeda and the Iranian regime and their attacks and pursuit on American interests. These are more facts about Iran's nefarious activities recorded in the administration's own public records.

Of course, the regime continues to not deny or suppress but, rather, proudly announce its support of violence in the region and propping up proxy groups, as I said, that are fighting from Syria, to Iraq, to Yemen, and further destabilizing an already volatile region. To add to that mix, this deal dumps nuclear weapons. That is like pouring gasoline on a fire, except it is much more dangerous.

Of course, this deal won't change any of those facts. In fact, President Obama and his national security advisers admitted that terrorist groups supported by the Iranian Government will likely be the real benefactors of sanctions relief under this deal. How will the Obama administration work to keep the billions of dollars that will pour into Iran as a result of this deal from being used to arm and otherwise finance the work of terrorists who seek to kill us and our friends and allies in the region? Well, they simply don't have an answer for that because they know that is a byproduct or I should say a direct result of this bad deal.

As I pointed out a moment ago, even after the deal was announced, the Supreme Leader in Iran and others continued their attacks on our closest ally in the Middle East, Israel. The so-called Supreme Leader of Iran went so far as to say that Israel won't exist in 25 years. If they had their way, they would wipe Israel off the map.

How does the administration plan to counter this theocratic regime that continues to call for the complete destruction of our Nation's closest ally in the Middle East, Israel? As far as I can tell, they don't have a plan, but that describes so much of their foreign policy.

We have witnessed the refugee crisis in Europe and the heartrending pictures on the news of a young boy's body being washed up on shore because he was trying to get away from a war-torn region of the Middle East—Syria—to somewhere where it is safe so he could grow up and have a productive and normal life. I mean, they are heartrending pictures, but they are a result of this administration having no policy and no real strategy in Syria.

So, really, this is more of the same—no strategy and no clue about how to deal with the dangers that confront the

region and the people in the Middle East and its ripple effect on the rest of the world, including the United States.

Tomorrow we will vote on a piece of legislation that addresses some major omissions from the President's executive agreement with Iran. Our friends across the aisle have made their bed and decided to lie down in it, and they have blocked now two times an up-or-down vote on this resolution of disapproval. They made that decision, so now it is time to have another vote and to fill in some of the gaps left by this bad deal.

The bill we will vote on tomorrow is pretty straightforward. It will bar President Obama from lifting sanctions on Iran until two specific benchmarks are met. This doesn't solve all of the problems I mentioned a moment ago, but it will fill in a couple of important gaps. First, we will vote on whether Iran must formally recognize Israel's right to exist as a state, and if they don't, then the President will not be authorized to lift sanctions on Iran. Second, Iran must release American citizens whom it continues to hold hostage. This is the part I just really can't believe. We had this negotiated deal for months and months at the very highest level of the U.S. Government. Yet, under this deal, the leadership of the U.S. Government decides to leave American citizens in prison in Iran and doesn't use this as an opportunity to negotiate their release.

This Chamber should wholeheartedly approve of these commonsense measures—one that calls for the safe return of our own citizens and one that affirms the right of our ally to exist. This is not a big ask. This does not fix all of the problems with this bad deal, but it does address two glaring deficiencies, and so I think that vote is entirely appropriate.

In conclusion, I will just say that this deal is dangerous, misguided, and, you know what, it is pretty darn unpopular. As I said earlier, bipartisan majorities in both Houses of Congress oppose it, and for good reason. When we look at the public opinion polls, only 21 percent of the public supports this executive agreement.

Tomorrow we will have an opportunity to let the voices of our constituents be heard loud and clear, and I hope our Democratic colleagues will come to their senses, quit playing defense for the White House, and join us in seeking the release of our U.S. citizens held captive abroad and the future security of our unwavering ally, the State of Israel.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

THE MIDDLE EAST

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, the Iranian deal—this executive agreement dealing with nuclear weapons and their policy in Iran that has been executed

between the President of the United States and Iran's leaders—not the Congress, not in a formal treaty that is binding over time but a personal executive agreement—I don't believe is a good one, and I think it is the predictable end, frankly, of a poorly initiated negotiation. I will vote against it based on many of the arguments our colleagues have heard over the last several days and will continue to hear. I do believe it is not the right policy for the United States. I am not going to attempt to restate all of the reasons.

I remember distinctly being in the Middle East, meeting with a top official in one of the countries whose name is well known. President Obama decided to intensify these negotiations toward this kind of end. This Middle Eastern official warned that talking could be a trap. He warned that the Iranians are sophisticated negotiators. They have been recognized as such throughout the world and the Middle East for decades. He warned that one could be trapped into these negotiations, and once you get into them, you have to be able to extract yourself as soon as you realize a good result isn't in the offing. I think that warning was not heeded. We have gone on for 6 years now, and we have reached a point where the President had to either agree to what they wanted or walk away and admit defeat, and he decided to reach an agreement. I think that put us in this bad position. He wanted to achieve this before he left office, apparently, and we can only hope that somehow, some way, this turns out to be better than it appears at this time.

The Iranian acquisition of and their drive to achieve nuclear weapons is just one aspect of the complex situation that results from the extremism that is arising in the Middle East. It is a part of the extremism that has been arising in the Middle East. I wish to take this opportunity to go further than just discuss Iran today. I think we need to discuss the need for a long-term strategy, bipartisan—Republicans and Democrats—and our Western World allies, the free world allies, for how we are going to deal with the problems of extremism in the Middle East over a long period of time.

It is clear that we are seeing a resurgence of militant Islam. This strain of Islam seeks to advance a theological and political approach to the world. It seeks to unify faith and politics, and believers, as such, seek to advance policies they think will honor Allah's religious command. So this strain that has been in Islam for years that advocates conversion by the sword in fact finds much support in the Koran. I wish it wasn't so, but it does. Many—even most—Muslims are certainly truly people of peace, faithful in their daily activities, but there is a sizable minority that oftentimes seeks dominance and achieves dominance that finds a basis

in the Koran for their violent jihad against those they describe as infidels. They see the hedonism of the West and other actions that occur in the Western World, for example, as totally destructive and contrary to what they believe is right, and they don't accommodate to it.

So we are seeing a spasm and an eruption of aggression that has occurred before over the centuries, but it is certainly reaching a high pitch today, exacerbated by the technology of weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons, and other dangerous weapons. The nature of this eruption is complex. It is different in every region, in every country, and area, and is different among sects, tribes, and traditions, and is shaped by economic conditions, security conditions, and tribal and human conditions in the various regions of the Middle East, spanning from Afghanistan, Pakistan, to Syria, to Yemen, to Egypt, to Morocco, and into Africa today.

This crisis, occasioned by Iran's religious determination to obtain a nuclear weapon, is just one aspect, though a huge one, that has arisen as a result of this extremism. The world is surely presented with a deep and complex problem that requires the most wise and consistent response over years. The surge of terrorism will not end quickly. We are most likely talking about decades. Our response to such violent actions cannot be based on short-term, political, partisan factors.

President Bush had in his mind a vision for a good future for the Middle East. I supported him. He believed all people wanted peace, freedom, education, and prosperity. He reached too far, perhaps, and made some tactical errors as he sought to advance his vision, but, by 2011, after much bloodshed and cost, Iraq had achieved stability of a kind and some real political progress. A democratically elected government had been formed and stability and even prosperity seemed possible. Our new President, however, was not impressed. He did not share the depth of this vision. President Obama did not consider the Bush vision as part of an established, bipartisan, long-term strategy of the United States. He thus felt little loyalty to that vision, and he started to execute his different vision in the Middle East.

I was with some British parliamentarians recently and noted that someone had said that President Obama's complete withdrawal from Iraq in 2011 was the greatest error of the 21st century to date. One of the experienced Brits responded: Well, some say it was the disbanding of the Iraqi Army after the victory in Iraq. So even when great nations act, things don't usually go smoothly, and failure of great nations to act often has its own consequences. Enemies do not desire to be defeated. They do not desire to be killed. En-

emies adjust to whatever tactics are used against them.

So the point, colleagues and friends, is that military actions are fraught with danger. Inaction is fraught with danger. The world is very complex. The very best minds who know very well the specific countries that are at risk and in turmoil must be involved when plans are made and evaluated. Long-term—even very long-term consequences of action and inaction must be considered at the beginning. The world is a dicey place indeed.

On my heart and mind is the concern that this spasm of Islamic extremism and terrorism will be with us for at least 40 years, perhaps more. Experts have told us this. Dr. Kenneth Pollack, at the Brookings Institute, testified before our Armed Services Committee recently. It came my time to ask a question, and I said: Dr. Pollack, you said that problems that are long in the making will be long in solving. Just briefly, would you say with the spasm of extremism, violence, and sectarianism in the Middle East that we have to have a long-term policy—I mean 30, 50, 60 years—to try to be a positive force in bringing some stability to that region? History tells us those states of violence tend to cool off but often take decades to cool off. And I remember it very distinctly. I got an answer that we do not often get. He looked up at me, and he said: Yes, that is what I am saying.

This terrorism, unfortunately, is often focused on the United States that the extremists see as the Great Satan. This represents a direct threat to the security and prosperity of our people. Thus, we should seek to act in a statesmanlike manner, considering the threats and interests of the people we serve in the near and the long term. That means making wise decisions that may not be popular in the 60-second sound bite world.

In the late 1940s, the famous George Kennan, a State Department official, penned the "long telegram" they called it. It formed the basis for a long-term Cold War policy that became known as the containment doctrine. It was the basis for resisting the expansionism of communism, totalitarianism, and atheism, and it was part of that movement that was clearly contrary to Western values. So his paper became a bipartisan policy of the United States as we confronted the enormous threat of totalitarian communism, that had a goal, as does radical Islam, of world domination.

While there were vigorous and usually healthy debates over the years over tactics and techniques and procedures, there was consistent and bipartisan support for the overarching strategy that communism could not be allowed to dominate ever-growing portions of the world, that it must be contained. Our Nation—indeed the entire

free world—became united in that goal. This strategy held until the blessed collapse of the Soviet Union.

So, once again, we face a totalitarian threat to the free world. This time it is from ideological and apocalyptic Islam. Like communism, its goals are incompatible with the laws, institutions, and freedoms that we see as central to our liberty and prosperity. There can be no compromise with this form of radical Islam. It just will not merge with or accommodate the freedom that we believe is essential in the Western World.

Theologically based sharia law fundamentally conflicts with our constitutional order, which separates church and State and considers free debate and dissent in the Senate as a way to a better world. We believe in debate and dissent and disagreement and the right of freedom of religion. Thus, this threat has to be resisted. It just has to be. To do so obviously means that we and our allies have to agree on an effective strategy—not just the tactics for Iran today, ISIS tomorrow, Egypt the next day, Yemen the next day.

Seven years into his Presidency, President Obama has failed in this regard. We must accept that fact. The result of that failure is instability, violence, and displaced persons. Would we have had none with a good effective strategy? No, I can't say that, but I believe with confidence that we would have had much less difficulty. Indeed, one wise, very sophisticated, European leader told me recently that the immigration crisis, as a result of refugees from the Middle East, is the greatest challenge to the European Union since World War II. What a dramatic statement.

I know many of my Democratic friends are concerned about where we are and are willing to discuss the kind of strategy we need.

The question of Iran and its sponsorship of terrorism and its acquisition of nuclear weapons is a dramatic and extremely important development. That is why it has engaged all of our attention lately.

I chair an Armed Services subcommittee—and I have been on it for 18 years—that deals with strategic forces—nuclear forces. It has been the unified position of the entire world that there not be a proliferation of nuclear weapons, and particularly not in the Middle East. So the acquisition of nuclear weapons by Iran is a dangerous event because they have ideological, apocalyptic, theological views that are scary. In addition, we have been told by the best experts accepted worldwide that if Iran has nuclear weapons, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Turkey—who knows what others—maybe Jordan in the future would want those too—and the idea that we will have multiple nations in that volatile region of the world with nuclear weapons has been a fear that has unified the U.N. and uni-

fied the nuclear anti-proliferation groups worldwide for decades.

But the Middle East presents even broader and more complex issues, in addition to that. Were the people of Syria and the world better off with Assad in power? Was Libya doing better under Qadhafi than it is now? One European official said a million people, mostly Libyans, are on the North African shore seeking to enter Europe or the United States. Is Egypt, under their new military regime, a more secure and positive force for good for the Egyptian people and the whole world and the Middle East than it was under the ousted Muslim Brotherhood and other extreme parties that were a part of that coalition? How would our discussions and actions have been different if our Nation had established a sound, long-term policy to guide our overall approach to this entire region?

Our involvement in each of those situations and others was, it seems to me, far too ad hoc, far too reactive to certain events. Our actions have not been consistent; they have not been predictable; they have not advanced a unified strategy; they have not been a part of a coherent strategy designed to reduce tensions and strife, to reduce our direct involvement in the region. Our policies have not resulted in a containment or a reduction of terrorism and extremism.

I asked a historian a few weeks ago before the Armed Services Committee about this and how we should be approaching the Middle East—Professor Walter Russell Mead. I mentioned George Kennan and the containment strategy and asked: Do you think what we need as a nation is people like some of the experts on the last two panels that we have had, seriously analyzing the future of the Middle East, the nature of the extremist ideology that is there, and developing a long-term, sophisticated policy to rebut it and try to diminish it over time?

He replied and said a number of things. He said:

But what we're also hearing in the background is a kind of a universal confession of failure of strategy.

What is our strategy for ISIS? Are we fighting Assad first, then ISIS? ISIS first, then Assad? Neither? Both? Something entirely different?

I think—I've rarely in my lifetime—although I certainly have heard moments of strategic incoherence—I've rarely seen American policy on such a wide scale on so many issues in such a vital region seem to be so incoherent. I'm still waiting to see what our strategy is in Libya or why we intervened. . . .

He goes on to say:

So we—we do, I think, need, as a country, to have the kind of discussion about the Middle East that we had about Soviet expansionism in the 1940s, and to try to work our way toward some kind of general bipartisan agreement or confidence in an analytical approach to really a very vital part of the world.

We are not close to that. We have a Presidential election going on, and people are making policies and statements based on the latest developments. It makes me uneasy.

Our policies have not resulted in containment and a reduction of extremism. Our policies have not resulted in improvement of conditions for the people in those countries or the security of the American people.

Statesmanship, as Henry Kissinger says, requires wisdom, insight, and a willingness of officials to understand the complexity and history and choices the nation faces, and then to provide leadership to the American people first that produces support for policies that may not seem clear or understandable or even positive at the time they are announced because the world is a complex place.

So, in conclusion, I am certain that the foreign policy of our Nation is too reactive. I am certain we have not adopted on a bipartisan basis a policy to confront Islamic extremism that provides direction for actions and can build confidence in our people and in our allies. I am certain this is a failure that must be remedied.

So let's get together, colleagues, and commit to developing a wise and sound strategy outside of the rush of daily politics, using the great insights and talents of people that are available to us. This Nation is fortunate to have persons of loyalty, experience in the Middle East, judgment, knowledge, and history, who can help us.

In its basic form, a good strategy must be simple and understandable to high officials and everyday Americans. This is not an impossible task. A good strategy will provide guidance and produce consistency in our policies over the long run. Importantly it will reduce the adverse impact of politics on our foreign powers. The American people will respond positively. I pledge to do my part in this effort. We have developed such strategies before. Most dramatic was the Kennan containment strategy, but there have been others—the Monroe Doctrine, other policies—and we can do it again.

I just think it is important to raise some additional concerns about where we are today. I think the President took unacceptable risks in going deeply into these negotiations. He went beyond the framework that President Bush was using to talk with Iranians. The Iranians were in clear violation of a number of U.N. resolutions that restricted what we would do in our negotiations with them. We refused to participate with them. Both Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter and Secretary of State John Kerry have recently testified before Congress that Iran remains the No. 1 state sponsor of terrorism in the world, and they do not contend that releasing this money to them, hundreds of billions of dollars,

which is being released on some sort of promise that they will cease to do that—they basically have said they are going to continue the same policies they have been advocating.

This is a terror-sponsoring State. Our own experts tell us that. Our own officials tell us that. It is very difficult to enter into any kind of negotiation with a person who sees you as a Great Satan, who says that Israel will not exist 25 years from now and must be eradicated from the Earth.

So these P5+1 negotiations did reverse cautious activities before, based on the fact that Iran was an outlaw State.

I will not continue to discuss this, other than to say that we entered into this, we have gotten down here to the end, and I think it is a mistake. I am going to vote no.

It looks as though it may somehow be processed anyway. If that occurs, it will create instability, even more so in the Middle East, and alarmingly will lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons in multiple countries in the Middle East, each one of which, if their unstable governments fall, could allow nuclear weapons to fall into the hands of terrorists who can use them at any time or place around the world, creating all kinds of ramifications that are too grim to think about.

I thank the Chair, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, what is the status of the session at this point? Are we in a quorum call?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are not in a quorum call.

Mr. KING. I ask unanimous consent to address the Senate as in morning business for approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNING IN THE SENATE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, one of the peculiar aspects of my service in this body is that I was sworn in as a U.S. Senator 40 years to the day from the day I entered Senate service as a staff member in January of 1973. Consequently, it has given me an interesting perspective about the operation of the Senate compared then and now.

I am sure that some part of my memory of working here in the early 1970s and mid-1970s is colored by the rosy view of nostalgia, looking back at one's youth and one's past; but, even correcting for that bit of nostalgia, it is my observation that in those days we spent about 80 percent of our time governing and about 20 percent of our time on politics.

And there were plenty of politics. This was during the Watergate period. There was a Democratic Senate and Republican President. President Nixon resigned during the period I was here. It wasn't as if politics were not a part

of our life, but the work of the government continued, and the governing, which was done by this body and the House of Representatives, continued even in an era of very intense politics in our Nation's history.

A friend asked me the other day: What is the difference between then and now?

I said: Well, in those days my recollection is that it was about 80 percent governing and 20 percent politics. Today it is reversed. It is 80 percent politics and 20 percent governing.

I want to talk a bit about governing. Probably our most fundamental responsibility after national security is a little matter of the Federal budget. It is something that we have to do every year. It is something that is in the Constitution. It is one of our most basic responsibilities. Yet here we are, 10 legislative days away from the end of the fiscal year with no budget, no appropriations bills that have been passed in both Houses, no conference committees, and as far as I can tell, no negotiations at the highest level in order to resolve what could be an impending shutdown of the U.S. Government.

In addition, we have the sequester facing us, which was designed to be stupid. It was designed to be so unacceptable to both sides of the political aisle that a solution would surely be found.

I remember being asked about it when I was running for this office in 2012. People said: Well, what do you think of this sequester that might happen next year? I said it will never happen because it is so unacceptable, both on the defense side and on the domestic side. Surely, Members of Congress will come together and find a compromise solution. That happened with the Murray-Ryan arrangement 2 years ago.

But here we are again, facing a potential shutdown. I don't have to enumerate the problems that creates: problems of national security, problems of the effect on the overall economy, problems of confidence and trust in the government itself. So here we are, and we are not governing when it comes to a budget.

The highway fund is an even worse embarrassment. We have patched the highway fund temporarily 34 times, most recently this summer. That expires in October. I have not heard a great deal of discussion about what the resolution of the highway fund is going to be, and I will make a bold prediction. Come October, there is going to be somebody who comes to this floor and says: We are close to a solution. All we need is 2 more months. So let's extend it to January, and then we will solve the highway problem once and for all.

That doesn't pass the straight-face test. Here we are. We have the budget in 10 days, the highway fund in Octo-

ber, and we have the tax extenders, which last year we passed and they only affected 2 weeks of the year. Yet we expect American businesses to make plans, investments, and look ahead. They don't know what the Tax Code situation is going to be until the last 2 weeks of the year, and they have gotten to the point where they expect this: Well, OK, it looks like they are going to take care of it.

But that is not governing, and there is a cost to that and a cost to our economy. I have been in business, and I know that one of the most important things to a business is certainty, knowing what the rules are, knowing what the Tax Code is, knowing what the regulations are going to be. Business people can deal with regulations or tax policy.

The very difficult thing, however, is uncertainty. When you have uncertainty, you have a lack of confidence; and when you have a lack of confidence, you have a lack of investment; and when you have a lack of investment, you have a lack of jobs. I don't have the econometric analysis, but in my view the uncertainty, the instability, and the unpredictability of this body and of this institution has significantly put a damper on economic growth in this country.

I don't know whether it is half a point of GDP, a full point or a quarter point, but it is a lot because people don't feel they can have confidence in what the rules of the game are going to be.

To pass tax extenders for 2015 in the last 2 weeks of 2015 is just embarrassing. Oh, I think I said the highway fund was embarrassing. They are both embarrassing.

Then we have the Export-Import Bank, whose charter expired at the end of June. This is one I really don't understand. This is a government agency that is 70 years old or 80 years old, provides support to businesses across the country, including in my State of Maine with some very small businesses, and it fills a market niche that the private sector is not filling. It returns money to the Treasury, and it helps to create jobs in the United States. What is there not to like? For reasons that I can't discern, it tends to be something about ideology, because you don't want to have—heaven forbid there should be a government agency that works. So we better put it out of business. It is not making any more loans.

Yesterday General Electric, one of our most important national companies, announced the elimination of 500 jobs, including 84 jobs in Bangor, ME, because of the lack of the support provided by the Export-Import Bank. By the way, every other industrialized nation in the world provides some level of support and encouragement for exports—except us as of June 30.

For a staff member for the financial services committee in the other body, which handles this, their comment about the 500 layoffs was this: Well, 500 jobs is a drop in the bucket for GE.

Eighty-four jobs is not a drop in the bucket for Bangor, ME. Those are families; those are real people. It makes a difference in our community, and it is ridiculous. If there were some policy reason for it, if there were some controversy, I could understand it. But to do it just because we don't like the idea of this agency, even though it is effective in its mission and returns money to the Treasury, just doesn't make any sense.

So the budget we are not doing; the highway fund we are not doing; the tax extenders we are not doing; the Export-Import Bank we are not doing.

What are we doing? We are spending another week on the issue of Iran, which we thoroughly debated and voted on last week. And I understand we may spend another 2 or 3 days on it next week for a series of amendments that can appear, to me, to be strictly designed to embarrass some Members of this body and to create fodder for 30-second ads a year from now. That is not governing. That is pure, unadulterated politics, and it is not dealing with the problems of this Nation.

We debated the Iran issue thoroughly. I have never worked so hard on a single issue in my life. We all had the entire recess to work on it, to think about it, to talk to people, and to read the agreement. Before the recess, there were innumerable hearings, briefings, and classified briefings. We have now had two identical votes.

Yesterday, one of my colleagues said: I feel like I am in "Groundhog Day." We are voting again on exactly the same issue. Now I understand we are going to have more votes.

I have never known an issue where every single Member of this body has expressed themselves on one side or the other. There is no question where anybody stands. Everybody has expressed themselves. Everybody has announced their position. One hundred Senators have announced their position.

I have to say a bit about 60 votes. To argue that this issue of such momentous import should not require 60 votes, when virtually everything else we have done around here since I have been in the Senate for the past 2½ years has required 60 votes, is just preposterous.

I remember standing on the floor a year ago hearing one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talking about some obscure amendment to some bill and saying: This amendment should be subjected to the normal 60-vote requirement.

And I said: Normal? When is it normal? Well, it has become normal. It was the rule for the last 2 years. Now, suddenly, it was a bulwark of democ-

racy. I remember talking about how should we modify the filibuster rule? No, we can't do that. The 60 votes is a bulwark of democracy. That protects the minority. That is built into the essence. That is what it is all about. Now, all of a sudden, it is not so important. People say: Well, this was a procedural vote, and you had a filibuster. How dare you filibuster?

Let me say, unequivocally, that the proponents of the Iran agreement are prepared to have an up-or-down vote on that agreement this afternoon as long as a 60-vote majority is part of the agreement about the vote. The only reason there was a 60-vote threshold on a filibuster motion, on a cloture motion, was so that the majority would not put that issue on the table—an up-or-down vote with a 60-vote margin. Yet everybody knew when this bill passed—when the Corker bill passed—that it was going to require 60 votes. Senator CORKER is on the record on the floor talking about this: Of course, it is going to require 60 votes. And even the famous letter to the Ayatollah in the second paragraph said: Of course, agreements like this are going to be subject to a three-fifths majority.

Everybody knew this was going to be 60 votes, and to express shock now reminds me of the end of "Casablanca," where the inspector says: I am shocked, shocked to see gambling here. I am shocked that there should be a 60-vote requirement.

But, of course, there is going to be a 60-vote requirement as there has been for every other substantive issue—and a lot of not so substantive issues—for the last 2½ years. Now we are going to start to vote, apparently, on other issues not in the Iran agreement: Bring home the hostages; recognize Israel. Those are desirable ends. I support them entirely, but that was not what this negotiation was all about.

This negotiation was to keep Iran from getting a nuclear weapon now. It was to roll back their nuclear program. That is what the negotiation was. It wasn't about the hostages. It wasn't about Israel. It wasn't about Iran's malign activities in the region.

One of my colleagues on the floor a few minutes ago said: Iran is a malign state, a rogue state. They are going to get money from the sanctions relief.

Yes, they are. But the only thing worse than a rogue State with money from the sanctions relief is a rogue State with money—as the sanctions erode—with nuclear weapons, and that is what this is all about.

When President Kennedy was negotiating with the Soviet Union to get the missiles out of Cuba, at the end of the negotiation he didn't say: By the way, Castro has to go—or you, Soviet Union, have to foreswear your enmity to the West.

And, by the way, we have heard Iran say "Death to America," and the So-

viet leadership said: "We will bury you." It is the same deal, the same level of threat. But President Kennedy was focused on getting those missiles out. That was the threat, just as today the threat is to keep nuclear arms out of the hands of Iran, which we all agree is what we need to do.

We have debated Iran. We have taken two identical votes. The outcomes are the same. I predict the outcome will continue to be the same, and yet every minute we now spend on an issue that has been resolved is a minute that we don't spend on issues that need resolution: the budget, the highway fund, the debt limit, the Export-Import Bank, the tax extenders. That is governing, and that is what this body should be doing.

I hope my colleagues at some point in the very near future will decide that it is time to attend to those issues. And if we disagree with a policy decision that has been made, so be it. But we need to move forward and not continue to politicize an issue that, in my view, should not have been politicized in the first place. These are weighty and important issues. The Iran decision was the hardest that I have ever had to make, but I have made it. We voted. It is done. We need to move forward, and we need to move forward to meet the urgent needs of the people of this country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I rise to express my deep disappointment that what has transpired at the end of everything we debated with regard to the Iran deal is that we have chosen, as a body—a minority of this body—to filibuster the Iran agreement.

For weeks—weeks—we have been talking about how important this agreement is and how we have been debating it. As to my colleague from Maine, I agree with him. All of us put so much time and effort into studying it and how it is one of the most important foreign policy and national security issues that many of us—even Senators who have been here for 10, 20, 30 years—will ever debate, study, and vote on. That is all agreed to.

And what happened? Now we are filibustering that.

American foreign policy and our national security are strongest when the executive branch and the congressional-legislative branch work together. That is when America is its strongest. That is why our Constitution gives powers to both branches of government in terms of foreign policy and national security. Yet every step of the way on this Iran deal of the President, the President and his team have been dismissive of the role of the American people through their representatives in Congress.

You have to remember where we began, because the only reason the Iranians actually came to the table was because of the sanctions that this body—Democrats and Republicans—put on the Iranian regime—American-led sanctions throughout the world. Two different administrations did this. Senator CORKER talked a lot about the role of the Congress today and how important that was. So we start these negotiations with Congress playing the critical role—drove Iran to the negotiating table—and then when we start negotiating, the President says: Nope, we are going to do this alone. We are going to go it alone. We do not need the Congress of the United States. We are going to do an executive agreement.

There was no involvement of the American people through their representatives in Congress to weigh in on one of the most important foreign policy issues in a generation. So this body acted. This body acted. Through the leadership of many Members on both sides of the aisle—Senator CORKER, Senator CARDIN—we passed legislation—98 Senators—that said: No, the Congress has a role. Congress should have a role.

Initially, the President said: I am going to veto that. We don't want you involved. I am going to veto that.

But this body came together and said: We want to be able to vote on this agreement. Our constituents want to be heard.

There were more affronts. The U.N. Security Council voted on this deal before Congress even started the debate on this deal. Again, Members of both parties, Democrats and Republicans, went to the administration—wrote the President, wrote Secretary Kerry—and said: Please do not do this. This would be an affront to the American people.

They did it anyway.

So now we have come to this moment. The U.N. Security Council and its member states have voted on the deal. The Iranian Parliament will need a majority vote to pass the deal, but the world's greatest deliberative body won't. On one of the biggest foreign policy and national security issues facing the United States, a partisan minority of the Senate has decided to take a pass on even voting up or down on the substance of this agreement.

Many of my colleagues have come to the floor over the last several weeks—both sides of the aisle—to explain why they are for or against the agreement. It has been a very good debate. People focused on this issue very intently. People of good will have a serious difference of opinion. I disagree profoundly with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but I respect them for explaining to the public why they are supporting a deal that so many Americans oppose and oppose intensely.

That has been one debate, but I am not sure I have seen any of my col-

leagues come to the floor to explain why they voted to filibuster a vote on the President's agreement with Iran; why they voted to deprive the American people of a right to be heard through their representatives in the Senate on the substance of the deal—not a procedural move but the substance of the deal; why they are letting the White House continually press to usurp their constitutional authority to weigh in and make foreign policy for our country; why they have done a 180-degree turn after voting for Corker-Cardin, saying that we need to vote on this, that the American people and their voices need to be heard on the substance of this deal, and then voting to stifle these same voices by supporting a filibuster.

I have been trying to see what the rationale of this is. Certainly there seems to be one where the White House says they should be doing this in order to spare the President the embarrassment of having to veto a bipartisan majority resolution of disapproval of the Iran deal. There are other press reports saying the filibuster happened to protect President Obama's legacy.

With due respect to the President, he will be gone—he will be moving on in a little over a year and a half—but the security implications of this dangerous deal will be something the American people—our kids and maybe even our grandkids—will be living with for years. This issue is much bigger than any so-called Obama legacy.

Today I have heard many of my colleagues come to the floor and say the agreement has already been voted on. I am a new Member of this body, but I am not sure that is exactly the case. The agreement has not been voted on. My colleagues have not held an up-or-down vote on this agreement. They are actually avoiding voting up or down on this agreement with their filibuster. They know it, and they should be clear on this point with the American people.

I think this body is making history during this debate. It appears that for the first time in U.S. history, an immensely important U.S. foreign policy agreement will move forward with a partisan minority of support in both Houses of Congress. For the first time in U.S. history on an agreement that is critical to our national security, the agreement will advance not on the basis of a vote on substance—a majority vote on substance—but on the basis of a filibuster, a procedural vote. And for the first time in U.S. history, the President of the United States sought the vote of foreign nations, including the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism, in approving and implementing a major foreign policy agreement and then fought the vote of the American people to weigh in on that same agreement.

Yes, the Senate is making history on the President's Iran deal, but it is not

a history we should be proud of. It is history, I fear, that will be remembered for undermining our national security and the U.S. Constitution.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I want to supplement my remarks from last week with some insights from Alan Dershowitz's book "The Case Against the Iran Deal." All of us received a copy of this last week. I read it last week.

Incidentally, Mr. Dershowitz has been a consultant to several Presidential commissions and has advised Presidents, U.N. officials, Prime Ministers, Governors, Senators, and Members of Congress. He has sold more than 1 million copies of his books worldwide in a dozen different languages, and he is a law professor emeritus at Harvard. He is an accomplished attorney and has been active in politics. I make that point because Mr. Dershowitz endorsed President Obama in 2008. So I think his comments might be particularly telling.

I want to start by discussing the point Mr. Dershowitz makes that I find the most intriguing. "The President is not the Commander in Chief of Foreign Policy." Mr. Dershowitz notes that the Constitution does not make the President Commander in Chief, period; rather, article II, section 2, clause 1 of the Constitution makes the President "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the Militia of the several States, when called into actual Service of the United States."

Mr. Dershowitz points out that this language does not make the President Commander in Chief for purposes of diplomatic negotiations, and his involvement in international diplomacy is as chief negotiator whose deliberations are subject to the checks and balances of the legislative and judicial branches. Specifically, Mr. Dershowitz writes that the President "cannot make a treaty without the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. He cannot appoint ambassadors without the consent of the Senate." And this is probably the most important one: "And he cannot terminate sanctions that were imposed by Congress without Congress changing the law. . . . Our Constitution separates the powers of government—the power to command—into three coequal branches." Mr. Dershowitz goes on to describe the President's actual constitutional role as the "head of the executive branch of our tripod government that stands on three equal legs."

I would remind my colleagues that this argument is being made by a prominent scholar on U.S. constitutional law.

This point reminds me of what a former colleague who carried a copy of

the Constitution in his pocket said in June of 2004. When debating the 2004 Omnibus appropriations conference report, Senator Byrd said:

Why so deferential to presidents? Under the Constitution, we have three separate but equal branches of government. . . . How many of us know that the executive branch is but the equal of the legislative branch—not above it, not below it, but equal.

I wonder what the former Senator from West Virginia would think of the ways the President has sought to diminish the role of Congress with regard to the Iran deal.

According to Mr. Dershowitz, those actions include declaring the Iran agreement to be an “executive agreement” instead of a treaty or joint agreement, promising to veto any congressional rejection of the deal, agreeing to submit the deal to the U.N. Security Council before Congress considered it, trying to marginalize opponents of the deal as politically motivated, and describing the only alternatives to the deal as Iran quickly developing nuclear weapons or war with Iran.

Another discussion I found interesting in “The Case Against the Iran Deal” relates to the President’s assertion that if we don’t accept this deal with Iran, the only other option is war. Mr. Dershowitz argues that this “sort of thinking out loud empowers the Iranian negotiators to demand more and compromise less, because they believe—and have been told by American supporters of the deal—that the United States has no alternative but to agree to a deal that is acceptable to the Iranians.”

He also writes that while numerous administration officials have said “no deal is better than a bad deal” with Iran, he views the United States as negotiating on the belief that the worst possible outcome would be no deal.

In addition, Mr. Dershowitz notes that “diplomacy is better than war, but bad diplomacy can cause bad wars” and points out that Israeli, French, Saudi, and other leaders have expressed concern “that the Iranian leadership is playing for time—that they want to make insignificant concessions in exchange for significant reductions in the sanctions that are crippling their economy.”

That leads me to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu’s 2013 United Nations speech, which Mr. Dershowitz argues was distorted by the New York Times.

The Prime Minister said:

Last Friday, [Iranian President Hassan] Rohani assured us that in pursuit of its nuclear program, Iran—this is a quote—Iran has never chosen deceit and secrecy, never chosen deceit and secrecy. Well, in 2002 Iran was caught red-handed secretly building an underground centrifuge facility in Natanz. And then in 2009 Iran was again caught red-handed secretly building a huge underground nuclear facility for uranium enrichment in a mountain near Qom.

What strikes me about the Prime Minister’s words is that they give us a clear picture of whom we are dealing with in Iran. And if we need more evidence, just last week Iran’s Supreme Leader, Ayatollah Khamenei, predicted that Israel will not exist in 25 years and referred to the United States as the Great Satan. What level of trust can we have for this regime? Even if this agreement were a good deal for the United States, what makes us think Iran will abide by the terms of the deal? In other words, do you trust Iran? And to be clear, this is not a good deal.

As Mr. Dershowitz writes, “All reasonable, thinking people should understand that weakening the sanctions against Iran without demanding that they dismantle their nuclear weapons program is a prescription for disaster.”

Mr. Dershowitz goes on to ask if we have learned nothing from North Korea and from Neville Chamberlain. For those in the Chamber who are not history buffs, let me explain how I interpret Mr. Dershowitz’s question.

In 1994, the United States and North Korea agreed to a roadmap for the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula. Several rounds of six-party talks were held between 2003 and 2009, but North Korea continues nuclear tests and ballistic missile launches. The President seems to be heading down a similar path with Iran.

As for Neville Chamberlain, he was the British Prime Minister when England entered World War II. He is best known for his policy of appeasing Germany in advance of World War II, signing the Munich Pact that gave part of then-Czechoslovakia to Germany. Hitler violated that pact and invaded Czechoslovakia, then Poland. Should we expect a stronger commitment to this deal from a country whose Supreme Leader refers to the United States as Satan?

How can Mr. Dershowitz label this deal as a prescription for disaster? He does so by pointing out the “enormous difference between a deal that merely delays Iran’s development of a nuclear arsenal for a period of years and a deal that prevents Iran from ever developing a nuclear arsenal.” Mr. Dershowitz says that if this deal is meant to prevent Iran from ever developing nuclear weapons, the President must clearly say so and the Iranians must agree with that interpretation. That has not happened.

How did we get to such a bad deal? Mr. Dershowitz says the first mistake was taking the military option off the table when the administration declared that they weren’t militarily capable of ending Iran’s nuclear weapons program. He says the second mistake was taking the current sanction regimen off the table by acknowledging that many of our partners would reduce or eliminate sanctions. Lastly, he says we took rejection of the deal off the table

by indicating that rejecting a deal would be worse than accepting a questionable deal. Mr. Dershowitz writes that “these three concessions left our negotiators with little leverage and provided their Iranian counterparts with every incentive to demand more compromise from us.” He adds that our negotiators “caved early and often because the Iranians knew we desperately need a deal to implement President Obama’s world vision and enhance his legacy.”

While this deal might implement the President’s world vision in the near term, I question whether it will enhance his legacy because I do not think it makes the United States or the world more safe.

I am disappointed that the President didn’t submit this deal to us as a treaty for our approval. I am disappointed that the minority has filibustered even allowing us to vote on disapproving the deal. I wish we had paid more attention to the fact that sanctions put in place by Congress have to be terminated by Congress, not by the President.

I urge all of my colleagues to read Mr. Dershowitz’s book because I think it provides some invaluable insights and might change their thinking. I think we need a different outcome.

I thank the leader for the amendments he has put up that will make a difference. I think one of those should have been done before any negotiations, and that is that the American hostages be released. That would have been a good starting point. They should have walked away several times to show that the deal was in favor of Iran rather than the United States. It has to be some of the world’s worst negotiating.

I hope everyone will read Mr. Dershowitz’s book, “The Case Against the Iran Deal.” We all got a copy.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I come before the Senate to discuss the agreement that is being proposed between the United States, the other members of the P5+1 nations, and Iran with regard to Iran’s capacity to build a nuclear weapon.

I strongly oppose this agreement for a number of different reasons. Before I get into the specifics of those reasons, I need to back up a little bit. About 2 years ago, I served on the banking committee. I don’t think most people in America realize that the banking committee has jurisdiction over the

sanctions legislation which deals with Iran and other sanctions legislation throughout the world.

Over the years, we have developed a very powerful and effective sanctions regime with regard to Iran. This regime involved not only the United States but the participation and agreement of nations around the globe, including sanctions that were followed by us through the United Nations.

Those sanctions—after having had four or five different versions of them, increasingly tightening them down—had worked very effectively to cause Iran to need to come to the negotiating table. I think most Americans realize that the reason Iran came to the negotiating table was the fact that our sanctions were working.

In fact, a couple of years ago, we had another version of new sanctions legislation to tighten down our sanctions even further and increase the leverage that the United States had on Iran in order to try to cause Iran to not only come to the negotiating table but also to agree to stop development of a nuclear weapon.

At that time, the President asked the banking committee—I was the ranking member at the time—to pull back our proposed new sanctions legislation. He gave us his explanation, which is the fact that he wanted to open up new negotiations with Iran and did not want to cause an offense that would cause Iran to back away from the negotiating table. I disagreed at the time. In fact, my position was that if the United States wanted to go into negotiations, we should have Congress pushing for a new round of sanctions legislation so the President could say honestly and effectively to Iran that we needed to get a workable deal put together or we had a Congress that was ready to move forward with ever-increasing and more effective sanctions. Instead, the President said no. I understand that his party controlled the Senate at that point in time and we could not get the chairman at that point to agree to move the legislation forward, even though the chairman and I had worked together with the other sponsors of the legislation to develop it. At that time, it was my position that if the United States was going to withdraw its leverage through increasing sanctions legislation, that we should at least ask for some kind of a good-faith effort on the part of the Iranians as we were exercising the right to withdraw our sanctions legislation.

So it was my position that we at least should have asked for the release of our prisoners. Most Americans are aware that we have four political prisoners—at least four—in Iran today who are being wrongfully held. One of them, Pastor Saeed Abedini, is from Idaho. He has been held illegally in Iran now since 2012. In addition, we have Robert Levinson, who is a retired FBI agent,

missing since 2007; Jason Rezaian from the Washington Post, a reporter, held since 2014; and Amir Hekmati, a former marine, who has been held since 2011. Yet the administration would not ask for the release of these prisoners as a token of good faith in return for starting the negotiations, even though we were willing to withdraw our efforts to impose new sanctions in an effort to start these negotiations. I felt that was a mistake from the outset. The United States gave up its leverage and refused to ask for a concession as we moved forward in these negotiations. Yet it has set a pattern for what has happened since.

Well, I think everyone knows the history from that time forward. We did engage in negotiations. It is important to note that at that time, the President assured—he assured us—that he would not enter into an agreement that would allow Iran to ever have a nuclear weapon and that we would have ironclad inspection and verification regimes in place to assure that.

So where are we today? We are now faced with an agreement that cements in place Iran's nuclear stockpiles, that effectively allows Iran to develop a nuclear weapon over time, even if it complies with the agreement, and does not have any kind of an effective sanctions regime. I strongly oppose this agreement.

During the remainder of my remarks, I wish to go through four or five critical reasons Congress should reject this agreement. First, it does not prohibit Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb. Second, it does not provide ironclad inspections and verification procedures. Third, it provides sanctions relief that is almost certain to result in increased terrorism around the globe. Fourth, it dangerously and needlessly lifts unrelated, nonnuclear embargoes. Fifth, it contains inexcusable and dangerous omissions. Finally, it will create instability in the Middle East and effectively a new regional arms race, dangerous to the entire world.

Let me go back through these. First, it does not prohibit Iran from obtaining a nuclear bomb. Even if Iran complies with the agreement, which it does not have a very good record of doing with regard to its agreements, it will still be able to develop a nuclear weapon. The agreement fails to roll back Iran's nuclear development program beyond a 1-year breakout period.

For 10 years, the agreement will only include IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, and IR-8 centrifuges. Now, this is getting into the weeds, but this is a level of centrifuge development that Iran has already been working on and engaging in. And the agreement says—and this is exactly from the agreement—“For 10 years will only include the IR-4, IR-5, IR-6, and IR-8 centrifuges as laid out in Annex 1.” In other words, the only application of the agreement is to

these centrifuges during a 10-year period.

During the 10 years, “Iran will continue testing IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges, and will commence testing of up to 30 IR-6 and IR-8 centrifuges, as detailed in Annex I.”

It does not dismantle any of its nuclear sites of concern, which are the sites at Arak, Natanz, and Fordow. None of them is dismantled. It recognizes Iran as a de facto nuclear state. And with all of the centrifuges that Iran now has, is it required to destroy them? No. It simply has to disconnect them and store them in another room. Iran is allowed to keep 6,000 centrifuges and 300 kilograms of uranium. Iran is allowed to conduct nuclear research and development during the terms of the agreement, and, in fact, amazingly the United States commits to assist Iran with its nuclear research and development in developing its own nuclear technology and infrastructure.

That is not even the end. One of the provisions of the agreement which I find most outrageous is that it requires the United States Government to oppose State and local sanctions against Iran and amazingly to help “strengthen Iran's ability to protect against, and respond to nuclear security threats, including sabotage, as well as to enable effective and sustainable nuclear security and physical protection systems.” In other words, if Iran develops nuclear weapons capacity, this seems to imply that the United States will need to help Iran protect its capacity.

I am sure the argument will be made that this is only to help Iran develop its peaceful nuclear weapons capacity, but the agreement isn't clear. At a minimum, these kinds of things should have been made clear in the agreement.

So let's look at the inspections. Assuming that Iran will comply with its one-sentence agreement that it will not build a nuclear bomb for 10 years, does the verification system that we have adopted prohibit that? Well, the agreement does not provide ironclad inspections and verification. I think Americans are increasingly becoming aware that not only do we not know what the inspection regime is, the United States does not participate in the inspection regime. The inspection is turned over to the United Nations. The IAEA, the committee under the United Nations that does these kinds of inspections, is in charge, and the IAEA has entered into side agreements with Iran that it will not disclose to the United States or any other country. Some of the information we are starting to see about it, if it is accurate—and we don't know if it is accurate—but it seems to imply that Iran will not even allow the IAEA inspectors onsite. It is going to provide its own samples. These are concerns that are serious. Yet we cannot even confirm them, and

Congress is being asked to deal with this issue without even having all of the agreement in front of us.

Moreover, as we move forward in this process, we have identified that the sites are identified as two different kinds. There are declared sites. Those are the ones that Iran admits exists. As to declared sites, Iran must first draw up a list and tell us what they are. We don't have onsite inspection to determine that. As to undeclared sites, Iran is permitted to negotiate for at least 14 days for the IAEA to say we have a site that we think there is, but we are not sure, and Iran is allowed to negotiate whether there is such a site. If the IAEA and Iran cannot agree to a joint inspection of a suspected new site, then there can be further delays, taking up to 54 days before anybody would be able to take a look at these sites.

Again, we don't know whether those persons then required to look at these sites will be Iranians showing the United Nations inspectors what they want them to see or whether they will be United Nations inspectors, but we are pretty sure we know they aren't going to be U.S. inspectors.

The bottom line is that we have a very weak inspection regime that is almost certain to result in the same outcomes we have seen for the last 10 years, as we have tried to inspect and monitor Iran's development activities on its nuclear weapons.

That brings me to the third issue, which is sanctions relief. Iran does get major sanctions relief under this agreement. Iran is regarded as one of the top, if not the top, sponsors in the world of terrorism—the top state sponsor of international terrorism. Many have said Iran has been connected to hundreds of U.S. service personnel deaths in Iraq. Some say more Americans have died in Iraq because of Iranian state-sponsored terrorism and other activities than any other source.

We lift economic sanctions that we have been putting onto Iran. There is some debate about what the value of those sanctions are, but the estimate that I think is fair is approximately \$100 billion will be released to Iran very quickly under this agreement. Just by comparison, \$100 billion to Iran, in terms of the size of its economy, is approximately the same as \$4.25 trillion to the United States respecting our economy. It is about one-quarter of Iran's economy. Those who say Iran will simply use these sanctions relief dollars in order to strengthen their economy ignore the reality that Iran today has a weak economy because of our sanctions and it is plowing money into sponsoring terrorism. There is no question that these dollars are going to result in an increased support of terrorism across the globe.

Next, the agreement dangerously and needlessly lifts unrelated, nonnuclear embargoes. As we were dealing with all

of these issues I have just discussed as the negotiations were moving forward, at the very end we find out that in order to complete the deal, Iran and Russia introduced new unrelated issues that the administration willingly conceded to. We lifted the existing conventional weapons embargoes on Iran and we lifted the ballistic missile embargoes on Iran. Russia is already today going forward with selling advanced S-300 surface-to-air missiles to Iran, making future military action increasingly more difficult.

The next issue is that the agreement contains inexcusable and dangerous omissions. First, as I said at the outset, it does not free Pastor Abedini and the other Americans who are detained in Iran. Secondly, it does not recognize Israel's right to exist. Third, it limits nuclear research for 10 years and frankly does not assure, as I have indicated earlier, that we don't have violations of the agreement before 10 years.

It does not require an accounting of past nuclear weapons cheating by Iran, meaning it does not require them to disclose where their facilities are. It does not require disclosure of the military component of Iran's nuclear program. What this means is that Iran has given us no information about its military facilities and has said that its military sites are off-limits. Now, where would we expect Iran to build a nuclear bomb?

It does not address Iran's existing ballistic missile capacity, and it does not ban ballistic missile development. We don't know what its capacity is and we no longer ban them from developing their capacity further. In fact, we have lifted the ballistic missile embargoes. The agreement does not require Iran to stop sponsoring international terrorism. The agreement is deficient in so many different ways.

Finally, the agreement creates instability in the Middle East and a new regional arms race. One hundred billion dollars is an immediate windfall to Iran, a portion of which the administration acknowledges will wind up in the hands of international terrorist groups targeting Americans and our allies. That money will be made available to Iran shortly.

Neighboring States have already said they are going to have to accelerate their own nuclear enrichment programs to counter Iran. Recognizing the new threats to Iran's regional neighbors, the President himself wrote to Congress on September 2 to announce stepped-up security enhancement for our Middle East allies, further evidence that the agreement is destabilizing and requires increased military commitments in the region.

Having abandoned the "no notice" inspections requirement, the administration has agreed to permit a process for contested sites that could stretch for weeks or months before inspectors

step a foot into the facility, if they are even able to do so at all. Some experts acknowledge that window is sufficient to hide or remove any kind of incriminating evidence of smaller illicit activities crucial to weapons development.

Other states in the region—Egypt and Saudi Arabia—have already signaled that they are going to embark on a nuclear weapons program, sparking a new arms race. The possibility of further instability in the Middle East does not serve our national security interests or give the American people comfort.

We cannot forget that Iran is a regime with a history of sponsoring terrorism against Americans and our allies and which continues to threaten the existence of Israel. This agreement changes the U.S. policy toward Iran but does very little, if anything, to change Iran's aggressive nature.

The Iranian leaders have already renewed their threats to Israel, and continue to call the United States the Great Satan and have publicly rejected the administration's hope that the agreement will lead to better cooperation with Iran.

So where are we?

The United States Senate passed legislation 98 to 1 saying that Congress should have a right to vote on this agreement. Twice already in these Senate Chambers within the last week we have tried to bring that legislation up only to face a filibuster that has stopped us from even being able to vote on the agreement. Ninety-eight Senators voted to let Congress have a right to vote on this agreement, and 42 of them voted twice now in the last week to refuse to let us bring the agreement before the Senate to vote on it.

So today we are facing yet another effort. Today the issue before the Senate is a provision that would say the agreement cannot go into effect until Iran recognizes Israel's right to exist and until Iran frees the four political prisoners whom I identified. Once again we are facing a threat of a filibuster.

As I indicated, this agreement is dangerous. It is dangerous to the security interests of the United States. It is dangerous to the security interests of the world. It is destabilizing in the Middle East, and it contains very, very serious potential consequences for the future security of all Americans, and, frankly, of people throughout the world.

This is a critical time. This is a monumentally important decision, and I encourage all of my colleagues to let us simply bring the agreement forward for a vote. A critical issue such as this should not be stopped from even being brought forward for a vote in the Senate.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mrs. CAPITO. Thank you, Mr. President. I want to thank my colleague for his speech. I will be echoing a lot of the same points that he has made.

I think that it is a critical time. This is important. It is important for the young people around this country to know what kind of a future they are going to have, and I think he has lined it out very well, and this week, I think, will be critically important in terms of the decisions that we make as a country.

In May, the Senate passed the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act by a vote of 98 to 1. You don't see too many 98-to-1 votes in this Chamber. Sixty-six Senators cosponsored this legislation. The principal reason for this overwhelming bipartisan support was the desire to give Congress, the voice of the people, the opportunity to weigh in on the President's agreement with Iran.

We have been working together now for 4 months across the aisle to ensure that the opportunity for Congress to review this agreement comes forward. Yet I am severely disappointed, as my colleague expressed, that 42 of our colleagues have now voted twice to deny the Senate the ability to take a simple up-or-down vote on this very important resolution—a simple vote to say exactly how they feel, to make sure everybody in the country and in your State knows your opinion, and yet 42 of them are blocking that simple vote.

Iran's supreme leader said earlier this month that he expects Iran's parliament to vote on whether their country will approve the nuclear agreement. At the very least we should have that up-or-down vote. Certainly this agreement is also worthy of this vote. Our constituents expect us to vote on this matter. Multiple national surveys have shown that the Iran nuclear agreement is opposed by either a plurality or a majority of the American people, and any support this agreement had, as you look at the national polling, is disintegrating.

A recent poll in my State shows that opponents of this deal outnumber supporters by a margin of 3 to 1. Yet I am not going to have the opportunity to vote my vote of disapproval of this agreement because of the obstructionism on the other side. In fact, when President Obama said that there was strong support for this deal among lawmakers and citizens, the Washington Post fact-checker awarded him three Pinocchios. We all know what Pinocchio was famous for, and that was the growing of his nose when he wasn't telling the truth. Three Pinocchios—that's a lot of skepticism about the President's statement.

There is bipartisan opposition to the Iran nuclear agreement in Congress, but only partisan and tepid support. Our colleagues in the House of Representatives voted last week on a resolution approving this agreement. That

resolution received only 162 votes, all from the Democratic Party. There was opposition by 260 House Members, including 25 Democrats. Here in the Senate, more Democrats joined with Republicans to support moving forward on an up-or-down vote on this resolution of disapproval.

It is important to recognize the depth of bipartisan opposition to the President's agreement with Iran. Many of the Democrats who have been opposing this deal have tremendous experience in foreign policy matters. In the House of Representatives, the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, the ranking Democratic member of the Appropriations Committee and the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa all voted against approving this agreement.

In the Senate, the former chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and the committee's current ranking member are among the Democrats who oppose this agreement. They have joined Republicans on the floor in seeking an up-or-down vote on this agreement. The senior Democratic foreign policy leaders and every Republican in both chambers of Congress oppose this deal, and they have made their reasons clear.

The President's agreement fails to make America safer, quite frankly. It is not likely to eliminate Iran's path to a nuclear weapon, and the agreement will hurt the security situation that is rapidly deteriorating in the Middle East, especially in Israel.

We have not seen the two side agreements between the IAEA and Iran. We have not seen those. We don't know what is in them. We are supposed to have seen everything, and these side agreements, we think, include important provisions about suspected Iranian nuclear sites. We already know that Iran will have the ability to delay inspectors' access to other sites for more than 3 weeks. We were supposed to get anytime, anywhere inspections. This benchmark falls severely short of that.

The combination of the cash from sanctions relief—anywhere from \$50 billion to \$150 billion, so I will go right in the middle and say \$100 billion—the end of the arms embargo in 5 years, the end of the international restrictions on Iran's ballistic missile program in 8 years will strengthen Iran's ability to cause trouble in the Middle East and around the world.

Think about this. I think about this—the country of Iran with another \$100 billion. Under the sanctions that have been imposed, Iran has expressed concern about the health and welfare of their people. Yet even under that sanctions domain they are still fomenting terror around the Middle East. What will they do with \$100 billion? I think it is pretty clear what their intentions will be.

International sanctions that have helped bring Iran to the negotiating table will be difficult to snap back into place in the event of violation of the agreement. Nothing snaps anywhere here in Washington, DC, and sanctions can't snap back, so that defies reason. This will lessen our leverage to ensure Iran's compliance.

Despite these serious flaws, it appears, based on the two failed cloture votes the Senate has taken thus far, that a partisan minority is prepared to thwart the bipartisan majority and move forward with the agreement.

Leader MCCONNELL has filed an amendment that would block sanctions relief until Iran both recognizes Israel's right to exist and releases American political prisoners. While that amendment will not cure the flaws of Iran's agreement, it does represent commonsense policy that should receive overwhelming support.

Regardless of their views on the substance of a nuclear Iran, I think most Americans would agree that before we provide tens of billions of dollars in sanctions relief to Iran, the Iranian government should have to recognize Israel's right to exist and should release our four American political prisoners.

Just last week, as the Senate was debating the Iranian nuclear agreement, the Iranian leader posted on Twitter his view that Israel would not exist in 25 years. That underscores, again, what a serious problem Iran is to our most important ally, and that is Israel.

Even proponents of the nuclear agreement have recognized that Iran is likely to use at least some of the funds they received from sanctions relief to strengthen their military and continue to finance terrorism. If this windfall is going to be provided to Iran, then ensuring Iran recognizes Israel's right to exist is the least we would ask.

Equally important is securing the release of our four American political prisoners held by Iran. I get this question at home all the time. Why was this not part of the bargaining? Why were we not asking for the release of our Americans before we moved forward? Frankly, I don't think the administration answered that question, and I don't have the answer to that question. Tomorrow we will have the opportunity to express our wishes. We should not provide sanctions relief to Iran without the release of the hostages.

The Senate will have the opportunity to decide whether to move forward with the McConnell amendment tomorrow. Those who have prevented a vote on the merits of the nuclear agreement have it in their power to block a vote on the McConnell amendment as well, but let's be clear on what that would mean. If a minority of the Senate blocks a vote on the McConnell amendment, then they will allow the President to provide sanctions relief to Iran

without securing Israel's right to exist and without the release of our Americans.

I believe the President's agreement with Iran should be rejected by the Senate, and we are going to have another opportunity to vote on cloture to allow the Senate to take a true up-or-down vote on that agreement. But even my colleagues who support the nuclear agreement should vote to protect Israel and bring our Americans home before providing that sanctions relief.

I hope our colleagues will reexamine their positions on cloture and allow the Senate to do what we have come here to do, to take the tough votes, to let people know how we feel, to show our commitment and our passion, and to have our voices and their voices heard.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut.

REFUGEE CRISIS

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I am always a little more than awed and inspired to be here on the floor of the United States Senate, a place that my father never could have predicted that I would be when he came here in 1935, an immigrant, fleeing persecution in Germany at 17 years old with not much more than the shirt on his back, speaking no English, and knowing virtually no one. This country gave him a chance to succeed. This great country opened its arms to him, much as the Statue of Liberty did, when he entered this country through Ellis Island.

We are a nation of immigrants and of refugees. It has given us strength. Our diversity is what makes America the greatest, strongest country in the history of the world.

Sadly, the kind of displacement that caused him to come to this country is far from unprecedented. This country has opened its arms again and again and again, generation after generation, to provide for refugees displaced by war and oppression. Inhumane dictators, territorial disputes, environmental degradation, all are contributing now more than ever to the largest refugee crisis since World War II.

We are going through a humanitarian crisis in this country. Part of it is due to the brutality and inhumanity of the Assad regime in Syria, the horrors unleashed by ISIL in Syria and Iraq. Neighboring countries have been overwhelmed by fleeing refugees.

During my Middle East trip in July 2013 with Senator McCain and others, I visited a refugee camp in Jordan that houses many of these refugees and, since my visit, the situation has only worsened significantly.

Syria alone has produced an estimated 4 million registered refugees—those are the individual ones counted—in addition to the 7.6 million internally displaced people.

Turkey bears the brunt of this refugee crisis, housing nearly 2 million of

them. Lebanon shelters over 1.1 million refugees, while Jordan has taken 600,000 or more, and Egypt recently exceeded the 130,000 mark.

These numbers are abstract. For every one of them, there is a human voice and a face. Many are children barely able to comprehend the fate that has befallen them. This year alone, Germany is expecting 800,000 asylum seekers, a marked increase from 626,000 in 2014 and 431,000 in 2013. Again, these numbers have impact on those countries, on their populations.

We met this morning with the Ambassadors of the European countries to hear about that impact on them and about their plans to do even more.

The Atlantic Ocean separates us from this crisis physically, but morally we have no separation at all. The destabilizing effect of that massive displacement ultimately affects us as well, our national security, and the stability of regions where we have a vital economic stake and a moral obligation.

I strongly support a policy of American generosity and humanitarian relief toward those refugees seeking to escape the untenable and unlivable conditions in Syria and Iraq. Exactly what steps this Nation should take will be a matter of contention and continuing debate, but clearly, we have obligations—moral obligations, self-interested obligations, economic obligations—to the men, women, and children who have walked hundreds of miles in search of safety and security and to the countries currently searching for ways to accommodate them.

Our obligation is multifaceted. First, we have provided \$4 billion in aid—which is real money—to countries where those refugees now live temporarily in camps. But humanitarian aid is desperately needed in greater amounts and rising magnitude in countries where refugees are flowing fast. Regional countries, including Turkey and Jordan, as well as the European Union, must be able to provide refugee camps that provide basic necessities for people to live, with adequate food, water, shelter, clothing, education, and other elements of a safe and stable life for adults but also for children who can be seen running, laughing, playing in these camps in the most rudimentary of conditions.

The United States must show international leadership as well in ensuring the availability of resources from other nations that, frankly, have failed to meet the test of moral and political obligation. Saudi Arabia is one. The Gulf States are others. Our allies in this region must fulfill their obligation to do more and to do their part in assisting those fleeing war and bringing about a diplomatic resolution to the crisis. The absence of these nations from this challenge is reprehensible and regrettable. Ultimately, Syria must seek and achieve a resolution internally but, in

the meantime, its neighbors have an obligation to do more.

I applaud the President's announcement that the United States will resettle approximately 10,000 Syrian refugees within our borders next year. As my colleague from Illinois, Senator DURBIN, has said this step is certainly in the right direction. But increasing the number of refugees coming here is an insufficient response alone if we fail to provide the expanded capacity and services that are necessary to effectively resettle and bring to this country refugees fleeing their homeland. Our focus should be on devising an effective program so that candidates for resettlement can have that hope without waiting years for assistance. Now, under the present system, they are waiting here.

In particular, I wish to cite a group of refugees that merits the special conscience and conviction of this Nation. They are the refugees—mostly women and young girls—who are victims of what the New York Times, in an extraordinary report, has called enshrining the theology of rape.

These girls and women have been enslaved. They are members of the Yazidi community. This New York Times report shows the systematic enslavement and rape of women and children held in the territory that ISIL controls. Approximately 5,000 Yazidis have been abducted by ISIL and 2,700 remain in captivity.

These reports, which are shocking and horrifying, challenge our conscience to do more. Nobody reading them can think of our daughters, the women in our family, without revulsion and shock. At the end of this week, several of my colleagues and I will be sending a letter to Secretary of State John Kerry urging him to take further action to help the Yazidis, the Christians, and other religious minorities who have been systematically kidnapped, enslaved, tortured, raped, and brutalized by ISIL simply because of their faith.

We talk a great deal on the floor in this body, in this building, and in this country about faith. The horror of this persecution calls to our conscience.

I am calling on the State Department to declare religious minorities as protected, priority groups, able to seek refugee assistance within Iraq's borders. As of now, the only Iraqis allowed to leave the country with assistance in this way are the people who have been affiliated with the U.S. Government during the war. That category should be expanded to include these refugees.

Second, I am calling on Secretary Kerry to improve the in-country processing for refugee claims in Iraq, specifically, the time required for that processing. The estimated time for Iraqis who served alongside U.S. military personnel is at the unacceptably high rate of 5 years to 8 years. This

issue has been brought to me by numerous veterans—Iraq and Afghanistan veterans—who owe their lives, in some cases, to the service of these Iraqi and Afghan colleagues. Yet they wait there 5 to 10 years simply to be processed to come here. We must assure timely access to refugee assistance for both Iraqis affiliated with the U.S. Government and Iraqis within persecuted religious minorities such as the Yazidis and Christians. There is mounting, irrefutable evidence of that persecution on a scale that sometimes defies imagination and comprehension.

There are many ways the State Department can accelerate processing times: Double the number from 10 to 20 of in-country State Department personnel processing Iraqi refugees; consult with the Department of Homeland Security on the use of video interviews, consistent with security requirements, to be conducted in addition to the in-person interviews currently required; identify a nongovernmental organization to work with the U.S. Embassy to identify and screen religious minorities seeking refugee assistance in Erbil; and establish a facility in Erbil where the U.S. Government can conduct refugee processing. These steps are not particularly complicated or ingenuous; they are common sense.

The United States has a proud, moral tradition and heritage of aiding refugees. That tradition and heritage are epitomized by the Statue of Liberty and by Ellis Island. The Nation has not always lived up to the high standards that have been set for it by us. We are still very much a work in progress, and there are times in our history when we have failed the high test of morality.

But the Statue of Liberty stands tall at our harbor and embodies what is best about our Nation. We are a nation of immigrants truly because we welcome the tired and hungry, yearning to be free. We need to demonstrate the international leadership that has made us proud in the past to establish a new, inconclusive vision for Syria; to abate this refugee crisis; to provide a path for them to come here; and to provide them, consistent with our security, the opportunities that fathers, mothers, grandfathers and grandmothers had—going back in history, all of us have come here from somewhere else, or almost all of us—and humane and effective policies that help us to keep alive that great tradition and heritage, serving millions of people who are tired, weary, yearning to be free and seek that lamp beside the golden door.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

(The remarks of Mr. GRASSLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. 2043 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Rhode Island.

CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Mr. President, I am here today for the 111th time in my "Time to Wake Up" series urging this body to wake up to climate change. It is happening all around us, and it is happening right now, not in some distant future. The warnings of what is to come if we fail to act are sobering.

Congress has the ability and responsibility to change the course we are on, but we can't do it until Senate Republicans step up and start debating real solutions. Smart climate policy can align with conservative values—conservative values, such as prudence in the face of risks, protection of property rights and individual liberty, and market-based solutions for solving problems.

Senator SCHATZ and I have proposed a fee on carbon emissions, correcting a market failure that currently allows major emitters to pollute for free while forcing regular citizens to bear the physical and financial burden. Even if you are a tea-partier, why would you want a big special interest to be able to distort the energy market and make regular people pay the price for the harm they cause? Other than special interest politics, it makes no sense.

This market incentive would work. It would reduce emissions. A recent report on our bill shows it will reduce carbon emissions 45 percent by 2030, more than the President's Clean Power Plan does. It will also generate significant revenue—over \$2 trillion over 10 years—to return to taxpayers. With \$2 trillion, you can lower a lot of tax rates.

I hope our Republican colleagues will give this bill a serious look. Former Congressman Bob Inglis, a dyed-in-the-wool conservative, described our bill not as an olive branch, but as an olive limb we have offered to Republicans. Yet still in this Chamber, all we hear from Republicans is equivocation and denial when it comes to climate change. We hear Republican Senators trumpet industry-backed reports that point to the costs of action, but ignore the terrible costs of inaction. They look at only one side of the ledger. If accountants did business that way, they would go to jail, but that is evidently good enough for Republicans in the climate debate.

We hear Senators using cherry-picked data. They will take a graph that goes up and down, up and down on

an upward trend and pick a high spot and a later low spot, and from those two selected points, they will say: Aha. See, there is no increase.

An expert witness would be thrown out of court for that nonsense, but it is evidently good enough for Republicans for the climate debate.

We hear Senators ducking and dodging on this issue, exclaiming they are not scientists, but then they will not listen to what they are being told by the people who are scientists. We hear deniers denigrate scientists, ignore basic established science, and venture into loopy conspiracy theories about a great hoax, one that the United States military and every American national laboratory and NASA are all evidently in on. Seriously? And they say this with no shame for the smear it implies of some of our most reputable scientists. Again, that is good enough for Republicans in the climate debate, I guess.

We even had a Senator throw a snowball on the Senate floor because he thought the continued existence of snow here somehow disproved climate change. Truly. I did not make that up.

Meanwhile, what we see all around us shows us that this is happening. Simple, straightforward measurements show that the climate is changing around us.

One summary is the annual "State of the Climate" report by the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration and the American Meteorological Society. The report reviews dozens of climate indicators—from ocean and air temperatures to extreme weather events. It doesn't get into forecasts or projections. It discusses what we are observing and measuring now. The "State of the Climate" report shows that 2014 was a benchmark year for the climate, and not in a good way. The article in Bloomberg News summarizing the report's findings was titled "The Freakish Year in Broken Climate Records."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Its author, Tom Randall, sums up the state of the climate with two words: "it's ugly." I have to agree. From record temperatures to record sea levels to changing weather to retreating glaciers, climate change is evident across an array of measurements and observations. We are watching our planet change before our very eyes.

Let's see what these measurements say.

Well, 2014 was another record year for global temperatures. NOAA and NASA both concluded that 2014 was the hottest year since recordkeeping began in 1880.

This chart shows where temperatures in 2014 were warmer than the 1981-to-2010 average, which is shown in red, and

blue shows where the temperatures were cooler than average.

The eastern part of the United States and Canada was one of only a handful of places around the world that saw cooler-than-average temperatures. But while it was cool here in 2014, almost everywhere else in the world was feeling the heat. All you have to do is look at the data to see it. It is a massive sea of red.

And 2014 does not stand alone; 17 of the 18 hottest years in the historical record have occurred in the last 18 years. The past decade was warmer than the one before that, which was warmer than the one before that, and so far 2015 is on track to be even hotter than 2014. All of this is measurement and straightforward fact.

Of course, as humans, we don't experience annual average changes in temperature, we experience the weather, and we are beginning to see climate change affect weather patterns all over the world.

This chart shows the number of extreme warm days and the number of extreme cold nights since 1960. The number of hot days, as we can see, is climbing, and the number of cold nights is decreasing. Both are symptoms of a warming planet. This matters because those very warm days pose human health risks and can be downright dangerous for people who don't have air conditioning, especially for the young, old, and infirm. Extreme heat can stunt crops and drive down yields, and it can stress livestock and other animals.

Cool nights are important too. It is the cold nights of winter that help control the mountain pine beetle, ticks, and other pests. With fewer cold nights, the mountain pine beetle has wreaked havoc over the west in the past few years.

Last week, my colleagues on the Senate Climate Action Task Force and I heard from Dave Chadwick of the Montana Wildlife Federation about climate change effects on the Montana's hunting industry, with hunters going to their favorite spots and no longer seeing the game they used to see.

Jill Ryan, the commissioner in Eagle County, CO, told us they are already seeing fewer ski days in her Rocky Mountain community—not good for Colorado's iconic ski industry.

In Maine and New Hampshire, out-of-control tick populations are attacking the region's iconic moose. A single moose might now carry tens of thousands of ticks. It is sickening to see, and it is no good for the New Hampshire moose-watching industry. Yes, people actually do that. Between mud and snowmobile trails and fewer, sicker, tick-encrusted moose, it ain't looking good.

This chart shows how much water various glaciers around the world have lost each year since 1980. Last year the

melting was equivalent to each glacier losing 33 inches right off the top. Look at these losses—31 consecutive years in a row of loss.

Last year's melt continues a sobering trend of heavier and heavier losses. The red line here shows the total amount of ice loss since 1980. It shows that glacial ice loss has been accelerated. Average losses were about 9 inches in the 1980s, 15 inches in the 1990s, and 29 inches in the 2000s. Again, this is measurement, folks, not conjecture.

The oceans are warming. Why? Well, it is simple. As greenhouse gases trap heat in the atmosphere, the heat is absorbed by the oceans. Over 90 percent of the excess heat from greenhouse gases that has been trapped has actually gone into the oceans, and 4 out of 5 analyses say that the heat in the upper ocean set a record high in 2014.

These data show the decades-long warming of the surface oceans. Colleagues who still insist that the climate has not warmed in the past couple of decades—look at the oceans, that's where the heat went. This warming is changing the oceans and changing our fisheries and, because of the law of thermal expansion, contributing to sea-level rise.

In 2014, global sea level was at its highest point since we began measuring it with satellites in 1993, which is shown on the chart.

In 2014, we saw the sea level continuing to rise at a rate of about $\frac{1}{8}$ of an inch per year. We measure this in Rhode Island. Sea level at the Newport Naval Station has increased almost 10 inches since the 1930s. This matters when you have storms riding in on higher seas and tearing away our Rhode Island coastline. Sea level rise matters a lot to my constituents.

Measurements are confirming what the scientists have predicted: The seas are rising because the oceans are warming and ice on land is melting. The climate is warming because greenhouse gases are trapping heat from the Sun in the atmosphere.

Again, these are irrefutable facts, confirmed by experts and scientific organizations and big corporations such as Walmart. Here is the reason. The main culprit behind the changes we are observing is carbon dioxide building up in the atmosphere, which in 2014 reached record levels. The global average exceeded 400 parts per million in 2014. In context, for as long as human beings have been on the planet, it has been between about 170 and 300. For our whole duration as a species, that has been the range. Now we are out of it by over 400 and climbing. The global carbon dioxide levels haven't been this high in human experience.

Where are we headed in 2015? Well, these trends are likely continuing. Scientists are already predicting that 2015 will eclipse 2014 in the record books for global temperature change. In 2015 we

can expect that the temperatures will continue to go up, the seas will continue to rise, and glaciers will continue to melt. It won't stop unless we choose to stop what is causing it.

We know our binge of carbon pollution is driving these changes. May I say that today a news report has come out that shows one of the biggest carbon polluters of all, ExxonMobil, knows that our binge of carbon pollution is driving these changes and spent decades covering up what they knew with a fusillade of lies that they launched to try to continue to sell their product. This is what folks who are engaged in climate denial are buying into—a campaign of lies from a fossil fuel company, ExxonMobil, that itself knows better. I will have more on that story later.

We can't just keep our heads buried in the sand. We have to wake up. We have to wake up to the facts, and we have to wake up to our duty.

I appreciate the patience of my friend the Senator from Utah.

With that, I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FREAKISH YEAR IN BROKEN CLIMATE RECORDS

(By Tom Randall, July 17, 2015)

STATE OF THE CLIMATE: BROKEN

The annual State of the Climate report is out, and it's ugly. Record heat, record sea levels, more hot days and fewer cool nights, surging cyclones, unprecedented pollution, and rapidly diminishing glaciers.

The U.S. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) issues a report each year compiling the latest data gathered by 413 scientists from around the world. It's 288 pages, but we'll save you some time. Here's a review, in six charts, of some of the climate highlights from 2014.

TEMPERATURES SET A NEW RECORD

It's getting hot out there. Four independent data sets show that last year was the hottest in 135 years of modern record keeping. The map above shows temperature departure from the norm. The eastern half of North America was one of the few cool spots on the planet.

SEA LEVELS ALSO SURGE TO A RECORD

The global mean sea level continued to rise, keeping pace with a trend of 3.2 millimeters per year over the last two decades. The global satellite record goes back only to 1993, but the trend is clear and consistent. Rising tides are one of the most physically destructive aspects of climate change. Eight of the world's 10 largest cities are near a coast, and 40 percent of the U.S. population lives in coastal areas, where the risk of flooding and erosion continues to rise.

GLACIERS RETREAT FOR THE 31ST CONSECUTIVE YEAR

Data from more than three dozen mountain glaciers show that 2014 was the 31st straight year of glacier ice loss worldwide. The consistent retreat of glaciers is considered one of the clearest signals of global warming. Most alarming: The rate of loss is accelerating over time.

THERE ARE MORE HOT DAYS AND FEWER COOL NIGHTS

Climate change doesn't just increase the average temperature—it also increases the

extremes. The chart above shows when daily high temperatures max out above the 90th percentile and nightly lows fall below the lowest 10th percentile. The measures were near their global records last year, and the trend is consistently miserable.

RECORD GREENHOUSE GASES FILL THE ATMOSPHERE

By burning fossil fuels, humans have cranked up concentrations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by more than 40 percent since the Industrial Revolution. Carbon dioxide, the most important greenhouse gas, reached a concentration of 400 parts per million for the first time in May 2013. Soon we'll stop seeing concentrations that low ever again.

The data shown are from the Mauna Loa Observatory in Hawaii. Data collection was started there by C. David Keeling of the Scripps Institution of Oceanography in March 1958. This chart is commonly referred to as the Keeling curve.

THE OCEANS ABSORB CRAZY AMOUNTS OF HEAT

The oceans store and release heat on a massive scale. Over shorter spans of years to decades, ocean temperatures naturally fluctuate from climate patterns like El Niño and what's known as the Pacific Decadal Oscillation. Longer term, oceans are absorbing even more global warming than the surface of the planet, contributing to rising seas, melting glaciers, and dying coral reefs and fish populations.

In 2015 the world has moved into an El Niño warming pattern in the Pacific Ocean. El Niño phases release some of the ocean's stored heat into the atmosphere, causing weather shifts around the world. This El Niño hasn't peaked yet, but by some measures it's already the most extreme ever recorded for this time of year and could lead 2015 to break even more records than last year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, last week I began a thorough examination of the facts in the case of Planned Parenthood and the scandal that is now engulfing our Nation's largest provider of abortions. Today I wish to review briefly the evidence against Planned Parenthood—evidence brought to light thanks to whistleblowers and the conscientious journalists working with an organization called the Center for Medical Progress.

After hearing that Planned Parenthood, in addition to performing almost 1,000 abortions every single day, was also selling the organs and body parts of its victims, CMP began investigating. CMP's investigation, which it calls the Human Capital Project, lasted for more than 2 years. Its findings have finally been published over the last few months in the form of a series of video documentaries posted on the Internet consisting mostly of interviews and undercover reporting of Planned Parenthood officials and facilities.

The videos have sparked debate and controversy and have thrown the abortion industry and its political clients back on their heels. But thanks to an indefensible coverage blackout in the pro-abortion mainstream media, most

Americans have never even heard of, much less seen, these videos. Based on the vote the Senate took last month, and in particular based on the lack of substance coming from the other side of the aisle during that debate, it is a good bet that most of our colleagues defending Planned Parenthood haven't seen those videos, either. So I thought it might do some good to at least get the facts into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD before we move forward.

To date, 10 of the expected 12 videos have been posted on the home page for the Center for Medical Progress. The first video was posted on July 14 and showed a luncheon meeting between CMP investigators posing as corporate buyers of fetal organs and Planned Parenthood's senior director of medical services. In the course of this business lunch, we learn from the senior Planned Parenthood official's own words that Planned Parenthood clinics traffic in the body parts of aborted children as a matter of routine; that Planned Parenthood keeps these transactions at the local franchise level for legal reasons that appear to be designed to sidestep corporate liability; that Planned Parenthood's abortionists may alter their surgical procedures—allegedly after consent forms have been signed—so as to maximize the organ harvest from unborn children. This was the infamous moment when we learned that Planned Parenthood doctors can “crush below” and “crush above” a baby's most lucrative parts. Finally, we learned that such alterations may involve performing dangerous and illegal partial-birth abortions.

These revelations by themselves—in and of themselves, all by themselves—shock the conscience, but they were only the beginning. In the Center for Medical Progress's second video released on July 21, we witness another undercover business lunch with investigators again posing as corporate organ buyers, this time with the president of Planned Parenthood's Medical Director's Council. What we see in this video, contrary to Planned Parenthood's protestations, is without question a financial negotiation about the price of baby organs. They are not talking about compensating Planned Parenthood for procurement and delivery costs; no, they are haggling. As the official herself, a medical doctor, jokes at one point, “I want a Lamborghini.”

In another video released August 4, the vice president and medical director of Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains is seen not only discussing exactly this kind of market pricing but the need to conceal such transactions through message discipline. Here we learn that Planned Parenthood physicians do indeed alter their surgical procedures “in a way that they get the best specimens”—that is, not to serve their patients but to maximize their

sales numbers—because, as this vice president boasts, “My department contributes so much to the bottom line of our organization.”

Subsequent videos have only corroborated these allegations. From the CEO of StemExpress, a major corporate buyer of fetal body parts, we learned that, yes, the price of fetal tissue is driven by supply and demand, not just cost reimbursements. And sometimes this market goes beyond organs and tissue and actually traffics in whole unborn children.

From a fetal tissue producer, we learned that sometimes babies are born alive and are killed outside the womb because, she says, it just fell out. Just this week, a new video showed a Planned Parenthood official admitting that some abortion clinics “generate a fair amount of income selling baby organs.” And these are just the undercover videos.

Other videos feature the heart-wrenching testimony of a former StemExpress employee who tells the harrowing stories of her work inside Planned Parenthood clinics. She tells not only of the screaming and crying of the patients but also witnessing unethical behavior by the medical staff. And, yes, the videos also contain horrifying, behind-the-scenes images at Planned Parenthood centers where the exploitation, butchering, and violence are worse than anything one can imagine. The images and stories will pierce the heart of anyone who has a child or has ever been one. But that is exactly why we must watch these videos. For those who don't already know what abortion clinics are like and what they do, these videos must be seen to be believed.

For anyone who has ever wondered why so many Members of Congress, so many citizens want to transfer taxpayer funding of abortion clinics to safe community health centers that actually practice life-preserving medicine as proposed in the bill recently introduced by Senator ERNST, watch these videos and you will know. Watch these videos and you will understand.

Every new video brings further corroboration not simply of particular instances of blood-chilling behavior but of what appears to be a pattern and practice of endangering vulnerable women by manipulating surgical procedures after consent forms have already been signed to perform abortions in a “less crunchy” way, for purposes not of women's health but greed; to harvest organs from aborted children and sell them to corporate purchasers; and to conduct this grisly business in secret to avoid public detection and outrage and, quite possibly, criminal indictment—yes, indictment.

That—the potential crimes of the abortion industry evidenced in these videos—will be the topic of my next speech on this scandal, for the behavior documented by the Center for Medical

Progress is not just stomach-turning—it is that, to be sure, but it may well also be illegal, violating not only the moral laws of nature and of nature's God, which we already knew, but also the criminal laws of the United States of America.

I would encourage my colleagues and all Americans to view these videos for themselves so that they, too, can judge for themselves. We should all be warned: The videos are as difficult to watch as they are easy to find, but the price of self-government is self-awareness.

The American people need to know the truth about what actually goes on in America's abortion clinics, what lies are being told, and what crimes are being committed in their name and with their own money. The truth about human life and dignity has the power to set us all free, but first, we have to tell it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, last week, I spoke about Senate Republicans' virtual shutdown of the judicial nominations process since they took over the majority. Their refusal to respond to the urgent needs of our independent third branch is threatening to harm our justice system and rob the judiciary of outstanding public servants.

One glaring example of this harm is the unnecessary delay of Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo, who was nominated last year to fill an emergency vacancy on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit in Pennsylvania. Judge Restrepo was unanimously confirmed 2 years ago by the Senate to serve as a district court judge. During his tenure as both a Federal district court judge and as a Federal magistrate judge, he has presided over 56 trials that have gone to verdict or judgment. He is superbly qualified, and I have heard no objection to his nomination. Despite his outstanding credentials and experience, it took the Republican majority 7 months just to schedule a hearing in the Judiciary Committee for this qualified nominee.

Judge Restrepo has bipartisan support from both Pennsylvania Senators and was voted out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously by voice vote.

Once confirmed, Judge Restrepo will be the first Hispanic judge from Pennsylvania to ever serve on this court and only the second Hispanic judge to serve on the Third Circuit. He has the strong endorsement of the nonpartisan Hispanic National Bar Association. At his confirmation hearing in June, Senator TOOMEY stated that "there is no question [Judge Restrepo] is a very well qualified candidate to serve on the Third Circuit." Senator TOOMEY described Judge Restrepo's life story as "an American Dream" and recounted how Judge Restrepo came to the United States from Colombia and rose to the top of his profession by "virtue of his hard work, his intellect, his integrity." I could not agree more.

Given his remarkable credentials, wealth of experience, and strong bipartisan support, you would think the Senate would have confirmed Judge Restrepo months ago. Instead, he was nominated for a judicial emergency vacancy back in November 2014, and for 10 months since his nomination, he has been denied a vote on his confirmation. No Senate Democrat opposes a vote on his nomination. The only ones who are holding up his nomination are the Senate Republicans. I have heard Senator TOOMEY indicate his strong support, and that he would like to see Judge Restrepo receive a vote. I know Senator TOOMEY can be a fierce advocate for issues he cares passionately about, and I hope he will get a firm commitment from the majority leader to schedule a confirmation vote this week.

In addition to Judge Restrepo's nomination, there are 12 other noncontroversial judicial nominees pending on the Executive Calendar waiting for a vote. All of them were approved by voice vote by the Judiciary Committee. There is no reason for Republicans to block these nominees. More than 8 months into this new year, Republican leadership has allowed votes on just six judicial nominees. By this time in 2007, when I was chairman of the Judiciary Committee, we had confirmed 29 judges nominated by President Bush. That is nearly five times more nominees than what this Republican majority has accomplished so far this year. Because of the Republicans' virtual shutdown of the confirmation process, judicial vacancies have increased by more than 50 percent—from 43 to 67. This is demonstrates an astounding neglect of the needs of our independent Third Branch.

Instead of confirming Judge Restrepo and the 12 other noncontroversial judicial nominees on the Executive Calendar, Republicans are talking about another doomed vote on harmful legislation to block women's health care choices. Republicans had already forced a failed "show vote" to defund critical health services for women, spending 2 days on that unnecessary

political exercise. Although Senate Republicans campaigned last year on the promise that they would govern responsibly if they won the majority, they continue to prioritize divisive issues that play only to their political base and yield no results for the American people.

I am urging Republican leadership to reverse course. Confirm Judge Luis Felipe Restrepo without further delay, and then confirm the other 12 noncontroversial judicial nominees pending on our Executive Calendar.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, the United States has a proud and unique history as a nation of immigrants. Ever since our founding, we have been a beacon of hope for those seeking opportunity. Generation after generation, our Nation has greatly benefited from the entrepreneurial spirit that these newcomers bring with them. That is as true today as it was 200 years ago.

Our Nation's history with immigration has not always been a story of acceptance. Newcomers have often faced resistance, isolation, discrimination and even racist opposition. Many of us here in this body know those painful stories from our own immigrant families—others here have felt the stinging words of bigotry themselves. My grandparents faced signs telling them to not bother applying for work because of their ancestry but those old stories are hard to imagine today.

That is why it is so shocking to hear the steady rise in racist, xenophobic rhetoric coming from the Republican field of Presidential candidates. These statements are offensive and have no place in our national dialogue. Those who use such rhetoric are fear mongering for political gain. Even in today's hyped up political theater, this kind of language is unacceptable. It is hurtful, harmful, and just plain wrong.

It is incumbent on all of us to speak out against this dehumanizing discourse. A topic as important as immigration is worthy of debate, but in an informed and thoughtful manner. This weekend, Steve Case, a co-founder of America Online, took a powerful stand in an opinion piece in the Washington Post titled "Business Leaders Must Speak Out Against Trump's Anti-Immigrant Rhetoric." Two years ago, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, I invited Mr. Case to testify before the committee when we were considering comprehensive immigration reform, and he has continued to be a leader on the issue. He is right to stand up, speak out, and call on all Americans to reject the ugly words we are hearing from too many political actors on one of the most pressing matters facing our country.

The growing partisan rhetoric that attempts to equate immigrants with

criminals and suggests we deport them en masse is both irrational and dangerous. It is time that they stop. The characterization of immigrants as criminals here to harm us and our communities is not just beneath the dignity of anyone who seeks to lead this Nation as President, it simply is not supported by the evidence. Anyone who listened to the extensive testimony that the Senate Judiciary Committee collected 2 years ago will know that immigrants commit crimes at lower rates than those born in the United States. Many become job producers and the vast majority are hard-working members of our communities who support our economy and strengthen our neighborhoods. No less than Grover Norquist testified that "Increased legal immigration will add millions of consumers, workers, renters, and others who will make our economy larger by working with Americans to produce more of the goods and services we demand."

We must put an end to this destructive anti-immigrant rhetoric and find a way back to the constructive, bipartisan approach to reforming our immigration system. The Senate Judiciary Committee played a critical role in that effort and I am proud of the productive, respectful debates that marked our consideration of comprehensive immigration reform in 2013. Both Democrats and Republicans praised the process as fair and thorough. Bipartisanship was a priority, and of the 136 amendments we adopted in committee, all but 3 passed on a bipartisan basis. As a result of that remarkable effort, the Senate passed comprehensive immigration reform with overwhelming support. If House Republican leaders had simply brought that bill up for a vote, it would have passed and been the law of the land. We would have taken an enormous step forward as a country to fix our broken immigration system.

That bill is an example of all we can accomplish when we put aside hateful slogans and focus on our primary job of actually legislating. I hope that we will return to a bipartisan approach this Congress so that we can again pass legislation that strengthens our communities and our economy, improves our border security, and keeps families together.

There is still strong support for meaningful immigration reform in the Senate, and that is what we should work on here in Congress. There is no excuse for continued inaction and scapegoating. The time for immigration reform is now.

RECOGNIZING DR. YUICHI SHODA, DR. WALTER MISCHER, AND DR. PHILIP PEAKE

Ms. CANTWELL. Mr. President, basic research is a building block of Amer-

ican innovation. Without it, profound breakthroughs in science, medicine, technology and other fields would simply not happen.

In Washington State, we know investments in basic scientific research are a key ingredient to the future of our information economy—from aerospace and agriculture to technology and health care, and across all sectors of our economy.

It is in that spirit that, today, I recognize my constituent Dr. Yuichi Shoda of the University of Washington and his colleagues, Dr. Walter Mischel and Dr. Philip Peake, for their receipt of a Golden Goose Award for federally funded research.

The Golden Goose Award recognizes the immense benefits of federally funded research to human knowledge and our economy by shining a spotlight on obscure studies that resulted in significant impacts to our society and major breakthroughs.

Dr. Shoda and his colleagues are being honored for their seminal longitudinal research project that has become known as "the marshmallow study." This study, funded by the National Institutes of Health, began in the 1960s. The study presented children aged 4-to-5-years-old with a choice between a single marshmallow they could eat immediately or the promise of two marshmallows for which they would have to wait.

Dr. Shoda and his team discovered a significant correlation between how long children were able to wait for the treat and social and academic traits as they became adults. Their discoveries have led to significant advances in the way we understand the human behaviors and the neuroscience behind self-control and delayed gratification. Already, educators are using Dr. Shoda's research to teach children positive habits at an early age. The implications of this research, from education to retirement and health, are vast.

As Dr. Shoda's project demonstrates, federally funded scientific research builds the foundation upon which new ideas are developed. Dr. Shoda's research also provides an example for why Congress must make robust and strategic investments in basic research across a variety of fields.

I congratulate Dr. Yuichi Shoda and his team for the marshmallow study and wish them a bright future as they continue unlocking new knowledge.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

REMEMBERING PAULA EKONOMOS KOZLEN

• Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, it is with a heavy heart that I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the life of my dear friend, Paula Kozlen, a former marketing executive, avid ten-

nis player, world traveler, community leader, beloved wife, sister, step-mother, aunt, and friend, who passed away on August 29, 2015, after a courageous battle with cancer.

Paula was truly one of a kind. Her energy and determination, her sense of humor and adventure, her incredibly kind heart and love of life will always be remembered by everyone lucky enough to have crossed her path during her amazing life.

Paula was born in Illinois on July 26, 1952. After graduating from Western Illinois University with a degree in education, she embarked on a long and successful career in marketing and sales for several major corporations around the country. Paula's career provided her with the opportunity to travel, which became a lifelong passion. She loved visiting new places and developed deep and lasting friendships with people all over the world who were drawn to her extraordinarily compassionate and generous personality. Of all the places she traveled, she found her home in the Coachella Valley of Southern California.

Paula cared so deeply about helping others and improving her community, and she gave her time and energy without reservation. She dedicated herself to supporting music, theatre, and education in the Coachella Valley, served on boards for organizations that provide services to those in need, and dropped everything to help the people of New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina hit in 2005. Paula was the type of person who wouldn't hesitate when she saw people in need and knew that she could make a difference.

My entire family joins me in mourning her loss and sending our heartfelt condolences to Paula's husband, Vern Kozlen; sisters Katherine Wolcott, and husband Keene, and Vicki Griffin, and husband Michael; step-son Mark Kozlen; and niece Katherine Griffin.

Those of us who were lucky enough to have known Paula will be forever grateful for the extraordinary time we had with her, the example she set, and the wonderful memories that we will forever cherish. We truly walked in her light. She will be deeply missed.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 4:30 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 720) to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 6:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had signed the following enrolled bill:

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

S. 2035. A bill to provide for the compensation of Federal employees affected by a lapse in appropriations.

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2816. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Small Rural Hospital Improvement Grant Program for Fiscal Year 2013"; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2817. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "United States Property Held by Controlled Foreign Corporations in Transactions Involving Partnerships; Rents and Royalties Derived in the Active Conduct of a Trade or Business" ((RIN1545-BJ49) (TD 9733)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2818. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Integrated Hedging Transactions of Qualifying Debt" ((RIN1545-BK98) (TD 9736)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2819. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Application of the Cooperative and Small Employer Charity Pension Flexibility Act" (Notice 2015-58) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2820. A communication from the Acting Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Administration's 2015 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2821. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Allocation of W-2 Wages in a Short Taxable Year and in Acquisition or Disposition" ((RIN1545-BM11) (TD 9731)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2822. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure: Examination of Returns and Claims for Refund, Credit, or Abatement; Determination of Tax Liability" (Rev. Proc. 2015-42) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 1, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2823. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-023); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2824. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-059); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2825. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-006); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2826. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-083); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2827. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-040); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2828. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-081); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2829. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-057); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2830. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, six (6) reports relative to vacancies in the Department of State, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2015; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2831. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting,

pursuant to law, a report entitled "Pre-market Approval of Pediatric Uses of Devices—FY 2013"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2832. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "United States Tobacco Product Exports That Do Not Conform to Tobacco Product Standards"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2833. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Patient Navigator Outreach and Chronic Disease Prevention Program"; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2834. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Administration of Multiemployer Plan Participant Vote on an Approved Suspension of Benefits Under MPRA" ((RIN1545-BM89) (TD 9735)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2835. A communication from the Deputy Director, National Institutes of Health, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Institute on Minority Health Disparities Research Endowments" (RIN0925-AA61) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2836. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-140, "Ruby Whitfield Way Designation Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2837. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-141, "Title IX Athletic Equity Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2838. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-142, "Naval Lodge Building, Inc. Real Property Tax Relief Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2839. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-143, "Margaret Peters and Roumania Peters Walker Tennis Courts Designation Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2840. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-144, "Closing of Public Street adjacent to Squares 603S, 605, 607, 661, 661N, and 665, and in U.S. Reservations 243 and 244, S.O. 13-14605, Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2841. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-145, "Medical Marijuana Cultivation Center Expansion Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2842. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-146, "Sale of Synthetic Drugs Temporary Amendment Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2843. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-147, "Ward 5 Paint Spray Booth Moratorium Temporary Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2844. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports entitled "District of Columbia Agencies' Compliance with Fiscal Year 2015 Small Business Enterprise Expenditure Goals through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2845. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to an alternative plan for pay increases for civilian Federal employees covered by the General Schedule and certain other pay systems in January 2016; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2846. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-84, Technical Amendments" (FAC 2005-84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2847. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-84, Small Entity Compliance Guide" (FAC 2005-84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2848. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; EPEAT Items" ((RIN9000-AM71) (FAC 2005-84)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2849. A communication from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, Office of Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2005-84, Introduction" (FAC 2005-84) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2850. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Visas: Interview Waiver Authority" (RIN1400-AD80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 4, 2015; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2851. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Adminis-

tration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Animals on VA Property" (RIN2900-AO39) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on August 27, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2852. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Denied Access to NASA Facilities (2015-N002)" (RIN2700-AE14) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2853. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0492)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2854. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0282)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2855. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0282)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2856. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0643)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2857. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0364)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2858. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3398)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2859. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-2048)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2860. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Regional Aircraft Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1744)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2861. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (26); Amdt. No. 3655" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2862. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (28); Amdt. No. 3656" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2863. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Modification of Restricted Areas R-3804A, R-3804B, and R-3804C; Fort Polk, LA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2014-0639)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2864. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kelso, WA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1133)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2865. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-3325)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2866. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Toledo, WA"

((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1135)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2867. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1481)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2868. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Northeastern United States" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-1650)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2869. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0671)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2870. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D Airspace; Ogden, Hill AFB, UT" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2015-0691)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2871. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Perth Amboy, New Jersey" ((RIN1625-AA09) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0374)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2872. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Wrightsville Channel; Wrightsville Beach, NC" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0663)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2873. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0738)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the Presi-

dent of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2874. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0568)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2875. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0427)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2876. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation, Tennessee River 647.0 to 648.0; Knoxville, TN" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0337)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2877. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulations; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone—Correction" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0705)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2878. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Local Regulation; Suncoast Super Boat Grand Prix; Gulf of Mexico, Sarasota, FL" ((RIN1625-AA08) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0216)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2879. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River MM 180.0 to 180.5; St. Louis, MO" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0704)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2880. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone—Oil Exploration Staging Area in Dutch Harbor, AK" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0246)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2881. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Security Zone; Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0731)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2882. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Cleveland National Air Show; Lake Erie and Cleveland Harbor, Cleveland, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0718)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2883. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone, Swim Around Charleston; Charleston, SC" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0276)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2884. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Whiskey Island Paddleboard Festival and Race; Lake Erie, Cleveland, OH" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0716)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2885. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2013-1060)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2886. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; Indian River Bay; Millsboro, Delaware" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0563)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2887. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zone; U.S. Army Exercise, Des Plaines River, Channahon, IL" ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0760)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2888. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled

“Safety Zone, James River; Newport News, VA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0701)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2889. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0646)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2890. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Carly’s Crossing; Outer Harbor, Gallagher Beach, Buffalo, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0717)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2891. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; TriMet Tilikum Crossing Bridge Fireworks Display, Willamette River, Portland, OR” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0510)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2892. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Waddington Homecoming Fireworks, St. Lawrence River, Ogden Island, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0715)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2893. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; NOBLE DISCOVERER, Outer Continental Shelf Drillship, Chukchi Sea, AK” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0248)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2894. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone, Seward, AK” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0800)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2895. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Schuylkill River; Philadelphia, PA” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0094)) received during adjourn-

ment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2896. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Unexploded Ordnance Removal, Vero Beach, FL” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0737)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2897. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zone; Incredoubleman Triathlon; Henderson Bay, Lake Ontario, Sackets Harbor, NY” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0509)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2898. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Safety Zones and Regulated Navigation Area; Shell Arctic Drilling/Exploration Vessel and Associated Voluntary First Amendment Area, Portland, OR” ((RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2015-0543)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2899. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “NASA Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: NASA Capitalization Threshold (NFS Case 2015-N004)” ((RIN2700-AE23)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2900. A communication from the Assistant Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Uniform Administrative Requirements, Cost Principles and Audit Requirements for Federal Awards” ((RIN2700-AE18)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2901. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Mackerel, Squid, and Butterfish Fisheries; Framework Adjustment 9” ((RIN0648-BF00)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2902. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; Quota

Transfer” ((RIN0648-XE077)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2903. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Golden Tilefish” ((RIN0648-XE087)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2904. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Hogfish” ((RIN0648-XE088)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2905. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2015-2016 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments” ((RIN0648-BF27)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2906. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” ((RIN0648-XD974)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2907. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” ((RIN0648-XE023)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2908. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area” ((RIN0648-XD996)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2909. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled “Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Prohibited Species Catch; Emergency Rule” ((RIN0648-BF24)) received during

adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2910. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area" (RIN0648-XE139) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2911. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fishery Management Plan; Revision to Prohibited Species Regulations" (RIN0648-BE80) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2912. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; West Coast Salmon Fisheries; 2015 Management Measures; Correction" (RIN0648-XD843) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 2, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2913. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Species Fisheries; California Swordfish Drift Gillnet Fishery; Vessel Monitoring System Requirements" (RIN0648-BE25) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 3, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2914. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial, Recreational, and Treaty Indian Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions Number 16 Through Number 21" (RIN0648-XE111) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 8, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petition or memorial was laid before the Senate and was referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-76. A communication from a citizen of the State of Illinois memorializing the State of Illinois's petition to the United States Congress calling for a constitutional convention for the purpose of proposing amendments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mrs. BOXER (for herself, Mr. DURBIN, Ms. WARREN, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. MURPHY):

S. 2037. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CORKER (for himself, Mr. WARNER, Mr. VITTER, and Ms. WARREN):

S. 2038. A bill to provide certainty that Congress and the Administration will undertake substantive and structural housing finance reform, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARASSO):

S. 2039. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2040. A bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY (for himself, Mr. CASIDY, and Mr. MENENDEZ):

S. 2041. A bill to promote the development of safe drugs for neonates; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. WARREN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, and Mr. REED):

S. 2042. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2043. A bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Mr. SCHATZ, and Mr. MORAN):

S. 2044. A bill to prohibit the use of certain clauses in form contracts that restrict the ability of a consumer to communicate regarding the goods or services offered in interstate commerce that were the subject of the contract, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 163

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 163, a bill to establish a grant

program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. SCOTT) were added as cosponsors of S. 298, a bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide States with the option of providing services to children with medically complex conditions under the Medicaid program and Children's Health Insurance Program through a care coordination program focused on improving health outcomes for children with medically complex conditions and lowering costs, and for other purposes.

S. 613

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 613, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the efficiency of summer meals.

S. 804

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 804, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to specify coverage of continuous glucose monitoring devices, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY), the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. MANCHIN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. CARPER) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1106

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1106, a bill to amend the

Higher Education Act of 1965 to allow the Secretary of Education to award Early College Federal Pell Grants.

S. 1127

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1127, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the denial of deduction for certain excessive employee remuneration, and for other purposes.

S. 1214

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1214, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1390

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1390, a bill to help provide relief to State education budgets during a recovering economy, to help fulfill the Federal mandate to provide higher educational opportunities for Native American Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1719

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, a bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1719, *supra*.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1833

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1833, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to improve the child and adult care food program.

S. 1916

At the request of Mr. THUNE, the name of the Senator from Minnesota

(Ms. KLOBUCHAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1916, a bill to include skilled nursing facilities as a type of health care provider under section 254(h) of the Communications Act of 1934.

S. 1919

At the request of Mr. LANKFORD, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1919, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes.

S. 1938

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1938, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the approval of certain programs of education for purposes of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

S. 1968

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1968, a bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain companies to disclose information describing any measures the company has taken to identify and address conditions of forced labor, slavery, human trafficking, and the worst forms of child labor within the company's supply chains.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 2026

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2026, a bill to foster bilateral engagement and scientific analysis of storing nuclear waste in permanent repositories in the Great Lakes Basin.

S. 2028

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. SESSIONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

S. CON. RES. 4

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 4, a concurrent resolution supporting the Local Radio Freedom Act.

S. RES. 199

At the request of Mr. NELSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 199, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate regarding establishing a National Strategic Agenda.

S. RES. 214

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 214, a resolution commemorating the 85th anniversary of the Daughters of Penelope, a pre-eminent international women's association and an affiliate organization of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association.

AMENDMENT NO. 2656

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

At the request of Mr. HELLER, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. ENZI (for himself and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2039. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to speak on the introduction of legislation which designates the mountain and populated place at Devils Tower National Monument as Devils Tower.

This is legislation I am introducing today with the support of Senator JOHN BARRASSO of Wyoming and in conjunction with Representative CYNTHIA LUMMIS who is introducing this same measure in the House.

Devils Tower National Monument is not an ordinary national treasure. There are approximately 117 national monuments, but Devils Tower has the distinction as being America's first national monument. Established by President Theodore Roosevelt on September 24, 1906, Devils Tower National Monument preserves the unique geologic, cultural, and aesthetic values of this breathtaking feature.

Devils Tower has a rich cultural history, and has many meanings to different cultures, including the many peoples and Native American tribes that have historical and geographic ties to Northeastern Wyoming. The Geographic Names Information System, GNIS, prepared by the U.S. Geological Survey, USGS, acknowledges there are sixteen documented variant names to Devils Tower. Documents submitted to the U.S. Board on Geographic Names cite approximately 94 different published names for Devils Tower. Meanwhile, official Federal records indicate the name Devils Tower has existed for over 130 years.

This is why I am glad there was an opportunity for public comment and debate on the most recent petition to rename Devils Tower. The results of that 5 month public comment period demonstrated there is strong support from the community and local officials to retain the Devils Tower name for the geologic feature, the populated place, and the National Monument.

Now that there has been an opportunity to hear comments about the most recent petition to rename Devils Tower, the Wyoming congressional delegation is introducing this legislation to preserve the Devils Tower name for the feature, populated place, and for America's first national monument. We also encourage the U.S. Board on Geographic Names, U.S. Department of Interior, and the President to suspend any additional consideration on the petition to rename the features at Devils Tower National Monument.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CROOK COUNTY
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS,
Sundance, WY, September 11, 2015.

In 1868, the Wyoming Territory was created. In 1885, Crook County was created. In 1890, the Territory of Wyoming obtained statehood. In 1906, the first national monument, Devils Tower, was established. The United States was the first country in the world to set aside its most significant places as national park units so they could be enjoyed by all.

Over the centuries, many people have passed through or have inhabited the region now known as Crook County. The many Native American tribes who were in the area called the summit different names over time. By establishing the summit and the surrounding grounds as Devils Tower National Monument, the decision was made as to its official name.

The Crook County Commission would like to submit comments from the public it began to solicit since March 2015. A survey was developed and was inserted in the local newspapers, put on Crook County's website and each Commissioner hand delivered comment sheets throughout the county to the area businesses and town halls. We received comments from within the County and from around the world. As of August 3, 2015, we have received 954 comments about the summit: 34 approve the name change and 886 oppose the name change. For changing the name of the settlement called Devils Tower, we received 953 comments: 37 for the name change and 855 against it.

Crook County citizens believe the Tower is special. There is evidence that organized gatherings have taken place at the Tower since the first recorded climb of the Tower July 4, 1893. Citizens urged State and Federal officials to recognize the importance of this landmark and pressed for improved roads to the Tower in the early 1900's. Since then, the Tower has been the site of numerous weddings, reunions, picnics, school outings and other important life events. Always, the Tower has been referred to with reverence. It is always called "Devils Tower" or "the Tower". We are not aware of any pet name or slang references used by local citizens. One definition of the word, "sacred", in Webster's Dictionary means "worthy of respect". By that definition, Devils Tower is sacred.

If the name is changed to "Bear Lodge", it will diminish the uniqueness of the site. This special place deserves more than a generic name. There is already the Bear Lodge Mountains east of the Monument. There is a rare earths mine being built in the Bear Lodge Mountains called the Bear Lodge Project. There is Bear Butte in Meade County, SD which is reportedly a sacred site to some Native Americans. By having so many places with "Bear" already in its name, it creates confusion for the over 400,000 annual visitors who come specifically to northeast Wyoming to see Devils Tower.

Records show the name Devils Tower has existed officially for over 130 years. In the Bureau of Land Management Cadastral Survey Land Plats dated August 24, 1883, it is indicated that the summit was named Devils Tower. This is based upon field notes from 1881 and 1882. Those field notes dated July 23, 1883 state "A prominent land mark is a high peak in Section 7 called Devils Tower".

Today is not the time to debate whether the site is sacred to some tribes or not. Anecdotal evidence exists that some tribes did avoid the area due to the "bad gods". Please see some of the comments submitted. For example, the Campstool Ranch was established by Lady Grace Esme MacKenzie in 1881. "The location of the ranch near the base of Devils Tower was chosen not due to its scenery but because the Native Americans were scared of it and would not go near it". This was in 1881. The Battle of the Little Bighorn was June 1876 and the Indian Wars continued until 1918.

We do not believe that all elders, leaders and individual tribal members find the name of the summit highly offensive, insulting, etc., as stated in the petition. There is an or-

ganization called Devils Tower Sacred to Many People whose mailing address is Devils Tower, Wyoming which owns land near the Tower. This federally recognized non-profit exists to benefit the Native Americans who live on reservations. The international monetary supports this organization receives show many people recognize the name Devils Tower. The Native artists who sell their wares to the organization recognize the name also and support their efforts.

We do not believe the summit was given its name purposely due to white people finding cultural and faith traditions practiced by Native Americans "evil". It was the name commonly used by the people who lived in the area. That is why one name was chosen for the summit and for the National Monument. Many tribes have their own historic name for the Tower. The United States Board on Geographic Names Case Brief cites approximately 94 different published names for Devils Tower. We do not believe that over twenty tribes who have potential cultural affiliation with the Tower have reached a consensus to support the proposal of one name for the summit. We believe each tribe will continue to use their traditional name for the Tower and Wyoming natives will do the same. Devils Tower has always been open to anyone to use as a respectful place to carry on their own traditions and we expect it to remain that way. The Tower can be shared by all.

The Crook County Commission questions what significant or historic benefit will be advanced by changing the name of the summit located at Devils Tower National Monument? Will the name change proposed by the petitioners benefit many, just a few, or will it cause more dissension? Therefore: We request the Wyoming Board on Geographic Names and the United States Board on Geographic Names retain the name of the summit as Devils Tower.

We question why the settlement of Devils Tower is being petitioned for change. There is a United States Post Office there and we have not received a recommendation from the USPS for a name change. Records show that particular Post Office has been in existence since 1925. Reading some of the comments we received from our Wyoming natives, we ask "How can people who do not even live in the area propose a name change to a populated place?" Numerous comments from the people who have Devils Tower as their mailing address mention the unnecessary distress of changing the name of their business and changing their address on passports, official documents and just receiving mail and packages.

Crook County received 855 comments to retain the name of the settlement of Devils Tower. Again we ask: what significant or historic benefit will be advanced by changing the name of the settlement? A name change should be proposed by the citizens it would most affect. Therefore, we request the name of the settlement be retained as Devils Tower, Wyoming.

Sincerely,

KELLY B. DENNIS,
Chairman.
JEANNE A. WHALEN,
Vice-Chairwoman.
STEVE J. STAHL,
Member.

By Mr. CORNYN (for himself, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. HATCH, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. LEE, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. FLAKE, Mr.

FRANKEN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. COONS, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. MARKEY):

S. 2040. A bill to deter terrorism, provide justice for victims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2040

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Justice Against Sponsors of Terrorism Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) International terrorism is a serious and deadly problem that threatens the vital interests of the United States.

(2) The Constitution confers upon Congress the power to punish crimes against the law of nations and therefore Congress may by law impose penalties on those who provide material support to foreign organizations engaged in terrorist activity, and allow for victims of international terrorism to recover damages from those who have harmed them.

(3) International terrorism affects the interstate and foreign commerce of the United States by harming international trade and market stability, and limiting international travel by United States citizens as well as foreign visitors to the United States.

(4) Some foreign terrorist organizations, acting through affiliated groups or individuals, raise significant funds outside of the United States for conduct directed and targeted at the United States.

(5) It is necessary to recognize the substantive causes of action for aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability under the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 (22 U.S.C. 5201 et seq.).

(6) The decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Halberstam v. Welch*, 705 F.2d 472 (D.C. Cir. 1983), which has been widely recognized as the leading case regarding Federal civil aiding and abetting and conspiracy liability, including by the Supreme Court of the United States, provides the proper legal framework for how such liability should function in the context of the Anti-Terrorism Act of 1987 (22 U.S.C. 5201 et seq.).

(7) The United Nations Security Council declared in Resolution 1373, adopted on September 28, 2001, that all countries have an affirmative obligation to "[r]efrain from providing any form of support, active or passive, to entities or persons involved in terrorist acts," and to "[e]nsure that any person who participates in the financing, planning, preparation or perpetration of terrorist acts or in supporting terrorist acts is brought to justice".

(8) Consistent with these declarations, no country has the discretion to engage knowingly in the financing or sponsorship of terrorism, whether directly or indirectly.

(9) Persons, entities, or countries that knowingly or recklessly contribute material support or resources, directly or indirectly, to persons or organizations that pose a significant risk of committing acts of terrorism that threaten the security of nationals of the

United States or the national security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States, necessarily direct their conduct at the United States, and should reasonably anticipate being brought to court in the United States to answer for such activities.

(10) The United States has a vital interest in providing persons and entities injured as a result of terrorist attacks committed within the United States with full access to the court system in order to pursue civil claims against persons, entities, or countries that have knowingly or recklessly provided material support or resources, directly or indirectly, to the persons or organizations responsible for their injuries.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to provide civil litigants with the broadest possible basis, consistent with the Constitution of the United States, to seek relief against persons, entities, and foreign countries, wherever acting and wherever they may be found, that have provided material support, directly or indirectly, to foreign organizations or persons that engage in terrorist activities against the United States.

SEC. 3. FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.

Section 1605(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending paragraph (5) to read as follows:

"(5) not otherwise encompassed in paragraph (2), in which money damages are sought against a foreign state arising out of physical injury or death, or damage to or loss of property, occurring in the United States and caused by the tortious act or omission of that foreign state or of any official or employee of that foreign state while acting within the scope of the office or employment of the official or employee (regardless of where the underlying tortious act or omission occurs), including any statutory or common law tort claim arising out of an act of extrajudicial killing, aircraft sabotage, hostage taking, terrorism, or the provision of material support or resources for such an act, or any claim for contribution or indemnity relating to a claim arising out of such an act, except this paragraph shall not apply to—

"(A) any claim based upon the exercise or performance of, or the failure to exercise or perform, a discretionary function, regardless of whether the discretion is abused; or

"(B) any claim arising out of malicious prosecution, abuse of process, libel, slander, misrepresentation, deceit, interference with contract rights, or any claim for emotional distress or derivative injury suffered as a result of an event or injury to another person that occurs outside of the United States; or"; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following:

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of subsection (a)(5)—

"(1) the terms 'aircraft sabotage', 'extrajudicial killing', 'hostage taking', and 'material support or resources' have the meanings given those terms in section 1605A(h); and

"(2) the term 'terrorism' means international terrorism and domestic terrorism, as those terms are defined in section 2331 of title 18."

SEC. 4. AIDING AND ABETTING LIABILITY FOR CIVIL ACTIONS REGARDING TERRORIST ACTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 2333 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(d) LIABILITY.—In an action under subsection (a) for an injury arising from an act

of international terrorism committed, planned, or authorized by an organization that had been designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189), as of the date on which such act of international terrorism was committed, planned, or authorized, or that was so designated as a result of such act of international terrorism, liability may be asserted as to any person who aided, abetted, or conspired with the person who committed such an act of international terrorism."

(b) EFFECT ON FOREIGN SOVEREIGN IMMUNITIES ACT.—Nothing in the amendments made by this section affects immunity of a foreign state, as that term is defined in section 1603 of title 28, United States Code, from jurisdiction under other law.

SEC. 5. PERSONAL JURISDICTION FOR CIVIL ACTIONS REGARDING TERRORIST ACTS.

Section 2334 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end the following:

"(e) PERSONAL JURISDICTION.—The district courts shall have personal jurisdiction, to the maximum extent permissible under the 5th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, over any person who commits or aids and abets an act of international terrorism or otherwise sponsors such act or the person who committed such act, for acts of international terrorism in which any national of the United States suffers injury in his or her person, property, or business by reason of such an act in violation of section 2333."

SEC. 6. LIABILITY FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN CIVIL ACTIONS REGARDING TERRORIST ACTS.

Section 2337 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2337. Suits against Government officials

"No action may be maintained under section 2333 against—

"(1) the United States;

"(2) an agency of the United States; or

"(3) an officer or employee of the United States or any agency of the United States acting within the official capacity of the officer or employee or under color of legal authority."

SEC. 7. SEVERABILITY.

If any provision of this Act or any amendment made by this Act, or the application of a provision or amendment to any person or circumstance, is held to be invalid, the remainder of this Act and the amendments made by this Act, and the application of the provisions and amendments to any other person not similarly situated or to other circumstances, shall not be affected by the holding.

SEC. 8. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to any civil action—

(1) pending on, or commenced on or after, the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) arising out of an injury to a person, property, or business on or after September 11, 2001.

By Mr. GRASSLEY:

S. 2043. A bill to revise counseling requirements for certain borrowers of student loans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, student debt is a big and growing concern for millions of American graduates.

As we look at ways of addressing this problem, it is important to keep in mind that about 90 percent of that debt is owed to the Federal Government. The Federal Government currently holds more than \$1 trillion of student loan debt. That makes the U.S. Department of Education one of the country's largest lenders.

As such, any solution to the debt problem needs to examine the Federal Government's lending practices. Federal banking regulations require commercial lenders to confirm a borrower's ability to repay the loan. Federal student loans are given without a credit check or any analysis of the student's ability to repay the loan in the future. This is intentional, since many prospective college students have no credit and little or no income, but it also puts all the burden on student borrowers to make sure they don't borrow more than they need.

As a Nation, we have accepted that it makes moral and financial sense to assist low-income Americans in accessing higher education opportunities, and we do that to the tune of billions of dollars through Pell grants, subsidized student loans, and other student aid programs. However, while need-based Federal student aid is vital to help students who could not otherwise afford to attend college, students are able to borrow well in excess of their financial need and potentially in excess of what they will be able to repay. So something needs to be done about this.

College financial aid officers are required under law to issue Federal loans up to the full amount for which the student is eligible even if a financial aid administrator knows a student is borrowing more than the student needs and will likely have trouble repaying. Think about that. Even if the financial aid administrator knows the student plans to put the funds toward an engagement ring or sports car, Federal rules say they must issue the loan. If a bank followed the same rules as the Federal Government follows for student aid, it would be accused of predatory lending.

There have been lots of suggestions about how to address the student debt issue, but if you don't tackle the root of the problem, it is like closing the barn door after the horse has gotten out. A good place to start is looking at how our current Federal student lending practices may be helping to fuel the student debt problem. For example, about 60 percent of the students at the University of Iowa graduate with debt, and their average debt is about \$25,000. However, the university estimates that of that \$25,000 figure, about \$13,000—or 60 percent of the debt—is debt that was incurred to pay for tuition, room and board, and books, and the remainder is for what can be called lifestyle expenses. In other words, about 40 percent of the average student debt taken

out by the University of Iowa student goes toward lifestyle-enhancing extras.

The Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee will be looking at a number of reforms to the student loan program as it drafts legislation to reauthorize and reform the Higher Education Act. I know that our esteemed Chairman ALEXANDER has in the past proposed giving higher education institutions additional tools to reduce unnecessary student borrowing. I have worked with Senator FRANKEN of Minnesota on some measures to provide more information about college costs when students are selecting a college in the very first place, which will hopefully encourage more price competition to combat rising tuition.

There is room for a lot of innovation in higher education. I don't pretend to have all the answers and solutions to the problem of college cost and student debt, but I am proposing some very simple, very commonsense first steps to empower students with the information they need to make sound financial decisions.

The Higher Education Act already contains a requirement for colleges to provide counseling to new borrowers of Federal student loans. However, the current disclosures in the law do not do enough to encourage students to understand the scope and impact of the debt they will face when they graduate.

I am here on the floor to introduce legislation I have entitled the Know Before You Owe Federal Student Loan Act. This bill strengthens the current student loan counseling requirement by making the counseling an annual requirement before new loans are disbursed rather than just for first-time borrowers. My bill then adds several key components to the information institutions of higher education are required to share with students as part of that loan counseling. Under my bill, colleges would have to provide an estimate of the student's projected loan debt-to-income ratio at the time of their graduation. This would be based on the starting wages for that student's program of study and the estimated total student loan debt the student will likely take out to complete the program. That way, students will have a real picture of the student loan payment they will face and whether they will be able to afford those payments with their likely future income from whatever program they majored in.

We often hear that statistics show that on average a college degree results in higher earnings over a lifetime. However, not all college degrees have the same earning potential, and many students will be in for a very rude awakening when they graduate and find that what they are able to earn with their degree does not match the level of their debt. Students deserve to have this information when they are

deciding how much to borrow, not after they graduate with unmanageable debt.

This legislation I am proposing will also ensure that students are counseled to borrow only the minimum amount necessary to cover expenses and informed that they do not have to accept the full amount of the loan offered. Students will also be given options for reducing borrowing through scholarships, reduced expenses, work study, or other work opportunities. Also, not graduating on time can significantly increase student loan debt, so students will be counseled on the impact of adding an additional year of study to the total indebtedness and how they can stay on track to graduate on time.

Crucially, the bill also requires that a student manually enter either in writing or through electronic means the exact dollar amount of the Federal direct loan funding the student desires to borrow. The current process almost makes borrowing the maximum the default option. If you want to borrow less than is offered, you have to ask for less.

Because the amount of Federal student loans a student is eligible to borrow is not limited by the calculation of the financial need or ability to repay, it is important that the student make a conscious, informed decision about how much to borrow rather than simply accepting the total amount of the Federal student loan which the law allows them to borrow.

Many schools already make a concerted effort to counsel students against over-borrowing, and such efforts are showing signs of success right in my home State of Iowa.

My alma mater, the University of Northern Iowa, created a program 5 years ago with the theme "Live Like a Student." The program includes workshops and courses designed to educate students on the importance of living within their means while they are in school so they need not live like a student later in life. As a result, the university has lowered average student debt from more than \$26,000 to \$23,163.

Grand View University, also in my State, has a financial empowerment plan where students and families construct a comprehensive 4-year financing plan. Under this plan, borrowing is based on the student's future earning potential in the student's field of study. The 4-year plan also helps ensure students graduate on time, and tuition increases are kept at 2 percent a year over those 4 years.

Iowa Student Loan, my State-based nonprofit lender, also has a program called the Student Loan Game Plan, which is an online interactive resource that calculates a student's likely debt-to-income ratio. It walks students through how their borrowing will affect their lifestyle in the future and what actions they can take now to reduce their borrowing. As a result, in

the past year 18.2 percent of the students who participated decreased the amount they planned to borrow by an average of \$3,680, saving students \$2.1 million in additional loan debt.

My legislation would also require that students receive regular statements about their loan while they are in school, just as they will when they graduate and start repaying. With just about any other kind of loan you can think of, borrowers start receiving statements right away and are expected to make payments. With Federal student loans, payments are not required until a period of time after graduation and no statements are sent out until that time, so students forget about the amount of debt they are accruing until they graduate and get their first bill.

What is more, many Federal student loans still accrue interest while the student is in school, which will be added to the total loan when they start repaying. That means that not only do students forget how much debt they have while in school, making them less conscientious about living like a student, but their loan may actually be growing while they are in school. Students have the option to pay that interest while they are in school so that it isn't capitalized into their loan. However, few students take advantage of this option. The regular statement my bill calls for would encourage this practice so students get used to paying some amount toward their loans even before they graduate. This will also make students more aware of their borrowing and less likely to overborrow each time they take out a new loan.

A college education generally remains a good investment. However, when students' academic dreams become a nightmare upon graduation because they borrowed more from the Federal Government than they can afford to repay with the degree they earned, they understandably feel something is very wrong. The Federal Government, as the lender making these loans, has a responsibility to at least ensure that students know what they are getting themselves into before they get in over their heads. My legislation is intended to deal with that issue.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill to prevent more students from drowning in Federal student loan debt, and I will introduce that bill at this particular time.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2663. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health.

SA 2664. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, *supra*.

SA 2665. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, *supra*.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2663. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health; as follows:

On page 4, line 1, strike "it is the sense of the Senate that" and insert "the Senate".

On page 4, strike line 2 and all that follows through page 5, line 23, and insert the following:

(1) commends ORWH for its work over the past 25 years to improve and save the lives of women worldwide and expresses that ORWH must remain intact for this and future generations;

(2) recognizes that there remain striking sex and gender differences among many diseases and conditions on which ORWH should continue to focus;

(3) encourages ORWH to continue to focus on ensuring that NIH supports biomedical research that considers sex as a biological variable across the research spectrum; and

(4) encourages the Director of the NIH to continue to consult and involve ORWH on all matters related to the influence of sex and gender on health, especially those matters pertaining to the consideration of sex as a biological variable in research with vertebrate animals and humans.

SA 2664. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health; as follows:

In the eighteenth whereas clause, strike "CDC" and insert "Centers for Disease Control and Prevention".

SA 2665. Ms. MIKULSKI (for herself and Ms. COLLINS) proposed an amendment to the resolution S. Res. 242, celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: "A resolution celebrating the 25th anniversary of the Office of Research on Women's Health at the National Institutes of Health."

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public

Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-406 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Oversight of the Cause, Response, and Impacts of EPA's Gold King Mine Spill."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "The U.S. Role and Strategy in the Middle East: Syria, Iraq, and the Fight against ISIS."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, in room SD-628 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, at 2:15 p.m., to conduct an oversight hearing entitled "EPA's Gold King Mine Disaster: Examining the Harmful Impacts to Indian Country."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Reforming the Electronic Communications Privacy Act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled "Achieving the Promise of Health Information Technology: Improving Care Through Patient Access to Their Records."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "A Review of Regulatory Reform Proposals."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 16, 2015, at 2:30 p.m. in room SR-418 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without object, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULE- MAKING (NPRM OR NOTICE), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the attached documentation from the Office of Compliance be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2015.

Hon. ORRIN G. HATCH,
President Pro Tempore, U.S. Senate,
The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Section 202(d) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. §1312(d), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") to issue regulations implementing Section 202 of the CAA relating to sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA"), 29 U.S.C. §§2611 through 2615, made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA. 2 U.S.C. §1312(a)(1).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting "such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached notice of proposed rulemaking to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate. I request that this notice be published in the Senate section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period of 60 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540; 202-724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Compliance.

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING (NPRM OR NOTICE), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

Modifications to the rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, as required by 2 U.S.C. §1331, Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, as amended (CAA).

Background:

The purpose of this Notice is to propose modifications to the existing legislative branch FMLA substantive regulations under section 202 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. §1302 et seq.), which applies the rights and protections of sections 101 through 105 of the FMLA to covered employees. These modifications are necessary in order to bring existing legislative branch FMLA regulations (adopted April 16, 1996) in line with recent statutory changes to the FMLA, 29 U.S.C. §2601 et seq.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations?

Section 202(a) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections established by sections 101 through 105 of the FMLA (29 U.S.C. §§2611–2615) shall apply to covered employees.

Section 202(d)(1) and (2) of the CAA require that the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board), pursuant to section 1384 of the CAA, issue regulations implementing the rights and protections of the FMLA and that those regulations shall be "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in the subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA] except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown . . . that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." The modifications to the regulations issued by the Board herein are on all matters for which section 202 of the CAA requires regulations to be issued.

Are there currently FMLA regulations in effect?

Yes. On January 22, 1996, the OOC Board adopted and submitted for publication in the Congressional Record the original FMLA final regulations implementing section 202 of the CAA, which applies certain rights and protections of the FMLA. On April 15, 1996, pursuant to section 304(c) of the CAA, the House and the Senate passed resolutions approving the final regulations. Specifically, the Senate passed S. Res. 242, providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to the Senate and the employees of the Senate; the House passed H. Res. 400 providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to the House and the employees of the House; and the House and the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 51, providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to employing offices and employees other than those offices and employees of the House and the Senate. After the Senate and the House passed these resolutions, the OOC Board formally issued the FMLA regulations on April 19, 1996.

What does the FMLA provide?

The FMLA entitles eligible employees of covered employers to take job-protected, unpaid leave, or to substitute appropriate accrued paid leave, for up to a total of 12 workweeks in a 12-month period: for the birth of the employee's son or daughter and to care for the newborn child; for the placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care; to care for the employee's

spouse, parent, son, or daughter with a serious health condition; when the employee is unable to work due to the employee's own serious health condition; or for any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty ("qualifying exigency leave"). An eligible employee may also take up to 26 workweeks of FMLA leave during a "single 12-month period" to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, when the employee is the spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of the servicemember.

FMLA leave may be taken in a block, or under certain circumstances, intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule basis. In addition to providing job-protected family and medical leave, employers must also maintain any preexisting group health plan coverage for an employee on FMLA-protected leave under the same conditions that would apply if the employee had not taken leave. 2 U.S.C. §1312(a)(1) (incorporating 29 U.S.C. §2614). Once the leave period is concluded, the employer is required to restore the employee to the same or an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. *Id.* Under the FMLA statute, but not applicable to the legislative branch, if an employee believes that his or her FMLA rights have been violated, the employee may file a complaint with the Department of Labor (DOL) or file a private lawsuit in federal or state court. Under the CAA, a covered employee of the legislative branch may be awarded damages if the employing office has violated the employee's FMLA rights. The employee is entitled to reimbursement for any monetary loss incurred, equitable relief as appropriate, interest, attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, and court costs. Liquidated damages also may be awarded. *See* 29 U.S.C. §2617.

What changes do the proposed amendments make?

First, these proposed amendments add the military leave provisions of the FMLA enacted under the National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA) for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 (Pub.L. 110–181, Div. A, Title V §§585(a)(2), (3)(A)–(D) and Pub.L. 111–84, Div. A, Title V §§565(a)(1)(B) & (4)), which: extend the availability of FMLA leave to family members of the Regular Armed Forces for qualifying exigencies arising out of a servicemember's deployment; define those deployments covered under these provisions; extend FMLA military caregiver leave for family members of current servicemembers to include an injury or illness that existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty; and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans with serious injuries or illnesses. This NPRM also sets forth a proposed revision to the regulation defining "spouse" under the FMLA in light of the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule on the definition of spouse and the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell, et al., v. Hodges*, No. 14–556, 2015 WL 2473451 (U.S. June 26, 2015), which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

Why are these changes to the FMLA regulations necessary?

The CAA requires that the FMLA regulations applicable to the legislative branch and promulgated by the OOC, be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary

of Labor, unless good cause is shown for deviation therefrom. On March 8, 2013, the DOL issued its Final Rule implementing its amended FMLA regulations (77 FR 8962), which provide for military caregiver leave for a veteran, qualifying exigency leave for parental care, and special leave calculations for flight crew employees. The OOC Board is required pursuant to the CAA to amend its regulations to achieve parity unless there is good cause shown to deviate from the DOL's regulations.

In addition, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for servicemembers and their families were enacted into law by the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010. The Congressional committee reports accompanying the bills containing these provisions do not comply with Section 102(b)(3) of the CAA in that, while the bills do contain sections relating "to terms and conditions of employment," the accompanying reports do not "describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment] . . . apply to the legislative branch" or "include a statement of the reasons the provision does not apply [to the legislative branch]" (in the case of a provision not applicable to the legislative branch). 2 U.S.C. §1302(3); House Committee on Armed Services, H.Rpt. 110-146 (May 11, 2007), H.Rpt. 111-166 (June 18, 2009). Consequently, when the FMLA was amended to add these additional rights and protections, Congress failed to make clear its intent as to whether these additional rights and protections apply to the legislative branch.¹ Therefore, as there is no provision in the CAA that states that the CAA will be considered amended whenever the FMLA is amended, these proposed amendments to the regulations are necessary to resolve any ambiguity regarding the applicability of the 2008 and 2010 FMLA amendments to the legislative branch by ensuring that protections under the CAA are in line with existing public and private sector protections under the FMLA.² Accordingly, while these regulations may technically require employing offices to do more than what section 202 of the CAA currently requires, the Board recommends that Congress use its rulemaking authority to clarify that the rights and protections for legislative branch servicemembers and their families have been expanded in a manner consistent with the 2008 and 2010 amendments to the FMLA.

What do the military family leave provisions provide?

Section 585(a) of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2008 amends the FMLA to provide leave to eligible employees of covered employers to care for injured servicemembers and for any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that a covered family member is on active duty or has been notified of an impending call to active duty status in support of a contingency operation (collectively referred to herein as "military family leave"). The provisions of this amendment providing FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember became effective on January 28, 2008, when the law was enacted. The provisions of this amendment providing for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency arising out of a covered family member's active duty (or call to active duty) status were effective on January 16, 2009.

Section 565(a) of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2010, enacted on October 28, 2009, amends the military family leave provisions of the FMLA. Pub. Law 111-84. The Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA expands the availability of qualifying

exigency leave and military caregiver leave. Qualifying exigency leave, which was made available to family members of the National Guard and Reserve components under the Fiscal Year 2008 NDAA, is expanded to include family members of the Regular Armed Forces. The entitlement to qualifying exigency leave is expanded by substituting the term "covered active duty" for "active duty" and defining covered active duty for a member of the Regular Armed Forces as "duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country" and for a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces as "duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a call or order to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code." 29 U.S.C. §2611(14). Prior to the Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA amendments, there was no requirement that members of the National Guard and Reserves be deployed to a foreign country.

The Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA amendments expand the definition of a serious injury or illness for military caregiver leave for current members of the Armed Forces to include an injury or illness that existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty. 29 U.S.C. §2611(18)(A). These amendments also expand the military caregiver leave provisions of the FMLA to allow family members to take military caregiver leave to care for certain veterans. The definition of a "covered servicemember," which is the term the Act uses to indicate the group of military members for whom military caregiver leave may be taken, is broadened to include a veteran with a serious injury or illness who is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, if the veteran was a member of the Armed Forces at any time during the period of five years preceding the date of the medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy. 29 U.S.C. §2611(15)(B). The amendments define a serious injury or illness for a veteran as a "qualifying (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and that manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran." 29 U.S.C. §2611(18)(B).

What is the effect of amending the definition of "spouse"?

Amending the definition of "spouse" brings the regulations in line with the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule and the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*.

On February 25, 2015, the DOL published its Final Rule for 29 CFR 825 in the Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 37, 9989. This Final Rule changed the definition of "spouse" under the FMLA in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Windsor*, which found section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) to be unconstitutional. The DOL's Final Rule amends the definition of spouse so that eligible employees in legal same-sex marriages will be able to take FMLA leave to care for their spouse or family member, regardless of where they live.

Also, on June 26, 2015, the United States Supreme Court issued *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*, which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage

was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

To date, the DOL has not indicated whether it plans to further amend the definition of spouse in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*. Therefore, the Board invites comment regarding whether the Board should adopt the DOL's current definition of spouse or revise the definition of spouse as the Board has proposed in sections 825.102 and 825.122.

Minor editorial changes are proposed to sections 825.120, 825.121, 825.122, 825.127, 825.201 and 825.202 to make gender neutral references to husbands and wives, and mothers and fathers where appropriate so that they apply equally to opposite-sex and same-sex spouses. The OOC proposes using the terms "spouses" and "parents," as appropriate, in these regulations. These editorial changes do not change the availability of FMLA leave but simply clarify its availability for all eligible employees who are legally married.

Procedural Summary:

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA?

Pursuant to section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384, the procedure for proposing and approving substantive regulations provides that:

(1) the Board of Directors proposes substantive regulations and publishes a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the Congressional Record;

(2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking;

(3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, the Board adopts regulations and transmits notice of such action (together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations) to the Speaker of the House and President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record;

(4) there be committee referral and action on the proposed regulations by resolution in each House, concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution; and

(5) there be final publication of the approved regulations in the Congressional Record, with an effective date prescribed in the final publication.

For more detail, please reference the text of 2 U.S.C. §1384. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is step (1) of the outline set forth above.

What is the approach taken by these proposed substantive regulations?

The Board will follow the procedures as enumerated above and as required by statute. The Board will review and respond to any comments received under step (2) of the outline above, and make any changes necessary to ensure that the regulations fully implement section 210 of the CAA and reflect the practices and policies particular to the legislative branch.

Are there substantive differences in the proposed regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate and other employing offices?

No. The Board of Directors has identified no "good cause" for varying the text of these regulations. Therefore, if these regulations are approved as proposed, there will be one text applicable to all employing offices and covered employees. See 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2).

Are these proposed regulations also recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives?

As required by section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), the substance of these regulations is also recommended by the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

Are these proposed substantive regulations available to persons with disabilities in an alternate format?

This Notice of Proposed Regulations is available on the OOC's web site, www.compliance.gov, which is compliant with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §794(d). This Notice can also be made available in large print or Braille. Requests for this Notice in an alternative format should be made to: Annie Leftwood, Executive Assistant, Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540; 202-724-9250; TDD: 202-426-1912; FAX: 202-426-1913.

60-DAY COMMENT PERIOD REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

How long do I have to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations?

Comments regarding the OOC's proposed regulations set forth in this Notice are invited for a period of sixty (60) days following the date of the appearance of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

How do I submit comments?

Comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided either on an accompanying computer disk or e-mailed to the OOC via its web site. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non-toll-free number).

Am I allowed to view copies of comments submitted by others?

Yes. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review on the OOC's web site at www.compliance.gov, and at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Summary:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of thirteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 202 of the CAA applies to employees covered by the CAA, the rights and protections established by sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), 29 U.S.C. §§2611-2615. The above provisions of section 202 became effective on January 1, 1997. 2 U.S.C. §1312.

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance (OOC) is now publishing proposed amended regulations to implement section 202 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §§1301-1438, as applied to covered employees of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and certain Congressional instrumentalities listed below.

The purpose of these amended regulations is to implement section 202 of the CAA. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM or Notice) the Board proposes that virtually identical regulations be adopted for the Sen-

ate, the House of Representatives, and the six Congressional instrumentalities. Accordingly:

(1) *Senate*. It is proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the Senate, and this proposal regarding the Senate entities is recommended by the OOC's Deputy Executive Director for the Senate.

(2) *House of Representatives*. It is further proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the House of Representatives, and this proposal regarding the House of Representatives entities is recommended by the OOC's Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

(3) *Certain Congressional instrumentalities*. It is further proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; and this proposal regarding these six Congressional instrumentalities is recommended by the OOC's Executive Director.

Dates: Comments are due within 60 days after the date of publication of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

Section-by-Section Discussion of Proposed Changes to the FMLA Regulations

The following is a section-by-section discussion of the proposed revisions. Where a change is proposed to a regulatory section, that section is discussed below. However, as the DOL has significantly reorganized its FMLA regulations, which the OOC's proposed regulations mirror, many of the sections are moved into other areas of the subpart. The OOC as a result will use the proposed section and numbers to provide explanation and analysis of changes. In addition, even if a section is not discussed, there may be minor editorial changes or corrections that do not warrant discussion. The titles to each section of the existing regulations are in the form of a question. The proposal would reword each question into the more common format of a descriptive title, and the OOC invites comments on whether this change is helpful. In addition, several sections have been restructured and reorganized to improve the accessibility of the information (e.g., guidance on leave for pregnancy and birth of a child is addressed in one consolidated section; an employing office's notice obligations are combined in one section).

Section by Section Discussion

Subpart A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Section 825.102 Definitions.

For the reasons stated below, the Board finds good cause to depart from the DOL regulations with respect to some of the definitions. For example, the term "Act" as defined in the DOL regulations and referring to the FMLA can be confused with the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA). Accordingly, the definition of "Act" is excluded from the Board's proposed regulations. In addition, to avoid any confusion, the definition for "Administrator" in the DOL regulations has been deleted. Similarly, as there is no airline flight crew covered under the CAA, the definition of "airline flight crew employee" has been deleted in the Board's pro-

posed regulations as have all references to "airline flight crew employee."

Because the DOL definitions of "commerce and industry or activity affecting commerce" and "applicable monthly guarantee" involve concepts that do not apply to employing offices covered by the CAA, the Board finds good cause to exclude these definitions from the proposed regulations.

Because the DOL's definition of "eligible employee" (paragraphs ii(3)(4)(5)(6)(7) in section 825.102) is not consistent with the definition of "eligible employee" in CAA section 202(a)(2)(B), the Board finds good cause to keep the definition of "employee" that is used in the current version of the OOC FMLA regulations and to exclude the definition in the DOL regulation.

Likewise, because the definition of "employer" in CAA section 202(a)(2)(A) is inconsistent with the definition in the DOL regulations, the Board finds good cause to keep the definition of "employing office" found in the current regulations.

In the paragraphs defining "health care provider," to avoid confusion, the Board is substituting "the Secretary" with "the Department of Labor." Thus, the OOC FMLA regulations include in the definition of "health care provider" as "any other person determined by the *Department of Labor* to be capable of providing health care services." 825.102(1)(ii) (emphasis added).

Because these terms are not applicable to employing offices covered by the CAA, the Board has also found good cause to exclude from the proposed OOC regulations the DOL definitions of "person" and "public agency."

Under the paragraph defining "physical or mental disability," the Board has replaced the language from the DOL regulations indicating that 29 CFR part 1630 *defines* these terms with language that states that regulations at 29 CFR part 1630 issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12101 *et seq.*, as amended, *provide guidance* to these terms. (Italics added).

The Board is proposing to adopt the following definition of "spouse":

Spouse means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either: (1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or, (2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

Section 825.105 Counting employees for determining coverage.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC's regulations.

Section 825.106 Joint Employer Coverage.

As joint employment relationships are treated differently under the CAA than by the DOL, the Board finds good cause to keep the language in the current OOC regulations in paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section. Also, as it is not applicable under the CAA, the Board finds good cause to exclude from its definitions language relating to Professional Employer Organizations (PEOs) as joint employers. As the DOL has noted, PEOs contract with private small businesses to provide services that large businesses can afford, but small businesses cannot, such as compliance with government standards, employer liability management, retirement

benefits, and other employment benefits. Congress already provides these services for its employees.

Sections 825.107–825.109 Successor in interest coverage; Public agency coverage; Federal agency coverage.

These sections do not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC's regulations. However, the Board invites comment with respect to whether the DOL section 825.107, Successor in interest coverage, should be adopted for the legislative branch.

Section 825.110 Eligible employee.

The Board sees good cause to exclude from this section the following language from the DOL regulations, which is not applicable to the CAA:

“(3) Is employed at a worksite where 50 or more employees are employed by the employer within 75 miles of that worksite. (See §825.105(b) regarding employees who work outside the U.S.)”

Similarly, the Board sees good cause to exclude from the OOC regulations the following paragraph:

“(e) Whether 50 employees are employed within 75 miles to ascertain an employee's eligibility for FMLA benefits is determined when the employee gives notice of the need for leave. Whether the leave is to be taken at one time or on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis, once an employee is determined eligible in response to that notice of the need for leave, the employee's eligibility is not affected by any subsequent change in the number of employees employed at or within 75 miles of the employee's worksite, for that specific notice of the need for leave. Similarly, an employer may not terminate employee leave that has already started if the employee-count drops below 50. For example, if an employer employs 60 employees in August, but expects that the number of employees will drop to 40 in December, the employer must grant FMLA benefits to an otherwise eligible employee who gives notice of the need for leave in August.”

Section 825.111 Determining whether 50 employees are employed within 75 miles.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Section 825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

References in the DOL's regulations to state law in this section and other sections throughout the DOL's regulations have not been adopted by the Board because state law does not apply to the legislative branch.

Further, in this section and other sections throughout the DOL regulations, any references to spouses who are employed at two different worksites of an employer located more than 75 miles from each other have not been adopted by the Board because such scenarios are not applicable to the legislative branch.

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Section 825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

Although the DOL amended its FMLA regulations to add computer employees to the list of exempt employees who do not lose their FLSA exempt status despite being provided unpaid FMLA leave, the Board finds good cause not to include “computer employees” to the list of employees who may qualify as exempt from the overtime and minimum wage requirements of the FLSA. In light of the fact that the Board's September 29, 2004 Proposed Regulations implementing exemptions from the overtime pay

requirements under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA) were never enacted into law and the existing OOC FLSA Regulations do not include exemptions for computer employees, the OOC's FMLA regulations should not include these employees in this section. The Board specifically seeks comments to this departure from the DOL regulations.

Further, any references in this section and other sections throughout the DOL regulations which place limitations on an employee who works for an employing office with fewer than 50 employees have not been adopted by the Board because such limitations do not apply to the legislative branch. See 825.111.

Section 825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

The DOL regulations under section 825.207(f) permit an employer to require that an employee's use of paid compensatory time for a FMLA reason can be used against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

As the Board does not know whether or under what circumstances, employing offices currently allow or require that paid compensatory time be used for a FMLA reason and be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement, the Board proposes that the comparable OOC FMLA regulation read as follows:

Under the FLSA, an employing office always has the right to cash out an employee's compensatory time or to require the employee to use the time. Therefore, if an employee requests and is permitted to use accrued compensatory time to receive pay for time taken off for an FMLA reason, or if the employing office requires such use pursuant to the FLSA, the time taken may be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

The Board seeks comments from interested parties as to whether such a provision is appropriate for the legislative branch.

Section 825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

The Board has changed what it believes to be a typographical error in the DOL regulations and cross references this section with section 825.102 and not section 825.800 when referring to the definition of “group health plan.”

Section 825.215 Equivalent position.

Any references from the DOL regulations in this section and other sections to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) have not been adopted by the Board because ERISA does not apply to the legislative branch.

Section 825.216 Limitations on employee's right to reinstatement.

The Board questions whether the following language in section 825.216(a)(3) of the DOL regulations applies to the legislative branch: “On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work on a contract, and after that contract period the contract was awarded to another contractor, the successor contractor may be required to restore the employee if it is a successor employer. See §825.107.”

The Board proposes that the OOC regulations contain the following language and requests comments from interested parties, especially with respect to caucus or committee employees: “On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work for one employing office for a project for a specific time period, and after that time period has ended, the same employee was assigned to work at another employing office on the

same project, the successor employing office may be required to restore the employee if it is a successor employing office.”

Section 825.217 Key employee, general rule.

For the reasons stated above, the Board finds good cause not to follow the DOL changes to section 825.217(b) which exempts computer employees from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA. As the language in the FLSA is inconsistent with the OOC FLSA regulations, the Board believes that this exemption should not be included. The Board requests comments from interested parties on this deletion.

Section 825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

Except for the paragraph related to settlements, as noted below, the Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.220 provides protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights and includes new language discussing remedies when an employing office interferes with an employee's rights under the FMLA. This section further clarifies that the prohibition against interference includes prohibitions against retaliation as well as discrimination. The Board believes that there is good cause to make changes to the DOL's clarification of the settlement provision in paragraph (d) of this section. Sections 1414 and 1415 of the CAA govern awards and settlements made as a result of parties proceeding through an OOC process. While the Board recognizes that parties will now have the right to settle or release FMLA claims without the approval of the OOC or a court, parties seeking to release claims which were raised in an OOC process pursuant to CAA sections 1414 and 1415 must still comply with those provisions. Therefore, the Board proposes to insert the following language: “Except for settlement agreements covered by 1414 and/or 1415 of the Congressional Accountability Act, this does not prevent the settlement or release of FMLA claims by employees based on past employing office conduct without the approval of the Office of Compliance or a court.”

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

Section 825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

The Board proposes to follow the DOL regulations insofar as they consolidate the employing office notice requirements from sections 825.300, 825.301, 825.110 and 825.208 into one comprehensive section addressing an employing office's notice obligations. However, the Board finds good cause not to adopt the DOL regulations in section 825.300(a) General notice, but instead to keep the requirements found in the current OOC regulations under section 825.301(a). The DOL regulations, at section 825.300(a), address the requirement that employing offices post a notice on employee rights and responsibilities under the law and the civil monetary penalty provision in the law for employing offices who willfully violate the posting requirement. In 1995, while developing the current FMLA regulations, the OOC Board determined that “while the CAA incorporates certain specific sections of the FMLA, the CAA explicitly did not incorporate the notice posting and recordkeeping requirements of sections 109 and 106(b) of the FMLA. For the reasons discussed with respect to the FLSA, as the CAA

has not incorporated the notice posting and recordkeeping requirements of the FMLA, the Board will not do so.” As a result, we find no authority that would require employing offices covered under the CAA to provide notice postings of employees’ FMLA rights in the workplace. See November 28, 1995 OOC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking S17628. As to the remainder of the paragraphs in this section, the Board finds no reason to depart from the amendments adopted by the DOL.

The Board proposes to adopt section 825.300 regarding the eligibility notice (825.300(b)); the rights and responsibility notice (825.300(c)); the designation notice (825.300(d)); and the consequences of failing to provide notice (825.300(e)).

(b) Eligibility notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. The Board also proposes to adopt the DOL regulations consolidating existing eligibility notice requirements in current sections 825.110 and 825.301 into one section, section 825.300(b) of the OOC regulations and to strengthen and clarify them. For example, section 825.300(b)(1) of the DOL regulations requires an employer to advise an employee of his or her eligibility status when the employee requests leave under the FMLA. The regulations extend the time frame for an employer to respond to an employee’s request for FMLA leave from two business days to five business days. Further, the DOL regulations in section 825.300(b)(2) specify what information an employer must convey to an employee as to eligibility status. The Board also proposes in its regulations that an employing office must provide reasons to an employee if he or she is not eligible for FMLA leave, as do the DOL regulations. The regulations limit that notification to any one of the potential reasons why an employee fails to meet the eligibility requirements.

Further, the proposed OOC regulations require employing offices to include in the eligibility notice an explanation of conditions applicable to the use of paid leave that runs concurrently with unpaid FMLA. While this requirement is in the current regulations, it is expanded to require that employing offices also notify employees of their continuing entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave if they do not comply with an employing office’s required conditions for use of paid leave.

(c) Rights and responsibilities notice.

The Board is following the DOL regulations separating the notice of rights and responsibilities from the notice of eligibility. Accordingly, if the employee is eligible for FMLA leave, section 825.300(c) of the OOC regulations require the employing office to provide the employee with specific notice of his or her rights and obligations under the law and the consequences of failing to meet those obligations.

To simplify the timing of the notice of rights and responsibilities and to avoid unnecessary administrative burden on employing offices, section 825.300(c)(1) of the Board’s proposed regulations requires employing offices to provide this notice to employees at the same time they provide the eligibility notice. Additionally, if the information in the notice of rights and responsibilities changes, section 825.300(c) requires the employing office to notify the employee of any changes within five business days of the first notice of the need for FMLA leave subsequent to any change. This timing requirement will ensure that employees receive timely notice of the expectations and obligations associated with their FMLA leave each

leave year and also receive prompt notice of any change in those rights or responsibilities when leave is needed during the leave year.

In this section, employing offices are required to notify employees of the method used for establishing the 12-month period for FMLA entitlement, or, in the case of military caregiver leave, the start date of the “single 12-month period.”

Employing offices are not, however, required to provide the certification form with the notice of rights and responsibilities. Notice of any changes in the rights and responsibilities notice must be provided within five business days of the first notice of an employee’s need for leave subsequent to any change. Electronic distribution of the notice of rights and responsibilities is allowed, so long as the employing office can demonstrate that the employee (who may already be on leave and who may not have access to employing office-provided computers) has access to the information electronically.

(d) Designation notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this requirement. Section 825.300(d) outlines the requirements of the designation notice an employing office must provide to an employee. Once the employing office has enough information to determine whether the leave qualifies as FMLA leave, the employing office must notify the employee within five business days of making the determination whether the leave has or has not been designated as FMLA leave. This is an increase from the two-day time frame in the current OOC regulations. Further, only one designation notice is required for each FMLA-qualifying reason per leave year, regardless of whether the leave is taken as a continuous block of leave or on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis.

Further, the employing office must inform the employee of the number of hours that would be designated as FMLA leave, only upon employee request and no more often than every 30 days if FMLA leave was taken during that period. To the extent it is not possible to provide such information (such as in the case of unforeseeable intermittent leave), the employing office is required to provide such information to the employee every 30 days if the employee took leave during the 30-day period. The employing office is permitted to notify the employee of the hours counted against the FMLA leave entitlement orally and follow up with written notification on a pay stub at the next payday (unless the next payday is in less than one week, in which case the notice must be no later than the subsequent payday). If the employing office requires that paid leave be substituted for unpaid leave, or that paid leave taken under an existing leave plan be counted as FMLA leave, the employing office must inform the employee of this designation at the time the leave is designated as FMLA leave.

Although the designation notice has to be in writing, it may be in any form, including a notation on the employee’s pay stub, and if the leave is not designated as FMLA leave, the notice to the employee may be in the form of a simple written statement. Employing offices can provide an employee with both the eligibility and designation notice at the same time in cases where the employing office has adequate information to designate leave as FMLA leave when an employee requests the leave.

Employing offices must provide written notice of any requirement for a fitness-for-duty certification, including whether the fit-

ness-for-duty certification must address the employee’s ability to perform the essential functions of the employee’s position and, if so, to provide a list of the essential functions of the employee’s position with the designation notice. If the employee handbook or other written documents clearly provides that a fitness-for-duty certificate will be required, written notice is not required, but oral notice must be provided.

Finally, the employing office is required to notify the employee if the information provided in the designation notice changes. For example, if an employee exhausts his or her FMLA leave entitlement and the leave will no longer be designated as FMLA leave, the employing office must provide the employee with written notice of this change consistent with this section.

(e) Consequences of failing to provide notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.300(e) clarifies that failure to comply with the notice requirements set forth in this section could constitute interference with, restraint of, or denial of the use of FMLA leave. The Board proposes that the following language be included in the OOC regulations:

Consequences of failing to provide notice.

Failure to follow the notice requirements set forth in this section may constitute an interference with, restraint, or denial of the exercise of an employee’s FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c).

Section 825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.301 addresses an employing office’s obligations regarding timely designation of leave as FMLA-qualifying and reiterates the requirement to notify the employee of the designation within five business days. Among other things, this section requires that the employing office’s designation decision be based only on information received from the employee or the employee’s representative and also provides that, if the employing office does not have sufficient information about the employee’s reason for leave, the employing office should inquire further of the employee or of the employee’s spokesperson.

Section 825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. In general, Section 825.302 addresses an employee’s obligation to provide notice of the need for foreseeable FMLA leave. This includes requiring an employee to give at least 30 days notice when the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable at least 30 days in advance or “as soon as practicable” if leave is foreseeable but 30 days notice is not practicable. In such cases, employees must respond to requests from employing offices to explain why it was not possible to give 30 days notice. Further, the language in this section defines “as soon as practicable” to be “as soon as both possible and practical, taking into account all of the facts and circumstances in the individual case.” This is a change from defining “as soon as practicable” as “ordinarily within one or two business days.”

Further, when an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason,

the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA but must provide: sufficient information that indicates that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job, or if the leave is for a family member, that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities; the anticipated duration of the absence; and whether the employee or the employee's family member intends to visit a health care provider or has a condition for which the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider. The regulations set forth the types of information that an employee may have to provide in order to put an employing office on notice of the employee's need for FMLA-protected leave. Rather than establish a list of information that must be provided in all cases, the regulations provide additional guidance to employees so that they would know what information to provide to their employing offices. The nature of the information necessary to put the employing office on notice of the need for FMLA leave will vary depending on the circumstances.

Employees seeking leave for previously certified FMLA leave must inform the employing office that the leave is for a condition, covered servicemember's serious injury or illness, or qualifying exigency that was previously certified or for which the employee has previously taken FMLA leave.

While an employee must still comply with the employing office's usual notice and procedural requirements for calling in absences and requesting leave, under the new regulations, language stating that an employing office cannot delay or deny FMLA leave if an employee fails to follow such procedures has been deleted. However, employing offices may need to inquire further to determine for which reason the leave is being taken, and employees will be required to respond to such inquiries.

Additionally, the regulations make clear that the requirement that an employee and employing office attempt to work out a schedule without unduly disrupting the employing office's operations applies only to military caregiver leave. It does not apply to qualifying exigency leave.

Section 825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.303 addresses an employee's obligation to provide notice when the need for FMLA leave is unforeseeable. Section 825.303 retains the current standard that employees must provide notice of their need for unforeseeable leave "as soon as practicable under the facts and circumstances of the particular case," but instead of expecting employees to give notice "within no more than one or two working days of learning of the need for leave," in "unusual circumstances," notice should be provided within the time prescribed by the employing office's usual and customary notice requirements applicable to such leave. Section 825.303 also retains the current standard that employees need not assert their rights under the FMLA or even mention the FMLA to put employing offices on notice of the need for unforeseeable FMLA leave, but adds the same language used in proposed section 825.302 clarifying what information must be provided in order to give sufficient notice to the employing office of the need for FMLA leave. New regulations in section 825.303 add that the employee has an obligation to respond to an

employing office's questions designed to determine whether leave is FMLA-qualifying, explaining that calling in "sick," without providing additional information, will not be sufficient notice.

Section 825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.304 follows the DOL's reorganization of the rules that are applicable to leave foreseeable at least 30 days in advance, leave foreseeable less than 30 days in advance, and unforeseeable leave. This section retains language that FMLA leave cannot be delayed due to lack of required employee notice if the employing office has not complied with its notice requirements.

Section 825.305 Certification, general rule.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Under the FMLA, as applied under the CAA, employing offices are permitted to require that employees provide a certification from their health care provider (or their family member's health care provider, as appropriate) to support the need for leave due to a serious health condition. Section 825.305 sets forth the general rules governing employing office requests for medical certification to substantiate an employee's need for FMLA leave due to a serious health condition. Military family leave provisions have been added to permit employing offices to require employees to provide a certification in the case of leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. Section 825.305 applies generally to all types of certification. In most cases, for example, former references to "medical certification" have been changed to "certification."

In section 825.305, the employing office should request that an employee furnish certification from a health care provider at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave or within five business days thereafter, or, in the case of unforeseen leave, within five business days after the leave commences. This time frame has been increased from two to five business days after notice of the need for FMLA leave is provided. Further, the employing office may request certification at some later date if the employing office later has reason to question the appropriateness of the leave or its duration. This section also adds a 15-day time period for providing a requested certification to all cases.

Definitions of incomplete and insufficient certifications have been added in this section, as well as a procedure for curing an incomplete or insufficient certification. This procedure requires that an employing office notify the employee in writing as to what additional information is necessary for the medical certification and provides seven calendar days in which the employee must provide the additional information. If an employee fails to submit a complete and sufficient certification, despite the opportunity to cure the deficiency, the employing office may deny the request for FMLA leave.

Section 825.305 also deletes an earlier provision that if a less stringent medical certification standard applies under the employing office's sick leave plan, only that lesser standard may be required when the employee substitutes any form of paid leave for FMLA leave and replaces it with a provision allowing employing offices to require a new certification on an annual basis for conditions lasting beyond a single leave year.

Section 825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.306 addresses the information an employing office can require in the medical certification to substantiate the existence of a serious health condition (of the employee or a family member) and the employee's need for leave due to the condition, and adds: the health care provider's specialization; guidance as to what may constitute appropriate medical facts, including that a health care provider may provide a diagnosis; and whether intermittent or reduced schedule leave is medically necessary. Section 825.306 clarifies that where a serious health condition may also be a disability, employing offices are not prevented from following the procedures under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as applied under the CAA, for requesting medical information. Section 825.306 also contains new language that employing offices may not require employees to sign a release of their medical information as a condition of taking FMLA leave.

This section does not apply to the military family leave provisions. The Board's proposed regulations have revised the current optional certification form into two separate optional forms, one for the employee's own serious health condition and one for the serious health condition of a covered family member.

Section 825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL's amendments covered under this section. Section 825.307 addresses the employing office's ability to clarify or authenticate a complete and sufficient FMLA certification. Section 825.307 defines the terms "authentication" and "clarification." "Authentication" involves providing the health care provider with a copy of the certification and requesting verification that the information on the form was completed and/or authorized by the provider. The regulations add that no additional medical information may be requested and the employee's permission is not required. In contrast, "clarification" involves contacting the employee's health care provider in order to understand the handwriting on the medical certification or to understand the meaning of a response. As is the case with authentication, no additional information beyond that included in the certification form may be requested. Any contact with the employee's health care provider must comply with the requirements of the HIPAA Privacy Rule.

It is no longer necessary that the employing office utilize a health care provider to make the contact with the employee's health care provider, but the regulations do clarify who may contact the employee's health care provider and ensure that the employee's direct supervisor is not the point of contact. Employee consent to the contact is no longer required. However, before the employing office contacts the employee's health care provider for clarification or authentication of the FMLA certification, the employee must first be given an opportunity to cure any deficiencies in the certification. Section 825.307 also provides requirements for an employing

office's request for a second opinion, and adds language requiring the employee or the employee's family member to authorize his or her health care provider to release relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if such information is requested by the second opinion health care provider. Section 825.307 also increases the number of days the employing office has to provide an employee with a requested copy of a second or third opinion from two to five business days. This section of the regulations does not apply to the military family leave provisions.

Section 825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments covered in this section. Section 825.308 of the regulations addresses the employing office's ability to seek recertification of an employee's medical condition. This section has been reorganized to clarify how often employing offices may seek recertification in situations where the minimum duration of the condition, as opposed to the duration of the period of incapacity, exceeds 30 days. Thus, an employing office may request recertification no more often than every 30 days and only in connection with an absence by the employee, unless the medical certification indicates that the minimum duration of the condition is more than 30 days, then an employing office must wait until that minimum duration expires before requesting a recertification. In all cases, an employing office may request a recertification of a medical condition every six months in connection with an absence by the employee. An employing office may request recertification in less than 30 days if, among other things, the employee requests an extension of leave or circumstances described by the previous certification change significantly. This section clarifies that an employing office may request the same information on recertification as required for the initial certification and the employee has the same obligation to cooperate in providing recertification as he or she does in providing the initial certification.

Section 825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL's regulations under this section. Under the military family leave provisions of the DOL regulations, an employing office may require that leave taken because of a qualifying exigency be supported by a certification and require that the employee provide a copy of the covered military member's active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the covered military member is on active duty (or has been notified of an impending call or order to active duty) in support of a contingency operation, as well as the dates of the covered military member's active duty service. While a form requesting this basic information may be used by the employing office, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section and in all instances the information on the form must relate only to the qualifying exigency for which the current need for leave exists. Section 825.309 also establishes the verification process for certifications.

This section also provides that the information required in a certification need only be provided to the employing office the first time an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency arising out of a par-

ticular active duty or call to active duty of a covered military member. While additional information may be needed to provide certification for subsequent requests for exigency leave, an employee is only required to give a copy of the active duty orders to the employing office once. A copy of new active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military only needs to be provided to the employing office if the need for leave because of a qualifying exigency arises out of a different active duty or call to active duty order of the same or a different covered military member. See DOL (Form WH-384) and OOC regulations proposed Form E.

An employing office may contact an appropriate unit of the Department of Defense to request verification that a covered military member has been called to active duty status (or notified of an impending call to active duty status) in support of a contingency operation. Again, no additional information may be requested by the employing office and the employee's permission is not required. This verification process will protect employees from unnecessary intrusion while still providing a useful tool for employing offices to verify the certification information given to them.

Consistent with the amendments to section 825.126(b)(6), with respect to Rest and Recuperation qualifying exigency leave, the employing office is permitted to request a copy of the military member's Rest and Recuperation orders, or other documentation issued by the military indicating that the military member has been granted Rest and Recuperation leave, as well as the dates of the leave, in order to determine the employee's specific qualifying exigency leave period available for Rest and Recuperation. Employing offices may also contact the appropriate unit of the DOD to verify that the military member is on active duty or call to active duty status. The employee's permission is not required to conduct such verifications. The employing office may not, however, request any additional information.

Section 825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. While the military family leave provisions of the NDAA amended the FMLA's certification requirements to permit an employer to request certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, the FMLA's existing certification requirements focus on providing information related to a serious health condition—a term that is not necessarily relevant to leave taken to care for a covered servicemember. At the same time, the military family leave provisions of the NDAA do not explicitly require that a sufficient certification for purposes of military caregiver leave provide relevant information regarding the covered servicemember's serious injury or illness. Section 825.310 of the DOL's regulations provide that when leave is taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an employer may require an employee to support his or her request for leave with a sufficient certification. An employer may require that certain necessary information to support the request for leave be supported by a certification from one of the following authorized health care providers: (1) A DOD health care provider; (2) a VA health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; or (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider. Sections

825.310(b)–(c) of the DOL regulations set forth the information an employing office may request from an employee (or the authorized health care provider) in order to support the employee's request for leave. The DOL developed a new optional form, Form WH-385, which the Board adopted for proposed OOC Form F. The Board agrees that OOC Form F may be used to obtain appropriate information to support an employee's request for leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. However, an employing office may use any form containing the following basic information: (1) whether the servicemember has incurred a serious injury or illness; (2) whether the injury or illness may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating; (3) whether the injury or illness was incurred by the member in line of duty on active duty; and (4) whether the servicemember is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise on outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list. However, as is the case for any required certification for leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition, no information may be required beyond that specified above. In all instances, the information on any required certification must relate only to the serious injury or illness for which the current need for leave exists.

Additionally, section 825.310 of the proposed OOC regulations provides that an employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification "invitational travel orders" (ITOs) or "invitational travel authorizations" (ITAs) issued by the DOD for a family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. If an employee will need leave to care for a covered servicemember beyond the expiration date specified in an ITO or an ITA, the regulations provide that an employing office may request further certification from the employee. Lastly this section provides that in all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave.

The regulations also permit an eligible employee who is a spouse, parent, son, daughter or next of kin of a covered servicemember to submit an ITO or ITA issued to another family member as sufficient certification for the duration of time specified in the ITO or ITA, even if the employee seeking leave is not the named recipient on the ITO or ITA. The regulations further permit an employing office to authenticate and clarify medical certifications submitted to support a request for leave to care for a covered servicemember using the procedures applicable to FMLA leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition. However, unlike the recertification, second and third opinion processes used for other types of FMLA leave, recertification, second and third opinions are not warranted for purposes of military caregiver leave when the certification has been completed by a DOD health care provider, a VA health care provider, a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider, or a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider, but are permitted when the certification has been completed by a health care provider who is not affiliated with the DOD, VA, or TRICARE.

An employee seeking to take military caregiver leave must provide the requested certification to the employing office within the time frame requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the employing office's request), unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee's diligent, good faith efforts.

Section 825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL's regulations under this section. Section 825.312 addresses the fitness-for-duty certification that an employee may be required to submit upon return to work from FMLA leave. This section clarifies that employees have the same obligation to provide a complete certification or provide sufficient authorization to the health care provider in order for that person to provide the information directly to the employing office in the fitness-for-duty certification process as they do in the initial certification process. The employing office may require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job, as long as the employing office provides the employee with a list of those essential job functions no later than the employing office provides the designation notice. The designation notice must indicate that the certification address the employee's ability to perform those essential functions. An employing office may contact the employee's health care provider directly, consistent with the procedure in proposed section 825.307(a), for purposes of authenticating or clarifying the fitness-for-duty certification. The employing office is required to advise the employee in the eligibility notice required by proposed section 825.300(b) if the employing office will require a fitness-for-duty certification to return to work. Employees are not entitled to the reinstatement protections of the Act if they do not provide the required fitness-for-duty certification or request additional FMLA leave.

Section 825.312 also requires that the employing office uniformly apply its policies permitting fitness-for-duty certifications to intermittent and reduced schedule leave users when reasonable safety concerns are present, but limits the frequency of such certifications to once in a 30-day period in which intermittent or reduced schedule leave was taken. "Reasonable safety concerns" means a reasonable belief of a significant risk of harm to the individual employee or others. In determining whether reasonable safety concerns exist, an employing office should consider the nature and severity of the potential harm and the likelihood that potential harm will occur. This is meant to be a high standard. Thus, the determination that there are reasonable safety concerns must rely on objective factual evidence, not subjective perceptions. Employing offices cannot, under this section, require such certifications in all intermittent or reduced leave schedule situations, but only where reasonable safety concerns are present. There is no fitness-for-duty certification form, nor is there any specific format such a certification must follow as long as it contains the required information. An employing office is allowed to require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of his or her position. However, the employing office can choose to accept a simple statement in place of the fitness-for-duty certification (or not require a fitness-for-duty certification at all).

There is no second and third opinion process for a fitness-for-duty certification. A fitness-for-duty certification need only address the condition for which FMLA leave was taken and the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the job. The employee's health care provider determines whether a separate examination is required in order to determine the employee's fitness to return to duty under the FMLA. A medical examination at the employing office's expense may be required only after the employee has returned from FMLA leave and must be job-related and consistent with business necessity as required by the ADA. The employing office cannot delay the employee's return to work while arranging for and having the employee undergo a medical examination.

Section 825.313 Failure to provide certification.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.313 explains the consequences for an employee who fails to provide medical certification in a timely manner. An employing office may "deny" FMLA leave until the required certification is provided. This section also addresses the consequences of failing to provide timely recertification. Section 825.313 also clarifies that recertification does not apply to leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember.

Employees must be provided at least 15 calendar days to provide the requested certification, and are entitled to additional time when they are unable to meet that deadline despite their diligent, good-faith efforts. An employee's certification (or recertification) is not untimely until that period has passed. Employing offices may deny FMLA protection when an employee fails to provide a timely certification or recertification, but it does not require employing offices to do so. Employing offices always have the option of accepting an untimely certification and not denying FMLA protection to any absences that occurred during the period in which the certification was delayed.

Subpart D—Enforcement Mechanisms

Section 825.400 Enforcement, general rules.

The Board finds good cause not to adopt DOL section 825.400 because the enforcement of FMLA violations is different in the legislative branch as opposed to the workforces regulated by the DOL. The OOC section 825.400 remains the same.

Sections 825.401–825.404 Filing a complaint with the Federal Government; Violations of the posting requirement; Appealing the assessment of a penalty for willful violation of the posting requirement; Consequences for an employer when not paying the penalty assessment after a final order is issued.

These sections do not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Subpart E—Recordkeeping Requirements

Section 825.500 Recordkeeping requirements.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Subpart F—Special Rules Applicable to Employees of Schools

Sections 825.600–825.604 Special rules for school employees, definitions; Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave; Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term; Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave; Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under these sections. Sections 825.600–825.604 cover the special rules applicable to instructional employees. When an eligible instructional employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced schedule basis to care for a covered servicemember, the employee may choose to either (1) take leave for a period or periods of particular duration; or (2) transfer temporarily to an available alternative position with equivalent pay and benefits that better accommodates recurring periods of leave.

These sections also extend some of the limitations on leave near the end of an academic term to leave requested during this period to care for a covered servicemember. If an instructional employee begins leave for a purpose other than the employee's own serious health condition during the five-week period before the end of the term, the employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the leave will last more than two weeks and the employee would return to work during the two-week period before the end of the term. Further, an employing office may require an instructional employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the employee begins leave that will last more than five working days for a purpose other than the employee's own serious health condition during the three-week period before the end of the term. The types of leave that are subject to the limitations are: (1) leave because of the birth of a son or daughter, (2) leave because of the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care, (3) leave taken to care for a spouse, parent, or child with a serious health condition, and (4) leave taken to care for a covered servicemember.

Subpart G—Effect of Other Laws, Employing Office Practices, and Collective Bargaining Agreements on Employee Rights Under FMLA

Section 825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.700 provides that an employing office may not limit the rights established by the FMLA through an employment benefit program or plan, but an employing office may provide greater leave rights than the FMLA requires. This section also provides that an employing office may amend existing leave programs, so long as they comply with the FMLA, and that nothing in the FMLA is intended to discourage employing offices from adopting or retaining more generous leave policies. The Board proposes to follow the DOL regulations and delete from the current OOC section 825.700(a) the following: "If an employee takes paid or unpaid leave and the employing office does not designate the leave as FMLA leave, the leave taken does not count against an employee's FMLA entitlement." As explained by the DOL, this last sentence of section 825.700(a) was deleted in order to conform to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in

Ragsdale v. Wolverine World Wide, 535 U.S. 81 (2002), which specifically invalidated this provision.

Section 825.701 Interaction with State laws.

This DOL section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Section 825.702 Interaction with Federal and State anti-discrimination laws.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.702 addresses the interaction between the FMLA and other Federal and State antidiscrimination laws. Section 825.702 discusses the interaction between the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) and the FMLA. Under USERRA, a returning servicemember would be entitled to FMLA leave if, after including the hours that he or she would have worked for the civilian employing office during the period of military service, the employee would have met the FMLA eligibility threshold. This is not an expansion of FMLA rights through regulation; this is a requirement of USERRA.

With respect to the interaction of the FMLA and ADA, where both laws may apply, the applicability of each statute needs to be evaluated independently.

Further, the reference to employers who receive Federal financial assistance and employers who contract with the Federal government in this section has not been adopted by the Board because federal contractor employers are not covered by the CAA.

In its final regulations, the DOL removed the following optional-use forms and notices from the Appendix of the regulations, but continued to make them available to the public on the WHD Web site: Forms WH-380-E (Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition); WH-380-F (Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition); WH-381 (Notice of Eligibility and Rights & Responsibilities); WH-382 (Designation Notice); WH-384 (Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave); WH-385 (Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Current Servicemember for Military Family Leave); and WH-385-V (Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave). The Board proposes to revise its forms and to make the following OOC forms available on its website: Form A: Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition; Form B: Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition; Form C: Notice of Eligibility and Rights and Responsibilities; Form D: Designation Notice to Employee of FMLA Leave; Form E: Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave; Form F: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Covered Servicemember for Military Family Leave; and Form G: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave. The Board's proposed forms now include references to the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, which is made applicable to employees covered under the CAA. The Board invites comment on whether these forms should be included in the regulations, or whether covered employees and employing offices should be directed to the DOL website for the appropriate forms. In any event, the use of a specific set of forms is optional and other forms requiring the same information may be used instead. In proposing these revised forms,

the Board recognizes that the use of specific forms play a key role in employing offices' compliance with the FMLA and employees' ability to take FMLA protected leave when needed.

SUBSTANTIVE REGULATIONS PROPOSED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE EXTENDING RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL ACT OF 1996, AS AMENDED

FINAL REGULATIONS

Part 825—Family and Medical Leave

825.1 Purpose and Scope.

Subpart A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

825.100 The Family and Medical Leave Act.

825.101 Purpose of the FMLA.

825.102 Definitions.

825.103 [Reserved]

825.104 Covered employing offices.

825.105 Counting employees for determining coverage.

825.106 Joint employer coverage.

825.107 Successor in interest coverage.

825.108–825.109 [Reserved]

825.110 Eligible employee.

825.111 [Reserved]

825.112 Qualifying reasons for leave, general rule.

825.113 Serious health condition.

825.114 Inpatient care.

825.115 Continuing treatment.

825.116–825.118 [Reserved]

825.119 Leave for treatment of substance abuse.

825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

825.121 Leave for adoption or foster care.

825.122 Definitions of covered servicemember, spouse, parent, son or daughter, next of kin of a covered servicemember, adoption, foster care, son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, son or daughter of a covered servicemember, and parent of a covered servicemember.

825.123 Unable to perform the functions of the position.

825.124 Needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember.

825.125 Definition of health care provider.

825.126 Leave because of a qualifying exigency.

825.127 Leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness (military caregiver leave).

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

825.200 Amount of leave.

825.201 Leave to care for a parent.

825.202 Intermittent leave or reduced leave schedule.

825.203 Scheduling of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.204 Transfer of an employee to an alternative position during intermittent leave or reduced schedule leave.

825.205 Increments of FMLA leave for intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

825.208 [Reserved]

825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

825.210 Employee payment of group health benefit premiums.

825.211 Maintenance of benefits under multi-employer health plans.

825.212 Employee failure to pay health plan premium payments.

825.213 Employing office recovery of benefit costs.

825.214 Employee right to reinstatement.

825.215 Equivalent position.

825.216 Limitations on an employee's right to reinstatement.

825.217 Key employee, general rule.

825.218 Substantial and grievous economic injury.

825.219 Rights of a key employee.

825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave.

825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

825.305 Certification, general rule.

825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

825.311 Intent to return to work.

825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

825.313 Failure to provide certification.

Subpart D—ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

825.400 Enforcement of FMLA rights, as made applicable by the CAA.

825.401–825.404 [Reserved]

Subpart E—[Reserved]

Subpart F—SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS

825.600 Special rules for school employees, definitions.

825.601 Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave.

825.602 Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term.

825.603 Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave.

825.604 Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

Subpart G—EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS, EMPLOYING OFFICE PRACTICES, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS ON EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA

825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

825.701 [Reserved]

825.702 Interaction with anti-discrimination laws as applied by section 201 of the CAA

Subpart H—[Reserved]

FORMS

Form A: Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition;

Form B: Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition;

Form C: Notice of Eligibility and Rights & Responsibilities;

Form D: Designation Notice to Employee of FMLA Leave;

Form E: Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave;

Form F: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Covered Servicemember for Military Family Leave;

Form G: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave.

825.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) Section 202 of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA) (2 U.S.C. 1312) applies the rights and protections of sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) (29 U.S.C. 2611-2615) to covered employees. (The term "covered employee" is defined in section 101(3) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1301(3)). See 825.102 of these regulations for that definition.) The purpose of this part is to set forth the regulations to carry out the provisions of section 202 of the CAA.

(b) These regulations are issued by the Board of Directors (Board) of the Office of Compliance, pursuant to sections 202(d) and 304 of the CAA, which direct the Board to promulgate regulations implementing section 202 that are "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA] except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown . . . that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." The regulations issued by the Board herein are on all matters for which section 202 of the CAA requires regulations to be issued. Specifically, it is the Board's considered judgment, based on the information available to it at the time of the promulgation of these regulations, that, with the exception of regulations adopted and set forth herein, there are no other "substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA]."

(c) In promulgating these regulations, the Board has made certain technical and nomenclature changes to the regulations as promulgated by the Secretary. Such changes are intended to make the provisions adopted accord more naturally to situations in the legislative branch. However, by making these changes, the Board does not intend a substantive difference between these regulations and those of the Secretary from which they are derived. Moreover, such changes, in and of themselves, are not intended to constitute an interpretation of the regulation or of the statutory provisions of the CAA upon which they are based.

SUBPART A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

825.100 The Family and Medical Leave Act.

(a) The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), allows eligible employees of an employing office to take job-protected, unpaid leave, or to substitute appropriate paid leave if the employee has earned or accrued it, for up to a total of 12 workweeks in any 12 months (see 825.200(b)) because of the birth of a child and to care for the newborn child, because of the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care, because the employee is needed to care for a family member

(child, spouse, or parent) with a serious health condition, because the employee's own serious health condition makes the employee unable to perform the functions of his or her job, or because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty). In addition, eligible employees of a covered employing office may take job-protected, unpaid leave, or substitute appropriate paid leave if the employee has earned or accrued it, for up to a total of 26 workweeks in a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. In certain cases, FMLA leave may be taken on an intermittent basis rather than all at once, or the employee may work a part-time schedule.

(b) An employee on FMLA leave is also entitled to have health benefits maintained while on leave as if the employee had continued to work instead of taking the leave. If an employee was paying all or part of the premium payments prior to leave, the employee would continue to pay his or her share during the leave period. The employing office or a disbursing or other financial office of the House of Representatives or [italicized language is in only the House and Instrumentalities versions of the regulations] the Senate may recover its share only if the employee does not return to work for a reason other than the serious health condition of the employee or the employee's covered family member, the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or another reason beyond the employee's control.

(c) An employee generally has a right to return to the same position or an equivalent position with equivalent pay, benefits, and working conditions at the conclusion of the leave. The taking of FMLA leave cannot result in the loss of any benefit that accrued prior to the start of the leave.

(d) The employing office generally has a right to advance notice from the employee. In addition, the employing office may require an employee to submit certification to substantiate that the leave is due to the serious health condition of the employee or the employee's covered family member, due to the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or because of a qualifying exigency. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in a delay in the start of FMLA leave. Pursuant to a uniformly applied policy, the employing office may also require that an employee present a certification of fitness to return to work when the absence was caused by the employee's serious health condition (see 825.312 and 825.313). The employing office may delay restoring the employee to employment without such certificate relating to the health condition which caused the employee's absence.

825.101 Purpose of the FMLA.

(a) FMLA is intended to allow employees to balance their work and family life by taking reasonable unpaid leave for medical reasons, for the birth or adoption of a child, for the care of a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition, for the care of a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, or because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status. The FMLA is intended to balance the demands of the workplace with the needs of families, to promote the stability and economic security

of families, and to promote national interests in preserving family integrity. It was intended that the FMLA accomplish these purposes in a manner that accommodates the legitimate interests of employing offices, and in a manner consistent with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in minimizing the potential for employment discrimination on the basis of sex, while promoting equal employment opportunity for men and women.

(b) The FMLA was predicated on two fundamental concerns—the needs of the American workforce, and the development of high-performance organizations. Increasingly, America's children and elderly are dependent upon family members who must spend long hours at work. When a family emergency arises, requiring workers to attend to seriously-ill children or parents, or to newly-born or adopted infants, or even to their own serious illness, workers need reassurance that they will not be asked to choose between continuing their employment, and meeting their personal and family obligations or tending to vital needs at home.

(c) The FMLA is both intended and expected to benefit employing offices as well as their employees. A direct correlation exists between stability in the family and productivity in the workplace. FMLA will encourage the development of high-performance organizations. When workers can count on durable links to their workplace they are able to make their own full commitments to their jobs. The record of hearings on family and medical leave indicate the powerful productive advantages of stable workplace relationships, and the comparatively small costs of guaranteeing that those relationships will not be dissolved while workers attend to pressing family health obligations or their own serious illness.

825.102 Definitions.

For purposes of this part:

ADA means the Americans With Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, as amended).

CAA means the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Pub. Law 104-1, 109 Stat. 3, 2 U.S.C. 1301 *et seq.*, as amended).

COBRA means the continuation coverage requirements of Title X of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (Pub. Law 99-272, title X, section 10002; 100 Stat. 227; 29 U.S.C. 1161-1168).

Contingency operation means a military operation that:

(1) Is designated by the Secretary of Defense as an operation in which members of the Armed Forces are or may become involved in military actions, operations, or hostilities against an enemy of the United States or against an opposing military force; or

(2) Results in the call or order to, or retention on, active duty of members of the uniformed services under section 688, 12301(a), 12302, 12304, 12305, or 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress. See also 825.126(a)(2).

Continuing treatment by a health care provider means any one of the following:

(1) *Incapacity and treatment.* A period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days, and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition, that also involves:

(i) Treatment two or more times, within 30 days of the first day of incapacity, unless extenuating circumstances exist, by a health care provider, by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider, or by a provider of health care services (e.g., physical

therapist) under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider; or

(ii) Treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regimen of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

(iii) The requirement in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of this definition for treatment by a health care provider means an in-person visit to a health care provider. The first in-person treatment visit must take place within seven days of the first day of incapacity.

(iv) Whether additional treatment visits or a regimen of continuing treatment is necessary within the 30-day period shall be determined by the health care provider.

(v) The term "extenuating circumstances" in paragraph (i) means circumstances beyond the employee's control that prevent the follow-up visit from occurring as planned by the health care provider. Whether a given set of circumstances are extenuating depends on the facts. *See also* 825.115(a)(5).

(2) *Pregnancy or prenatal care.* Any period of incapacity due to pregnancy, or for prenatal care. *See also* 825.120.

(3) *Chronic conditions.* Any period of incapacity or treatment for such incapacity due to a chronic serious health condition. A chronic serious health condition is one which:

(i) Requires periodic visits (defined as at least twice a year) for treatment by a health care provider, or by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider;

(ii) Continues over an extended period of time (including recurring episodes of a single underlying condition); and

(iii) May cause episodic rather than a continuing period of incapacity (e.g., asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, etc.).

(4) *Permanent or long-term conditions.* A period of incapacity which is permanent or long-term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective. The employee or family member must be under the continuing supervision of, but need not be receiving active treatment by, a health care provider. Examples include Alzheimer's, a severe stroke, or the terminal stages of a disease.

(5) *Conditions requiring multiple treatments.* Any period of absence to receive multiple treatments (including any period of recovery therefrom) by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider, for:

(i) Restorative surgery after an accident or other injury; or

(ii) A condition that would likely result in a period of incapacity of more than three consecutive full calendar days in the absence of medical intervention or treatment, such as cancer (chemotherapy, radiation, etc.), severe arthritis (physical therapy), kidney disease (dialysis).

(6) Absences attributable to incapacity under paragraphs (2) or (3) of this definition qualify for FMLA leave even though the employee or the covered family member does not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last more than three consecutive, full calendar days. For example, an employee with asthma may be unable to report for work due to the onset of an asthma attack or because the employee's health care provider has advised the employee to stay home when the pollen count exceeds a certain level. An employee who is pregnant may be unable to report to work because of severe morning sickness.

Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status means:

(1) In the case of a member of the Regular Armed Forces, duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country; and,

(2) In the case of a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a Federal call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation pursuant to: Section 688 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering to active duty retired members of the Regular Armed Forces and members of the retired Reserve who retired after completing at least 20 years of active service; Section 12301(a) of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering all reserve component members to active duty in the case of war or national emergency; Section 12302 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12304 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Selected Reserve and certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12305 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes the suspension of promotion, retirement or separation rules for certain Reserve components; Section 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard into Federal service in certain circumstances; chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard and state military into Federal service in the case of insurrections and national emergencies; or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress so long as it is in support of a contingency operation. *See* 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(13)(B). *See also* 825.126(a).

Covered employee as defined in the CAA, means any employee of—(1) the House of Representatives; (2) the Senate; (3) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services; (4) the Capitol Police; (5) the Congressional Budget Office; (6) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; (7) the Office of the Attending Physician; (8) the Office of Compliance; or (9) the Office of Technology Assessment.

Covered servicemember means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness, or

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for a serious injury or illness.

Covered veteran means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. *See* 825.127(b)(2).

Eligible employee as defined in the CAA, means:

(1) A covered employee who has been employed for a total of at least 12 months in any employing office on the date on which any FMLA leave is to commence, except that an employing office need not consider any period of previous employment that occurred more than seven years before the date of the most recent hiring of the employee, *unless*:

(i) The break in service is occasioned by the fulfillment of the employee's Uniformed

Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, covered service obligation (the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service must be also counted in determining whether the employee has been employed for at least 12 months by any employing office, but this section does not provide any greater entitlement to the employee than would be available under the USERRA, as made applicable by the CAA); or

(ii) A written agreement, including a collective bargaining agreement, exists concerning the employing office's intention to rehire the employee after the break in service (e.g., for purposes of the employee furthering his or her education or for childrearing purposes); and

(2) Who, on the date on which any FMLA leave is to commence, has met the hours of service requirement by having been employed for at least 1,250 hours of service with an employing office during the previous 12-month period, *except that*:

(i) An employee returning from fulfilling his or her USERRA-covered service obligation shall be credited with the hours of service that would have been performed but for the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service in determining whether the employee met the hours of service requirement (accordingly, a person reemployed following absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service has the hours that would have been worked for the employing office added to any hours actually worked during the previous 12-month period to meet the hours of service requirement); and

(ii) To determine the hours that would have been worked during the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, the employee's pre-service work schedule can generally be used for calculations.

Employ means to suffer or permit to work.

Employee means an employee as defined by the CAA and includes an applicant for employment and a former employee.

Employee employed in an instructional capacity. *See* the definition of *Teacher* in this section.

Employee of the Capitol Police means any member or officer of the Capitol Police.

Employee of the House of Representatives means an individual occupying a position the pay for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or another official designated by the House of Representatives, or any employment position in an entity that is paid with funds derived from the clerk-hire allowance of the House of Representatives but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) under the definition of *covered employee* above.

Employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol means any employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol or the Botanic Garden.

Employee of the Senate means any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) under the definition of *covered employee* above.

Employing Office, as defined in the CAA, means:

(1) The personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator;

(2) A committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

(3) Any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or

privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate; or

(4) The Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the United States Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, the Office of Compliance, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

Employment benefits means all benefits provided or made available to employees by an employing office, including group life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, sick leave, annual leave, educational benefits, and pensions, regardless of whether such benefits are provided by a practice or written policy of an employing office or through an employee benefit plan. The term does not include non-employment related obligations paid by employees through voluntary deductions such as supplemental insurance coverage. *See also* 825.209(a).

FLSA means the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*).

FMLA means the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, Public Law 103-3 (February 5, 1993), 107 Stat. 6 (29 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*, as amended).

Group health plan means the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and any other plan of, or contributed to by, an employing office (including a self-insured plan) to provide health care (directly or otherwise) to the employing office's employees, former employees, or the families of such employees or former employees. For purposes of FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, the term *group health plan* shall not include an insurance program providing health coverage under which employees purchase individual policies from insurers provided that:

(1) No contributions are made by the employing office;

(2) Participation in the program is completely voluntary for employees;

(3) The sole functions of the employing office with respect to the program are, without endorsing the program, to permit the insurer to publicize the program to employees, to collect premiums through payroll deductions and to remit them to the insurer;

(4) The employing office receives no consideration in the form of cash or otherwise in connection with the program, other than reasonable compensation, excluding any profit, for administrative services actually rendered in connection with payroll deduction; and,

(5) The premium charged with respect to such coverage does not increase in the event the employment relationship terminates.

Health care provider means:

(1) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, defines health care provider as:

(i) A doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

(ii) Any other person determined by the Department of Labor to be capable of providing health care services.

(2) Others "capable of providing health care services" include only:

(i) Podiatrists, dentists, clinical psychologists, optometrists, and chiropractors (limited to treatment consisting of manual manipulation of the spine to correct a subluxation as demonstrated by X-ray to exist) authorized to practice in the State and performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law; and

(ii) Nurse practitioners, nurse-midwives and clinical social workers and physician as-

sistants who are authorized to practice under State law and who are performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law; and

(iii) Christian Science practitioners listed with the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston, Massachusetts. Where an employee or family member is receiving treatment from a Christian Science practitioner, an employee may not object to any requirement from an employing office that the employee or family member submit to examination (though not treatment) to obtain a second or third certification from a health care provider other than a Christian Science practitioner except as otherwise provided under applicable State or local law or collective bargaining agreement.

(iv) Any health care provider from whom an employing office or a group health plan's benefits manager will accept certification of the existence of a serious health condition to substantiate a claim for benefits; and

(v) A health care provider listed above who practices in a country other than the United States, who is authorized to practice in accordance with the law of that country, and who is performing within the scope of his or her practice as defined under such law.

(3) The phrase "authorized to practice in the State" as used in this section means that the provider must be authorized to diagnose and treat physical or mental health conditions.

Incapable of self-care means that the individual requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in several of the "activities of daily living" (ADLs) or "instrumental activities of daily living" (IADLs). Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing and eating. Instrumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc.

Instructional employee: *See* the definition of *Teacher* in this section.

Intermittent leave means leave taken in separate periods of time due to a single illness or injury, rather than for one continuous period of time, and may include leave of periods from an hour or more to several weeks. Examples of intermittent leave would include leave taken on an occasional basis for medical appointments, or leave taken several days at a time spread over a period of six months, such as for chemotherapy.

Invitational travel authorization (ITA) or Invitational travel order (ITO) mean orders issued by the Armed Forces to a family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. *See also* 825.310(e).

Key employee means a salaried FMLA-eligible employee who is among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the employee's worksite. *See also* 825.217.

Mental disability: *See* the definition of *Physical or mental disability* in this section.

Military caregiver leave means leave taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. *See also* 825.127.

Next of kin of a covered servicemember means the nearest blood relative other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the covered servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions,

brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of military caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. *See also* 825.127(d)(3).

Office of Compliance means the independent office established in the legislative branch under section 301 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1381).

Outpatient status means, with respect to a covered servicemember who is a current member of the Armed Forces, the status of a member of the Armed Forces assigned to either a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient; or a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients. *See also* 825.127(b)(1).

Parent means a biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the employee when the employee was a son or daughter as defined below. This term does not include parents "in law."

Parent of a covered servicemember means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law." *See also* 825.127(d)(2).

Physical or mental disability means a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual. Regulations at 29 CFR part 1630, issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, as amended, provide guidance to these terms.

Reduced leave schedule means a leave schedule that reduces the usual number of hours per workweek, or hours per workday, of an employee.

Reserve components of the Armed Forces, for purposes of qualifying exigency leave, include the Army National Guard of the United States, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard of the United States, Air Force Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, and retired members of the Regular Armed Forces or Reserves who are called up in support of a contingency operation. *See also* 825.126(a)(2)(i).

Secretary means the Secretary of Labor or authorized representative.

Serious health condition means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves inpatient care as defined in 825.114 or continuing treatment by a health care provider as defined in 825.115. Conditions for which cosmetic treatments are administered (such as most treatments for acne or plastic surgery) are not serious health conditions unless inpatient hospital care is required or unless complications develop. Restorative dental or plastic surgery after an injury or removal of cancerous growths are serious health conditions provided all the other conditions of this regulation are met. Mental illness or allergies may be serious health conditions, but only if all the conditions of 825.113 are met.

Serious injury or illness means:

(1) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, an injury or illness that was incurred by the covered servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces and that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating; and

(2) In the case of a covered veteran, an injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran, and is:

(i) A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(ii) A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(iii) A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(iv) An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers. *See also* 825.127(c).

Son or daughter means a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and "incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability" at the time that FMLA leave is to commence.

Son or daughter of a covered servicemember means a covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age. *See also* 825.127(d)(1).

Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age. *See also* 825.126(a)(5).

Spouse, as defined in the FMLA and as made applicable by the CAA, means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either:

(1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or,

(2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

State means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

Teacher (or employee employed in an instructional capacity, or instructional employee) means an employee employed principally in an instructional capacity by an educational agency or school whose principal function is to teach and instruct students in a class, a small group, or an individual setting, and includes athletic coaches, driving instructors, and special education assistants such as signers for the hearing impaired. The term does not include teacher assistants or aides who do not have as their principal function actual teaching or instructing, nor auxiliary personnel such as counselors, psychologists, curriculum specialists, cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, bus drivers, or other primarily noninstructional employees.

TRICARE is the health care program serving active duty servicemembers, National Guard and Reserve members, retirees, their families, survivors, and certain former spouses worldwide.

825.103 [Removed and Reserved]**825.104 Covered employing offices.**

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, covers all employing offices. As used in the CAA, the term employing office means:

(1) The personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator;

(2) A committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

(3) Any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate; or

(4) The Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the United States Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, the Office of Compliance, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

(b) [Reserved]

(c) Separate entities will be deemed to be parts of a single employing office for purposes of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, if they meet the "integrated employer" test. Where this test is met, the employees of all entities making up the integrated employer will be counted in determining employer coverage and employee eligibility. A determination of whether or not separate entities are an integrated employer is not determined by the application of any single criterion, but rather the entire relationship is to be reviewed in its totality. Factors considered in determining whether two or more entities are an integrated employer include:

(1) Common management;

(2) Interrelation between operations;

(3) Centralized control of labor relations; and

(4) Degree of common financial control.

825.105 [Reserved].**825.106 Joint employer coverage.**

(a) Where two or more employing offices exercise some control over the work or working conditions of the employee, the employing offices may be joint employers under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Where the employee performs work which simultaneously benefits two or more employing offices, or works for two or more employing offices at different times during the workweek, a joint employment relationship generally will be considered to exist in situations such as:

(1) Where there is an arrangement between employing offices to share an employee's services or to interchange employees;

(2) Where one employing office acts directly or indirectly in the interest of the other employing office in relation to the employee; or

(3) Where the employing offices are not completely disassociated with respect to the employee's employment and may be deemed to share control of the employee, directly or indirectly, because one employing office controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the other employing office.

(b) A determination of whether or not a joint employment relationship exists is not determined by the application of any single criterion, but rather the entire relationship is to be viewed in its totality. For example, joint employment will ordinarily be found to exist when:

(1) An employee, who is employed by an employing office other than the personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator, is under the actual direction and control of the Member of the House of Representatives or Senator; or

(2) Two or more employing offices employ an individual to work on common issues or other matters for both or all of them.

(c) When employing offices employ a covered employee jointly, they may designate one of themselves to be the primary employing office, and the other or others to be the secondary employing office(s). Such a designation shall be made by written notice to the covered employee.

(d) If an employing office is designated a primary employing office pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, only that employing office is responsible for giving required notices to the covered employee, providing FMLA leave, and maintenance of health benefits. Job restoration is the primary responsibility of the primary employing office, and the secondary employing office(s) may, subject to the limitations in 825.216, be responsible for accepting the employee returning from FMLA leave.

(e) If employing offices employ an employee jointly, but fail to designate a primary employing office pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, then all of these employing offices shall be jointly and severally liable for giving required notices to the employee, for providing FMLA leave, for assuring that health benefits are maintained, and for job restoration. The employee may give notice of need for FMLA leave, as described in 825.302 and 825.303, to whichever of these employing offices the employee chooses. If the employee makes a written request for restoration to one of these employing offices, that employing office shall be primarily responsible for job restoration, and the other employing office(s) may, subject to the limitations in 825.216, be responsible for accepting the employee returning from FMLA leave.

825.107 [Reserved]**825.108 [Reserved]****825.109 [Reserved]****825.110 Eligible employees.**

(a) An eligible employee is an employee of a covered employing office who:

(1) Has been employed by any employing office for at least 12 months, and

(2) Has been employed for at least 1,250 hours of service during the 12-month period immediately preceding the commencement of the leave.

(b) The 12 months an employee must have been employed by any employing office need not be consecutive months, *provided:*

(1) Subject to the exceptions provided in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, employment periods prior to a break in service of seven years or more need not be counted in determining whether the employee has been employed by the employing office for at least 12 months.

(2) Employment periods preceding a break in service of more than seven years must be counted in determining whether the employee has been employed by the employing office for at least 12 months where:

(i) The employee's break in service is occasioned by the fulfillment of his or her Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, covered service obligation. The period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service must be also counted in determining whether the employee has been employed for at least 12 months by the employing office. However, this section does not provide any greater entitlement to the employee than would be available under the USERRA; or

(ii) A written agreement, including a collective bargaining agreement, exists concerning the employing office's intention to rehire the employee after the break in service (*e.g.*, for purposes of the employee furthering his or her education or for childrearing purposes).

(3) If an employee worked for two or more employing offices sequentially, the time worked will be aggregated to determine whether it equals 12 months.

(4) If an employee is maintained on the payroll for any part of a week, including any periods of paid or unpaid leave (sick, vacation) during which other benefits or compensation are provided by the employing office (*e.g.*, Federal Employees' Compensation, group health plan benefits, *etc.*), the week counts as a week of employment. For purposes of determining whether intermittent/occasional/casual employment qualifies as at least 12 months, 52 weeks is deemed to be equal to 12 months.

(5) Nothing in this section prevents employing offices from considering employment prior to a continuous break in service of more than seven years when determining whether an employee has met the 12-month employment requirement. However, if an employing office chooses to recognize such prior employment, the employing office must do so uniformly, with respect to all employees with similar breaks in service.

(c)(1) If an employee was employed by two or more employing offices, either sequentially or concurrently, the hours of service will be aggregated to determine whether the minimum of 1,250 hours has been reached.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(3) of this section, whether an employee has worked the minimum 1,250 hours of service is determined according to the principles established under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), as applied by section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), for determining compensable hours of work. The determining factor is the number of hours an employee has worked for one or more employing offices. The determination is not limited by methods of recordkeeping, or by compensation agreements that do not accurately reflect all of the hours an employee has worked for or been in service to the employing office. Any accurate accounting of actual hours worked under the FLSA's principles may be used.

(3) An employee returning from USERRA-covered service shall be credited with the hours of service that would have been performed but for the period of absence from

work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service in determining the employee's eligibility for FMLA-qualifying leave. Accordingly, a person reemployed following USERRA-covered service has the hours that would have been worked for the employing office added to any hours actually worked during the previous 12-month period to meet the hours of service requirement. In order to determine the hours that would have been worked during the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, the employee's pre-service work schedule can generally be used for calculations.

(4) In the event an employing office does not maintain an accurate record of hours worked by an employee, including for employees who are exempt from FLSA's requirement that a record be kept of their hours worked (*e.g.*, bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees as defined in the FLSA Regulations, 29 CFR part 541, and as made applicable by the CAA, the employing office has the burden of showing that the employee has not worked the requisite hours. An employing office must be able to clearly demonstrate, for example, that full-time teachers (*see* 825.102 for definition) of an elementary or secondary school system, or institution of higher education, or other educational establishment or institution (who often work outside the classroom or at their homes) did not work 1,250 hours during the previous 12 months in order to claim that the teachers are not eligible for FMLA leave.

(d) The determination of whether an employee has worked for any employing office for at least 1,250 hours in the past 12 months and has been employed by any employing office for a total of at least 12 months must be made as of the date the FMLA leave is to start. An employee may be on non-FMLA leave at the time he or she meets the 12-month eligibility requirement, and in that event, any portion of the leave taken for an FMLA-qualifying reason after the employee meets the eligibility requirement would be FMLA leave. *See* 825.300(b) for rules governing the content of the eligibility notice given to employees.

(e) [Reserved]

825.111 [Reserved]

825.112 Qualifying reasons for leave, general rule.

(a) *Circumstances qualifying for leave.* Employing offices covered by FMLA as made applicable by the CAA are required to grant leave to eligible employees:

(1) For birth of a son or daughter, and to care for the newborn child (*see* 825.120);

(2) For placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care (*see* 825.121);

(3) To care for the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition (*see* 825.113 and 825.122); and

(4) Because of a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the functions of the employee's job (*see* 825.113 and 825.123);

(5) Because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active status) (*see* 825.122 and 825.126); and

(6) To care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness if the employee is the spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of the covered servicemember (*see* 825.122 and 825.127).

(b) *Equal Application.* The right to take leave under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, applies equally to male and female employees. A father, as well as a mother, can take family leave for the birth, placement for adoption, or foster care of a child.

(c) *Active employee.* In situations where the employing office/employee relationship has been interrupted, such as an employee who has been on layoff, the employee must be recalled or otherwise be re-employed before being eligible for FMLA leave. Under such circumstances, an eligible employee is immediately entitled to further FMLA leave for a qualifying reason.

825.113 Serious health condition.

(a) For purposes of FMLA, *serious health condition* entitling an employee to FMLA leave means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves inpatient care as defined in 825.114 or continuing treatment by a health care provider as defined in 825.115.

(b) The term *incapacity* means inability to work, attend school or perform other regular daily activities due to the serious health condition, treatment therefore, or recovery therefrom.

(c) The term *treatment* includes (but is not limited to) examinations to determine if a serious health condition exists and evaluations of the condition. Treatment does not include routine physical examinations, eye examinations, or dental examinations. A regimen of continuing treatment includes, for example, a course of prescription medication (*e.g.*, an antibiotic) or therapy requiring special equipment to resolve or alleviate the health condition (*e.g.*, oxygen). A regimen of continuing treatment that includes the taking of over-the-counter medications such as aspirin, antihistamines, or salves; or bed-rest, drinking fluids, exercise, and other similar activities that can be initiated without a visit to a health care provider, is not, by itself, sufficient to constitute a regimen of continuing treatment for purposes of FMLA leave.

(d) Conditions for which cosmetic treatments are administered (such as most treatments for acne or plastic surgery) are not serious health conditions unless inpatient hospital care is required or unless complications develop. Ordinarily, unless complications arise, the common cold, the flu, ear aches, upset stomach, minor ulcers, headaches other than migraine, routine dental or orthodontia problems, periodontal disease, *etc.*, are examples of conditions that do not meet the definition of a serious health condition and do not qualify for FMLA leave. Restorative dental or plastic surgery after an injury or removal of cancerous growths are serious health conditions provided all the other conditions of this regulation are met. Mental illness or allergies may be serious health conditions, but only if all the conditions of this section are met.

825.114 Inpatient care.

Inpatient care means an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility, including any period of incapacity as defined in 825.113(b), or any subsequent treatment in connection with such inpatient care.

825.115 Continuing treatment.

A serious health condition involving continuing treatment by a health care provider includes any one or more of the following:

(a) *Incapacity and treatment.* A period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days, and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition, that also involves:

(1) Treatment two or more times, within 30 days of the first day of incapacity, unless extenuating circumstances exist, by a health care provider, by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider, or by a provider of health care services (e.g., physical therapist) under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider; or

(2) Treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regimen of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

(3) The requirement in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section for treatment by a health care provider means an in-person visit to a health care provider. The first (or only) in-person treatment visit must take place within seven days of the first day of incapacity.

(4) Whether additional treatment visits or a regimen of continuing treatment is necessary within the 30-day period shall be determined by the health care provider.

(5) The term *extenuating circumstances* in paragraph (a)(1) of this section means circumstances beyond the employee's control that prevent the follow-up visit from occurring as planned by the health care provider. Whether a given set of circumstances are extenuating depends on the facts. For example, extenuating circumstances exist if a health care provider determines that a second in-person visit is needed within the 30-day period, but the health care provider does not have any available appointments during that time period.

(b) *Pregnancy or prenatal care.* Any period of incapacity due to pregnancy, or for prenatal care. See also 825.120.

(c) *Chronic conditions.* Any period of incapacity or treatment for such incapacity due to a chronic serious health condition. A chronic serious health condition is one which:

(1) Requires periodic visits (defined as at least twice a year) for treatment by a health care provider, or by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider;

(2) Continues over an extended period of time (including recurring episodes of a single underlying condition); and

(3) May cause episodic rather than a continuing period of incapacity (e.g., asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, etc.).

(d) *Permanent or long-term conditions.* A period of incapacity which is permanent or long-term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective. The employee or family member must be under the continuing supervision of, but need not be receiving active treatment by, a health care provider. Examples include Alzheimer's, a severe stroke, or the terminal stages of a disease.

(e) *Conditions requiring multiple treatments.* Any period of absence to receive multiple treatments (including any period of recovery therefrom) by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider, for:

(1) Restorative surgery after an accident or other injury; or

(2) A condition that would likely result in a period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days in the absence of medical intervention or treatment, such as cancer (chemotherapy, radiation, etc.), severe arthritis (physical therapy), or kidney disease (dialysis).

(f) Absences attributable to incapacity under paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section qualify for FMLA leave even though the employee or the covered family member does

not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last more than three consecutive, full calendar days. For example, an employee with asthma may be unable to report for work due to the onset of an asthma attack or because the employee's health care provider has advised the employee to stay home when the pollen count exceeds a certain level. An employee who is pregnant may be unable to report to work because of severe morning sickness.

825.116 [Removed and Reserved]

825.117 [Removed and Reserved]

825.118 [Removed and Reserved]

825.119 Leave for treatment of substance abuse.

(a) Substance abuse may be a serious health condition if the conditions of 825.113 through 825.115 are met. However, FMLA leave may only be taken for treatment for substance abuse by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services on referral by a health care provider. On the other hand, absence because of the employee's use of the substance, rather than for treatment, does not qualify for FMLA leave.

(b) Treatment for substance abuse does not prevent an employing office from taking employment action against an employee. The employing office may not take action against the employee because the employee has exercised his or her right to take FMLA leave for treatment. However, if the employing office has an established policy, applied in a non-discriminatory manner that has been communicated to all employees, that provides under certain circumstances an employee may be terminated for substance abuse, pursuant to that policy the employee may be terminated whether or not the employee is presently taking FMLA leave. An employee may also take FMLA leave to care for a covered family member who is receiving treatment for substance abuse. The employing office may not take action against an employee who is providing care for a covered family member receiving treatment for substance abuse.

825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

(a) *General rules.* Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave for pregnancy or birth of a child as follows:

(1) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave for the birth of their child.

(2) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave to be with the healthy newborn child (i.e., bonding time) during the 12-month period beginning on the date of birth. An employee's entitlement to FMLA leave for a birth expires at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the birth. If the employing office permits bonding leave to be taken beyond this period, such leave will not qualify as FMLA leave. Under this section, both parents are entitled to FMLA leave even if the newborn does not have a serious health condition.

(3) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken for birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care or to care for the child after placement, or to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for

example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a healthy, newborn child, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition. Note, too, that many state pregnancy disability laws specify a period of disability either before or after the birth of a child; such periods would also be considered FMLA leave for a serious health condition of the birth mother, and would not be subject to the combined limit.

(4) The expectant mother is entitled to FMLA leave for incapacity due to pregnancy, for prenatal care, or for her own serious health condition following the birth of the child. An expectant mother may take FMLA leave before the birth of the child for prenatal care or if her condition makes her unable to work. The expectant mother is entitled to leave for incapacity due to pregnancy even though she does not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last for more than three consecutive calendar days.

(5) A spouse is entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for a pregnant spouse who is incapacitated or if needed to care for her during her prenatal care, or if needed to care for her following the birth of a child if she has a serious health condition. See 825.124.

(6) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for a child with a serious health condition if the requirements of 825.113 through 825.115 and 825.122(d) are met. Thus, spouses may each take 12 weeks of FMLA leave if needed to care for their newborn child with a serious health condition, even if both are employed by the same employing office, provided they have not exhausted their entitlements during the applicable 12-month FMLA leave period.

(b) *Intermittent and reduced schedule leave.* An eligible employee may use intermittent or reduced schedule leave after the birth to be with a healthy newborn child only if the employing office agrees. For example, an employing office and employee may agree to a part-time work schedule after the birth. If the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the birth of a child, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced leave. The employing office's agreement is not required for intermittent leave required by the serious health condition of the expectant mother or newborn child. See 825.202–

825.205 for general rules governing the use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for adoption or foster care. See 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

825.121 Leave for adoption or foster care.

(a) *General rules.* Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave for placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care as follows:

(1) Employees may take FMLA leave before the actual placement or adoption of a child if an absence from work is required for the placement for adoption or foster care to proceed. For example, the employee may be required to attend counseling sessions, appear in court, consult with his or her attorney or the doctor(s) representing the birth parent, submit to a physical examination, or travel to another country to complete an adoption. The source of an adopted child (e.g., whether from a licensed placement agency or otherwise) is not a factor in determining eligibility for leave for this purpose.

(2) An employee's entitlement to leave for adoption or foster care expires at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the placement. If the employing office permits leave for adoption or foster care to be taken beyond this period, such leave will not qualify as FMLA leave. Under this section, the employee is entitled to FMLA leave even if the adopted or foster child does not have a serious health condition.

(3) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken for the placement of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after placement, for the birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, or to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a healthy, newly placed child, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition.

(4) An eligible employee is entitled to FMLA leave in order to care for an adopted or foster child with a serious health condition if the requirements of 825.113 through 825.115 and 825.122(d) are met. Thus, spouses may each take 12 weeks of FMLA leave if needed to care for an adopted or foster child with a serious health condition, even if both are employed by the same employing office, provided they have not exhausted their entitlements during the applicable 12-month FMLA leave period.

(b) *Use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave.* An eligible employee may use intermittent or reduced schedule leave after the placement of a healthy child for adoption or

foster care only if the employing office agrees. Thus, for example, the employing office and employee may agree to a part-time work schedule after the placement for bonding purposes. If the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the placement for adoption or foster care, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced leave. The employing office's agreement is not required for intermittent leave required by the serious health condition of the adopted or foster child. See 825.202–825.205 for general rules governing the use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave. See 825.120 for general rules governing leave for pregnancy and birth of a child. See 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

825.122 Definitions of covered servicemember, spouse, parent, son or daughter, next of kin of a covered servicemember, adoption, foster care, son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, son or daughter of a covered servicemember, and parent of a covered servicemember.

(a) *Covered servicemember* means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness; or

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for a serious injury or illness. *Covered veteran* means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. See 825.127(b)(2).

(b) *Spouse*, as defined in the FMLA and as made applicable by the CAA, means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either:

(1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or,

(2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

(c) *Parent.* Parent means a biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the employee when the employee was a son or daughter as defined in paragraph (d) of this section. This term does not include parents "in law."

(d) *Son or daughter.* For purposes of FMLA leave taken for birth or adoption, or to care

for a family member with a serious health condition, son or daughter means a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and "incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability" at the time that FMLA leave is to commence.

(1) *Incapable of self-care* means that the individual requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in three or more of the activities of daily living (ADLs) or instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs). Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing and eating. Instrumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc.

(2) *Physical or mental disability* means a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual. Regulations at 29 CFR 1630.2(h), (i), and (j), issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, define these terms.

(3) Persons who are "in loco parentis" include those with day-to-day responsibilities to care for and financially support a child, or, in the case of an employee, who had such responsibility for the employee when the employee was a child. A biological or legal relationship is not necessary.

(e) *Next of kin of a covered servicemember* means the nearest blood relative other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the covered servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions, brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of military caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. See 825.127(d)(3).

(f) *Adoption* means legally and permanently assuming the responsibility of raising a child as one's own. The source of an adopted child (e.g., whether from a licensed placement agency or otherwise) is not a factor in determining eligibility for FMLA leave. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for adoption.

(g) *Foster care* means 24-hour care for children in substitution for, and away from, their parents or guardian. Such placement is made by or with the agreement of the State as a result of a voluntary agreement between the parent or guardian that the child be removed from the home, or pursuant to a judicial determination of the necessity for foster care, and involves agreement between the State and foster family that the foster family will take care of the child. Although foster care may be with relatives of the child, State action is involved in the removal of the child from parental custody. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for foster care.

(h) *Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age. See 825.126(a)(5).

(i) *Son or daughter of a covered servicemember* means the covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age. See 825.127(d)(1).

(j) *Parent of a covered servicemember* means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law." See 825.127(d)(2).

(k) *Documenting relationships.* For purposes of confirmation of family relationship, the employing office may require the employee giving notice of the need for leave to provide reasonable documentation or statement of family relationship. This documentation may take the form of a simple statement from the employee, or a child's birth certificate, a court document, *etc.* The employing office is entitled to examine documentation such as a birth certificate, *etc.*, but the employee is entitled to the return of the official document submitted for this purpose.

825.123 Unable to perform the functions of the position.

(a) *Definition.* An employee is unable to perform the functions of the position where the health care provider finds that the employee is unable to work at all or is unable to perform any one of the essential functions of the employee's position within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and made applicable by Section 201(a) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(3)). An employee who must be absent from work to receive medical treatment for a serious health condition is considered to be unable to perform the essential functions of the position during the absence for treatment.

(b) *Statement of functions.* An employing office has the option, in requiring certification from a health care provider, to provide a statement of the essential functions of the employee's position for the health care provider to review. A sufficient medical certification must specify what functions of the employee's position the employee is unable to perform so that the employing office can then determine whether the employee is unable to perform one or more essential functions of the employee's position. For purposes of FMLA, the essential functions of the employee's position are to be determined with reference to the position the employee held at the time notice is given or leave commenced, whichever is earlier. See 825.306.

825.124 Needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember.

(a) The medical certification provision that an employee is needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember encompasses both physical and psychological care. It includes situations where, for example, because of a serious health condition, the family member is unable to care for his or her own basic medical, hygienic, or nutritional needs or safety, or is unable to transport himself or herself to the doctor. The term also includes providing psychological comfort and reassurance which would be beneficial to a child, spouse or parent with a serious health condition who is receiving inpatient or home care.

(b) The term also includes situations where the employee may be needed to substitute for others who normally care for the family member or covered servicemember, or to make arrangements for changes in care, such as transfer to a nursing home. The employee need not be the only individual or family member available to care for the family member or covered servicemember.

(c) An employee's intermittent leave or a reduced leave schedule necessary to care for a family member or covered servicemember includes not only a situation where the condition of the family member or covered servicemember itself is intermittent, but also where the employee is only needed intermittently—such as where other care is normally available, or care responsibilities are shared with another member of the family or a third party. See 825.202–825.205 for rules governing the use of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.125 Definition of health care provider.

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, defines *health care provider* as:

(1) A doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

(2) Any other person determined by the Office of Compliance to be capable of providing health care services.

(3) In making a determination referred to in subparagraph (a)(2), and absent good cause shown to do otherwise, the Office of Compliance will follow any determination made by the Department of Labor (under section 101(6)(B) of FMLA (29 U.S.C. 2611(6)(B))) that a person is capable of providing health care services, provided the determination by the Department of Labor was not made at the request of a person who was then a covered employee.

(b) Others capable of providing health care services include only:

(1) Podiatrists, dentists, clinical psychologists, optometrists, and chiropractors (limited to treatment consisting of manual manipulation of the spine to correct a subluxation as demonstrated by X-ray to exist) authorized to practice in the State and performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law;

(2) Nurse practitioners, nurse-midwives, clinical social workers and physician assistants who are authorized to practice under State law and who are performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law;

(3) Christian Science Practitioners listed with the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston, Massachusetts. Where an employee or family member is receiving treatment from a Christian Science practitioner, an employee may not object to any requirement from an employing office that the employee or family member submit to examination (though not treatment) to obtain a second or third certification from a health care provider other than a Christian Science practitioner except as otherwise provided under applicable State or local law or collective bargaining agreement;

(4) Any health care provider from whom an employing office or the employing office's group health plan's benefits manager will accept certification of the existence of a serious health condition to substantiate a claim for benefits; and

(5) A health care provider listed above who practices in a country other than the United States, who is authorized to practice in accordance with the law of that country, and who is performing within the scope of his or her practice as defined under such law.

(c) The phrase authorized to practice in the State as used in this section means that the provider must be authorized to diagnose and treat physical or mental health conditions.

825.126 Leave because of a qualifying exigency.

(a) Eligible employees may take FMLA leave for a qualifying exigency while the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent (the military member or member) is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty).

(1) *Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* in the case of a member of the Regular Armed Forces means duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country. The active duty orders of a member of the Regular components of the Armed Forces will generally specify if the member is deployed to a foreign country.

(2) *Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* in the case of a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces means duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a Federal call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation pursuant to: Section 688 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering to active duty retired members of the Regular Armed Forces and members of the retired Reserve who retired after completing at least 20 years of active service; Section 12301(a) of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering all reserve component members to active duty in the case of war or national emergency; Section 12302 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12304 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Selected Reserve and certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12305 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes the suspension of promotion, retirement or separation rules for certain Reserve components; Section 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard into Federal service in certain circumstances; chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard and state military into Federal service in the case of insurrections and national emergencies; or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress so long as it is in support of a contingency operation. See 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(13)(B).

(i) For purposes of covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, the Reserve components of the Armed Forces include the Army National Guard of the United States, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard of the United States, Air Force Reserve and Coast Guard Reserve, and retired members of the Regular Armed Forces or Reserves who are called up in support of a contingency operation pursuant to one of the provisions of law identified in paragraph (a)(2).

(ii) The active duty orders of a member of the Reserve components will generally specify if the military member is serving in support of a contingency operation by citation to the relevant section of Title 10 of the United States Code and/or by reference to the specific name of the contingency operation and will specify that the deployment is to a foreign country.

(3) *Deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country* means deployment to areas outside of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States, including international waters.

(4) A call to covered active duty for purposes of leave taken because of a qualifying exigency refers to a Federal call to active duty. State calls to active duty are not covered unless under order of the President of the United States pursuant to one of the provisions of law identified in paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

(5) *Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age.

(b) An eligible employee may take FMLA leave for one or more of the following qualifying exigencies:

(1) *Short-notice deployment.* (i) To address any issue that arises from the fact that the military member is notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty seven or less calendar days prior to the date of deployment;

(ii) Leave taken for this purpose can be used for a period of seven calendar days beginning on the date the military member is notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty;

(2) *Military events and related activities.* (i) To attend any official ceremony, program, or event sponsored by the military that is related to the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(ii) To attend family support or assistance programs and informational briefings sponsored or promoted by the military, military service organizations, or the American Red Cross that are related to the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(3) *Childcare and school activities.* For the purposes of leave for childcare and school activities listed in (i) through (iv) of this paragraph, a child of the military member must be the military member's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or child for whom the military member stands in loco parentis, who is either under 18 years of age or 18 years of age or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability at the time that FMLA leave is to commence. As with all instances of qualifying exigency leave, the military member must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent of the employee requesting qualifying exigency leave.

(i) To arrange for alternative childcare for a child of the military member when the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member necessitates a change in the existing childcare arrangement;

(ii) To provide childcare for a child of the military member on an urgent, immediate need basis (but not on a routine, regular, or everyday basis) when the need to provide such care arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(iii) To enroll in or transfer to a new school or day care facility a child of the military member when enrollment or transfer is necessitated by the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(iv) To attend meetings with staff at a school or a daycare facility, such as meetings with school officials regarding disciplinary measures, parent-teacher conferences, or meetings with school counselors, for a child of the military member, when such meetings are necessary due to circumstances arising from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(4) *Financial and legal arrangements.* (i) To make or update financial or legal arrangements to address the military member's absence while on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, such as preparing and executing financial and healthcare powers of attorney, transferring bank account signature authority, enrolling in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS), obtaining military identification cards, or preparing or updating a will or living trust; and

(ii) To act as the military member's representative before a federal, state, or local agency for purposes of obtaining, arranging, or appealing military service benefits while the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and for a period of 90 days following the termination of the military member's covered active duty status;

(5) *Counseling.* To attend counseling provided by someone other than a health care provider, for oneself, for the military member, or for the biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, or a legal ward of the military member, or a child for whom the military member stands in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability at the time that FMLA leave is to commence, provided that the need for counseling arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(6) *Rest and Recuperation.* (i) To spend time with the military member who is on short-term, temporary, Rest and Recuperation leave during the period of deployment;

(ii) Leave taken for this purpose can be used for a period of 15 calendar days beginning on the date the military member commences each instance of Rest and Recuperation leave;

(7) *Post-deployment activities.* (i) To attend arrival ceremonies, reintegration briefings and events, and any other official ceremony or program sponsored by the military for a period of 90 days following the termination of the military member's covered active duty status; and

(ii) To address issues that arise from the death of the military member while on covered active duty status, such as meeting and recovering the body of the military member, making funeral arrangements, and attending funeral services;

(8) *Parental care.* For purposes of leave for parental care listed in (i) through (iv) of this paragraph, the parent of the military member must be incapable of self-care and must be the military member's biological, adoptive, step, or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the military member when the member was under 18 years of age. A parent who is incapable of self-care means that the parent requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in three or more of the activities of daily living or instrumental activities of daily living. Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing, and eating. In-

strumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc. As with all instances of qualifying exigency leave, the military member must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent of the employee requesting qualifying exigency leave.

(i) To arrange for alternative care for a parent of the military member when the parent is incapable of self-care and the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member necessitates a change in the existing care arrangement for the parent;

(ii) To provide care for a parent of the military member on an urgent, immediate need basis (but not on a routine, regular, or everyday basis) when the parent is incapable of self-care and the need to provide such care arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(iii) To admit to or transfer to a care facility a parent of the military member when admittance or transfer is necessitated by the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(iv) To attend meetings with staff at a care facility, such as meetings with hospice or social service providers for a parent of the military member, when such meetings are necessary due to circumstances arising from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member but not for routine or regular meetings;

(9) *Additional activities.* To address other events which arise out of the military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status provided that the employing office and employee agree that such leave shall qualify as an exigency, and agree to both the timing and duration of such leave.

825.127 Leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness (military caregiver leave).

(a) Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious illness or injury.

(b) *Covered servicemember* means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in *outpatient status*; or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness. Outpatient status means the status of a member of the Armed Forces assigned to either a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient or a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients.

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation or therapy for a serious injury or illness. *Covered veteran* means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. An eligible employee must commence leave to care for a covered veteran within five years of the veteran's active duty service, but the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e)(1) of this section may extend beyond the five-year period.

(i) For an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of

the National Guard or Reserves) and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable prior to the effective date of this Final Rule, the period between October 28, 2009 and the effective date of this Final Rule shall not count towards the determination of the five-year period for covered veteran status.

(c) A *serious injury or illness* means:

(1) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, means an injury or illness that was incurred by the covered servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces, and that may render the member medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank or rating; and,

(2) In the case of a covered veteran, means an injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces), and manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran, and is:

(i) A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(ii) A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(iii) A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(iv) An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

(d) In order to care for a covered servicemember, an eligible employee must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent, or next of kin of a covered servicemember.

(1) *Son or daughter of a covered servicemember* means the covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age.

(2) *Parent of a covered servicemember* means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law."

(3) *Next of kin of a covered servicemember* means the nearest blood relative, other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions, brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of mili-

tary caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. For example, if a covered servicemember has three siblings and has not designated a blood relative to provide care, all three siblings would be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin. Alternatively, where a covered servicemember has a sibling(s) and designates a cousin as his or her next of kin for FMLA purposes, then only the designated cousin is eligible as the covered servicemember's next of kin. An employing office is permitted to require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the covered servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k).

(e) An eligible employee is entitled to 26 workweeks of leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness during a single 12-month period.

(1) The single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section begins on the first day the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember and ends 12 months after that date, regardless of the method used by the employing office to determine the employee's 12 workweeks of leave entitlement for other FMLA-qualifying reasons. If an eligible employee does not take all of his or her 26 workweeks of leave entitlement to care for a covered servicemember during this single 12-month period, the remaining part of his or her 26 workweeks of leave entitlement to care for the covered servicemember is forfeited.

(2) The leave entitlement described in paragraph (e) of this section is to be applied on a per-covered-servicemember, per-injury basis such that an eligible employee may be entitled to take more than one period of 26 workweeks of leave if the leave is to care for different covered servicemembers or to care for the same servicemember with a subsequent serious injury or illness, except that no more than 26 workweeks of leave may be taken within any single 12-month period. An eligible employee may take more than one period of 26 workweeks of leave to care for a covered servicemember with more than one serious injury or illness only when the serious injury or illness is a subsequent serious injury or illness. When an eligible employee takes leave to care for more than one covered servicemember or for a subsequent serious injury or illness of the same covered servicemember, and the single 12-month periods corresponding to the different military caregiver leave entitlements overlap, the employee is limited to taking no more than 26 workweeks of leave in each single 12-month period.

(3) An eligible employee is entitled to a combined total of 26 workweeks of leave for any FMLA-qualifying reason during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section, provided that the employee is entitled to no more than 12 workweeks of leave for one or more of the following: because of the birth of a son or daughter of the employee and in order to care for such son or daughter; because of the placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care; in order to care for the spouse, son, daughter, or parent

with a serious health condition; because of the employee's own serious health condition; or because of a qualifying exigency. Thus, for example, an eligible employee may, during the single 12-month period, take 16 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember and 10 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a newborn child. However, the employee may not take more than 12 weeks of FMLA leave to care for the newborn child during the single 12-month period, even if the employee takes fewer than 14 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember.

(4) In all circumstances, including for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, the employing office is responsible for designating leave, paid or unpaid, as FMLA-qualifying, and for giving notice of the designation to the employee as provided in 825.300. In the case of leave that qualifies as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section, the employing office must designate such leave as leave to care for a covered servicemember in the first instance. Leave that qualifies as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section must not be designated and counted as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition. As is the case with leave taken for other qualifying reasons, employing offices may retroactively designate leave as leave to care for a covered servicemember pursuant to 825.301(d).

(f) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 26 workweeks of leave during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section if the leave is taken for birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care, or to care for the child after placement, to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition, or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 26 workweeks of FMLA leave.

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 825.200 Amount of Leave.

(a) Except in the case of leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a total of 12 workweeks of leave during any 12-month period for any one, or more, of the following reasons:

(1) The birth of the employee's son or daughter, and to care for the newborn child;

(2) The placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care, and to care for the newly placed child;

(3) To care for the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition;

(4) Because of a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform one or more of the essential functions of his or her job; and

(5) Because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to active duty).

(b) An employing office is permitted to choose any one of the following methods for determining the 12-month period in which the 12 weeks of leave entitlement described in paragraph (a) of this section occurs:

(1) The calendar year;

(2) Any fixed 12-month leave year, such as a fiscal year or a year starting on an employee's anniversary date;

(3) The 12-month period measured forward from the date any employee's first FMLA leave under paragraph (a) begins; or

(4) A "rolling" 12-month period measured backward from the date an employee uses any FMLA leave as described in paragraph (a).

(c) Under methods in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section an employee would be entitled to up to 12 weeks of FMLA leave at any time in the fixed 12-month period selected. An employee could, therefore, take 12 weeks of leave at the end of the year and 12 weeks at the beginning of the following year. Under the method in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, an employee would be entitled to 12 weeks of leave during the year beginning on the first date FMLA leave is taken; the next 12-month period would begin the first time FMLA leave is taken after completion of any previous 12-month period. Under the method in paragraph (b)(4) of this section, the "rolling" 12-month period, each time an employee takes FMLA leave the remaining leave entitlement would be any balance of the 12 weeks which has not been used during the immediately preceding 12 months. For example, if an employee has taken eight weeks of leave during the past 12 months, an additional four weeks of leave could be taken. If an employee used four weeks beginning February 1, 2008, four weeks beginning June 1, 2008, and four weeks beginning December 1, 2008, the employee would not be entitled to any additional leave until February 1, 2009. However, beginning on February 1, 2009, the employee would again be eligible to take FMLA leave, recouping the right to take the leave in the same manner and amounts in which it was used in the previous year. Thus, the employee would recoup (and be entitled to use) one additional day of FMLA leave each day for four weeks, commencing February 1, 2009. The employee would also begin to recoup additional days beginning on June 1, 2009, and additional days beginning on December 1, 2009. Accordingly, employing offices using the rolling 12-month period may need to calculate whether the employee is entitled to take FMLA leave each time that leave is requested, and employees taking FMLA leave on such a basis may fall in and out of FMLA protection based on their FMLA usage in the prior 12 months. For example, in the example above, if the employee needs six weeks of leave for a serious health condition commencing February 1, 2009, only the first four weeks of the leave would be FMLA-protected.

(d)(1) Employing offices will be allowed to choose any one of the alternatives in paragraph (b) of this section for the leave entitlements described in paragraph (a) of this section provided the alternative chosen is applied consistently and uniformly to all em-

ployees. An employing office wishing to change to another alternative is required to give at least 60 days notice to all employees, and the transition must take place in such a way that the employees retain the full benefit of 12 weeks of leave under whichever method affords the greatest benefit to the employee. Under no circumstances may a new method be implemented in order to avoid the CAA's FMLA leave requirements.

(2) [Reserved]

(e) If an employing office fails to select one of the options in paragraph (b) of this section for measuring the 12-month period for the leave entitlements described in paragraph (a), the option that provides the most beneficial outcome for the employee will be used. The employing office may subsequently select an option only by providing the 60-day notice to all employees of the option the employing office intends to implement. During the running of the 60-day period any other employee who needs FMLA leave may use the option providing the most beneficial outcome to that employee. At the conclusion of the 60-day period the employing office may implement the selected option.

(f) An eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a total of 26 workweeks of leave during a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. An employing office shall determine the single 12-month period in which the 26 weeks of leave entitlement described in this paragraph occurs using the 12-month period measured forward from the date an employee's first FMLA leave to care for the covered servicemember begins. See 825.127(e)(1).

(g) During the single 12-month period described in paragraph (f), an eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a combined total of 26 workweeks of FMLA leave for any qualifying reason. See 825.127(e)(3).

(h) For purposes of determining the amount of leave used by an employee, the fact that a holiday may occur within the week taken as FMLA leave has no effect; the week is counted as a week of FMLA leave. However, if an employee is using FMLA leave in increments of less than one week, the holiday will not count against the employee's FMLA entitlement unless the employee was otherwise scheduled and expected to work during the holiday. Similarly, if for some reason the employing office's business activity has temporarily ceased and employees generally are not expected to report for work for one or more weeks (e.g., a school closing two weeks for the Christmas/New Year holiday or the summer vacation or an employing office closing the office for repairs), the days the employing office's activities have ceased do not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Methods for determining an employee's 12-week leave entitlement are also described in 825.205.

(i)(1) If employing offices jointly employ an employee, and if they designate a primary employing office pursuant to 825.106(c), the primary employing office may choose any one of the alternatives in paragraph (b) of this section for measuring the 12-month period, provided that the alternative chosen is applied consistently and uniformly to all employees of the primary employing office including the jointly employed employee.

(2) If employing offices fail to designate a primary employing office pursuant to 825.106(c), an employee jointly employed by the employing offices may, by so notifying one of the employing offices, select that em-

ploying office to be the primary employing office of the employee for purposes of the application of paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section.

825.201 Leave to care for a parent.

(a) *General rule.* An eligible employee is entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. Care for parents-in-law is not covered by the FMLA. See 825.122(c) for definition of parent.

(b) *Same employing office limitation.* Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition, for the birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after the birth, or for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care or to care for the child after placement. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where the spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a parent, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition. See also 825.127(d).

825.202 Intermittent leave or reduced leave schedule.

(a) *Definition.* FMLA leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule under certain circumstances. *Intermittent leave* is FMLA leave taken in separate blocks of time due to a single qualifying reason. A *reduced leave schedule* is a leave schedule that reduces an employee's usual number of working hours per workweek, or hours per workday. A reduced leave schedule is a change in the employee's schedule for a period of time, normally from full-time to part-time.

(b) *Medical necessity.* For intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule taken because of one's own serious health condition, to care for a spouse, parent, son, or daughter with a serious health condition, or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, there must be a medical need for leave and it must be that such medical need can be best accommodated through an intermittent or reduced leave schedule. The treatment regimen and other information described in the certification of a serious health condition and in the certification of a serious injury or illness, if required by the employing office, addresses the medical necessity of intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule. See 825.306, 825.310. Leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule when medically necessary for planned and/or unanticipated medical treatment of a serious health condition or of a covered servicemember's serious injury or illness, or for recovery from treatment or recovery from a serious health condition or a covered

servicemember's serious injury or illness. It may also be taken to provide care or psychological comfort to a covered family member with a serious health condition or a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness.

(1) Intermittent leave may be taken for a serious health condition of a spouse, parent, son, or daughter, for the employee's own serious health condition, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember which requires treatment by a health care provider periodically, rather than for one continuous period of time, and may include leave of periods from an hour or more to several weeks. Examples of intermittent leave would include leave taken on an occasional basis for medical appointments, or leave taken several days at a time spread over a period of six months, such as for chemotherapy. A pregnant employee may take leave intermittently for prenatal examinations or for her own condition, such as for periods of severe morning sickness. An example of an employee taking leave on a reduced leave schedule is an employee who is recovering from a serious health condition and is not strong enough to work a full-time schedule.

(2) Intermittent or reduced schedule leave may be taken for absences where the employee or family member is incapacitated or unable to perform the essential functions of the position because of a chronic serious health condition or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, even if he or she does not receive treatment by a health care provider. *See* 825.113 and 825.127.

(c) *Birth or placement.* When leave is taken after the birth of a healthy child or placement of a healthy child for adoption or foster care, an employee may take leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule only if the employing office agrees. Such a schedule reduction might occur, for example, where an employee, with the employing office's agreement, works part-time after the birth of a child, or takes leave in several segments. The employing office's agreement is not required, however, for leave during which the expectant mother has a serious health condition in connection with the birth of her child or if the newborn child has a serious health condition. *See* 825.204 for rules governing transfer to an alternative position that better accommodates intermittent leave. *See also* 825.120 (pregnancy) and 825.121 (adoption and foster care).

(d) *Qualifying exigency.* Leave due to a qualifying exigency may be taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis.

825.203 Scheduling of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

Eligible employees may take FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis when medically necessary due to the serious health condition of a covered family member or the employee or the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember. *See* 825.202. Eligible employees may also take FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis when necessary because of a qualifying exigency. If an employee needs leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule for planned medical treatment, then the employee must make a reasonable effort to schedule the treatment so as not to disrupt unduly the employing office's operations.

825.204 Transfer of an employee to an alternative position during intermittent leave or reduced schedule leave.

(a) *Transfer or reassignment.* If an employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule that is foreseeable

based on planned medical treatment for the employee, a family member, or a covered servicemember, including during a period of recovery from one's own serious health condition, a serious health condition of a spouse, parent, son, or daughter, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or if the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the birth of a child or for placement of a child for adoption or foster care, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. *See* 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

(b) *Compliance.* Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and Federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced scheduled leave.

(c) *Equivalent pay and benefits.* The alternative position must have equivalent pay and benefits. An alternative position for these purposes does not have to have equivalent duties. The employing office may increase the pay and benefits of an existing alternative position, so as to make them equivalent to the pay and benefits of the employee's regular job. The employing office may also transfer the employee to a part-time job with the same hourly rate of pay and benefits, provided the employee is not required to take more leave than is medically necessary. For example, an employee desiring to take leave in increments of four hours per day could be transferred to a half-time job, or could remain in the employee's same job on a part-time schedule, paying the same hourly rate as the employee's previous job and enjoying the same benefits. The employing office may not eliminate benefits which otherwise would not be provided to part-time employees; however, an employing office may proportionately reduce benefits such as vacation leave where an employing office's normal practice is to base such benefits on the number of hours worked.

(d) *Employing office limitations.* An employing office may not transfer the employee to an alternative position in order to discourage the employee from taking leave or otherwise work a hardship on the employee. For example, a white collar employee may not be assigned to perform laborer's work; an employee working the day shift may not be reassigned to the graveyard shift; an employee working in the headquarters facility may not be reassigned to a branch a significant distance away from the employee's normal job location. Any such attempt on the part of the employing office to make such a transfer will be held to be contrary to the prohibited acts provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(e) *Reinstatement of employee.* When an employee who is taking leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule and has been transferred to an alternative position no longer needs to continue on leave and is able to return to full-time work, the employee must be placed in the same or equivalent job as the job he or she left when the leave commenced. An employee may not be required to take more leave than necessary to address the circumstance that precipitated the need for leave.

825.205 Increments of FMLA leave for intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

(a) *Minimum increment.* (1) When an employee takes FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis, the employing office must account for the leave using an increment no greater than the shortest period of time that the employing office uses to account for use of other forms of leave provided that it is not greater than one hour and provided further that an employee's FMLA leave entitlement may not be reduced by more than the amount of leave actually taken. An employing office may not require an employee to take more leave than is necessary to address the circumstances that precipitated the need for the leave, provided that the leave is counted using the shortest increment of leave used to account for any other type of leave. *See also* 825.205(a)(2) for the physical impossibility exception, and 825.600 and 825.601 for special rules applicable to employees of schools. If an employing office uses different increments to account for different types of leave, the employing office must account for FMLA leave in the smallest increment used to account for any other type of leave. For example, if an employing office accounts for the use of annual leave in increments of one hour and the use of sick leave in increments of one-half hour, then FMLA leave use must be accounted for using increments no larger than one-half hour. If an employing office accounts for use of leave in varying increments at different times of the day or shift, the employing office may also account for FMLA leave in varying increments, provided that the increment used for FMLA leave is no greater than the smallest increment used for any other type of leave during the period in which the FMLA leave is taken. If an employing office accounts for other forms of leave use in increments greater than one hour, the employing office must account for FMLA leave use in increments no greater than one hour. An employing office may account for FMLA leave in shorter increments than used for other forms of leave. For example, an employing office that accounts for other forms of leave in one hour increments may account for FMLA leave in a shorter increment when the employee arrives at work several minutes late, and the employing office wants the employee to begin work immediately. Such accounting for FMLA leave will not alter the increment considered to be the shortest period used to account for other forms of leave or the use of FMLA leave in other circumstances. In all cases, employees may not be charged FMLA leave for periods during which they are working.

(2) Where it is physically impossible for an employee using intermittent leave or working a reduced leave schedule to commence or end work mid-way through a shift, such as where a flight attendant or a railroad conductor is scheduled to work aboard an airplane or train, or a laboratory employee is unable to enter or leave a sealed "clean room" during a certain period of time and no equivalent position is available, the entire period that the employee is forced to be absent is designated as FMLA leave and counts against the employee's FMLA entitlement. The period of the physical impossibility is limited to the period during which the employing office is unable to permit the employee to work prior to a period of FMLA leave or return the employee to the same or equivalent position due to the physical impossibility after a period of FMLA leave. *See* 825.214.

(b) *Calculation of leave.* (1) When an employee takes leave on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule, only the amount of

leave actually taken may be counted toward the employee's leave entitlement. The actual workweek is the basis of leave entitlement. Therefore, if an employee who would otherwise work 40 hours a week takes off eight hours, the employee would use one-fifth ($\frac{1}{5}$) of a week of FMLA leave. Similarly, if a full-time employee who would otherwise work eight hour days works four-hour days under a reduced leave schedule, the employee would use one half ($\frac{1}{2}$) week of FMLA leave each week. Where an employee works a part-time schedule or variable hours, the amount of FMLA leave that an employee uses is determined on a pro rata or proportional basis. If an employee who would otherwise work 30 hours per week, but works only 20 hours a week under a reduced leave schedule, the employee's 10 hours of leave would constitute one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$) of a week of FMLA leave for each week the employee works the reduced leave schedule. An employing office may convert these fractions to their hourly equivalent so long as the conversion equitably reflects the employee's total normally scheduled hours. An employee does not accrue FMLA-protected leave at any particular hourly rate. An eligible employee is entitled to up to a total of 12 workweeks of leave, or 26 workweeks in the case of military caregiver leave, and the total number of hours contained in those workweeks is necessarily dependent on the specific hours the employee would have worked but for the use of leave. See also 825.601 and 825.602 on special rules for schools.

(2) If an employing office has made a permanent or long-term change in the employee's schedule (for reasons other than FMLA, and prior to the notice of need for FMLA leave), the hours worked under the new schedule are to be used for making this calculation.

(3) If an employee's schedule varies from week to week to such an extent that an employing office is unable to determine with any certainty how many hours the employee would otherwise have worked (but for the taking of FMLA leave), a weekly average of the hours worked over the 12 months prior to the beginning of the leave period (including any hours for which the employee took leave of any type) would be used for calculating the employee's leave entitlement.

(c) *Overtime.* If an employee would normally be required to work overtime, but is unable to do so because of a FMLA-qualifying reason that limits the employee's ability to work overtime, the hours which the employee would have been required to work may be counted against the employee's FMLA entitlement. In such a case, the employee is using intermittent or reduced schedule leave. For example, if an employee would normally be required to work for 48 hours in a particular week, but due to a serious health condition the employee is unable to work more than 40 hours that week, the employee would utilize eight hours of FMLA-protected leave out of the 48-hour workweek, or one-sixth ($\frac{1}{6}$) of a week of FMLA leave. Voluntary overtime hours that an employee does not work due to an FMLA-qualifying reason may not be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

(a) Leave taken under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, may be unpaid. If an employee is otherwise exempt from minimum wage and overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), as made applicable by the CAA, as a salaried executive, administrative, or professional

employee (under regulations issued by the Board, at part 541), providing unpaid FMLA-qualifying leave to such an employee will not cause the employee to lose the FLSA exemption. This means that under regulations currently in effect, where an employee meets the specified duties test, is paid on a salary basis, and is paid a salary of at least the amount specified in the regulations, the employing office may make deductions from the employee's salary for any hours taken as intermittent or reduced FMLA leave within a workweek, without affecting the exempt status of the employee. The fact that an employing office provides FMLA leave, whether paid or unpaid, and maintains records regarding FMLA leave, will not be relevant to the determination whether an employee is exempt within the meaning of the Board's regulations at part 541.

(b) For an employee paid in accordance with a fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime, where permitted by section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), the employing office, during the period in which intermittent or reduced schedule FMLA leave is scheduled to be taken, may compensate an employee on an hourly basis and pay only for the hours the employee works, including time and one-half the employee's regular rate for overtime hours. The change to payment on an hourly basis would include the entire period during which the employee is taking intermittent leave, including weeks in which no leave is taken. The hourly rate shall be determined by dividing the employee's weekly salary by the employee's normal or average schedule of hours worked during weeks in which FMLA leave is not being taken. If an employing office chooses to follow this exception from the fluctuating workweek method of payment, the employing office must do so uniformly, with respect to all employees paid on a fluctuating workweek basis for whom FMLA leave is taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis. If an employing office does not elect to convert the employee's compensation to hourly pay, no deduction may be taken for FMLA leave absences. Once the need for intermittent or reduced schedule leave is over, the employee may be restored to payment on a fluctuating workweek basis.

(c) This special exception to the salary basis requirements of the FLSA exemption or fluctuating workweek payment requirements applies only to employees of covered employing offices who are eligible for FMLA leave, and to leave which qualifies as FMLA leave. Hourly or other deductions which are not in accordance with the Board's FLSA regulations at part 541 or with a permissible fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime may not be taken, for example, where the employee has not worked long enough to be eligible for FMLA leave without potentially affecting the employee's eligibility for exemption. Nor may deductions which are not permitted by the Board's FLSA regulations at part 541 or by a permissible fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime be taken from such an employee's salary for any leave which does not qualify as FMLA leave, for example, deductions from an employee's pay for leave required under an employing office's policy or practice for a reason which does not qualify as FMLA leave, e.g., leave to care for a grandparent or for a medical condition which does not qualify as a serious health condition; or for leave which is more generous than provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, such as leave in excess of 12 weeks in a year. Employing offices may

comply with the employing office's own policy/practice under these circumstances and maintain the employee's eligibility for exemption or for the fluctuating workweek method of pay by not taking hourly deductions from the employee's pay, in accordance with FLSA requirements, as made applicable by the CAA, or may take such deductions, treating the employee as an hourly employee and pay overtime premium pay for hours worked over 40 in a workweek.

825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

(a) Generally, FMLA leave is unpaid. However, under the circumstances described in this section, FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an eligible employee to choose to substitute accrued paid leave for FMLA leave. If an employee does not choose to substitute accrued paid leave, the employing office may require the employee to substitute accrued paid leave for unpaid FMLA leave. The term substitute means that the paid leave provided by the employing office, and accrued pursuant to established policies of the employing office, will run concurrently with the unpaid FMLA leave. Accordingly, the employee receives pay pursuant to the employing office's applicable paid leave policy during the period of otherwise unpaid FMLA leave. An employee's ability to substitute accrued paid leave is determined by the terms and conditions of the employing office's normal leave policy. When an employee chooses, or an employing office requires, substitution of accrued paid leave, the employing office must inform the employee that the employee must satisfy any procedural requirements of the paid leave policy only in connection with the receipt of such payment. See 825.300(c). If an employee does not comply with the additional requirements in an employing office's paid leave policy, the employee is not entitled to substitute accrued paid leave, but the employee remains entitled to take unpaid FMLA leave. Employing offices may not discriminate against employees on FMLA leave in the administration of their paid leave policies.

(b) If neither the employee nor the employing office elects to substitute paid leave for unpaid FMLA leave under the above conditions and circumstances, the employee will remain entitled to all the paid leave which is earned or accrued under the terms of the employing office's plan.

(c) If an employee uses paid leave under circumstances which do not qualify as FMLA leave, the leave will not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. For example, paid sick leave used for a medical condition which is not a serious health condition or serious injury or illness does not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

(d) Leave taken pursuant to a disability leave plan would be considered FMLA leave for a serious health condition and counted in the leave entitlement permitted under FMLA if it meets the criteria set forth above in 825.112 through 825.115. In such cases, the employing office may designate the leave as FMLA leave and count the leave against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Because leave pursuant to a disability benefit plan is not unpaid, the provision for substitution of the employee's accrued paid leave is inapplicable, and neither the employee nor the employing office may require the substitution of paid leave. However, employing offices and employees may agree to have paid leave supplement the disability plan benefits, such as in the case where a plan only provides replacement income for two-thirds of an employee's salary.

(e) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, provides that a serious health condition may result from injury to the employee on or off the job. If the employing office designates the leave as FMLA leave in accordance with 825.300(d), the leave counts against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Because the workers' compensation absence is not unpaid, the provision for substitution of the employee's accrued paid leave is not applicable, and neither the employee nor the employing office may require the substitution of paid leave. However, employing offices and employees may agree, to have paid leave supplement workers' compensation benefits, such as in the case where workers' compensation only provides replacement income for two-thirds of an employee's salary. If the health care provider treating the employee for the workers' compensation injury certifies the employee is able to return to a light duty job but is unable to return to the same or equivalent job, the employee may decline the employing office's offer of a light duty job. As a result, the employee may lose workers' compensation payments, but is entitled to remain on unpaid FMLA leave until the employee's FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted. As of the date workers' compensation benefits cease, the substitution provision becomes applicable and either the employee may elect or the employing office may require the use of accrued paid leave. See also 825.210(f), 825.216(d), 825.220(d), 825.307(a) and 825.702 (d)(1) and (2) regarding the relationship between workers' compensation absences and FMLA leave.

(f) Under the FLISA, as made applicable by the CAA, an employing office always has the right to cash out an employee's compensatory time or to require the employee to use the time. Therefore, if an employee requests and is permitted to use accrued compensatory time to receive pay for time taken off for an FMLA reason, or if the employing office requires such use pursuant to the FLISA, the time taken may be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

825.208 [Removed and reserved]

825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

(a) During any FMLA leave, an employing office must maintain the employee's coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program or any group health plan (as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 at 26 U.S.C. 5000(b)(1)) on the same conditions as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the entire leave period. All employing offices are subject to the requirements of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to maintain health coverage. The definition of group health plan is set forth in 825.102. For purposes of FMLA, the term group health plan shall not include an insurance program providing health coverage under which employees purchase individual policies from insurers provided that:

(1) No contributions are made by the employing office;

(2) Participation in the program is completely voluntary for employees;

(3) The sole functions of the employing office with respect to the program are, without endorsing the program, to permit the insurer to publicize the program to employees, to collect premiums through payroll deductions and to remit them to the insurer;

(4) The employing office receives no consideration in the form of cash or otherwise in connection with the program, other than reasonable compensation, excluding any profit, for administrative services actually

rendered in connection with payroll deduction; and

(5) The premium charged with respect to such coverage does not increase in the event the employment relationship terminates.

(b) The same group health plan benefits provided to an employee prior to taking FMLA leave must be maintained during the FMLA leave. For example, if family member coverage is provided to an employee, family member coverage must be maintained during the FMLA leave. Similarly, benefit coverage during FMLA leave for medical care, surgical care, hospital care, dental care, eye care, mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment, etc., must be maintained during leave if provided in an employing office's group health plan, including a supplement to a group health plan, whether or not provided through a flexible spending account or other component of a cafeteria plan.

(c) If an employing office provides a new health plan or benefits or changes health benefits or plans while an employee is on FMLA leave, the employee is entitled to the new or changed plan/benefits to the same extent as if the employee were not on leave. For example, if an employing office changes a group health plan so that dental care becomes covered under the plan, an employee on FMLA leave must be given the same opportunity as other employees to receive (or obtain) the dental care coverage. Any other plan changes (e.g., in coverage, premiums, deductibles, etc.) which apply to all employees of the workforce would also apply to an employee on FMLA leave.

(d) Notice of any opportunity to change plans or benefits must also be given to an employee on FMLA leave. If the group health plan permits an employee to change from single to family coverage upon the birth of a child or otherwise add new family members, such a change in benefits must be made available while an employee is on FMLA leave. If the employee requests the changed coverage it must be provided by the employing office.

(e) An employee may choose not to retain group health plan coverage during FMLA leave. However, when an employee returns from leave, the employee is entitled to be reinstated on the same terms as prior to taking the leave, including family or dependent coverages, without any qualifying period, physical examination, exclusion of pre-existing conditions, etc. See 825.212(c).

(f) Except as required by the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (COBRA) or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable, and for key employees (as discussed below), an employing office's obligation to maintain health benefits during leave (and to restore the employee to the same or equivalent employment) under FMLA ceases if and when the employment relationship would have terminated if the employee had not taken FMLA leave (e.g., if the employee's position is eliminated as part of a non-discriminatory reduction in force and the employee would not have been transferred to another position); an employee informs the employing office of his or her intent not to return from leave (including before starting the leave if the employing office is so informed before the leave starts); or the employee fails to return from leave or continues on leave after exhausting his or her FMLA leave entitlement in the 12-month period.

(g) If a key employee (see 825.218) does not return from leave when notified by the employing office that substantial or grievous economic injury will result from his or her

reinstatement, the employee's entitlement to group health plan benefits continues unless and until the employee advises the employing office that the employee does not desire restoration to employment at the end of the leave period, or the FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted, or reinstatement is actually denied.

(h) An employee's entitlement to benefits other than group health benefits during a period of FMLA leave (e.g., holiday pay) is to be determined by the employing office's established policy for providing such benefits when the employee is on other forms of leave (paid or unpaid, as appropriate).

825.210 Employee payment of group health benefit premiums.

(a) Group health plan benefits must be maintained on the same basis as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the FMLA leave period. Therefore, any share of group health plan premiums which had been paid by the employee prior to FMLA leave must continue to be paid by the employee during the FMLA leave period. If premiums are raised or lowered, the employee would be required to pay the new premium rates. Maintenance of health insurance policies which are not a part of the employing office's group health plan, as described in 825.209(a), are the sole responsibility of the employee. The employee and the insurer should make necessary arrangements for payment of premiums during periods of unpaid FMLA leave.

(b) If the FMLA leave is substituted paid leave, the employee's share of premiums must be paid by the method normally used during any paid leave, presumably as a payroll deduction.

(c) If FMLA leave is unpaid, the employing office has a number of options for obtaining payment from the employee. The employing office may require that payment be made to the employing office or to the insurance carrier, but no additional charge may be added to the employee's premium payment for administrative expenses. The employing office may require employees to pay their share of premium payments in any of the following ways:

(1) Payment would be due at the same time as it would be made if by payroll deduction;

(2) Payment would be due on the same schedule as payments are made under COBRA or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable;

(3) Payment would be prepaid pursuant to a cafeteria plan at the employee's option;

(4) The employing office's existing rules for payment by employees on leave without pay would be followed, provided that such rules do not require prepayment (i.e., prior to the commencement of the leave) of the premiums that will become due during a period of unpaid FMLA leave or payment of higher premiums than if the employee had continued to work instead of taking leave; or

(5) Another system voluntarily agreed to between the employing office and the employee, which may include prepayment of premiums (e.g., through increased payroll deductions when the need for the FMLA leave is foreseeable).

(d) The employing office must provide the employee with advance written notice of the terms and conditions under which these payments must be made. See 825.300(c).

(e) An employing office may not require more of an employee using unpaid FMLA leave than the employing office requires of other employees on leave without pay.

(f) An employee who is receiving payments as a result of a workers' compensation injury

must make arrangements with the employing office for payment of group health plan benefits when simultaneously taking FMLA leave. See 825.207(e).

825.211 Maintenance of benefits under multi-employer health plans.

(a) A multi-employer health plan is a plan to which more than one employing office is required to contribute, and which is maintained pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements between employee organization(s) and the employing offices.

(b) An employing office under a multi-employer plan must continue to make contributions on behalf of an employee using FMLA leave as though the employee had been continuously employed, unless the plan contains an explicit FMLA provision for maintaining coverage such as through pooled contributions by all employing offices party to the plan.

(c) During the duration of an employee's FMLA leave, coverage by the group health plan, and benefits provided pursuant to the plan, must be maintained at the level of coverage and benefits which were applicable to the employee at the time FMLA leave commenced.

(d) An employee using FMLA leave cannot be required to use banked hours or pay a greater premium than the employee would have been required to pay if the employee had been continuously employed.

(e) As provided in 825.209(f) of this part, group health plan coverage must be maintained for an employee on FMLA leave until:

(1) The employee's FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted;

(2) The employing office can show that the employee would have been laid off and the employment relationship terminated; or

(3) The employee provides unequivocal notice of intent not to return to work.

825.212 Employee failure to pay health plan premium payments.

(a)(1) In the absence of an established employing office policy providing a longer grace period, an employing office's obligations to maintain health insurance coverage cease under FMLA if an employee's premium payment is more than 30 days late. In order to drop the coverage for an employee whose premium payment is late, the employing office must provide written notice to the employee that the payment has not been received. Such notice must be mailed to the employee at least 15 days before coverage is to cease, advising that coverage will be dropped on a specified date at least 15 days after the date of the letter unless the payment has been received by that date. If the employing office has established policies regarding other forms of unpaid leave that provide for the employing office to cease coverage retroactively to the date the unpaid premium payment was due, the employing office may drop the employee from coverage retroactively in accordance with that policy, provided the 15-day notice was given. In the absence of such a policy, coverage for the employee may be terminated at the end of the 30-day grace period, where the required 15-day notice has been provided.

(2) An employing office has no obligation regarding the maintenance of a health insurance policy which is not a group health plan. See 825.209(a).

(3) All other obligations of an employing office under FMLA would continue; for example, the employing office continues to have an obligation to reinstate an employee upon return from leave.

(b) The employing office may recover the employee's share of any premium payments

missed by the employee for any FMLA leave period during which the employing office maintains health coverage by paying the employee's share after the premium payment is missed.

(c) If coverage lapses because an employee has not made required premium payments, upon the employee's return from FMLA leave the employing office must still restore the employee to coverage/benefits equivalent to those the employee would have had if leave had not been taken and the premium payment(s) had not been missed, including family or dependent coverage. See 825.215(d)(1)-(5). In such case, an employee may not be required to meet any qualification requirements imposed by the plan, including any new preexisting condition waiting period, to wait for an open season, or to pass a medical examination to obtain reinstatement of coverage. If an employing office terminates an employee's insurance in accordance with this section and fails to restore the employee's health insurance as required by this section upon the employee's return, the employing office may be liable for benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable relief tailored to the harm suffered.

825.213 Employing office recovery of benefit costs.

(a) In addition to the circumstances discussed in 825.212(b), an employing office may recover its share of health plan premiums during a period of unpaid FMLA leave from an employee if the employee fails to return to work after the employee's FMLA leave entitlement has been exhausted or expires, unless the reason the employee does not return is due to:

(1) The continuation, recurrence, or onset of either a serious health condition of the employee or the employee's family member, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, which would otherwise entitle the employee to leave under FMLA; or

(2) Other circumstances beyond the employee's control. Examples of other circumstances beyond the employee's control are necessarily broad. They include such situations as where a parent chooses to stay home with a newborn child who has a serious health condition; an employee's spouse is unexpectedly transferred to a job location more than 75 miles from the employee's worksite; a relative or individual other than a covered family member has a serious health condition and the employee is needed to provide care; the employee is laid off while on leave; or, the employee is a key employee who decides not to return to work upon being notified of the employing office's intention to deny restoration because of substantial and grievous economic injury to the employing office's operations and is not reinstated by the employing office. Other circumstances beyond the employee's control would not include a situation where an employee desires to remain with a parent in a distant city even though the parent no longer requires the employee's care, or a parent chooses not to return to work to stay home with a well, newborn child.

(3) When an employee fails to return to work because of the continuation, recurrence, or onset of either a serious health condition of the employee or employee's family member, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, thereby precluding the employing office from recovering its (share of) health benefit premium payments made on the employee's behalf during a pe-

riod of unpaid FMLA leave, the employing office may require medical certification of the employee's or the family member's serious health condition or the covered servicemember's serious injury or illness. Such certification is not required unless requested by the employing office. The cost of the certification shall be borne by the employee, and the employee is not entitled to be paid for the time or travel costs spent in acquiring the certification. The employee is required to provide medical certification in a timely manner which, for purposes of this section, is within 30 days from the date of the employing office's request. For purposes of medical certification, the employee may use the optional forms developed for this purpose. See 825.306(b), 825.310(c)-(d) and Forms A, B, and F. If the employing office requests medical certification and the employee does not provide such certification in a timely manner (within 30 days), or the reason for not returning to work does not meet the test of other circumstances beyond the employee's control, the employing office may recover 100 percent of the health benefit premiums it paid during the period of unpaid FMLA leave.

(b) Under some circumstances an employing office may elect to maintain other benefits, *e.g.*, life insurance, disability insurance, *etc.*, by paying the employee's (share of) premiums during periods of unpaid FMLA leave. For example, to ensure the employing office can meet its responsibilities to provide equivalent benefits to the employee upon return from unpaid FMLA leave, it may be necessary that premiums be paid continuously to avoid a lapse of coverage. If the employing office elects to maintain such benefits during the leave, at the conclusion of leave, the employing office is entitled to recover only the costs incurred for paying the employee's share of any premiums whether or not the employee returns to work.

(c) An employee who returns to work for at least 30 calendar days is considered to have returned to work. An employee who transfers directly from taking FMLA leave to retirement, or who retires during the first 30 days after the employee returns to work, is deemed to have returned to work.

(d) When an employee elects or an employing office requires paid leave to be substituted for FMLA leave, the employing office may not recover its (share of) health insurance or other non-health benefit premiums for any period of FMLA leave covered by paid leave. Because paid leave provided under a plan covering temporary disabilities (including workers' compensation) is not unpaid, recovery of health insurance premiums does not apply to such paid leave.

(e) The amount that self-insured employing offices may recover is limited to only the employing office's share of allowable premiums as would be calculated under COBRA, excluding the two percent fee for administrative costs.

(f) When an employee fails to return to work, any health and non-health benefit premiums which this section of the regulations permits an employing office to recover are a debt owed by the non-returning employee to the employing office. The existence of this debt caused by the employee's failure to return to work does not alter the employing office's responsibilities for health benefit coverage and, under a self-insurance plan, payment of claims incurred during the period of FMLA leave. To the extent recovery is allowed, the employing office may recover the costs through deduction from any sums due to the employee (*e.g.*, unpaid wages, vacation pay, *etc.*), provided such deductions do

not otherwise violate applicable wage payment or other laws. Alternatively, the employing office may initiate legal action against the employee to recover such costs.

825.214 Employee right to reinstatement.

General Rule. On return from FMLA leave, an employee is entitled to be returned to the same position the employee held when leave commenced, or to an equivalent position with equivalent benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. An employee is entitled to such reinstatement even if the employee has been replaced or his or her position has been restructured to accommodate the employee's absence. *See also* 825.106(e) for the obligations of employing offices that are joint employers.

825.215 Equivalent position.

(a) *Equivalent position.* An equivalent position is one that is virtually identical to the employee's former position in terms of pay, benefits and working conditions, including privileges, prerequisites and status. It must involve the same or substantially similar duties and responsibilities, which must entail substantially equivalent skill, effort, responsibility, and authority.

(b) *Conditions to qualify.* If an employee is no longer qualified for the position because of the employee's inability to attend a necessary course, renew a license, *etc.*, as a result of the leave, the employee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to fulfill those conditions upon return to work.

(c) *Equivalent Pay.* (1) An employee is entitled to any unconditional pay increases which may have occurred during the FMLA leave period, such as cost of living increases. Pay increases conditioned upon seniority, length of service, or work performed must be granted in accordance with the employing office's policy or practice with respect to other employees on an equivalent leave status for a reason that does not qualify as FMLA leave. An employee is entitled to be restored to a position with the same or equivalent pay premiums, such as a shift differential. If an employee departed from a position averaging ten hours of overtime (and corresponding overtime pay) each week, an employee is ordinarily entitled to such a position on return from FMLA leave.

(2) Equivalent pay includes any bonus or payment, whether it is discretionary or non-discretionary, made to employees consistent with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section. However, if a bonus or other payment is based on the achievement of a specified goal such as hours worked, products sold or perfect attendance, and the employee has not met the goal due to FMLA leave, then the payment may be denied, unless otherwise paid to employees on an equivalent leave status for a reason that does not qualify as FMLA leave. For example, if an employee who used paid vacation leave for a non-FMLA purpose would receive the payment, then the employee who used paid vacation leave for an FMLA-protected purpose also must receive the payment.

(d) *Equivalent benefits.* Benefits include all benefits provided or made available to employees by an employing office, including group life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, sick leave, annual leave, educational benefits, and pensions, regardless of whether such benefits are provided by a practice or written policy of an employing office through an employee benefit plan.

(1) At the end of an employee's FMLA leave, benefits must be resumed in the same manner and at the same levels as provided when the leave began, and subject to any

changes in benefit levels that may have taken place during the period of FMLA leave affecting the entire work force, unless otherwise elected by the employee. Upon return from FMLA leave, an employee cannot be required to requalify for any benefits the employee enjoyed before FMLA leave began (including family or dependent coverages). For example, if an employee was covered by a life insurance policy before taking leave but is not covered or coverage lapses during the period of unpaid FMLA leave, the employee cannot be required to meet any qualifications, such as taking a physical examination, in order to requalify for life insurance upon return from leave. Accordingly, some employing offices may find it necessary to modify life insurance and other benefits programs in order to restore employees to equivalent benefits upon return from FMLA leave, make arrangements for continued payment of costs to maintain such benefits during unpaid FMLA leave, or pay these costs subject to recovery from the employee on return from leave. *See* 825.213(b).

(2) An employee may, but is not entitled to, accrue any additional benefits or seniority during unpaid FMLA leave. Benefits accrued at the time leave began, however, (*e.g.*, paid vacation, sick or personal leave to the extent not substituted for FMLA leave) must be available to an employee upon return from leave.

(3) If, while on unpaid FMLA leave, an employee desires to continue life insurance, disability insurance, or other types of benefits for which he or she typically pays, the employing office is required to follow established policies or practices for continuing such benefits for other instances of leave without pay. If the employing office has no established policy, the employee and the employing office are encouraged to agree upon arrangements before FMLA leave begins.

(4) With respect to pension and other retirement plans, any period of unpaid FMLA leave shall not be treated as or counted toward a break in service for purposes of vesting and eligibility to participate. Also, if the plan requires an employee to be employed on a specific date in order to be credited with a year of service for vesting, contributions or participation purposes, an employee on unpaid FMLA leave on that date shall be deemed to have been employed on that date. However, unpaid FMLA leave periods need not be treated as credited service for purposes of benefit accrual, vesting and eligibility to participate.

(5) Employees on unpaid FMLA leave are to be treated as if they continued to work for purposes of changes to benefit plans. They are entitled to changes in benefits plans, except those which may be dependent upon seniority or accrual during the leave period, immediately upon return from leave or to the same extent they would have qualified if no leave had been taken. For example if the benefit plan is predicated on a pre-established number of hours worked each year and the employee does not have sufficient hours as a result of taking unpaid FMLA leave, the benefit is lost. (In this regard, 825.209 addresses health benefits.)

(e) *Equivalent terms and conditions of employment.* An equivalent position must have substantially similar duties, conditions, responsibilities, privileges and status as the employee's original position.

(1) The employee must be reinstated to the same or a geographically proximate worksite (*i.e.*, one that does not involve a significant increase in commuting time or distance) from where the employee had previously

been employed. If the employee's original worksite has been closed, the employee is entitled to the same rights as if the employee had not been on leave when the worksite closed. For example, if an employing office transfers all employees from a closed worksite to a new worksite in a different city, the employee on leave is also entitled to transfer under the same conditions as if he or she had continued to be employed.

(2) The employee is ordinarily entitled to return to the same shift or the same or an equivalent work schedule.

(3) The employee must have the same or an equivalent opportunity for bonuses, and other similar discretionary and non-discretionary payments.

(4) FMLA does not prohibit an employing office from accommodating an employee's request to be restored to a different shift, schedule, or position which better suits the employee's personal needs on return from leave, or to offer a promotion to a better position. However, an employee cannot be induced by the employing office to accept a different position against the employee's wishes.

(f) *De minimis exception.* The requirement that an employee be restored to the same or equivalent job with the same or equivalent pay, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment does not extend to de minimis, intangible, or unmeasurable aspects of the job.

825.216 Limitations on an employee's right to reinstatement.

(a) An employee has no greater right to reinstatement or to other benefits and conditions of employment than if the employee had been continuously employed during the FMLA leave period. An employing office must be able to show that an employee would not otherwise have been employed at the time reinstatement is requested in order to deny restoration to employment. For example:

(1) If an employee is laid off during the course of taking FMLA leave and employment is terminated, the employing office's responsibility to continue FMLA leave, maintain group health plan benefits and restore the employee ceases at the time the employee is laid off, provided the employing office has no continuing obligations under a collective bargaining agreement or otherwise. An employing office would have the burden of proving that an employee would have been laid off during the FMLA leave period and, therefore, would not be entitled to restoration. Restoration to a job slated for lay-off when the employee's original position is not would not meet the requirements of an equivalent position.

(2) If a shift has been eliminated, or overtime has been decreased, an employee would not be entitled to return to work that shift or the original overtime hours upon restoration. However, if a position on, for example, a night shift has been filled by another employee, the employee is entitled to return to the same shift on which employed before taking FMLA leave.

(3) If an employee was hired for a specific term or only to perform work on a discrete project, the employing office has no obligation to restore the employee if the employment term or project is over and the employing office would not otherwise have continued to employ the employee. On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work for one employing office for a specific time period, and after that time period has ended, the work was assigned to another employing office, the successor employing office may be required to restore the employee

if it is a successor employing office. See 825.107.

(b) In addition to the circumstances explained above, an employing office may deny job restoration to salaried eligible employees (key employees, as defined in 825.217(c)), if such denial is necessary to prevent substantial and grievous economic injury to the operations of the employing office; or may delay restoration to an employee who fails to provide a fitness-for-duty certificate to return to work under the conditions described in 825.312.

(c) If the employee is unable to perform an essential function of the position because of a physical or mental condition, including the continuation of a serious health condition or an injury or illness also covered by workers' compensation, the employee has no right to restoration to another position under the FMLA. The employing office's obligations may, however, be governed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and as made applicable by the CAA. See 825.702.

(d) An employee who fraudulently obtains FMLA leave from an employing office is not protected by the job restoration or maintenance of health benefits provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(e) If the employing office has a uniformly-applied policy governing outside or supplemental employment, such a policy may continue to apply to an employee while on FMLA leave. An employing office which does not have such a policy may not deny benefits to which an employee is entitled under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, on this basis unless the FMLA leave was fraudulently obtained as in paragraph (d) of this section.

825.217 Key employee, general rule.

(a) A *key employee* is a salaried FMLA-eligible employee who is among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the employee's worksite.

(b) The term *salaried* means paid on a salary basis, within the meaning of the Board's regulations at part 541, implementing section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), regarding employees who may qualify as exempt from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA, as made applicable by the CAA, as executive, administrative, and professional employees).

(c) A key employee must be among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees—both salaried and non-salaried, eligible and ineligible—who are employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the worksite.

(1) In determining which employees are among the highest paid 10 percent, year-to-date earnings are divided by weeks worked by the employee (including weeks in which paid leave was taken). Earnings include wages, premium pay, incentive pay, and non-discretionary and discretionary bonuses. Earnings do not include incentives whose value is determined at some future date, e.g., benefits or prerequisites.

(2) The determination of whether a salaried employee is among the highest paid 10 percent shall be made at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave. No more than 10 percent of the employing office's employees within 75 miles of the worksite may be key employees.

825.218 Substantial and grievous economic injury.

(a) In order to deny restoration to a key employee, an employing office must determine that the restoration of the employee to

employment will cause substantial and grievous economic injury to the operations of the employing office, not whether the absence of the employee will cause such substantial and grievous injury.

(b) An employing office may take into account its ability to replace on a temporary basis (or temporarily do without) the employee on FMLA leave. If permanent replacement is unavoidable, the cost of then reinstating the employee can be considered in evaluating whether substantial and grievous economic injury will occur from restoration; in other words, the effect on the operations of the employing office of reinstating the employee in an equivalent position.

(c) A precise test cannot be set for the level of hardship or injury to the employing office which must be sustained. If the reinstatement of a key employee threatens the economic viability of the employing office, that would constitute substantial and grievous economic injury. A lesser injury which causes substantial, long-term economic injury would also be sufficient. Minor inconveniences and costs that the employing office would experience in the normal course would certainly not constitute substantial and grievous economic injury.

(d) FMLA's substantial and grievous economic injury standard is different from and more stringent than the undue hardship test under the ADA. See also 825.702.

825.219 Rights of a key employee

(a) An employing office that believes that reinstatement may be denied to a key employee, must give written notice to the employee at the time the employee gives notice of the need for FMLA leave (or when FMLA leave commences, if earlier) that he or she qualifies as a key employee. At the same time, the employing office must also fully inform the employee of the potential consequences with respect to reinstatement and maintenance of health benefits if the employing office should determine that substantial and grievous economic injury to the employing office's operations will result if the employee is reinstated from FMLA leave. If such notice cannot be given immediately because of the need to determine whether the employee is a key employee, it shall be given as soon as practicable after being notified of a need for leave (or the commencement of leave, if earlier). It is expected that in most circumstances there will be no desire that an employee be denied restoration after FMLA leave and, therefore, there would be no need to provide such notice. However, an employing office who fails to provide such timely notice will lose its right to deny restoration even if substantial and grievous economic injury will result from reinstatement.

(b) As soon as an employing office makes a good faith determination, based on the facts available, that substantial and grievous economic injury to its operations will result if a key employee who has given notice of the need for FMLA leave or is using FMLA leave is reinstated, the employing office shall notify the employee in writing of its determination, that it cannot deny FMLA leave, and that it intends to deny restoration to employment on completion of the FMLA leave. It is anticipated that an employing office will ordinarily be able to give such notice prior to the employee starting leave. The employing office must serve this notice either in person or by certified mail. This notice must explain the basis for the employing office's finding that substantial and grievous economic injury will result, and, if leave has commenced, must provide the employee a

reasonable time in which to return to work, taking into account the circumstances, such as the length of the leave and the urgency of the need for the employee to return.

(c) If an employee on leave does not return to work in response to the employing office's notification of intent to deny restoration, the employee continues to be entitled to maintenance of health benefits and the employing office may not recover its cost of health benefit premiums. A key employee's rights under FMLA continue unless and until the employee either gives notice that he or she no longer wishes to return to work, or the employing office actually denies reinstatement at the conclusion of the leave period.

(d) After notice to an employee has been given that substantial and grievous economic injury will result if the employee is reinstated to employment, an employee is still entitled to request reinstatement at the end of the leave period even if the employee did not return to work in response to the employing office's notice. The employing office must then again determine whether there will be substantial and grievous economic injury from reinstatement, based on the facts at that time. If it is determined that substantial and grievous economic injury will result, the employing office shall notify the employee in writing (in person or by certified mail) of the denial of restoration.

825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, prohibits interference with an employee's rights under the law, and with legal proceedings or inquiries relating to an employee's rights. More specifically, the law contains the following employee protections:

(1) An employing office is prohibited from interfering with, restraining, or denying the exercise of (or attempts to exercise) any rights provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(2) An employing office is prohibited from discharging or in any other way discriminating against any covered employee (whether or not an eligible employee) for opposing or complaining about any unlawful practice under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(3) All employing offices are prohibited from discharging or in any other way discriminating against any covered employee (whether or not an eligible employee) because that covered employee has—

(i) Filed any charge, or has instituted (or caused to be instituted) any proceeding under or related to the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA;

(ii) Given, or is about to give, any information in connection with an inquiry or proceeding relating to a right under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA;

(iii) Testified, or is about to testify, in any inquiry or proceeding relating to a right under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(b) Any violations of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or of these regulations constitute interfering with, restraining, or denying the exercise of rights provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c). Interfering with the exercise of an employee's rights would

include, for example, not only refusing to authorize FMLA leave, but discouraging an employee from using such leave. It would also include manipulation by a covered employing office to avoid responsibilities under FMLA, for example:

(1) [Reserved]

(2) Changing the essential functions of the job in order to preclude the taking of leave; or

(3) Reducing hours available to work in order to avoid employee eligibility.

(c) The FMLA's prohibition against interference prohibits an employing office from discriminating or retaliating against an employee or prospective employee for having exercised or attempted to exercise FMLA rights. For example, if an employee on leave without pay would otherwise be entitled to full benefits (other than health benefits), the same benefits would be required to be provided to an employee on unpaid FMLA leave. By the same token, employing offices cannot use the taking of FMLA leave as a negative factor in employment actions, such as hiring, promotions or disciplinary actions; nor can FMLA leave be counted under no fault attendance policies. *See* 825.215.

(d) Employees cannot waive, nor may employing offices induce employees to waive, their rights under FMLA. For example, employees (or their collective bargaining representatives) cannot trade off the right to take FMLA leave against some other benefit offered by the employing office. Except for settlement agreements covered by 1414 and/or 1415 of the Congressional Accountability Act, this does not prevent the settlement or release of FMLA claims by employees based on past employing office conduct without the approval of the Office of Compliance or a court. Nor does it prevent an employee's voluntary and uncoerced acceptance (not as a condition of employment) of a light duty assignment while recovering from a serious health condition. *See* 825.702(d). An employee's acceptance of such light duty assignment does not constitute a waiver of the employee's prospective rights, including the right to be restored to the same position the employee held at the time the employee's FMLA leave commenced or to an equivalent position. The employee's right to restoration, however, ceases at the end of the applicable 12-month FMLA leave year.

(e) Individuals, and not merely covered employees, are protected from retaliation for opposing (e.g., filing a complaint about) any practice which is unlawful under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. They are similarly protected if they oppose any practice which they reasonably believe to be a violation of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or regulations.

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA

825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

(a)(1) If an employing office has any eligible employees and has any written guidance to employees concerning employee benefits or leave rights, such as in an employee handbook, information concerning both entitlements and employee obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, must be included in the handbook or other document. For example, if an employing office provides an employee handbook to all employees that describes the employing office's policies regarding leave, wages, attendance, and similar matters, the handbook must incorporate information on FMLA rights and

responsibilities and the employing office's policies regarding the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Informational publications describing the provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, are available from the Office of Compliance and may be incorporated in such employing office handbooks or written policies.

(2) If such an employing office does not have written policies, manuals, or handbooks describing employee benefits and leave provisions, the employing office shall provide written guidance to an employee concerning all the employee's rights and obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. This notice shall be provided to employees each time notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c), and in accordance with the provisions of that paragraph. Employing offices may duplicate and provide the employee a copy of the FMLA Fact Sheet available from the Office of Compliance to provide such guidance.

(b) *Eligibility notice.* (1) When an employee requests FMLA leave, or when the employing office acquires knowledge that an employee's leave may be for an FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office must notify the employee of the employee's eligibility to take FMLA leave within five business days, absent extenuating circumstances. *See* 825.110 for definition of an eligible employee. Employee eligibility is determined (and notice must be provided) at the commencement of the first instance of leave for each FMLA-qualifying reason in the applicable 12-month period. *See* 825.127(c) and 825.200(b). All FMLA absences for the same qualifying reason are considered a single leave and employee eligibility as to that reason for leave does not change during the applicable 12-month period.

(2) The eligibility notice must state whether the employee is eligible for FMLA leave as defined in 825.110. If the employee is not eligible for FMLA leave, the notice must state at least one reason why the employee is not eligible, including as applicable the number of months the employee has been employed by the employing office and the hours of service with the employing office during the 12-month period. Notification of eligibility may be oral or in writing; employing offices may use Form C to provide such notification to employees. The employing office is obligated to translate this notice in any situation in which it is obligated to do so in 825.300(a)(4).

(3) If, at the time an employee provides notice of a subsequent need for FMLA leave during the applicable 12-month period due to a different FMLA-qualifying reason, and the employee's eligibility status has not changed, no additional eligibility notice is required. If, however, the employee's eligibility status has changed (e.g., if the employee has not met the hours of service requirement in the 12 months preceding the commencement of leave for the subsequent qualifying reason), the employing office must notify the employee of the change in eligibility status within five business days, absent extenuating circumstances.

(c) *Rights and responsibilities notice.* (1) Employing offices shall provide written notice detailing the specific expectations and obligations of the employee and explaining any consequences of a failure to meet these obligations. The employing office is obligated to translate this notice in any situation in which it is obligated to do so in 825.300(a)(4). This notice shall be provided to the employee each time the eligibility notice is provided pursuant to paragraph (b) of this sec-

tion. If leave has already begun, the notice should be mailed to the employee's address of record. Such specific notice must include, as appropriate:

(i) That the leave may be designated and counted against the employee's annual FMLA leave entitlement if qualifying (*see* 825.300(c) and 825.301) and the applicable 12-month period for FMLA entitlement (*see* 825.127(c), 825.200(b), (f), and (g));

(ii) Any requirements for the employee to furnish certification of a serious health condition, serious injury or illness, or qualifying exigency arising out of active duty or call to active duty status, and the consequences of failing to do so (*see* 825.305, 825.309, 825.310, 825.313);

(iii) The employee's right to substitute paid leave, whether the employing office will require the substitution of paid leave, the conditions related to any substitution, and the employee's entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave if the employee does not meet the conditions for paid leave (*see* 825.207);

(iv) Any requirement for the employee to make any premium payments to maintain health benefits and the arrangements for making such payments (*see* 825.210), and the possible consequences of failure to make such payments on a timely basis (*i.e.*, the circumstances under which coverage may lapse);

(v) The employee's status as a key employee and the potential consequence that restoration may be denied following FMLA leave, explaining the conditions required for such denial (*see* 825.218);

(vi) The employee's right to maintenance of benefits during the FMLA leave and restoration to the same or an equivalent job upon return from FMLA leave (*see* 825.214 and 825.604); and

(vii) The employee's potential liability for payment of health insurance premiums paid by the employing office during the employee's unpaid FMLA leave if the employee fails to return to work after taking FMLA leave (*see* 825.213).

(2) The notice of rights and responsibilities may include other information—e.g., whether the employing office will require periodic reports of the employee's status and intent to return to work—but is not required to do so.

(3) The notice of rights and responsibilities may be accompanied by any required certification form.

(4) If the specific information provided by the notice of rights and responsibilities changes, the employing office shall, within five business days of receipt of the employee's first notice of need for leave subsequent to any change, provide written notice referencing the prior notice and setting forth any of the information in the notice of rights and responsibilities that has changed. For example, if the initial leave period was paid leave and the subsequent leave period would be unpaid leave, the employing office may need to give notice of the arrangements for making premium payments.

(5) Employing offices are also expected to responsively answer questions from employees concerning their rights and responsibilities under the FMLA, as made applicable under the CAA.

(6) A prototype notice of rights and responsibilities may be obtained in Form C, or from the Office of Compliance. Employing offices may adapt the prototype notice as appropriate to meet these notice requirements. The notice of rights and responsibilities may be distributed electronically so long as it otherwise meets the requirements of this section.

(d) *Designation notice.* (1) The employing office is responsible in all circumstances for designating leave as FMLA-qualifying, and for giving notice of the designation to the employee as provided in this section. When the employing office has enough information to determine whether the leave is being taken for a FMLA-qualifying reason (e.g., after receiving a certification), the employing office must notify the employee whether the leave will be designated and will be counted as FMLA leave within five business days absent extenuating circumstances. Only one notice of designation is required for each FMLA-qualifying reason per applicable 12-month period, regardless of whether the leave taken due to the qualifying reason will be a continuous block of leave or intermittent or reduced schedule leave. If the employing office determines that the leave will not be designated as FMLA-qualifying (e.g., if the leave is not for a reason covered by FMLA or the FMLA leave entitlement has been exhausted), the employing office must notify the employee of that determination. If the employing office requires paid leave to be substituted for unpaid FMLA leave, or that paid leave taken under an existing leave plan be counted as FMLA leave, the employing office must inform the employee of this designation at the time of designating the FMLA leave.

(2) If the employing office has sufficient information to designate the leave as FMLA leave immediately after receiving notice of the employee's need for leave, the employing office may provide the employee with the designation notice at that time.

(3) If the employing office will require the employee to present a fitness-for-duty certification to be restored to employment, the employing office must provide notice of such requirement with the designation notice. If the employing office will require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's position, the employing office must so indicate in the designation notice, and must include a list of the essential functions of the employee's position. See 825.312. If the employing office's handbook or other written documents (if any) describing the employing office's leave policies clearly provide that a fitness-for-duty certification will be required in specific circumstances (e.g., by stating that fitness-for-duty certification will be required in all cases of back injuries for employees in a certain occupation), the employing office is not required to provide written notice of the requirement with the designation notice, but must provide oral notice no later than with the designation notice.

(4) The designation notice must be in writing. A prototype designation notice is contained in Form D or may be obtained from the Office of Compliance. If the leave is not designated as FMLA leave because it does not meet the requirements of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, the notice to the employee that the leave is not designated as FMLA leave may be in the form of a simple written statement.

(5) If the information provided by the employing office to the employee in the designation notice changes (e.g., the employee exhausts the FMLA leave entitlement), the employing office shall provide, within five business days of receipt of the employee's first notice of need for leave subsequent to any change, written notice of the change.

(6) The employing office must notify the employee of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

If the amount of leave needed is known at the time the employing office designates the leave as FMLA-qualifying, the employing office must notify the employee of the number of hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement in the designation notice. If it is not possible to provide the hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement (such as in the case of unforeseeable intermittent leave), then the employing office must provide notice of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement upon the request by the employee, but no more often than once in a 30-day period and only if leave was taken in that period. The notice of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA entitlement may be oral or in writing. If such notice is oral, it shall be confirmed in writing no later than the following payday (unless the payday is less than one week after the oral notice, in which case the notice must be no later than the subsequent payday). Such written notice may be in any form, including a notation on the employee's pay stub.

(e) *Consequences of failing to provide notice.* Failure to follow the notice requirements set forth in this section may constitute an interference with, restraint, or denial of the exercise of an employee's FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c).

825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

(a) *Employing office responsibilities.* The employing office's decision to designate leave as FMLA-qualifying must be based only on information received from the employee or the employee's spokesperson (e.g., if the employee is incapacitated, the employee's spouse, adult child, parent, doctor, etc.), may provide notice to the employing office of the need to take FMLA leave). In any circumstance where the employing office does not have sufficient information about the reason for an employee's use of leave, the employing office should inquire further of the employee or the spokesperson to ascertain whether leave is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Once the employing office has acquired knowledge that the leave is being taken for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office must notify the employee as provided in 825.300(d).

(b) *Employee responsibilities.* An employee giving notice of the need for FMLA leave does not need to expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA to meet his or her obligation to provide notice, though the employee would need to state a qualifying reason for the needed leave and otherwise satisfy the notice requirements set forth in 825.302 or 825.303 depending on whether the need for leave is foreseeable or unforeseeable. An employee giving notice of the need for FMLA leave must explain the reasons for the needed leave so as to allow the employing office to determine whether the leave qualifies under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. If the employee fails to explain the reasons, leave may be denied. In many cases, in explaining the reasons for a request to use leave, especially when the need for the leave was unexpected or unforeseen, an employee will provide sufficient in-

formation for the employing office to designate the leave as FMLA leave. An employee using accrued paid leave may in some cases not spontaneously explain the reasons or their plans for using their accrued leave. However, if an employee requesting to use paid leave for a FMLA-qualifying reason does not explain the reason for the leave and the employing office denies the employee's request, the employee will need to provide sufficient information to establish a FMLA-qualifying reason for the needed leave so that the employing office is aware that the leave may not be denied and may designate that the paid leave be appropriately counted against (substituted for) the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Similarly, an employee using accrued paid vacation leave who seeks an extension of unpaid leave for a FMLA-qualifying reason will need to state the reason. If this is due to an event which occurred during the period of paid leave, the employing office may count the leave used after the FMLA-qualifying reason against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

(c) *Disputes.* If there is a dispute between an employing office and an employee as to whether leave qualifies as FMLA leave, it should be resolved through discussions between the employee and the employing office. Such discussions and the decision must be documented.

(d) *Retroactive designation.* If an employing office does not designate leave as required by 825.300, the employing office may retroactively designate leave as FMLA leave with appropriate notice to the employee as required by 825.300 provided that the employing office's failure to timely designate leave does not cause harm or injury to the employee. In all cases where leave would qualify for FMLA protections, an employing office and an employee can mutually agree that leave be retroactively designated as FMLA leave.

(e) *Remedies.* If an employing office's failure to timely designate leave in accordance with 825.300 causes the employee to suffer harm, it may constitute an interference with, restraint of, or denial of the exercise of an employee's FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c). For example, if an employing office that was put on notice that an employee needed FMLA leave failed to designate the leave properly, but the employee's own serious health condition prevented him or her from returning to work during that time period regardless of the designation, an employee may not be able to show that the employee suffered harm as a result of the employing office's actions. However, if an employee took leave to provide care for a son or daughter with a serious health condition believing it would not count toward his or her FMLA entitlement, and the employee planned to later use that FMLA leave to provide care for a spouse who would need assistance when recovering from surgery planned for a later date, the employee may be able to show that harm has occurred as a result of the employing office's failure to designate properly. The employee might establish this by showing that he or she would have arranged for an alternative caregiver for the seriously-ill son or daughter if the leave had been designated timely.

825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

(a) *Timing of notice.* An employee must provide the employing office at least 30 days advance notice before FMLA leave is to begin if the need for the leave is foreseeable based on an expected birth, placement for adoption or foster care, planned medical treatment for a serious health condition of the employee or of a family member, or the planned medical treatment for a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember. If 30 days notice is not practicable, such as because of a lack of knowledge of approximately when leave will be required to begin, a change in circumstances, or a medical emergency, notice must be given as soon as practicable. For example, an employee's health condition may require leave to commence earlier than anticipated before the birth of a child. Similarly, little opportunity for notice may be given before placement for adoption. For foreseeable leave due to a qualifying exigency, notice must be provided as soon as practicable, regardless of how far in advance such leave is foreseeable. Whether FMLA leave is to be continuous or is to be taken intermittently or on a reduced schedule basis, notice need only be given one time, but the employee shall advise the employing office as soon as practicable if dates of scheduled leave change or are extended, or were initially unknown. In those cases where the employee is required to provide at least 30 days notice of foreseeable leave and does not do so, the employee shall explain the reasons why such notice was not practicable upon a request from the employing office for such information.

(b) *As soon as practicable* means as soon as both possible and practical, taking into account all of the facts and circumstances in the individual case. When an employee becomes aware of a need for FMLA leave less than 30 days in advance, it should be practicable for the employee to provide notice of the need for leave either the same day or the next business day. In all cases, however, the determination of when an employee could practicably provide notice must take into account the individual facts and circumstances.

(c) *Content of notice.* An employee shall provide at least verbal notice sufficient to make the employing office aware that the employee needs FMLA-qualifying leave, and the anticipated timing and duration of the leave. Depending on the situation, such information may include that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job; that the employee is pregnant or has been hospitalized overnight; whether the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider; if the leave is due to a qualifying exigency, that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty), and that the requested leave is for one of the reasons listed in 825.126(b); if the leave is for a family member, that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities, or that the family member is a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness; and the anticipated duration of the absence, if known. When an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA. When an employee seeks leave due to a FMLA-qualifying reason, for which the employing office has

previously provided FMLA-protected leave, the employee must specifically reference the qualifying reason for leave or the need for FMLA leave. In all cases, the employing office should inquire further of the employee if it is necessary to have more information about whether FMLA leave is being sought by the employee, and obtain the necessary details of the leave to be taken. In the case of medical conditions, the employing office may find it necessary to inquire further to determine if the leave is because of a serious health condition and may request medical certification to support the need for such leave. See 825.305. An employing office may also request certification to support the need for leave for a qualifying exigency or for military caregiver leave. See 825.309, 825.310. When an employee has been previously certified for leave due to more than one FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office may need to inquire further to determine for which qualifying reason the leave is needed. An employee has an obligation to respond to an employing office's questions designed to determine whether an absence is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Failure to respond to reasonable employing office inquiries regarding the leave request may result in denial of FMLA protection if the employing office is unable to determine whether the leave is FMLA-qualifying.

(d) *Complying with the employing office policy.* An employing office may require an employee to comply with the employing office's usual and customary notice and procedural requirements for requesting leave, absent unusual circumstances. For example, an employing office may require that written notice set forth the reasons for the requested leave, the anticipated duration of the leave, and the anticipated start of the leave. An employee also may be required by an employing office's policy to contact a specific individual. Unusual circumstances would include situations such as when an employee is unable to comply with the employing office's policy that requests for leave should be made by contacting a specific number because on the day the employee needs to provide notice of his or her need for FMLA leave there is no one to answer the call-in number and the voice mail box is full. Where an employee does not comply with the employing office's usual notice and procedural requirements, and no unusual circumstances justify the failure to comply, FMLA-protected leave may be delayed or denied. However, FMLA-protected leave may not be delayed or denied where the employing office's policy requires notice to be given sooner than set forth in paragraph (a) of this section and the employee provides timely notice as set forth in paragraph (a) of this section.

(e) *Scheduling planned medical treatment.* When planning medical treatment, the employee must consult with the employing office and make a reasonable effort to schedule the treatment so as not to disrupt unduly the employing office's operations, subject to the approval of the health care provider. Employees are ordinarily expected to consult with their employing offices prior to the scheduling of treatment in order to work out a treatment schedule which best suits the needs of both the employing office and the employee. For example, if an employee who provides notice of the need to take FMLA leave on an intermittent basis for planned medical treatment neglects to consult with the employing office to make a reasonable effort to arrange the schedule of treatments so as not to unduly disrupt the employing office's operations, the employing office may

initiate discussions with the employee and require the employee to attempt to make such arrangements, subject to the approval of the health care provider. See 825.203 and 825.205.

(f) Intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule must be medically necessary due to a serious health condition or a serious injury or illness. An employee shall advise the employing office, upon request, of the reasons why the intermittent/reduced leave schedule is necessary and of the schedule for treatment, if applicable. The employee and employing office shall attempt to work out a schedule for such leave that meets the employee's needs without unduly disrupting the employing office's operations, subject to the approval of the health care provider.

(g) An employing office may waive employees' FMLA notice requirements. See 825.304.

825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave.

(a) *Timing of notice.* When the approximate timing of the need for leave is not foreseeable, an employee must provide notice to the employing office as soon as practicable under the facts and circumstances of the particular case. It generally should be practicable for the employee to provide notice of leave that is unforeseeable within the time prescribed by the employing office's usual and customary notice requirements applicable to such leave. See 825.303(c). Notice may be given by the employee's spokesperson (e.g., spouse, adult family member, or other responsible party) if the employee is unable to do so personally. For example, if an employee's child has a severe asthma attack and the employee takes the child to the emergency room, the employee would not be required to leave his or her child in order to report the absence while the child is receiving emergency treatment. However, if the child's asthma attack required only the use of an inhaler at home followed by a period of rest, the employee would be expected to call the employing office promptly after ensuring the child has used the inhaler.

(b) *Content of notice.* An employee shall provide sufficient information for an employing office to reasonably determine whether the FMLA may apply to the leave request. Depending on the situation, such information may include that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job; that the employee is pregnant or has been hospitalized overnight; whether the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider; if the leave is due to a qualifying exigency, that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty), that the requested leave is for one of the reasons listed in 825.126(b), and the anticipated duration of the absence; or if the leave is for a family member that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities or that the family member is a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness; and the anticipated duration of the absence, if known. When an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA. When an employee seeks leave due to a qualifying reason, for which the employing office has previously provided the employee FMLA-protected leave, the employee must specifically reference either the qualifying reason for leave or the need for

FMLA leave. Calling in "sick" without providing more information will not be considered sufficient notice to trigger an employing office's obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. The employing office will be expected to obtain any additional required information through informal means. An employee has an obligation to respond to an employing office's questions designed to determine whether an absence is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Failure to respond to reasonable employing office inquiries regarding the leave request may result in denial of FMLA protection if the employing office is unable to determine whether the leave is FMLA-qualifying.

(c) *Complying with employing office policy.* When the need for leave is not foreseeable, an employee must comply with the employing office's usual and customary notice and procedural requirements for requesting leave, absent unusual circumstances. For example, an employing office may require employees to call a designated number or a specific individual to request leave. However, if an employee requires emergency medical treatment, he or she would not be required to follow the call-in procedure until his or her condition is stabilized and he or she has access to, and is able to use, a phone. Similarly, in the case of an emergency requiring leave because of a FMLA-qualifying reason, written advance notice pursuant to an employing office's internal rules and procedures may not be required when FMLA leave is involved. If an employee does not comply with the employing office's usual notice and procedural requirements, and no unusual circumstances justify the failure to comply, FMLA-protected leave may be delayed or denied.

825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

(a) *Proper notice required.* In all cases, in order for the onset of an employee's FMLA leave to be delayed due to lack of required notice, it must be clear that the employee had actual notice of the FMLA notice requirements. This condition would be satisfied by the employing office's proper posting, at the worksite where the employee is employed, of the information regarding the FMLA provided (pursuant to section 301(h)(2) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1381(h)(2)) by the Office of Compliance to the employing office in a manner suitable for posting.

(b) *Foreseeable leave—30 days.* When the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable at least 30 days in advance and an employee fails to give timely advance notice with no reasonable excuse, the employing office may delay FMLA coverage until 30 days after the date the employee provides notice. The need for leave and the approximate date leave would be taken must have been clearly foreseeable to the employee 30 days in advance of the leave. For example, knowledge that an employee would receive a telephone call about the availability of a child for adoption at some unknown point in the future would not be sufficient to establish the leave was clearly foreseeable 30 days in advance.

(c) *Foreseeable leave—less than 30 days.* When the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable fewer than 30 days in advance and an employee fails to give notice as soon as practicable under the particular facts and circumstances, the extent to which an employing office may delay FMLA coverage for leave depends on the facts of the particular case. For example, if an employee reasonably should have given the employing office two weeks' notice but instead only provided one week's notice, then the employing office may delay FMLA-protected leave for one

week (thus, if the employing office elects to delay FMLA coverage and the employee nonetheless takes leave one week after providing the notice (*i.e.*, a week before the two week notice period has been met) the leave will not be FMLA-protected).

(d) *Unforeseeable leave.* When the need for FMLA leave is unforeseeable and an employee fails to give notice in accordance with 825.303, the extent to which an employing office may delay FMLA coverage for leave depends on the facts of the particular case. For example, if it would have been practicable for an employee to have given the employing office notice of the need for leave very soon after the need arises consistent with the employing office's policy, but instead the employee provided notice two days after the leave began, then the employing office may delay FMLA coverage of the leave by two days.

(e) *Waiver of notice.* An employing office may waive employees' FMLA notice obligations or the employing office's own internal rules on leave notice requirements. If an employing office does not waive the employee's obligations under its internal leave rules, the employing office may take appropriate action under its internal rules and procedures for failure to follow its usual and customary notification rules, absent unusual circumstances, as long as the actions are taken in a manner that does not discriminate against employees taking FMLA leave and the rules are not inconsistent with 825.303(a).

825.305 Certification, general rule.

(a) *General.* An employing office may require that an employee's leave to care for the employee's covered family member with a serious health condition, or due to the employee's own serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform one or more of the essential functions of the employee's position, be supported by a certification issued by the health care provider of the employee or the employee's family member. An employing office may also require that an employee's leave because of a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness be supported by a certification, as described in 825.309 and 825.310, respectively. An employing office must give notice of a requirement for certification each time a certification is required; such notice must be written notice whenever required by 825.300(c). An employing office's oral request to an employee to furnish any subsequent certification is sufficient.

(b) *Timing.* In most cases, the employing office should request that an employee furnish certification at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave or within five business days thereafter, or, in the case of unforeseen leave, within five business days after the leave commences. The employing office may request certification at some later date if the employing office later has reason to question the appropriateness of the leave or its duration. The employee must provide the requested certification to the employing office within 15 calendar days after the employing office's request, unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee's diligent, good faith efforts or the employing office provides more than 15 calendar days to return the requested certification.

(c) *Complete and sufficient certification.* The employee must provide a complete and sufficient certification to the employing office if required by the employing office in accordance with 825.306, 825.309, and 825.310. The em-

ploying office shall advise an employee whenever the employing office finds a certification incomplete or insufficient, and shall state in writing what additional information is necessary to make the certification complete and sufficient. A certification is considered incomplete if the employing office receives a certification, but one or more of the applicable entries have not been completed. A certification is considered insufficient if the employing office receives a complete certification, but the information provided is vague, ambiguous, or non-responsive. The employing office must provide the employee with seven calendar days (unless not practicable under the particular circumstances despite the employee's diligent good faith efforts) to cure any such deficiency. If the deficiencies specified by the employing office are not cured in the resubmitted certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave, in accordance with 825.313. A certification that is not returned to the employing office is not considered incomplete or insufficient, but constitutes a failure to provide certification.

(d) *Consequences.* At the time the employing office requests certification, the employing office must also advise an employee of the anticipated consequences of an employee's failure to provide adequate certification. If the employee fails to provide the employing office with a complete and sufficient certification, despite the opportunity to cure the certification as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, or fails to provide any certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave, in accordance with 825.313. It is the employee's responsibility either to furnish a complete and sufficient certification or to furnish the health care provider providing the certification with any necessary authorization from the employee or the employee's family member in order for the health care provider to release a complete and sufficient certification to the employing office to support the employee's FMLA request. This provision will apply in any case where an employing office requests a certification permitted by these regulations, whether it is the initial certification, a recertification, a second or third opinion, or a fitness-for-duty certificate, including any clarifications necessary to determine if such certifications are authentic and sufficient. See 825.306, 825.307, 825.308, and 825.312.

(e) *Annual medical certification.* Where the employee's need for leave due to the employee's own serious health condition, or the serious health condition of the employee's covered family member, lasts beyond a single leave year (as defined in 825.200), the employing office may require the employee to provide a new medical certification in each subsequent leave year. Such new medical certifications are subject to the provisions for authentication and clarification set forth in 825.307, including second and third opinions.

825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

(a) *Required information.* When leave is taken because of an employee's own serious health condition, or the serious health condition of a family member, an employing office may require an employee to obtain a medical certification from a health care provider that sets forth the following information:

(1) The name, address, telephone number, and fax number of the health care provider and type of medical practice/specialization;

(2) The approximate date on which the serious health condition commenced, and its probable duration;

(3) A statement or description of appropriate medical facts regarding the patient's health condition for which FMLA leave is requested. The medical facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave. Such medical facts may include information on symptoms, diagnosis, hospitalization, doctor visits, whether medication has been prescribed, any referrals for evaluation or treatment (physical therapy, for example), or any other regimen of continuing treatment;

(4) If the employee is the patient, information sufficient to establish that the employee cannot perform the essential functions of the employee's job as well as the nature of any other work restrictions, and the likely duration of such inability (see 825.123(b) and (c));

(5) If the patient is a covered family member with a serious health condition, information sufficient to establish that the family member is in need of care, as described in 825.124, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the leave required to care for the family member;

(6) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for planned medical treatment of the employee's or a covered family member's serious health condition, information sufficient to establish the medical necessity for such intermittent or reduced schedule leave and an estimate of the dates and duration of such treatments and any periods of recovery;

(7) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for the employee's serious health condition, including pregnancy, that may result in unforeseeable episodes of incapacity, information sufficient to establish the medical necessity for such intermittent or reduced schedule leave and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the episodes of incapacity; and

(8) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition, a statement that such leave is medically necessary to care for the family member, as described in 825.124 and 825.203(b), which can include assisting in the family member's recovery, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the required leave.

(b) The Office of Compliance has developed two optional forms (Form A and Form B) for use in obtaining medical certification, including second and third opinions, from health care providers that meets FMLA's certification requirements, as made applicable by the CAA. (See Forms A and B.) Optional Form A is for use when the employee's need for leave is due to the employee's own serious health condition. Optional Form B is for use when the employee needs leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition. These optional forms reflect certification requirements so as to permit the health care provider to furnish appropriate medical information. Forms A and B are modeled closely on Form WH-380E and Form WH-380F, as revised, which were developed by the Department of Labor (see 29 C.F.R. Part 825). The employing office may use the Office of Compliance's forms, or Form WH-380E and Form WH-380F, as revised, or another form containing the same basic information; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in 825.306, 825.307, and 825.308. In all instances the information on the form must relate only to the serious health condition for which the current need for leave exists.

(c) If an employee is on FMLA leave running concurrently with a workers' compensa-

tion absence, and the provisions of the workers' compensation statute permit the employing office or the employing office's representative to request additional information from the employee's workers' compensation health care provider, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the applicable workers' compensation provisions and information received under those provisions may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave. Similarly, an employing office may request additional information in accordance with a paid leave policy or disability plan that requires greater information to qualify for payments or benefits, provided that the employing office informs the employee that the additional information only needs to be provided in connection with receipt of such payments or benefits. Any information received pursuant to such policy or plan may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave. If the employee fails to provide the information required for receipt of such payments or benefits, such failure will not affect the employee's entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave. See 825.207(a).

(d) If an employee's serious health condition may also be a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and as made applicable by the CAA, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the procedures for requesting medical information under the ADA. Any information received pursuant to these procedures may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave.

(e) While an employee may choose to comply with the certification requirement by providing the employing office with an authorization, release, or waiver allowing the employing office to communicate directly with the health care provider of the employee or his or her covered family member, the employee may not be required to provide such an authorization, release, or waiver. In all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave. See 825.305(d).

825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

(a) *Clarification and authentication.* If an employee submits a complete and sufficient certification signed by the health care provider, the employing office may not request additional information from the health care provider. However, the employing office may contact the health care provider for purposes of clarification and authentication of the medical certification (whether initial certification or recertification) after the employing office has given the employee an opportunity to cure any deficiencies as set forth in 825.305(c). To make such contact, the employing office must use a health care provider, a human resources professional, a leave administrator, or a management official. Under no circumstances, however, may the employee's direct supervisor contact the employee's health care provider.

For purposes of these regulations, *authentication* means providing the health care provider with a copy of the certification and requesting verification that the information

contained on the certification form was completed and/or authorized by the health care provider who signed the document; no additional medical information may be requested. *Clarification* means contacting the health care provider to understand the handwriting on the medical certification or to understand the meaning of a response. Employing offices may not ask health care providers for additional information beyond that required by the certification form. The requirements of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rule, (see 45 CFR parts 160 and 164), which governs the privacy of individually-identifiable health information created or held by HIPAA-covered entities, must be satisfied when individually-identifiable health information of an employee is shared with an employing office by a HIPAA-covered health care provider. If an employee chooses not to provide the employing office with authorization allowing the employing office to clarify the certification with the health care provider, and does not otherwise clarify the certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave if the certification is unclear. See 825.305(d). It is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with a complete and sufficient certification and to clarify the certification if necessary.

(b) *Second Opinion.* (1) An employing office that has reason to doubt the validity of a medical certification may require the employee to obtain a second opinion at the employing office's expense. Pending receipt of the second (or third) medical opinion, the employee is provisionally entitled to the benefits of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, including maintenance of group health benefits. If the certifications do not ultimately establish the employee's entitlement to FMLA leave, the leave shall not be designated as FMLA leave and may be treated as paid or unpaid leave under the employing office's established leave policies. In addition, the consequences set forth in 825.305(d) will apply if the employee or the employee's family member fails to authorize his or her health care provider to release all relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if requested by the health care provider designated to provide a second opinion in order to render a sufficient and complete second opinion.

(2) The employing office is permitted to designate the health care provider to furnish the second opinion, but the selected health care provider may not be employed on a regular basis by the employing office. The employing office may not regularly contract with or otherwise regularly utilize the services of the health care provider furnishing the second opinion unless the employing office is located in an area where access to health care is extremely limited (e.g., a rural area where no more than one or two doctors practice in the relevant specialty in the vicinity).

(c) *Third opinion.* If the opinions of the employee's and the employing office's designated health care providers differ, the employing office may require the employee to obtain certification from a third health care provider, again at the employing office's expense. This third opinion shall be final and binding. The third health care provider must be designated or approved jointly by the employing office and the employee. The employing office and the employee must each act in good faith to attempt to reach agreement on whom to select for the third opinion

provider. If the employing office does not attempt in good faith to reach agreement, the employing office will be bound by the first certification. If the employee does not attempt in good faith to reach agreement, the employee will be bound by the second certification. For example, an employee who refuses to agree to see a doctor in the specialty in question may be failing to act in good faith. On the other hand, an employing office that refuses to agree to any doctor on a list of specialists in the appropriate field provided by the employee and whom the employee has not previously consulted may be failing to act in good faith. In addition, the consequences set forth in 825.305(d) will apply if the employee or the employee's family member fails to authorize his or her health care provider to release all relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if requested by the health care provider designated to provide a third opinion in order to render a sufficient and complete third opinion.

(d) *Copies of opinions.* The employing office is required to provide the employee with a copy of the second and third medical opinions, where applicable, upon request by the employee. Requested copies are to be provided within five business days unless extenuating circumstances prevent such action.

(e) *Travel expenses.* If the employing office requires the employee to obtain either a second or third opinion the employing office must reimburse an employee or family member for any reasonable "out of pocket" travel expenses incurred to obtain the second and third medical opinions. The employing office may not require the employee or family member to travel outside normal commuting distance for purposes of obtaining the second or third medical opinions except in very unusual circumstances.

(f) *Medical certification abroad.* In circumstances in which the employee or a family member is visiting in another country, or a family member resides in another country, and a serious health condition develops, the employing office shall accept a medical certification as well as second and third opinions from a health care provider who practices in that country. Where a certification by a foreign health care provider is in a language other than English, the employee must provide the employing office with a written translation of the certification upon request.

825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

(a) *30-day rule.* An employing office may request recertification no more often than every 30 days and only in connection with an absence by the employee, unless paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section apply.

(b) *More than 30 days.* If the medical certification indicates that the minimum duration of the condition is more than 30 days, an employing office must wait until that minimum duration expires before requesting a recertification, unless paragraph (c) of this section applies. For example, if the medical certification states that an employee will be unable to work, whether continuously or on an intermittent basis, for 40 days, the employing office must wait 40 days before requesting a recertification. In all cases, an employing office may request a recertification of a medical condition every six months in connection with an absence by the employee. Accordingly, even if the medical certification indicates that the employee will need

intermittent or reduced schedule leave for a period in excess of six months (e.g., for a lifetime condition), the employing office would be permitted to request recertification every six months in connection with an absence.

(c) *Less than 30 days.* An employing office may request recertification in less than 30 days if:

(1) The employee requests an extension of leave;

(2) Circumstances described by the previous certification have changed significantly (e.g., the duration or frequency of the absence, the nature or severity of the illness, complications). For example, if a medical certification stated that an employee would need leave for one to two days when the employee suffered a migraine headache and the employee's absences for his or her last two migraines lasted four days each, then the increased duration of absence might constitute a significant change in circumstances allowing the employing office to request a recertification in less than 30 days. Likewise, if an employee had a pattern of using unscheduled FMLA leave for migraines in conjunction with his or her scheduled days off, then the timing of the absences also might constitute a significant change in circumstances sufficient for an employing office to request a recertification more frequently than every 30 days; or

(3) The employing office receives information that casts doubt upon the employee's stated reason for the absence or the continuing validity of the certification. For example, if an employee is on FMLA leave for four weeks due to the employee's knee surgery, including recuperation, and the employee plays in company softball league games during the employee's third week of FMLA leave, such information might be sufficient to cast doubt upon the continuing validity of the certification allowing the employing office to request a recertification in less than 30 days.

(d) *Timing.* The employee must provide the requested recertification to the employing office within the time frame requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the employing office's request), unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee's diligent, good faith efforts.

(e) *Content.* The employing office may ask for the same information when obtaining recertification as that permitted for the original certification as set forth in 825.306. The employee has the same obligations to participate and cooperate (including providing a complete and sufficient certification or adequate authorization to the health care provider) in the recertification process as in the initial certification process. See 825.305(d). As part of the information allowed to be obtained on recertification for leave taken because of a serious health condition, the employing office may provide the health care provider with a record of the employee's absence pattern and ask the health care provider if the serious health condition and need for leave is consistent with such a pattern.

(f) Any recertification requested by the employing office shall be at the employee's expense unless the employing office provides otherwise. No second or third opinion on recertification may be required.

825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

(a) *Active Duty Orders.* The first time an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the covered active duty or call to covered active duty sta-

tus (or notification of an impending call or order to covered active duty) of a military member (see 825.126(a)), an employing office may require the employee to provide a copy of the military member's active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and the dates of the military member's covered active duty service. This information need only be provided to the employing office once. A copy of new active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military may be required by the employing office if the need for leave because of a qualifying exigency arises out of a different covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or notification of an impending call or order to covered active duty) of the same or a different military member;

(b) *Required information.* An employing office may require that leave for any qualifying exigency specified in 825.126 be supported by a certification from the employee that sets forth the following information:

(1) A statement or description, signed by the employee, of appropriate facts regarding the qualifying exigency for which FMLA leave is requested. The facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave. Such facts should include information on the type of qualifying exigency for which leave is requested and any available written documentation which supports the request for leave; such documentation, for example, may include a copy of a meeting announcement for informational briefings sponsored by the military, a document confirming an appointment with a counselor or school official, or a copy of a bill for services for the handling of legal or financial affairs;

(2) The approximate date on which the qualifying exigency commenced or will commence;

(3) If an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency for a single, continuous period of time, the beginning and end dates for such absence;

(4) If an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis, an estimate of the frequency and duration of the qualifying exigency;

(5) If the qualifying exigency involves meeting with a third party, appropriate contact information for the individual or entity with whom the employee is meeting (such as the name, title, organization, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address) and a brief description of the purpose of the meeting; and

(6) If the qualifying exigency involves *Rest and Recuperation* leave, a copy of the military member's Rest and Recuperation orders, or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the military member has been granted Rest and Recuperation leave, and the dates of the military member's Rest and Recuperation leave.

(c) The Office of Compliance has developed an optional form (Form E) for employees' use in obtaining a certification that meets FMLA's certification requirements. (See Form E). This optional form reflects certification requirements so as to permit the employee to furnish appropriate information to support his or her request for leave because of a qualifying exigency. Form E, or another form containing the same basic information, may be used by the employing office; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section.

(d) *Verification.* If an employee submits a complete and sufficient certification to support his or her request for leave because of a

qualifying exigency, the employing office may not request additional information from the employee. However, if the qualifying exigency involves meeting with a third party, the employing office may contact the individual or entity with whom the employee is meeting for purposes of verifying a meeting or appointment schedule and the nature of the meeting between the employee and the specified individual or entity. The employee's permission is not required in order to verify meetings or appointments with third parties, but no additional information may be requested by the employing office. An employing office also may contact an appropriate unit of the Department of Defense to request verification that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty); no additional information may be requested and the employee's permission is not required.

825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

(a) *Required information from health care provider.* When leave is taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an employing office may require an employee to obtain a certification completed by an authorized health care provider of the covered servicemember. For purposes of leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, any one of the following health care providers may complete such a certification:

- (1) A United States Department of Defense ("DOD") health care provider;
- (2) A United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider;
- (3) A DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider;
- (4) A DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or
- (5) Any health care provider as defined in 825.125.

(b) If the authorized health care provider is unable to make certain military-related determinations outlined below, the authorized health care provider may rely on determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as a DOD recovery care coordinator) or an authorized VA representative. An employing office may request that the health care provider provide the following information:

- (1) The name, address, and appropriate contact information (telephone number, fax number, and/or email address) of the health care provider, the type of medical practice, the medical specialty, and whether the health care provider is one of the following:
 - (i) A DOD health care provider;
 - (ii) A VA health care provider;
 - (iii) A DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider;
 - (iv) A DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or
 - (v) A health care provider as defined in 825.125.

(2) Whether the covered servicemember's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or, if not, whether the covered servicemember's injury or illness existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty;

(3) The approximate date on which the serious injury or illness commenced, or was aggravated, and its probable duration;

(4) A statement or description of appropriate medical facts regarding the covered servicemember's health condition for which FMLA leave is requested. The medical facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave.

(i) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, such medical facts must include information on whether the injury or illness may render the covered servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating and whether the member is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy;

(ii) In the case of a covered veteran, such medical facts must include:

(A) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is the continuation of an injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(B) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is a physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and that such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(C) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(D) Documentation of enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

(5) Information sufficient to establish that the covered servicemember is in need of care, as described in 825.124, and whether the covered servicemember will need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery, and an estimate as to the beginning and ending dates for this period of time;

(6) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for planned medical treatment appointments for the covered servicemember, whether there is a medical necessity for the covered servicemember to have such periodic care and an estimate of the treatment schedule of such appointments;

(7) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis to care for a covered servicemember other than for planned medical treatment (e.g., episodic flare-ups of a medical condition), whether there is a medical necessity for the covered servicemember to have such periodic care, which can include assisting in the covered servicemember's recovery, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the periodic care.

(c) *Required information from employee and/or covered servicemember.* In addition to the information that may be requested under 825.310(b), an employing office may also request that such certification set forth the following information provided by an employee and/or covered servicemember:

(1) The name and address of the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for a covered servicemember, the name of the employee requesting such leave, and the name of the covered servicemember for whom the employee is requesting leave to care;

(2) The relationship of the employee to the covered servicemember for whom the employee is requesting leave to care;

(3) Whether the covered servicemember is a current member of the Armed Forces, the National Guard or Reserves, and the covered servicemember's military branch, rank, and current unit assignment;

(4) Whether the covered servicemember is assigned to a military medical facility as an outpatient or to a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients (such as a medical hold or warrior transition unit), and the name of the medical treatment facility or unit;

(5) Whether the covered servicemember is on the temporary disability retired list;

(6) Whether the covered servicemember is a veteran, the date of separation from military service, and whether the separation was other than dishonorable. The employing office may require the employee to provide documentation issued by the military which indicates that the covered servicemember is a veteran, the date of separation, and that the separation is other than dishonorable. Where an employing office requires such documentation, an employee may provide a copy of the veteran's Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty issued by the U.S. Department of Defense (DD Form 214) or other proof of veteran status. See 825.127(c)(2).

(7) A description of the care to be provided to the covered servicemember and an estimate of the leave needed to provide the care.

(d) The Office of Compliance has developed an optional form (Form F) for employees' use in obtaining certification that meets FMLA's certification requirements. (See Form F). This optional form reflects certification requirements so as to permit the employee to furnish appropriate information to support his or her request for leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. Form F, or Form WH-385 (developed by the Department of Labor), or another form containing the same basic information, may be used by the employing office; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section. In all instances the information on the certification must relate only to the serious injury or illness for which the current need for leave exists. An employing office may seek authentication and/or clarification of the certification under 825.307. However, second and third opinions under 825.307 are not permitted for leave to care for a covered servicemember. Additionally, recertifications under 825.308 are not permitted for leave to care for a covered servicemember. An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(j) of the FMLA.

(e) An employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification, in lieu of the Office of Compliance's optional certification form (Form F) or an employing office's own certification form, invitational travel orders (ITOs) or invitational travel authorizations (ITAs) issued to any family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. An ITO or ITA is sufficient certification for the duration of time specified in the ITO or ITA. During that time period, an eligible employee may take leave to care for the covered servicemember in a continuous

block of time or on an intermittent basis. An eligible employee who provides an ITO or ITA to support his or her request for leave may not be required to provide any additional or separate certification that leave taken on an intermittent basis during the period of time specified in the ITO or ITA is medically necessary. An ITO or ITA is sufficient certification for an employee entitled to take FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember regardless of whether the employee is named in the order or authorization.

(1) If an employee will need leave to care for a covered servicemember beyond the expiration date specified in an ITO or ITA, an employing office may request that the employee have one of the authorized health care providers listed under 825.310(a) complete the Office of Compliance optional certification form (Form F) or an employing office's own form, as requisite certification for the remainder of the employee's necessary leave period.

(2) An employing office may seek authentication and clarification of the ITO or ITA under 825.307. An employing office may not utilize the second or third opinion process outlined in 825.307 or the recertification process under 825.308 during the period of time in which leave is supported by an ITO or ITA.

(3) An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k) when an employee supports his or her request for FMLA leave with a copy of an ITO or ITA.

(f) An employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification of the servicemember's serious injury or illness documentation indicating the servicemember's enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers. Such documentation is sufficient certification of the servicemember's serious injury or illness to support the employee's request for military caregiver leave regardless of whether the employee is the named caregiver in the enrollment documentation.

(1) An employing office may seek authentication and clarification of the documentation indicating the servicemember's enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers under 825.307. An employing office may not utilize the second or third opinion process outlined in 825.307 or the recertification process under 825.308 when the servicemember's serious injury or illness is shown by documentation of enrollment in this program.

(2) An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k) when an employee supports his or her request for FMLA leave with a copy of such enrollment documentation. An employing office may also require an employee to provide documentation, such as a veteran's Form DD-214, showing that the discharge was other than dishonorable and the date of the veteran's discharge.

(g) Where medical certification is requested by an employing office, an employee may not be held liable for administrative delays in the issuance of military documents, despite the employee's diligent, good-faith efforts to obtain such documents. See

825.305(b). In all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave. See 825.305(d).

825.311 Intent to return to work.

(a) An employing office may require an employee on FMLA leave to report periodically on the employee's status and intent to return to work. The employing office's policy regarding such reports may not be discriminatory and must take into account all of the relevant facts and circumstances related to the individual employee's leave situation.

(b) If an employee gives unequivocal notice of intent not to return to work, the employing office's obligations under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to maintain health benefits (subject to COBRA requirements or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable) and to restore the employee cease. However, these obligations continue if an employee indicates he or she may be unable to return to work but expresses a continuing desire to do so.

(c) It may be necessary for an employee to take more leave than originally anticipated. Conversely, an employee may discover after beginning leave that the circumstances have changed and the amount of leave originally anticipated is no longer necessary. An employee may not be required to take more FMLA leave than necessary to resolve the circumstance that precipitated the need for leave. In both of these situations, the employing office may require that the employee provide the employing office reasonable notice (*i.e.*, within two business days) of the changed circumstances where foreseeable. The employing office may also obtain information on such changed circumstances through requested status reports.

825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

(a) As a condition of restoring an employee whose FMLA leave was occasioned by the employee's own serious health condition that made the employee unable to perform the employee's job, an employing office may have a uniformly-applied policy or practice that requires all similarly-situated employees (*i.e.*, same occupation, same serious health condition) who take leave for such conditions to obtain and present certification from the employee's health care provider that the employee is able to resume work. The employee has the same obligations to participate and cooperate (including providing a complete and sufficient certification or providing sufficient authorization to the health care provider to provide the information directly to the employing office) in the fitness-for-duty certification process as in the initial certification process. See 825.305(d).

(b) An employing office may seek a fitness-for-duty certification only with regard to the particular health condition that caused the employee's need for FMLA leave. The certification from the employee's health care provider must certify that the employee is able to resume work. Additionally, an employing office may require that the certification specifically address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job. In order to require such a certification, an employing office must provide an employee with a list of the essential functions of the employee's job no later than with the designation notice required by 825.300(d), and must indicate in the designation notice that the certification must ad-

dress the employee's ability to perform those essential functions. If the employing office satisfies these requirements, the employee's health care provider must certify that the employee can perform the identified essential functions of his or her job. Following the procedures set forth in 825.307(a), the employing office may contact the employee's health care provider for purposes of clarifying and authenticating the fitness-for-duty certification. Clarification may be requested only for the serious health condition for which FMLA leave was taken. The employing office may not delay the employee's return to work while contact with the health care provider is being made. No second or third opinions on a fitness-for-duty certification may be required.

(c) The cost of the certification shall be borne by the employee, and the employee is not entitled to be paid for the time or travel costs spent in acquiring the certification.

(d) The designation notice required in 825.300(d) shall advise the employee if the employing office will require a fitness-for-duty certification to return to work and whether that fitness-for-duty certification must address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job.

(e) An employing office may delay restoration to employment until an employee submits a required fitness-for-duty certification unless the employing office has failed to provide the notice required in paragraph (d) of this section. If an employing office provides the notice required, an employee who does not provide a fitness-for-duty certification or request additional FMLA leave is no longer entitled to reinstatement under the FMLA. See 825.313(d).

(f) An employing office is not entitled to a certification of fitness to return to duty for each absence taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule. However, an employing office is entitled to a certification of fitness to return to duty for such absences up to once every 30 days if reasonable safety concerns exist regarding the employee's ability to perform his or her duties, based on the serious health condition for which the employee took such leave. If an employing office chooses to require a fitness-for-duty certification under such circumstances, the employing office shall inform the employee at the same time it issues the designation notice that for each subsequent instance of intermittent or reduced schedule leave, the employee will be required to submit a fitness-for-duty certification unless one has already been submitted within the past 30 days. Alternatively, an employing office can set a different interval for requiring a fitness-for-duty certification as long as it does not exceed once every 30 days and as long as the employing office advises the employee of the requirement in advance of the employee taking the intermittent or reduced schedule leave. The employing office may not terminate the employment of the employee while awaiting such a certification of fitness to return to duty for an intermittent or reduced schedule leave absence. *Reasonable safety concerns* means a reasonable belief of significant risk of harm to the individual employee or others. In determining whether reasonable safety concerns exist, an employing office should consider the nature and severity of the potential harm and the likelihood that potential harm will occur.

(g) If the terms of a collective bargaining agreement govern an employee's return to work, those provisions shall be applied.

(h) Requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and

as made applicable by the CAA, apply. After an employee returns from FMLA leave, the ADA requires any medical examination at an employing office's expense by the employing office's health care provider be job-related and consistent with business necessity. For example, an attorney could not be required to submit to a medical examination or inquiry just because her leg had been amputated. The essential functions of an attorney's job do not require use of both legs; therefore such an inquiry would not be job related. An employing office may require a warehouse laborer, whose back impairment affects the ability to lift, to be examined by an orthopedist, but may not require this employee to submit to an HIV test where the test is not related to either the essential functions of his or her job or to his/her impairment. If an employee's serious health condition may also be a disability within the meaning of the ADA, as made applicable by the CAA, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the procedures for requesting medical information under the ADA.

825.313 Failure to provide certification.

(a) *Foreseeable leave.* In the case of foreseeable leave, if an employee fails to provide certification in a timely manner as required by 825.305, then an employing office may deny FMLA coverage until the required certification is provided. For example, if an employee has 15 days to provide a certification and does not provide the certification for 45 days without sufficient reason for the delay, the employing office can deny FMLA protections for the 30-day period following the expiration of the 15-day time period, if the employee takes leave during such period.

(b) *Unforeseeable leave.* In the case of unforeseeable leave, an employing office may deny FMLA coverage for the requested leave if the employee fails to provide a certification within 15 calendar days from receipt of the request for certification unless not practicable due to extenuating circumstances. For example, in the case of a medical emergency, it may not be practicable for an employee to provide the required certification within 15 calendar days. Absent such extenuating circumstances, if the employee fails to timely return the certification, the employing office can deny FMLA protections for the leave following the expiration of the 15-day time period until a sufficient certification is provided. If the employee never produces the certification, the leave is not FMLA leave.

(c) *Recertification.* An employee must provide recertification within the time requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the request) or as soon as practicable under the particular facts and circumstances. If an employee fails to provide a recertification within a reasonable time under the particular facts and circumstances, then the employing office may deny continuation of the FMLA leave protections until the employee produces a sufficient recertification. If the employee never produces the recertification, the leave is not FMLA leave. Recertification does not apply to leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember.

(d) *Fitness-for-duty certification.* When requested by the employing office pursuant to a uniformly applied policy for similarly-situated employees, the employee must provide medical certification, at the time the employee seeks reinstatement at the end of FMLA leave taken for the employee's serious health condition, that the employee is fit for

duty and able to return to work (see 825.312(a)) if the employing office has provided the required notice (see 825.300(e)); the employing office may delay restoration until the certification is provided. Unless the employee provides either a fitness-for-duty certification or a new medical certification for a serious health condition at the time FMLA leave is concluded, the employee may be terminated. See also 825.213(a)(3).

SUBPART D—ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

825.400 Enforcement of FMLA rights, as made applicable by the CAA.

(a) To commence a proceeding, a covered employee alleging a violation of the rights and protections of the FMLA, made applicable by the CAA, must request counseling by the Office of Compliance not later than 180 days after the date of the alleged violation. If a covered employee misses this deadline, the covered employee will be unable to obtain a remedy under the CAA.

(b) The following procedures are available under title IV of the CAA for covered employees who believe that their rights under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, have been violated:

- (1) counseling;
- (2) mediation; and
- (3) election of either—

(A) a formal complaint, filed with the Office of Compliance, and a hearing before a hearing officer, subject to review by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance, and judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; or

(B) a civil action in a district court of the United States.

(c) Regulations of the Office of Compliance describing and governing these procedures are found at www.compliance.gov.

825.401 [Reserved]

825.402 [Reserved]

825.403 [Reserved]

825.404 [Reserved]

SUBPART E—[RESERVED]

SUBPART F—SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS

825.600 Special rules for school employees, definitions.

(a) Certain special rules apply to employees of local educational agencies, including public school boards and elementary schools under their jurisdiction, and private elementary and secondary schools. The special rules do not apply to other kinds of educational institutions, such as colleges and universities, trade schools, and preschools.

(b) Educational institutions are covered by FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA (and these special rules). The usual requirements for employees to be eligible do apply.

(c) The special rules affect the taking of intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule, or leave near the end of an academic term (semester), by instructional employees. *Instructional employees* are those whose principal function is to teach and instruct students in a class, a small group, or an individual setting. This term includes not only teachers, but also athletic coaches, driving instructors, and special education assistants such as signers for the hearing impaired. It does not include, and the special rules do not apply to, teacher assistants or aides who do not have as their principal job actual teaching or instructing, nor does it include auxiliary personnel such as counselors, psychologists, or curriculum specialists. It also does not include cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, or bus drivers.

(d) Special rules which apply to restoration to an equivalent position apply to all employees of local educational agencies.

825.601 Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave.

(a) Leave taken for a period that ends with the school year and begins the next semester is leave taken consecutively rather than intermittently. The period during the summer vacation when the employee would not have been required to report for duty is not counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. An instructional employee who is on FMLA leave at the end of the school year must be provided with any benefits over the summer vacation that employees would normally receive if they had been working at the end of the school year.

(1) If an eligible instructional employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule to care for a family member with a serious health condition, to care for a covered servicemember, or for the employee's own serious health condition, which is foreseeable based on planned medical treatment, and the employee would be on leave for more than 20 percent of the total number of working days over the period the leave would extend, the employing office may require the employee to choose either to:

(i) Take leave for a period or periods of a particular duration, not greater than the duration of the planned treatment; or

(ii) Transfer temporarily to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified, which has equivalent pay and benefits and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position.

(2) These rules apply only to a leave involving more than 20 percent of the working days during the period over which the leave extends. For example, if an instructional employee who normally works five days each week needs to take two days of FMLA leave per week over a period of several weeks, the special rules would apply. Employees taking leave which constitutes 20 percent or less of the working days during the leave period would not be subject to transfer to an alternative position. *Periods of a particular duration* means a block, or blocks, of time beginning no earlier than the first day for which leave is needed and ending no later than the last day on which leave is needed, and may include one uninterrupted period of leave.

(b) If an instructional employee does not give required notice of foreseeable FMLA leave (see 825.302) to be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule, the employing office may require the employee to take leave of a particular duration, or to transfer temporarily to an alternative position. Alternatively, the employing office may require the employee to delay the taking of leave until the notice provision is met.

825.602 Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term.

(a) There are also different rules for instructional employees who begin leave more than five weeks before the end of a term, less than five weeks before the end of a term, and less than three weeks before the end of a term. Regular rules apply except in circumstances when:

(1) An instructional employee begins leave more than five weeks before the end of a term. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if—

(i) The leave will last at least three weeks, and

(ii) The employee would return to work during the three-week period before the end of the term.

(2) The employee begins leave during the five-week period before the end of a term because of the birth of a son or daughter; the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care; to care for a spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition; or to care for a covered service-member. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if—

(i) The leave will last more than two weeks, and

(ii) The employee would return to work during the two-week period before the end of the term.

(3) The employee begins leave during the three-week period before the end of a term because of the birth of a son or daughter; the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care; to care for a spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition; or to care for a covered service-member. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the leave will last more than five working days.

(b) For purposes of these provisions, *academic term* means the school semester, which typically ends near the end of the calendar year and the end of spring each school year. In no case may a school have more than two academic terms or semesters each year for purposes of FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. An example of leave falling within these provisions would be where an employee plans two weeks of leave to care for a family member which will begin three weeks before the end of the term. In that situation, the employing office could require the employee to stay out on leave until the end of the term.

825.603 Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave.

(a) If an employee chooses to take leave for periods of a particular duration in the case of intermittent or reduced schedule leave, the entire period of leave taken will count as FMLA leave.

(b) In the case of an employee who is required to take leave until the end of an academic term, only the period of leave until the employee is ready and able to return to work shall be charged against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. The employing office has the option not to require the employee to stay on leave until the end of the school term. Therefore, any additional leave required by the employing office to the end of the school term is not counted as FMLA leave; however, the employing office shall be required to maintain the employee's group health insurance and restore the employee to the same or equivalent job including other benefits at the conclusion of the leave.

825.604 Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

The determination of how an employee is to be restored to an equivalent position upon return from FMLA leave will be made on the basis of "established school board policies and practices, private school policies and practices, and collective bargaining agreements." The "established policies" and collective bargaining agreements used as a basis for restoration must be in writing, must be made known to the employee prior to the taking of FMLA leave, and must clearly explain the employee's restoration rights upon return from leave. Any established policy which is used as the basis for

restoration of an employee to an equivalent position must provide substantially the same protections as provided in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, for reinstated employees. See 825.215. In other words, the policy or collective bargaining agreement must provide for restoration to an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. For example, an employee may not be restored to a position requiring additional licensure or certification.

SUBPART G—EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS, EMPLOYING OFFICE PRACTICES, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS ON EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

(a) An employing office must observe any employment benefit program or plan that provides greater family or medical leave rights to employees than the rights established by the FMLA. Conversely, the rights established by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, may not be diminished by any employment benefit program or plan. For example, a provision of a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) which provides for reinstatement to a position that is not equivalent because of seniority (*e.g.*, provides lesser pay) is superseded by FMLA. If an employing office provides greater unpaid family leave rights than are afforded by FMLA, the employing office is not required to extend additional rights afforded by FMLA, such as maintenance of health benefits (other than through COBRA or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable), to the additional leave period not covered by FMLA.

(b) Nothing in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, prevents an employing office from amending existing leave and employee benefit programs, provided they comply with FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. However, nothing in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, is intended to discourage employing offices from adopting or retaining more generous leave policies.

825.701 [Reserved]

825.702 Interaction with anti-discrimination laws, as applied by section 201 of the CAA.

(a) Nothing in FMLA modifies or affects any applicable law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability (*e.g.*, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and as made applicable by the CAA). FMLA's legislative history explains that FMLA is "not intended to modify or affect the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the regulations concerning employment which have been promulgated pursuant to that statute, or the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 [as amended] or the regulations issued under that act. Thus, the leave provisions of the [FMLA] are wholly distinct from the reasonable accommodation obligations of employers covered under the [ADA] . . . or the Federal government itself. The purpose of the FMLA, as applied by the CAA, is to make leave available to eligible employees and [employing offices] within its coverage, and not to limit already existing rights and protection." S. Rep. No. 3, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. 38 (1993). An employing office must therefore provide leave under whichever statutory provision provides the greater rights to employees. When an employer violates both FMLA and a discrimination law,

an employee may be able to recover under either or both statutes (double relief may not be awarded for the same loss; when remedies coincide a claimant may be allowed to utilize whichever avenue of relief is desired. *Laffey v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*, 567 F.2d 429, 445 (D.C. Cir. 1976), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 1086 (1978).

(b) If an employee is a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the employing office must make reasonable accommodations, *etc.*, barring undue hardship, in accordance with the ADA. At the same time, the employing office must afford an employee his or her FMLA rights. ADA's "disability" and FMLA's "serious health condition" are different concepts, and must be analyzed separately. FMLA entitles eligible employees to 12 weeks of leave in any 12-month period due to their own serious health condition, whereas the ADA allows an indeterminate amount of leave, barring undue hardship, as a reasonable accommodation. FMLA requires employing offices to maintain employees' group health plan coverage during FMLA leave on the same conditions as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the leave period, whereas ADA does not require maintenance of health insurance unless other employees receive health insurance during leave under the same circumstances.

(c)(1) A reasonable accommodation under the ADA might be accomplished by providing an individual with a disability with a part-time job with no health benefits, assuming the employing office did not ordinarily provide health insurance for part-time employees. However, FMLA would permit an employee to work a reduced leave schedule until the equivalent of 12 workweeks of leave were used, with group health benefits maintained during this period. FMLA permits an employing office to temporarily transfer an employee who is taking leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule to an alternative position, whereas the ADA allows an accommodation of reassignment to an equivalent, vacant position only if the employee cannot perform the essential functions of the employee's present position and an accommodation is not possible in the employee's present position, or an accommodation in the employee's present position would cause an undue hardship. The examples in the following paragraphs of this section demonstrate how the two laws would interact with respect to a qualified individual with a disability.

(2) A qualified individual with a disability who is also an eligible employee entitled to FMLA leave requests 10 weeks of medical leave as a reasonable accommodation, which the employing office grants because it is not an undue hardship. The employing office advises the employee that the 10 weeks of leave is also being designated as FMLA leave and will count towards the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. This designation does not prevent the parties from also treating the leave as a reasonable accommodation and reinstating the employee into the same job, as required by the ADA, rather than an equivalent position under FMLA, if that is the greater right available to the employee. At the same time, the employee would be entitled under FMLA to have the employing office maintain group health plan coverage during the leave, as that requirement provides the greater right to the employee.

(3) If the same employee needed to work part-time (a reduced leave schedule) after returning to his or her same job, the employee

would still be entitled under FMLA to have group health plan coverage maintained for the remainder of the two-week equivalent of FMLA leave entitlement, notwithstanding an employing office policy that part-time employees do not receive health insurance. This employee would be entitled under the ADA to reasonable accommodations to enable the employee to perform the essential functions of the part-time position. In addition, because the employee is working a part-time schedule as a reasonable accommodation, the FMLA's provision for temporary assignment to a different alternative position would not apply. Once the employee has exhausted his or her remaining FMLA leave entitlement while working the reduced (part-time) schedule, if the employee is a qualified individual with a disability, and if the employee is unable to return to the same full-time position at that time, the employee might continue to work part-time as a reasonable accommodation, barring undue hardship; the employee would then be entitled to only those employment benefits ordinarily provided by the employing office to part-time employees.

(4) At the end of the FMLA leave entitlement, an employing office is required under FMLA to reinstate the employee in the same or an equivalent position, with equivalent pay and benefits, to that which the employee held when leave commenced. The employing office's FMLA obligations would be satisfied if the employing office offered the employee an equivalent full-time position. If the employee were unable to perform the essential functions of that equivalent position even with reasonable accommodation, because of a disability, the ADA may require the employing office to make a reasonable accommodation at that time by allowing the employee to work part-time or by reassigning the employee to a vacant position, barring undue hardship.

(d)(1) If FMLA entitles an employee to leave, an employing office may not, in lieu of FMLA leave entitlement, require an employee to take a job with a reasonable accommodation. However, ADA may require that an employing office offer an employee the opportunity to take such a position. An employing office may not change the essen-

tial functions of the job in order to deny FMLA leave. *See* 825.220(b).

(2) An employee may be on a workers' compensation absence due to an on-the-job injury or illness which also qualifies as a serious health condition under FMLA. The workers' compensation absence and FMLA leave may run concurrently (subject to proper notice and designation by the employing office). At some point the health care provider providing medical care pursuant to the workers' compensation injury may certify the employee is able to return to work in a light duty position. If the employing office offers such a position, the employee is permitted but not required to accept the position. *See* 825.220(d). As a result, the employee may no longer qualify for payments from the workers' compensation benefit plan, but the employee is entitled to continue on unpaid FMLA leave either until the employee is able to return to the same or equivalent job the employee left or until the 12-week FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted. *See* 825.207(e). If the employee returning from the workers' compensation injury is a qualified individual with a disability, he or she will have rights under the ADA.

(e) If an employing office requires certifications of an employee's fitness for duty to return to work, as permitted by FMLA under a uniform policy, it must comply with the ADA requirement that a fitness for duty physical be job-related and consistent with business necessity.

(f) Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, and as made applicable by the CAA, an employing office should provide the same benefits for women who are pregnant as the employing office provides to other employees with short-term disabilities. Because Title VII does not require employees to be employed for a certain period of time to be protected, an employee employed for less than 12 months by the employing office (and, therefore, not an "eligible" employee under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA) may not be denied maternity leave if the employing office normally provides short-term disability benefits to employees with the same tenure who are experiencing other short-term disabilities.

(g) Under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994

(USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, veterans are entitled to receive all rights and benefits of employment that they would have obtained if they had been continuously employed. Therefore, under USERRA, a returning servicemember would be eligible for FMLA leave if the months and hours that he or she would have worked for the civilian employing office during the period of absence due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, combined with the months employed and the hours actually worked, meet the FMLA eligibility threshold of 12 months of employment and the hours of service requirement. *See* 825.110(b)(2)(i) and (c)(2) and 825.802(c).

(h) For further information on Federal antidiscrimination laws applied by section 201 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1311), including Title VII, the Rehabilitation Act, and the ADA, individuals are encouraged to contact the Office of Compliance.

ENDNOTES

1. In contrast, the committee report accompanying the bill containing the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 complied with section 102(b)(3) of the CAA and contained a provision that indicated an intent to apply the ADA Amendments to the legislative branch. Committee on Education and Labor, H.Rpt. 110-730 § VII (June 23, 2008).

2. By regulation, the Board can require employing offices to provide the additional rights and protections for servicemembers and their families added to the FMLA since 1996. This is because, unlike executive branch agencies, the rulemaking power of the Board (after Congressional approval) is "an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate" under the Constitution. 2 U.S.C. §1431(1). The rulemaking power of Congress under the Constitution, U.S. Const. Art. 1, §5, cl. 2, is a "broad grant of authority" that allows each house of Congress to determine its own internal rules bounded only by "constitutional restraints and fundamental rights." *Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Ass'n*, 515 F.2d 1341, 1343 (D.C. Cir. 1975); *United States v. Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1, 5 (1892).

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification of Health Care Provider
for Employee's Serious Health Condition**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable
by the Congressional Accountability Act)**Form A****SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA protections because of a need for leave due to a serious health condition to submit a medical certification issued by the employee's health care provider. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.306-825.308. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

Employing office name and contact: _____

Employee's job title: _____ Regular work schedule: _____

Employee's essential job functions: _____

Check if job description is attached: ☐**SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II before giving this form to your medical provider. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient medical certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to your own serious health condition. If requested by your employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA protections. Failure to provide a complete and sufficient medical certification may result in a denial of your FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.313. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form. OOC regulations at 825.305(b).

Your Name: _____
First Middle Last**SECTION III: For Completion by the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER**

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: Your patient has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the condition for which the employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests

as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e), or the manifestation of disease or disorder in the employee's family members, 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(b). Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.

Provider's name and business address: _____

Type of practice / Medical specialty: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____ Fax: (_____) _____ - _____

PART A: MEDICAL FACTS

1. Approximate date condition commenced: _____

Probable duration of condition: _____

Mark below as applicable:

Was the patient admitted for an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, dates of admission: _____

Date(s) you treated the patient for condition: _____

Will the patient need to have treatment visits at least twice per year due to the condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was medication, other than over-the-counter medication, prescribed? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was the patient referred to other health care provider(s) for evaluation or treatment (e.g., physical therapist)?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, state the nature of such treatments and expected duration of treatment: _____

2. Is the medical condition pregnancy? ☐ No ☐ Yes If so, expected delivery date: _____

3. Use the information provided by the employing office in Section I to answer this question. If the employing office fails to provide a list of the employee's essential functions or a job description, answer these questions based upon the employee's own description of his/her job functions.

Is the employee unable to perform any of his/her job functions due to the condition: ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, identify the job functions the employee is unable to perform: _____

4. Describe other relevant medical facts, if any, related to the condition for which the employee seeks leave (such medical facts may include symptoms, diagnosis, or any regimen of continuing treatment such as the use of specialized equipment): _____

PART B: AMOUNT OF LEAVE NEEDED

5. Will the employee be incapacitated for a single continuous period of time due to his/her medical condition, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of incapacity: _____

6. Will the employee need to attend follow-up treatment appointments or work part-time or on a reduced schedule because of the employee's medical condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, are the treatments or the reduced number of hours of work medically necessary? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate treatment schedule, if any, including the dates of any scheduled appointments and the time required for each appointment, including any recovery period:

Estimate the part-time or reduced work schedule the employee needs, if any:

_____ hour(s) per day; _____ days per week from _____ through _____

7. Will the condition cause episodic flare-ups periodically preventing the employee from performing his/her job functions? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Is it medically necessary for the employee to be absent from work during the flare-ups? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, explain: _____

Based upon the patient's medical history and your knowledge of the medical condition, estimate the frequency of flare-ups and the duration of related incapacity that the patient may have over the next 6 months (e.g., 1 episode every 3 months lasting 1-2 days):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours or _____ day(s) per episode

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: IDENTIFY QUESTION NUMBER WITH YOUR ADDITIONAL ANSWER.

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There is no text or other markings on the paper.

Signature of Health Care Provider

Date _____

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification of Health Care Provider
for Family Member's Serious Health
Condition**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable
by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form B

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA protections because of a need for leave to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition to submit a medical certification issued by the health care provider of the covered family member. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.306-825.308. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees' family members created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

Employing office name and contact: _____

SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II before giving this form to your family member or his/her medical provider. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient medical certification to support a request for FMLA leave to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition. If requested by your employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA protections. Failure to provide a complete and sufficient medical certification may result in a denial of your FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.313. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form to your employing office. OOC regulations at 825.305(b).

Your Name: _____
First Middle LastName of family member for whom you will provide care: _____
First Middle Last

Relationship of family member to you: _____

If family member is your son or daughter, date of birth: _____

Describe care you will provide to your family member and estimate leave needed to provide care:

Employee Signature

Date

SECTION III: For Completion by the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee listed above has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for your patient. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts below. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the condition for which the patient needs leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e). Page 3 provides space for additional information, should you need it. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.

Provider's name and business address: _____

Type of practice / Medical specialty: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____ Fax: (_____) _____ - _____

PART A: MEDICAL FACTS

1. Approximate date condition commenced: _____

Probable duration of condition: _____

Was the patient admitted for an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, dates of admission: _____

Date(s) you treated the patient for condition: _____

Was medication, other than over-the-counter medication, prescribed? ☐ No ☐ YesWill the patient need to have treatment visits at least twice per year due to the condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was the patient referred to other health care provider(s) for evaluation or treatment (e.g., physical therapist)?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, state the nature of such treatments and expected duration of treatment:_____
_____2. Is the medical condition pregnancy? ☐ No ☐ Yes If so, expected delivery date: _____

3. Describe other relevant medical facts, if any, related to the condition for which the patient needs care (such medical facts may include symptoms, diagnosis, or any regimen of continuing treatment such as the use of specialized equipment):

PART B: AMOUNT OF CARE NEEDED: When answering these questions, keep in mind that your patient's need for care by the employee seeking leave may include assistance with basic medical, hygienic, nutritional, safety or transportation needs, or the provision of physical or psychological care:

4. Will the patient be incapacitated for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of incapacity: _____

During this time, will the patient need care? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Explain the care needed by the patient and why such care is medically necessary: _____

5. Will the patient require follow-up treatments, including any time for recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate treatment schedule, if any, including the dates of any scheduled appointments and the time required for each appointment, including any recovery period:

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

6. Will the patient require care on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis, including any time for recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate the hours the patient needs care on an intermittent basis, if any:

_____ hour(s) per day; _____ days per week from _____ through _____

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

7. Will the condition cause episodic flare-ups periodically preventing the patient from participating in normal daily activities? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Based upon the patient’s medical history and your knowledge of the medical condition, estimate the frequency of flare-ups and the duration of related incapacity that the patient may have over the next 6 months (e.g., 1 episode every 3 months lasting 1-2 days):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours or _____ day(s) per episode

Does the patient need care during these flare-ups? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: IDENTIFY QUESTION NUMBER WITH YOUR ADDITIONAL ANSWER.

Signature of Health Care Provider

Date:

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Notice of Eligibility Rights and Responsibilities**

(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form C

In general, to be eligible a covered employee must have worked for an employing office for at least 12 months and have worked at least 1,250 hours in the 12 months preceding the leave. While use of this form by employing offices is optional, a fully completed form provides employees with the information required by the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.300(b), which must be provided within five business days of the employee notifying the employing office of the need for FMLA leave. Part B provides employees with information regarding their rights and responsibilities for taking FMLA leave, as required by the Board's FMLA regulations at 825.300(b), (c).

[Part A – NOTICE OF ELIGIBILITY]TO: _____
EmployeeFROM: _____
Employing Office Representative

DATE: _____

On _____, you informed us that you needed leave beginning on _____ for:

- ☐ The birth of a child, or placement of a child with you for adoption or foster care;
- ☐ Your own serious health condition;
- ☐ Because you are needed to care for your ☐ spouse; ☐ child; ☐ parent due to his/her serious health condition.
- ☐ Because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that your ☐ spouse; ☐ son or daughter; ☐ parent is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status with the Armed Forces.
- ☐ Because you are the ☐ spouse; ☐ son or daughter; ☐ parent; ☐ next of kin of a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness.

This Notice is to inform you that you:

- ☐ Are eligible for FMLA leave (See Part B below for Rights and Responsibilities)
- ☐ Are **not** eligible for FMLA leave, because (only one reason need be checked, although you may not be eligible for other reasons):
- ☐ You have not met the FMLA's 12-month length of service requirement. As of the first date of requested leave, you will have worked approximately _____ months towards this requirement.
- ☐ You have not met the FMLA's 1,250-hours-worked requirement.

If you have any questions, contact: _____ or view the FMLA poster located in _____.

[PART B—RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TAKING FMLA LEAVE]

As explained in Part A, you meet the eligibility requirements for taking FMLA leave and still have FMLA leave available in the applicable 12-month period. **However, in order for us to determine whether your absence qualifies as FMLA leave, you must return the following information to us by _____.** (If a certification is requested, employing offices must allow at least 15 calendar days from receipt of this notice; additional time may be required in some circumstances.) If sufficient information is not provided in a timely manner, your leave may be denied.

- ☐ Sufficient certification to support your request for FMLA leave. A certification form that sets forth the information necessary to support your request is/ is not enclosed.
- ☐ Sufficient documentation to establish the required relationship between you and your family member.
- ☐ Other information needed (such as documentation for military family leave): _____

- ☐ No additional information requested

If your leave does qualify as FMLA leave, you will have the following responsibilities while on FMLA leave (only checked blanks apply):

- ☐ Contact _____ at _____ to make arrangements to continue to make your share of the premium payments on your health insurance to maintain health benefits while you are on leave. You have a minimum 30-day (or, indicate longer period, if applicable) grace period in which to make premium payments. If payment is not made timely, your group health insurance may be cancelled, provided we notify you in writing at least 15 days before the date that your health coverage will lapse, or, at our option, we may pay your share of the premiums during FMLA leave, and recover these payments from you upon your return to work.
- ☐ You will be required to use your available paid sick , vacation , and/or other leave during your FMLA absence. This means that you will receive your paid leave and the leave will also be considered protected FMLA leave and counted against your FMLA leave entitlement.
- ☐ Due to your status within the company, you are considered a “key employee” as defined in the FMLA. As a “key employee,” restoration to employment may be denied following FMLA leave on the grounds that such restoration will cause substantial and grievous economic injury to us. We have/ have not determined that restoring you to employment at the conclusion of FMLA leave will cause substantial and grievous economic harm to us.
- ☐ While on leave you will be required to furnish us with periodic reports of your status and intent to return to work every _____. (Indicate interval of periodic reports, as appropriate for the particular leave situation).

If the circumstances of your leave change, and you are able to return to work earlier than the date indicated on this form, you will be required to notify us at least two workdays prior to the date you intend to report for work.

If your leave does qualify as FMLA leave you will have the following rights while on FMLA leave:

- You have a right under the FMLA for up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave in a 12-month period calculated as:

- ☐ the calendar year (January – December).
- ☐ a fixed leave year based on _____.
- ☐ the 12-month period measured forward from the date of your first FMLA leave usage.
- ☐ a “rolling” 12-month period measured backward from the date of any FMLA leave usage.
- You have a right under the FMLA for up to 26 weeks of unpaid leave in a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. This single 12-month period commenced on _____.
 - Your health benefits must be maintained during any period of unpaid leave under the same conditions as if you continued to work.
 - You must be reinstated to the same or an equivalent job with the same pay, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment on your return from FMLA-protected leave. (If your leave extends beyond the end of your FMLA entitlement, you do not have return rights under FMLA.)
 - If you do not return to work following FMLA leave for a reason other than: 1) the continuation, recurrence, or onset of a serious health condition which would entitle you to FMLA leave; 2) the continuation, recurrence, or onset of a covered servicemember’s serious injury or illness which would entitle you to FMLA leave; or 3) other circumstances beyond your control, you may be required to reimburse us for our share of health insurance premiums paid on your behalf during your FMLA leave.
 - If we have not informed you above that you must use accrued paid leave while taking your unpaid FMLA leave entitlement, you have the right to have ____ **sick**, ____ **vacation**, and/or ____ **other leave** run concurrently with your unpaid leave entitlement, provided you meet any applicable requirements of the leave policy. Applicable conditions related to the substitution of paid leave are referenced or set forth below. If you do not meet the requirements for taking paid leave, you remain entitled to take unpaid FMLA leave.
- ☐ For a copy of conditions applicable to sick/vacation/other leave usage please refer to _____ available at: _____.
- ☐ Applicable conditions for use of paid leave: _____

Once we obtain the information from you as specified above, we will inform you, within 5 business days, whether your leave will be designated as FMLA leave and count towards your FMLA leave entitlement. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact: _____ at _____.

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Designation Notice**

(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form D

Leave covered under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), must be designated as FMLA-protected and the employing office must inform the employee of the amount of leave that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. In order to determine whether leave is covered under the FMLA, the employing office may request that the leave be supported by a certification. If the certification is incomplete or insufficient, the employing office must state in writing what additional information is necessary to make the certification complete and sufficient. While use of this form by employing offices is optional, a fully completed form provides an easy method of providing employees with the written information required by the regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.300(d), 825.301, and 825.305(c).

To: _____

Date: _____

We have reviewed your request for leave under the FMLA and any supporting documentation that you have provided. We received your most recent information on _____ and decided:

____ Your FMLA leave request is approved. All leave taken for this reason will be designated as FMLA leave.

The FMLA requires that you notify us as soon as practicable if dates of scheduled leave change or are extended, or were initially unknown. Based on the information you have provided to date, we are providing the following information about the amount of time that will be counted against your leave entitlement:

____ Provided there is no deviation from your anticipated leave schedule, the following number of hours, days, or weeks will be counted against your leave entitlement: _____.

____ Because the leave you will need will be unscheduled, it is not possible to provide the hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against your FMLA entitlement at this time. You have the right to request this information once in a 30-day period (if leave was taken in the 30-day period).

Please be advised (check if applicable):

____ You have requested to use paid leave during your FMLA leave. Any paid leave taken for this reason will count against your FMLA leave entitlement.

____ We are requiring you to substitute or use paid leave during your FMLA leave.

____ You will be required to present a fitness-for-duty certificate to be restored to employment. If such certification is not timely received, your return to work may be delayed until certification is provided. A list of the essential functions of your position ____ is ____ is not attached. If attached, the fitness-for-duty certification must address your ability to perform these functions.

Additional information is needed to determine if your FMLA leave request can be approved:

____ The certification you have provided is not complete and sufficient to determine whether the FMLA applies to your leave request. You must provide the following information no later than _____,
(Provide at least seven calendar days)
unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances despite your diligent good faith efforts, or your leave may be denied.

(Specify information needed to make certification complete and sufficient)

____ We are exercising our right to have you obtain a second or third opinion medical certification at our expense, and we will provide further details at a later time.

____ Your FMLA Leave request is Not Approved.

____ The FMLA does not apply to your leave request.

____ You have exhausted your FMLA leave entitlement in the applicable 12-month period.

Office of Compliance

advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch

Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave

(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form E

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency to submit a certification. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary, and while you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.309.

Employing office name: _____

Contact Information: _____

SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II fully and completely. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency. Several questions in this section seek a response as to the frequency or duration of the qualifying exigency. Be as specific as you can; terms such as “unknown,” or “indeterminate” may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Your response is required to obtain a benefit. OOC regulations at 825.310. While you are not required to provide this information, failure to do so may result in a denial of your request for FMLA leave. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form to your employing office.

Your Name: _____
First Middle Last

Name of military member on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status:

First Middle Last

Relationship of military member to you: _____

Period of military member's covered active duty: _____

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency includes written documentation confirming a military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status. Please check one of the following and attach the indicated document to support that the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status.

___ A copy of the military member's covered active duty orders is attached.

___ Other documentation from the military certifying that the military member is on covered active duty (or has been notified of an impending call to covered active duty) is attached.

___ I have previously provided my employing office with sufficient written documentation confirming the military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status.

PART A: QUALIFYING REASON FOR LEAVE

1. Describe the reason you are requesting FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency (including the specific reason you are requesting leave):

2. A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency includes any available written documentation which supports the need for leave; such documentation may include a copy of a meeting announcement for informational briefings sponsored by the military, a document confirming the military member's Rest and Recuperation leave; a document confirming an appointment with a third party, such as a counselor or school official, or staff at a care facility; or a copy of a bill for services for the handling of legal or financial affairs. Available written documentation supporting this request for leave is attached.

Yes ☐ No ☐ None Available ☐

PART B: AMOUNT OF LEAVE NEEDED:

1. Approximate date exigency commenced: _____

Probable duration of exigency: _____

2. Will you need to be absent from work for a single continuous period of time due to the qualifying exigency? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of absence:

3. Will you need to be absent from work periodically to address this qualifying exigency? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Estimate schedule of leave, including the dates of any scheduled meetings or appointments:

Estimate the frequency and duration of each appointment, meeting, or leave event, including any travel time (*i.e.*, 1 deployment-related meeting every month lasting 4 hours):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours _____ day(s) per event.

PART C:

If leave is requested to meet with a third party (such as to arrange for childcare, to attend counseling, to attend meetings with school, childcare or parental care providers, to make financial or legal arrangements, to act as the military member's representative before a federal, state, or local agency for purposes of obtaining, arranging or appealing military service benefits, or to attend any event sponsored by the military or military service organizations), a complete and sufficient certification includes the name, address, and appropriate contact

information of the individual or entity with whom you are meeting (*i.e.*, either the telephone or fax number or email address of the individual or entity). This information may be used by your employing office to verify that the information contained on this form is accurate.

Name of Individual: _____ Title: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ Fax: (____) _____

Email: _____

Describe nature of meeting: _____

PART D:

I certify that the information I provided above is true and correct.

Signature of Employee

Date:

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a
Current Servicemember –
for Military Family Leave**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form F

Notice to the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a current servicemember to submit a certification providing sufficient facts to support the request for leave. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.310. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees or employees' family members created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

**SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the CURRENT
SERVICEMEMBER for whom the Employee is Requesting Leave**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE or CURRENT SERVICEMEMBER: Please complete Section I before having Section II completed. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that an employee submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a servicemember. If requested by the employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA-protected leave. Failure to do so may result in a denial of an employee's FMLA request. Board's regulations at 825.310(f). The employing office must give an employee at least 15 calendar days to return this form to the employing office.

SECTION II: For Completion by a UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE ("DOD") HEALTH CARE PROVIDER or a HEALTH CARE PROVIDER who is either: (1) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (2) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (3) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (4) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125.

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee listed on Page 2 has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for a family member who is a current member of the Regular Armed Forces, the National Guard, or the Reserves who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list for a serious injury or illness. For purposes of FMLA leave, a serious injury or illness is one that was incurred in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of his or her office, grade, rank, or rating.

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a covered servicemember's serious injury or illness includes written documentation confirming that the servicemember's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or if not, that the current servicemember's injury or illness existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces, and that the current servicemember is undergoing treatment for such injury or illness by a health care provider listed above. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as

to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the servicemember's condition for which the employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e).

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the CURRENT SERVICEMEMBER for whom the Employee Is Requesting Leave:

(This section must be completed first before any of the below sections can be completed by a health care provider.)

Part A: EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Name and Address of Employing Office (this is the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for the current servicemember):

Name of Employee Requesting Leave to Care for Current Servicemember:

Name of the Current Servicemember (for whom employee is requesting leave to care):

Relationship of Employee to the Current Servicemember:

☐ Spouse ☐ Parent ☐ Son ☐ Daughter ☐ Next of Kin

Part B: SERVICEMEMBER INFORMATION

- (1) Is the Servicemember a Current Member of the Regular Armed Forces, the National Guard or Reserves?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide the servicemember's military branch, rank and unit currently assigned to:

Is the servicemember assigned to a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient or to a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients (such as a medical hold or warrior transition unit)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide the name of the medical treatment facility or unit:

- (2) Is the Servicemember on the Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL)?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Part C: CARE TO BE PROVIDED TO THE SERVICEMEMBER

Describe the Care to Be Provided to the Current Servicemember and an Estimate of the Leave Needed to Provide the Care:

SECTION II: For Completion by a United States Department of Defense ("DOD") Health Care Provider or a Health Care Provider who is either: (1) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (2) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (3) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (4) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125.

If you are unable to make certain of the military-related determinations contained below in Part B, you are permitted to rely upon determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as a DOD recovery care coordinator).

(Please ensure that Section I above has been completed before completing this section. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.)

Part A: HEALTH CARE PROVIDER INFORMATION

Health Care Provider's Name and Business Address:

Type of Practice/Medical Specialty:

Please state whether you are either: (1) a DOD health care provider; (2) a VA health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (5) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125:

Telephone: () - Fax: () -

Email: _____

PART B: MEDICAL STATUS

(1) The current Servicemember's medical condition is classified as (Check One of the Appropriate Boxes):

☐ **(VSI) Very Seriously Ill/Injured** – Illness/Injury is of such a severity that life is imminently endangered. Family members are requested at bedside immediately. (Please note this is an internal DOD casualty assistance designation used by DOD healthcare providers.)

☐ **(SI) Seriously Ill/Injured** – Illness/injury is of such severity that there is cause for immediate concern, but there is no imminent danger to life. Family members are requested at bedside. (Please note this is an internal DOD casualty assistance designation used by DOD healthcare providers.)

☐ **OTHER Ill/Injured** – a serious injury or illness that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating.

☐ **NONE OF THE ABOVE** (Note to Employee: If this box is checked, you may still be eligible to take leave to care for a covered family member with a "serious health condition" under 825.113 of the FMLA,

as made applicable by the CAA. If such leave is requested, you may be required to complete the OOC's optional certification form (Form B) or an employing office-provided form seeking the same information.)

- (2) Is the current Servicemember being treated for a condition which was incurred or gravitated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (3) Approximate date condition commenced: _____
- (4) Probable duration of condition and/or need for care: _____
- (5) Is the servicemember undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for this condition?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe medical treatment, recuperation or therapy:

PART C: SERVICEMEMBER'S NEED FOR CARE BY FAMILY MEMBER

- (1) Will the servicemember need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, estimate the beginning and ending dates for this period of time:

- (2) Will the servicemember require periodic follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, estimate the treatment schedule: _____

- (3) Is there a medical necessity for the servicemember to have periodic care for these follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No.

- (4) Is there a medical necessity for the servicemember to have periodic care for other than scheduled follow-up treatment appointments (*e.g.*, episodic flare-ups of medical condition)? ☐ Yes ☐ No.

If yes, please estimate the frequency and duration of the periodic care:

Signature of Health Care Provider: _____ Date: _____

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a
Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form G

Notice to the EMPLOYING OFFICE

The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking military caregiver leave under the FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a covered veteran to submit a certification providing sufficient facts to support the request for leave. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.310. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees or employees' family members, created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

**SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the VETERAN for whom the
employee is requesting leave**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE and/or VETERAN: Please complete Section I before having Section II completed. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that an employee submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for military caregiver leave under the FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a covered veteran. If requested by the employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA-protected leave. Failure to do so may result in a denial of an employee's FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.310(g). The employing office must give an employee at least 15 calendar days to return this form to the employing office.

(This section must be completed before Section II can be completed by a health care provider.)

Part A: EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Name and address of employing office (this is the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for a veteran):

Name of employee requesting leave to care for a veteran:

First	Middle	Last
-------	--------	------

Name of veteran (for whom employee is requesting leave):

First	Middle	Last
-------	--------	------

Relationship of employee to veteran:

☐ Spouse ☐ Parent ☐ Son ☐ Daughter ☐ Next of Kin ☐ _____ (please specify relationship):

Part B: VETERAN INFORMATION

- (1) Date of the veteran's discharge: _____
- (2) Was the veteran **dishonorably** discharged or released from the Armed Forces (including the National Guard or Reserves)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (3) Please provide the veteran's military branch, rank and unit at the time of discharge:

- (4) Is the veteran receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Part C: CARE TO BE PROVIDED TO THE VETERAN

Describe the care to be provided to the veteran and an estimate of the leave needed to provide the care:

SECTION II: For completion by: (1) a United States Department of Defense ("DOD") health care provider; (2) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (5) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125.

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee named in Section I has requested leave under the military caregiver leave provision of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for a family member who is a veteran. For purposes of FMLA military caregiver leave, a serious injury or illness means an injury or illness incurred by the servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or that existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and manifested itself before or after the servicemember became a veteran, and is:

- (i) a continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or
- (ii) a physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or
- (iii) a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or
- (iv) an injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans' Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA military caregiver leave due to a covered veteran's serious injury or illness includes written documentation confirming that the veteran's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or existed before the beginning of the veteran's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty, and that the veteran is undergoing treatment, recuperation, or therapy for such injury or illness by a health care provider listed above. Answer fully and completely all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA military caregiver leave coverage. Limit your responses to the veteran's condition for which the

employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e).

(Please ensure that Section I has been completed before completing this section. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page and return this form to the employee requesting leave (See Section I, Part A above). **DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.**)

Part A: HEALTH CARE PROVIDER INFORMATION

Health care provider's name and business address: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ - _____ Fax: (____) _____ - _____

Email: _____

Type of Practice/Medical Specialty: _____

Please indicate if you are:

- ☐ a DOD health care provider
- ☐ a VA health care provider
- ☐ a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider
- ☐ a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider
- ☐ other health care provider

PART B: MEDICAL STATUS

Note: If you are unable to make certain of the military-related determinations contained in Part B, you are permitted to rely upon determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as, DOD Recovery Care Coordinator) or an authorized VA representative.

(1) The Veteran's medical condition is:

- ☐ A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating.
- ☐ A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50% or higher, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave.
- ☐ A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment.
- ☐ An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran is enrolled in the Department of Veterans' Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.
- ☐ None of the above.

(2) Is the veteran being treated for a condition which was incurred or aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (3) Approximate date condition commenced: _____
- (4) Probable duration of condition and/or need for care: _____
- (5) Is the veteran undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for this condition? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, please describe medical treatment, recuperation or therapy: _____
- _____

PART C: VETERAN'S NEED FOR CARE BY FAMILY MEMBER

"Need for care" encompasses both physical and psychological care. It includes situations where, for example, due to his or her serious injury or illness, the veteran is unable to care for his or her own basic medical, hygienic, or nutritional needs or safety, or is unable to transport him or herself to the doctor. It also includes providing psychological comfort and reassurance which would be beneficial to the veteran who is receiving inpatient or home care.

- (1) Will the veteran need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, estimate the beginning and ending dates for this period of time: _____
- (2) Will the veteran require periodic follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, estimate the treatment schedule: _____
- (3) Is there a medical necessity for the veteran to have periodic care for these follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (4) Is there a medical necessity for the veteran to have periodic care for other than scheduled follow-up treatment appointments (e.g., episodic flare-ups of medical condition)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, please estimate the frequency and duration of the periodic care: _____
- _____
- _____

Signature of Health Care Provider: _____ Date: _____

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE
CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE DIS-
TRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL
OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT
TORCH RUN

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE
CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR THE 2ND
ANNUAL FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS
CONGRESSIONAL FLAG PRESEN-
TATION CEREMONY

AUTHORIZING THE USE OF THE
CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR AN
EVENT TO COMMEMORATE THE
20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MIL-
LION MAN MARCH

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following House concurrent resolutions, which are at the desk: H. Con. Res. 70, H. Con. Res. 73, and H. Con. Res. 74.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolutions en bloc.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolutions were agreed to.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 17, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Thursday, September 17; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; finally, that the filing deadline for all second-degree amendments be at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned, following the remarks of Senator DAINES.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Montana.

CYBER SECURITY

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, this generation is at the forefront of techno-

logical advances. In fact, it is making the United States and this generation that lives here one of the best networked in history, in fact, not only here but around the world.

The need for new and better technology to accommodate such a generation has also left a gaping hole in the security of our country. In recent years, cyber security attacks and breaches have multiplied and left American citizens incredibly vulnerable. Make no mistake, the cyber security of the United States is in great danger. But, unfortunately, proper precautions and reforms needed to set a better course have yet to be taken.

Just look at last week's headlines. USA Today recently reported hackers have attempted to compromise the Department of Energy over 1,100 times between 2010 and 2014, and these attackers have been successful over 150 times.

In a 2013 breach these attackers gained access to the information of over 104,000 Energy Department employees. After these attacks, the auditors noted "unclear lines of responsibility" and "lack of awareness by responsible officials." Yet nothing was done to mitigate the potential for future attacks.

Our government needs to stop being content with simply being reactive to serious cyber threats. There are no deterrents or consequences to these foreign attackers. Not one person at the Department of Energy has faced consequences. The CIO of the Office of Personnel Management, or OPM, remains in charge after one of the largest hacks on Federal employees.

In an age ruled by technology, it is our responsibility to make sure we take the necessary steps to protect the information of the American people.

This past Monday I held the first bi-annual Montana High Tech Jobs Summit in my hometown of Bozeman at my alma mater, Montana State University. We had over 600 Montanans attend.

We need to be more disruptive of the status quo in the technology sector, rather than passively sitting by as other nations innovate and leave us behind. We need to encourage STEM education in our classrooms and bring more people into the science and technology sector.

In my home State of Montana, high-tech jobs are growing 10 times faster than the statewide job growth rate. Last year alone, 40 percent of the wage growth in our entire State took place in Gallatin County, the county where Bozeman is located, and it has become a hub of technology. Yet too often Montana kids have to leave to find work. We need more high-paying technology jobs in Montana.

During my time at the cloud computing company RightNow Technologies, which was founded, started

up, and grew to a company that was acquired by Oracle for \$1.8 billion, over the 12 years I was there, I saw firsthand how Montana is becoming a leading hub for innovation and high-tech job growth. Montana has a qualified workforce and an unparalleled quality of life that makes our State a wise investment for tech companies. In fact, where the campus of our software company is located in Bozeman we are just minutes away from the Gallatin River. The Gallatin River is where the movie "A River Runs Through It" was filmed, where Brad Pitt made his debut, and directed by Robert Redford.

This tech summit showcased the great work done in our State, a State where we can combine the quality of life of fishing, hunting, backpacking, mountain climbing, spending time with family outdoors with technology and create a world-class high-tech company, because millennials want to have that quality of life, but they also want to have a world-class career in building global companies.

This tech summit allowed our Nation's tech leaders to share their views and experiences and encouraged our future tech leaders to lead. It provided a unique opportunity for our State's tech and business leaders to learn from one another. We had a great slate of speakers and panelists from across the technology industry: Laef Olson, the senior VP for cloud operations at Oracle; Dr. Dava Newman, a Montana native and the new Deputy Administrator at NASA. We had two of the five FCC Commissioners, Ajit Pai and Michael O'Rielly. We had Doug Burgum, the former CEO and chairman of Great Plains Software. Great Plains Software was started up in North Dakota. He grew that company. It was acquired by Microsoft in 2001 for \$1.1 billion, the largest acquisition at that time for Microsoft. Now Doug is cofounder and partner of Arthur Ventures and chairman of the Kilbourne Group. We had Craig Barrett. Dr. Craig Barrett received his undergrad, master's, and Ph.D. at Stanford and was a professor at Stanford for 10 years in metallurgical engineering and then went to this small company in 1974 called Intel. There, he rose all the way to CEO, and in fact, worked with Gordon Moore, who became CEO of Intel and who is famous for Moore's law.

Mike Goguen, the managing director of Sequoia Capital, a company that was an early initial investor in companies such as Google, YouTube, Apple, PayPal. We had Will Lansing, a former board member of RightNow Technologies who is now the CEO of FICO. We had Matt Rose, the BNSF Railway executive chairman.

We had panelists as well who explored issues of critical importance to our technology sector, cyber security infrastructure, and our economy. All convened in Bozeman on Monday. One

doesn't think of the Gallatin Valley as being a hub of technology—maybe the Silicon Valley—but as the world is changing, as technology removes geography as a constraint, you have a quality of life that is exceptional, where you are an hour away from Yellowstone National Park and can grow world-class tech companies there.

We heard from cyber security professionals from Microsoft and Facebook that we need not only to run faster, technically speaking, but work together between the private and public sectors to fend off potential hackers.

We heard how technology is removing geography as a constraint. We heard how companies are adopting innovative cyber security practices to keep information safe while maintaining global competitiveness. We learned about the importance of maintaining and advancing our technology infrastructure and the factors that affect start-up companies willing to grow, attract investments, and create jobs.

We have great technology leaders moving our country forward and working to protect our country, but we need to run faster than those seeking to destroy us. We need to ensure that we don't have burdensome regulations facing our entrepreneurs and our companies. We need to continue to encourage policies that drive innovation.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 6:45 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

JOHN W. LESLIE, JR., OF CONNECTICUT, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 22, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION

EDUARDO CASTELL, OF NEW YORK, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2019. VICE JAVAI ANWAR, TERM EXPIRED.

STEVEN H. COHEN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2019. (REAPPOINTMENT)

VICKI MILES-LAGRANGE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2015. VICE ROGER L. HUNT, TERM EXPIRED.

VICKI MILES-LAGRANGE, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE HARRY S TRUMAN SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 10, 2021. (REAPPOINTMENT)

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

DEBORAH R. MALAC, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA.

EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

CATHERINE ANN NOVELLI, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES ALTERNATE GOVERNOR OF THE EUROPEAN BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT, VICE ROBERT D. HORMATS, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

LISA J. PETERSON, OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE KINGDOM OF SWAZILAND.

H. DEAN PITTMAN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE.

ERIC SETH RUBIN, OF NEW YORK, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF BULGARIA.

KYLE R. SCOTT, OF ARIZONA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ROBERT MCKINNON CALIFF, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE COMMISSIONER OF FOOD AND DRUGS, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, VICE MARGARET A. HAMBURG, RESIGNED.

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD

LINDA A. PUCHALA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

DAVID S. ABRAHAMS
LAWRENCE N. AIELLO
SARAH K. ALBRYCHT
DEMETRIUS C. ALEXANDER
JAMES C. ALLEN
SCOTT ALLEN
DAVID K. ALMQUIST
BRENDAN J. ARCURI
THOMAS D. ASBERY
PATRICK C. ASPLAND
GAIL E. ATKINS
MAYCROS I. BAEZ
DESMOND V. BAILEY
RICHARD J. BALL
ERIC A. BAUS
KYLE W. BAYLESS
JONATHAN R. BEASLEY
SLADE H. BEAUDOIN
JOHN C. BECKING
BRIAN T. BECKNO
ERIK M. BERDY
CARL L. BERGMANN
BARRETT M. BERNARD
MICHAEL J. BIRMINGHAM
RONALD C. BLACK
ADRIAN T. BOGART III
MATTHEW W. BRAMAN
JASON T. BRIDGES
MARK E. BROCK
CHRISTOPHER L. BUDIHAS
JAY P. BULLOCK
JONATHAN C. BYROM
PAUL R. CALLAHAN
CHAD A. CALLIS
ROMAN J. CANTU
STEVEN P. CARPENTER
NEIL T. CHAFFEE
JERRY E. CHANDLER, JR.
CHAD E. CHASTEEN
STEVEN N. CHO
ROBERT J. CLARK
JOHN P. COGBILL
ROLANDA D. COLBERT
KENNETH C. COLE
PATRICK T. COLLOTON
CHRISTOPHER D. COMPTON
WILLIAM M. CONDE
JAMES L. CONNER
ERNESTO A. CORTEZ
KEVIN E. COUNTS
CLINTON W. COX
RICHARD R. COYLE
JEFFREY S. CRAPO
MICHAEL A. CRAWFORD
SHAWN P. CREAMER
DALE S. CROCKETT
COREY L. CROSBIE
PAUL E. CUNNINGHAM II
LAWRENCE J. DALEY
GILBERT F. DEIMEL
JAMES A. DEORE, JR.
LARRY C. DEWEY, JR.

OSCAR F. K. DIANO
ROLAND H. DICKS
BENJAMIN T. DIMAGGIO
JAMES E. DIMON
ROBERT C. DONNELLY
AARON L. DORF
OSCAR W. DOWARD, JR.
LYNN E. DOWNIE
WILLIAM S. DOWNING
WILLIAM E. DUVALL IV
JOHN E. ELRICH
JOSEPH E. ESCANDON
LEE H. EVANS
GEORGE G. FERIDO
ERIC C. FLESCH
ROBERT B. FOCHE
PARKER L. FRAWLEY
MICHAEL D. GAFFNEY
PHILLIP K. GAGE
WILLIAM S. GALLAWAY
ANTOINETTE R. GANT
CHARLES E. GETZ, JR.
JEFFREY P. GOTTLIEB
BRIAN R. GREATA
CHRISTOPHER A. GRICE
FERNANDO GUADALUPE, JR.
BRIAN M. HAGER
SCOTT M. HALTER
MICHAEL L. HAMMERSTROM
THOMAS D. HANSBARGER
BERNARD J. HARRINGTON
BRIAN J. HARTHORN
SHAUNA M. HAUSER
EDWARD B. HAYES, JR.
JAMES E. HAYES
PETER J. HEBERT
ERIC L. HEFNER
MICHAEL C. HENSHAW
ROBERT B. HENSLEY
RAYMOND J. HERRERA
DANIEL H. HIBNER
DAVID R. HIBNER
CHRISTOPHER W. HOFFMAN
JOHN C. HOPKINS
BRIAN S. HORINE
BRIAN E. HOWELL
JOHN L. HUDSON
MICHAEL J. JACKSON
WILLIAM G. JACOBS II
KEITH R. JAROLIMEK
DARREN K. JENNINGS
JAMES H. JENSEN
RONNY A. JOHNSON
KEVIN L. JOHNSTON
KENNETH E. JONES
JASON E. JOOSE
ROBERT R. KEETER
ANDREW D. KELLY, JR.
CURTIS W. KING
DON A. KING, JR.
MATTHEW S. KINKEAD
ROBERT KJELDEN
JAMES R. KOEPPEN
MICHAEL KORNBERGER
KIP A. KORTH
ROBERT A. KRIEG
ERIK KRIVDA
SETH D. KRUMMRICH
JOSEPH P. KUCHAN
ROBERT B. KUTH
MARC V. LAROCHE
PAUL L. LARSON
JOSEPH L. LEARDI
RYAN T. LEHMAN
THOMAS E. LEWIS, JR.
JAMES L. LOCK
ERIC P. LOPEZ
RAFAEL LOPEZ
MATTHEW D. MACNEILLY
AARON P. MAGAN
TOBIN A. MAGSIG
ROBERT W. MARSHALL
JOSEPH J. MCGRAW
JEREMY P. MCGUIRE
WILLIAM J. MCKNIGHT
HENRY I. B. MCNEILLY
NOBERTO R. MENENDEZ III
ANGEL C. MESA
DAVID A. MEYER
JASON L. MILLER
JASON A. MISELI
JOSHUA L. MOON
JON P. MOORE
THEO K. MOORE
MICHAEL E. MORA
SHANE P. MORGAN
DANIEL Y. MORRIS
JOHN B. MOUNTFORD
SCOTT W. MUELLER
STEPHEN O. MURPHY
THOMAS M. NELSON
CLAY E. NOVAK
TIMOTHY F. OBRIEN
MARK P. OLIN
JOHN A. OLIVER, JR.
PATRICK S. ONEAL
LUIS A. ORTIZ
DARCY L. OVERBEY
ANTONIO M. PAZ
HENRY C. PERRY, JR.
THOMAS C. PETTY
STEVEN M. PIERCE

OSCAR PINTADORRODRIGUEZ
 ESLI T. PITTS
 DAWSON A. PLUMMER
 JOSE L. POLANCO
 DONALD S. POTOCZNY
 JEFFREY H. POWELL II
 LEWIS J. POWERS
 CARTER L. PRICE
 BRIAN K. PRUITT
 MARK T. PURDY
 CHARLES R. RAMBO
 MATTHEW D. RAUSCHER
 KYLE A. REED
 AARON W. REISINGER
 WILLIAM E. RIEPER
 MICHAEL T. RIPLEY
 LUIS M. RIVERA
 CHRISTOPHER M. RIZZO
 THOMAS J. ROBINSON, JR.
 JOSEPH D. ROLLER
 MONTE L. RONE
 FIDEL V. RUIZ
 THOMAS M. RUSSELLTUTTY
 JUSTIN W. SAPP
 TERESA A. SCHLOSSER
 GLENN C. SCHMICK
 MARTIN J. SCHMIDT
 CURTIS M. SCHROEDER
 JAMES M. SCHULTZE
 JACKSON J. SEIMS
 GEORGE M. SELF
 ARTHUR W. SELLERS
 DAVID E. SHANK
 JOHN D. SHANK
 ERIC P. SHVEDO
 SAMUEL K. SIMPSON II
 BRYAN K. SIZEMORE
 ERIC T. SMITH
 JAMES P. SMITH
 ROBERT L. SMITH
 STUART S. SMITH
 FREDERICK R. SNYDER
 MIKE SOLIS
 SCOTT E. SONSALLA
 JAVIER C. SORIA
 NORMAN D. SPIVEY
 CIRO C. STEFANO
 LAWRENCE I. STEWART
 ERIC S. STRONG
 MICHAEL D. SULLIVAN
 MICHAEL P. SULLIVAN
 MATTHEW J. TACKETT
 BRUCE W. TERRY
 GREGORY S. TRAHAN
 JAMES A. VANATTA
 JEFFREY T. VANCELEAVE
 TERRY R. VEENEMAN
 JOHN A. VEST
 CHRISTOPHER C. VINE
 THOMAS P. VOGEL
 BRIAN E. WALSH
 CHAD E. WARD
 LARS A. WENDT
 JASON A. WESBROCK
 LAWRENCE B. WHITE
 SCOTT D. WILKINSON
 MICHAEL R. WILLIAMS
 JASON A. WOLTER
 SCOTT C. WOODWARD
 RICHARD W. WRIGHT
 STEVEN G. YAMASHITA
 RICHARD H. ZAMPELLI
 MICHAEL T. ZERNICKOW
 DAVID J. ZINN
 D002605
 D003450
 D004487
 D005229
 D005322
 D005670
 D005950
 D006293
 D012577
 D012627

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

STEPHANIE R. AHERN
 DANIEL M. ALLEN
 EDWARD G. ANDERSON IV
 PHILIP R. ARCHER
 AMANDA I. AZUBUIKE
 DANIEL J. BENICK
 DANIEL T. BENNETT
 JAMES T. BLEJSKI, JR.
 NATHAN J. BOLLINGER
 BA K. BOOZE
 ROGER L. BOWMAN
 ADAM J. BOYD
 STEPHON M. BRANNON
 KAREN L. T. BRIGGMAN
 COREY L. BRUMSEY
 JASON A. BRYAN
 JOEL M. BUENAFLO
 CURTIS R. BURNS
 LAWRENCE M. BURNS
 ULISES V. CALVO
 CHAD G. CARROLL
 CHARLES B. CHALFONT
 JUANITA A. CHANG

JASON A. CHARLAND
 PATRICK C. CHAVEZ
 NATHAN S. CLINE
 RICHARD D. CONKLE
 WILLIAM W. COPPERNOLL
 SCOTT A. CRUMP
 JEFFREY S. DAVIS
 MICHAEL A. DAVIS
 SCOTT T. DAVIS
 MARK L. DOTSON
 MARK S. DREWETT
 DARRELL W. DRIVER
 DAVID M. DUDAS
 MATTHEW W. DUNLOP
 MONTGOMERY C. ERFORTH
 TROY L. EWING
 WILLIAM M. FAIRCLOUGH
 KEVIN N. FAUGHNDER
 RYAN J. FAYRWEATHER
 JOHN M. FERRELL
 SCOTT W. FITZGERALD
 ANDREW S. FLETCHER
 GREGORY J. FORD
 CALONDRA L. FORTSON
 JAMES A. FOSBRINK
 JOSHUA J. FULMER
 JOHN P. GALLAGHER
 BRAD T. GANDY
 JOSEPH C. GELINEAU III
 THOMAS M. GILLERAN
 KENNON S. GILLIAM
 NICHOLAS H. GIST
 PAUL L. GOETHALS
 VINCENT S. GOLEMBESKI
 JOHN P. GREGOR
 JEFFREY S. GRIBSCHAW
 KATHERINE P. GUTTORMSEN
 JOSEPH E. GUZMAN
 DAVID A. HARPER
 JERAD I. HARPER
 BRIAN D. HARRIS
 JOHN K. HARRIS
 KENNETH D. HARRISON
 PETER G. HART
 GARY M. HAUSMAN
 MICHAEL T. HEATON
 MICHAEL C. HERRERA
 CHRISTOPHER J. HICKEY
 KEVIN L. HILL
 CHRISTOPHER L. HOPKINS
 BRITTON T. HOPPER
 PAUL D. HOWARD
 CHAD T. JAGMIN
 JEFFERY N. JAMES
 KYLE F. JETTE
 STEVEN K. JONES
 JASON R. KALAINOFF
 MELINDA Z. KALAINOFF
 PATRICK N. KAUNE
 LAURA L. KNAPP
 MICHAEL K. KOLB
 JOHN M. KOSTUR
 MICHAEL J. KULKOWSKI
 DAVID J. LAMBRECHT
 DAVID R. LAMY
 HAROLD L. LAROCK II
 WILLIAM I. LEWIS, JR.
 JOEL S. LINDEMAN
 ABIGAIL T. LINNINGTON
 KIMBERLY K. LUBICH
 LANGDON J. LUCAS
 DAVID S. LYLE
 KEVIN R. LYNCH
 ANDREW F. MACLEAN
 MICHAEL P. MARTEL
 JOSEPH G. MATTHEWS
 SCOTT D. MAXWELL
 SHON A. MCCORMICK
 MICHAEL S. MCCULLOUGH
 INGO MCLEAN
 THOMAS A. MCNALLY
 WILLIAM H. MENGEL, JR.
 MARK D. MILES
 TRENT I. MILLS
 ROBB C. MITCHELL
 SCOTT H. MORGAN
 JONATHAN C. MUENCHOW
 CHRISTOPHER W. MULLER
 BRUCE A. MURPHY
 STEPHEN M. MURPHY
 JASON R. MUSTEEN
 STEVEN L. OATMAN
 CHRISTOPHER M. OCONNOR
 FRANCIS J. PARK
 INGRID A. PARKER
 JAREN K. PRICE
 VANESSA K. RAGSDALE
 ARMANDO J. RAMIREZ
 ERIC M. REMOY
 BRETT J. RIDDLE
 JOSEPH F. ROACH
 JARED D. H. ROBBINS
 JEFFERY D. ROBERTSON
 WELLINGTON W. SAMOUCÉ
 AARON A. SAMPSON
 PATRICIA K. SAYLES
 JEFFREY M. SCHROEDER
 JOSEPH E. SCROCCA
 PATRICK R. SEIBER
 STEVEN E. SEXTON
 STEPHEN T. SHORE
 ROBERT B. SIMS

SCOTT H. SINKULAR
 CHRISTOPHER L. SMITH
 GREGORY K. SMITH
 JEFFREY S. SPEAR
 RYAN T. STEWART
 DARLENE M. STRAUB
 BARBARA A. STRATER
 MARNE L. SUTTEN
 CURTIS D. TAIT
 COREY M. TEJCHMA
 DIANNA N. TERPIN
 DAVID A. THOMAS
 MARK A. THOMSON
 MARIO TORRES
 DEITRA L. TROTTER
 MICHAEL A. TRUE
 PAUL W. TURNBULL, JR.
 KATHLEEN T. TURNER
 HEIDI A. URBEN
 RICHARD D. VANGORDEN
 JUAN C. VEGA
 BRIAN D. VILE
 BRITTIAN A. WALKER
 JAMES P. WALSH
 ADAM Z. WALTON
 LISA D. WHITTAKER
 PETER B. WILSON
 WARREN R. WOOD
 MICHAEL F. YANKOVICH
 JOHN B. YORKO
 ROBERT E. YOUNG
 JOHN J. ZAVAGE
 JERZY S. ZUBR
 D001832
 D012473
 G001147
 G001255
 G001433
 G010027
 G010047
 G010384

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

CHRISTOPHER W. ABBOTT
 JON W. ALTHOFF
 TACHIDAYUS ANDREWS
 GREGORY N. ASH, JR.
 JON P. BEALE
 LESLIE D. BEGLEY
 BETH A. BEHN
 JOSEPH D. BLANDING
 RALPH T. BORJA
 DARRIN M. BOWSER
 RODNEY O. BRIGGMAN
 JEFFREY J. BRITTON
 MICHAEL C. BRUENS
 TODD W. BURNLEY
 ELLIOTT R. CAGGINS
 JEFFREY L. CALDWELL
 FRAZARIEL I. CASTRO
 PHILIP R. CLARK
 JUANITA R. CLARKE
 ENRIQUE L. COSTASOLIVERA
 KEVIN L. COTMAN
 PETER J. CRANDALL
 GARY J. CREGAN
 JASON A. CROWE
 FRED L. DELACRUZ
 SCOT A. DOBOSZENSKI
 DANIEL J. DUNCAN
 MICHAEL D. EGAN
 STEPHEN F. ELDER
 ANDREW J. ESCH
 BRIAN R. FORMYDUVAL
 GREGORY S. FORTIER
 BRYAN E. FOWLER
 RACQUEL M. GALLMAN
 ALLEN B. GARRISON, JR.
 ISABEL E. GEIGER
 ADDALYRICA Q. GEORGE
 JAMES J. GODFREY
 HECTOR A. GONZALEZ
 DAVID A. GRANT
 DAVID K. GREEN
 GARY A. GRUBB
 MEGAN A. GUMPF
 LAMONT J. HALL
 MICHAEL R. HARPER
 CHAD M. HARRIS
 ARCHIE S. HERNDON
 HAROLD B. HODGE III
 ELLSWORTH K. JOHNSON
 GREGORY S. JOHNSON
 STEPHEN L. KAVANAUGH
 JIM R. KEENE
 DENNIS W. KERWOOD
 MICHAEL S. KNAPP
 JOSEPH R. KURZ
 ROGER D. KUYKENDALL
 KENNETH W. LETCHER
 KARL S. LINDERMAN
 BRUCE A. LLOYD
 RALPH A. LOUNSBROUGH
 NICOLE M. LUCAS
 NEIL R. MAHABIR
 RENEE L. MANN
 ROBERT P. MANN
 ADRIAN A. MARSH
 HOLLIE J. MARTIN

ROBERT S. MATHEWS, JR.
 WILLIAM P. MCDONOUGH
 JASON J. C. MCGUIRE
 ROBERT J. MIKESH, JR.
 JEFFREY S. NIEMI
 JIN H. PAK
 RALPH N. PERKINS IV
 ROBERT L. PHILLIPS III
 ROSS C. POPPENBERGER
 ANTONIO D. RALPH
 ROBERT L. RALSTON
 JOSEPH O. RITTER
 JOSEPH W. ROBERTS
 CHRISTOPHER H. ROBERTSON
 ROBERT D. ROUSE
 PAUL U. ROYLE
 ARIZMENDI E. SANTIAGO
 MARIA D. SCHNEIDER
 MATTHEW F. SCHRAMM
 SHAWN C. SCHULTZ
 ERIC M. SCHWARTZ
 CARMELIA J. SCOTT'SKILLERN
 TALMADGE C. SHEPPARD
 THEODORE B. SHINKLE
 WILLIAM J. SHINN, JR.
 TERRY D. SIMMS
 CHARLONE E. STALLWORTH
 RODRIGUEZ L. STUCKEY
 SHANE M. SULLIVAN
 STEPHEN K. SULLIVAN
 NATHAN M. SWARTZ
 JAMES B. SWIFT
 PATRICK E. TAYLOR
 JARRETT A. THOMAS II
 KIM M. THOMAS
 GREGORY S. TOWNSEND
 GRANT A. VAUGHAN
 LUIS A. VELEZCORTES
 MARK A. VINEY
 DINA S. WANDLER
 MONICA P. WASHINGTON
 JOHN L. WEDGES III
 JEANINE M. WHITE
 DANIEL J. WILLIAMSON
 HERBERT R. WILLINGHAM, JR.
 PATRICIA K. WRIGHT
 CODY L. ZILHAVER
 D012591
 D011026

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SEC-
 TIONS 624 AND 3064:

To be colonel

NEIL I. NELSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be colonel

BENJAMIN J. BIGELOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant colonel

DAVID M. JACKSON

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

WHITNEY A. ABRAHAM
 JOSEPH F. ABRUTZ III
 BRANDON J. ADAMS
 CHRISTINA C. ADAMS
 JAMESON R. ADLER
 KURT W. ALBAUGH
 CORY E. ALEXANDER
 BENJAMIN E. ALSUP
 BRIAN D. ANDERSON
 JAMES A. ANDERSON
 TOY W. ANDREWS
 MATTHEW M. ANTHONY
 JOHN T. APPELBAUM
 JEFFREY L. APPLEBAUGH
 MATTHEW APPLETON
 ROBERT D. ARCHER
 MATTHEW D. ARNDT
 WILLIAM F. ASHLEY, JR.
 GLENN A. ATHERTON
 JESSICA S. ATHERTON
 FREDERICK J. AUTH
 ANDREW D. BABAKAN
 BLAKE A. BACCIGALLOPI
 JONATHAN H. BACCUS
 PAUL M. D. BAINBRIDGE
 AARON J. BAKER
 RYAN L. BALDWIN
 ROBERT C. BALLARD, JR.
 TAMMI L. BALLINGER
 VICTOR M. BARBA
 JAMES R. BARBER III
 STEVEN D. BARBER
 ALLEN J. BARD
 JARED J. BARNARD
 GLEN A. BARNETT

GEOFFREY S. BAUCHMAN
 JASON R. BAUMANN
 AMANDA B. BAXTER
 JAMES T. BEAMAN, JR.
 CHARLES A. BEAUCHENE
 KYLE M. BELKE
 ROBERT M. BELFLOWER II
 ANDREW T. BELL
 DAN J. BELLINGHAUSEN
 DAVID V. BELLIS
 JENS D. BERDAHL
 BENJAMIN J. BERNARD
 JEFFREY R. BERNHARDT
 BRAD M. BERTHELOTTE
 MATTHEW G. BERTHOLD
 STEVEN B. BETTIS
 CHRISTOPHER M. BEULIGMANN
 GARY J. BICKEL
 STEPHANIE M. BIEHLE
 GARY W. BISSONETTE
 KERRY L. BISTLINE, JR.
 LISA C. BLACHFORD
 MICHAEL C. BLACKMAN
 BRADLEY A. BLANCHETTE
 MARC P. BLANCO
 DAVID S. A. BLAS
 JAMES H. BLATTER
 TYLER C. BLOECHER
 ERIC J. BLOMBERG
 MARTIN J. BLOMBERG
 SHANE R. BOBBE
 ALEXANDER W. BOCK
 CHRISTOPHER G. BOEHM
 LANDERRICK E. BOLDING
 JAMES H. BOND
 RICHARD A. BOWERS
 DANIEL P. BRADLEY
 PETER M. BRAS
 THOMAS K. BREWER
 TIMOTHY B. BROCK
 LEVI D. BROECKELMAN
 CHRISTOPHER D. BROOKS
 RYAN L. BROOKS
 BURNES C. W. BROWN
 MATTHEW D. BROWN, JR.
 ANNE C. BRUCKMAN
 MICHAEL J. BRUGGER
 CHRISTOPHER J. BRUGLER
 STEPHEN G. BRUNER
 CHELSEA R. BRUNOEHLER
 OMARI D. BUCKLEY
 NICHOLAS K. BULLARD
 DANIEL P. BURBA
 MARK A. BURCHILL
 GABRIEL D. BURGI
 CAMERON J. BURNETTE
 MARTY E. BURNS
 JOSHUA A. CALANDRA
 MICHELLE C. CALARASU
 JOHN A. CALDECUTT
 JOHN R. CALLAHAN
 SARAH B. CAMARENA
 DEREK M. CAMERON
 JOSEPH A. CAMPBELL
 MATTHEW W. CAMPBELL
 RICHARD E. CAMPBELL, JR.
 DANA S. CANBY
 JOSEPH M. CANDRILLI
 ZACHARY N. CAPACETE
 GUY K. CARLSWARD
 BARRY F. CARMODY, JR.
 KENDRA B. CARTER
 MARK W. CARTWRIGHT
 CHRISTOPHER A. CASE
 BRANDON S. CASTLE
 SEAN T. CAVANAGH
 KEVIN P. CAVICCHI
 JONATHAN E. CEBIK
 COLIN B. CHANCE
 ROBERT J. CHANDLER
 JEREMIAH M. CHASE
 MERLIN J. CHRISOSTOMIDIS
 XAVIER M. CHRISTIAN
 JOHN D. CICCOCIOPPI
 RONNIE P. CITUK
 CORY D. CLARK
 TIMOTHY B. CLARK
 MICAH W. CLAY
 DANIEL P. CLAYTOR
 KATIOUSKA L. CLEA
 MATTHEW S. CLIFFORD
 ROBERT A. COFFMAN, JR.
 BARRY J. COHEN
 JESSE P. COHEN
 ANDREW M. COLE
 JOSEPH R. COLLINS
 PATRICK R. COLLINS
 JASON COLTELLINO
 BRANDON J. COLVIN
 BRIAN T. CONNER
 GLENN A. CONRAD
 CHRISTOPHER T. COOK
 DONALD E. COOMES
 JASON A. COPARE
 MICHAEL S. COPPOCK
 DEREK W. CORBETT
 BENJAMIN A. CORDRAY
 JON A. CORKEY
 LINDA M. CORRELL
 MATTHEW R. COULTER
 ANDREW S. COUNTISS
 GREGORY M. COY

BENJAMIN G. COYLE
 WILLIAM W. CRAIG
 MATTHEW P. CRAWFORD
 DANIEL R. CRENSHAW
 CHAD P. CRONAUBER
 BRIAN R. CROSBY
 CHARLES N. CUDDY
 RYAN D. CUNNINGHAM
 MATTHEW C. CURRID
 BRIAN M. CUSH
 DAVID M. DAGOSTINO
 CHRISTOPHER M. DANLEY
 BRAD M. DANSE, JR.
 JASON E. DATINGUINO
 BRANDON C. DAUGHTRY
 DARRIN D. DAVIS
 EDWARD J. DAVIS, JR.
 JAY L. DAVIS
 SEAN F. DAVIS
 JEREMY D. DAWSON
 RICHARD A. DEAN II
 CHRISTOPHER K. DEANGELIS
 OLIVIA K. DEGENKOLB
 MATTHEW J. DEGREE
 MARCOS A. DELGADONAZARIO
 JEFFREY A. DELLAPENTA
 CHRISTOPHER B. DELONG
 ALFRED A. DELVECCHIO II
 JESSICA L. DENNEY
 CAMERON D. DENNIS
 DUSTIN W. DETRICK
 ROBERT J. DIBERN
 CHARLES B. DIEHL
 MORGAN M. DIETZEL
 RYAN E. DINNEN
 JAMES A. DIPASQUALE
 KENNETH P. DITTIG
 MICHAEL J. DIXON
 RANDALL L. DODDS
 ANNE L. DOMKO
 THOMAS D. DOTSTRY
 PETER J. DOWNES, JR.
 JASON S. DOYLE
 MEREDITH J. DOZIER
 JEFFREY A. DREWISKE
 KEITH D. DROWN
 LANE R. DRUMMOND
 MATTHEW E. DRYDEN
 VICTOR T. DUENOW
 ERIC W. DUFFIELD
 ANDREW E. DUMM
 ANDREW J. DYLAG
 PATRICK J. EARLS
 ANDREW J. ECKENFELS
 MICHAEL J. ECKERT
 GABRIEL V. EDWARDS
 SEAN A. EDWARDS
 SHANE L. EHLER
 ANGELA A. EICKELMANN
 MARK D. EISBRENNER II
 JASON D. ELFE
 DOUGLAS S. ELKINS
 CHRISTOPHER H. ELLIOTT
 RYAN D. ELLISON
 LEWIS R. EMERY
 W. T. EMMONS
 CLINTON D. EMRICH
 NICHOLAS R. EPPERS
 JOSHUA P. ESTEVAN
 GIOVANNI A. ESTRADA
 JUSTIN J. ESTRADA
 TAYLOR A. EVANS
 MCINTOSH K. EWELL II
 RONALD C. FAIRBANKS
 DAMON J. FALDOWSKI II
 MATTHEW B. FANNIN
 ADAM M. FARBER
 MICHAEL R. FARLEY
 MICHAEL W. FARMER
 MATTHEW G. FARRELL
 JAYNE T. FAUL
 MICHAEL FEAGANS
 TIMOTHY W. FEDRICK
 JOSHUA C. FELDMAN
 CORY M. FENTON
 HECTOR B. FERRELL
 RANDALL L. FIELDS, JR.
 IAN P. FISHER
 TIMOTHY F. FITZGERALD
 GRAHAM D. FLETTERICH
 BRADFORD S. FOSTER
 JEFFREY C. FOULDS
 COLLIN R. FOX
 LUCAS A. FRANCAVILLA
 RYAN D. FRANTZ
 JOSHUA J. FREEZE
 FORREST F. FRENCH
 SAMUEL S. I. FROMMILLE
 MATTHEW R. FURTADO
 THOMAS D. FUTCH
 AMY M. GABRIEL
 TROY GACHETT
 GEOFFREY C. GAINES
 PHILIP GALINDO
 ISAAH D. GAMMACHE
 JOSEPH P. GARBITELLI
 JEREMY D. GARCIA
 MICHAEL V. GARCIA
 DAVID T. GARDNER
 JASON M. GARFIELD
 IAN T. GARRISON
 DANIEL C. GATELY

BRIAN K. GAUTHIER
DANIEL M. GAUVIN
STEPHEN C. GAY
JAMES W. GELSINON
JORDAN T. GENTRY
MORGAN D. GEORGE
RYAN C. GEORGE
MATTHEW L. GERMAN
IAN B. GETZLER
KEITH R. GIACOPUZZI
ANDREW P. GIBBONS
RYAN T. GIELEGHEM
PAUL A. GILLET
JONATHAN M. GILLIOM
DANA P. GILMOUR
KEVIN W. GOETTSCHE
ZACHARY A. GOLDSTEIN
VINCENT C. GOMES
VERONICA A. GOMEZ
JOSE GONCALVES
ROBERT M. GORE
JUSTIN M. GOYER
RIDGELY H. M. GRAHAM
TIMOTHY J. GRANT
WILLIAM S. GREEN
MICHAEL B. GREENSTREET
FORREST J. GRIGGS
CHRISTOPHER A. GRILLO
ZACHARY S. GRISWOLD
JUSTIN L. GUERNSEY
JOHN W. GUSTINE
DAVID C. HAERTEL
JAMES B. HAIZLIP
CHAD W. HALL
DEAN R. HALTON
JOHN R. L. HANSEN
RICHARD K. HANSING
CORY J. HANSON
SETH L. HARBIN
BRANDON C. HARDIN
SEAN M. HARRINGTON
CHAD R. HARRIS
JACOB A. HART
SAMUEL F. HARTLEY
MICHAEL S. HARTZELL
BRENDON A. HATHORN
BRETT R. HAVELKA
JAMES P. HAWKE
CAMERON H. HAYES
ERIC E. HAYES
DEREK G. HAYNES
DAVID C. HEBERT
CHRISTOPHER J. HEINE
ROBERT V. HEINZE
JARRETT L. HELLER
STEVEN W. HELMER
EVAN E. HENTSCHEL
TAYLOR A. HESSE
WILLIAM E. HESSELL
ADAM L. HILL
RICHARD D. HILL
JOHN W. HILLS
CHRISTOPHER M. HIMES
EDWARD T. HINE
WILLIAM C. HINSON
JONATHAN L. HIRSCH
EAN P. HOBBS
RYAN M. HOFER
ROBERT C. HOFFACKER
JASON E. HOLBROOK
SEAN K. HOLLOWWA
DAVID A. HOOPENGARDNER, JR.
SETH T. HOOPER
MICHAEL P. HOOTEN
ZACHARY T. T. HOPE
ALEXANDER F. HORN
JAMES D. HOSTETTLER
JASON A. HOUSER
MATTHEW M. HOWELL
JOSEPH S. HUCK
JUSTIN J. HUGGINS
CALE B. HUGHES
MICHAEL C. HUGHES
JONATHAN A. HULECKI
CALEB J. HUMBERD
DAVID A. HUNT
SPENCER S. HUNT
DOUGLAS A. IVEY
RYAN R. JACKSON
ANDREW N. JAEGER
PETER S. JAGLOM
CHRISTOPHER T. JAMES
TIMOTHY R. JARRATT
BRETT J. JASIONOWSKI
AARON C. JOHNSON
ALAN J. JOHNSON
KEITH Z. JOHNSON
WESLEY A. JOHNSON
CHARLES P. JONES
DANIEL T. JONES
MASON P. JONES
AARON K. JORDAN
JAMES C. JORDAN
KEVIN M. KAHL
ANTHONY M. KANIA
CHRISTOPHER R. KARAPOSTOLES
ISAAC A. KEEVER
ROBERT E. KELLER
JORDAN W. KELLY
JEFFREY J. KELSO
IAN A. KEMP
DAVID W. KENDALL

TYLER KENDALL
ALEXANDER B. KENDRIS
MATTHEW C. KENFIELD
TOWNEY G. KENNARD III
PETER J. KEUSS
PATRICK L. KIEFER
SEAN M. KILGORE
DERMOT N. KILLIAN II
JAE Y. KIM
JASON C. KIM
JONATHAN D. KINDEL
JACOB E. KING
JOSHUA C. KING
SAULOMON D. KING
JOHN D. KINMAN
MATIAS J. KINSMAN
JUSTIN P. KIRKPATRICK
KENNETH M. KIRKWOOD
MATTHEW G. KLOCK
ERIC J. KNEPPER
WILLIAM E. KNIPS
ROBERT W. KNOERZER
MATTHEW T. KNUTH
DANIEL M. KOHLBECK
BRENTON A. KOLB
WILLIAM J. KOZLOWSKI
DUSTIN T. KRAEMER
CARL J. KRUEGER
CHRISTOPHER M. KRUEGER
JOSEPH W. KRUKAR
CHRISTOPHER P. KRUKOWSKI
DEREK J. KUNZMAN
RONALD A. LABORDE, JR.
PATRICK D. LAFFEY
ANDREW L. LAIDLER
JEFFREY K. LAIRD
KRISTIN S. LAKE
JOSEPH R. LANDI
RYAN C. LANGHAM
SEAN S. LANSANG
LEVI J. LAROCHE
JAYSON C. LARSEN
BRIAN C. LAWS
SEAN P. LAWSON
COREY K. LEEWRIGHT
RAMSES N. LEON
JOHN M. LESTER
CARLO D. LEVERONE
MATTHEW D. LIASHEK
ANDREW G. LICHTENSTEIN
KEVIN J. LIND
BRYAN J. LINGLE
PATRICK E. LINK
YILEI LIU
PAUL A. LLANO
JASON D. LOCKE
AUSTIN M. LONG IV
STEPHEN R. LONG
STEPHEN J. LOONEY
IAN M. B. LOPEZ
ASHLEY M. LORENZ
MICHAEL J. LORINGER
ERRIC N. LOTT
MATTHEW R. LOVICK
MATTHEW S. LUKEVICS
ANDREW M. LUKICH
PHILLIP O. LUNDBERG
JONATHAN J. LUSHENKO
KEN H. LUSK
MICHAEL C. MABREY
RUSSELL J. MACKAY
SEAN J. MAHONEY
JARED M. MALLIS
STEPHANIE L. MARCELO
CHAD A. MARTIN
JOHN E. MARTIN
ROBERT W. MARTIN
NICHOLAS A. MARUCA
REBECCA A. Z. MARVIN
NATHAN P. MATHERLY
MICHAEL Q. MATT
CASEY J. MATTHEWS
EDWARD J. MAY, JR.
STEVEN G. MAY
RICHARD A. MAYER
SCOTT D. MAYNES
ONYINYE I. MBANO
MICHAEL L. MCBRIDE
MICHAEL R. MCCABE
ANDREW J. L. MCCAFFREY
SCOTT R. MCCANN
GREGORY A. MCCARTHY
BENJAMIN I. MCCARTY
MATTHEW E. MCCAY
PATRICK L. MCCLERNON
BRADEN C. MCCORMACK
THOMAS R. MCCURDY
GORDON R. MCDONALD
JOSEPH R. MCDONALD
THOMAS J. MCDONALD
MATTHEW C. MCDONOUGH
COLIN S. MCFERRAN
ANDREW S. MCGOVERN
MICHAEL J. MCINERNEY
JASON L. MCKEOWN
TYLER P. MCKNIGHT
GREGORY E. MCLEAN
DOUGLAS V. MCMAHON
ELIZABETH E. MCMULLEN
JAMES S. MCNAMEE
THOMAS E. MCNEIL
TYLER C. MCQUIGGAN

JAMES T. MCRANDLE
MICHELLE MECKLENBURG
RUBEN A. MEDALLA, JR.
SCOTT B. MEHAFFEY
MICHAEL E. MELVILLE
JOSHUA D. MENKS
PHILIP W. MESSNER
BRANDON J. MILLER
JOSHUA B. MILLER
MATTHEW C. MILLER
NATHAN A. MILLER
STEPHEN E. A. MILLER
THOMAS F. MILLER
WALLACE E. MILLER II
ZACHARY R. MILLER
JEFFERY A. MILOTA
MATTHEW J. MINCK
JEREMY B. MITCHELL
PETER P. MITCHELL
ADAM L. MOFFITT
ERIK N. MOLINA
DENNIS W. MONROE
JASON M. MOODY
ANDREW Y. MOORE
CALEB C. MOORE
DAXTON H. MOORE
JON T. MOORE
JOSHUA J. MOORE
TYLER B. MOORE
EMILY M. MOOREN
MICHAEL S. MOORSE
RAMON MORALES, JR.
DANIEL E. MORAN
ROBERT J. MORENO
TREVOR D. MOREY
DOUGLAS J. MORROW
JOHN R. MOSS
CHRISTOPHER M. MOTTINO
MICHAEL N. MOWRY
JOHN D. MULCAIR
MARK A. MUNCY
JARED P. MUNDE
DONACIANO MUNOZ, JR.
RYAN C. MURGIA
DOUGLAS E. MURPH
CONSTANTY M. MURPHY
COREY C. MURPHY
GWENDOLYN H. MURPHY
PATRICK M. MURPHY
STEPHEN A. MURPHY
JONATHAN D. MURRAY
WILLIAM P. MURTHA III
DOUGLAS V. NASSIF
BRIAN J. NAUGHTON
JEREMY T. NAUTA
JUSTIN M. NEFF
ROBERT C. NEMETH
JOSEPH V. NEPOMUCENO
JASON A. NERIO
MATTHEW C. NICHOLS
MATTHEW A. NOBLE
EDWARD J. NOWAK
JASON T. NOWELL
XYRONE R. OCAMPO
ADAM J. OCHS
RYAN H. OCONNOR
PAUL G. ODANIEL
JUSTIN D. OGBURN
MARY K. OGDEN
MICHAEL R. OLDENBORG
DANIEL E. OLSON
MARK D. P. OLSON
MATTHEW D. OLSON
BRADY D. ONEAL
MICHAEL P. ORFINI
MATTHEW J. ORNER
CARLOS A. OROZA
ROBERT J. OSBORNE
CHRISTOPHER S. OSIPOWER
MICHAEL J. OSTERHAUS
JESSICA C. PACTHER
DUSTIN A. PACKER
ELI C. PADELL
DENNIS R. PALANIUK
JOSEPH E. PALCHAK
DHURV PARASHAR
LUKE A. PARCHMENT
RICHARD S. PARISI
DAVID J. PARNELL
MATTHEW A. PARR
JOSEPH G. PASKO
JAMES M. PATTERSON
LLOYD G. PATTERSON
PAUL G. PAVELIN
THOMAS F. PAVLIK
ADAM R. PAWLAK
DONALD W. PELTIER III
ASHLEY E. PELZEK
BRIAN R. PENNINGTON
JOHN R. PEPIN
TIMOTHY S. PERKINS
PATRICK J. PERROTT
CHRISTOPHER J. PETERS
JOSHUA D. PETERS
CHRISTOPHER A. PETERSEN
ANDREW P. PETRY
THOMAS N. PETTY
ALLAN T. PHILLIPS
JAMES D. PIERCE III
KEVIN A. PILCHER
JARRAD O. PILGRIM
REBECCA M. PING

CHRISTOPHER J. PITTMAN
 MATTHEW E. PLANT
 CARL P. POE
 CHARLES C. POGUE
 JESSICA L. PONIATOSKI
 BROCK B. POOLER
 ANDREW S. POREDA
 BRIAN R. PULTRO
 ERIN L. PURSLEY
 DAVID M. PUTMAN
 ANDREW D. PYLE
 ANDREW R. RA
 TERRELL W. RADFORD
 DAVID M. RADOMILE
 VINCENT J. RAGONA
 TRAVIS L. RAINEY
 CHRISTOPHER B. RAMIRO
 TYLER J. RASMUSSEN
 KEVIN A. RASPET
 ALEXANDER E. RATCLIFFE
 HUSSEIN M. RAWJI
 RICHARD S. RAY
 ETHAN A. REBER
 JUSTIN L. REDDICK
 GARY A. REDMAN
 SEAN REED
 JOSHUA A. REEDER
 DANA E. REEVES
 JAMES M. REEVES
 GRANT H. REGELIN
 JOHN L. REID
 ETHAN E. REINHOLD
 KENNETH L. RELETHFORD, JR.
 CATHERINE A. B. REPPERT
 JAMES P. REYNOSO
 PAUL F. RICHARDSON III
 RANDALL K. RIEWERTS
 JASON A. RILEY
 BRETT M. RINGO
 PAUL C. RITTER
 COLE C. ROBERTS
 LINDSAY J. ROBERTSON
 RYAN W. ROBERTSON
 SCOTT A. ROBERTSON
 JEFFREY F. ROBESON
 BRIAN J. ROBINSON
 CHRISTOPHER L. ROBINSON
 DANIEL R. ROGERS
 DENNIS A. ROPP
 MARTIN E. ROSCHMANN
 KALLIE M. ROSE
 BENJAMIN A. ROSS
 JEFFREY A. ROSS
 JUSTIN L. ROSS
 IAN M. RUMMEL
 WILLIAM A. RUSSELL
 GRETCHEN M. RYBARCZYK
 MARTIN A. SALAZAR
 CHRIS L. SALOMON
 MARK T. SANDEEN
 JOHNNY A. SANSON
 PATRICK B. SARGENT
 KEVIN R. SARTAIN
 CASEY D. SCAMEHEORN
 CODY M. SCARBOROUGH
 HARVEY J. SCHAFER II
 DAVID M. SCHALLER
 KASEY S. SCHEEL
 NATHAN T. SCHEIBER
 MICHAEL A. SCHENK
 BRANDON K. SCHMIDT
 THOMAS F. SCHMITZ
 ALLYSON K. SCHOLL
 JOSEPH M. SCHULTZ
 JEFFREY D. SCHWAMB
 KURTIS D. SCOPY
 THOMAS J. SCULTHORPE
 ANDREW J. SEATOR
 ANDREW C. SERFASS
 FRANK J. SGRUI, JR.
 JAY T. SHALLINGTON
 ADAM A. SHAPIRO
 GREG D. SHARP
 ROBERT B. SHARY II
 MICHAEL P. SHAUGHNESSY
 JAMES E. SHEETS
 GREGORY D. SHERMAN
 TIMOTHY W. SHILLING
 KRISTOPHER M. SHOLD
 FRANCIS E. SHOUP
 ADAM R. SHREDERS
 VINCENT F. SIMMON, JR.
 CHANEL G. SIMS
 SHEILA M. SINGER
 MARIO T. SINGLETARY
 JOSHUA B. SINK
 JONATHAN E. SITURIUS
 DAVID H. SIVLEY
 DANIEL A. SLEDZ
 BRENDON P. SMERESKY
 ALTON L. SMITH
 CHRISTOPHER R. SMITH
 DAVID A. SMITH
 DAVID J. SMITH
 DUSTIN T. SMITH
 KEVIN P. SMITH
 PHILIP S. SMITH
 RONALD L. SMITH
 TYLER L. SMITH
 WILLIAM E. SOPP
 ROBERT M. SPANN II
 EDWIN M. SPENCER

JEFFREY W. SPENCER
 SAMUEL M. SPLETZER
 JUSTIN B. SPOTSER
 TIMOTHY P. SPRAGUE II
 RANSOME N. SPRINGER
 SETH M. SQUIRES
 KARL D. STAEBLE
 RONNIE D. STAHL, JR.
 NATHAN L. STAPLES
 BRADLEY D. STEIDLE
 CHRISTOPHER H. STEIN
 ADAM R. STEPHENS
 ANDREW R. STEWART
 RYAN A. STEWART
 WILLIAM C. STEWART
 BENJAMIN N. STICKLER, JR.
 JOHNATHAN D. STINETTE
 JOHN L. STOCKDILL
 CHRISTOPHER M. STOLLE
 JARED M. STOLLE
 ERIC M. STOLPMAN
 CHRISTOPHER B. STONE
 TIMOTHY W. STONE
 GREGORY B. STORER
 SEAN M. STUART
 DOUGLAS B. STUHLMAN
 DANIEL S. SUPPLE
 JOHAN E. W. SUYDERHOUD
 MATTHEW J. P. SUYDERHOUD
 KEVIN A. SWIFT
 DAVID S. SWIMM
 ROBERT SZELIGOWSKI
 ANDREW C. TABELLION
 TIANA TAFUA
 ROBERT A. TALBOT
 ANDREW G. TALBOTT
 HEATHER O. TALLEY
 JOHN G. TAYLOR
 NICHOLAS B. TAYLOR
 JAMES W. TEAL
 TODD C. TEASDALE
 BRADLEY C. TEGTMEYER
 CHAD T. TELLA
 KRISTOFER A. TESTER
 CHRISTOPHER O. THOMAS
 CURTIS L. THOMAS
 DAVID M. THOMAS
 JOSHUA D. THOMPSON
 KYLE L. THOMPSON
 JOSHUA P. THURMAN
 GERRALL E. TIEMAN
 DAVID R. TIFFIN
 JOSHUA H. TILEY
 STEVEN G. TIMM
 ANDREW E. TINGLEY
 MICHAEL S. TOBIN
 MATTHEW E. TODD
 ROBERT J. TOOFIG, JR.
 TIMOTHY S. TROSSEVIN
 KEITH P. TURNBULL
 CHRISTOPHER S. TURNER
 DAVID M. TURNER
 LATHAM H. TURNER
 JON K. TURNIPSEED
 DAVID A. TURPIN
 LINDSAY C. UNDERWOOD
 ANDREW J. VALERIUS
 THOMAS B. VANDAM
 KYLE R. VANDEGRIF
 NICHOLAS J. VANDYKE
 KYLE J. VANHEEST
 ADAM T. VANHORN
 CHAD J. VANKEULEN
 JOHN N. VANWAGONER
 RICHARD B. VAUGHN
 OMAR J. VIEIRA
 BRETT R. VINING
 JOSEPH R. VIOLA
 JUAN P. VIVES
 ARPRELL WALKER II
 ROBERT O. WALKER
 JOSEPH F. WALTER
 KEVIN W. WALTER
 NELLIE WANG
 GRANT A. WANIER
 ERNEST O. WASHINGTON
 TIMOTHY R. WATERS
 JOHN W. WEAVER
 NICHOLAS C. WEIDEMAN
 JONATHAN L. WENDT
 ANDREW J. WENDTH
 MARK H. WERNLY
 LIONEL P. WESLEY
 RICHARD S. WESTERFIELD
 KRISTEN A. WHEELER
 TIMOTHY M. WHITE
 CHARLES S. WICKWARE
 RAYMOND C. WIGGIN
 NATHAN W. WILKINSON
 BRADLEY S. WILLIAMS
 JONATHAN C. WILLIAMS
 KIRBY WILLIAMS II
 RONALD T. WILLIAMS
 THOMAS A. WILLIAMS
 ERIC W. WILSON
 RODERICK D. WILSON
 JASON M. WINDOM
 ADAM C. WISEMAN
 CHRISTOPHER M. WOLF
 REBECCA E. WOLF
 MICHAEL F. WOLFE
 BLAKE J. WOMBLE

ANDREW C. WOOD
 DUSTIN S. WOOD
 MATTHEW E. WOOD
 DANIELLE G. WOODS
 JOHN E. WOODSON
 DAVID A. WRIGHT
 STEVEN H. YANG
 CAMERON R. YASTE
 JENNIFER M. YEDONI
 JESSE D. YOAST
 DAVID R. YOCUM
 MATTHEW T. YOKELEY
 CHRISTOPHER J. YOUNG
 THOMAS J. YOUNG, JR.
 THOMAS J. YOUNGHANS
 ALEXANDER K. YURANK
 THOMAS M. ZAGER
 MICHAEL A. ZDUNKIEWICZ
 NICHOLAS M. ZERLER
 KEITH S. ZEUNER
 BRADLEY C. ZINGONE
 BETHANY R. ZMITROVICH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

REBECCA K. ADAMS
 SUNG H. AHN
 DAVID M. ARMANDT
 MICHAEL J. BAHR
 WARREN H. C. BONG
 STEPHAN C. BROCK
 BRENTON N. CAMPBELL
 DUSTIN R. CUNNINGHAM
 CHRISTOPHER R. DEIGEL
 TIMOTHY J. EMGE II
 KATHERINE L. GERHARD
 SAVANNAH L. GILL
 PATRICK M. GILLEN
 KRISTINE Y. C. HIME
 DANIEL B. HOGUE
 MATTHEW C. HORTON
 DANIEL D. C. HUYNH
 ARTURO JACINTO II
 RANDALL T. JAGOE
 LESLIE A. JARVIS, JR.
 ADAM T. JONES
 TIMOTHY D. KUBISAK
 REBECCA I. MACUS
 NICHOLAS A. MANZINI
 AMBER J. MASON
 TYLER B. MCDONALD
 ANDREW J. METZCUS
 DAMIAN G. OSLEBO
 ANDRES A. OTERO
 LUCAS S. PAROBK
 ROXANE B. POWERS
 RYAN R. REED
 MICHAEL R. ROWLES, JR.
 ERIC D. SHUEY
 ROBERT J. SMITH
 TAYLOR J. SOUTH
 JUSTIN K. STEPANCHICK
 JON M. WASHKO
 CORY L. WHEATLEY
 ALEXANDER G. WILLIAMS
 MATTHEW J. WILLIAMS
 TODD A. WILLIAMSON
 MARCELA C. ZELAYA
 MICHAEL L. ZUEHLKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

CHRISTOPHER M. BADE
 KRISTINE N. BENCH
 ERIC R. DRIDGE
 STEPHEN M. FLEET
 JESSICA A. GARRETT
 LARRY T. GULLIVER
 RICHARD E. ILICZUK, JR.
 STEPHANIE A. JOHNSON
 JESSICA S. KOSCINSKI
 PAUL W. LENZ
 ALLISON B. MABREY
 MICHELLE L. MAHAN
 BETHANY E. MCDONALD
 CHRISTOPHER J. MERRIAM
 JOSEPH R. OXENDINE
 ELIZABETH A. PARKS
 KATHRYN A. PARRISH
 RICHARD B. RAINER
 CASSANDRA M. SISTI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
 TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
 UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JAMIE P. DRAGE
 DERRICK A. DREESE
 ANDREW R. GATES
 JAMES D. GOLLDAY
 ALEXANDRA M. GRAYSON
 VALERIE A. GREENAWAY
 LOUIS J. JACKSON
 RICHARD A. JARCHOW, JR.
 ROBERT J. KENNING
 WILLIAM P. LANGFORD

CHRISTOPHER Z. MATTHEWS
TIMOTHY S. SHAFFER
EMILY K. WILSON
SHANE T. WRIGHT
RICHARD M. YATES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JASON M. BAUMAN
JEREMY M. BECKHAM
KENNETH L. CHAMBERS
ANTHONY J. CLARK
JOHN P. CURRY
AARON J. DILLION
JOSHUA J. KAISER
JOHN B. KRAFT
JAMES A. MAGIN
CHRISTOPHER A. MEDFORD
THOMAS D. MIYANO
TOBY L. NEWTON
WAYNE A. SHIPMAN III
CLEMENT L. SMITH
MARK A. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

JOSHUA A. AISEN
JOSEPH T. BALLARD
JASON K. BRUCE
LYNDSEY D. FATZ
ZHRA M. GHAVAM
PHILIP D. HENRY
PAUL D. KANE, JR.
VANESSA M. N. RIGOROSO
TONJA W. ROSS
BRIAN M. SHECKELLS
SEAN M. SONODA
SCOTT M. THORNBURY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

RICHARD S. CHERNITZER
LAUREN E. COLE
RYAN R. P. DEVERA
REBECCA B. HAGGARD
MEGAN E. ISAAC
REAGAN B. LAURITZEN
DAVID A. LEVY
DAVID C. LLOYD
ROBERT G. MYERS
LAURA K. STEGHERR
BETH A. TEACH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

NICHOLAS A. DENISON
BRYANNA H. HERRING
THEODORE J. STOW

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

TRAVIS C. ADAMS
TIMOTHY M. AGUIAR
ISAM S. ALMABROUK
CHRISTOPHER M. ANCTIL
RODERIGUS C. ANDERSON
TRAVIS W. ARRINGTON
DAVID L. BADMAN, JR.
ANTONIO BARCELOS, JR.
CHARLES E. BARRERAS
MICHAEL L. BECKMAN
MARC D. BENOIT
MICHAEL A. BERBERICH
BRIAN L. BITTNER
TIMOTHY C. BITTNER
RUSSELL L. BLACKBURN, JR.
JASON L. BLICKENS
PATRICK J. BLOTZER
STEPHEN G. BOATWRIGHT
WARREN A. BOWMAN
CLARENCE M. BRADLEY
CHERIE Y. BRANDT
STEPHEN D. BROWN
CHARLES S. BRYANT
JONATHAN BUTLER
FERNANDO C. BYRD
MICHAEL M. CAFFEY
CHARLES E. CALDWELL
WILLIAM R. CALLAHAN
DANVECO M. CARTER
MAURY C. CASTANEDA
ADAM D. CHAMBERS
ODARIOUS L. CHAMBERS
FRANCISCO N. CHAVEZ III
JESSICA R. CHRISTIANSEN
KEMUEL A. CLARK
DARRYL D. COLBERT
FRANKIE S. COLVIN
REFUS M. COMBS, JR.

JASON E. CONYER
SHANE V. COOK
PAUL K. COOPER, JR.
QUENTIN M. COOPER
CHARLES M. CRANSTON, JR.
CHRISTIAN CRUZ
PHILLIP E. DAVIS
TIMOTHY D. DAY II
BRANDON T. DEHAAN
MARK E. DEMAREE
HARRISON A. DEPONDICHELLO
REISHEID L. DIXON
JEFFREY D. DOLAN
BENJAMIN T. DORSCH
KEVIN G. DUNCAN
ARNEL R. EBUE
MICHAEL W. EFIRD
GERALD L. EPPOLITO
KEVIN A. FOLLETT
JONATHAN S. FRANCE
ROBERT GALLARDO
ALFONSO G. GARCIA
ALBERT H. GONZALES
DUANE A. GOWINS
TODD M. GRAHEK
JOSEPH GRAYER, JR.
BRIAN K. GRONDIN
MARIO D. HAGGERTY
STEPHEN F. HANDSOM
JEFFERY D. HANSON
MICHAEL J. HARMON
PAUL D. HARMON
MICHAEL E. HARRIS
ROGER L. HEGGS, JR.
JAMES M. HIGGINS, JR.
DAVID L. HIGHSMITH
MICHELLE V. HIGINGBOTHAM
JASON R. HINKLEY
JEREMY D. HOLLAWAY
JASON W. HOLMES
GARY J. HUGHES
PETER D. IULI
CARLTON R. JACKSON
SAMUEL S. JACKSON
KABRAN N. JOHNSON
AARON M. KASTRUP
ROBERT F. KERSEY III
DAVID W. KING
JAMES A. KNEPP
MICHAEL W. KRALLMAN
JOSEPH M. LANEY
MOSE T. LETOI
MICHAEL A. LOMBARDOZZI
JOEL J. LOPEZ
RICARDO LOPEZ, JR.
GARY D. MABRY
DALLAS MARTIN
DEREK D. MARTIN
GEORGE A. MCINTOSH III
GILDANIEL L. MCKETHAN
JERRY L. MCNEW, JR.
STEPHEN B. MERRITT
DAVID L. MIMS
CURTIS M. MITCHELL
CARRIE A. MONTGOMERY
DONALD R. NEESE
DANIEL T. NEWMAN
KENNETH W. NICHOLS
CAMERON S. NORRIS
NATASHA NORRIS
JOSHUA L. NORVILLE
ANGEL O. OLIVERA
JEREMY E. OLSEN
JAMES M. PADDOCK
ART K. PALALAY
ANDREW J. PALAS
EDWIN V. PARKER
RICHARD D. PARNELL
ROBERT E. PARSONS
MATTHEW A. PAUL
MARK J. PETERSON
MICHAEL A. PETERSON
MICHAEL C. PITTMAN, JR.
ARTHUR L. PORCHE, JR.
MICHAEL S. PREASTER
DANIEL C. RAYBURN
BRIAN M. RE
JEREMY S. REED
STEPHANIE A. RIVERA
ALBERTO C. RUIZ
WILLIAM A. RUSSELL
HEATH M. RUSSELL
STEPHEN C. SAMPICA
ALEXA SANDIFER
JAMES H. SANDIFER, JR.
LAWRENCE E. SCHAFFER
MARK E. SMITH
JACK L. SMOCK, JR.
WILLIAM E. SNIDER III
GEORGE R. SPANN
CHARLES L. STAMPS IV
ERIC R. STOFFERS
TODD H. STOVER
JOANN M. SWAPP
PATRICK K. SWEETEN
KIMBERLEY A. TEMPLE
DERRICK A. THOMAS
TIMOTHY G. THOMPSON
KARL C. THOMSEN
JEFFREY D. TOBOLA
RICARDO M. TOVAR
TERESA L. TURNER

WILLIAM A. TURNER
KATHERINE VESTER
JARRETT C. WALKER
LYNN M. WALL
ROBERT C. WARD
WILLIAM W. WEAVER
CHARLES S. WHITE, JR.
TIMOTHY D. WIK
ALFRED J. WILLIAMS
DARRIN L. WILLIAMS
HAYWOOD WILLIAMS, JR.
KEVIN R. WILLIAMS
RONALD E. WILLIAMS
MARVIN L. WILSON
TROY L. WRIGHT
ADRIAN D. YOUNG
ALAN W. YOUNG
ANTONIO ZUBIA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

MICHAEL K. ALLEN
RACHEL K. BARNETT
ADAM M. BECKER
DANIEL F. BELLE
CHRISTOPHER M. BINGHAM
MAXWELL E. BIERKE
CHRISTOPHER J. BLAKE
JEFFREY K. BRILL
CANDACE M. BRUEGGEMAN
MICHAEL J. BUTLER
MICHAEL A. CANTILLO
SEAN B. CANTWELL
KIMBERLY E. CARSON
KENNY L. CASWELL
RALPH W. COREY IV
RYAN C. COWAN
ERIC L. CUMMINS
WESLEY R. CURTIS
STEVEN I. DAVIS
MICHAEL T. DEHNZ
BENJAMIN C. DEWITT
JESSICA M. FERNANDEZ
WILLIAM B. FOX
ANTONETTE R. GEDDIS
ALAINA M. GEMBARA
JAMES C. GEORGE
ADRIANA M. GIBSON
TARYNE C. A. HASKAMP
JOSEPH M. HATFIELD
NICHOLAS J. HEDBERG
DAVID M. JAKUBEK
DAVID R. JOHANSON II
DANE E. JOHNSON
LAVAGUHN KELLEY, JR.
JENNIFER L. KING
PAUL J. KNITTLE
JOSHUA J. LAMBERTUS
RICHARD A. LISTER II
CHRISTOPHER J. MANNING, JR.
JAY P. MCVANN
MICHAEL E. MOORE
CHRISTOPHER P. OSEGUEDA
BRIAN S. PAGE
BRANDY S. PLOTNER
NICHOLE T. REINER
DAVID J. RIVERA
SAMUEL M. ROBERTS
JAMES R. SANBORN
JAMES E. SAULS
AMIR M. SHAREEF
GREGORY R. STORWICK
RICHARD A. TUININGA
JEFFREY T. VANAK
EDUARDO J. VARGAS
RYAN A. WEBER
PETER C. WENGEL
JERRY W. WYRICK II

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

BRIELLE L. ADAMOVICH
ANDREW J. ADAMS
JOSHUA M. ANGICHODO
MARK A. BARNES
MARK A. BOYLE
JOEY C. CARTER
MICHAEL J. CLIA
DANIEL R. CLARK
AGUSTIN COLLAZO, JR.
PATRICK J. CONDREN
JOSHUA D. CORNEY
TRULEA M. CRAIG
BRADLEY S. CROCKER
DANIEL B. DITCHBURN
ERNEST M. FERNANDEZ
PHILLIP J. FORD
LOUIS M. FORTI
NICHOLAS J. GODDARD
BRIAN P. GREENFIELD
STACEY L. GROSS
JASON R. HENDERSON
MICHAEL P. HETTINGER, JR.
LEIGHTON T. HILL
JASON L. HOOPER
NICHOLAS F. JENSEN
KENNETH D. JEW

JOSEPH J. KRUPPA
CHRISTY L. LAWSON
ANDREW D. LINGG
JOHN M. LUNDGREN, JR.
PETER B. MANZOLI
CAYANNE V. MCFARLANE
DONALD K. MOARATTY, JR.
YASMIN M. ODUNUKWE
TYRONE D. PHAM
CARRIE K. SANDERS
GRIFFIN E. SAVING
DREW C. SKINNER
LAURICE H. STROTHER II
CAMERON R. THOMAS
JOSEPH A. TOWNS
SAMUEL T. TRASSARE
MARK J. TURNER
JENNIFER L. VAUGHN
ROBERT D. VIRDEN
NICHOLAS P. WALKER
CHRISTOPHER A. WEIS
ERIC R. WEISS
BRADLEY J. WILLIFORD
JASON M. WITTROCK
SHEIVON A. YUILLE
RICHARD S. ZIBA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

GILBERT R. BAUGHN
QUINZELL T. BROWN
SEAN S. BROWN
JARED D. BURGESS
LLEWELLYN E. CHALLENGER
JEFFREY T. COVINGTON
JAMES R. CROWE
KEVIN D. CUMMINGS
LISA M. GEBREAMLAK
ERIK C. HANSEN
ELIZABETH E. HUNTOON
PATRICK HURRINUS
BRANDON D. LAMBAISO
CHRISTOPHER B. LANDIS
KARRIE M. LANG
WELTON LAWRENCE, JR.
THOMAS S. LEVIER
DAVID C. LIMMER
MATTHEW R. LIVINGSTONE
JUAN G. LUNA

CAMERON J. MACKLEY
EHAB MAKHLOUF
MICHAEL J. MCGONAGLE
JOHNATHAN V. MOORING
NELSON J. MOZZINI
MICHAEL M. ORDONEZ
VICENTE ORTIZ
MICHAEL D. PAWLUK
ROBERT R. PINCKNEY, JR.
MAXIMILIANO PINO III
DAVID T. SCOTT
ARIC S. SHELBY
VAN E. STEWART, JR.
CHRISTOPHER D. SWARTZ
RICHARD B. THOMPSON
JOHN R. VANASSCHE
KERRI L. WILLIAMS
SERGIO B. WOODEN

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT
TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY
UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

To be lieutenant commander

GREGORY A. GRUBBS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 16, 2015

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 16, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ANDY HARRIS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m.

CHRISTIAN PERSECUTION WORLDWIDE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, soon Pope Francis will deliver a historical address to this Congress. During this year, he has addressed a form of genocide happening in the world.

Globally, Christians are being imprisoned, tortured, and killed because they are Christians. In 2013, Christians faced persecution in 102 out of 190-plus countries. In Iran, American Christian pastor Saeed Abedini has been languishing in jail for the last 2½ years because he is a Christian.

According to the 2015 Open Doors' World Watch List, North Korea is the worst persecutor of Christians in the whole world. There, Christians are often sent to prison camps for possession of Bibles, sometimes even executed because they are Christians. The State Department estimates that 80,000 to 120,000 North Koreans are imprisoned in labor camps because of their religious beliefs. In November of 2013, 80 North Korean Christians were reportedly executed for possession of Bi-

bles and possessing South Korean religious films.

In Pakistan, in one city, Christian churches have been bombed. A 14-year-old Christian boy was beaten and set on fire because he was a Christian. Burns now cover more than 55 percent of his body.

In Egypt, over a 3-day period in 2013, Coptic Christians experienced the worst single attack against their churches in 700 years, with 40 Christian churches destroyed and over 100 others severely damaged. Thousands of Coptic Christians have fled Egypt to other countries.

In Libya, ISIS captured and beheaded 21 people because they were Christians. When the victims' families tried to build a church in their honor, they were attacked by a Muslim mob and beaten.

It is not just Assad's thugs in Syria killing Christians; religious cleansing takes place in other places. In Syria, militants expelled 90 percent of the Christians in the city of Homs. Patriarch Gregorios III of Antioch says, out of a population of 1.75 million, 450,000 Syrian Christians have fled in fear.

Mr. Speaker, no Christian anywhere on Earth should have to leave their homeland because of their faith.

In Iraq, where Christians have been calling home since the time of Christ, the story is just as dark. Its Christian population has almost entirely disappeared—dropping 90 percent since the first gulf war. The number of churches has declined from 300 in 2003 to 57.

In Africa, the terrorist group al Shabaab attacked a university in Kenya, going door-to-door to find and execute Christians. Al Shabaab attacked a shopping mall in Kenya in 2013 and took shoppers captive. One of them was Joshua Hakim. When Joshua got close to his attackers, he showed them his ID, and he covered up his Christian name with his thumb. "They told me to go," Joshua recalled later. "Then another man came forward, and they said, what is the name of Muhammad's mother?" The individual couldn't answer; so they shot him.

Mr. Speaker, history tells us that the persecution of Christians has been going on since the day Stephen was stoned for his faith in Acts 7.

As a country, the United States needs to reexamine its relationship with countries and states that persecute or tolerate the persecution of Christians. Countries should get no U.S. foreign aid until they start pro-

tecting Christians instead of persecuting them. And let's call groups like ISIS what they truly are: a radical and dangerous Islamic extremist terrorist group.

Religious liberty is a basic civil right, a humanitarian right, and an inalienable right. Since Pilgrims came to America to escape religious persecution in their homeland, our Nation has stood as a bright beacon to the world for religious freedom for everyone—Jews, Muslims, Hindus, Christians, and others.

It is written in the Good Book that a man was traveling on the Jericho road and fell among robbers. The man was beaten, his property was stolen, and he was left for dead. Other people traveled down the same road, saw him in the ditch, but passed on by him on the other side of the road. They went their own way. They did nothing.

The United States cannot be silent and walk on the other side of the road while Christians worldwide are beaten, beheaded, and brutalized because they are Christians. We must be that beacon that shines in proud protection of religious freedom for all—including Christians.

And that is just the way it is.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY WISHES TO THE HONORABLE RON PAUL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, one of my dearest friends, and a man nationally known for his knowledge and wisdom on so many subjects, recently celebrated his 80th birthday on August 20. That special friend is Ron Paul.

Those who had the pleasure to serve with Ron know how he served with unwavering principles. Whether he was fighting the Federal Reserve, speaking out against unnecessary war, or defending life, Ron Paul lived out the principles he holds dear and upheld the Constitution. That is why I supported him when he ran for the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, it was Ron Paul who started the Liberty Caucus, of which I am still a member. I will always remember very fondly when we met in his office in the Cannon Building for lunch meetings. He would invite speakers who were expert in everything from monetary policy to foreign policy. We all got so much out of those Liberty Caucus meetings.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

He helped me and many of my colleagues have a better understanding of monetary policy, what are good policies and what are bad policies. Too many times our leaders don't understand the impact and complexities of monetary policy. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious, with our growing debt of \$18.3 trillion, that our leadership in both parties should call on Ron Paul and ask his advice.

In my 20 years in Congress, I have not had a better friend than Ron Paul. I have always been able to count on Ron as both a personal and professional confidant.

In his many years as a "citizen patriot," as his son United States Senator RAND PAUL calls him, the cause of liberty has never had a better friend than Ron Paul. Ron is a great fighter for the Constitution; and even though he is out of public office, his fight is just as strong today as ever.

I'm sure many of my colleagues in the House would join me in wishing a belated happy birthday to Ron Paul, my dear friend, and a friend of the Constitution.

U.S. FORESTRY BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this has been, once again, a really catastrophic wildfire season. In fact, we saw the loss of lives of individuals who serve our country in the United States Forest Service, and so we certainly keep them and their family members in our thoughts and prayers.

It is time that we address this issue in terms of the expansive fires that we have seen. The administration has been very vocal for the need to provide more funding to combat more wildfires and also stop more fire-borrowing from the Forest Service budget. As a matter of fact, there was a press release yesterday regarding the administration's letter to Congress addressing the budget issue.

I agree there needs to be a solution, but fixing the budget is not the final solution. However, addressing the fire-borrowing will not solve the problem alone.

Mr. Speaker, in 1995, fighting wildfires consumed one-sixth of the Forest Service budget. In 2015, this August, it is consuming one-half, 50 percent, of the Forest Service budget. We have to address, though, the root cause of this problem, which is not just warmer temperatures, but it is largely the fuel load, the fire load, from the lack of active management, insufficient active management, in our national forests.

It is also very important that the Forest Service have the ability to ex-

pediently treat national forest acres for forest health and wildfire prevention. The Agriculture Committee passed through the House H.R. 2647. I was very proud to be a cosponsor of that bill and managed that bill on the floor. It passed with bipartisan support. This bill is called the Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2015. This legislation is an earnest attempt to give the Forest Service more authority and much-needed flexibility to deal with these challenges of process, funding, litigation, necessary timber harvesting, and much-needed active management in our national forests.

Now, the Obama administration strongly opposes this legislation despite, yesterday, in an Agriculture oversight hearing where we heard from the Under Secretary words like "collaborative" and the "need for expedited NEPA," which is a national environmental assessment. It doesn't mean there is no assessment; it just does it in an efficient way. It provides what is necessary, not overregulation, providing more categorical exclusions to NEPA. Those were all things the Under Secretary said that this administration is supportive of.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are all things in this bill, and yet the administration, for whatever reason I have a hard time understanding, is opposed to this bill.

One of the solutions here, obviously, is to do good, active timbering. I want to come back, Mr. Speaker, to those years, 1995, where one-sixth of the Forest Service budget was consumed for fighting wildfires—and that is a lot, one-sixth. That year, they generated 3.8 billion board-feet of timber. That was the harvesting that took place. Just 7 years prior to that, we were harvesting 12.7 billion board-feet. That was the high in recent decades, in 1987.

As you can imagine, when you are doing that much harvesting, you are reducing the fuel load. You are reducing the risk. Fire needs oxygen, it needs fuel, and it needs some type of energy to ignite it. If you take away the fuel, any of those three triangles, as a long-time firefighter, I can tell you that is how you prevent fires. Yet today, August 2015, where we are spending one-half of the Forest Service budget, we are taking money out of timbering programs and multiuse programs, they are only producing 2.4 billion board-feet from our forests.

Now, you look at what is the value of that? So you take the difference between where we were at a high of 12.7 billion board-feet—and that wasn't at a sustainable rate; we were growing much more timber than what we were cutting even in 1987—so that is a difference of 10.3 billion board-feet.

How do we put an economic value on that? Well, if you just look at what the most recent average is for board-foot of timber harvested in national forests,

Mr. Speaker, and you calculate that difference, if we would be harvesting and active timbering, active management the way we should, just looking at that 1987 standard—which is well below what we potentially could be cutting—that is \$169 billion in revenue coming into the Treasury of the United States.

Our national forests are meant to be resources that provide for our Nation. With \$169 billion, do you know what, I think we would have the resources to fight the fires. But if we were truly timbering where we should be, we wouldn't be having those fires.

The U.S. Forest Service did recently announce that it has already surpassed its more than \$1 billion budget for fighting wildfires and that it will have to transfer an additional \$450 million from programs which benefit national forests across the Nation. This is the eighth time since 2002 that the service has had to transfer such funds because of wildfire costs. Such transfers take money directly out of timber harvesting and salvage logging, recreational activities, grants to States, and even funding for fire suppression.

There is a better way to do things. I look forward to working with our Forest Service, and I encourage the Obama administration to support that.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with many of my colleagues that these wildfires should be treated as natural disasters and the Forest Service needs budget flexibility.

This is why I strongly support H.R. 167, the Wildfire Disaster Funding Act.

Avoiding these funding transfers, keeping funding where it belongs, and increasing our harvest are critical first steps in getting our nation forests on track.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HARRIS) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God of the universe, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We thank You that You give us a share in Your creative work, having endowed each with unique and important talents.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women of the people's

House, who have been entrusted with the care of this great Nation's people. Because of the great blessings You have bestowed on our Nation, may we embrace the opportunity to build a better world beyond our borders as well.

Bless all those who work in the Nation's Capitol. May their work be appreciated by the American people, for their faithfulness in service to our Nation is truly edifying.

May all that they do this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. ASHFORD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

HELPING FAMILIES IN MENTAL HEALTH CRISIS ACT

(Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, I have met with thousands of families of those with mental illness. Their number one concern is how the current system shuts them out.

Debbie and Chaz Mahoney lost their son Chuckie to suicide in 2002. Although Chuckie sought counseling from his college and showed signs of mental crisis, his parents knew nothing about his struggle. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act, also known as FERPA, kept Chuckie's parents in the dark.

The Mahoneys aren't alone. Each day, millions of families experience the same tragic frustration. Schools will be sure to remind you when the tuition check arrives, but because of FERPA, when it comes to your child's mental health, you only receive a call when it is too, too late.

This Suicide Prevention Month, Congress can fix this problem. The Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act allows doctors to provide limited, but crucial, information concerning individuals with a serious mental illness to known caregivers. To save their lives and protect their rights to treatment, I

urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2646.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have only 7 legislative days left until another unnecessary, costly, and entirely preventable government shutdown.

We need to negotiate an agreement to replace the sequester with a responsible alternative. Because Republicans have refused to start these negotiations, I have talked to Mrs. LOWEY, the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee, and I have talked to Mr. VAN HOLLEN, the ranking member on the Budget Committee, and I have talked to Mr. MCCARTHY, but we have had no discussions on how to keep the government open just 8 legislative days from now.

If the government were to shut down, as it did in 2013, it would cost our economy billions of dollars and put our national security at risk. Hundreds of thousands of public service workers would be furloughed, and millions of people would be cut off from critical programs and services.

Many Republicans are urging their leadership not to risk a shutdown. Representative CHARLIE DENT of Pennsylvania said, "I don't think we need to do a replay of 2013. It would be an enormous tactical and strategic blunder." Indiana Senator DAN COATS, a conservative Republican, called a shutdown a failed tactic for political purposes that is not going to succeed.

I urge my Republican colleagues to stop threatening a shutdown—not all of them, but some of them—and to, instead, take action to keep the government open as we work to reach an agreement on a budget that replaces the sequester and funds our Nation's priorities responsibly.

NUCLEAR IRAN DEAL MERITS SENATE'S "NUCLEAR" OPTION

(Mr. SMITH of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this week, I am circulating a letter to my House colleagues that asks the Senate to drop the 60-vote requirement for consideration of the Iran deal.

The American people sent us to Congress to represent their interests and to take actions that benefit our great country.

Yet, time and time again, we hear from our constituents that Congress is not listening or is incapable of performing its basic responsibilities as a legislature.

Our request to eliminate the filibuster for some votes simply under-

scores that, in a democracy, the majority should decide.

It is time to send a strong signal to this administration that it can no longer disregard the will of the American people and their representatives in Congress.

I urge my colleagues to sign this letter that asks for a majority vote on the Iran deal in the Senate.

AVOID A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, today, we face another government shutdown, another government shutdown that threatens our economy.

And what is this potential shutdown about?

It is about Congress trying to dictate to women in my community which healthcare providers they can and cannot see to get care.

Let me set the record straight.

Planned Parenthood of the Heartland provides vital preventive care to women in my community. Last year, Planned Parenthood of the Heartland served nearly 10,000 patients.

They conducted over 4,000 cervical and breast cancer screenings and over 13,000 tests for sexually transmitted infections. They provided prenatal care, pregnancy testing, and other preventive health services.

They are an active supporter of the national campaign to prevent teen and unplanned pregnancy, and they even have licensed adoption professionals on site to help women navigate the steps of adoption.

I am a strong believer that education regarding women's health prevents abortions. We must come together and work in a spirit of bipartisanship to avoid this government shutdown.

SACRED RIGHT—RELIGIOUS FREEDOM

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Coptic Christians—the largest religious minority in Egypt and the largest Christian community in the Middle East—are constantly persecuted.

In 2011, Ayman Nabil Labib went to school like he did every day. Ayman, like most Coptic Christians in Egypt, had a cross tattooed on his wrist as a sign of his Christian faith.

When he got to school, Ayman's Arabic language teacher asked him to cover the tattoo. Instead, Ayman pulled the cross from underneath his shirt and left it hanging around his neck.

The teacher became enraged. He choked Ayman and asked Ayman's

Muslim classmates: What are you going to do with him? Then his classmates beat him to death to silence his faith.

Ayman was murdered because he was a Christian.

Religious freedom is a basic, sacred, universal human right. Alexander Hamilton said in 1775, "The sacred rights of mankind . . . are written, as with a sun beam in the whole volume of human nature, by the hand of the divinity itself; and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power."

And that is just the way it is.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, there are only 7 legislative days until the GOP shuts down this government again.

I have been back home. I don't know about you, but what I have heard is that the American people do not want to see another government shutdown. They don't want to see Planned Parenthood defunded, taking away essential health care for women across the country.

What they want to see is for us to work together. They want to see both parties work together to keep the government open for sure, but to go beyond that, to make sure that families can save to own a home, that they can send their kids to college, that they can have something set aside for retirement.

It is not just enough to keep the government open. That ought to be a given. We ought to take up the priorities of the American people.

Unfortunately, what we see is that, in an attempt to get something that a minority of this body wants, they are going to hold up the entirety of the government—shut down the government—over one issue. That is not responsible, and that is not what the American people sent us here to do.

House Democrats are ready to work together. We will compromise, but let's negotiate. Let's have a discussion.

Let's talk to one another and come up with a budget that we can work together on and that we can present to the American people, and let's get back to the business the people sent us here to do.

MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage support in promoting National Manufacturing Day, an annual event that is recognized on Friday, October 2.

During a time in which the manufacturing sector is under a number of

challenges, Manufacturing Day aims to revitalize the image of manufacturing and to bring awareness of this sector's many contributions to the economy and to the United States' competitiveness.

As the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commerce, Manufacturing, and Trade, I intend to support this day of recognition on October 2 in my district, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same in their districts. Manufacturing Day also serves as an opportunity for manufacturers across the country to highlight their work.

Manufacturing is imperative for the future of the United States' economy, and it encourages the growth of American innovation, a skill that must continue to be fostered in this generation and those generations yet to come.

A BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the need to come together, put aside partisan politics, and pass a budget.

More than 7 in 10 Americans are saying they would prefer a budget agreement to prevent the government from shutting down.

I was elected to Congress and came here promising my constituents no more government shutdowns, no more Federal furloughs, and no more sequestration.

I ask for the leadership of both parties to put forward a bipartisan, long-term budget solution to help prevent a government shutdown.

We need to focus on what matters: growing our economy, upgrading our aging infrastructure, and helping to ensure that our citizens are able to obtain the American Dream.

We cannot waste any more time on political gridlock, and it is not fair to hijack our Nation's budget bill. Let's come together. Let's get to work. Let's answer the call of our constituents, and let's pass a budget.

CHILDREN'S CARDIOMYOPATHY AWARENESS MONTH

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September as Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month.

Cardiomyopathy is a chronic disease of the heart muscle that increases the risk of sudden cardiac arrest, which is a condition that claims approximately 295,000 lives in the United States every

year. It is also the leading cause of death among schoolchildren.

That is one reason I introduced the SAFE PLAY Act, which would improve the health and safety of student athletes, including those who are diagnosed with cardiomyopathy.

We know that, when sudden cardiac arrest hits, quick intervention saves lives. That is why the SAFE PLAY Act includes provisions to teach students across the country the life-saving skills of CPR and how to use AEDs.

As we recognize Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month, I want to invite my colleagues and their staffs to the second annual AED Hunt on the Hill, taking place tomorrow at 4 p.m. in the afternoon. There you can learn more about cardiomyopathy, how AEDs save lives, and how the SAFE PLAY Act can help. Together, we can make a difference.

□ 1415

GOP SHUTDOWN/PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, once again, Republicans are threatening to shut down our government.

Instead of passing a sensible funding bill or a long-term transportation bill that will create jobs, Republicans have chosen to put jobs at risk. They have chosen to weaken security at our airports. They have chosen to close our national parks. They pretty much have chosen not to serve their constituents back home.

And it is for what reason? It is because they are so determined to regulate women's bodies and block women's right to access preventive and life-saving health care that they would rather throw Americans under the bus.

Last year alone, in my State of North Carolina, Planned Parenthood served more than 31,000 patients, providing mammograms, pap smears, cancer screenings, contraceptive services, and STD testing.

Why would we want to deny women, many who are low income, of these necessary health benefits? Women's access to health care has always been important to me, and that is why I am a consistent advocate for the work that Planned Parenthood does.

More importantly, I refuse to put jobs and our country's safety at risk over partisan grandstanding. Only 7 days left—it is time to do what we were sent here to do and end this senseless shutdown talk.

GOP DYSFUNCTION

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my Republican colleagues to please don't shut down the government. Let's work together. Let's put politics aside and do what is best for the American people.

By the end of this month, we are expected to negotiate a responsible budget agreement, but threats from the rightwing extremists are taking us off course once again.

I recently wrote an op-ed challenging Republican threats to women's healthcare coverage, as I refuse to stand on the sidelines when our country's daughters, sisters, and mothers are under attack.

Instead of, once again, holding women's health care hostage in order to pass a biased agenda, we need to come together to pass a responsible, bipartisan budget to address our Nation's most pressing problems.

Now, residents in the Dallas/Fort Worth area are concerned about getting some congestion off of our freeways and doing things like making sure that the American public has good, well-paying jobs and protecting our businesses.

They want us to pass a balanced and responsible budget that averts another government shutdown. We cannot expect to repeat the same mistakes and think that it is going to yield different results.

The American people are counting on us to focus on what matters: jobs, education, and fixing our country's crumbling infrastructure.

STOP GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you today outraged and disappointed. Once again, petty partisan politics is threatening to derail government funding and shut down critical services to hard-working, deserving Americans.

Later today, I will be hosting a forum with the media, talking about how women are treated and misrepresented in the media; and here, we have an issue that has a direct impact on women being used as a pawn to shut down our government. The only group that is portrayed more negatively—and we all hear it—is our own Congress.

We must act now to change how we are portrayed and how America views us. We must work together and stop another wasteful and harmful government shutdown. We are better than this.

Congress, my colleagues, let's work together and keep our government working.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following commu-

nication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 16, 2015 at 9:23 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 2036.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 3 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1500

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) at 3 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later today.

NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION ACT REAUTHORIZATION OF 2015

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 23) to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) *DIRECTOR.*—Section 203(1) of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15702(1)) is amended by striking "Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy" and inserting "Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology".

(b) *LIFELINES.*—Section 203 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15702) is further amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (2) through (4) as paragraphs (3) through (5), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following new paragraph:

"(2) *LIFELINES.*—The term 'lifelines' means public works and utilities, including transportation facilities and infrastructure, oil and gas pipelines, electrical power and communication facilities and infrastructure, and water supply and sewage treatment facilities."

(c) *WINDSTORM.*—Paragraph (5) of such section, as redesignated by subsection (b), is amended by inserting "northeaster," after "tropical storm,".

SEC. 3. NATIONAL WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION PROGRAM.

Section 204 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15703) is amended—

(1) by striking subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting the following:

"(a) *ESTABLISHMENT.*—There is established the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, the purpose of which is to achieve major measurable reductions in the losses of life and property from windstorms through a coordinated Federal effort, in cooperation with other levels of government, academia, and the private sector, aimed at improving the understanding of windstorms and their impacts and developing and encouraging the implementation of cost-effective mitigation measures to reduce those impacts.

"(b) *RESPONSIBILITIES OF PROGRAM AGENCIES.*—

"(1) *LEAD AGENCY.*—The National Institute of Standards and Technology shall have the primary responsibility for planning and coordinating the Program. In carrying out this paragraph, the Director shall—

"(A) ensure that the Program includes the necessary components to promote the implementation of windstorm risk reduction measures by Federal, State, and local governments, national standards and model building code organizations, architects and engineers, and others with a role in planning and constructing buildings and lifelines;

"(B) support the development of performance-based engineering tools, and work with appropriate groups to promote the commercial application of such tools, including through wind-related model building codes, voluntary standards, and construction best practices;

"(C) request the assistance of Federal agencies other than the Program agencies, as necessary to assist in carrying out this Act;

"(D) coordinate all Federal post-windstorm investigations to the extent practicable; and

"(E) when warranted by research or investigative findings, issue recommendations to assist in informing the development of model codes, and provide information to Congress on the use of such recommendations.

(2) *NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.*—In addition to the lead agency responsibilities described under paragraph (1), the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall be responsible for carrying out research and development to improve model building codes, voluntary standards, and best practices for the design, construction, and retrofit of buildings, structures, and lifelines.

(3) *NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.*—The National Science Foundation shall support research in—

"(A) engineering and the atmospheric sciences to improve the understanding of the behavior of windstorms and their impact on buildings, structures, and lifelines; and

“(B) economic and social factors influencing windstorm risk reduction measures.

“(4) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration shall support atmospheric sciences research to improve the understanding of the behavior of windstorms and their impact on buildings, structures, and lifelines.

“(5) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—The Federal Emergency Management Agency shall—

“(A) support—

“(i) the development of risk assessment tools and effective mitigation techniques;

“(ii) windstorm-related data collection and analysis;

“(iii) public outreach and information dissemination; and

“(iv) promotion of the adoption of windstorm preparedness and mitigation measures, including for households, businesses, and communities, consistent with the Agency’s all-hazards approach; and

“(B) work closely with national standards and model building code organizations, in conjunction with the National Institute of Standards and Technology, to promote the implementation of research results and promote better building practices within the building design and construction industry, including architects, engineers, contractors, builders, and inspectors.”;

(2) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (c), and by striking subsections (e) and (f); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (c), as so redesignated, the following new subsections:

“(d) BUDGET ACTIVITIES.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the Director of the National Science Foundation, the Director of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency shall each include in their agency’s annual budget request to Congress a description of their agency’s projected activities under the Program for the fiscal year covered by the budget request, along with an assessment of what they plan to spend on those activities for that fiscal year.

“(e) INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established an Interagency Coordinating Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction, chaired by the Director or the Director’s designee.

“(2) MEMBERSHIP.—In addition to the chair, the Committee shall be composed of—

“(A) the heads or such designees of—

“(i) the Federal Emergency Management Agency;

“(ii) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

“(iii) the National Science Foundation;

“(iv) the Office of Science and Technology Policy; and

“(v) the Office of Management and Budget; and

“(B) the head of any other Federal agency, or such designee, the chair considers appropriate.

“(3) MEETINGS.—The Committee shall meet not less than once a year at the call of the Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

“(4) GENERAL PURPOSE AND DUTIES.—The Committee shall oversee the planning and coordination of the Program.

“(5) STRATEGIC PLAN.—The Committee shall develop and submit to Congress, not later than one year after the date of enactment of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, a Strategic Plan for the Program that includes—

“(A) prioritized goals for the Program that will mitigate against the loss of life and property from future windstorms;

“(B) short-term, mid-term, and long-term research objectives to achieve those goals;

“(C) a description of the role of each Program agency in achieving the prioritized goals;

“(D) the methods by which progress towards the goals will be assessed; and

“(E) an explanation of how the Program will foster the transfer of research results into outcomes, such as improved model building codes.

“(6) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, the Committee shall submit to the Congress a report on the progress of the Program that includes—

“(A) a description of the activities funded under the Program, a description of how these activities align with the prioritized goals and research objectives established in the Strategic Plan, and the budgets, per agency, for these activities;

“(B) the outcomes achieved by the Program for each of the goals identified in the Strategic Plan;

“(C) a description of any recommendations made to change existing building codes that were the result of Program activities; and

“(D) a description of the extent to which the Program has incorporated recommendations from the Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction.

“(7) COORDINATED BUDGET.—The Committee shall develop a coordinated budget for the Program, which shall be submitted to the Congress not later than 60 days after the date of the President’s budget submission for each fiscal year.”.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.

Section 205 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15704) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 205. NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON WINDSTORM IMPACT REDUCTION.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institute of Standards and Technology shall establish an Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction, which shall be composed of at least 7 and not more than 15 members who are qualified to provide advice on windstorm impact reduction and represent related scientific, architectural, and engineering disciplines, none of whom may be employees of the Federal Government, including—

“(1) representatives of research and academic institutions;

“(2) industry standards development organizations;

“(3) emergency management agencies;

“(4) State and local government; and

“(5) business communities, including the insurance industry.

“(b) ASSESSMENTS.—The Advisory Committee on Windstorm Impact Reduction shall offer assessments and recommendations on—

“(1) trends and developments in the natural, engineering, and social sciences and practices of windstorm impact mitigation;

“(2) the priorities of the Program’s Strategic Plan;

“(3) the coordination of the Program;

“(4) the effectiveness of the Program in meeting its purposes; and

“(5) any revisions to the Program which may be necessary.

“(c) COMPENSATION.—The members of the Advisory Committee established under this section shall serve without compensation.

“(d) REPORTS.—At least every 2 years, the Advisory Committee shall report to the Director on the assessments carried out under subsection (b)

and its recommendations for ways to improve the Program.

“(e) CHARTER.—Notwithstanding section 14(b)(2) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.), the Advisory Committee shall not be required to file a charter subsequent to its initial charter, filed under section 9(c) of such Act, before the termination date specified in subsection (f) of this section.

“(f) TERMINATION.—The Advisory Committee shall terminate on September 30, 2017.

“(g) CONFLICT OF INTEREST.—An Advisory Committee member shall recuse himself from any Advisory Committee activity in which he has an actual pecuniary interest.”.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 207 of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act of 2004 (42 U.S.C. 15706) is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 207. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

“(a) FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Emergency Management Agency for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$5,332,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(b) NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$9,682,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(c) NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Institute of Standards and Technology for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$4,120,000 for fiscal year 2017.

“(d) NATIONAL OCEANIC AND ATMOSPHERIC ADMINISTRATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration for carrying out this title—

“(1) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2015;

“(2) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2016; and

“(3) \$2,266,000 for fiscal year 2017.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 23, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015, reauthorizes the activities of the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program through fiscal year 2017.

Representative RANDY NEUGEBAUER, my Texas colleague, has championed this program for over a decade. In the

113th Congress, he and Representative FREDERICA WILSON's bipartisan efforts helped move this legislation through the Science Committee and to successfully pass the House.

It is because of their past work that we were able to bring this bill to the House floor on January 7, the second day of business in the 114th Congress, this Congress. The bill overwhelmingly passed the House 381-39.

Today, we consider the Senate amendment to H.R. 23. Thanks to leadership of my colleague on the other side of the Capitol, Senator JOHN THUNE, an amended version of H.R. 23 passed the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in June. It then passed the Senate by unanimous consent in July.

The National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program supports Federal research and development efforts to help mitigate the loss of life and property due to wind-related hazards.

Millions of Americans live in areas vulnerable to hurricanes, tornados, and other windstorms. The National Weather Service reported just over 100 deaths and over 900 injuries last year due to tornados and other windstorms.

In Texas, we are all too familiar with the harm that strong wind can cause. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's storm prediction center, 128 tornados and 1,366 windstorms were reported just in Texas in the last 2 years. The effects of these disasters can be felt for a long time.

Initially established in 2004, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program supports activities to improve our understanding of windstorms and their impacts and helps to develop and encourage the implementation of cost-effective mitigation measures. H.R. 23 establishes the National Institute of Standards and Technology as the lead agency for the program.

The bill also improves coordination of interagency activities in a fiscally responsible manner. It expands transparency for how much money is being spent on windstorm research at the four participating agencies, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, the National Science Foundation, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and FEMA. It authorizes \$21.4 million for this interagency research.

The Senate amendment provides some flexibility to the advisory committee on windstorm impact reduction when it provides recommendations in its report. It also ensures that northeasters are included in the definition of windstorm and makes a few other minor conforming and technical changes.

Again, I want to thank Representative NEUGEBAUER for his continued efforts in support of this program. I encourage my colleagues to support the

bill and to send it to the President's desk for his autograph.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 23, legislation that reauthorizes the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, or NWIRP.

America faces significant exposure to windstorms. We saw that, indeed, in 2012 when Superstorm Sandy devastated parts of the Northeast. Superstorm Sandy was responsible for over 200 deaths and caused over \$70 billion in damage.

According to the National Weather Service, from 2005 to 2014, thousands of Americans lost their lives from the impacts of windstorms. Along with the loss of life, windstorms caused many billions of dollars in property and crop damage during that time.

When windstorms occur, we must work to save lives and reduce the amount of property and crop damage that the windstorm or other natural disaster causes. We already are investing significant resources after a windstorm, but we should be investing more in preparedness.

FEMA's predisaster mitigation program has demonstrated that every dollar invested in mitigation activities saves \$3 to \$4 in recovery costs.

The National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act Reauthorization of 2015 is largely a mitigation program. The bill reauthorizes the NWIRP program that directs NIST, NSF, NOAA, and FEMA to support coordinated activities to improve our understanding of windstorms and their impacts and to develop cost-effective mitigation measures.

This program has the potential to lessen the loss of life and economic damage of windstorms by supporting research and helping to translate that research into more effective building codes and mitigation programs, but this program needs robust investment to achieve that result.

Unfortunately, this bill includes a lower total authorization level than was authorized for this program in fiscal year 2008.

We have the responsibility, I believe, to assist our constituents after a natural disaster occurs, but we also have the responsibility to properly support mitigation programs that could reduce the loss of life and property damage caused by the next natural disaster.

Nevertheless, this is an important program that needs reauthorization, and I, today, support its passage.

I want to thank the members of the Science, Space and Technology Committee, including Chair SMITH, Ranking Member JOHNSON, and Representative NEUGEBAUER, for their hard work on this bill.

I want to thank the members of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Trans-

portation Committee for their hard work as well. It is nice to see my colleagues here in the House of Representatives and over in the Senate working in a bipartisan, bicameral manner to bring this bill to the floor today.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO), a member of the Science Committee, for his comments and for supporting this piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Lubbock, Texas (Mr. NEUGEBAUER), a Texas colleague. I want to thank him for sponsoring this piece of legislation and look forward to its passage today and to its being enacted into law as well.

Mr. NEUGEBAUER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support today for my bill, the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Act, or NWIRP.

As I said, I want to thank Chairman SMITH. I also want to thank Senator JOHN THUNE of the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, who helped shepherd this bill through the Senate.

The United States averages almost 1,300 recorded tornados every year, causing over 70 deaths and 1,500 injuries. These storms cost about \$400 million in damage each year, but particularly in a bad year, like 2011, wind damage from tornados and thunderstorms cost more than \$28 billion. This is a natural and a national disaster.

When a family loses their home in a windstorm, they don't just have to rebuild their house; they have to rebuild their lives as well, and we can help these families, and we can help save their lives and, in many cases, help save their property through the important research that is going on at many universities around the country, including my alma mater, Texas Tech University.

With those families in mind, I introduced NWIRP. NWIRP promotes research that helps save lives, reduce injuries, and lessens damage from windstorms.

As was mentioned by my colleague from New York, we have found that \$1 in investments in the resilience against windstorms can result in \$4 in savings in a disaster response. Not only are we investing dollars to make America safer, but we are also saving the taxpayers in the long run.

Upon passage, this bill will move to the President's desk to be signed into law, and I think it is important that we get this bill passed as quickly as we can because, again, windstorms can cause a lot of damage and can cause the loss of life.

The more we understand about the dynamics of these windstorms and understanding how they interface with

different types of building materials, the safer and better structures that we are able to build and ultimately, in many cases, save lives.

A lot of important research has been going on. One of the things I like about this particular piece of legislation is that it brings some accountability in making sure that we are investing the dollars in the places where we are getting the most bang for the buck for the American taxpayers.

Not only are we looking out for the taxpayers in this bill, but we are also looking out for the people, the men and women, that are affected by these windstorms. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we must help our constituents prepare for and mitigate the impacts of windstorms that threaten lives and property. This bill reauthorizes a program that would do just that, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no other requests from Members to speak on this piece of legislation, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 23, legislation that would reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program—or NWIRP.

The last few years have been devastating years for natural disasters across the country. For example, in May, the Great Plains had a six-day outbreak of tornado activity that affected areas ranging from Colorado to Texas and resulted in over 60 injuries and 5 fatalities.

H.R. 23 directs NIST, NSF, NOAA, and FEMA to support activities to improve the understanding of windstorms and their impacts. We can use that knowledge to reduce the vulnerability of our communities to natural disasters. The NWIRP program helps our federal agencies and communities across the nation to develop and implement many measures that help minimize the loss of life and property during windstorms and to rebuild effectively and safely after such storms.

I was pleased that when this bill was considered by the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee, we worked in a bipartisan manner and made several improvements to the bill. We worked together to increase the authorization for FEMA, the agency tasked with implementing the research conducted by the other NWIRP agencies. Also, we added several social science-related provisions to the bill. We cannot design effective disaster preparation strategies without understanding how people make decisions and respond to disaster warnings.

The House of Representatives passed H.R. 23 at the end of January with a vote of 381–39 and sent it to the Senate. During their consideration, the Senate made minor changes to the bill, but I am happy to report that all of the bipartisan improvements we made to the bill remain in H.R. 23.

I want to thank my fellow Texans—Chairman SMITH and Mr. NEUGEBAUER—for working across the aisle on this bill. I also want to thank the Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee in the Senate for their work on this bill.

This is an important program that needs to be reauthorized. It is good to see Members of the House and Senate coming together, working out their differences, compromising, and ending up with a bill with bipartisan, bicameral support.

I support the bill and urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 23.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERARDO HERNANDEZ AIRPORT SECURITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 720) to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ASSISTANT SECRETARY.—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The term “Administration” means the Transportation Security Administration.

SEC. 3. SECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE AT AIRPORTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with other Federal agencies as appropriate, conduct outreach to all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures, and provide technical assistance as necessary, to verify such airports have in place individualized working plans for responding to security incidents inside the perimeter of the airport, including active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

(b) TYPES OF PLANS.—Such plans may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to persons inside the perimeter of the airport, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command, including identification of staging areas for non-airport-specific law enforcement and fire response.

(3) A schedule for regular testing of communications equipment used to receive emergency calls.

(4) An evaluation of how emergency calls placed by persons inside the perimeter of the airport will reach airport police in an expeditious manner.

(5) A practiced method and plan to communicate with travelers and all other persons inside the perimeter of the airport.

(6) To the extent practicable, a projected maximum timeframe for law enforcement response to active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger security-screening checkpoints.

(7) A schedule of joint exercises and training to be conducted by the airport, the Administration, other stakeholders such as airport and airline tenants, and any relevant law enforcement, airport police, fire, and medical personnel.

(8) A schedule for producing after-action joint exercise reports to identify and determine how to improve security incident response capabilities.

(9) A strategy, where feasible, for providing airport law enforcement with access to airport security video surveillance systems at category X airports where those systems were purchased and installed using Administration funds.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings from its outreach to airports under subsection (a), including an analysis of the level of preparedness such airports have to respond to security incidents, including active shooters, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints.

SEC. 4. DISSEMINATING INFORMATION ON BEST PRACTICES.

The Assistant Secretary shall—

(1) identify best practices that exist across airports for security incident planning, management, and training; and

(2) establish a mechanism through which to share such best practices with other airport operators nationwide.

SEC. 5. CERTIFICATION.

Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, and annually thereafter, the Assistant Secretary shall certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that all screening personnel have participated in practical training exercises for active shooter scenarios.

SEC. 6. REIMBURSABLE AGREEMENTS.

Not later than 90 days after the enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall provide to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate an analysis of how the Administration can use cost savings achieved through efficiencies to increase over the next 5 fiscal years the funding available for checkpoint screening law enforcement support reimbursable agreements.

SEC. 7. SECURITY INCIDENT RESPONSE FOR SURFACE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Secretary of Transportation, and other relevant agencies, conduct outreach to all passenger transportation agencies and providers with high-risk facilities, as identified by the Assistant Secretary, to verify such agencies and providers have in place plans to respond to active shooters, acts of terrorism, or other security-related incidents that target passengers.

(b) *TYPES OF PLANS.*—As applicable, such plans may include, but may not be limited to, the following:

(1) A strategy for evacuating and providing care to individuals, with consideration given to the needs of persons with disabilities.

(2) A plan for establishing a unified command.

(3) A plan for frontline employees to receive active shooter training.

(4) A schedule for regular testing of communications equipment used to receive emergency calls.

(5) An evaluation of how emergency calls placed by individuals using the transportation system will reach police in an expeditious manner.

(6) A practiced method and plan to communicate with individuals using the transportation system.

(c) *REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall report to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the findings from its outreach to the agencies and providers under subsection (a), including an analysis of the level of preparedness such transportation systems have to respond to security incidents.

(d) *DISSEMINATION OF BEST PRACTICES.*—The Assistant Secretary shall identify best practices for security incident planning, management, and training and establish a mechanism through which to share such practices with passenger transportation agencies nationwide.

SEC. 8. NO ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act, and this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise available for such purpose.

SEC. 9. INTEROPERABILITY REVIEW.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Assistant Secretary shall, in consultation with the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Cybersecurity and Communications, conduct a review of the interoperable communications capabilities of the law enforcement, fire, and medical personnel responsible for responding to a security incident, including active shooter events, acts of terrorism, and incidents that target passenger-screening checkpoints, at all airports in the United States at which the Administration performs, or oversees the implementation and performance of, security measures.

(b) *REPORT.*—Not later than 30 days after the completion of the review, the Assistant Secretary shall report the findings of the review to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, in strong support of H.R. 720, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015.

This critically important piece of legislation is the product of a strong bipartisan effort stemming from the fatal shooting at Los Angeles International Airport on November 1, 2013. On that tragic day, TSA Officer Gerardo Hernandez was shot and killed by an active shooter, becoming the first Transportation Security Administration employee to be killed in the line of duty. Two other Transportation Security Administration officers and a passenger were also injured during the attack.

In the wake of that attack, Congressman RICHARD HUDSON, who was then serving as the chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, spearheaded a bipartisan effort to investigate the vulnerabilities highlighted by the attack and enhance the state of airport security across the United States.

One of my first acts as chairman of the subcommittee in the 114th Congress was to work with Mr. HUDSON and reintroduce this important legislation, and I am pleased to see it through to final passage today.

This bill builds on important steps taken by TSA and airports across the country and was developed with input from both public and private sector partners. The legislation makes important strides in enhancing the level of preparedness of our Nation's transportation systems in responding and mitigating security incidents, such as active shooters and terror attacks.

For example, it requires TSA to verify that airports and high-risk surface transportation hubs have plans in place to effectively train for and respond to security incidents when they occur.

□ 1515

Further, it will ensure that emergency communications equipment is regularly tested and that emergency first responders are able to communicate with each other and the public during a major security incident. The legislation also directs TSA to seek ways in which funding for reimbursable agreements to airport law enforcement can be increased in order to provide better support to the critical layer of security they provide.

Developing this preparedness will go a long way in improving the response to threats to public safety and will work to overcome the challenges experienced by law enforcement, emergency first responders, TSA, and the public during the LAX shooting.

Just last week, the need for efficient and effective communications was

highlighted during a stabbing and shooting incident at Union Station here in Washington, D.C., in which law enforcement from multiple agencies responded to mitigate the situation.

We must ensure that our frontline employees and first responders are equipped with the necessary tools and training to respond to these types of incidents in order to protect both themselves and the general public.

I wish to extend a sincere thanks to Congressman HUDSON for his work on this legislation as well as to the chairman of the full committee, Mr. MCCAUL of Texas, for his support. Additionally, I would like to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON, Ranking Member RICE, and the other bipartisan cosponsors for their work in getting this legislation to the finish line. I would also like to extend gratitude to our colleagues in the Senate, especially Chairman THUNE and Ranking Member NELSON, for further refining the legislation and moving it through the Senate.

I urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of the Senate amendment to H.R. 720, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015, a bill that I am pleased to cosponsor.

The November 2013 shooting at the Los Angeles International Airport resulted in the death of Transportation Security Officer Gerardo Hernandez. This terrible incident brought into focus the heroism of those who serve on the front lines of aviation security—Transportation Security officers. Unarmed and exposed, Transportation Security officers perform the often thankless task of screening 1.8 million passengers per day, even though they have limited workplace protections and are charged with great responsibility.

In March of 2014, I traveled with my committee's Subcommittee on Transportation Security to conduct a site visit and oversight hearing at Los Angeles International Airport to explore what lessons could be learned from the tragic events of the shooting. Through this valuable oversight work, we learned that there was much to be done to address gaps and vulnerabilities within airports. We found that vital equipment, such as panic buttons at the checkpoints, were not in working order. We also found that there were other factors that could be bolstered to aid during active shooter situations, such as interoperable communications, so that every emergency responder would have access to realtime information.

The legislation under consideration today is the product of a bipartisan effort to remedy many of the deficiencies identified following the shooting.

Before yielding back, I would like to once again give my condolences to the family of Officer Hernandez and to remind Members that, under current law, TSO's families do not receive death benefits.

Currently, Transportation Security officers do not meet the definition for a public safety officer; and as a result, the families of TSOs who are killed in the line of duty, such as the Hernandez family, are not entitled to funds from the Public Safety Officers' Benefits Programs.

Last Congress, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) introduced legislation that would grant Transportation Security officers the benefits of other law enforcement officers that are killed in the line of duty; and she plans to reintroduce that legislation, the Honoring Our Fallen TSA Officers Act, today.

I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this forthcoming legislation so that the families of the men and women on the front lines of protecting our aviation sector are properly compensated if tragedy strikes. Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the Senate amendment to H.R. 720.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015.

As the former chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security's Subcommittee on Transportation Security, I introduced this bipartisan bill in the 113th Congress to improve the state of preparedness at our Nation's airports in response to the shooting at Los Angeles International Airport in November of 2013.

I would like to thank Ranking Member THOMPSON for working with me in a bipartisan way. We traveled together for the field hearing and toured the site. And I think the work that he does in a bipartisan way on this committee is a true testament to what the American people expect us to do here, which is to work together and put the people's business first. It was a pleasure working with the ranking member.

I also want to thank Chairman MCCAUL for his strong leadership of this committee. He also worked very closely with me on this legislation and traveled with us that day to Los Angeles. So without his support, this would not have been possible.

That event, which tragically took the life of Transportation Security Officer Gerardo Hernandez and wounded three other people, served as an unfortunate wake-up call to the gaps in our security and the relative ease to which someone could wreak havoc on one of our Nation's airports.

After months and months of careful review and hard work, including the

site visit I mentioned to LAX, the subcommittee found that while State, Federal, and local law enforcement's response to the LAX shooting could be described as nothing but heroic and was swiftly executed, there was room for improvement in the coordinated response and communications in the critical moments after the major security incident. That is where this important, bipartisan bill stems from.

And I know, as chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) has taken our work from the last Congress and has built upon it. He has done the hard work to make sure that it reached the finish line. I take my hat off to Chairman KATKO for showing great leadership and the kind of fortitude and determination necessary to advance this legislation, to finally get it to the Senate, and to have the President sign it into law.

Serving as chairman of the House committee that oversees transportation security is no easy task, but it is one that the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) has excelled at. He is not afraid to ask tough questions. He holds folks accountable, and he has worked diligently to improve aviation security in this Nation.

The bottom line is, while TSA has taken positive measures to update the emergency response protocols since the LAX incident, this bill will help to solidify these changes and ensure our airports are fully prepared to respond to future security incidents and potential acts of terrorism. This bill will provide for more extensive collaboration and coordination between airports, law enforcement, first responders, and TSA, which will result in safer airports across the country. It is a necessary step towards countering the threats facing our Nation's airports without placing an undue burden on airport operators, law enforcement, and the taxpayers.

The shooting at LAX was a tragedy that will never be forgotten by those affected and those of us who are committed to protecting the traveling public.

My thoughts today and my prayers continue to be with the family of Officer Hernandez. I hope that they are watching today, and I hope they are proud of the work of this Congress.

I want to thank, again, Chairman KATKO for his work to keep the traveling public safe, and I applaud him for stepping up on such an important issue and ensuring this bill reaches the President's desk.

I urge my colleagues to honor the memory of Transportation Security Officer Hernandez and to support this legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Subcommittee Chairman KATKO and Ranking Member RICE for their efforts on this legislation.

Through our votes today, we are honoring the life of Officer Hernandez and ensuring that Transportation Security officers, airport workers, and members of the flying public are more safe and secure.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support the Senate amendment to this bill as well as the Honoring Our Fallen TSA Officers Act.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I once again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 720. The tragic event that unfolded at LAX in November of 2013 was a stark reminder that much remains to be done in securing America's transit hubs, particularly the nonsterile or nonsecure areas of airports that are, in many ways, just like open shopping malls. Because of this reality, we must react to ensure that airport communities are prepared to respond swiftly to any major security incidents that threaten the safety of the traveling public.

In remembrance of TSA Officer Hernandez, I urge my colleagues to pass this important legislation.

Before I close, Mr. Speaker, I do want to recognize and echo the sentiments of my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON) with respect to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON): He set a tone of bipartisanship in the committee; and because of that, in the Committee on Homeland Security, itself, as well as the subcommittee, much good work is being done and many bills are being passed. So I appreciate and acknowledge the bipartisanship because it is important. It is an art that all too often gets lost in this Congress, and we are doing well with it in our committee.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Homeland Security, it is with great pride that I rise in support of H.R. 720, the Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015. The passage of this bipartisan legislation demonstrates the importance with which the Committee on Homeland Security considers the security of our nation's airports and transit hubs. Moreover, this legislation shows Congress' dedication to the men and women of the TSA, who work diligently each day to keep the American people safe.

In order to mitigate threats from those with malicious intent seeking to wreak havoc on our critical transportation systems, we must stand together. Our law enforcement and first responder community must communicate, collaborate and coordinate, so they are better prepared to execute emergency plans in response to all types of security incidents. I believe the passage of this bill creates a roadmap that will provide our first responders and TSA with the proper level of coordination to respond to incidents like the senseless shooting that took place at Los Angeles International Airport on November 1, 2013.

After the shooting, I travelled with other Members of the Committee, including Ranking Member THOMPSON, to Los Angeles to meet with first responders, TSA officials, airport personnel, as well as the injured Transportation Security Officers who bravely put themselves in harm's way to help an elderly passenger. I also had the somber opportunity to meet with the widow of Officer Hernandez, before holding a field hearing to examine what could be done to mitigate such tragedies in the future. Today, I am proud to see this Committee's efforts set to cross the finish line, and I hope that the wife of Officer Hernandez can find some solace in the passage of this legislation, which bears her husband's name.

The legislation will direct TSA to conduct necessary outreach to airports and transit hubs across the United States to ensure that there are adequate security incident response and communications plans in place. Moreover, H.R. 720 establishes TSA as a clearinghouse of best-practices for transportation sector preparedness and incident response, which will streamline the proliferation of information and communication across transportation systems in the United States. This bill also looks for ways to overcome interoperable communications challenges and increase funding for airport law enforcement, while also ensuring that airport personnel are equipped with training on how to respond to active shooters and other security incidents, such as terrorism.

It is my pleasure to commend the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Transportation Security, Mr. KATKO and former Chairman of the Subcommittee, Mr. HUDSON, for their efforts in addressing this issue, as well as, working to foster bipartisan cooperation. I also wish to commend the bipartisan efforts of both the Ranking Member of the Full Committee, Mr. THOMPSON, and the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee, Ms. RICE, whose support of this legislation is greatly appreciated. Additionally, I would like to thank the other bipartisan cosponsors of this legislation, as well as Chairman THUNE and our Senate colleagues for moving this important bill through the Senate. I urge my colleagues to support the final passage of H.R. 720 and strengthen the security of U.S. transportation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 720, The Gerardo Hernandez Airport Security Act of 2015, which improves intergovernmental planning and communication during security incidents at domestic airports.

As a former chair and ranking member of the Homeland Security Committee Transportation Security Subcommittee, I understand how important this bill will be in enhancing safety and protection in the air transit industry, not just for our citizens but for our Transportation Security Officers working in the line of duty.

This legislation, which requires the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) to devote more resources for planning and communication during and in case of threats or emergencies, is prompted by the tragic death of Gerardo I. Hernandez, a Transportation Security Officer who was killed in the line of duty at Los Angeles International Airport on November 1, 2013.

In a senseless act of violence, the love and care TSA Officer Gerardo Ismael Hernandez

gave to his wife, Ana Machuca, his 14-year-old son and 12-year-old daughter, and the community he served, ended entirely too soon.

Mr. Speaker, Gerardo Hernandez was what we want in an American, he is in spirit and deed the type of person we want in our Transportation Security Officers (TSOs).

At just 39 years old, Gerardo Hernandez was the first TSA officer to lose his life in the line of duty in the 12-year history of the agency.

He died from several gunshot wounds inflicted by an assailant while on duty at the Los Angeles International Airport.

Gerardo Hernandez was among those thousands of TSA employees carrying out their mission to keep the airways safe for traveling citizens, and their work across the nation cannot be understated.

On average, TSA officers screen 1.7 million air passengers at more than 450 airports across the nation, which averaged over 637.5 million passengers in 2012.

In 2014, the TSA screened more than 653 million passengers, or nearly 1.8 million persons per day.

The Bush International and the William P. Hobby Airports that serve the Houston metropolitan area are essential hubs for domestic and international air travel for Houston and the region:

Nearly 40 million passengers traveled through Bush International Airport (IAH) and an additional 10 million traveled through William P. Hobby (HOU).

More than 650 daily departures occur at IAH.

IAH is the 11th busiest airport in the U.S. for total passenger traffic.

IAH has 12 all-cargo airlines handling more than 419,205 metric tons of cargo in 2012.

The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the implementation of H.R. 720 would cost about \$2.5 million in 2015. Of the \$2.5 million, an estimated \$1.5 million would serve to provide additional technical assistance to airports, and the remaining \$1 million would be used to evaluate the interoperability of communication systems used by emergency response teams.

Mr. Speaker, this month marked the 14th anniversary of the tragedy of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

We will never forget how that day changed our lives, and the lives of every American generation to follow.

Security measures in airports across the country have been enhanced dramatically, and the resulting inconvenience is a small price to pay for the protective measures needed to keep the travelling public safe.

It is people like Gerardo Hernandez who do their best to make the necessary screening as least intrusive and burdensome as possible, consistent with the mission of ensuring the security of all members of the flying public.

TSA officers willingly risk their lives to make sure the job gets done, and for that we owe these men and women a debt of gratitude.

In honor of Gerardo Hernandez's contribution to his country, I strongly support this bill and urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for its passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 720.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIAMI TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA LAND LEASE OR TRANSFER

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 487) to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED TO VALIDATE LAND TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, without further approval, ratification, or authorization by the United States, the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma may lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of its interests in any real property that is not held in trust by the United States for the benefit of such tribe.

(b) TRUST LAND NOT AFFECTED.—Nothing in this section shall—

(1) authorize the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any part of an interest in any real property that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of such tribe; or

(2) affect the operation of any law governing leasing, selling, conveying, warranting, or otherwise transferring any interest in such trust land.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 487 is a non-controversial, one-page bill that would exempt lands held in fee by the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma from the limitations imposed by the Indian Nonintercourse Act. According to the tribe, these limitations may hinder economic development.

Specifically, H.R. 487 would allow the tribe to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or

transfer all or any portion of interest in any real property not held in trust for the tribe. The bill also states that the legislation does not authorize the tribe to lease, sell, convey, warrant, or otherwise transfer all or any portion of any interest in any real property that is held in trust.

In accordance with the expressed wishes of the tribe's leadership, Congressman MARKWAYNE MULLIN, who represents the tribe in the House, sponsored H.R. 487. The Department of the Interior supports this bill, which passed the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent earlier this year.

I commend my colleague from Oklahoma for his hard work, and I urge my colleagues to pass the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 487 will allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to effectively manage their nontrust lands by providing relief from the Indian Nonintercourse Act. The Indian Nonintercourse Act was intended to protect Indian tribes by preventing the loss of their lands, except by treaty. Historically, the act has generally not interfered with the tribe's ability to buy, sell, or lease land that it owns in fee simple.

□ 1530

But uncertainties raised by the act can be a hindrance when securing purchase agreements from outside parties.

Therefore, relief from the act is at times necessary for a tribe to successfully manage their lands and to sell fee parcels that are determined to be in excess of the tribe's needs or were purchased for investment purposes.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 487 would simply allow the Miami Tribe to convey all the land that the tribe holds in fee simple without further Federal approval to facilitate those future transactions. I agree with the goals of this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN), the author of this measure.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, thank you for allowing us to bring this to the floor. This is one of those common-sense bills that, unfortunately, requires Congress to act. Several tribes before us have obtained legislation like this from Congress to authorize them to sell or mortgage specific lands. The lands we are talking about are lands that aren't needed anymore; it is outside of the trust. But in order for the tribes such as the Miami and other tribes that are out there to effectively manage their lands, Congress is required to act.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairmen BISHOP and YOUNG for ad-

vancing this legislation, and I urge support for the passage of H.R. 487.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. MULLIN for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge all Members to support H.R. 487, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would urge adoption of the measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 487.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEDGAR EVERS HOUSE STUDY ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 959) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 959

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Medgar Evers House Study Act".

SEC. 2. SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special resource study of the home of the late civil rights activist Medgar Evers, located at 2332 Margaret Walker Alexander Drive in Jackson, Mississippi.

(b) CONTENTS.—In conducting the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall—

(1) evaluate the national significance of the site;

(2) determine the suitability and feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park System;

(3) consider other alternatives for preservation, protection, and interpretation of the site by Federal, State, or local governmental entities, or private and nonprofit organizations;

(4) consult with interested Federal, State, or local governmental entities, private and nonprofit organizations or any other interested individuals;

(5) determine the effect of the designation of the site as a unit of the National Park System on existing commercial and recreational uses, and the effect on State and local governments to manage those activities;

(6) identify any authorities, including condemnation, that will compel or permit the Secretary to influence or participate in local land use decisions (such as zoning) or place restrictions on non-Federal land if the site is designated a unit of the National Park System; and

(7) identify cost estimates for any Federal acquisition, development, interpretation, op-

eration, and maintenance associated with the alternatives.

(c) APPLICABLE LAW.—The study required under subsection (a) shall be conducted in accordance with section 100507 of title 54, United States Code.

(d) STUDY RESULTS.—Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are first made available for the study under subsection (a), the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate the results of the study and any conclusions and recommendations of the Secretary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 959 authorizes a special resource study to be conducted by the Department of the Interior on the home of the late civil rights activist Medgar Evers. This bill requires the Secretary to determine the national significance of the home and the feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park Service.

The National Park Service does not have any objections to this bill, and it was reported out of the Natural Resources Committee by unanimous consent. Once results of the study are available, Congress would have to act to create any new unit of the National Park system.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago, on June 12, 1963, Medgar Evers, a native Mississippian and the first field officer in that State for the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which we have come to know as the NAACP, was shot in the driveway of his home in Jackson, Mississippi. This horrific event occurred hours after President Kennedy made a televised speech in support of civil rights. This was a critical moment in the modern civil rights movement as it moved towards the seminal March on Washington for Jobs and Freedom.

Evers was a World War II veteran, fighting in the Battle of Normandy. He returned home to find his path to the voting booth literally blocked at gunpoint. He personally fought to integrate the University of Mississippi Law

School and was integral in assisting James Meredith successfully enroll as an undergraduate.

Evers was an activist, an organizer, a loving father, a husband, and, finally, a martyr. He is a true American hero whose time came too soon, yet his name and what he stood for continues to inspire so many. It is time that his service and loss be properly recognized by our Nation.

H.R. 959, the Medgar Evers House Study Act, would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House in Jackson, Mississippi, for potential inclusion in the National Park system. We estimate that this study will cost approximately \$200,000 to \$300,000. Funding for this proposed study would need to be allocated from the set amount of funding that Congress appropriates for all special resource studies.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman BENNIE THOMPSON of Mississippi, for his very hard work on this legislation and for his leadership on this critical issue. The Medgar Evers House is a piece of American history that must be preserved, which is why this legislation is so important.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the adoption of H.R. 959.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Michigan for yielding me the necessary time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge our colleagues to support H.R. 959, the Medgar Evers House Study Act.

Medgar Wiley Evers was born in the small town of Decatur, Mississippi, in 1925. Medgar would go on to serve in our country's Army in France and in Germany during World War II. After his military service, Medgar attended Alcorn State University, where he would meet his future wife, Myrlie.

After graduating from Alcorn, Medgar devoted his life to seeking justice and equality for all Americans. As field secretary for the NAACP in Mississippi, Mr. Evers led successful voter registration efforts throughout the State. He applied for admission to the University of Mississippi Law School in an unsuccessful effort to desegregate the university. Medgar also courageously led investigations into the death of Emmett Till and publicly supported Clyde Kennard after his imprisonment on erroneous charges stemming from his efforts to integrate the University of Southern Mississippi.

On June 12, 1963, as he returned home from a NAACP planning meeting, Medgar was shot in the back in the driveway of his home while his family was inside the house. He died at a local hospital less than an hour later. One

week after his death, he was buried with full military honors at Arlington National Cemetery.

Today, the Medgar Evers House has been preserved as a museum by Tougaloo College. The home has been refurbished to appear as it did at the time of Evers' death. The home contains an exhibit regarding Evers' family, career, death, and his legacy. The home has hosted scores of visitors including many Members of Congress who participated in the Faith & Politics pilgrimages throughout the South.

My bill, H.R. 959, the Medgar Evers House Study Act, authorizes a special resource study by the Secretary of the Interior on the home in which his family lived and Medgar Evers was assassinated located at 2332 Margaret Walker Alexander Drive in Jackson, Mississippi. The study will determine the national significance of the Evers home and determine the feasibility of designating the site as a unit of the National Park system.

Mr. Speaker, Medgar Evers was a civil rights giant. He dedicated his life to bringing down the pillars that maintained Jim Crow in Mississippi. The heroic life he lived and the remarkable legacy that he left are unquestioned. Today's bill will further cement the role that he played in advancing civil and human rights in our Nation. With that, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 959.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge all Members to support H.R. 959.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Medgar Evers was a patriot and a civil rights leader who gave his life to realize the full promise of the American Declaration of Independence. His memory is vivid and revered by every American of goodwill who lived through those momentous years. It is for us now to preserve his memory for the many generations of Americans to follow who will have to look to history to know him.

This bill is a step toward recognizing the enormous debt our Nation owes him and to ensure that future generations can draw inspiration from his leadership, his patriotism, his courage, and his sacrifice that he made in the cause of freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 959, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL FOREST SMALL TRACTS ACT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1214) to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1214

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Forest Small Tracts Act Amendments Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL AUTHORITY FOR SALE OR EXCHANGE OF SMALL PARCELS OF NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.

(a) INCREASE IN MAXIMUM VALUE OF SMALL PARCELS.—Section 3 of Public Law 97-465 (commonly known as the Small Tracts Act; 16 U.S.C. 521e) is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking "\$150,000" and inserting "\$500,000".

(b) ADDITIONAL CONVEYANCE PURPOSES.—Section 3 of Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521e) is further amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "which are—" and inserting "which involve any one of the following:";

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "parcels" and inserting "Parcels"; and

(B) by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period;

(3) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "parcels" the first place it appears and inserting "Parcels"; and

(B) by striking "or" at the end and inserting a period;

(4) in paragraph (3), by striking "road" and inserting "Road"; and

(5) by adding at the end the following new paragraphs:

"(4) Parcels of 40 acres or less which are determined by the Secretary to be physically isolated, to be inaccessible, or to have lost their National Forest character.

"(5) Parcels of 10 acres or less which are not eligible for conveyance under paragraph (2), but which are encroached upon by permanent habitable improvements for which there is no evidence that the encroachment was intentional or negligent.

"(6) Parcels used as a cemetery, a landfill, or a sewage treatment plant under a special use authorization issued by the Secretary. In the case of a cemetery expected to reach capacity within 10 years, the sale, exchange, or interchange may include, in the sole discretion of the Secretary, up to one additional acre abutting the permit area to facilitate expansion of the cemetery."

(c) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—Section 2 of Public Law 97-465 (16 U.S.C. 521d) is amended—

(1) by striking "The Secretary is authorized" and inserting the following:

"(a) CONVEYANCE AUTHORITY; CONSIDERATION.—The Secretary is authorized";

(2) by striking "The Secretary shall insert" and inserting the following:

“(b) INCLUSION OF TERMS, COVENANTS, CONDITIONS, AND RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary shall insert”;

(3) by striking “covenants” and inserting “covenants”; and

(4) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(c) DISPOSITION OF PROCEEDS.—

“(1) DEPOSIT IN SISK FUND.—The net proceeds derived from any sale or exchange conducted under the authority of paragraph (4), (5), or (6) of section 3 shall be deposited in the fund established by Public Law 90–171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a).

“(2) USE.—Amounts deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended for—

“(A) the acquisition of land or interests in land for administrative sites for the National Forest System in the State from which the amounts were derived;

“(B) the acquisition of land or interests in land for inclusion in the National Forest System in that State, including land or interests in land which enhance opportunities for recreational access;

“(C) the performance of deferred maintenance on administrative sites for the National Forest System in that State or other deferred maintenance activities in that State which enhance opportunities for recreational access; or

“(D) the reimbursement of the Secretary for costs incurred in preparing a sale conducted under the authority of section 3 if the sale is a competitive sale.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1214 would amend the Small Tracts Act to allow for the sale of small, isolated, federally owned parcels outside of the main body of a national forest as well as parcels encumbered with certain special uses such as cemeteries. The management of these isolated and encumbered parcels takes considerable resources away from the core mission of the Forest Service. Proceeds from the sale of these parcels would be deposited into a Sisk Act fund and may be used for deferred maintenance, acquisition of lands for administrative sites or recreational access, or to reimburse the Forest Service for administrative costs in preparing the sales.

The U.S. Forest Service has a challenging mission. Enabling it to develop a more manageable land base is simply good government, which is why this bill has such broad-based support.

I also want to thank Chairman CONAWAY of the Agriculture Committee for his assistance in expediting this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2015.

Hon. K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On April 30, 2015, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered reported without amendment H.R. 1214, the National Forest Small Tracts Act Amendments Act of 2015, by unanimous consent. The bill was referred primarily to the Committee on Natural Resources, with an additional referral to the Committee on Agriculture.

I ask that you allow the Committee on Agriculture to be discharged from further consideration of the bill so that it may be scheduled by the Majority Leader. This discharge in no way affects your jurisdiction over the subject matter of the bill, and it will not serve as precedent for future referrals. In addition, should a conference on the bill be necessary, I would support your request to have the Committee on Agriculture represented on the conference committee. Finally, I would be pleased to include this letter and any response in the bill report filed by the Committee on Natural Resources to memorialize our understanding.

Thank you for your consideration of my request, and for your continued strong cooperation between our committees.

Sincerely,

ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2015.

Hon. ROB BISHOP,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am writing concerning H.R. 1214, the National Forest Small Tracts Act Amendments Act of 2015. It is my understanding that, on April 30, 2015, the Committee on Natural Resources ordered the bill reported without amendment and by unanimous consent.

This legislation contains provisions within the Committee on Agriculture's Rule X jurisdiction. As a result of your having consulted with the Committee and in order to expedite this bill for floor consideration, the Committee on Agriculture will forego action on the bill. This is being done on the basis of our mutual understanding that doing so will in no way diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture with respect to the appointment of conferees, or to any future jurisdictional claim over the subject matters contained in the bill or similar legislation.

I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would request that you include a copy of this letter and your response in the Committee Report and in the Congressional Record during the floor consideration of this bill. Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1214 amends the Small Tracts Act to provide the Forest Service with more flexibility to sell or

exchange small parcels of national forest land. This increased flexibility will allow the Forest Service to identify opportunities where the sale or exchange of small parcels of land will increase efficiency and improve the overall integrity and health of our national forests.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. AMODEI, the sponsor of this legislation, for working with the Forest Service to update this bill so that it could be supported by both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I support adoption of H.R. 1214.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI), my good friend and Nevada neighbor, the author of this bill.

Mr. AMODEI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you Madam Ranking Member. I also want to thank the chairman of the full committee as well as my cosponsors in this measure: Mr. POLIS from Colorado, Mr. SHIMKUS from Illinois, and Mr. JONES from North Carolina.

So as not to risk snatching defeat from the jaws of victory, I will be brief. I would like to say that this was my idea and it is a wonderful thing, but this represents taking care of business that has been knocking around for probably a decade or more as far as the Forest Service is concerned. We are not moving the frontier into national forests; we are simply giving them the ability to administratively dispose of those lands that have become not attached to the national forest and have no management or land use characteristics with respect to the managing of a national forest.

□ 1545

The other thing I want to point out is that it will allow them the ability to dispose of well into six figures' worth of acres, potentially, over the next few years, much more than last year, which was almost nothing.

The most interesting thing is that the resources generated by this will stay with the Forest Service for use under their various charges as opposed to disappearing into that sometimes black hole in space, referred to as the “United States Treasury.”

I urge nationwide bipartisan support.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would urge the adoption of the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1214, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE EXPANSION ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1289) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1289

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act".

SEC. 2. JOHN MUIR NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE LAND ACQUISITION.

(a) *ACQUISITION.*—The Secretary of the Interior may acquire by donation the approximately 44 acres of land, and interests in such land, that are identified on the map entitled "John Muir National Historic Site Proposed Boundary Expansion", numbered 426/127150, and dated November, 2014.

(b) *BOUNDARY.*—Upon the acquisition of the land authorized by subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior shall adjust the boundaries of the John Muir Historic Site in Martinez, California, to include the land identified on the map referred to in subsection (a).

(c) *ADMINISTRATION.*—The land and interests in land acquired under subsection (a) shall be administered as part of the John Muir National Historic Site established by the Act of August 31, 1964 (Public Law 88-547; 78 Stat. 753; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1289 would expand the John Muir National Historic Site by approximately 44 acres. This expansion may only occur by donation of the land.

Located in the San Francisco Bay Area, in Martinez, California, this site preserves the 14-room Italianate Victorian mansion where John Muir lived, as well as a 325-acre tract of native oak woodlands and grasslands owned by the Muir family.

The additional proposed acreage in this bill is directly adjacent to the current site and will allow for better public access to trails in the area. This acreage has been donated to the National Park Service and will not be acquired with any Federal dollars.

This bill passed out of committee by unanimous consent, and a previous version passed the House during the 113th Congress. I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1289 will authorize the National Park Service to expand the boundary of the John Muir National Historic Site and acquire, by donation, 44 acres of land from the Muir Heritage Land Trust. The donation will expand the site and help carry on Muir's important legacy of conservation and environmental stewardship.

John Muir is one of our Nation's most respected and revered ecologists. His writings have inspired millions, and his activism and advocacy led to the establishment of some of our first and most iconic national parks.

From the moment he set foot in Yosemite Valley, John Muir was consumed with its natural wonder and beauty. He became Yosemite's most vocal champion, but he didn't spend his whole life there.

From 1890 until his death in 1914, Muir lived on a farm not far from San Francisco. It was from this corner of the Bay Area that Muir cofounded the Sierra Club and helped lay the groundwork for a century of conservation.

Muir's tireless advocacy led to the creation of the Yosemite and Sequoia National Parks, and his spirit and enduring legacy led to the protection of much more.

Since he is known by some as the father of our national parks, I know he would be proud of all of our national parks today, especially as we are approaching the 100th anniversary of the National Park System.

My home State of Michigan has several beautiful national parks, including the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Isle Royale, and the River Raisin National Battlefield.

The passage of H.R. 1289 will contribute to John Muir's legacy, and it will help to protect and conserve the place where he found solace and inspiration in his later years.

I want to thank the bill's sponsor, my good friend Representative MARK DESAULNIER from California, for his leadership.

I urge the swift passage of this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. DESAULNIER).

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for her kind comments.

What a pleasure it is to be here on the House floor to continue to honor and respect a great American and a great Californian, his adopted State.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of H.R. 1289, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

This bipartisan legislation will expand the Martinez, California, historic site in my district as it celebrates the life and legacy of John Muir.

Muir was a lifelong conservationist and leading advocate of the National Park Service and a cofounder of the Sierra Club. He worked to establish and protect national parks, including Yosemite, Sequoia, the Grand Canyon, and Mt. Rainier.

The John Muir National Historic Site, which includes the home where he lived, covers 330 acres in Contra Costa County, where Muir championed the revolutionary idea that wild spaces should be set aside for all Americans to enjoy.

This bill would add 44 acres of donated land from a nonprofit trust, improving access to the park and its scenic trails, including those on Mount Wanda, named after Muir's eldest daughter.

The trail systems are accessible for hikers and bikers, including critical connections to the 550-mile Bay Area Ridge Trail.

As Muir once said:

Every American needs beauty as well as bread, places to live in . . . where nature may heal and cheer and give enough strength to body and soul alike.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my predecessor, Congressman George Miller, who has been a champion of this bill and who introduced it in an earlier session.

I would also like to thank Natural Resources Committee Chairman BISHOP, Ranking Member GRIJALVA, as well as Subcommittee Chairman MCCLINTOCK and Ranking Member TSONGAS, for their leadership in bringing H.R. 1289 to the floor today.

I am also grateful for the support of 31 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who cosponsored the bill as well as Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN for sponsoring this legislation in the Senate.

I would also like to thank the John Muir Land Trust for its hard work and dedication to preserving and protecting this valuable parkland and shoreline in the Bay Area for future generations.

As our Nation prepares to celebrate the centennial of the National Park Service, this legislation will help preserve the trails and lands that surround the long-time home of the man

known as the father of the National Park Service.

I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan legislation, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, my district comprises the Sierra Nevada, and we are daily reminded of the foresight of pioneers like John Muir who worked to set aside these natural assets for, in the words of the original Yosemite Charter, “the public’s use, resort, and recreation for all time.”

Keeping their memory fresh is an important objective, and I urge the adoption of the legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DESAULNIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my strong support of H.R. 1289, the John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

This bipartisan legislation will expand the Martinez, California historic site in my district that celebrates the life and legacy of John Muir. Muir was a lifelong conservationist, leading advocate of the National Park Service and a co-founder of the Sierra Club. He worked to establish and protect national parks including Yosemite, Sequoia, the Grand Canyon and Mt. Rainier.

The John Muir National Historic Site, which includes the home where he lived, covers 330 acres of Contra Costa County where Muir championed the revolutionary idea that wild spaces should be set aside for all to enjoy. This bill would add 44 acres of donated land from a non-profit trust, improving access to the park and its scenic trails, including those on Mount Wanda, named for Muir’s eldest daughter. The trail systems are accessible for hikers, bikers and equestrians, including critical connections to the 550-mile Bay Area Ridge Trail and to nearby protected lands along the Franklin Ridge corridor.

As John Muir said, “everybody needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in . . . where nature may heal and cheer and give strength to body and soul alike.”

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my predecessor Congressman George Miller who has been a champion of this bill. I appreciate Natural Resource Committee Chairman BISHOP and Ranking Member GRIJALVA, Subcommittee Chairman MCCLINTOCK, and Subcommittee Ranking Member TSONGAS for their leadership in bringing H.R. 1289 to the floor today.

I am grateful for the support of 31 of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle who cosponsored this bill and to Senators BOXER and FEINSTEIN for sponsoring this legislation in the U.S. Senate. I would also like to thank the John Muir Land Trust for its hard work and dedication preserving and protecting this valuable parkland and shoreline in Contra Costa County for future generations.

As our Nation prepares to celebrate the Centennial of the National Park Service, this legislation will help preserve the trails and

lands that surround the longtime home of the man known as the Father of the National Park Service. I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this bipartisan legislation—The John Muir National Historic Site Expansion Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1289, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELKHORN RANCH AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST CONVEYANCE ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1554) to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Elkhorn Ranch and White River National Forest Conveyance Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. LAND CONVEYANCE, ELKHORN RANCH AND WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO.

(a) LAND CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Consistent with the purpose of the Act of March 3, 1909 (43 U.S.C. 772), all right, title, and interest of the United States (subject to subsection (b)) in and to a parcel of land consisting of approximately 148 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled “Elkhorn Ranch Land Parcel-White River National Forest” and dated March 2015 shall be conveyed by patent to the Gordman-Leverich Partnership, a Colorado Limited Liability Partnership (in this section referred to as “GLP”).

(b) EXISTING RIGHTS.—The conveyance under subsection (a)—

(1) is subject to the valid existing rights of the lessee of Federal oil and gas lease COC-75070 and any other valid existing rights; and

(2) shall reserve to the United States the right to collect rent and royalty payments on the lease referred to in paragraph (1) for the duration of the lease.

(c) EXISTING BOUNDARIES.—The conveyance under subsection (a) does not modify the exterior boundary of the White River National Forest or the boundaries of Sections 18 and 19 of Township 7 South, Range 93 West, Sixth Principal Meridian, Colorado, as such boundaries are in effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) TIME FOR CONVEYANCE; PAYMENT OF COSTS.—The conveyance directed under subsection (a) shall be completed not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act. The conveyance shall be without consideration, except that all costs incurred by the Secretary of the Interior relating to any survey, platting, legal description, or

other activities carried out to prepare and issue the patent shall be paid by GLP to the Secretary prior to the land conveyance.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1554, introduced by my friend Congressman SCOTT TIPTON of Colorado, would require the U.S. Forest Service to convey by patent a small area of land near Rifle, Colorado, to its rightful owner.

Conflicting surveys between Federal agencies resulted in the inclusion of this land in the White River National Forest even though it was originally patented in the early 20th century and was legally owned by private landowners for decades. These landowners have paid property taxes on the acreage and have used it for a variety of purposes, including agriculture and grazing.

Earlier this year, the Forest Service testified that the bill would “resolve a longstanding title issue associated with the property” and has recommended that the area be “confirmed in the successors in interest to the original patentees.”

The bill is supported by Garfield County, Colorado, the city of Rifle, Colorado, and many others.

Congressman TIPTON has worked hard to correct this survey discrepancy and return this land to its rightful owner. I encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on H.R. 1554.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 1554 will convey 148 acres of land to the Gordman-Leverich Partnership, a Colorado Limited Liability Partnership, and remedy a land dispute between a private landowner and the Forest Service.

In 1947, an administrative error occurred that shifted the boundary between the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest. This survey placed 148 acres of private land inside the forest boundary without providing consideration to the landholders.

Since then, the title to the ranch has changed hands several times, but the

administrative error has not been corrected. This bill will correct the error and acknowledge the correct boundary of the Elkhorn Ranch, providing the current owner with a free and clear title.

I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman POLIS and Congressman Tipton, for their good work on this legislation. The Forest Service testified in support of this bill, and I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my friend who has worked tirelessly to correct this administrative error.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their support on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1554 is a straightforward bill, which Congressman POLIS and I introduced, to reconfirm the private ownership of 140 acres of land in my congressional district.

The lands concerned were patented into two private ownerships via the United States land patents issued in 1914 and 1917 and 1957, but their ownership has come into question by virtue of the 1949 government survey, which showed them to be national forest land rather than private land.

Long-held U.S. law specifically states that a government resurvey cannot take away private property or private property rights.

Mr. Speaker, the Forest Service and the private landowners of the Elkhorn Ranch only became aware of the potential title issue in the early 2000s. Thereafter, the Forest Service conducted a lengthy and thorough review of the matter.

Upon the completion of the review, both the supervisor and surveyor of the White River National Forest concluded that the ownership of the 140 acres should be confirmed in the successors in interest to the original patentees, namely the Elkhorn Ranch.

In reaching this conclusion, the Forest Service noted that the land has never been managed by the national forestland and, indeed, has been fenced and occupied with stock ponds to develop springs, roads, and other private improvements, and it has been used as private land for ranching and agriculture for the better part of the past 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a simple matter of fairness and equity to a private landowner to honor government land patents that were granted to the landowner's predecessors 60 to 100 years ago.

The bill is supported by both the surveyor and the supervisor of the White River National Forest, the Garfield County Surveyor, the Garfield County Commissioners, the city of Rifle, Colorado Club 20, which represents 20 of

Colorado's counties, and Piceance Energy, which has the lease on part of the area.

In addition, at our hearing on H.R. 1554 in mid-June, the administration testified that this bill is a practical and workable way to address the long-standing title issue.

□ 1600

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I join the gentlewoman in requesting the adoption of this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1554.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LIBERTY MEMORIAL CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1949) to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1949

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE WITH CERTAIN STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS IN ESTABLISHMENT OF NATIONAL LIBERTY MEMORIAL.

Section 2860(c) of the Military Construction Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 (division B of Public Law 112-239; 40 U.S.C. 8903 note) is amended by striking the period at the end and inserting the following: " , except that, under subsections (a)(2) and (b) of section 8905, the Secretary of Agriculture, rather than the Secretary of the Interior or the Administrator of General Services, shall be responsible for the consideration of site and design proposals and the submission of such proposals on behalf of the sponsor to the Commission of Fine Arts and National Capital Planning Commission."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Mem-

bers may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1949 would transfer the responsibilities regarding the construction of the National Liberty Memorial that honors the slaves and freemen of African descent who fought during the American Revolution to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The proposed site for the memorial is on Department of Agriculture land, so this change makes sense. Under current law, either the Secretary of the Interior or the General Services Administrator would otherwise be responsible.

As a cosponsor of this bill, which passed out of committee by unanimous consent, I would urge my colleagues to vote favorably for its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Public Law 112-239 authorized the establishment of a fund to create the National Liberty Memorial, dedicated to the honor and sacrifice of more than 5,000 enslaved and free Black people who served as sailors, soldiers, or provided civilian assistance during the Revolutionary War. This is a long overdue memorial, which recognizes the early military role Black people played in securing our Nation's freedom.

In June 2014, the General Services Administration identified a location for the memorial at 14th and Independence Avenue, Southwest, here in Washington, D.C. The approved site is on the grounds of the Department of Agriculture campus.

In the interest of eliminating unnecessary bureaucracy through overlapping jurisdiction, H.R. 1949 would make the Department of Agriculture responsible for the consideration of the site and design proposals, doing so on behalf of the Commission of Fine Arts and National Capital Planning Commission. This responsibility would be transferred from the GSA or the Department of the Interior, as it was originally written.

I want to thank my good friend and colleague, the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Congressman BUTTERFIELD of North Carolina, for his years of hard work and leadership in establishing the National Liberty Memorial. We are all looking forward to seeing it open sometime in the future, and it will be a fitting tribute to those who sacrificed so much to create this great Nation of ours.

I ask all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1949, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am ready to close when the gentlewoman concludes, so I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD).

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman DINGELL for yielding time. I thank her for those kind words a moment ago and thank her for her leadership here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, H.R. 1949, the National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015. I was joined by my colleague, Congressman TOM MCCLINTOCK from California, who serves as chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

I am grateful for Chairman MCCLINTOCK's early and sustained support for this bill and appreciate his moving it expeditiously to the floor for consideration.

The National Liberty Memorial, which I have long supported, seeks to honor the more than 5,000 slaves and free persons of color or, as historians sometimes refer to them, free Negroes who fought for independence during the American Revolution.

The memorial will ultimately be constructed near the National Mall in what is known as area one, pursuant to H.J. Res. 120, my resolution that was signed into law by President Obama last year. The preferred site location for the memorial is at the Department of Agriculture's Whitten Building, where both the memorial's private sponsor and the USDA want it to be ultimately constructed.

Under current law, governed by the Commemorative Works Act, the Government Services Administration is charged with, among other things, site and design proposals and their submission to the appropriate memorial planning commissions.

However, because the preferred site is physically located on property occupied by the Department of Agriculture, my bill will simply transfer site and design responsibilities to the Secretary of Agriculture. The memorial sponsor and the USDA both believe that the Secretary of Agriculture is in the best position to expeditiously move this important memorial project forward.

Doing so will allow the memorial sponsor and USDA to make progress on a design and construction plan. This simple change, Mr. Speaker, will eliminate duplication, better use scarce Federal resources, and avoid unnecessary delay.

Seeing this important and culturally significant memorial to fruition is of great importance to me. It is of great

importance to the Congressional Black Caucus. It is important, certainly, to the constituents that I represent in North Carolina and descendants of the brave Revolutionary War soldiers who sacrificed so much on behalf of American independence.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to signal their support for H.R. 1949 simply by voting "yes" on final passage.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the National Liberty Memorial reminds us of a story of patriotism and sacrifice that won the independence of our country and that set in motion what Lincoln called "the last best hope of mankind." It is a story from the American Revolution that, to this day, has not been adequately acknowledged.

I am pleased to commend Mr. BUTTERFIELD for his legislation, to have joined as a cosponsor of it, and to urge the House its speedy adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1949, the National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015, which will help lay the final foundation for a National Liberty Memorial in Washington, D.C.

Two-hundred and thirty-nine years ago our nation was inked into existence by Thomas Jefferson in defense of a simple idea: that all men were created equal, and are endowed with certain unalienable rights. Countless men and women stood up for that idea around the new nation—some volunteered to fight, but others served in their own way as civilians. We know so many of those patriots' names by heart—George Washington, Benjamin Franklin, John Paul Jones, John Adams—and those we do not are remembered in their hometowns all across America.

However, there are a number of patriots who are too often forgotten: the thousands of slaves and freed men and women who fought for our country and provided civilian assistance at our most vulnerable time. These men and women believed so fully in the ideas and principles of the American Revolution that they fought, died, and sacrificed even as their own rights were trampled.

Their actions demonstrated patriotism in its absolute highest form. But there is no monument to their sacrifice, no memorial for their descendants to honor, and no place for our nation to offer their collective thanks.

The National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015 will finally pay the debt we owe to these brave patriots who helped breathe life into our new nation. After some 230 years, it is the least we can do.

I would like to thank Mr. BUTTERFIELD and Mr. MCCLINTOCK for offering this important legislation. I would also like to thank my former Judiciary staffer, Maurice Barboza, who has been fighting to honor the sacrifices of slaves and freed persons for decades. Their work is a credit to us all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1949, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

WESTERN OREGON TRIBAL FAIRNESS ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2791) to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

Sec. 101. Short title.

Sec. 102. Definitions.

Sec. 103. Conveyance.

Sec. 104. Map and legal description.

Sec. 105. Administration.

Sec. 106. Land reclassification.

TITLE II—COQUILLE FOREST FAIRNESS

Sec. 201. Short title.

Sec. 202. Amendments to Coquille Restoration Act.

TITLE III—OREGON COASTAL LANDS

Sec. 301. Short title.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Conveyance.

Sec. 304. Map and legal description.

Sec. 305. Administration.

Sec. 306. Land reclassification.

TITLE I—COW CREEK UMPQUA LAND CONVEYANCE

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Cow Creek Umpqua Land Conveyance Act".

SEC. 102. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) COUNCIL CREEK LAND.—The term "Council Creek land" means the approximately 17,519 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Canyon Mountain Land Conveyance" and dated June 27, 2013.

(2) TRIBE.—The term "Tribe" means the Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Tribe of Indians.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 103. CONVEYANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in

and to the Council Creek land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Tribe.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 104. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Council Creek land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 105. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Tribe existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Council Creek land.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 103 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **FOREST MANAGEMENT.**—Any forest management activity that is carried out on the Council Creek land shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

SEC. 106. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Tribe under section 103.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) **RECLASSIFICATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

TITLE II—COQUILLE FOREST FAIRNESS

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Coquille Forest Fairness Act”.

SEC. 202. AMENDMENTS TO COQUILLE RESTORATION ACT.

Section 5(d) of the Coquille Restoration Act (25 U.S.C. 715c(d)) is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (5) and inserting the following:

“(5) **MANAGEMENT.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), the Secretary, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Indian Affairs, shall manage the Coquille Forest in accordance with the laws pertaining to the management of Indian trust land.

“(B) **ADMINISTRATION.**—

“(i) **UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Unprocessed logs harvested from the Coquille Forest shall be subject to the same Federal statutory restrictions on export to foreign nations that apply to unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land.

“(ii) **SALES OF TIMBER.**—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, all sales of timber from land subject to this subsection shall be advertised, offered, and awarded according to competitive bidding practices, with sales being awarded to the highest responsible bidder.”;

(2) by striking paragraph (9); and

(3) by redesignating paragraphs (10) through (12) as paragraphs (9) through (11), respectively.

TITLE III—OREGON COASTAL LANDS

SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Oregon Coastal Lands Act”.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **CONFEDERATED TRIBES.**—The term “Confederated Tribes” means the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw Indians.

(2) **OREGON COASTAL LAND.**—The term “Oregon Coastal land” means the approximately 14,408 acres of land, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Oregon Coastal Land Conveyance” and dated March 27, 2013.

(3) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 303. CONVEYANCE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, including rights-of-way, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Oregon Coastal land, including any improvements located on the land, appurtenances to the land, and minerals on or in the land, including oil and gas, shall be—

(1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes; and

(2) part of the reservation of the Confederated Tribes.

(b) **SURVEY.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete a survey of the boundary lines to establish the boundaries of the land taken into trust under subsection (a).

SEC. 304. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file a map and legal description of the Oregon Coastal land with—

(1) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives.

(b) **FORCE AND EFFECT.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical or typographical errors in the map or legal description.

(c) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—The map and legal description filed under subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Secretary.

SEC. 305. ADMINISTRATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Unless expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title affects any right or claim of the Confederated Tribes existing on the date of enactment of this Act to any land or interest in land.

(b) **PROHIBITIONS.**—

(1) **EXPORTS OF UNPROCESSED LOGS.**—Federal law (including regulations) relating to the export of unprocessed logs harvested from Federal land shall apply to any unprocessed logs that are harvested from the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 303.

(2) **NON-PERMISSIBLE USE OF LAND.**—Any real property taken into trust under section 303 shall not be eligible, or used, for any gaming activity carried out under Public Law 100-497 (25 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.).

(c) **LAWS APPLICABLE TO COMMERCIAL FORESTRY ACTIVITY.**—Any commercial forestry activity that is carried out on the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 303 shall be managed in accordance with all applicable Federal laws.

(d) **AGREEMENTS.**—The Confederated Tribes shall consult with the Secretary and other parties as necessary to develop agreements to provide for access to the Oregon Coastal land taken into trust under section 303 that provide for—

(1) honoring existing reciprocal right-of-way agreements;

(2) administrative access by the Bureau of Land Management; and

(3) management of the Oregon Coastal lands that are acquired or developed under chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code (commonly known as the “Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965”), consistent with section 200305(f)(3) of that title.

(e) **LAND USE PLANNING REQUIREMENTS.**—Except as provided in subsection (c), once the Oregon Coastal land is taken into trust under section 303, the land shall not be subject to the land use planning requirements of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) or the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

SEC. 306. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) **IDENTIFICATION OF OREGON AND CALIFORNIA RAILROAD GRANT LAND.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary shall identify any Oregon and California Railroad grant land that is held in trust by the United States for the benefit of the Confederated Tribes under section 303.

(b) **IDENTIFICATION OF PUBLIC DOMAIN LAND.**—Not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall identify public domain land in the State of Oregon that—

(1) is approximately equal in acreage and condition as the Oregon and California Railroad grant land identified under subsection (a); and

(2) is located in the vicinity of the Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(c) **MAPS.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress and publish in the Federal Register one or more maps depicting the land identified in subsections (a) and (b).

(d) RECLASSIFICATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After providing an opportunity for public comment, the Secretary shall reclassify the land identified in subsection (b) as Oregon and California Railroad grant land.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.), shall apply to land reclassified as Oregon and California Railroad grant land under paragraph (1).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to acknowledge the gentlemen from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. WALDEN, for their hard work on this important piece of legislation that will benefit several Indian tribes in the State of Oregon.

H.R. 2791 is a compilation of three stand-alone bills that were reported out of the Natural Resources Committee and passed by the full House as part of larger measures during the 113th Congress.

Since I have every confidence that Mr. DEFAZIO will describe the bill in detail, I will, at this point, reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2791 is the culmination of years of work to address the wrongs of the past. The "termination era" in Federal Indian policy is one of the darkest chapters in American history. In Oregon, all but one of the tribes lost their Federal recognition.

Fortunately, the Federal Government eventually saw the error of their ways and restored the recognition of the tribes, but they were now left with nonexistent or inadequate land bases.

H.R. 2791, the Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act, will go a long way in helping reestablish long-promised land bases for the Oregon tribes, while also giving them the ability to effectively manage their land on their own terms.

Like my colleague, I want to thank our colleagues from Oregon, Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. WALDEN, for listening to the needs of the Oregon tribal people and continuing to push for this bipartisan legislation.

All the sections included in this bill passed the House by voice vote last Congress, and I urge my colleagues to do the same now.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for both the kind words and for yielding the time here on the floor. I particularly want to thank the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee and his words of support, also, and I thank the committee for sending this bill to the floor.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act is a bipartisan, no-cost, common-sense bill that will go a long way toward helping resolve some of the problems Federal Government and its haphazard policy shifts have created for three western Oregon tribes. The bill provides fairness for three tribes: the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw; the Cow Creek; and the Coquille.

The bill contains the text of provisions within H.R. 5701, which passed unanimously last December, but was not enacted into law.

For too long, Federal policies have unfairly disadvantaged Indian tribes in western Oregon. After signing many treaties with the tribes, the United States removed them from their original homelands and put them on only two reservations, established to house potentially more than 60 tribal governments.

In 1954, Congress made things worse. All tribes west of the Cascades lost Federal recognition when the Western Oregon Termination Act became law. Scholars called it the "termination era." It was terrible Federal Indian policy. It was so bad that it was formally rebuked by Congress less than 30 years later.

In the 1970s, Congress began the process of restoring the western Oregon tribes to Federal recognition, cleaning up the mess and injustice the United States had made.

In fact, I began my congressional career as an original sponsor of the Coquille Restoration Act, legislation to restore one of Oregon's terminated tribes; yet, even today, it remains difficult for these tribes to function as the sovereign nations they are and to govern themselves effectively. Unlike many tribes, the Coos, Lower Umpqua, and Siuslaw, as well as the Cow Creek, are deprived of any land held in trust.

Unlike any other tribe in the United States, the Coquille Indian Tribe must function under a legal anomaly with regard to its own forest.

The Western Oregon Tribal Fairness Act makes good on a decades-old promise to restore land bases for the Coos and Cow Creek tribes, and it puts the Coquille Indian Tribe's forest on an equal footing with those of other Indian tribes nationwide.

H.R. 2791 deals only with Oregon issues, Oregon tribes, and Oregon constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join us in supporting this bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, my complete faith in Mr. DEFAZIO's powers of description was well placed. I endorse his remarks and ask for adoption of the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2791.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NEW MEXICO NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 501) to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 501

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act".

SEC. 2. NAVAJO WATER SETTLEMENT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 10302 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 407 note; Public Law 111-11) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking "Arrellano" and inserting "Arellano"; and

(2) in paragraph (27), by striking "75-185" and inserting "75-184".

(b) DELIVERY AND USE OF NAVAJO-GALLUP WATER SUPPLY PROJECT WATER.—Section 10603(c)(2)(A) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1385) is amended—

(1) in clause (i), by striking "Article III(c)" and inserting "Articles III(c)"; and

(2) in clause (ii)(II), by striking "Article III(c)" and inserting "Articles III(c)".

(c) PROJECT CONTRACTS.—Section 10604(f)(1) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1391) is amended by inserting "Project" before "water".

(d) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 10609 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1395) is amended—

(1) in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b), by striking "construction or rehabilitation" each place it appears and inserting "planning, design, construction, rehabilitation,,";

(2) in subsection (e)(1), by striking "2 percent" and inserting "4 percent"; and

(3) in subsection (f)(1), by striking “4 percent” and inserting “2 percent”.

(e) AGREEMENT.—Section 10701(e) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1400) is amended in paragraphs (2)(A), (2)(B), and (3)(A) by striking “and Contract” each place it appears.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 501, the New Mexico Navajo Water Settlement Technical Corrections Act, makes a number of small changes to a Federal law impacting the Navajo Nation's water projects in New Mexico.

The bill specifically fixes misspellings, citations, and other errors to help expedite the completion of water infrastructure projects.

I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

S. 501 would make technical corrections, as my colleague has stated, to the Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project, which was authorized by Congress in the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009.

□ 1615

The legislation will help provide a reliable water supply to tribal communities on a faster timeline and promote economic growth in northwestern New Mexico. This legislation has the administration's support and has already passed the Senate by unanimous consent.

I want to thank my friend and colleague, Congressman BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, the sponsor of the companion legislation here in the House, for all of his hard work and leadership on this critical issue.

I fully support S. 501 and urge its adoption by all Members.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I also urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 501.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YUKON KUSKOKWIM HEALTH CORPORATION PROPERTY CONVEYANCE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 230) to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 230

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. CONVEYANCE OF PROPERTY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable, but not later than 180 days, after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (referred to in this Act as the “Secretary”) shall convey to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska (referred to in this Act as the “Corporation”), all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the property described in section 2 for use in connection with health and social services programs.

(b) EFFECT ON ANY QUITCLAIM DEED.—The conveyance by the Secretary of title by warranty deed under this section shall, on the effective date of the conveyance, supersede and render of no future effect any quitclaim deed to the property described in section 2 executed by the Secretary and the Corporation.

(c) CONDITIONS.—The conveyance of the property under this Act—

(1) shall be made by warranty deed; and

(2) shall not—

(A) require any consideration from the Corporation for the property;

(B) impose any obligation, term, or condition on the Corporation; or

(C) allow for any reversionary interest of the United States in the property.

SEC. 2. PROPERTY DESCRIBED.

The property, including all land and appurtenances, described in this section is the property included in U.S. Survey No. 4000, Lot 2, T. 8 N., R. 71 W., Seward Meridian, containing 22.98 acres.

SEC. 3. ENVIRONMENTAL LIABILITY.

(a) LIABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Corporation shall not be liable for any soil, surface water, groundwater, or other contamination resulting from the disposal, release, or presence of any environmental contamination on any portion of the property described in section 2 on or before the date on which the property is conveyed to the Corporation.

(2) ENVIRONMENTAL CONTAMINATION.—An environmental contamination described in paragraph (1) includes any oil or petroleum products, hazardous substances, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, pollutants, toxic substances, solid waste, or any other environmental contamination or hazard as defined in any Federal or State of Alaska law.

(b) EASEMENT.—The Secretary shall be accorded any easement or access to the property conveyed under this Act as may be reasonably necessary to satisfy any retained obligation or liability of the Secretary.

(c) NOTICE OF HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE ACTIVITY AND WARRANTY.—In carrying out this Act, the Secretary shall comply with subparagraphs (A) and (B) of section 120(h)(3) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9620(h)(3)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK) and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would first like to acknowledge the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs, for his hard work as the sponsor of the House companion to this bill, H.R. 521.

This bill was favorably reported from the Committee on Natural Resources by unanimous consent in July of this year. The Senate version, S. 230, sponsored by Senator MURKOWSKI, is before us today. This bill directs the Secretary of Health and Human Services to convey by warranty deed a 23-acre parcel of Federal land under the administration of the Indian Health Service and located in Bethel, Alaska, to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation for health and social service-related programs.

The YKHC is a nonprofit Alaska Native organization which operates a regional hospital on the 23 acres of the Federal land conveyed under this bill. In recent years, the hospital has had a need to expand and renovate the existing facilities in this location. To secure funding for the hospital expansion, the YKHC must demonstrate sufficient site control, but because the surrounding land is federally owned, this bill is necessary to provide the health corporation the site control necessary to improve its facilities.

Congress has enacted two similar bills in the last several Congresses and, like those, this bill is supported by the entire Alaska delegation and by the administration.

I again want to commend my colleague from Alaska for his hard work for Alaska Natives, and I urge my colleagues to pass this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 230, as my colleague has so eloquently stated, will provide for the conveyance of approximately 23 acres to the YKHC, located in Bethel, Alaska, for the purposes of constructing a primary care clinic attached to the existing hospital.

This bill is identical to H.R. 521, introduced by our colleague and my very dear and good friend, Chairman DON YOUNG, which we passed by unanimous consent out of the Committee on Natural Resources. The land transfer is needed so that the YKHC might participate in the Indian Health Service Joint Venture Construction Program.

Access to quality health care is a fundamental part of our trust responsibility to tribal members, and passage of this bill will ensure that the YKHC can meet the current and future needs of its residents.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of S. 230.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), that legendary force of Alaskan nature.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I do thank the chairman and I do thank the ranking member for their kind comments.

Much has been said about this fine piece of legislation. As was mentioned, it has passed the House twice. The Senate finally passed out a bill, and now we are dealing with a Senate bill.

As was mentioned, this gives an opportunity for the YKHC, a Native hospital, to expand on Federal lands. By ownership of the land now, there will be no cloud on that title.

I do appreciate the comments. I do appreciate the work that has been put into this. This is a bill that should have been signed into law a lot sooner. It will be done now, and we will be able to expand this hospital for my Alaska Natives.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this legislation.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back for the day, I want to thank my colleague, Chairman MCCLINTOCK, for his collegiality today and his leadership in making this a pleasant afternoon and a bipartisan afternoon.

I urge all Members to join me in supporting S. 230.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I would reciprocate those kind words to the gentlewoman from Michigan; thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for adoption of this measure.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 230.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1831

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee) at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1214, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 1949, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The second electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

NATIONAL FOREST SMALL TRACTS ACT AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1214) to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 0, not voting 30, as follows:

Abraham	DeSaulnier	Jordan
Adams	DesJarlais	Joyce
Aderholt	Deutch	Kaptur
Aguilar	Diaz-Balart	Katko
Allen	Dingell	Keating
Amash	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Amodei	Dold	Kelly (MS)
Ashford	Donovan	Kelly (PA)
Babin	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Barletta	F.	Kildee
Barr	Duckworth	Kilmer
Barton	Duffy	Kind
Bass	Duncan (SC)	King (IA)
Beatty	Duncan (TN)	King (NY)
Becerra	Edwards	Kinzinger (IL)
Benishek	Ellison	Kline
Bera	Ellmers (NC)	Kuster
Bishop (GA)	Emmer (MN)	Labrador
Bishop (MI)	Engel	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Eshoo	Lamborn
Black	Esty	Lance
Blackburn	Farenthold	Langevin
Blum	Farr	Larsen (WA)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Larson (CT)
Bonamici	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Bost	Fleischmann	Lawrence
Boustany	Flores	Lee
Brady (PA)	Forbes	Levin
Brady (TX)	Fortenberry	Lewis
Brat	Foster	Lieu, Ted
Bridenstine	Fox	Lipinski
Brooks (AL)	Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Loeb
Brown (FL)	Frelinghuysen	Lofgren
Brownley (CA)	Fudge	Long
Buchanan	Gabbard	Loudermilk
Buck	Gallagher	Love
Bucshon	Garamendi	Lowenthal
Burgess	Garrett	Lowe
Bustos	Gibbs	Lucas
Butterfield	Gibson	Luetkemeyer
Byrne	Gohmert	Lujan Grisham
Calvert	Goodlatte	(NM)
Capps	Gosar	Lujan, Ben Ray
Capuano	Gowdy	(NM)
Cárdenas	Graham	Lynch
Carney	Granger	MacArthur
Carson (IN)	Graves (GA)	Maloney,
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Carolyn
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Maloney, Sean
Cartwright	Green, Al	Marino
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene	Massie
Castro (TX)	Griffith	Matsui
Chabot	Grijalva	McCarthy
Chaffetz	Grothman	McCauley
Chu, Judy	Guinta	McClintock
Ciçilline	Guthrie	McCollum
Clark (MA)	Hahn	McDermott
Clarke (NY)	Hanna	McGovern
Clay	Hardy	McHenry
Cleaver	Harper	McKinley
Clyburn	Harris	McMorris
Coffman	Hartzer	Rodgers
Cohen	Hastings	McNerney
Collins (GA)	Heck (NV)	McSally
Collins (NY)	Heck (WA)	Meadows
Comstock	Hensarling	Meehan
Conaway	Herrera Beutler	Meeks
Connolly	Hice, Jody B.	Meng
Conyers	Higgins	Mica
Cook	Hill	Miller (MI)
Cooper	Himes	Moelenaar
Costa	Hinojosa	Mooney (WV)
Costello (PA)	Holding	Moore
Courtney	Honda	Moulton
Cramer	Huelskamp	Mullin
Crawford	Huffman	Mulvaney
Crenshaw	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (FL)
Crowley	Hultgren	Murphy (PA)
Cuellar	Hurd (TX)	Nadler
Culberson	Hurt (VA)	Napolitano
Cummings	Israel	Neal
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Neugebauer
Davis (CA)	Jackson Lee	Newhouse
Davis, Danny	Jeffries	Noem
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Nolan
DeFazio	Jenkins (WV)	Norcross
DeGette	Johnson (GA)	Nugent
Delaney	Johnson (OH)	Nunes
DeLauro	Johnson, E. B.	O'Rourke
DelBene	Johnson, Sam	Olson
Dent	Jolly	Palazzo
DeSantis	Jones	Pallone

[Roll No. 495]

YEAS—403

Palmer Ruiz Titus
 Pascrell Ruppertsberger Tonko
 Paulsen Russell Torres
 Payne Ryan (WI) Trotter
 Pearce Salmon Tsongas
 Pelosi Sánchez, Linda Turner
 Perlmutter T. Upton
 Perry Sanford Valadao
 Peters Sarbanes Van Hollen
 Peterson Scalise Vargas
 Pittenger Schakowsky Veasey
 Pitts Schiff Vela
 Pocan Schrader Velázquez
 Poe (TX) Schweikert Visclosky
 Poliquin Scott (VA) Walberg
 Polis Scott, Austin Walden
 Pompeo Scott, David Walker
 Posey Sensenbrenner Walorski
 Price (NC) Serrano Walters, Mimi
 Price, Tom Sessions Sewell (AL)
 Quigley Sherman Whitfield
 Rangel Shimkus Williams
 Ratcliffe Shuster Wilson (FL)
 Reed Shuster Wilson (SC)
 Reichert Simpson Wittman
 Renacci Sinema Womack
 Ribble Slaughter Woodall
 Rice (NY) Smith (MO) Yarmuth
 Rice (SC) Smith (NE) Yoder
 Richmond Smith (NJ) Yoho
 Rigell Smith (TX) Young (AK)
 Roby Speier Young (IA)
 Roe (TN) Stefanik Young (IN)
 Rogers (AL) Stewart Zeldin
 Rogers (KY) Stivers Zinke
 Rokita Stutzman
 Rooney (FL) Swalwell (CA)
 Ros-Lehtinen Takai
 Roskam Takano
 Ross Thompson (MS)
 Rothfus Thompson (PA)
 Rouzer Thornberry
 Roybal-Allard Tiberi
 Royce Tipton

NOT VOTING—30

Beyer Hoyer Rush
 Bilirakis Hudson Ryan (OH)
 Boyle, Brendan Hunter Sanchez, Loretta
 F. Kirkpatrick Sires
 Clawson (FL) Knight Smith (WA)
 Cole Lummis Thompson (CA)
 Denham Marchant Wagner
 Fincher Messer Wasserman
 Fleming Miller (FL) Schultz
 Grayson Pingree Westmoreland
 Gutiérrez Rohrabacher

□ 1915

Ms. TSONGAS and Mr. GOSAR changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL LIBERTY MEMORIAL
CLARIFICATION ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1949) to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr.

McCLINTOCK) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 496]

YEAS—402

Abraham DeGette Hultgren
 Adams Delaney Hurd (TX)
 Aderholt Delauro Hurt (VA)
 Aguilera DeBene Israel
 Allen Dent Issa
 Amash DeSantis Jackson Lee
 Amodei DeSaunier Jeffries
 Ashford Deutch Jenkins (KS)
 Babin Diaz-Balart Jenkins (WV)
 Barletta Dingell Johnson (GA)
 Barr Doggett Johnson (OH)
 Barton Dold Johnson, E. B.
 Bass Donovan Johnson, Sam
 Beatty Doyle, Michael Jolly
 Becerra F. Jones
 Benishek Duckworth Jordan
 Bera Duffy Joyce
 Bishop (GA) Duncan (SC) Kaptur
 Bishop (MI) Duncan (TN) Katko
 Black Edwards Keating
 Blackburn Ellison Kelly (IL)
 Blum Ellmers (NC) Kelly (MS)
 Blumenauer Emmer (MN) Kelly (PA)
 Bonamici Engel Kennedy
 Bost Eshoo Kildee
 Boustany Esty Kilmer
 Brady (PA) Farenthold Kind
 Brady (TX) Farr King (IA)
 Brat Fattah King (NY)
 Bridenstine Fitzpatrick Kline
 Brooks (AL) Fleischmann Kuster
 Brooks (IN) Fleming Labrador
 Brown (FL) Flores LaMalfa
 Brownley (CA) Forbes Lamborn
 Buck Portenberry Lance
 Bucshon Foster Langevin
 Burgess Foxx Larsen (WA)
 Bustos Frank (FL) Larson (CT)
 Butterfield Franks (AZ) Latta
 Byrne Frelinghuysen Lawrence
 Calvert Fudge Lee
 Capps Gabbard Levin
 Capuano Gallego Lewis
 Cárdenas Garamendi Lieu, Ted
 Carney Garrett Lipinski
 Carson (IN) Gibbs LoBiondo
 Carter (GA) Goeback Lujan Grisham
 Carter (TX) Gohmert Lofgren (NM)
 Cartwright Goodlatte Long
 Castor (FL) Gosar Loudermilk
 Castro (TX) Gowdy Love
 Chabot Graham Lowenthal
 Chaffetz Granger Lowey
 Chu, Judy Graves (GA) Lucas
 Cicilline Graves (LA) Luetkemeyer
 Clark (MA) Graves (MO) Lujan Grisham
 Clarke (NY) Green, Al (NM)
 Clay Green, Gene Luján, Ben Ray
 Cleaver Griffith (NM)
 Clyburn Grijalva Lummis
 Coffman Grothman Lynch
 Cohen Guinta MacArthur
 Cole Guthrie Maloney,
 Collins (GA) Hahn Carolyn
 Collins (NY) Hanna Maloney, Sean
 Comstock Hardy Marchant
 Conaway Harper Marino
 Connolly Harris Massie
 Conyers Conyers Matsui
 Cook Cook McCarthy
 Cooper Heck (NV) McCaul
 Costa Heck (WA) McClintock
 Costello (PA) Hensarling McCollum
 Courtney Herrera Beutler McDermott
 Cramer Hice, Jody B. McGovern
 Crawford Higgins McHenry
 Crenshaw Hill McKinley
 Crowley Himes McMorris
 Cuellar Hinojosa Rodgers
 Culberson Holding McNeerney
 Cummings Honda McSally
 Curbelo (FL) Hudson Meadows
 Davis (CA) Huelskamp Meehan
 Davis, Danny Huffman Meeks
 Davis, Rodney Huizenga (MI) Meng

Messer Rice (NY) Stivers
 Mica Rice (SC) Stutzman
 Miller (MI) Richmond Swalwell (CA)
 Moolenaar Rigell Takai
 Mooney (WV) Roby Takano
 Moore Roe (TN) Thompson (MS)
 Moulton Rogers (AL) Thompson (PA)
 Mullin Rogers (KY) Thornberry
 Mulvaney Rokita Tiberi
 Murphy (FL) Rooney (FL) Tipton
 Murphy (PA) Ros-Lehtinen Titus
 Nadler Roskam Tonko
 Napolitano Ross Torres
 Neal Rothfus Trott
 Neugebauer Rouzer Tsongas
 Newhouse Roybal-Allard Turner
 Noem Royce Upton
 Nolan Ruiz Valadao
 Norcross Ruppertsberger Van Hollen
 Nugent Rush Vargas
 Nunes Russell Veasey
 O'Rourke Ryan (WI) Vela
 Olson Sánchez, Linda Velázquez
 Palazzo T. Visclosky
 Pallone Sanford Walberg
 Palmer Sarbanes Walden
 Pascrell Scalise Walker
 Paulsen Schakowsky Walorski
 Payne Schiff Walters, Mimi
 Pearce Schrader Walz
 Pelosi Schweikert Waters, Maxine
 Perlmutter Scott (VA) Watson Coleman
 Perry Scott, Austin Weber (TX)
 Peters Scott, David Webster (FL)
 Peterson Sensenbrenner Welch
 Pittenger Serrano Wenstrup
 Pitts Sessions Westerman
 Pocan Sewell (AL) Whitfield
 Poe (TX) Sherman Williams
 Poliquin Shimkus Wilson (FL)
 Polis Shuster Wilson (SC)
 Pompeo Simpson Wittman
 Posey Sinema Womack
 Price, Tom Slaughter Woodall
 Quigley Smith (MO) Yarmuth
 Rangel Smith (NE) Yoder
 Ratcliffe Smith (NJ) Young (AK)
 Reed Smith (TX) Young (IA)
 Reichert Speier Young (IN)
 Renacci Stefanik Zeldin
 Ribble Stewart Zinke

NOT VOTING—31

Beyer Grayson Ryan (OH)
 Bilirakis Gutiérrez Salmon
 Bishop (UT) Hoyer Sanchez, Loretta
 Boyle, Brendan Hunter Sires
 F. Kinzinger (IL) Smith (WA)
 Buchanan Kirkpatrick Thompson (CA)
 Clawson (FL) Knight Wagner
 DeFazio Miller (FL) Wasserman
 Denham Pingree Schultz
 DesJarlais Price (NC) Westmoreland
 Fincher Rohrabacher Yoho

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1922

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I attended the funeral of a fallen Air Force Special Operator from my district and missed the following rollcall votes: Nos. 495 and 496 on September 16, 2015.

Had I been present, I would have voted: rollcall vote No. 495—H.R. 1214—National Forest Small Tracts Amendments Act of 2015, as amended, “aye,” and rollcall vote No. 496—H.R. 1949—National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015, as amended, “aye.”

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for votes on Wednesday, September 16, 2015. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall votes 495 and 496.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING IN JOINT MEETING POPE FRANCIS OF THE HOLY SEE

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time on Thursday, September 24, 2015, for the Speaker to declare a recess, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in Joint Meeting Pope Francis of the Holy See.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HURD of Texas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

CRAGS, COLORADO LAND EXCHANGE ACT OF 2015

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2223) to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2223

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Craggs, Colorado Land Exchange Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are—

(1) to authorize, direct, expedite and facilitate the land exchange set forth herein; and

(2) to promote enhanced public outdoor recreational and natural resource conservation opportunities in the Pike National Forest near Pikes Peak, Colorado via acquisition of the non-Federal land and trail easement.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) BHI.—The term "BHI" means Broadmoor Hotel, Inc., a Colorado corporation.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term "Federal land" means all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 83 acres of land within the Pike National Forest, El Paso County, Colorado, together with a non-exclusive perpetual access easement to BHI to and from such land on Forest Service Road 371, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Federal Parcel—Emerald Valley Ranch", dated March 2015.

(3) NON-FEDERAL LAND.—The term "non-Federal land" means the land and trail easement to be conveyed to the Secretary by BHI in the exchange and is—

(A) approximately 320 acres of land within the Pike National Forest, Teller County,

Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Non-Federal Parcel—Craggs Property", dated March 2015; and

(B) a permanent trail easement for the Barr Trail in El Paso County, Colorado, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Proposed Craggs Land Exchange—Barr Trail Easement to United States", dated March 2015, and which shall be considered as a voluntary donation to the United States by BHI for all purposes of law.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Agriculture, unless otherwise specified.

SEC. 4. LAND EXCHANGE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If BHI offers to convey to the Secretary all right, title, and interest of BHI in and to the non-Federal land, the Secretary shall accept the offer and simultaneously convey to BHI the Federal land.

(b) LAND TITLE.—Title to the non-Federal land conveyed and donated to the Secretary under this Act shall be acceptable to the Secretary and shall conform to the title approval standards of the Attorney General of the United States applicable to land acquisitions by the Federal Government.

(c) PERPETUAL ACCESS EASEMENT TO BHI.—The nonexclusive perpetual access easement to be granted to BHI as shown on the map referred to in section 3(2) shall allow—

(1) BHI to fully maintain, at BHI's expense, and use Forest Service Road 371 from its junction with Forest Service Road 368 in accordance with historic use and maintenance patterns by BHI; and

(2) full and continued public and administrative access and use of FSR 371 in accordance with the existing Forest Service travel management plan, or as such plan may be revised by the Secretary.

(d) ROUTE AND CONDITION OF ROAD.—BHI and the Secretary may mutually agree to improve, relocate, reconstruct, or otherwise alter the route and condition of all or portions of such road as the Secretary, in close consultation with BHI, may determine advisable.

(e) EXCHANGE COSTS.—BHI shall pay for all land survey, appraisal, and other costs to the Secretary as may be necessary to process and consummate the exchange directed by this Act, including reimbursement to the Secretary, if the Secretary so requests, for staff time spent in such processing and consummation.

SEC. 5. EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE AND APPRAISALS.

(a) APPRAISALS.—The values of the lands to be exchanged under this Act shall be determined by the Secretary through appraisals performed in accordance with—

(1) the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

(2) the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice;

(3) appraisal instructions issued by the Secretary; and

(4) shall be performed by an appraiser mutually agreed to by the Secretary and BHI.

(b) EQUAL VALUE EXCHANGE.—The values of the Federal and non-Federal land parcels exchanged shall be equal, or if they are not equal, shall be equalized as follows:

(1) SURPLUS OF FEDERAL LAND VALUE.—If the final appraised value of the Federal land exceeds the final appraised value of the non-Federal land parcel identified in section 3(3)(A), BHI shall make a cash equalization payment to the United States as necessary to achieve equal value, including, if necessary, an amount in excess of that authorized pursuant to section 206(b) of the Federal

Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1716(b)).

(2) USE OF FUNDS.—Any cash equalization moneys received by the Secretary under paragraph (1) shall be—

(A) deposited in the fund established under Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the "Sisk Act"; 16 U.S.C. 484a); and

(B) made available to the Secretary for the acquisition of land or interests in land in Region 2 of the Forest Service.

(3) SURPLUS OF NON-FEDERAL LAND VALUE.—If the final appraised value of the non-Federal land parcel identified in section 3(3)(A) exceeds the final appraised value of the Federal land, the United States shall not make a cash equalization payment to BHI, and surplus value of the non-Federal land shall be considered a donation by BHI to the United States for all purposes of law.

(c) APPRAISAL EXCLUSIONS.—

(1) SPECIAL USE PERMIT.—The appraised value of the Federal land parcel shall not reflect any increase or diminution in value due to the special use permit existing on the date of the enactment of this Act to BHI on the parcel and improvements thereunder.

(2) BARR TRAIL EASEMENT.—The Barr Trail easement donation identified in section 3(3)(B) shall not be appraised for purposes of this Act.

SEC. 6. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) WITHDRAWAL PROVISIONS.—

(1) WITHDRAWAL.—Lands acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall, without further action by the Secretary, be permanently withdrawn from all forms of appropriation and disposal under the public land laws (including the mining and mineral leasing laws) and the Geothermal Steam Act of 1930 (30 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(2) WITHDRAWAL REVOCATION.—Any public land order that withdraws the Federal land from appropriation or disposal under a public land law shall be revoked to the extent necessary to permit disposal of the Federal land parcel to BHI.

(3) WITHDRAWAL OF FEDERAL LAND.—All Federal land authorized to be exchanged under this Act, if not already withdrawn or segregated from appropriation or disposal under the public lands laws upon enactment of this Act, is hereby so withdrawn, subject to valid existing rights, until the date of conveyance of the Federal land to BHI.

(b) POSTEXCHANGE LAND MANAGEMENT.—Land acquired by the Secretary under this Act shall become part of the Pike-San Isabel National Forest and be managed in accordance with the laws, rules, and regulations applicable to the National Forest System.

(c) EXCHANGE TIMETABLE.—It is the intent of Congress that the land exchange directed by this Act be consummated no later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(d) MAPS, ESTIMATES, AND DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) MINOR ERRORS.—The Secretary and BHI may by mutual agreement make minor boundary adjustments to the Federal and non-Federal lands involved in the exchange, and may correct any minor errors in any map, acreage estimate, or description of any land to be exchanged.

(2) CONFLICT.—If there is a conflict between a map, an acreage estimate, or a description of land under this Act, the map shall control unless the Secretary and BHI mutually agree otherwise.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—Upon enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file and make available for public inspection in the headquarters of the Pike-San Isabel National Forest a copy of all maps referred to in this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 2223, the Craggs, Colorado Land Exchange Act of 2015, which I introduced, along with Mr. POLIS, to facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties in Colorado.

Specifically, this legislation would convey to the United States the 320-acre Craggs property located on the west side of Pikes Peak that is currently owned by the Broadmoor Hotel and that is a perpetual public access easement for the lower portion of the popular Barr Trail.

In exchange, an 83-acre Federal parcel located at Emerald Valley Ranch on the southeast side of Pikes Peak and that is a perpetual access easement along two Forest Service roads would be transferred to the Broadmoor.

This exchange would eliminate the management and liability issues currently facing the United States because of the significant upgrades and improvements that Broadmoor has made to the Emerald Valley Ranch parcel.

Mr. Speaker, this land exchange will also provide increased outdoor recreational opportunities for the public. The 320-acre Craggs property is completely surrounded by the Pike National Forest and has been the top acquisition priority for the Pikes Peak Ranger District for several years.

The property provides several opportunities to connect forest system trails emanating from The Craggs Campground with trails in the Putney Gulch area. In addition, existing trails within the property could become key links in the proposed Ring the Peak Trail.

I would like to thank Chairman BISHOP and Chairman MCCLINTOCK and the entire staff of the Subcommittee on Federal Lands for all of their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor tonight to help increase the economic and recreational opportunities around Colorado Springs. I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Rather than repeat what the chairman of the subcommittee just indi-

cated on H.R. 2223, let me just say that the exchange eliminates a large private inholding in the National Forest and removes the need for the Federal land management of the Emerald Valley Ranch. The Forest Service testified in support of the legislation.

I want to thank my colleagues, Congressman POLIS and Congressman LAMBORN, for their hard and constructive work on this legislation. This is a good, bipartisan piece of legislation, and I congratulate its two sponsors. I urge its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I appreciate the ranking member, Representative GRIJALVA, for his work on the committee.

We have many spirited discussions. Sometimes we don't agree, but sometimes we do. This is one of those great occasions when, on a bipartisan basis, we do agree.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2223.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1930

CONGRATULATING SABADO GIGANTE AND DON FRANCISCO

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to congratulate Mario Kreutzberger, better known as Don Francisco, for his successful career as the host of Sabado Gigante whose last airing will be this Saturday, September 19.

From its humble beginnings in the country of Chile 53 years ago, Sabado Gigante has captivated and won the hearts of audiences throughout Latin America and especially in our south Florida community.

Nearly 30 years since its first transmission into the United States, Sabado Gigante has attracted loyal and enthusiastic viewers who enjoy the combination of entertainment and coverage of current events. In 2012, the Guinness Book of Records listed Sabado Gigante as the world's longest running TV variety show.

Don Francisco has also been dedicated to promoting charitable giving through his Teleton and has served as a spokesperson for the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Wherever Don

Francisco decides to go, he will not only find success, but also the heartfelt support of our community.

Congratulations—felicidades, Don Francisco. Godspeed.

HONORING VERONICA POTTER

(Ms. DUCKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to recognize one of my outstanding constituents, Ms. Veronica Potter, of Barrington, Illinois.

She recently wrote a letter to a hometown paper saying:

I know that the service of women in our current history is applauded because the service is indeed equal to that of men in our military, but in World War II, there were many women involved in serving their country in the military, but as a whole, nothing is ever mentioned.

Well, Mr. Speaker, she is right, so I would like to mention her today here on the House floor.

The Women's Reserve was created in 1942 when the strain of our two-front war caused shortages in military personnel. Recognizing her country needed her in a time of war, Veronica selflessly volunteered and served in the U.S. Marines Corps Reserves from 1944 to 1946 and supported our country's efforts during World War II.

Veronica joined the Marines right out of high school. After basic training, she was deployed to the Marine base in Parris Island, South Carolina, for 2 years, where she contributed to the wartime operations on the base that helped train more than 204,000 marines destined for the front line in defense of our great Nation.

Ms. Potter served our country in a dire time of need and has not been properly recognized for her efforts.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and recognizing Veronica Potter, a woman who contributed to the success of the U.S. Marines during World War II.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HONDA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, we are now 7 legislative days from yet another Republican government shutdown, simply because the Republicans want to deny women access to comprehensive health care—7 days away from a government shutdown—and we have no solution to keep our government funded and running.

We have radio silence on how to strengthen our middle class, build bigger paychecks for all Americans, and invest our infrastructure.

In light of this Republican Congress' dysfunction, just this week, General

Electric announced that, because of the “political debate over America’s global competitiveness and the future of the Export-Import Bank,” it is shifting 500 manufacturing jobs out of the U.S.

As a representative of Silicon Valley, I know that manufacturing jobs, such as those at GE, are the foundation to reversing income inequality and igniting innovation.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot hold our government and our American livelihood hostage. I call upon my Republican colleagues to stop pulling a Kim Davis and do your job.

NEW JERSEY’S CONFECTIONARY INDUSTRY

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize an industry that has a large and very delicious impact on my home district in the Fifth District of New Jersey. I, of course, am talking about New Jersey’s confectionary manufacturers.

I am proud to see New Jersey products in stores, not only throughout the State and the country, but around the world. The Fifth District’s own Promotion in Motion and M&M Mars have contributed to countless fond memories of enjoying candy at sports games, movie theaters, and birthday parties; but the confectionary industry provides even more than just tasty treats.

In New Jersey and throughout the country, this industry is an economic driver comprised of family-owned businesses employing tens of thousands of employees across the State and across the country.

No doubt, New Jersey is a sweeter place thanks to the candy manufacturers that call our State of New Jersey home.

CONCERNING THE CONTINUING RESOLUTION

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Members, here we are, 2 weeks away from another potential shutdown of the government.

Do my Republican friends know how silly it sounds to threaten shutting down the entire government over a manufactured crisis for funding that does not even go to abortions?

Current law already withholds Federal funding from covering a woman’s abortion, except in cases of extreme limited circumstances. To gamble with valuable Federal programs should be embarrassing.

Here are just a few examples of programs that will be affected if the GOP pursues a strategy that I doubt they would want to see happen.

The GOP shutdown would mean that the Centers for Disease Control would be unable to support the annual seasonal influenza program.

The GOP shutdown means we rely more on foreign energy as the issuance of permits for energy production on Federal lands stop. I certainly know my Republican colleagues wouldn’t want to see that happen.

Head Start centers around the country would close. During fiscal year 2014, an estimated 1,600 Head Start agencies served over 927,000 children, including 71,000 in Texas. Apparently, our children are okay to target in a political debate.

Under the GOP shutdown, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives would be affected; and gun permits will not be processed.

We could be using this time to debate the extension of valuable programs like the Export-Import Bank or the highway trust fund, but instead, we are going through the same theatrics we went through 2 years ago, which accomplished nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to be reasonable and pass a clean continuing resolution so Congress can get back to work doing what the American people sent us here to do.

QUESTIONS FOR TONIGHT’S DEBATE

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, the good news of this place is a congratulations offered by my colleague just a few minutes ago to a 90-year-old lady who served in World War II and had never received a thank you.

Wouldn’t it be a positive step to reflect on America and to be able to hold in this body positive things that shows the Congress working together? Yet, as has been mentioned, our colleagues want to defund Planned Parenthood and shut down the government.

I wonder whether or not, in this debate coming up, that any of the moderators will ask whether any of those debating will stand in shutting down the government. I wonder whether they will ask them whether they support voting rights and will support the restoration of the Voting Rights Act, like the Americans who walked 1,000 miles for justice.

I wonder whether or not, in fact, they would ask them whether they care anything about criminal justice reform and decriminalizing, if you will, this system where it has mass incarceration, children in jail, where it doesn’t believe in rehabilitation for those who have served.

I wonder whether these individuals that have been making a lot of noise in front of the public who will be in the public eye all over America, Mr.

Speaker, whether they will answer the real questions about America and bring us together.

Voting rights, health care for women, and making sure that we fix the criminal justice system, those are the questions that should be asked tonight.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Land and Water Conservation Fund, our Nation’s most important conservation and outdoor recreation program.

For more than 50 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has conserved our Nation’s most cherished natural spaces and historic landmarks. This groundbreaking program, created and reauthorized on a strong bipartisan basis, has protected and expanded iconic landscapes in every State and is responsible for more than 40,000 State and local outdoor recreation projects, from playgrounds and baseball fields to urban parks and nature refuges.

By reinvesting revenues from offshore oil and gas development in communities across America, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has become “America’s best parks program.”

In my home State of Arizona, the fund has provided approximately \$223 million in funding to help preserve iconic places like the Grand Canyon, Buenos Aires National Wildlife Refuge, and the San Pedro Riparian National Conservation Area.

Recently, I had the pleasure of joining National Park staff and students from Cholla High School, Desert View High School, and Pueblo High School for a day of appreciation at Saguaro National Park West. For many of the students that joined us on this visit, this was their first visit to Saguaro, despite it being a 15-minute drive from Tucson.

Saguaro officials have leveraged the Land and Water Conservation Fund funding to benefit Arizonans, the desert tortoise, Gila monsters, and other desert wildlife that call Saguaro home. Without it, our students would have had a smaller national park to experience, less to learn, and less to enjoy.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund has preserved iconic sites like this all over the country. Our trip to Saguaro was hardly unique. These stories of discovery happen every day thanks to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Unfortunately, the fund’s authorizing legislation expires on September 30, 2015. Six legislative days remain before

the clock runs out. The stakes are high.

If the Land and Water Conservation Fund is not renewed, special wild areas will be at greater risk of overdevelopment, and our Nation's ability to conserve lands for future generations will be severely undercut.

Congress should build on the Land and Water Conservation Fund's legacy. We should stop playing political games and do what the public clearly wants us to do. We should permanently reauthorize and fully fund the program. It is that simple.

The House Republican leadership has not acted to extend the Land and Water Conservation Fund. They seem perfectly content to let it expire.

Rather than meeting with their fellow legislators and reaching a compromise, as Senate Republicans have done, the House Republican leadership, once again, has shown an inability to do what is best for sportsmen, the outdoor industry, recreation enthusiasts, and wildlife. By allowing the fund to expire, they serve no one's interest and create a deficit in our legacy as protectors of public land and public resources in this country.

This is not a controversial program. It protects public land for future use. There is no more an American goal than that, but it is held up by a leadership team that would rather do nothing.

Past Congresses have reauthorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund with support from both parties. It shouldn't be any different this time. The support is there.

On April 15, as the chart illustrates, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund was introduced. To date, the bill boasts support from over 165 Members of Congress, both Republican and Democrats.

I have made a request—as the sequence of time that we have been waiting—asking for a full hearing, a markup, and an eventual vote on this floor.

We asked for a hearing on H.R. 1814. I made a request to hold a vote on H.R. 1814. These requests have fallen on deaf ears.

The clock is running out. House Republican leaders must act. It won't take much to get the Land and Water Conservation Fund back on track, but they have to say yes to moving forward and to doing a bipartisan legislation, which is what the colleagues of this Chamber are asking for. It is time for action.

We are calling, in a bipartisan way, on our colleagues to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund. To not do so is not carrying out our full responsibilities as stewards of the public lands, but also, more importantly, when you have before you a request by over 165 Members on a bipartisan manner on a bill that has compromises within it that were

reached at the Senate level as well, it appears to me that not to do this fund is to set up this fund for failure, to set up this fund for dismantling, and to set up this fund to redirect the purpose for which this fund was created 50 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS), the ranking member for the Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

□ 1945

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Ranking Member GRIJALVA for his leadership and advocacy on behalf of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

We have a generational responsibility to protect our Nation's remaining natural and historic resources for our children and our grandchildren. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has been an instrumental tool, an invaluable tool in this effort.

For over 50 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has carried out a simple, bipartisan idea: use revenues from the depletion of one Federal resource—offshore oil and gas—to conserve another—our land and water—and provide recreation opportunities for all Americans. It does not cost taxpayer money or contribute to the Federal deficit, relying instead on royalties paid by oil and gas companies in exchange for their right to develop offshore resources in waters that belong to all of the American people.

LWCF has also proven to be a critical tool to protect some of our Nation's most significant cultural and historic sites, protecting places that have shaped and defined who we are as a people and a country and would not have been protected without support from the Federal Government.

This past weekend, I was honored to host Secretary of the Interior Sally Jewell at my annual River Day, an event I have held in my district for the past 9 years that celebrates the rivers that connect the Third Congressional District of Massachusetts and the many partners who work to protect these resources that provide clean drinking water, create tremendous recreational opportunities, and bring natural beauty to our daily life.

As part of River Day, Secretary Jewell and I visited Minute Man National Historical Park, which commemorates the famous shot heard 'round the world in the very beginnings of our country. Like many national parks and public lands across the country, Minute Man, and all those who visit, have directly benefited from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Barrett's Farm is the former home of Colonel James Barrett, the commander of the Middlesex militia during the Revolutionary War. His farm was used to store colonial militia weapons and was the objective of the British march

on Concord that inspired Paul Revere's ride. British forces marched from Boston to seize the munitions stored at the farm, but Barrett's militia confronted the British soldiers at the North Bridge, where the shot heard 'round the world was fired, launching America's war for independence.

For many years, this important historic site, Barrett's Farm, was privately owned, restricted from the public, and was in a complete state of disrepair. Thanks to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, the National Park Service was able to purchase Barrett's Farm from a willing, private local foundation, ensuring that this nationally significant historical site is preserved to be enjoyed by visitors for many years to come.

Fifty years ago, our predecessors in this Congress had the wisdom and foresight to establish the Land and Water Conservation Fund for the benefit of future generations of Americans. Dismantling this program or letting its authorization expire disadvantages all in real and significant ways. I can't imagine the loss of the important piece of history of Barrett's Farm that the LWCF made possible to preserve.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting full funding and permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, making sure that it remains one of our Nation's most successful and effective conservation tools.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California's 47th District (Mr. LOWENTHAL), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member GRIJALVA for calling us together for this Special Order hour to highlight the need for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and for his leadership in seeking a permanent reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

As has been pointed out, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is far and away our Nation's most important conservation program. The LWCF is a popular and successful bipartisan program for the conservation and protection of America's irreplaceable natural, historic, cultural, and outdoor landmarks.

Over its 50-year history, the fund has conserved more than 5 million acres for parks, for recreation, for forests, for refuges, and for other land through the Federal program, but that is just part of the LWCF. Also, more than 2.6 million acres has been saved in communities throughout every State in the Nation.

It has conserved iconic landscapes in every State. It is responsible for more than 40,000 State and local outdoor recreational projects at no cost, as has been pointed out, to the American taxpayer. In fact, according to a recent

economic analysis, every dollar invested in the conservation of public lands through the LWCF leads to \$4 in economic activities to local communities.

Our Nation's conserved public lands are the essential infrastructure for a vibrant outdoor recreational economy that contributes over \$646 billion to the economy each year and supports more than 1 in every 15 jobs in the United States.

That economic activity and job creation plays out locally all over the country, not only in the broad service and manufacturing sectors, but in the thousands upon thousands of recreational destination areas and the gateway communities where we all go to enjoy the outdoors. My home State of California has received more than \$2.3 billion in LWCF funding over the past five decades, which has helped to protect some of our State's most treasured places.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund also plays a crucial role in building up the ability of our lands to reduce the damages caused by climate change. Our network of public lands plays a critical role in addressing the challenges that climate change poses to our forests, fish and wildlife, and riparian resources. America's forests naturally capture a remarkable 13 percent of U.S. carbon emissions each year, but the U.S. Forest Service projects that private forests, storing more than 2 billion tons of carbon, are at risk of development in addition. Coastal wetlands, we also know, can lessen the damages caused by major storms, and land conservation in the wildland-urban interface can reduce home losses from major fires.

Continued investment in the Land and Water Conservation Fund will be essential to help us buffer the impacts of a changing climate. If funding is allowed to expire, the American public will lose one of our greatest tools to ensure the protection of our public lands and waters and the ability of everyone to go outside and to enjoy these wonderful resources. We simply cannot let that happen.

Congress must honor the bipartisan commitment it made over 50 years ago and ensure that our children and our grandchildren get to enjoy America's treasured outdoor spaces the same way we have been able to enjoy those spaces. We must permanently reauthorize the LWCF.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California's Second District (Mr. HUFFMAN), the ranking member on the Water, Power, and Oceans Subcommittee of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 50 years, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has protected America's natural heritage. This fund is one of our Nation's most impor-

tant conservation tools. Every single year, millions of Americans hike the trails that this fund has helped build, they visit the national parks that this fund helped create, and they enjoy the wildland vistas that it helped protect.

This fund has supported more than 40,000 projects in nearly every county in every State in our Nation. In my own district on California's north coast, it has funded projects in Redwood National Park, in Six Rivers National Forest, and in the Point Reyes National Seashore.

Since 2004, it has helped add more than 1,000 acres to the King Range National Conservation Area, which is one of the most rugged and spectacular backpacking areas you will find anywhere in the continental United States. It is also known as the Lost Coast.

The positive impact that this fund has had is simply staggering. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has permanently protected 5 million acres of public lands, and that includes sections of American icons, like the Grand Canyon National Park and the Appalachian Trail. Best of all, it has done all of this at no taxpayer expense. The Land and Water Conservation Fund is financed by a portion of offshore drilling fees.

Congress needs to remember that preserving our natural heritage isn't just good for our environment; it is good for our economy. Outdoor recreation is a cornerstone for many local and State economies, bringing tourists from around the world to shop at local businesses, to eat at restaurants, to stay at hotels.

In California alone, outdoor recreation supports \$85.4 billion in consumer spending and 732,000 jobs across the State; but in just 2 weeks, authorization of this fund will expire, leaving local economies in jeopardy, leaving our land managers struggling to make up for lost funding.

Fifty years ago, Congress created the Land and Water Conservation Fund with an overwhelming bipartisan vote. I hope Congress can come together now to support H.R. 1814, a bipartisan bill sponsored by my friend Mr. GRIJALVA, that permanently reauthorizes the Land and Water Conservation Fund. America's natural heritage and our economy depend on it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington's First District (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of representing one of the most beautiful and diverse districts in the country. It includes the Alpine Lakes Wilderness, the Mount Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest, the North Cascades National Park, and the North Creek Forest, all incredible areas for people throughout our region and across the country to enjoy.

Unfortunately, in just 14 days, the congressional authorization for the

Land and Water Conservation Fund will expire. LWCF was established 50 years ago to maintain outdoor recreational opportunities nationwide. It is the only Federal program dedicated to the conservation of our national parks, forests, wildernesses, wildlife refuges, State and local parks, and working forests.

Since its inception, the fund has invested \$637 million in Washington State projects alone, including three grants for the North Creek Forest, a 64-acre park I visited just last month. A community organization called Friends of North Creek Forest and a college student named Jordan from the University of Washington at Bothell gave me a tour of the forest.

For his senior thesis, Jordan has worked with the community and conservation volunteers to clean up the site and design new trails for hikers and hundreds of schoolchildren to enjoy. This forest is a safe and healthy place for our families and students to have fun and learn about species diversity and the importance of conservation efforts. This is just one project among thousands across the country.

Without a new authorization for this critical program, environmental conservation projects and Washington's outdoor recreational industry would be needlessly harmed because not only is the Land and Water Conservation Fund crucial for protecting the Pacific Northwest's beautiful spaces, it is also important for our State's economy as well as the entire country's. In Washington State alone, outdoor recreation supports nearly 200,000 jobs and contributes \$20 billion a year to our economy.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund uses no taxpayer dollars and is funded through oil and gas receipts paid by energy companies. Unfortunately, in the past, Congress has diverted this money for other uses. That is why I, along with 159 of my colleagues, have cosponsored a bill to permanently reauthorize the fund.

My beautiful State boasts some of our Nation's most beautiful forests, mountains, and waterways, and taking care of these natural resources and protecting our environment is critical to preserving the quality of life that we cherish.

□ 2000

We can't risk defunding the great work of these environmental conservation projects, which is why Congress must reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I want to thank Congressman GRIJALVA for organizing this Special Order hour on such a critical issue.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, after September 30, the authorization for the Land and Water Conservation Fund expires. That date is a looming date for the Republican leadership of this House.

With it comes the talk and potential of a government shutdown. Other critical programs that face reauthorization are also ending on September 30.

Part of the issue of leadership is to allow the House to work its will. Until this House has the opportunity to deal with this issue of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we will continue to not know its status and we will watch the agonizingly slow and painful dismantling and end of this program.

The reauthorization has, in its history, been bipartisan and bicameral. This legislation enjoys bipartisan and bicameral support.

Both Republican and Democratic colleagues are part of the 165 sponsors of the legislation in the House. The compromise in that committee was between the ranking member and the chair of that committee in the Senate.

So I think it behooves us to look at this fund, for every day past the 30th of September \$2.5 million will be lost to that fund, money that we cannot afford to lose.

Mr. Speaker, to wait for the ashes of the Land and Water Conservation Fund after the 30th and then to develop it without bipartisan input, without the Democrats playing any role at all in legislation that redefines the Fund and that includes purposes for which the Fund was never established and redirect its funds into areas which are far from the mission of the Fund when it was established 50 years ago, is effectively killing the Fund.

The cuts in our Federal land agencies and land management agencies that have endured in the last four or five budgets point to the fact that the Land and Water Conservation Fund has become an essential supplemental support to many of our public lands and the projects and outdoor activities and wildlife protections that the American people expect.

I suggest to the House that this reauthorization should be devoid of controversy and should be devoid of partisan bickering and political grandstanding. This is a routine item that requires action by the House.

Mr. Speaker, before the time runs out, fully funding and fully authorizing the Land and Water Conservation Fund on a permanent basis is what the public is asking for and is what 165 Members of this House are asking for.

I believe that the Republican leadership of this House has to act and allow the House of Representatives, the elected Representatives of the people of this Nation, to work its will and take that vote.

My colleagues have mentioned the economic benefit and priorities of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Let me just add that a bipartisan poll found that 88 percent of the voters support continuing to set aside offshore oil and gas drilling fees that should go into the Land and Water Conservation

Fund and 85 percent of Americans want the fund to be fully funded.

For every dollar that is spent on Land and Water Conservation Funds and that is invested, it results in a return of \$4 in economic value from the natural resources goods and services alone.

I think it is worth noting that \$900 million comes from those offshore oil and gas resources and \$17 billion that is collected from those fees and resources that are collected from offshore drilling and gas and oil development goes for other purposes elsewhere in the government.

So we are talking essentially about a very small sum of money that many of us felt should have been raised a long time ago. We are jeopardizing this sum of money.

In jeopardizing this sum of money, we are further dismantling and further hurting the public's use of our public lands and, more importantly, the protections and cultural resource activities that occur as a result of the fund.

It is a simple matter. Bring it to a hearing. Bring it to a vote. I would urge the leadership of this House that it is way past time. To agonizingly wait for September 30 is not a function of government. It is cynical. It is wrong.

When you have a bill before you that enjoys the bipartisan support that H.R. 1814 enjoys, it is time to bring it to the floor and allow this Congress to vote and allow this bill to be reauthorized on a permanent level, on a permanent basis.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, actually, there are some people that it is more of a pleasure to work in this House with than others.

Congressman BUCK, you are one of those that it is a real honor and privilege to work with.

Mr. Speaker, I am back here on the floor to talk about one of the most important issues, maybe the most important issue, of this Congress, recent Congresses, maybe future Congresses, because it has to do with whether or not the Republican-marked majority in the Senate are going to just appear to oppose the Iranian agreement or if they are going to stop it.

The Corker-Cardin bill was done, I have no reason to doubt, with the best of intentions. I didn't vote for it. I could see what I was afraid was coming, and it is what has come. But those that voted for it had a legitimate basis for doing so.

Because the President of the United States, Barack Obama, had said this is basically an executive agreement, he doesn't need the Senate's vote. And that is true if it is not a treaty.

We had the Secretary of State say that he was—and he said it—negotiating a nonbinding agreement. Those were the kind of statements from which the Corker-Cardin bill was based.

And so that bill gave the House and the Senate each a vote on something that was considered to be a nonbinding executive agreement with Iran. However, after the U.N. Security Council voted on it, finally Congress got to see the so-called nonbinding agreement.

After the U.N. voted on it, then we keep getting messages about: Gee, you cannot stop this. Because to stop it would put us in breach of the agreement. How can we be in breach of a nonbinding agreement?

Well, the truth came out once we had a chance to read the so-called Iranian deal, Iranian agreement. It is a treaty. There is no question it is a treaty.

I don't care whose law you go under. You cannot amend a treaty with anything that falls short of being a treaty itself.

It is just like here in the House. You can't amend legislation unless you amend it with other legislation, although we have bureaucracies like the EPA and others who have just decided to go off on their own and start legislating against the clear and expressed intent of Congress. But it is not lawful. They are acting unlawfully. They are acting outside the bounds of the Constitution.

The President has usurped power that is not his. He has done so in setting out an amnesty. He spoke it, as any good monarch would, and then the Secretary of Homeland Security put it into memos.

They effectively changed law from what it was on naturalization and immigration passed by Congress, signed by the President. They just changed it with the President speaking it and then Jeh Johnson, the Secretary of Homeland Security, doing memos.

Well, that is one thing. It does damage to this country. But when we are talking about an agreement which, under most everybody's description, will allow Iran to get nuclear weapons, there is disagreement whether that will be later or sooner.

But it seems to be almost unanimous that, yes, it is going to allow them to get nukes, but it will be later. Others of us know. They have cheated on every agreement they have entered since 1979, when they came into existence as mullahs running a country.

Yes, President Carter welcomed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace—a peace of destruction—but they have broken every international agreement in which they participated in since 1979.

They have never been made to account or held accountable for taking our embassy employees hostage for over a year.

For heaven's sake, it is bad enough the administration negotiated with a man that is being charged with desertion in return for giving radical Islamists, murderers, and terrorists back to continue to create havoc and kill Americans and others, but now we are going to give them the ability to have an agreement.

Well, they have broken every agreement they have entered for 36 years. But this one, we think we in the Obama administration are so special that this time they are really not going to breach this agreement, despite the fact that the Ayatollah himself and the other top leaders still say death to America, they still say they are plotting the destruction or overthrow of Israel, they still say they are plotting the destruction of the United States.

And all the time they are doing that, we have people who didn't learn enough from the disastrous agreement with North Korea that gave the North Koreans nuclear weapons. Now they are trying the same strategy.

If we are nice enough and let them have the wherewithal to produce nuclear weapons, then maybe they really won't do that.

And if they do, it will be years down the road. But you don't even know in Congress what the side deals are between the IAEA and Iran.

So where it says that this will hold Iran at bay for 8 years in this provision or until the IAEA states the broader conclusion that Iran's nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes, whichever is sooner, we don't even know what the deal between the IAEA and Iran is.

I heard recently the IAEA has been quoted as saying that, as far as they know, their nuclear material is being used for peaceful purposes, but they haven't been allowed into the material facilities for years.

As soon as this administration were to decide the agreement is finalized and ratified, the IAEA could turn right around and say: As far as we know, it is peaceful materials, but we haven't been allowed into the military facilities where they are doing the real nuclear weapons work. They are going to give us samples, and the samples they gave us showed they are using it for peaceful purposes.

So surely they wouldn't lie, even though they have lied about every international agreement they have entered since 1979.

□ 2015

For some reason, these people think they wouldn't lie now. I am telling you that this Iranian agreement has to be stopped, and the United States voters gave the United States Senate over to

a majority of Republicans in the last elections. As our great President has said, elections have consequences.

Now, he acts like the elections, where we got a majority, Republicans got a majority in the House, that that was not meaningful, and he acts like the voters giving the majority to Republicans in the Senate, that didn't count, but it does count.

The only way it is going to count, it is going to have consequences, is if the Senate stands up—and I would encourage them, their leaders. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I am asking too much to ask that the Republican leadership have the same or close to the same amount of backbone that HARRY REID did when he suspended cloture on confirmations. I hope that is not too much to ask.

Just have HARRY REID—just almost as much as HARRY REID has stood up for things he believes in, we are asking the Senate to, the Republicans in the Senate, please stand up, almost as much as HARRY REID did when he set aside cloture on confirmations.

Now, a number of us sent a letter to Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL, down the hall, imploring him to treat the Iranian agreement as the treaty it is because, if they just go along with the fiction that the Iranian agreement does fall under the Corker bill and, therefore, it takes two-thirds to disapprove in the Senate, two-thirds to disapprove in the House, well, here in the House, we have said the Corker bill doesn't apply at this time for sure. I would submit it doesn't apply at all.

All we have to do is rely on our founding document, the Constitution, ratified, made effective 1789, written 1787, and this article II, section 2, second paragraph, beginning of the paragraph says the President "shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two thirds of the Senators present concur."

The last thing the President wants is for us to follow the Constitution here because the Iranian agreement is a treaty. It modifies other treaties, like the nonproliferation treaty.

It also, as was specifically not contemplated in the Corker bill, it deals with allowing them to have weapons, purchase weapons, armaments, that was not supposed to be in the Iranian agreement.

It also addresses the sanctions allowing them to have over \$100 billion, to \$150 billion, so that they can use it for terrorist activity, so that more Americans and Israeli, Jews, Christians, can be terrorized and killed—and I shouldn't fail to mention moderate Muslims. They are at every bit as much risk—or more—as Christians and Jews because the first people they go after are Muslims that disagree with them.

It is clearly a treaty. All the Senate has to do is take the example that

HARRY REID gave when he set aside cloture with 51 Democratic votes, so they could get through a whole bunch of judges confirmed.

It must have been in hopes that they could have judges get to the bench that might have been stopped otherwise, judges like Justice Ginsburg and Justice Kagan, who violated the law by not disqualifying themselves on the same-sex marriage ruling. They performed same-sex marriages.

The law requires them to, therefore, disqualify themselves because, by their actions and words, they made clear they thought it was constitutional. Their impartiality was beyond being reasonably questioned. They didn't have any impartiality.

I guess, when Leader REID, at the time, got 51 Democrats to remove cloture as a problem for their confirmations, he probably did get some more judges confirmed.

This is so much more serious—even then that, as serious as that is—because, if the Senate does not treat the Iranian agreement as the treaty it is, then the President's already saying he is going to treat it as being approved—ratified is what that means.

When our U.S. administration treats the Iranian agreement as ratified, then when our dear friend in the Middle East, Israel, defends itself, then the United States, under Commander in Chief Barack Obama, will have to be at war with Israel for defending themselves against Iran continuing to move toward nuclear weapons.

Now, it is possible, I don't think it will happen, but it is possible that squeamish in Israel could win the day by saying—when we said "never again" all those years, we meant never again, except we are going to let Iran have nukes and let them nuke us once they have nuclear weapons.

Other than the millions of Jews that may be killed with nuclear weapons Iran has, other than that, we mean never again, but I don't think that is what a majority of Israelis are going to accept.

I have such complete respect for Prime Minister Netanyahu—I disagree with him on issues; that is what friends often do. I don't believe when Prime Minister Netanyahu has said never again, he meant never again after the Iranians nuke Israeli cities. They are going to have to do something.

If the Senate, with the Republican majority, does not stand up and have a ratification vote on this treaty, the Iranian treaty, and in that vote, fail to get the two-thirds to concur, as our Constitution requires, then President Obama is going to go forward as if it were ratified; and the consequences in the Middle East and to the United States will be absolutely devastating.

As bad as the leadership is in North Korea, they are not radical Islamists. The leaders in North Korea do not advocate or at least haven't been advocating suicide bombers. They haven't

been advocating that, if you die blowing up lots of innocent people in Israel or the United States, you go to paradise. They don't advocate that in North Korea.

This is 10 times—many, many, many times worse than North Korea having nukes. This is something that would be written about in history books years from now. If the Republican majority in the Senate doesn't stand up, it will be written that, when Iran got nuclear weapons—because the Republicans that were given the majority in the Senate, they were given the majority in the House, but they refused to use their majority to vote on ratification of what was clearly a treaty.

As a result, the President was able to move forward as if it had been ratified. Iran got nuclear weapons, and millions of people died, and it changed the course of Western civilization forever.

If they have their way, we are headed for a dark age with nukes leading the way, and that will be on our heads. The blood from all those lost lives, all of the murders, all of the bombings, all of those that occur with the tens of billions of dollars that the Obama administration gives to Iran, all of those will not just be on President Obama's head, they will be on all of our heads because America gave us the majority in the House and Senate, and we didn't have the nerve to stop this horrendous, disastrous treaty with Iran.

Mr. Speaker, I even made an offer. I asked if the House just pass my resolution, which laid out this path for stopping this Iranian treaty, but it ended with the Senate calling a vote on ratification as a treaty the Iranian agreement is, and they fail to get two-thirds, then it can't be enforced in any United States court or any court anywhere around the world because our Constitution requires ratification, the Senate took the vote, and they did not ratify it.

I said, if the Senate follows up the House and does that, I won't run again. I know that will make a lot of people happy, especially those that I am making very angry tonight with what I have got to say. I know that there is a debate on, so probably most Republicans that are politically plugged in are watching the debate.

I skipped some of the debate. I cannot avoid taking the opportunity, at least one more time, to beg our Republicans in the Senate to stop this disaster to Western civilization so this chapter never has to be written about the demise of Western civilization going back to when the Senate refused to use their power to stop a horrendous treaty that gave to the biggest supporter of terrorism all of the instrumentality, all of the money they needed to set Western civilization back 100 years.

Here I am, Mr. Speaker. I promised you I wasn't going to take 30 minutes,

but I had to take the time to beg the Senate: Use your majority; 51 votes is all it takes.

Yes, I know, I know, the President normally sends things over that get on the executive calendar, and that is when you vote on things for the President. I get that.

The President sent over this agreement. Now, he didn't call it a treaty, but you should recognize it is a treaty. You have got one of two ways to bring it to the floor. One is you can say it is part of the executive calendar.

He sent it over to us, and under our own procedure, we set that for a vote, but it is a treaty, so we are treating it as a treaty, and it is made through the executive calendar. I get that. You can do that in the Senate. Mr. Speaker, they could.

Or the other way is just to say: Look, the Constitution does not require that the President send us a treaty and say, Here is a treaty, now ratify it, for us to take a vote on a treaty on whether or not to ratify it.

That is not in the Constitution. It is in the Senate rules.

What does it take to suspend the Senate rules? It is 51 votes, and the Senate has that many votes that know how bad this deal is.

□ 2030

So either call it on the Executive Calendar because the President submitted, or suspend both the calendar rule and the cloture rule with 51 votes and then bring it to the floor of the Senate for a vote where you won't get the two-thirds needed to ratify it and we can all proclaim, "This Iranian treaty is dead." Then we don't risk defending Iran against our friend Israel in the beginning of a war that should never have to start.

The alternative to this horrendous treaty is not war. As Michael Oren once said, the day Iran believes the United States is a credible threat to attack its nuclear facilities is the day they stop enriching uranium. And he is exactly right. I hope he doesn't mind my saying that, but he was exactly right.

War is not inevitable. It doesn't need to be. We don't need it. But if this Iranian treaty is not stopped by the Senate, it is going to be a war that we don't see coming—at least our leaders don't—and millions die. It doesn't have to happen. I hope and pray it won't. I urge the Senate to do the right thing: Have a vote on ratification, stop the Iranian treaty, and then we can get a better deal.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2204

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-261) on the resolution (H. Res. 420) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-262) on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. WAGNER (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and for the balance of the week on account of the

passing of her mother, Ruth Ann Trousdale.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE,
Washington, DC, September 16, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Section 202(d) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), 2 U.S.C. §1312(d), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance ("the Board") to issue regulations implementing Section 202 of the CAA relating to sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 ("FMLA"), 29 U.S.C. §§2611 through 2615, made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1312(a)(1).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting "such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached notice of proposed rulemaking to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I request that this notice be published in the House section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period of 60 days after the publication of this notice of proposed rulemaking is being provided before adoption of the rules.

Any inquiries regarding this notice should be addressed to Barbara J. Sapin, Executive Director of the Office of Compliance, Room LA-200, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Washington, DC 20540; 202-724-9250.

Sincerely,

BARBARA L. CAMENS,
*Chair of the Board of Directors,
Office of Compliance.*

FROM THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING (NPRM OR NOTICE), AND REQUEST FOR COMMENTS FROM INTERESTED PARTIES.

Modifications to the rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, as required by 2 U.S.C. §1331, Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, as amended (CAA).

Background:

The purpose of this Notice is to propose modifications to the existing legislative branch FMLA substantive regulations under section 202 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. §1302 et seq.), which applies the rights and protections of sections 101 through 105 of the FMLA to covered employees. These modifications are necessary in order to bring existing legislative branch FMLA regulations (adopted April 16, 1996) in line with recent statutory changes to the FMLA, 29 U.S.C. §2601 et seq.

What is the authority under the CAA for these proposed substantive regulations?

Section 202(a) of the CAA provides that the rights and protections established by sections 101 through 105 of the FMLA (29 U.S.C. §§2611–2615) shall apply to covered employees.

Section 202(d)(1) and (2) of the CAA require that the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board), pursuant to section 1384 of the CAA, issue regulations implementing the rights and protections of the FMLA and that those regulations shall be "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in the subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA] except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown . . . that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." The modifications to the regulations issued by the Board herein are on all matters for which section 202 of the CAA requires regulations to be issued.

Are there currently FMLA regulations in effect?

Yes. On January 22, 1996, the OOC Board adopted and submitted for publication in the Congressional Record the original FMLA final regulations implementing section 202 of the CAA, which applies certain rights and protections of the FMLA. On April 15, 1996, pursuant to section 304(c) of the CAA, the House and the Senate passed resolutions approving the final regulations. Specifically, the Senate passed S. Res. 242, providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to the Senate and the employees of the Senate; the House passed H. Res. 400 providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to the House and the employees of the House; and the House and the Senate passed S. Con. Res. 51, providing for approval of the final regulations applicable to employing offices and employees other than those offices and employees of the House and the Senate. After the Senate and the House passed these resolutions, the OOC Board formally issued the FMLA regulations on April 19, 1996.

What does the FMLA provide?

The FMLA entitles eligible employees of covered employers to take job-protected, unpaid leave, or to substitute appropriate accrued paid leave, for up to a total of 12 workweeks in a 12-month period: for the birth of the employee's son or daughter and to care for the newborn child; for the placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care; to care for the employee's

spouse, parent, son, or daughter with a serious health condition; when the employee is unable to work due to the employee's own serious health condition; or for any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty ("qualifying exigency leave"). An eligible employee may also take up to 26 workweeks of FMLA leave during a "single 12-month period" to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, when the employee is the spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of the servicemember.

FMLA leave may be taken in a block, or under certain circumstances, intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule basis. In addition to providing job-protected family and medical leave, employers must also maintain any preexisting group health plan coverage for an employee on FMLA-protected leave under the same conditions that would apply if the employee had not taken leave. 2 U.S.C. §1312(a)(1) (incorporating 29 U.S.C. §2614). Once the leave period is concluded, the employer is required to restore the employee to the same or an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. *Id.* Under the FMLA statute, but not applicable to the legislative branch, if an employee believes that his or her FMLA rights have been violated, the employee may file a complaint with the Department of Labor (DOL) or file a private lawsuit in federal or state court. Under the CAA, a covered employee of the legislative branch may be awarded damages if the employing office has violated the employee's FMLA rights. The employee is entitled to reimbursement for any monetary loss incurred, equitable relief as appropriate, interest, attorneys' fees, expert witness fees, and court costs. Liquidated damages also may be awarded. *See* 29 U.S.C. §2617.

What changes do the proposed amendments make?

First, these proposed amendments add the military leave provisions of the FMLA enacted under the National Defense Authorization Acts (NDAA) for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010 (Pub.L. 110–181, Div. A, Title V §§585(a)(2), (3)(A)–(D) and Pub.L. 111–84, Div. A, Title V §§565(a)(1)(B) & (4)), which: extend the availability of FMLA leave to family members of the Regular Armed Forces for qualifying exigencies arising out of a servicemember's deployment; define those deployments covered under these provisions; extend FMLA military caregiver leave for family members of current servicemembers to include an injury or illness that existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty; and extend FMLA military caregiver leave to family members of certain veterans with serious injuries or illnesses. This NPRM also sets forth a proposed revision to the regulation defining "spouse" under the FMLA in light of the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule on the definition of spouse and the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell, et al., v. Hodges*, No. 14–556, 2015 WL 2473451 (U.S. June 26, 2015), which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

Why are these changes to the FMLA regulations necessary?

The CAA requires that the FMLA regulations applicable to the legislative branch and promulgated by the OOC, be the same as substantive regulations issued by the Secretary

of Labor, unless good cause is shown for deviation therefrom. On March 8, 2013, the DOL issued its Final Rule implementing its amended FMLA regulations (77 FR 8962), which provide for military caregiver leave for a veteran, qualifying exigency leave for parental care, and special leave calculations for flight crew employees. The OOC Board is required pursuant to the CAA to amend its regulations to achieve parity unless there is good cause shown to deviate from the DOL's regulations.

In addition, the FMLA amendments providing additional rights and protections for servicemembers and their families were enacted into law by the NDAA for Fiscal Years 2008 and 2010. The Congressional committee reports accompanying the bills containing these provisions do not comply with Section 102(b)(3) of the CAA in that, while the bills do contain sections relating "to terms and conditions of employment," the accompanying reports do not "describe the manner in which the provision of the bill [relating to terms and conditions of employment] . . . apply to the legislative branch" or "include a statement of the reasons the provision does not apply [to the legislative branch]" (in the case of a provision not applicable to the legislative branch). 2 U.S.C. §1302(3); House Committee on Armed Services, H.Rpt. 110-146 (May 11, 2007), H.Rpt. 111-166 (June 18, 2009). Consequently, when the FMLA was amended to add these additional rights and protections, Congress failed to make clear its intent as to whether these additional rights and protections apply to the legislative branch.¹ Therefore, as there is no provision in the CAA that states that the CAA will be considered amended whenever the FMLA is amended, these proposed amendments to the regulations are necessary to resolve any ambiguity regarding the applicability of the 2008 and 2010 FMLA amendments to the legislative branch by ensuring that protections under the CAA are in line with existing public and private sector protections under the FMLA.² Accordingly, while these regulations may technically require employing offices to do more than what section 202 of the CAA currently requires, the Board recommends that Congress use its rulemaking authority to clarify that the rights and protections for legislative branch servicemembers and their families have been expanded in a manner consistent with the 2008 and 2010 amendments to the FMLA.

What do the military family leave provisions provide?

Section 585(a) of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2008 amends the FMLA to provide leave to eligible employees of covered employers to care for injured servicemembers and for any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that a covered family member is on active duty or has been notified of an impending call to active duty status in support of a contingency operation (collectively referred to herein as "military family leave"). The provisions of this amendment providing FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember became effective on January 28, 2008, when the law was enacted. The provisions of this amendment providing for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency arising out of a covered family member's active duty (or call to active duty) status were effective on January 16, 2009.

Section 565(a) of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2010, enacted on October 28, 2009, amends the military family leave provisions of the FMLA. Pub. Law 111-84. The Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA expands the availability of qualifying

exigency leave and military caregiver leave. Qualifying exigency leave, which was made available to family members of the National Guard and Reserve components under the Fiscal Year 2008 NDAA, is expanded to include family members of the Regular Armed Forces. The entitlement to qualifying exigency leave is expanded by substituting the term "covered active duty" for "active duty" and defining covered active duty for a member of the Regular Armed Forces as "duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country" and for a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces as "duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a call or order to active duty under a provision of law referred to in section 101(a)(13)(B) of title 10, United States Code." 29 U.S.C. §2611(14). Prior to the Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA amendments, there was no requirement that members of the National Guard and Reserves be deployed to a foreign country.

The Fiscal Year 2010 NDAA amendments expand the definition of a serious injury or illness for military caregiver leave for current members of the Armed Forces to include an injury or illness that existed prior to service and was aggravated in the line of duty on active duty. 29 U.S.C. §2611(18)(A). These amendments also expand the military caregiver leave provisions of the FMLA to allow family members to take military caregiver leave to care for certain veterans. The definition of a "covered servicemember," which is the term the Act uses to indicate the group of military members for whom military caregiver leave may be taken, is broadened to include a veteran with a serious injury or illness who is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, if the veteran was a member of the Armed Forces at any time during the period of five years preceding the date of the medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy. 29 U.S.C. §2611(15)(B). The amendments define a serious injury or illness for a veteran as a "qualifying (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and that manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran." 29 U.S.C. §2611(18)(B).

What is the effect of amending the definition of "spouse"?

Amending the definition of "spouse" brings the regulations in line with the DOL's February 25, 2015 Final Rule and the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*.

On February 25, 2015, the DOL published its Final Rule for 29 CFR 825 in the Federal Register, Vol. 80, No. 37, 9989. This Final Rule changed the definition of "spouse" under the FMLA in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *United States v. Windsor*, which found section 3 of the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) to be unconstitutional. The DOL's Final Rule amends the definition of spouse so that eligible employees in legal same-sex marriages will be able to take FMLA leave to care for their spouse or family member, regardless of where they live.

Also, on June 26, 2015, the United States Supreme Court issued *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*, which requires a state to license a marriage between two people of the same sex and to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage

was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state.

To date, the DOL has not indicated whether it plans to further amend the definition of spouse in light of the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell et al. v. Hodges*. Therefore, the Board invites comment regarding whether the Board should adopt the DOL's current definition of spouse or revise the definition of spouse as the Board has proposed in sections 825.102 and 825.122.

Minor editorial changes are proposed to sections 825.120, 825.121, 825.122, 825.127, 825.201 and 825.202 to make gender neutral references to husbands and wives, and mothers and fathers where appropriate so that they apply equally to opposite-sex and same-sex spouses. The OOC proposes using the terms "spouses" and "parents," as appropriate, in these regulations. These editorial changes do not change the availability of FMLA leave but simply clarify its availability for all eligible employees who are legally married.

Procedural Summary:

How are substantive regulations proposed and approved under the CAA?

Pursuant to section 304 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384, the procedure for proposing and approving substantive regulations provides that:

(1) the Board of Directors proposes substantive regulations and publishes a general notice of proposed rulemaking in the Congressional Record;

(2) there be a comment period of at least 30 days after the date of publication of the general notice of proposed rulemaking;

(3) after consideration of comments by the Board of Directors, the Board adopts regulations and transmits notice of such action (together with the regulations and a recommendation regarding the method for Congressional approval of the regulations) to the Speaker of the House and President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record;

(4) there be committee referral and action on the proposed regulations by resolution in each House, concurrent resolution, or by joint resolution; and

(5) there be final publication of the approved regulations in the Congressional Record, with an effective date prescribed in the final publication.

For more detail, please reference the text of 2 U.S.C. §1384. This Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is step (1) of the outline set forth above.

What is the approach taken by these proposed substantive regulations?

The Board will follow the procedures as enumerated above and as required by statute. The Board will review and respond to any comments received under step (2) of the outline above, and make any changes necessary to ensure that the regulations fully implement section 210 of the CAA and reflect the practices and policies particular to the legislative branch.

Are there substantive differences in the proposed regulations for the House of Representatives, the Senate and other employing offices?

No. The Board of Directors has identified no "good cause" for varying the text of these regulations. Therefore, if these regulations are approved as proposed, there will be one text applicable to all employing offices and covered employees. See 2 U.S.C. §1331(e)(2).

Are these proposed regulations also recommended by the Office of Compliance's Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate, and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives?

As required by section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §1384(b)(1), the substance of these regulations is also recommended by the Executive Director, the Deputy Executive Director for the Senate and the Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

Are these proposed substantive regulations available to persons with disabilities in an alternate format?

This Notice of Proposed Regulations is available on the OOC's web site, www.compliance.gov, which is compliant with section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. §794(d). This Notice can also be made available in large print or Braille. Requests for this Notice in an alternative format should be made to: Annie Leftwood, Executive Assistant, Office of Compliance, 110 2nd Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540; 202-724-9250; TDD: 202-426-1912; FAX: 202-426-1913.

60-DAY COMMENT PERIOD REGARDING THE PROPOSED REGULATIONS

How long do I have to submit comments regarding the proposed regulations?

Comments regarding the OOC's proposed regulations set forth in this Notice are invited for a period of sixty (60) days following the date of the appearance of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

How do I submit comments?

Comments must be made in writing to the Executive Director, Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Room LA-200, Washington, D.C. 20540-1999. Those wishing to receive confirmation of the receipt of their comments are requested to provide a self-addressed, stamped post card with their submission. It is requested, but not required, that an electronic version of any comments be provided either on an accompanying computer disk or e-mailed to the OOC via its web site. Comments may also be submitted by facsimile to the Executive Director at 202-426-1913 (a non-toll-free number).

Am I allowed to view copies of comments submitted by others?

Yes. Copies of submitted comments will be available for review on the OOC's web site at www.compliance.gov, and at the Office of Compliance, 110 Second Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20540-1999, on Monday through Friday (non-federal holidays) between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 4:30 p.m.

Summary:

The Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA), PL 104-1, was enacted into law on January 23, 1995. The CAA, as amended, applies the rights and protections of thirteen federal labor and employment statutes to covered employees and employing offices within the legislative branch of the federal government. Section 202 of the CAA applies to employees covered by the CAA, the rights and protections established by sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), 29 U.S.C. §§2611-2615. The above provisions of section 202 became effective on January 1, 1997. 2 U.S.C. §1312.

The Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance (OOC) is now publishing proposed amended regulations to implement section 202 of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. §§1301-1438, as applied to covered employees of the House of Representatives, the Senate, and certain Congressional instrumentalities listed below.

The purpose of these amended regulations is to implement section 202 of the CAA. In this Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (NPRM or Notice) the Board proposes that virtually identical regulations be adopted for the Sen-

ate, the House of Representatives, and the six Congressional instrumentalities. Accordingly:

(1) *Senate*. It is proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the Senate, and this proposal regarding the Senate entities is recommended by the OOC's Deputy Executive Director for the Senate.

(2) *House of Representatives*. It is further proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to entities within the House of Representatives, and this proposal regarding the House of Representatives entities is recommended by the OOC's Deputy Executive Director for the House of Representatives.

(3) *Certain Congressional instrumentalities*. It is further proposed that the amended regulations as described in this Notice be included in the body of regulations that shall apply to the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol (including the Botanic Garden), the Office of the Attending Physician, and the Office of Compliance; and this proposal regarding these six Congressional instrumentalities is recommended by the OOC's Executive Director.

Dates: Comments are due within 60 days after the date of publication of this Notice in the *Congressional Record*.

Section-by-Section Discussion of Proposed Changes to the FMLA Regulations

The following is a section-by-section discussion of the proposed revisions. Where a change is proposed to a regulatory section, that section is discussed below. However, as the DOL has significantly reorganized its FMLA regulations, which the OOC's proposed regulations mirror, many of the sections are moved into other areas of the subpart. The OOC as a result will use the proposed section and numbers to provide explanation and analysis of changes. In addition, even if a section is not discussed, there may be minor editorial changes or corrections that do not warrant discussion. The titles to each section of the existing regulations are in the form of a question. The proposal would reword each question into the more common format of a descriptive title, and the OOC invites comments on whether this change is helpful. In addition, several sections have been restructured and reorganized to improve the accessibility of the information (e.g., guidance on leave for pregnancy and birth of a child is addressed in one consolidated section; an employing office's notice obligations are combined in one section).

Section by Section Discussion

Subpart A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Section 825.102 Definitions.

For the reasons stated below, the Board finds good cause to depart from the DOL regulations with respect to some of the definitions. For example, the term "Act" as defined in the DOL regulations and referring to the FMLA can be confused with the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA). Accordingly, the definition of "Act" is excluded from the Board's proposed regulations. In addition, to avoid any confusion, the definition for "Administrator" in the DOL regulations has been deleted. Similarly, as there is no airline flight crew covered under the CAA, the definition of "airline flight crew employee" has been deleted in the Board's pro-

posed regulations as have all references to "airline flight crew employee."

Because the DOL definitions of "commerce and industry or activity affecting commerce" and "applicable monthly guarantee" involve concepts that do not apply to employing offices covered by the CAA, the Board finds good cause to exclude these definitions from the proposed regulations.

Because the DOL's definition of "eligible employee" (paragraphs ii(3)(4)(5)(6)(7) in section 825.102) is not consistent with the definition of "eligible employee" in CAA section 202(a)(2)(B), the Board finds good cause to keep the definition of "employee" that is used in the current version of the OOC FMLA regulations and to exclude the definition in the DOL regulation.

Likewise, because the definition of "employer" in CAA section 202(a)(2)(A) is inconsistent with the definition in the DOL regulations, the Board finds good cause to keep the definition of "employing office" found in the current regulations.

In the paragraphs defining "health care provider," to avoid confusion, the Board is substituting "the Secretary" with "the Department of Labor." Thus, the OOC FMLA regulations include in the definition of "health care provider" as "any other person determined by the *Department of Labor* to be capable of providing health care services." 825.102(1)(ii) (emphasis added).

Because these terms are not applicable to employing offices covered by the CAA, the Board has also found good cause to exclude from the proposed OOC regulations the DOL definitions of "person" and "public agency."

Under the paragraph defining "physical or mental disability," the Board has replaced the language from the DOL regulations indicating that 29 CFR part 1630 *defines* these terms with language that states that regulations at 29 CFR part 1630 issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12101 *et seq.*, as amended, *provide guidance* to these terms. (Italics added).

The Board is proposing to adopt the following definition of "spouse":

Spouse means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either: (1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or, (2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

Section 825.105 Counting employees for determining coverage.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC's regulations.

Section 825.106 Joint Employer Coverage.

As joint employment relationships are treated differently under the CAA than by the DOL, the Board finds good cause to keep the language in the current OOC regulations in paragraphs (b) through (e) of this section. Also, as it is not applicable under the CAA, the Board finds good cause to exclude from its definitions language relating to Professional Employer Organizations (PEOs) as joint employers. As the DOL has noted, PEOs contract with private small businesses to provide services that large businesses can afford, but small businesses cannot, such as compliance with government standards, employer liability management, retirement

benefits, and other employment benefits. Congress already provides these services for its employees.

Sections 825.107–825.109 Successor in interest coverage; Public agency coverage; Federal agency coverage.

These sections do not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC's regulations. However, the Board invites comment with respect to whether the DOL section 825.107, Successor in interest coverage, should be adopted for the legislative branch.

Section 825.110 Eligible employee.

The Board sees good cause to exclude from this section the following language from the DOL regulations, which is not applicable to the CAA:

“(3) Is employed at a worksite where 50 or more employees are employed by the employer within 75 miles of that worksite. (See §825.105(b) regarding employees who work outside the U.S.)”

Similarly, the Board sees good cause to exclude from the OOC regulations the following paragraph:

“(e) Whether 50 employees are employed within 75 miles to ascertain an employee's eligibility for FMLA benefits is determined when the employee gives notice of the need for leave. Whether the leave is to be taken at one time or on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis, once an employee is determined eligible in response to that notice of the need for leave, the employee's eligibility is not affected by any subsequent change in the number of employees employed at or within 75 miles of the employee's worksite, for that specific notice of the need for leave. Similarly, an employer may not terminate employee leave that has already started if the employee-count drops below 50. For example, if an employer employs 60 employees in August, but expects that the number of employees will drop to 40 in December, the employer must grant FMLA benefits to an otherwise eligible employee who gives notice of the need for leave in August.”

Section 825.111 Determining whether 50 employees are employed within 75 miles.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Section 825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

References in the DOL's regulations to state law in this section and other sections throughout the DOL's regulations have not been adopted by the Board because state law does not apply to the legislative branch.

Further, in this section and other sections throughout the DOL regulations, any references to spouses who are employed at two different worksites of an employer located more than 75 miles from each other have not been adopted by the Board because such scenarios are not applicable to the legislative branch.

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

Section 825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

Although the DOL amended its FMLA regulations to add computer employees to the list of exempt employees who do not lose their FLSA exempt status despite being provided unpaid FMLA leave, the Board finds good cause not to include “computer employees” to the list of employees who may qualify as exempt from the overtime and minimum wage requirements of the FLSA. In light of the fact that the Board's September 29, 2004 Proposed Regulations implementing exemptions from the overtime pay

requirements under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (FLSA) were never enacted into law and the existing OOC FLSA Regulations do not include exemptions for computer employees, the OOC's FMLA regulations should not include these employees in this section. The Board specifically seeks comments to this departure from the DOL regulations.

Further, any references in this section and other sections throughout the DOL regulations which place limitations on an employee who works for an employing office with fewer than 50 employees have not been adopted by the Board because such limitations do not apply to the legislative branch. See 825.111.

Section 825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

The DOL regulations under section 825.207(f) permit an employer to require that an employee's use of paid compensatory time for a FMLA reason can be used against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

As the Board does not know whether or under what circumstances, employing offices currently allow or require that paid compensatory time be used for a FMLA reason and be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement, the Board proposes that the comparable OOC FMLA regulation read as follows:

Under the FLSA, an employing office always has the right to cash out an employee's compensatory time or to require the employee to use the time. Therefore, if an employee requests and is permitted to use accrued compensatory time to receive pay for time taken off for an FMLA reason, or if the employing office requires such use pursuant to the FLSA, the time taken may be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

The Board seeks comments from interested parties as to whether such a provision is appropriate for the legislative branch.

Section 825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

The Board has changed what it believes to be a typographical error in the DOL regulations and cross references this section with section 825.102 and not section 825.800 when referring to the definition of “group health plan.”

Section 825.215 Equivalent position.

Any references from the DOL regulations in this section and other sections to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (ERISA) have not been adopted by the Board because ERISA does not apply to the legislative branch.

Section 825.216 Limitations on employee's right to reinstatement.

The Board questions whether the following language in section 825.216(a)(3) of the DOL regulations applies to the legislative branch: “On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work on a contract, and after that contract period the contract was awarded to another contractor, the successor contractor may be required to restore the employee if it is a successor employer. See §825.107.”

The Board proposes that the OOC regulations contain the following language and requests comments from interested parties, especially with respect to caucus or committee employees: “On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work for one employing office for a project for a specific time period, and after that time period has ended, the same employee was assigned to work at another employing office on the

same project, the successor employing office may be required to restore the employee if it is a successor employing office.”

Section 825.217 Key employee, general rule.

For the reasons stated above, the Board finds good cause not to follow the DOL changes to section 825.217(b) which exempts computer employees from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA. As the language in the FLSA is inconsistent with the OOC FLSA regulations, the Board believes that this exemption should not be included. The Board requests comments from interested parties on this deletion.

Section 825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

Except for the paragraph related to settlements, as noted below, the Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.220 provides protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights and includes new language discussing remedies when an employing office interferes with an employee's rights under the FMLA. This section further clarifies that the prohibition against interference includes prohibitions against retaliation as well as discrimination. The Board believes that there is good cause to make changes to the DOL's clarification of the settlement provision in paragraph (d) of this section. Sections 1414 and 1415 of the CAA govern awards and settlements made as a result of parties proceeding through an OOC process. While the Board recognizes that parties will now have the right to settle or release FMLA claims without the approval of the OOC or a court, parties seeking to release claims which were raised in an OOC process pursuant to CAA sections 1414 and 1415 must still comply with those provisions. Therefore, the Board proposes to insert the following language: “Except for settlement agreements covered by 1414 and/or 1415 of the Congressional Accountability Act, this does not prevent the settlement or release of FMLA claims by employees based on past employing office conduct without the approval of the Office of Compliance or a court.”

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

Section 825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

The Board proposes to follow the DOL regulations insofar as they consolidate the employing office notice requirements from sections 825.300, 825.301, 825.110 and 825.208 into one comprehensive section addressing an employing office's notice obligations. However, the Board finds good cause not to adopt the DOL regulations in section 825.300(a) General notice, but instead to keep the requirements found in the current OOC regulations under section 825.301(a). The DOL regulations, at section 825.300(a), address the requirement that employing offices post a notice on employee rights and responsibilities under the law and the civil monetary penalty provision in the law for employing offices who willfully violate the posting requirement. In 1995, while developing the current FMLA regulations, the OOC Board determined that “while the CAA incorporates certain specific sections of the FMLA, the CAA explicitly did not incorporate the notice posting and recordkeeping requirements of sections 109 and 106(b) of the FMLA. For the reasons discussed with respect to the FLSA, as the CAA

has not incorporated the notice posting and recordkeeping requirements of the FMLA, the Board will not do so.” As a result, we find no authority that would require employing offices covered under the CAA to provide notice postings of employees’ FMLA rights in the workplace. See November 28, 1995 OOC Notice of Proposed Rulemaking S17628. As to the remainder of the paragraphs in this section, the Board finds no reason to depart from the amendments adopted by the DOL.

The Board proposes to adopt section 825.300 regarding the eligibility notice (825.300(b)); the rights and responsibility notice (825.300(c)); the designation notice (825.300(d)); and the consequences of failing to provide notice (825.300(e)).

(b) Eligibility notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. The Board also proposes to adopt the DOL regulations consolidating existing eligibility notice requirements in current sections 825.110 and 825.301 into one section, section 825.300(b) of the OOC regulations and to strengthen and clarify them. For example, section 825.300(b)(1) of the DOL regulations requires an employer to advise an employee of his or her eligibility status when the employee requests leave under the FMLA. The regulations extend the time frame for an employer to respond to an employee’s request for FMLA leave from two business days to five business days. Further, the DOL regulations in section 825.300(b)(2) specify what information an employer must convey to an employee as to eligibility status. The Board also proposes in its regulations that an employing office must provide reasons to an employee if he or she is not eligible for FMLA leave, as do the DOL regulations. The regulations limit that notification to any one of the potential reasons why an employee fails to meet the eligibility requirements.

Further, the proposed OOC regulations require employing offices to include in the eligibility notice an explanation of conditions applicable to the use of paid leave that runs concurrently with unpaid FMLA. While this requirement is in the current regulations, it is expanded to require that employing offices also notify employees of their continuing entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave if they do not comply with an employing office’s required conditions for use of paid leave.

(c) Rights and responsibilities notice.

The Board is following the DOL regulations separating the notice of rights and responsibilities from the notice of eligibility. Accordingly, if the employee is eligible for FMLA leave, section 825.300(c) of the OOC regulations require the employing office to provide the employee with specific notice of his or her rights and obligations under the law and the consequences of failing to meet those obligations.

To simplify the timing of the notice of rights and responsibilities and to avoid unnecessary administrative burden on employing offices, section 825.300(c)(1) of the Board’s proposed regulations requires employing offices to provide this notice to employees at the same time they provide the eligibility notice. Additionally, if the information in the notice of rights and responsibilities changes, section 825.300(c) requires the employing office to notify the employee of any changes within five business days of the first notice of the need for FMLA leave subsequent to any change. This timing requirement will ensure that employees receive timely notice of the expectations and obligations associated with their FMLA leave each

leave year and also receive prompt notice of any change in those rights or responsibilities when leave is needed during the leave year.

In this section, employing offices are required to notify employees of the method used for establishing the 12-month period for FMLA entitlement, or, in the case of military caregiver leave, the start date of the “single 12-month period.”

Employing offices are not, however, required to provide the certification form with the notice of rights and responsibilities. Notice of any changes in the rights and responsibilities notice must be provided within five business days of the first notice of an employee’s need for leave subsequent to any change. Electronic distribution of the notice of rights and responsibilities is allowed, so long as the employing office can demonstrate that the employee (who may already be on leave and who may not have access to employing office-provided computers) has access to the information electronically.

(d) Designation notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this requirement. Section 825.300(d) outlines the requirements of the designation notice an employing office must provide to an employee. Once the employing office has enough information to determine whether the leave qualifies as FMLA leave, the employing office must notify the employee within five business days of making the determination whether the leave has or has not been designated as FMLA leave. This is an increase from the two-day time frame in the current OOC regulations. Further, only one designation notice is required for each FMLA-qualifying reason per leave year, regardless of whether the leave is taken as a continuous block of leave or on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis.

Further, the employing office must inform the employee of the number of hours that would be designated as FMLA leave, only upon employee request and no more often than every 30 days if FMLA leave was taken during that period. To the extent it is not possible to provide such information (such as in the case of unforeseeable intermittent leave), the employing office is required to provide such information to the employee every 30 days if the employee took leave during the 30-day period. The employing office is permitted to notify the employee of the hours counted against the FMLA leave entitlement orally and follow up with written notification on a pay stub at the next payday (unless the next payday is in less than one week, in which case the notice must be no later than the subsequent payday). If the employing office requires that paid leave be substituted for unpaid leave, or that paid leave taken under an existing leave plan be counted as FMLA leave, the employing office must inform the employee of this designation at the time the leave is designated as FMLA leave.

Although the designation notice has to be in writing, it may be in any form, including a notation on the employee’s pay stub, and if the leave is not designated as FMLA leave, the notice to the employee may be in the form of a simple written statement. Employing offices can provide an employee with both the eligibility and designation notice at the same time in cases where the employing office has adequate information to designate leave as FMLA leave when an employee requests the leave.

Employing offices must provide written notice of any requirement for a fitness-for-duty certification, including whether the fit-

ness-for-duty certification must address the employee’s ability to perform the essential functions of the employee’s position and, if so, to provide a list of the essential functions of the employee’s position with the designation notice. If the employee handbook or other written documents clearly provides that a fitness-for-duty certificate will be required, written notice is not required, but oral notice must be provided.

Finally, the employing office is required to notify the employee if the information provided in the designation notice changes. For example, if an employee exhausts his or her FMLA leave entitlement and the leave will no longer be designated as FMLA leave, the employing office must provide the employee with written notice of this change consistent with this section.

(e) Consequences of failing to provide notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.300(e) clarifies that failure to comply with the notice requirements set forth in this section could constitute interference with, restraint of, or denial of the use of FMLA leave. The Board proposes that the following language be included in the OOC regulations:

Consequences of failing to provide notice.

Failure to follow the notice requirements set forth in this section may constitute an interference with, restraint, or denial of the exercise of an employee’s FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c).

Section 825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.301 addresses an employing office’s obligations regarding timely designation of leave as FMLA-qualifying and reiterates the requirement to notify the employee of the designation within five business days. Among other things, this section requires that the employing office’s designation decision be based only on information received from the employee or the employee’s representative and also provides that, if the employing office does not have sufficient information about the employee’s reason for leave, the employing office should inquire further of the employee or of the employee’s spokesperson.

Section 825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. In general, Section 825.302 addresses an employee’s obligation to provide notice of the need for foreseeable FMLA leave. This includes requiring an employee to give at least 30 days notice when the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable at least 30 days in advance or “as soon as practicable” if leave is foreseeable but 30 days notice is not practicable. In such cases, employees must respond to requests from employing offices to explain why it was not possible to give 30 days notice. Further, the language in this section defines “as soon as practicable” to be “as soon as both possible and practical, taking into account all of the facts and circumstances in the individual case.” This is a change from defining “as soon as practicable” as “ordinarily within one or two business days.”

Further, when an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason,

the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA but must provide: sufficient information that indicates that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job, or if the leave is for a family member, that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities; the anticipated duration of the absence; and whether the employee or the employee's family member intends to visit a health care provider or has a condition for which the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider. The regulations set forth the types of information that an employee may have to provide in order to put an employing office on notice of the employee's need for FMLA-protected leave. Rather than establish a list of information that must be provided in all cases, the regulations provide additional guidance to employees so that they would know what information to provide to their employing offices. The nature of the information necessary to put the employing office on notice of the need for FMLA leave will vary depending on the circumstances.

Employees seeking leave for previously certified FMLA leave must inform the employing office that the leave is for a condition, covered servicemember's serious injury or illness, or qualifying exigency that was previously certified or for which the employee has previously taken FMLA leave.

While an employee must still comply with the employing office's usual notice and procedural requirements for calling in absences and requesting leave, under the new regulations, language stating that an employing office cannot delay or deny FMLA leave if an employee fails to follow such procedures has been deleted. However, employing offices may need to inquire further to determine for which reason the leave is being taken, and employees will be required to respond to such inquiries.

Additionally, the regulations make clear that the requirement that an employee and employing office attempt to work out a schedule without unduly disrupting the employing office's operations applies only to military caregiver leave. It does not apply to qualifying exigency leave.

Section 825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.303 addresses an employee's obligation to provide notice when the need for FMLA leave is unforeseeable. Section 825.303 retains the current standard that employees must provide notice of their need for unforeseeable leave "as soon as practicable under the facts and circumstances of the particular case," but instead of expecting employees to give notice "within no more than one or two working days of learning of the need for leave," in "unusual circumstances," notice should be provided within the time prescribed by the employing office's usual and customary notice requirements applicable to such leave. Section 825.303 also retains the current standard that employees need not assert their rights under the FMLA or even mention the FMLA to put employing offices on notice of the need for unforeseeable FMLA leave, but adds the same language used in proposed section 825.302 clarifying what information must be provided in order to give sufficient notice to the employing office of the need for FMLA leave. New regulations in section 825.303 add that the employee has an obligation to respond to an

employing office's questions designed to determine whether leave is FMLA-qualifying, explaining that calling in "sick," without providing additional information, will not be sufficient notice.

Section 825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.304 follows the DOL's reorganization of the rules that are applicable to leave foreseeable at least 30 days in advance, leave foreseeable less than 30 days in advance, and unforeseeable leave. This section retains language that FMLA leave cannot be delayed due to lack of required employee notice if the employing office has not complied with its notice requirements.

Section 825.305 Certification, general rule.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Under the FMLA, as applied under the CAA, employing offices are permitted to require that employees provide a certification from their health care provider (or their family member's health care provider, as appropriate) to support the need for leave due to a serious health condition. Section 825.305 sets forth the general rules governing employing office requests for medical certification to substantiate an employee's need for FMLA leave due to a serious health condition. Military family leave provisions have been added to permit employing offices to require employees to provide a certification in the case of leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. Section 825.305 applies generally to all types of certification. In most cases, for example, former references to "medical certification" have been changed to "certification."

In section 825.305, the employing office should request that an employee furnish certification from a health care provider at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave or within five business days thereafter, or, in the case of unforeseen leave, within five business days after the leave commences. This time frame has been increased from two to five business days after notice of the need for FMLA leave is provided. Further, the employing office may request certification at some later date if the employing office later has reason to question the appropriateness of the leave or its duration. This section also adds a 15-day time period for providing a requested certification to all cases.

Definitions of incomplete and insufficient certifications have been added in this section, as well as a procedure for curing an incomplete or insufficient certification. This procedure requires that an employing office notify the employee in writing as to what additional information is necessary for the medical certification and provides seven calendar days in which the employee must provide the additional information. If an employee fails to submit a complete and sufficient certification, despite the opportunity to cure the deficiency, the employing office may deny the request for FMLA leave.

Section 825.305 also deletes an earlier provision that if a less stringent medical certification standard applies under the employing office's sick leave plan, only that lesser standard may be required when the employee substitutes any form of paid leave for FMLA leave and replaces it with a provision allowing employing offices to require a new certification on an annual basis for conditions lasting beyond a single leave year.

Section 825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments with respect to this section. Section 825.306 addresses the information an employing office can require in the medical certification to substantiate the existence of a serious health condition (of the employee or a family member) and the employee's need for leave due to the condition, and adds: the health care provider's specialization; guidance as to what may constitute appropriate medical facts, including that a health care provider may provide a diagnosis; and whether intermittent or reduced schedule leave is medically necessary. Section 825.306 clarifies that where a serious health condition may also be a disability, employing offices are not prevented from following the procedures under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as applied under the CAA, for requesting medical information. Section 825.306 also contains new language that employing offices may not require employees to sign a release of their medical information as a condition of taking FMLA leave.

This section does not apply to the military family leave provisions. The Board's proposed regulations have revised the current optional certification form into two separate optional forms, one for the employee's own serious health condition and one for the serious health condition of a covered family member.

Section 825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL's amendments covered under this section. Section 825.307 addresses the employing office's ability to clarify or authenticate a complete and sufficient FMLA certification. Section 825.307 defines the terms "authentication" and "clarification." "Authentication" involves providing the health care provider with a copy of the certification and requesting verification that the information on the form was completed and/or authorized by the provider. The regulations add that no additional medical information may be requested and the employee's permission is not required. In contrast, "clarification" involves contacting the employee's health care provider in order to understand the handwriting on the medical certification or to understand the meaning of a response. As is the case with authentication, no additional information beyond that included in the certification form may be requested. Any contact with the employee's health care provider must comply with the requirements of the HIPAA Privacy Rule.

It is no longer necessary that the employing office utilize a health care provider to make the contact with the employee's health care provider, but the regulations do clarify who may contact the employee's health care provider and ensure that the employee's direct supervisor is not the point of contact. Employee consent to the contact is no longer required. However, before the employing office contacts the employee's health care provider for clarification or authentication of the FMLA certification, the employee must first be given an opportunity to cure any deficiencies in the certification. Section 825.307 also provides requirements for an employing

office's request for a second opinion, and adds language requiring the employee or the employee's family member to authorize his or her health care provider to release relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if such information is requested by the second opinion health care provider. Section 825.307 also increases the number of days the employing office has to provide an employee with a requested copy of a second or third opinion from two to five business days. This section of the regulations does not apply to the military family leave provisions.

Section 825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL amendments covered in this section. Section 825.308 of the regulations addresses the employing office's ability to seek recertification of an employee's medical condition. This section has been reorganized to clarify how often employing offices may seek recertification in situations where the minimum duration of the condition, as opposed to the duration of the period of incapacity, exceeds 30 days. Thus, an employing office may request recertification no more often than every 30 days and only in connection with an absence by the employee, unless the medical certification indicates that the minimum duration of the condition is more than 30 days, then an employing office must wait until that minimum duration expires before requesting a recertification. In all cases, an employing office may request a recertification of a medical condition every six months in connection with an absence by the employee. An employing office may request recertification in less than 30 days if, among other things, the employee requests an extension of leave or circumstances described by the previous certification change significantly. This section clarifies that an employing office may request the same information on recertification as required for the initial certification and the employee has the same obligation to cooperate in providing recertification as he or she does in providing the initial certification.

Section 825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

The Board proposes to adopt the DOL's regulations under this section. Under the military family leave provisions of the DOL regulations, an employing office may require that leave taken because of a qualifying exigency be supported by a certification and require that the employee provide a copy of the covered military member's active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the covered military member is on active duty (or has been notified of an impending call or order to active duty) in support of a contingency operation, as well as the dates of the covered military member's active duty service. While a form requesting this basic information may be used by the employing office, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section and in all instances the information on the form must relate only to the qualifying exigency for which the current need for leave exists. Section 825.309 also establishes the verification process for certifications.

This section also provides that the information required in a certification need only be provided to the employing office the first time an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency arising out of a par-

ticular active duty or call to active duty of a covered military member. While additional information may be needed to provide certification for subsequent requests for exigency leave, an employee is only required to give a copy of the active duty orders to the employing office once. A copy of new active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military only needs to be provided to the employing office if the need for leave because of a qualifying exigency arises out of a different active duty or call to active duty order of the same or a different covered military member. See DOL (Form WH-384) and OOC regulations proposed Form E.

An employing office may contact an appropriate unit of the Department of Defense to request verification that a covered military member has been called to active duty status (or notified of an impending call to active duty status) in support of a contingency operation. Again, no additional information may be requested by the employing office and the employee's permission is not required. This verification process will protect employees from unnecessary intrusion while still providing a useful tool for employing offices to verify the certification information given to them.

Consistent with the amendments to section 825.126(b)(6), with respect to Rest and Recuperation qualifying exigency leave, the employing office is permitted to request a copy of the military member's Rest and Recuperation orders, or other documentation issued by the military indicating that the military member has been granted Rest and Recuperation leave, as well as the dates of the leave, in order to determine the employee's specific qualifying exigency leave period available for Rest and Recuperation. Employing offices may also contact the appropriate unit of the DOD to verify that the military member is on active duty or call to active duty status. The employee's permission is not required to conduct such verifications. The employing office may not, however, request any additional information.

Section 825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. While the military family leave provisions of the NDAA amended the FMLA's certification requirements to permit an employer to request certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, the FMLA's existing certification requirements focus on providing information related to a serious health condition—a term that is not necessarily relevant to leave taken to care for a covered servicemember. At the same time, the military family leave provisions of the NDAA do not explicitly require that a sufficient certification for purposes of military caregiver leave provide relevant information regarding the covered servicemember's serious injury or illness. Section 825.310 of the DOL's regulations provide that when leave is taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an employer may require an employee to support his or her request for leave with a sufficient certification. An employer may require that certain necessary information to support the request for leave be supported by a certification from one of the following authorized health care providers: (1) A DOD health care provider; (2) a VA health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; or (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider. Sections

825.310(b)–(c) of the DOL regulations set forth the information an employing office may request from an employee (or the authorized health care provider) in order to support the employee's request for leave. The DOL developed a new optional form, Form WH-385, which the Board adopted for proposed OOC Form F. The Board agrees that OOC Form F may be used to obtain appropriate information to support an employee's request for leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. However, an employing office may use any form containing the following basic information: (1) whether the servicemember has incurred a serious injury or illness; (2) whether the injury or illness may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating; (3) whether the injury or illness was incurred by the member in line of duty on active duty; and (4) whether the servicemember is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise on outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list. However, as is the case for any required certification for leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition, no information may be required beyond that specified above. In all instances, the information on any required certification must relate only to the serious injury or illness for which the current need for leave exists.

Additionally, section 825.310 of the proposed OOC regulations provides that an employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification "invitational travel orders" (ITOs) or "invitational travel authorizations" (ITAs) issued by the DOD for a family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. If an employee will need leave to care for a covered servicemember beyond the expiration date specified in an ITO or an ITA, the regulations provide that an employing office may request further certification from the employee. Lastly this section provides that in all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave.

The regulations also permit an eligible employee who is a spouse, parent, son, daughter or next of kin of a covered servicemember to submit an ITO or ITA issued to another family member as sufficient certification for the duration of time specified in the ITO or ITA, even if the employee seeking leave is not the named recipient on the ITO or ITA. The regulations further permit an employing office to authenticate and clarify medical certifications submitted to support a request for leave to care for a covered servicemember using the procedures applicable to FMLA leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition. However, unlike the recertification, second and third opinion processes used for other types of FMLA leave, recertification, second and third opinions are not warranted for purposes of military caregiver leave when the certification has been completed by a DOD health care provider, a VA health care provider, a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider, or a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider, but are permitted when the certification has been completed by a health care provider who is not affiliated with the DOD, VA, or TRICARE.

An employee seeking to take military caregiver leave must provide the requested certification to the employing office within the time frame requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the employing office's request), unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee's diligent, good faith efforts.

Section 825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL's regulations under this section. Section 825.312 addresses the fitness-for-duty certification that an employee may be required to submit upon return to work from FMLA leave. This section clarifies that employees have the same obligation to provide a complete certification or provide sufficient authorization to the health care provider in order for that person to provide the information directly to the employing office in the fitness-for-duty certification process as they do in the initial certification process. The employing office may require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job, as long as the employing office provides the employee with a list of those essential job functions no later than the employing office provides the designation notice. The designation notice must indicate that the certification address the employee's ability to perform those essential functions. An employing office may contact the employee's health care provider directly, consistent with the procedure in proposed section 825.307(a), for purposes of authenticating or clarifying the fitness-for-duty certification. The employing office is required to advise the employee in the eligibility notice required by proposed section 825.300(b) if the employing office will require a fitness-for-duty certification to return to work. Employees are not entitled to the reinstatement protections of the Act if they do not provide the required fitness-for-duty certification or request additional FMLA leave.

Section 825.312 also requires that the employing office uniformly apply its policies permitting fitness-for-duty certifications to intermittent and reduced schedule leave users when reasonable safety concerns are present, but limits the frequency of such certifications to once in a 30-day period in which intermittent or reduced schedule leave was taken. "Reasonable safety concerns" means a reasonable belief of a significant risk of harm to the individual employee or others. In determining whether reasonable safety concerns exist, an employing office should consider the nature and severity of the potential harm and the likelihood that potential harm will occur. This is meant to be a high standard. Thus, the determination that there are reasonable safety concerns must rely on objective factual evidence, not subjective perceptions. Employing offices cannot, under this section, require such certifications in all intermittent or reduced leave schedule situations, but only where reasonable safety concerns are present. There is no fitness-for-duty certification form, nor is there any specific format such a certification must follow as long as it contains the required information. An employing office is allowed to require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of his or her position. However, the employing office can choose to accept a simple statement in place of the fitness-for-duty certification (or not require a fitness-for-duty certification at all).

There is no second and third opinion process for a fitness-for-duty certification. A fitness-for-duty certification need only address the condition for which FMLA leave was taken and the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the job. The employee's health care provider determines whether a separate examination is required in order to determine the employee's fitness to return to duty under the FMLA. A medical examination at the employing office's expense may be required only after the employee has returned from FMLA leave and must be job-related and consistent with business necessity as required by the ADA. The employing office cannot delay the employee's return to work while arranging for and having the employee undergo a medical examination.

Section 825.313 Failure to provide certification.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.313 explains the consequences for an employee who fails to provide medical certification in a timely manner. An employing office may "deny" FMLA leave until the required certification is provided. This section also addresses the consequences of failing to provide timely recertification. Section 825.313 also clarifies that recertification does not apply to leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember.

Employees must be provided at least 15 calendar days to provide the requested certification, and are entitled to additional time when they are unable to meet that deadline despite their diligent, good-faith efforts. An employee's certification (or recertification) is not untimely until that period has passed. Employing offices may deny FMLA protection when an employee fails to provide a timely certification or recertification, but it does not require employing offices to do so. Employing offices always have the option of accepting an untimely certification and not denying FMLA protection to any absences that occurred during the period in which the certification was delayed.

Subpart D—Enforcement Mechanisms

Section 825.400 Enforcement, general rules.

The Board finds good cause not to adopt DOL section 825.400 because the enforcement of FMLA violations is different in the legislative branch as opposed to the workforces regulated by the DOL. The OOC section 825.400 remains the same.

Sections 825.401–825.404 Filing a complaint with the Federal Government; Violations of the posting requirement; Appealing the assessment of a penalty for willful violation of the posting requirement; Consequences for an employer when not paying the penalty assessment after a final order is issued.

These sections do not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Subpart E—Recordkeeping Requirements

Section 825.500 Recordkeeping requirements.

This section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Subpart F—Special Rules Applicable to Employees of Schools

Sections 825.600–825.604 Special rules for school employees, definitions; Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave; Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term; Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave; Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under these sections. Sections 825.600–825.604 cover the special rules applicable to instructional employees. When an eligible instructional employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced schedule basis to care for a covered servicemember, the employee may choose to either (1) take leave for a period or periods of particular duration; or (2) transfer temporarily to an available alternative position with equivalent pay and benefits that better accommodates recurring periods of leave.

These sections also extend some of the limitations on leave near the end of an academic term to leave requested during this period to care for a covered servicemember. If an instructional employee begins leave for a purpose other than the employee's own serious health condition during the five-week period before the end of the term, the employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the leave will last more than two weeks and the employee would return to work during the two-week period before the end of the term. Further, an employing office may require an instructional employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the employee begins leave that will last more than five working days for a purpose other than the employee's own serious health condition during the three-week period before the end of the term. The types of leave that are subject to the limitations are: (1) leave because of the birth of a son or daughter, (2) leave because of the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care, (3) leave taken to care for a spouse, parent, or child with a serious health condition, and (4) leave taken to care for a covered servicemember.

Subpart G—Effect of Other Laws, Employing Office Practices, and Collective Bargaining Agreements on Employee Rights Under FMLA

Section 825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.700 provides that an employing office may not limit the rights established by the FMLA through an employment benefit program or plan, but an employing office may provide greater leave rights than the FMLA requires. This section also provides that an employing office may amend existing leave programs, so long as they comply with the FMLA, and that nothing in the FMLA is intended to discourage employing offices from adopting or retaining more generous leave policies. The Board proposes to follow the DOL regulations and delete from the current OOC section 825.700(a) the following: "If an employee takes paid or unpaid leave and the employing office does not designate the leave as FMLA leave, the leave taken does not count against an employee's FMLA entitlement." As explained by the DOL, this last sentence of section 825.700(a) was deleted in order to conform to the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in

Ragsdale v. Wolverine World Wide, 535 U.S. 81 (2002), which specifically invalidated this provision.

Section 825.701 Interaction with State laws.

This DOL section does not apply to the CAA and will remain reserved in the OOC regulations.

Section 825.702 Interaction with Federal and State anti-discrimination laws.

The Board proposes to adopt the amendments covered in the DOL regulations under this section. Section 825.702 addresses the interaction between the FMLA and other Federal and State antidiscrimination laws. Section 825.702 discusses the interaction between the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA) and the FMLA. Under USERRA, a returning servicemember would be entitled to FMLA leave if, after including the hours that he or she would have worked for the civilian employing office during the period of military service, the employee would have met the FMLA eligibility threshold. This is not an expansion of FMLA rights through regulation; this is a requirement of USERRA.

With respect to the interaction of the FMLA and ADA, where both laws may apply, the applicability of each statute needs to be evaluated independently.

Further, the reference to employers who receive Federal financial assistance and employers who contract with the Federal government in this section has not been adopted by the Board because federal contractor employers are not covered by the CAA.

In its final regulations, the DOL removed the following optional-use forms and notices from the Appendix of the regulations, but continued to make them available to the public on the WHD Web site: Forms WH-380-E (Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition); WH-380-F (Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition); WH-381 (Notice of Eligibility and Rights & Responsibilities); WH-382 (Designation Notice); WH-384 (Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave); WH-385 (Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Current Servicemember for Military Family Leave); and WH-385-V (Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave). The Board proposes to revise its forms and to make the following OOC forms available on its website: Form A: Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition; Form B: Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition; Form C: Notice of Eligibility and Rights and Responsibilities; Form D: Designation Notice to Employee of FMLA Leave; Form E: Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave; Form F: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Covered Servicemember for Military Family Leave; and Form G: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave. The Board's proposed forms now include references to the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act of 2008, which is made applicable to employees covered under the CAA. The Board invites comment on whether these forms should be included in the regulations, or whether covered employees and employing offices should be directed to the DOL website for the appropriate forms. In any event, the use of a specific set of forms is optional and other forms requiring the same information may be used instead. In proposing these revised forms,

the Board recognizes that the use of specific forms play a key role in employing offices' compliance with the FMLA and employees' ability to take FMLA protected leave when needed.

SUBSTANTIVE REGULATIONS PROPOSED BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE EXTENDING RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL ACT OF 1996, AS AMENDED

FINAL REGULATIONS

Part 825—Family and Medical Leave

825.1 Purpose and Scope.

Subpart A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

825.100 The Family and Medical Leave Act.

825.101 Purpose of the FMLA.

825.102 Definitions.

825.103 [Reserved]

825.104 Covered employing offices.

825.105 Counting employees for determining coverage.

825.106 Joint employer coverage.

825.107 Successor in interest coverage.

825.108–825.109 [Reserved]

825.110 Eligible employee.

825.111 [Reserved]

825.112 Qualifying reasons for leave, general rule.

825.113 Serious health condition.

825.114 Inpatient care.

825.115 Continuing treatment.

825.116–825.118 [Reserved]

825.119 Leave for treatment of substance abuse.

825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

825.121 Leave for adoption or foster care.

825.122 Definitions of covered servicemember, spouse, parent, son or daughter, next of kin of a covered servicemember, adoption, foster care, son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, son or daughter of a covered servicemember, and parent of a covered servicemember.

825.123 Unable to perform the functions of the position.

825.124 Needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember.

825.125 Definition of health care provider.

825.126 Leave because of a qualifying exigency.

825.127 Leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness (military caregiver leave).

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

825.200 Amount of leave.

825.201 Leave to care for a parent.

825.202 Intermittent leave or reduced leave schedule.

825.203 Scheduling of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.204 Transfer of an employee to an alternative position during intermittent leave or reduced schedule leave.

825.205 Increments of FMLA leave for intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

825.208 [Reserved]

825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

825.210 Employee payment of group health benefit premiums.

825.211 Maintenance of benefits under multi-employer health plans.

825.212 Employee failure to pay health plan premium payments.

825.213 Employing office recovery of benefit costs.

825.214 Employee right to reinstatement.

825.215 Equivalent position.

825.216 Limitations on an employee's right to reinstatement.

825.217 Key employee, general rule.

825.218 Substantial and grievous economic injury.

825.219 Rights of a key employee.

825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave.

825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

825.305 Certification, general rule.

825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

825.311 Intent to return to work.

825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

825.313 Failure to provide certification.

Subpart D—ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

825.400 Enforcement of FMLA rights, as made applicable by the CAA.

825.401–825.404 [Reserved]

Subpart E—[Reserved]

Subpart F—SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS

825.600 Special rules for school employees, definitions.

825.601 Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave.

825.602 Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term.

825.603 Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave.

825.604 Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

Subpart G—EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS, EMPLOYING OFFICE PRACTICES, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS ON EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA

825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

825.701 [Reserved]

825.702 Interaction with anti-discrimination laws as applied by section 201 of the CAA

Subpart H—[Reserved]

FORMS

Form A: Certification of Health Care Provider for Employee's Serious Health Condition;

Form B: Certification of Health Care Provider for Family Member's Serious Health Condition;

Form C: Notice of Eligibility and Rights & Responsibilities;

Form D: Designation Notice to Employee of FMLA Leave;

Form E: Certification of Qualifying Exigency for Military Family Leave;

Form F: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of Covered Servicemember for Military Family Leave;

Form G: Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave.

825.1 Purpose and scope.

(a) Section 202 of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA) (2 U.S.C. 1312) applies the rights and protections of sections 101 through 105 of the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA) (29 U.S.C. 2611-2615) to covered employees. (The term "covered employee" is defined in section 101(3) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1301(3)). See 825.102 of these regulations for that definition.) The purpose of this part is to set forth the regulations to carry out the provisions of section 202 of the CAA.

(b) These regulations are issued by the Board of Directors (Board) of the Office of Compliance, pursuant to sections 202(d) and 304 of the CAA, which direct the Board to promulgate regulations implementing section 202 that are "the same as substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA] except insofar as the Board may determine, for good cause shown . . . that a modification of such regulations would be more effective for the implementation of the rights and protections under this section." The regulations issued by the Board herein are on all matters for which section 202 of the CAA requires regulations to be issued. Specifically, it is the Board's considered judgment, based on the information available to it at the time of the promulgation of these regulations, that, with the exception of regulations adopted and set forth herein, there are no other "substantive regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Labor to implement the statutory provisions referred to in subsection (a) [of section 202 of the CAA]."

(c) In promulgating these regulations, the Board has made certain technical and nomenclature changes to the regulations as promulgated by the Secretary. Such changes are intended to make the provisions adopted accord more naturally to situations in the legislative branch. However, by making these changes, the Board does not intend a substantive difference between these regulations and those of the Secretary from which they are derived. Moreover, such changes, in and of themselves, are not intended to constitute an interpretation of the regulation or of the statutory provisions of the CAA upon which they are based.

SUBPART A—COVERAGE UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

825.100 The Family and Medical Leave Act.

(a) The Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), allows eligible employees of an employing office to take job-protected, unpaid leave, or to substitute appropriate paid leave if the employee has earned or accrued it, for up to a total of 12 workweeks in any 12 months (see 825.200(b)) because of the birth of a child and to care for the newborn child, because of the placement of a child with the employee for adoption or foster care, because the employee is needed to care for a family member

(child, spouse, or parent) with a serious health condition, because the employee's own serious health condition makes the employee unable to perform the functions of his or her job, or because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty). In addition, eligible employees of a covered employing office may take job-protected, unpaid leave, or substitute appropriate paid leave if the employee has earned or accrued it, for up to a total of 26 workweeks in a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. In certain cases, FMLA leave may be taken on an intermittent basis rather than all at once, or the employee may work a part-time schedule.

(b) An employee on FMLA leave is also entitled to have health benefits maintained while on leave as if the employee had continued to work instead of taking the leave. If an employee was paying all or part of the premium payments prior to leave, the employee would continue to pay his or her share during the leave period. The employing office or a disbursing or other financial office of the House of Representatives or [italicized language is in only the House and Instrumentalities versions of the regulations] the Senate may recover its share only if the employee does not return to work for a reason other than the serious health condition of the employee or the employee's covered family member, the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or another reason beyond the employee's control.

(c) An employee generally has a right to return to the same position or an equivalent position with equivalent pay, benefits, and working conditions at the conclusion of the leave. The taking of FMLA leave cannot result in the loss of any benefit that accrued prior to the start of the leave.

(d) The employing office generally has a right to advance notice from the employee. In addition, the employing office may require an employee to submit certification to substantiate that the leave is due to the serious health condition of the employee or the employee's covered family member, due to the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or because of a qualifying exigency. Failure to comply with these requirements may result in a delay in the start of FMLA leave. Pursuant to a uniformly applied policy, the employing office may also require that an employee present a certification of fitness to return to work when the absence was caused by the employee's serious health condition (see 825.312 and 825.313). The employing office may delay restoring the employee to employment without such certificate relating to the health condition which caused the employee's absence.

825.101 Purpose of the FMLA.

(a) FMLA is intended to allow employees to balance their work and family life by taking reasonable unpaid leave for medical reasons, for the birth or adoption of a child, for the care of a child, spouse, or parent who has a serious health condition, for the care of a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, or because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status. The FMLA is intended to balance the demands of the workplace with the needs of families, to promote the stability and economic security

of families, and to promote national interests in preserving family integrity. It was intended that the FMLA accomplish these purposes in a manner that accommodates the legitimate interests of employing offices, and in a manner consistent with the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment in minimizing the potential for employment discrimination on the basis of sex, while promoting equal employment opportunity for men and women.

(b) The FMLA was predicated on two fundamental concerns—the needs of the American workforce, and the development of high-performance organizations. Increasingly, America's children and elderly are dependent upon family members who must spend long hours at work. When a family emergency arises, requiring workers to attend to seriously-ill children or parents, or to newly-born or adopted infants, or even to their own serious illness, workers need reassurance that they will not be asked to choose between continuing their employment, and meeting their personal and family obligations or tending to vital needs at home.

(c) The FMLA is both intended and expected to benefit employing offices as well as their employees. A direct correlation exists between stability in the family and productivity in the workplace. FMLA will encourage the development of high-performance organizations. When workers can count on durable links to their workplace they are able to make their own full commitments to their jobs. The record of hearings on family and medical leave indicate the powerful productive advantages of stable workplace relationships, and the comparatively small costs of guaranteeing that those relationships will not be dissolved while workers attend to pressing family health obligations or their own serious illness.

825.102 Definitions.

For purposes of this part:

ADA means the Americans With Disabilities Act (42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, as amended).

CAA means the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (Pub. Law 104-1, 109 Stat. 3, 2 U.S.C. 1301 *et seq.*, as amended).

COBRA means the continuation coverage requirements of Title X of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (Pub. Law 99-272, title X, section 10002; 100 Stat. 227; 29 U.S.C. 1161-1168).

Contingency operation means a military operation that:

(1) Is designated by the Secretary of Defense as an operation in which members of the Armed Forces are or may become involved in military actions, operations, or hostilities against an enemy of the United States or against an opposing military force; or

(2) Results in the call or order to, or retention on, active duty of members of the uniformed services under section 688, 12301(a), 12302, 12304, 12305, or 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress. See also 825.126(a)(2).

Continuing treatment by a health care provider means any one of the following:

(1) *Incapacity and treatment.* A period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days, and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition, that also involves:

(i) Treatment two or more times, within 30 days of the first day of incapacity, unless extenuating circumstances exist, by a health care provider, by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider, or by a provider of health care services (e.g., physical

therapist) under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider; or

(ii) Treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regimen of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

(iii) The requirement in paragraphs (i) and (ii) of this definition for treatment by a health care provider means an in-person visit to a health care provider. The first in-person treatment visit must take place within seven days of the first day of incapacity.

(iv) Whether additional treatment visits or a regimen of continuing treatment is necessary within the 30-day period shall be determined by the health care provider.

(v) The term "extenuating circumstances" in paragraph (i) means circumstances beyond the employee's control that prevent the follow-up visit from occurring as planned by the health care provider. Whether a given set of circumstances are extenuating depends on the facts. *See also* 825.115(a)(5).

(2) *Pregnancy or prenatal care.* Any period of incapacity due to pregnancy, or for prenatal care. *See also* 825.120.

(3) *Chronic conditions.* Any period of incapacity or treatment for such incapacity due to a chronic serious health condition. A chronic serious health condition is one which:

(i) Requires periodic visits (defined as at least twice a year) for treatment by a health care provider, or by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider;

(ii) Continues over an extended period of time (including recurring episodes of a single underlying condition); and

(iii) May cause episodic rather than a continuing period of incapacity (e.g., asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, etc.).

(4) *Permanent or long-term conditions.* A period of incapacity which is permanent or long-term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective. The employee or family member must be under the continuing supervision of, but need not be receiving active treatment by, a health care provider. Examples include Alzheimer's, a severe stroke, or the terminal stages of a disease.

(5) *Conditions requiring multiple treatments.* Any period of absence to receive multiple treatments (including any period of recovery therefrom) by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider, for:

(i) Restorative surgery after an accident or other injury; or

(ii) A condition that would likely result in a period of incapacity of more than three consecutive full calendar days in the absence of medical intervention or treatment, such as cancer (chemotherapy, radiation, etc.), severe arthritis (physical therapy), kidney disease (dialysis).

(6) Absences attributable to incapacity under paragraphs (2) or (3) of this definition qualify for FMLA leave even though the employee or the covered family member does not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last more than three consecutive, full calendar days. For example, an employee with asthma may be unable to report for work due to the onset of an asthma attack or because the employee's health care provider has advised the employee to stay home when the pollen count exceeds a certain level. An employee who is pregnant may be unable to report to work because of severe morning sickness.

Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status means:

(1) In the case of a member of the Regular Armed Forces, duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country; and,

(2) In the case of a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces, duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a Federal call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation pursuant to: Section 688 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering to active duty retired members of the Regular Armed Forces and members of the retired Reserve who retired after completing at least 20 years of active service; Section 12301(a) of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering all reserve component members to active duty in the case of war or national emergency; Section 12302 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12304 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Selected Reserve and certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12305 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes the suspension of promotion, retirement or separation rules for certain Reserve components; Section 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard into Federal service in certain circumstances; chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard and state military into Federal service in the case of insurrections and national emergencies; or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress so long as it is in support of a contingency operation. *See* 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(13)(B). *See also* 825.126(a).

Covered employee as defined in the CAA, means any employee of—(1) the House of Representatives; (2) the Senate; (3) the Office of Congressional Accessibility Services; (4) the Capitol Police; (5) the Congressional Budget Office; (6) the Office of the Architect of the Capitol; (7) the Office of the Attending Physician; (8) the Office of Compliance; or (9) the Office of Technology Assessment.

Covered servicemember means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness, or

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for a serious injury or illness.

Covered veteran means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. *See* 825.127(b)(2).

Eligible employee as defined in the CAA, means:

(1) A covered employee who has been employed for a total of at least 12 months in any employing office on the date on which any FMLA leave is to commence, except that an employing office need not consider any period of previous employment that occurred more than seven years before the date of the most recent hiring of the employee, *unless*:

(i) The break in service is occasioned by the fulfillment of the employee's Uniformed

Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, covered service obligation (the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service must be also counted in determining whether the employee has been employed for at least 12 months by any employing office, but this section does not provide any greater entitlement to the employee than would be available under the USERRA, as made applicable by the CAA); or

(ii) A written agreement, including a collective bargaining agreement, exists concerning the employing office's intention to rehire the employee after the break in service (e.g., for purposes of the employee furthering his or her education or for childrearing purposes); and

(2) Who, on the date on which any FMLA leave is to commence, has met the hours of service requirement by having been employed for at least 1,250 hours of service with an employing office during the previous 12-month period, *except that*:

(i) An employee returning from fulfilling his or her USERRA-covered service obligation shall be credited with the hours of service that would have been performed but for the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service in determining whether the employee met the hours of service requirement (accordingly, a person reemployed following absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service has the hours that would have been worked for the employing office added to any hours actually worked during the previous 12-month period to meet the hours of service requirement); and

(ii) To determine the hours that would have been worked during the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, the employee's pre-service work schedule can generally be used for calculations.

Employ means to suffer or permit to work.

Employee means an employee as defined by the CAA and includes an applicant for employment and a former employee.

Employee employed in an instructional capacity. *See* the definition of *Teacher* in this section.

Employee of the Capitol Police means any member or officer of the Capitol Police.

Employee of the House of Representatives means an individual occupying a position the pay for which is disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or another official designated by the House of Representatives, or any employment position in an entity that is paid with funds derived from the clerk-hire allowance of the House of Representatives but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) under the definition of *covered employee* above.

Employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol means any employee of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol or the Botanic Garden.

Employee of the Senate means any employee whose pay is disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate, but not any such individual employed by any entity listed in subparagraphs (3) through (9) under the definition of *covered employee* above.

Employing Office, as defined in the CAA, means:

(1) The personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator;

(2) A committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

(3) Any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or

privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate; or

(4) The Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the United States Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, the Office of Compliance, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

Employment benefits means all benefits provided or made available to employees by an employing office, including group life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, sick leave, annual leave, educational benefits, and pensions, regardless of whether such benefits are provided by a practice or written policy of an employing office or through an employee benefit plan. The term does not include non-employment related obligations paid by employees through voluntary deductions such as supplemental insurance coverage. *See also* 825.209(a).

FLSA means the Fair Labor Standards Act (29 U.S.C. 201 *et seq.*).

FMLA means the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, Public Law 103-3 (February 5, 1993), 107 Stat. 6 (29 U.S.C. 2601 *et seq.*, as amended).

Group health plan means the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program and any other plan of, or contributed to by, an employing office (including a self-insured plan) to provide health care (directly or otherwise) to the employing office's employees, former employees, or the families of such employees or former employees. For purposes of FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, the term *group health plan* shall not include an insurance program providing health coverage under which employees purchase individual policies from insurers provided that:

(1) No contributions are made by the employing office;

(2) Participation in the program is completely voluntary for employees;

(3) The sole functions of the employing office with respect to the program are, without endorsing the program, to permit the insurer to publicize the program to employees, to collect premiums through payroll deductions and to remit them to the insurer;

(4) The employing office receives no consideration in the form of cash or otherwise in connection with the program, other than reasonable compensation, excluding any profit, for administrative services actually rendered in connection with payroll deduction; and,

(5) The premium charged with respect to such coverage does not increase in the event the employment relationship terminates.

Health care provider means:

(1) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, defines health care provider as:

(i) A doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

(ii) Any other person determined by the Department of Labor to be capable of providing health care services.

(2) Others "capable of providing health care services" include only:

(i) Podiatrists, dentists, clinical psychologists, optometrists, and chiropractors (limited to treatment consisting of manual manipulation of the spine to correct a subluxation as demonstrated by X-ray to exist) authorized to practice in the State and performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law; and

(ii) Nurse practitioners, nurse-midwives and clinical social workers and physician as-

sistants who are authorized to practice under State law and who are performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law; and

(iii) Christian Science practitioners listed with the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston, Massachusetts. Where an employee or family member is receiving treatment from a Christian Science practitioner, an employee may not object to any requirement from an employing office that the employee or family member submit to examination (though not treatment) to obtain a second or third certification from a health care provider other than a Christian Science practitioner except as otherwise provided under applicable State or local law or collective bargaining agreement.

(iv) Any health care provider from whom an employing office or a group health plan's benefits manager will accept certification of the existence of a serious health condition to substantiate a claim for benefits; and

(v) A health care provider listed above who practices in a country other than the United States, who is authorized to practice in accordance with the law of that country, and who is performing within the scope of his or her practice as defined under such law.

(3) The phrase "authorized to practice in the State" as used in this section means that the provider must be authorized to diagnose and treat physical or mental health conditions.

Incapable of self-care means that the individual requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in several of the "activities of daily living" (ADLs) or "instrumental activities of daily living" (IADLs). Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing and eating. Instrumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc.

Instructional employee: *See* the definition of *Teacher* in this section.

Intermittent leave means leave taken in separate periods of time due to a single illness or injury, rather than for one continuous period of time, and may include leave of periods from an hour or more to several weeks. Examples of intermittent leave would include leave taken on an occasional basis for medical appointments, or leave taken several days at a time spread over a period of six months, such as for chemotherapy.

Invitational travel authorization (ITA) or Invitational travel order (ITO) mean orders issued by the Armed Forces to a family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. *See also* 825.310(e).

Key employee means a salaried FMLA-eligible employee who is among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the employee's worksite. *See also* 825.217.

Mental disability: *See* the definition of *Physical or mental disability* in this section.

Military caregiver leave means leave taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. *See also* 825.127.

Next of kin of a covered servicemember means the nearest blood relative other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the covered servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions,

brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of military caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. *See also* 825.127(d)(3).

Office of Compliance means the independent office established in the legislative branch under section 301 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1381).

Outpatient status means, with respect to a covered servicemember who is a current member of the Armed Forces, the status of a member of the Armed Forces assigned to either a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient; or a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients. *See also* 825.127(b)(1).

Parent means a biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the employee when the employee was a son or daughter as defined below. This term does not include parents "in law."

Parent of a covered servicemember means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law." *See also* 825.127(d)(2).

Physical or mental disability means a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual. Regulations at 29 CFR part 1630, issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, as amended, provide guidance to these terms.

Reduced leave schedule means a leave schedule that reduces the usual number of hours per workweek, or hours per workday, of an employee.

Reserve components of the Armed Forces, for purposes of qualifying exigency leave, include the Army National Guard of the United States, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard of the United States, Air Force Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve, and retired members of the Regular Armed Forces or Reserves who are called up in support of a contingency operation. *See also* 825.126(a)(2)(i).

Secretary means the Secretary of Labor or authorized representative.

Serious health condition means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves inpatient care as defined in 825.114 or continuing treatment by a health care provider as defined in 825.115. Conditions for which cosmetic treatments are administered (such as most treatments for acne or plastic surgery) are not serious health conditions unless inpatient hospital care is required or unless complications develop. Restorative dental or plastic surgery after an injury or removal of cancerous growths are serious health conditions provided all the other conditions of this regulation are met. Mental illness or allergies may be serious health conditions, but only if all the conditions of 825.113 are met.

Serious injury or illness means:

(1) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, an injury or illness that was incurred by the covered servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces and that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating; and

(2) In the case of a covered veteran, an injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran, and is:

(i) A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(ii) A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(iii) A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(iv) An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers. *See also* 825.127(c).

Son or daughter means a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and "incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability" at the time that FMLA leave is to commence.

Son or daughter of a covered servicemember means a covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age. *See also* 825.127(d)(1).

Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age. *See also* 825.126(a)(5).

Spouse, as defined in the FMLA and as made applicable by the CAA, means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either:

(1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or,

(2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

State means any State of the United States or the District of Columbia or any Territory or possession of the United States.

Teacher (or employee employed in an instructional capacity, or instructional employee) means an employee employed principally in an instructional capacity by an educational agency or school whose principal function is to teach and instruct students in a class, a small group, or an individual setting, and includes athletic coaches, driving instructors, and special education assistants such as signers for the hearing impaired. The term does not include teacher assistants or aides who do not have as their principal function actual teaching or instructing, nor auxiliary personnel such as counselors, psychologists, curriculum specialists, cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, bus drivers, or other primarily noninstructional employees.

TRICARE is the health care program serving active duty servicemembers, National Guard and Reserve members, retirees, their families, survivors, and certain former spouses worldwide.

825.103 [Removed and Reserved]

825.104 Covered employing offices.

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, covers all employing offices. As used in the CAA, the term employing office means:

(1) The personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator;

(2) A committee of the House of Representatives or the Senate or a joint committee;

(3) Any other office headed by a person with the final authority to appoint, hire, discharge, and set the terms, conditions, or privileges of the employment of an employee of the House of Representatives or the Senate; or

(4) The Office of Congressional Accessibility Services, the United States Capitol Police, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, the Office of the Attending Physician, the Office of Compliance, and the Office of Technology Assessment.

(b) [Reserved]

(c) Separate entities will be deemed to be parts of a single employing office for purposes of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, if they meet the "integrated employer" test. Where this test is met, the employees of all entities making up the integrated employer will be counted in determining employer coverage and employee eligibility. A determination of whether or not separate entities are an integrated employer is not determined by the application of any single criterion, but rather the entire relationship is to be reviewed in its totality. Factors considered in determining whether two or more entities are an integrated employer include:

(1) Common management;

(2) Interrelation between operations;

(3) Centralized control of labor relations; and

(4) Degree of common financial control.

825.105 [Reserved].

825.106 Joint employer coverage.

(a) Where two or more employing offices exercise some control over the work or working conditions of the employee, the employing offices may be joint employers under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Where the employee performs work which simultaneously benefits two or more employing offices, or works for two or more employing offices at different times during the workweek, a joint employment relationship generally will be considered to exist in situations such as:

(1) Where there is an arrangement between employing offices to share an employee's services or to interchange employees;

(2) Where one employing office acts directly or indirectly in the interest of the other employing office in relation to the employee; or

(3) Where the employing offices are not completely disassociated with respect to the employee's employment and may be deemed to share control of the employee, directly or indirectly, because one employing office controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the other employing office.

(b) A determination of whether or not a joint employment relationship exists is not determined by the application of any single criterion, but rather the entire relationship is to be viewed in its totality. For example, joint employment will ordinarily be found to exist when:

(1) An employee, who is employed by an employing office other than the personal office of a Member of the House of Representatives or of a Senator, is under the actual direction and control of the Member of the House of Representatives or Senator; or

(2) Two or more employing offices employ an individual to work on common issues or other matters for both or all of them.

(c) When employing offices employ a covered employee jointly, they may designate one of themselves to be the primary employing office, and the other or others to be the secondary employing office(s). Such a designation shall be made by written notice to the covered employee.

(d) If an employing office is designated a primary employing office pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, only that employing office is responsible for giving required notices to the covered employee, providing FMLA leave, and maintenance of health benefits. Job restoration is the primary responsibility of the primary employing office, and the secondary employing office(s) may, subject to the limitations in 825.216, be responsible for accepting the employee returning from FMLA leave.

(e) If employing offices employ an employee jointly, but fail to designate a primary employing office pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section, then all of these employing offices shall be jointly and severally liable for giving required notices to the employee, for providing FMLA leave, for assuring that health benefits are maintained, and for job restoration. The employee may give notice of need for FMLA leave, as described in 825.302 and 825.303, to whichever of these employing offices the employee chooses. If the employee makes a written request for restoration to one of these employing offices, that employing office shall be primarily responsible for job restoration, and the other employing office(s) may, subject to the limitations in 825.216, be responsible for accepting the employee returning from FMLA leave.

825.107 [Reserved]

825.108 [Reserved]

825.109 [Reserved]

825.110 Eligible employees.

(a) An eligible employee is an employee of a covered employing office who:

(1) Has been employed by any employing office for at least 12 months, and

(2) Has been employed for at least 1,250 hours of service during the 12-month period immediately preceding the commencement of the leave.

(b) The 12 months an employee must have been employed by any employing office need not be consecutive months, *provided*:

(1) Subject to the exceptions provided in paragraph (b)(2) of this section, employment periods prior to a break in service of seven years or more need not be counted in determining whether the employee has been employed by the employing office for at least 12 months.

(2) Employment periods preceding a break in service of more than seven years must be counted in determining whether the employee has been employed by the employing office for at least 12 months where:

(i) The employee's break in service is occasioned by the fulfillment of his or her Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, covered service obligation. The period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service must be also counted in determining whether the employee has been employed for at least 12 months by the employing office. However, this section does not provide any greater entitlement to the employee than would be available under the USERRA; or

(ii) A written agreement, including a collective bargaining agreement, exists concerning the employing office's intention to rehire the employee after the break in service (*e.g.*, for purposes of the employee furthering his or her education or for childrearing purposes).

(3) If an employee worked for two or more employing offices sequentially, the time worked will be aggregated to determine whether it equals 12 months.

(4) If an employee is maintained on the payroll for any part of a week, including any periods of paid or unpaid leave (sick, vacation) during which other benefits or compensation are provided by the employing office (*e.g.*, Federal Employees' Compensation, group health plan benefits, *etc.*), the week counts as a week of employment. For purposes of determining whether intermittent/occasional/casual employment qualifies as at least 12 months, 52 weeks is deemed to be equal to 12 months.

(5) Nothing in this section prevents employing offices from considering employment prior to a continuous break in service of more than seven years when determining whether an employee has met the 12-month employment requirement. However, if an employing office chooses to recognize such prior employment, the employing office must do so uniformly, with respect to all employees with similar breaks in service.

(c)(1) If an employee was employed by two or more employing offices, either sequentially or concurrently, the hours of service will be aggregated to determine whether the minimum of 1,250 hours has been reached.

(2) Except as provided in paragraph (c)(3) of this section, whether an employee has worked the minimum 1,250 hours of service is determined according to the principles established under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), as applied by section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), for determining compensable hours of work. The determining factor is the number of hours an employee has worked for one or more employing offices. The determination is not limited by methods of recordkeeping, or by compensation agreements that do not accurately reflect all of the hours an employee has worked for or been in service to the employing office. Any accurate accounting of actual hours worked under the FLSA's principles may be used.

(3) An employee returning from USERRA-covered service shall be credited with the hours of service that would have been performed but for the period of absence from

work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service in determining the employee's eligibility for FMLA-qualifying leave. Accordingly, a person reemployed following USERRA-covered service has the hours that would have been worked for the employing office added to any hours actually worked during the previous 12-month period to meet the hours of service requirement. In order to determine the hours that would have been worked during the period of absence from work due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, the employee's pre-service work schedule can generally be used for calculations.

(4) In the event an employing office does not maintain an accurate record of hours worked by an employee, including for employees who are exempt from FLSA's requirement that a record be kept of their hours worked (*e.g.*, bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees as defined in the FLSA Regulations, 29 CFR part 541, and as made applicable by the CAA, the employing office has the burden of showing that the employee has not worked the requisite hours. An employing office must be able to clearly demonstrate, for example, that full-time teachers (*see* 825.102 for definition) of an elementary or secondary school system, or institution of higher education, or other educational establishment or institution (who often work outside the classroom or at their homes) did not work 1,250 hours during the previous 12 months in order to claim that the teachers are not eligible for FMLA leave.

(d) The determination of whether an employee has worked for any employing office for at least 1,250 hours in the past 12 months and has been employed by any employing office for a total of at least 12 months must be made as of the date the FMLA leave is to start. An employee may be on non-FMLA leave at the time he or she meets the 12-month eligibility requirement, and in that event, any portion of the leave taken for an FMLA-qualifying reason after the employee meets the eligibility requirement would be FMLA leave. *See* 825.300(b) for rules governing the content of the eligibility notice given to employees.

(e) [Reserved]

825.111 [Reserved]

825.112 Qualifying reasons for leave, general rule.

(a) *Circumstances qualifying for leave.* Employing offices covered by FMLA as made applicable by the CAA are required to grant leave to eligible employees:

(1) For birth of a son or daughter, and to care for the newborn child (*see* 825.120);

(2) For placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care (*see* 825.121);

(3) To care for the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition (*see* 825.113 and 825.122); and

(4) Because of a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform the functions of the employee's job (*see* 825.113 and 825.123);

(5) Because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active status) (*see* 825.122 and 825.126); and

(6) To care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness if the employee is the spouse, son, daughter, parent, or next of kin of the covered servicemember (*see* 825.122 and 825.127).

(b) *Equal Application.* The right to take leave under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, applies equally to male and female employees. A father, as well as a mother, can take family leave for the birth, placement for adoption, or foster care of a child.

(c) *Active employee.* In situations where the employing office/employee relationship has been interrupted, such as an employee who has been on layoff, the employee must be recalled or otherwise be re-employed before being eligible for FMLA leave. Under such circumstances, an eligible employee is immediately entitled to further FMLA leave for a qualifying reason.

825.113 Serious health condition.

(a) For purposes of FMLA, *serious health condition* entitling an employee to FMLA leave means an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that involves inpatient care as defined in 825.114 or continuing treatment by a health care provider as defined in 825.115.

(b) The term *incapacity* means inability to work, attend school or perform other regular daily activities due to the serious health condition, treatment therefore, or recovery therefrom.

(c) The term *treatment* includes (but is not limited to) examinations to determine if a serious health condition exists and evaluations of the condition. Treatment does not include routine physical examinations, eye examinations, or dental examinations. A regimen of continuing treatment includes, for example, a course of prescription medication (*e.g.*, an antibiotic) or therapy requiring special equipment to resolve or alleviate the health condition (*e.g.*, oxygen). A regimen of continuing treatment that includes the taking of over-the-counter medications such as aspirin, antihistamines, or salves; or bed-rest, drinking fluids, exercise, and other similar activities that can be initiated without a visit to a health care provider, is not, by itself, sufficient to constitute a regimen of continuing treatment for purposes of FMLA leave.

(d) Conditions for which cosmetic treatments are administered (such as most treatments for acne or plastic surgery) are not serious health conditions unless inpatient hospital care is required or unless complications develop. Ordinarily, unless complications arise, the common cold, the flu, ear aches, upset stomach, minor ulcers, headaches other than migraine, routine dental or orthodontia problems, periodontal disease, *etc.*, are examples of conditions that do not meet the definition of a serious health condition and do not qualify for FMLA leave. Restorative dental or plastic surgery after an injury or removal of cancerous growths are serious health conditions provided all the other conditions of this regulation are met. Mental illness or allergies may be serious health conditions, but only if all the conditions of this section are met.

825.114 Inpatient care.

Inpatient care means an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility, including any period of incapacity as defined in 825.113(b), or any subsequent treatment in connection with such inpatient care.

825.115 Continuing treatment.

A serious health condition involving continuing treatment by a health care provider includes any one or more of the following:

(a) *Incapacity and treatment.* A period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days, and any subsequent treatment or period of incapacity relating to the same condition, that also involves:

(1) Treatment two or more times, within 30 days of the first day of incapacity, unless extenuating circumstances exist, by a health care provider, by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider, or by a provider of health care services (e.g., physical therapist) under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider; or

(2) Treatment by a health care provider on at least one occasion, which results in a regimen of continuing treatment under the supervision of the health care provider.

(3) The requirement in paragraphs (a)(1) and (2) of this section for treatment by a health care provider means an in-person visit to a health care provider. The first (or only) in-person treatment visit must take place within seven days of the first day of incapacity.

(4) Whether additional treatment visits or a regimen of continuing treatment is necessary within the 30-day period shall be determined by the health care provider.

(5) The term *extenuating circumstances* in paragraph (a)(1) of this section means circumstances beyond the employee's control that prevent the follow-up visit from occurring as planned by the health care provider. Whether a given set of circumstances are extenuating depends on the facts. For example, extenuating circumstances exist if a health care provider determines that a second in-person visit is needed within the 30-day period, but the health care provider does not have any available appointments during that time period.

(b) *Pregnancy or prenatal care.* Any period of incapacity due to pregnancy, or for prenatal care. See also 825.120.

(c) *Chronic conditions.* Any period of incapacity or treatment for such incapacity due to a chronic serious health condition. A chronic serious health condition is one which:

(1) Requires periodic visits (defined as at least twice a year) for treatment by a health care provider, or by a nurse under direct supervision of a health care provider;

(2) Continues over an extended period of time (including recurring episodes of a single underlying condition); and

(3) May cause episodic rather than a continuing period of incapacity (e.g., asthma, diabetes, epilepsy, etc.).

(d) *Permanent or long-term conditions.* A period of incapacity which is permanent or long-term due to a condition for which treatment may not be effective. The employee or family member must be under the continuing supervision of, but need not be receiving active treatment by, a health care provider. Examples include Alzheimer's, a severe stroke, or the terminal stages of a disease.

(e) *Conditions requiring multiple treatments.* Any period of absence to receive multiple treatments (including any period of recovery therefrom) by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services under orders of, or on referral by, a health care provider, for:

(1) Restorative surgery after an accident or other injury; or

(2) A condition that would likely result in a period of incapacity of more than three consecutive, full calendar days in the absence of medical intervention or treatment, such as cancer (chemotherapy, radiation, etc.), severe arthritis (physical therapy), or kidney disease (dialysis).

(f) Absences attributable to incapacity under paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section qualify for FMLA leave even though the employee or the covered family member does

not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last more than three consecutive, full calendar days. For example, an employee with asthma may be unable to report for work due to the onset of an asthma attack or because the employee's health care provider has advised the employee to stay home when the pollen count exceeds a certain level. An employee who is pregnant may be unable to report to work because of severe morning sickness.

825.116 [Removed and Reserved]

825.117 [Removed and Reserved]

825.118 [Removed and Reserved]

825.119 Leave for treatment of substance abuse.

(a) Substance abuse may be a serious health condition if the conditions of 825.113 through 825.115 are met. However, FMLA leave may only be taken for treatment for substance abuse by a health care provider or by a provider of health care services on referral by a health care provider. On the other hand, absence because of the employee's use of the substance, rather than for treatment, does not qualify for FMLA leave.

(b) Treatment for substance abuse does not prevent an employing office from taking employment action against an employee. The employing office may not take action against the employee because the employee has exercised his or her right to take FMLA leave for treatment. However, if the employing office has an established policy, applied in a non-discriminatory manner that has been communicated to all employees, that provides under certain circumstances an employee may be terminated for substance abuse, pursuant to that policy the employee may be terminated whether or not the employee is presently taking FMLA leave. An employee may also take FMLA leave to care for a covered family member who is receiving treatment for substance abuse. The employing office may not take action against an employee who is providing care for a covered family member receiving treatment for substance abuse.

825.120 Leave for pregnancy or birth.

(a) *General rules.* Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave for pregnancy or birth of a child as follows:

(1) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave for the birth of their child.

(2) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave to be with the healthy newborn child (i.e., bonding time) during the 12-month period beginning on the date of birth. An employee's entitlement to FMLA leave for a birth expires at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the birth. If the employing office permits bonding leave to be taken beyond this period, such leave will not qualify as FMLA leave. Under this section, both parents are entitled to FMLA leave even if the newborn does not have a serious health condition.

(3) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken for birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care or to care for the child after placement, or to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for

example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a healthy, newborn child, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition. Note, too, that many state pregnancy disability laws specify a period of disability either before or after the birth of a child; such periods would also be considered FMLA leave for a serious health condition of the birth mother, and would not be subject to the combined limit.

(4) The expectant mother is entitled to FMLA leave for incapacity due to pregnancy, for prenatal care, or for her own serious health condition following the birth of the child. An expectant mother may take FMLA leave before the birth of the child for prenatal care or if her condition makes her unable to work. The expectant mother is entitled to leave for incapacity due to pregnancy even though she does not receive treatment from a health care provider during the absence, and even if the absence does not last for more than three consecutive calendar days.

(5) A spouse is entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for a pregnant spouse who is incapacitated or if needed to care for her during her prenatal care, or if needed to care for her following the birth of a child if she has a serious health condition. See 825.124.

(6) Both parents are entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for a child with a serious health condition if the requirements of 825.113 through 825.115 and 825.122(d) are met. Thus, spouses may each take 12 weeks of FMLA leave if needed to care for their newborn child with a serious health condition, even if both are employed by the same employing office, provided they have not exhausted their entitlements during the applicable 12-month FMLA leave period.

(b) *Intermittent and reduced schedule leave.* An eligible employee may use intermittent or reduced schedule leave after the birth to be with a healthy newborn child only if the employing office agrees. For example, an employing office and employee may agree to a part-time work schedule after the birth. If the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the birth of a child, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced leave. The employing office's agreement is not required for intermittent leave required by the serious health condition of the expectant mother or newborn child. See 825.202–

825.205 for general rules governing the use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for adoption or foster care. See 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

825.121 Leave for adoption or foster care.

(a) *General rules.* Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave for placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care as follows:

(1) Employees may take FMLA leave before the actual placement or adoption of a child if an absence from work is required for the placement for adoption or foster care to proceed. For example, the employee may be required to attend counseling sessions, appear in court, consult with his or her attorney or the doctor(s) representing the birth parent, submit to a physical examination, or travel to another country to complete an adoption. The source of an adopted child (e.g., whether from a licensed placement agency or otherwise) is not a factor in determining eligibility for leave for this purpose.

(2) An employee's entitlement to leave for adoption or foster care expires at the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of the placement. If the employing office permits leave for adoption or foster care to be taken beyond this period, such leave will not qualify as FMLA leave. Under this section, the employee is entitled to FMLA leave even if the adopted or foster child does not have a serious health condition.

(3) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken for the placement of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after placement, for the birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, or to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a healthy, newly placed child, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition.

(4) An eligible employee is entitled to FMLA leave in order to care for an adopted or foster child with a serious health condition if the requirements of 825.113 through 825.115 and 825.122(d) are met. Thus, spouses may each take 12 weeks of FMLA leave if needed to care for an adopted or foster child with a serious health condition, even if both are employed by the same employing office, provided they have not exhausted their entitlements during the applicable 12-month FMLA leave period.

(b) *Use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave.* An eligible employee may use intermittent or reduced schedule leave after the placement of a healthy child for adoption or

foster care only if the employing office agrees. Thus, for example, the employing office and employee may agree to a part-time work schedule after the placement for bonding purposes. If the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the placement for adoption or foster care, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced leave. The employing office's agreement is not required for intermittent leave required by the serious health condition of the adopted or foster child. See 825.202–825.205 for general rules governing the use of intermittent and reduced schedule leave. See 825.120 for general rules governing leave for pregnancy and birth of a child. See 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

825.122 Definitions of covered servicemember, spouse, parent, son or daughter, next of kin of a covered servicemember, adoption, foster care, son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, son or daughter of a covered servicemember, and parent of a covered servicemember.

(a) *Covered servicemember* means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness; or

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for a serious injury or illness. *Covered veteran* means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. See 825.127(b)(2).

(b) *Spouse*, as defined in the FMLA and as made applicable by the CAA, means a husband or wife. For purposes of this definition, husband or wife refers to all individuals in lawfully recognized marriages. This definition includes an individual in a same-sex marriage. This definition also includes an individual in a common law marriage that either:

(1) was entered into in a State that recognizes such marriages or,

(2) if entered into outside of any State, is valid in the place where entered into and could have been entered into in at least one State.

(c) *Parent.* Parent means a biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the employee when the employee was a son or daughter as defined in paragraph (d) of this section. This term does not include parents "in law."

(d) *Son or daughter.* For purposes of FMLA leave taken for birth or adoption, or to care

for a family member with a serious health condition, son or daughter means a biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, a legal ward, or a child of a person standing in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and "incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability" at the time that FMLA leave is to commence.

(1) *Incapable of self-care* means that the individual requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in three or more of the activities of daily living (ADLs) or instrumental activities of daily living (IADLs). Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing and eating. Instrumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc.

(2) *Physical or mental disability* means a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of an individual. Regulations at 29 CFR 1630.2(h), (i), and (j), issued by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. 12101 *et seq.*, define these terms.

(3) Persons who are "in loco parentis" include those with day-to-day responsibilities to care for and financially support a child, or, in the case of an employee, who had such responsibility for the employee when the employee was a child. A biological or legal relationship is not necessary.

(e) *Next of kin of a covered servicemember* means the nearest blood relative other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the covered servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions, brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of military caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. See 825.127(d)(3).

(f) *Adoption* means legally and permanently assuming the responsibility of raising a child as one's own. The source of an adopted child (e.g., whether from a licensed placement agency or otherwise) is not a factor in determining eligibility for FMLA leave. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for adoption.

(g) *Foster care* means 24-hour care for children in substitution for, and away from, their parents or guardian. Such placement is made by or with the agreement of the State as a result of a voluntary agreement between the parent or guardian that the child be removed from the home, or pursuant to a judicial determination of the necessity for foster care, and involves agreement between the State and foster family that the foster family will take care of the child. Although foster care may be with relatives of the child, State action is involved in the removal of the child from parental custody. See 825.121 for rules governing leave for foster care.

(h) *Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age. See 825.126(a)(5).

(i) *Son or daughter of a covered servicemember* means the covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age. See 825.127(d)(1).

(j) *Parent of a covered servicemember* means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law." See 825.127(d)(2).

(k) *Documenting relationships.* For purposes of confirmation of family relationship, the employing office may require the employee giving notice of the need for leave to provide reasonable documentation or statement of family relationship. This documentation may take the form of a simple statement from the employee, or a child's birth certificate, a court document, etc. The employing office is entitled to examine documentation such as a birth certificate, etc., but the employee is entitled to the return of the official document submitted for this purpose.

825.123 Unable to perform the functions of the position.

(a) *Definition.* An employee is unable to perform the functions of the position where the health care provider finds that the employee is unable to work at all or is unable to perform any one of the essential functions of the employee's position within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and made applicable by Section 201(a) of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1311(a)(3)). An employee who must be absent from work to receive medical treatment for a serious health condition is considered to be unable to perform the essential functions of the position during the absence for treatment.

(b) *Statement of functions.* An employing office has the option, in requiring certification from a health care provider, to provide a statement of the essential functions of the employee's position for the health care provider to review. A sufficient medical certification must specify what functions of the employee's position the employee is unable to perform so that the employing office can then determine whether the employee is unable to perform one or more essential functions of the employee's position. For purposes of FMLA, the essential functions of the employee's position are to be determined with reference to the position the employee held at the time notice is given or leave commenced, whichever is earlier. See 825.306.

825.124 Needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember.

(a) The medical certification provision that an employee is needed to care for a family member or covered servicemember encompasses both physical and psychological care. It includes situations where, for example, because of a serious health condition, the family member is unable to care for his or her own basic medical, hygienic, or nutritional needs or safety, or is unable to transport himself or herself to the doctor. The term also includes providing psychological comfort and reassurance which would be beneficial to a child, spouse or parent with a serious health condition who is receiving inpatient or home care.

(b) The term also includes situations where the employee may be needed to substitute for others who normally care for the family member or covered servicemember, or to make arrangements for changes in care, such as transfer to a nursing home. The employee need not be the only individual or family member available to care for the family member or covered servicemember.

(c) An employee's intermittent leave or a reduced leave schedule necessary to care for a family member or covered servicemember includes not only a situation where the condition of the family member or covered servicemember itself is intermittent, but also where the employee is only needed intermittently—such as where other care is normally available, or care responsibilities are shared with another member of the family or a third party. See 825.202–825.205 for rules governing the use of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

825.125 Definition of health care provider.

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, defines *health care provider* as:

(1) A doctor of medicine or osteopathy who is authorized to practice medicine or surgery (as appropriate) by the State in which the doctor practices; or

(2) Any other person determined by the Office of Compliance to be capable of providing health care services.

(3) In making a determination referred to in subparagraph (a)(2), and absent good cause shown to do otherwise, the Office of Compliance will follow any determination made by the Department of Labor (under section 101(6)(B) of FMLA (29 U.S.C. 2611(6)(B))) that a person is capable of providing health care services, provided the determination by the Department of Labor was not made at the request of a person who was then a covered employee.

(b) Others capable of providing health care services include only:

(1) Podiatrists, dentists, clinical psychologists, optometrists, and chiropractors (limited to treatment consisting of manual manipulation of the spine to correct a subluxation as demonstrated by X-ray to exist) authorized to practice in the State and performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law;

(2) Nurse practitioners, nurse-midwives, clinical social workers and physician assistants who are authorized to practice under State law and who are performing within the scope of their practice as defined under State law;

(3) Christian Science Practitioners listed with the First Church of Christ, Scientist in Boston, Massachusetts. Where an employee or family member is receiving treatment from a Christian Science practitioner, an employee may not object to any requirement from an employing office that the employee or family member submit to examination (though not treatment) to obtain a second or third certification from a health care provider other than a Christian Science practitioner except as otherwise provided under applicable State or local law or collective bargaining agreement;

(4) Any health care provider from whom an employing office or the employing office's group health plan's benefits manager will accept certification of the existence of a serious health condition to substantiate a claim for benefits; and

(5) A health care provider listed above who practices in a country other than the United States, who is authorized to practice in accordance with the law of that country, and who is performing within the scope of his or her practice as defined under such law.

(c) The phrase authorized to practice in the State as used in this section means that the provider must be authorized to diagnose and treat physical or mental health conditions.

825.126 Leave because of a qualifying exigency.

(a) Eligible employees may take FMLA leave for a qualifying exigency while the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent (the military member or member) is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty).

(1) *Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* in the case of a member of the Regular Armed Forces means duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country. The active duty orders of a member of the Regular components of the Armed Forces will generally specify if the member is deployed to a foreign country.

(2) *Covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* in the case of a member of the Reserve components of the Armed Forces means duty during the deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country under a Federal call or order to active duty in support of a contingency operation pursuant to: Section 688 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering to active duty retired members of the Regular Armed Forces and members of the retired Reserve who retired after completing at least 20 years of active service; Section 12301(a) of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering all reserve component members to active duty in the case of war or national emergency; Section 12302 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12304 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes ordering any unit or unassigned member of the Selected Reserve and certain members of the Individual Ready Reserve to active duty; Section 12305 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes the suspension of promotion, retirement or separation rules for certain Reserve components; Section 12406 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard into Federal service in certain circumstances; chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Code, which authorizes calling the National Guard and state military into Federal service in the case of insurrections and national emergencies; or any other provision of law during a war or during a national emergency declared by the President or Congress so long as it is in support of a contingency operation. See 10 U.S.C. 101(a)(13)(B).

(i) For purposes of covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, the Reserve components of the Armed Forces include the Army National Guard of the United States, Army Reserve, Navy Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air National Guard of the United States, Air Force Reserve and Coast Guard Reserve, and retired members of the Regular Armed Forces or Reservists who are called up in support of a contingency operation pursuant to one of the provisions of law identified in paragraph (a)(2).

(ii) The active duty orders of a member of the Reserve components will generally specify if the military member is serving in support of a contingency operation by citation to the relevant section of Title 10 of the United States Code and/or by reference to the specific name of the contingency operation and will specify that the deployment is to a foreign country.

(3) *Deployment of the member with the Armed Forces to a foreign country* means deployment to areas outside of the United States, the District of Columbia, or any Territory or possession of the United States, including international waters.

(4) A call to covered active duty for purposes of leave taken because of a qualifying exigency refers to a Federal call to active duty. State calls to active duty are not covered unless under order of the President of the United States pursuant to one of the provisions of law identified in paragraph (a)(2) of this section.

(5) *Son or daughter on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status* means the employee's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the employee stood in loco parentis, who is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and who is of any age.

(b) An eligible employee may take FMLA leave for one or more of the following qualifying exigencies:

(1) *Short-notice deployment.* (i) To address any issue that arises from the fact that the military member is notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty seven or less calendar days prior to the date of deployment;

(ii) Leave taken for this purpose can be used for a period of seven calendar days beginning on the date the military member is notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty;

(2) *Military events and related activities.* (i) To attend any official ceremony, program, or event sponsored by the military that is related to the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(ii) To attend family support or assistance programs and informational briefings sponsored or promoted by the military, military service organizations, or the American Red Cross that are related to the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(3) *Childcare and school activities.* For the purposes of leave for childcare and school activities listed in (i) through (iv) of this paragraph, a child of the military member must be the military member's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or child for whom the military member stands in loco parentis, who is either under 18 years of age or 18 years of age or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability at the time that FMLA leave is to commence. As with all instances of qualifying exigency leave, the military member must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent of the employee requesting qualifying exigency leave.

(i) To arrange for alternative childcare for a child of the military member when the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member necessitates a change in the existing childcare arrangement;

(ii) To provide childcare for a child of the military member on an urgent, immediate need basis (but not on a routine, regular, or everyday basis) when the need to provide such care arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(iii) To enroll in or transfer to a new school or day care facility a child of the military member when enrollment or transfer is necessitated by the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(iv) To attend meetings with staff at a school or a daycare facility, such as meetings with school officials regarding disciplinary measures, parent-teacher conferences, or meetings with school counselors, for a child of the military member, when such meetings are necessary due to circumstances arising from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(4) *Financial and legal arrangements.* (i) To make or update financial or legal arrangements to address the military member's absence while on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, such as preparing and executing financial and healthcare powers of attorney, transferring bank account signature authority, enrolling in the Defense Enrollment Eligibility Reporting System (DEERS), obtaining military identification cards, or preparing or updating a will or living trust; and

(ii) To act as the military member's representative before a federal, state, or local agency for purposes of obtaining, arranging, or appealing military service benefits while the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and for a period of 90 days following the termination of the military member's covered active duty status;

(5) *Counseling.* To attend counseling provided by someone other than a health care provider, for oneself, for the military member, or for the biological, adopted, or foster child, a stepchild, or a legal ward of the military member, or a child for whom the military member stands in loco parentis, who is either under age 18, or age 18 or older and incapable of self-care because of a mental or physical disability at the time that FMLA leave is to commence, provided that the need for counseling arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(6) *Rest and Recuperation.* (i) To spend time with the military member who is on short-term, temporary, Rest and Recuperation leave during the period of deployment;

(ii) Leave taken for this purpose can be used for a period of 15 calendar days beginning on the date the military member commences each instance of Rest and Recuperation leave;

(7) *Post-deployment activities.* (i) To attend arrival ceremonies, reintegration briefings and events, and any other official ceremony or program sponsored by the military for a period of 90 days following the termination of the military member's covered active duty status; and

(ii) To address issues that arise from the death of the military member while on covered active duty status, such as meeting and recovering the body of the military member, making funeral arrangements, and attending funeral services;

(8) *Parental care.* For purposes of leave for parental care listed in (i) through (iv) of this paragraph, the parent of the military member must be incapable of self-care and must be the military member's biological, adoptive, step, or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the military member when the member was under 18 years of age. A parent who is incapable of self-care means that the parent requires active assistance or supervision to provide daily self-care in three or more of the activities of daily living or instrumental activities of daily living. Activities of daily living include adaptive activities such as caring appropriately for one's grooming and hygiene, bathing, dressing, and eating. In-

strumental activities of daily living include cooking, cleaning, shopping, taking public transportation, paying bills, maintaining a residence, using telephones and directories, using a post office, etc. As with all instances of qualifying exigency leave, the military member must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent of the employee requesting qualifying exigency leave.

(i) To arrange for alternative care for a parent of the military member when the parent is incapable of self-care and the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member necessitates a change in the existing care arrangement for the parent;

(ii) To provide care for a parent of the military member on an urgent, immediate need basis (but not on a routine, regular, or everyday basis) when the parent is incapable of self-care and the need to provide such care arises from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member;

(iii) To admit to or transfer to a care facility a parent of the military member when admittance or transfer is necessitated by the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member; and

(iv) To attend meetings with staff at a care facility, such as meetings with hospice or social service providers for a parent of the military member, when such meetings are necessary due to circumstances arising from the covered active duty or call to covered active duty status of the military member but not for routine or regular meetings;

(9) *Additional activities.* To address other events which arise out of the military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status provided that the employing office and employee agree that such leave shall qualify as an exigency, and agree to both the timing and duration of such leave.

825.127 Leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness (military caregiver leave).

(a) Eligible employees are entitled to FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious illness or injury.

(b) *Covered servicemember* means:

(1) A current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in *outpatient status*; or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list, for a serious injury or illness. Outpatient status means the status of a member of the Armed Forces assigned to either a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient or a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients.

(2) A covered veteran who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation or therapy for a serious injury or illness. *Covered veteran* means an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of the National Guard or Reserves), and was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable at any time during the five-year period prior to the first date the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for the covered veteran. An eligible employee must commence leave to care for a covered veteran within five years of the veteran's active duty service, but the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e)(1) of this section may extend beyond the five-year period.

(i) For an individual who was a member of the Armed Forces (including a member of

the National Guard or Reserves) and who was discharged or released under conditions other than dishonorable prior to the effective date of this Final Rule, the period between October 28, 2009 and the effective date of this Final Rule shall not count towards the determination of the five-year period for covered veteran status.

(c) A *serious injury or illness* means:

(1) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, including a member of the National Guard or Reserves, means an injury or illness that was incurred by the covered servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces, and that may render the member medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank or rating; and,

(2) In the case of a covered veteran, means an injury or illness that was incurred by the member in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces), and manifested itself before or after the member became a veteran, and is:

(i) A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(ii) A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(iii) A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(iv) An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

(d) In order to care for a covered servicemember, an eligible employee must be the spouse, son, daughter, or parent, or next of kin of a covered servicemember.

(1) *Son or daughter of a covered servicemember* means the covered servicemember's biological, adopted, or foster child, stepchild, legal ward, or a child for whom the covered servicemember stood in loco parentis, and who is of any age.

(2) *Parent of a covered servicemember* means a covered servicemember's biological, adoptive, step or foster father or mother, or any other individual who stood in loco parentis to the covered servicemember. This term does not include parents "in law."

(3) *Next of kin of a covered servicemember* means the nearest blood relative, other than the covered servicemember's spouse, parent, son, or daughter, in the following order of priority: blood relatives who have been granted legal custody of the servicemember by court decree or statutory provisions, brothers and sisters, grandparents, aunts and uncles, and first cousins, unless the covered servicemember has specifically designated in writing another blood relative as his or her nearest blood relative for purposes of mili-

tary caregiver leave under the FMLA. When no such designation is made, and there are multiple family members with the same level of relationship to the covered servicemember, all such family members shall be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin and may take FMLA leave to provide care to the covered servicemember, either consecutively or simultaneously. When such designation has been made, the designated individual shall be deemed to be the covered servicemember's only next of kin. For example, if a covered servicemember has three siblings and has not designated a blood relative to provide care, all three siblings would be considered the covered servicemember's next of kin. Alternatively, where a covered servicemember has a sibling(s) and designates a cousin as his or her next of kin for FMLA purposes, then only the designated cousin is eligible as the covered servicemember's next of kin. An employing office is permitted to require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the covered servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k).

(e) An eligible employee is entitled to 26 workweeks of leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness during a single 12-month period.

(1) The single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section begins on the first day the eligible employee takes FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember and ends 12 months after that date, regardless of the method used by the employing office to determine the employee's 12 workweeks of leave entitlement for other FMLA-qualifying reasons. If an eligible employee does not take all of his or her 26 workweeks of leave entitlement to care for a covered servicemember during this single 12-month period, the remaining part of his or her 26 workweeks of leave entitlement to care for the covered servicemember is forfeited.

(2) The leave entitlement described in paragraph (e) of this section is to be applied on a per-covered-servicemember, per-injury basis such that an eligible employee may be entitled to take more than one period of 26 workweeks of leave if the leave is to care for different covered servicemembers or to care for the same servicemember with a subsequent serious injury or illness, except that no more than 26 workweeks of leave may be taken within any single 12-month period. An eligible employee may take more than one period of 26 workweeks of leave to care for a covered servicemember with more than one serious injury or illness only when the serious injury or illness is a subsequent serious injury or illness. When an eligible employee takes leave to care for more than one covered servicemember or for a subsequent serious injury or illness of the same covered servicemember, and the single 12-month periods corresponding to the different military caregiver leave entitlements overlap, the employee is limited to taking no more than 26 workweeks of leave in each single 12-month period.

(3) An eligible employee is entitled to a combined total of 26 workweeks of leave for any FMLA-qualifying reason during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section, provided that the employee is entitled to no more than 12 workweeks of leave for one or more of the following: because of the birth of a son or daughter of the employee and in order to care for such son or daughter; because of the placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care; in order to care for the spouse, son, daughter, or parent

with a serious health condition; because of the employee's own serious health condition; or because of a qualifying exigency. Thus, for example, an eligible employee may, during the single 12-month period, take 16 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember and 10 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a newborn child. However, the employee may not take more than 12 weeks of FMLA leave to care for the newborn child during the single 12-month period, even if the employee takes fewer than 14 workweeks of FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember.

(4) In all circumstances, including for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, the employing office is responsible for designating leave, paid or unpaid, as FMLA-qualifying, and for giving notice of the designation to the employee as provided in 825.300. In the case of leave that qualifies as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section, the employing office must designate such leave as leave to care for a covered servicemember in the first instance. Leave that qualifies as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section must not be designated and counted as both leave to care for a covered servicemember and leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition. As is the case with leave taken for other qualifying reasons, employing offices may retroactively designate leave as leave to care for a covered servicemember pursuant to 825.301(d).

(f) Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 26 workweeks of leave during the single 12-month period described in paragraph (e) of this section if the leave is taken for birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after birth, for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care, or to care for the child after placement, to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition, or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 26 workweeks of FMLA leave.

Subpart B—EMPLOYEE LEAVE ENTITLEMENTS UNDER THE FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT 825.200 Amount of Leave.

(a) Except in the case of leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a total of 12 workweeks of leave during any 12-month period for any one, or more, of the following reasons:

(1) The birth of the employee's son or daughter, and to care for the newborn child;

(2) The placement with the employee of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care, and to care for the newly placed child;

(3) To care for the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition;

(4) Because of a serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform one or more of the essential functions of his or her job; and

(5) Because of any qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that the employee's spouse, son, daughter, or parent is a military member on covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to active duty).

(b) An employing office is permitted to choose any one of the following methods for determining the 12-month period in which the 12 weeks of leave entitlement described in paragraph (a) of this section occurs:

(1) The calendar year;

(2) Any fixed 12-month leave year, such as a fiscal year or a year starting on an employee's anniversary date;

(3) The 12-month period measured forward from the date any employee's first FMLA leave under paragraph (a) begins; or

(4) A "rolling" 12-month period measured backward from the date an employee uses any FMLA leave as described in paragraph (a).

(c) Under methods in paragraphs (b)(1) and (b)(2) of this section an employee would be entitled to up to 12 weeks of FMLA leave at any time in the fixed 12-month period selected. An employee could, therefore, take 12 weeks of leave at the end of the year and 12 weeks at the beginning of the following year. Under the method in paragraph (b)(3) of this section, an employee would be entitled to 12 weeks of leave during the year beginning on the first date FMLA leave is taken; the next 12-month period would begin the first time FMLA leave is taken after completion of any previous 12-month period. Under the method in paragraph (b)(4) of this section, the "rolling" 12-month period, each time an employee takes FMLA leave the remaining leave entitlement would be any balance of the 12 weeks which has not been used during the immediately preceding 12 months. For example, if an employee has taken eight weeks of leave during the past 12 months, an additional four weeks of leave could be taken. If an employee used four weeks beginning February 1, 2008, four weeks beginning June 1, 2008, and four weeks beginning December 1, 2008, the employee would not be entitled to any additional leave until February 1, 2009. However, beginning on February 1, 2009, the employee would again be eligible to take FMLA leave, recouping the right to take the leave in the same manner and amounts in which it was used in the previous year. Thus, the employee would recoup (and be entitled to use) one additional day of FMLA leave each day for four weeks, commencing February 1, 2009. The employee would also begin to recoup additional days beginning on June 1, 2009, and additional days beginning on December 1, 2009. Accordingly, employing offices using the rolling 12-month period may need to calculate whether the employee is entitled to take FMLA leave each time that leave is requested, and employees taking FMLA leave on such a basis may fall in and out of FMLA protection based on their FMLA usage in the prior 12 months. For example, in the example above, if the employee needs six weeks of leave for a serious health condition commencing February 1, 2009, only the first four weeks of the leave would be FMLA-protected.

(d)(1) Employing offices will be allowed to choose any one of the alternatives in paragraph (b) of this section for the leave entitlements described in paragraph (a) of this section provided the alternative chosen is applied consistently and uniformly to all em-

ployees. An employing office wishing to change to another alternative is required to give at least 60 days notice to all employees, and the transition must take place in such a way that the employees retain the full benefit of 12 weeks of leave under whichever method affords the greatest benefit to the employee. Under no circumstances may a new method be implemented in order to avoid the CAA's FMLA leave requirements.

(2) [Reserved]

(e) If an employing office fails to select one of the options in paragraph (b) of this section for measuring the 12-month period for the leave entitlements described in paragraph (a), the option that provides the most beneficial outcome for the employee will be used. The employing office may subsequently select an option only by providing the 60-day notice to all employees of the option the employing office intends to implement. During the running of the 60-day period any other employee who needs FMLA leave may use the option providing the most beneficial outcome to that employee. At the conclusion of the 60-day period the employing office may implement the selected option.

(f) An eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a total of 26 workweeks of leave during a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. An employing office shall determine the single 12-month period in which the 26 weeks of leave entitlement described in this paragraph occurs using the 12-month period measured forward from the date an employee's first FMLA leave to care for the covered servicemember begins. See 825.127(e)(1).

(g) During the single 12-month period described in paragraph (f), an eligible employee's FMLA leave entitlement is limited to a combined total of 26 workweeks of FMLA leave for any qualifying reason. See 825.127(e)(3).

(h) For purposes of determining the amount of leave used by an employee, the fact that a holiday may occur within the week taken as FMLA leave has no effect; the week is counted as a week of FMLA leave. However, if an employee is using FMLA leave in increments of less than one week, the holiday will not count against the employee's FMLA entitlement unless the employee was otherwise scheduled and expected to work during the holiday. Similarly, if for some reason the employing office's business activity has temporarily ceased and employees generally are not expected to report for work for one or more weeks (e.g., a school closing two weeks for the Christmas/New Year holiday or the summer vacation or an employing office closing the office for repairs), the days the employing office's activities have ceased do not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Methods for determining an employee's 12-week leave entitlement are also described in 825.205.

(i)(1) If employing offices jointly employ an employee, and if they designate a primary employing office pursuant to 825.106(c), the primary employing office may choose any one of the alternatives in paragraph (b) of this section for measuring the 12-month period, provided that the alternative chosen is applied consistently and uniformly to all employees of the primary employing office including the jointly employed employee.

(2) If employing offices fail to designate a primary employing office pursuant to 825.106(c), an employee jointly employed by the employing offices may, by so notifying one of the employing offices, select that em-

ploying office to be the primary employing office of the employee for purposes of the application of paragraphs (d) and (e) of this section.

825.201 Leave to care for a parent.

(a) *General rule.* An eligible employee is entitled to FMLA leave if needed to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition. Care for parents-in-law is not covered by the FMLA. See 825.122(c) for definition of parent.

(b) *Same employing office limitation.* Spouses who are eligible for FMLA leave and are employed by the same covered employing office may be limited to a combined total of 12 weeks of leave during any 12-month period if the leave is taken to care for the employee's parent with a serious health condition, for the birth of the employee's son or daughter or to care for the child after the birth, or for placement of a son or daughter with the employee for adoption or foster care or to care for the child after placement. This limitation on the total weeks of leave applies to leave taken for the reasons specified as long as the spouses are employed by the same employing office. It would apply, for example, even though the spouses are employed at two different worksites of an employing office. On the other hand, if one spouse is ineligible for FMLA leave, the other spouse would be entitled to a full 12 weeks of FMLA leave. Where the spouses both use a portion of the total 12-week FMLA leave entitlement for either the birth of a child, for placement for adoption or foster care, or to care for a parent, the spouses would each be entitled to the difference between the amount he or she has taken individually and 12 weeks for FMLA leave for other purposes. For example, if each spouse took six weeks of leave to care for a parent, each could use an additional six weeks due to his or her own serious health condition or to care for a child with a serious health condition. See also 825.127(d).

825.202 Intermittent leave or reduced leave schedule.

(a) *Definition.* FMLA leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule under certain circumstances. *Intermittent leave* is FMLA leave taken in separate blocks of time due to a single qualifying reason. A *reduced leave schedule* is a leave schedule that reduces an employee's usual number of working hours per workweek, or hours per workday. A reduced leave schedule is a change in the employee's schedule for a period of time, normally from full-time to part-time.

(b) *Medical necessity.* For intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule taken because of one's own serious health condition, to care for a spouse, parent, son, or daughter with a serious health condition, or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, there must be a medical need for leave and it must be that such medical need can be best accommodated through an intermittent or reduced leave schedule. The treatment regimen and other information described in the certification of a serious health condition and in the certification of a serious injury or illness, if required by the employing office, addresses the medical necessity of intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule. See 825.306, 825.310. Leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule when medically necessary for planned and/or unanticipated medical treatment of a serious health condition or of a covered servicemember's serious injury or illness, or for recovery from treatment or recovery from a serious health condition or a covered

servicemember's serious injury or illness. It may also be taken to provide care or psychological comfort to a covered family member with a serious health condition or a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness.

(1) Intermittent leave may be taken for a serious health condition of a spouse, parent, son, or daughter, for the employee's own serious health condition, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember which requires treatment by a health care provider periodically, rather than for one continuous period of time, and may include leave of periods from an hour or more to several weeks. Examples of intermittent leave would include leave taken on an occasional basis for medical appointments, or leave taken several days at a time spread over a period of six months, such as for chemotherapy. A pregnant employee may take leave intermittently for prenatal examinations or for her own condition, such as for periods of severe morning sickness. An example of an employee taking leave on a reduced leave schedule is an employee who is recovering from a serious health condition and is not strong enough to work a full-time schedule.

(2) Intermittent or reduced schedule leave may be taken for absences where the employee or family member is incapacitated or unable to perform the essential functions of the position because of a chronic serious health condition or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, even if he or she does not receive treatment by a health care provider. *See* 825.113 and 825.127.

(c) *Birth or placement.* When leave is taken after the birth of a healthy child or placement of a healthy child for adoption or foster care, an employee may take leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule only if the employing office agrees. Such a schedule reduction might occur, for example, where an employee, with the employing office's agreement, works part-time after the birth of a child, or takes leave in several segments. The employing office's agreement is not required, however, for leave during which the expectant mother has a serious health condition in connection with the birth of her child or if the newborn child has a serious health condition. *See* 825.204 for rules governing transfer to an alternative position that better accommodates intermittent leave. *See also* 825.120 (pregnancy) and 825.121 (adoption and foster care).

(d) *Qualifying exigency.* Leave due to a qualifying exigency may be taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis.

825.203 Scheduling of intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

Eligible employees may take FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis when medically necessary due to the serious health condition of a covered family member or the employee or the serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember. *See* 825.202. Eligible employees may also take FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis when necessary because of a qualifying exigency. If an employee needs leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule for planned medical treatment, then the employee must make a reasonable effort to schedule the treatment so as not to disrupt unduly the employing office's operations.

825.204 Transfer of an employee to an alternative position during intermittent leave or reduced schedule leave.

(a) *Transfer or reassignment.* If an employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule that is foreseeable

based on planned medical treatment for the employee, a family member, or a covered servicemember, including during a period of recovery from one's own serious health condition, a serious health condition of a spouse, parent, son, or daughter, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, or if the employing office agrees to permit intermittent or reduced schedule leave for the birth of a child or for placement of a child for adoption or foster care, the employing office may require the employee to transfer temporarily, during the period the intermittent or reduced leave schedule is required, to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position. *See* 825.601 for special rules applicable to instructional employees of schools.

(b) *Compliance.* Transfer to an alternative position may require compliance with any applicable collective bargaining agreement and Federal law (such as the Americans with Disabilities Act, as made applicable by the CAA). Transfer to an alternative position may include altering an existing job to better accommodate the employee's need for intermittent or reduced scheduled leave.

(c) *Equivalent pay and benefits.* The alternative position must have equivalent pay and benefits. An alternative position for these purposes does not have to have equivalent duties. The employing office may increase the pay and benefits of an existing alternative position, so as to make them equivalent to the pay and benefits of the employee's regular job. The employing office may also transfer the employee to a part-time job with the same hourly rate of pay and benefits, provided the employee is not required to take more leave than is medically necessary. For example, an employee desiring to take leave in increments of four hours per day could be transferred to a half-time job, or could remain in the employee's same job on a part-time schedule, paying the same hourly rate as the employee's previous job and enjoying the same benefits. The employing office may not eliminate benefits which otherwise would not be provided to part-time employees; however, an employing office may proportionately reduce benefits such as vacation leave where an employing office's normal practice is to base such benefits on the number of hours worked.

(d) *Employing office limitations.* An employing office may not transfer the employee to an alternative position in order to discourage the employee from taking leave or otherwise work a hardship on the employee. For example, a white collar employee may not be assigned to perform laborer's work; an employee working the day shift may not be reassigned to the graveyard shift; an employee working in the headquarters facility may not be reassigned to a branch a significant distance away from the employee's normal job location. Any such attempt on the part of the employing office to make such a transfer will be held to be contrary to the prohibited acts provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(e) *Reinstatement of employee.* When an employee who is taking leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule and has been transferred to an alternative position no longer needs to continue on leave and is able to return to full-time work, the employee must be placed in the same or equivalent job as the job he or she left when the leave commenced. An employee may not be required to take more leave than necessary to address the circumstance that precipitated the need for leave.

825.205 Increments of FMLA leave for intermittent or reduced schedule leave.

(a) *Minimum increment.* (1) When an employee takes FMLA leave on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis, the employing office must account for the leave using an increment no greater than the shortest period of time that the employing office uses to account for use of other forms of leave provided that it is not greater than one hour and provided further that an employee's FMLA leave entitlement may not be reduced by more than the amount of leave actually taken. An employing office may not require an employee to take more leave than is necessary to address the circumstances that precipitated the need for the leave, provided that the leave is counted using the shortest increment of leave used to account for any other type of leave. *See also* 825.205(a)(2) for the physical impossibility exception, and 825.600 and 825.601 for special rules applicable to employees of schools. If an employing office uses different increments to account for different types of leave, the employing office must account for FMLA leave in the smallest increment used to account for any other type of leave. For example, if an employing office accounts for the use of annual leave in increments of one hour and the use of sick leave in increments of one-half hour, then FMLA leave use must be accounted for using increments no larger than one-half hour. If an employing office accounts for use of leave in varying increments at different times of the day or shift, the employing office may also account for FMLA leave in varying increments, provided that the increment used for FMLA leave is no greater than the smallest increment used for any other type of leave during the period in which the FMLA leave is taken. If an employing office accounts for other forms of leave use in increments greater than one hour, the employing office must account for FMLA leave use in increments no greater than one hour. An employing office may account for FMLA leave in shorter increments than used for other forms of leave. For example, an employing office that accounts for other forms of leave in one hour increments may account for FMLA leave in a shorter increment when the employee arrives at work several minutes late, and the employing office wants the employee to begin work immediately. Such accounting for FMLA leave will not alter the increment considered to be the shortest period used to account for other forms of leave or the use of FMLA leave in other circumstances. In all cases, employees may not be charged FMLA leave for periods during which they are working.

(2) Where it is physically impossible for an employee using intermittent leave or working a reduced leave schedule to commence or end work mid-way through a shift, such as where a flight attendant or a railroad conductor is scheduled to work aboard an airplane or train, or a laboratory employee is unable to enter or leave a sealed "clean room" during a certain period of time and no equivalent position is available, the entire period that the employee is forced to be absent is designated as FMLA leave and counts against the employee's FMLA entitlement. The period of the physical impossibility is limited to the period during which the employing office is unable to permit the employee to work prior to a period of FMLA leave or return the employee to the same or equivalent position due to the physical impossibility after a period of FMLA leave. *See* 825.214.

(b) *Calculation of leave.* (1) When an employee takes leave on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule, only the amount of

leave actually taken may be counted toward the employee's leave entitlement. The actual workweek is the basis of leave entitlement. Therefore, if an employee who would otherwise work 40 hours a week takes off eight hours, the employee would use one-fifth ($\frac{1}{5}$) of a week of FMLA leave. Similarly, if a full-time employee who would otherwise work eight hour days works four-hour days under a reduced leave schedule, the employee would use one half ($\frac{1}{2}$) week of FMLA leave each week. Where an employee works a part-time schedule or variable hours, the amount of FMLA leave that an employee uses is determined on a pro rata or proportional basis. If an employee who would otherwise work 30 hours per week, but works only 20 hours a week under a reduced leave schedule, the employee's 10 hours of leave would constitute one-third ($\frac{1}{3}$) of a week of FMLA leave for each week the employee works the reduced leave schedule. An employing office may convert these fractions to their hourly equivalent so long as the conversion equitably reflects the employee's total normally scheduled hours. An employee does not accrue FMLA-protected leave at any particular hourly rate. An eligible employee is entitled to up to a total of 12 workweeks of leave, or 26 workweeks in the case of military caregiver leave, and the total number of hours contained in those workweeks is necessarily dependent on the specific hours the employee would have worked but for the use of leave. See also 825.601 and 825.602 on special rules for schools.

(2) If an employing office has made a permanent or long-term change in the employee's schedule (for reasons other than FMLA, and prior to the notice of need for FMLA leave), the hours worked under the new schedule are to be used for making this calculation.

(3) If an employee's schedule varies from week to week to such an extent that an employing office is unable to determine with any certainty how many hours the employee would otherwise have worked (but for the taking of FMLA leave), a weekly average of the hours worked over the 12 months prior to the beginning of the leave period (including any hours for which the employee took leave of any type) would be used for calculating the employee's leave entitlement.

(c) *Overtime.* If an employee would normally be required to work overtime, but is unable to do so because of a FMLA-qualifying reason that limits the employee's ability to work overtime, the hours which the employee would have been required to work may be counted against the employee's FMLA entitlement. In such a case, the employee is using intermittent or reduced schedule leave. For example, if an employee would normally be required to work for 48 hours in a particular week, but due to a serious health condition the employee is unable to work more than 40 hours that week, the employee would utilize eight hours of FMLA-protected leave out of the 48-hour workweek, or one-sixth ($\frac{1}{6}$) of a week of FMLA leave. Voluntary overtime hours that an employee does not work due to an FMLA-qualifying reason may not be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

825.206 Interaction with the FLSA.

(a) Leave taken under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, may be unpaid. If an employee is otherwise exempt from minimum wage and overtime requirements of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), as made applicable by the CAA, as a salaried executive, administrative, or professional

employee (under regulations issued by the Board, at part 541), providing unpaid FMLA-qualifying leave to such an employee will not cause the employee to lose the FLSA exemption. This means that under regulations currently in effect, where an employee meets the specified duties test, is paid on a salary basis, and is paid a salary of at least the amount specified in the regulations, the employing office may make deductions from the employee's salary for any hours taken as intermittent or reduced FMLA leave within a workweek, without affecting the exempt status of the employee. The fact that an employing office provides FMLA leave, whether paid or unpaid, and maintains records regarding FMLA leave, will not be relevant to the determination whether an employee is exempt within the meaning of the Board's regulations at part 541.

(b) For an employee paid in accordance with a fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime, where permitted by section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), the employing office, during the period in which intermittent or reduced schedule FMLA leave is scheduled to be taken, may compensate an employee on an hourly basis and pay only for the hours the employee works, including time and one-half the employee's regular rate for overtime hours. The change to payment on an hourly basis would include the entire period during which the employee is taking intermittent leave, including weeks in which no leave is taken. The hourly rate shall be determined by dividing the employee's weekly salary by the employee's normal or average schedule of hours worked during weeks in which FMLA leave is not being taken. If an employing office chooses to follow this exception from the fluctuating workweek method of payment, the employing office must do so uniformly, with respect to all employees paid on a fluctuating workweek basis for whom FMLA leave is taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule basis. If an employing office does not elect to convert the employee's compensation to hourly pay, no deduction may be taken for FMLA leave absences. Once the need for intermittent or reduced scheduled leave is over, the employee may be restored to payment on a fluctuating workweek basis.

(c) This special exception to the salary basis requirements of the FLSA exemption or fluctuating workweek payment requirements applies only to employees of covered employing offices who are eligible for FMLA leave, and to leave which qualifies as FMLA leave. Hourly or other deductions which are not in accordance with the Board's FLSA regulations at part 541 or with a permissible fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime may not be taken, for example, where the employee has not worked long enough to be eligible for FMLA leave without potentially affecting the employee's eligibility for exemption. Nor may deductions which are not permitted by the Board's FLSA regulations at part 541 or by a permissible fluctuating workweek method of payment for overtime be taken from such an employee's salary for any leave which does not qualify as FMLA leave, for example, deductions from an employee's pay for leave required under an employing office's policy or practice for a reason which does not qualify as FMLA leave, e.g., leave to care for a grandparent or for a medical condition which does not qualify as a serious health condition; or for leave which is more generous than provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, such as leave in excess of 12 weeks in a year. Employing offices may

comply with the employing office's own policy/practice under these circumstances and maintain the employee's eligibility for exemption or for the fluctuating workweek method of pay by not taking hourly deductions from the employee's pay, in accordance with FLSA requirements, as made applicable by the CAA, or may take such deductions, treating the employee as an hourly employee and pay overtime premium pay for hours worked over 40 in a workweek.

825.207 Substitution of paid leave.

(a) Generally, FMLA leave is unpaid. However, under the circumstances described in this section, FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an eligible employee to choose to substitute accrued paid leave for FMLA leave. If an employee does not choose to substitute accrued paid leave, the employing office may require the employee to substitute accrued paid leave for unpaid FMLA leave. The term substitute means that the paid leave provided by the employing office, and accrued pursuant to established policies of the employing office, will run concurrently with the unpaid FMLA leave. Accordingly, the employee receives pay pursuant to the employing office's applicable paid leave policy during the period of otherwise unpaid FMLA leave. An employee's ability to substitute accrued paid leave is determined by the terms and conditions of the employing office's normal leave policy. When an employee chooses, or an employing office requires, substitution of accrued paid leave, the employing office must inform the employee that the employee must satisfy any procedural requirements of the paid leave policy only in connection with the receipt of such payment. See 825.300(c). If an employee does not comply with the additional requirements in an employing office's paid leave policy, the employee is not entitled to substitute accrued paid leave, but the employee remains entitled to take unpaid FMLA leave. Employing offices may not discriminate against employees on FMLA leave in the administration of their paid leave policies.

(b) If neither the employee nor the employing office elects to substitute paid leave for unpaid FMLA leave under the above conditions and circumstances, the employee will remain entitled to all the paid leave which is earned or accrued under the terms of the employing office's plan.

(c) If an employee uses paid leave under circumstances which do not qualify as FMLA leave, the leave will not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. For example, paid sick leave used for a medical condition which is not a serious health condition or serious injury or illness does not count against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

(d) Leave taken pursuant to a disability leave plan would be considered FMLA leave for a serious health condition and counted in the leave entitlement permitted under FMLA if it meets the criteria set forth above in 825.112 through 825.115. In such cases, the employing office may designate the leave as FMLA leave and count the leave against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Because leave pursuant to a disability benefit plan is not unpaid, the provision for substitution of the employee's accrued paid leave is inapplicable, and neither the employee nor the employing office may require the substitution of paid leave. However, employing offices and employees may agree to have paid leave supplement the disability plan benefits, such as in the case where a plan only provides replacement income for two-thirds of an employee's salary.

(e) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, provides that a serious health condition may result from injury to the employee on or off the job. If the employing office designates the leave as FMLA leave in accordance with 825.300(d), the leave counts against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Because the workers' compensation absence is not unpaid, the provision for substitution of the employee's accrued paid leave is not applicable, and neither the employee nor the employing office may require the substitution of paid leave. However, employing offices and employees may agree, to have paid leave supplement workers' compensation benefits, such as in the case where workers' compensation only provides replacement income for two-thirds of an employee's salary. If the health care provider treating the employee for the workers' compensation injury certifies the employee is able to return to a light duty job but is unable to return to the same or equivalent job, the employee may decline the employing office's offer of a light duty job. As a result, the employee may lose workers' compensation payments, but is entitled to remain on unpaid FMLA leave until the employee's FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted. As of the date workers' compensation benefits cease, the substitution provision becomes applicable and either the employee may elect or the employing office may require the use of accrued paid leave. See also 825.210(f), 825.216(d), 825.220(d), 825.307(a) and 825.702(d)(1) and (2) regarding the relationship between workers' compensation absences and FMLA leave.

(f) Under the FLISA, as made applicable by the CAA, an employing office always has the right to cash out an employee's compensatory time or to require the employee to use the time. Therefore, if an employee requests and is permitted to use accrued compensatory time to receive pay for time taken off for an FMLA reason, or if the employing office requires such use pursuant to the FLISA, the time taken may be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

825.208 [Removed and reserved]

825.209 Maintenance of employee benefits.

(a) During any FMLA leave, an employing office must maintain the employee's coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program or any group health plan (as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 at 26 U.S.C. 5000(b)(1)) on the same conditions as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the entire leave period. All employing offices are subject to the requirements of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to maintain health coverage. The definition of group health plan is set forth in 825.102. For purposes of FMLA, the term group health plan shall not include an insurance program providing health coverage under which employees purchase individual policies from insurers provided that:

(1) No contributions are made by the employing office;

(2) Participation in the program is completely voluntary for employees;

(3) The sole functions of the employing office with respect to the program are, without endorsing the program, to permit the insurer to publicize the program to employees, to collect premiums through payroll deductions and to remit them to the insurer;

(4) The employing office receives no consideration in the form of cash or otherwise in connection with the program, other than reasonable compensation, excluding any profit, for administrative services actually

rendered in connection with payroll deduction; and

(5) The premium charged with respect to such coverage does not increase in the event the employment relationship terminates.

(b) The same group health plan benefits provided to an employee prior to taking FMLA leave must be maintained during the FMLA leave. For example, if family member coverage is provided to an employee, family member coverage must be maintained during the FMLA leave. Similarly, benefit coverage during FMLA leave for medical care, surgical care, hospital care, dental care, eye care, mental health counseling, substance abuse treatment, etc., must be maintained during leave if provided in an employing office's group health plan, including a supplement to a group health plan, whether or not provided through a flexible spending account or other component of a cafeteria plan.

(c) If an employing office provides a new health plan or benefits or changes health benefits or plans while an employee is on FMLA leave, the employee is entitled to the new or changed plan/benefits to the same extent as if the employee were not on leave. For example, if an employing office changes a group health plan so that dental care becomes covered under the plan, an employee on FMLA leave must be given the same opportunity as other employees to receive (or obtain) the dental care coverage. Any other plan changes (e.g., in coverage, premiums, deductibles, etc.) which apply to all employees of the workforce would also apply to an employee on FMLA leave.

(d) Notice of any opportunity to change plans or benefits must also be given to an employee on FMLA leave. If the group health plan permits an employee to change from single to family coverage upon the birth of a child or otherwise add new family members, such a change in benefits must be made available while an employee is on FMLA leave. If the employee requests the changed coverage it must be provided by the employing office.

(e) An employee may choose not to retain group health plan coverage during FMLA leave. However, when an employee returns from leave, the employee is entitled to be reinstated on the same terms as prior to taking the leave, including family or dependent coverages, without any qualifying period, physical examination, exclusion of pre-existing conditions, etc. See 825.212(c).

(f) Except as required by the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1986 (COBRA) or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable, and for key employees (as discussed below), an employing office's obligation to maintain health benefits during leave (and to restore the employee to the same or equivalent employment) under FMLA ceases if and when the employment relationship would have terminated if the employee had not taken FMLA leave (e.g., if the employee's position is eliminated as part of a non-discriminatory reduction in force and the employee would not have been transferred to another position); an employee informs the employing office of his or her intent not to return from leave (including before starting the leave if the employing office is so informed before the leave starts); or the employee fails to return from leave or continues on leave after exhausting his or her FMLA leave entitlement in the 12-month period.

(g) If a key employee (see 825.218) does not return from leave when notified by the employing office that substantial or grievous economic injury will result from his or her

reinstatement, the employee's entitlement to group health plan benefits continues unless and until the employee advises the employing office that the employee does not desire restoration to employment at the end of the leave period, or the FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted, or reinstatement is actually denied.

(h) An employee's entitlement to benefits other than group health benefits during a period of FMLA leave (e.g., holiday pay) is to be determined by the employing office's established policy for providing such benefits when the employee is on other forms of leave (paid or unpaid, as appropriate).

825.210 Employee payment of group health benefit premiums.

(a) Group health plan benefits must be maintained on the same basis as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the FMLA leave period. Therefore, any share of group health plan premiums which had been paid by the employee prior to FMLA leave must continue to be paid by the employee during the FMLA leave period. If premiums are raised or lowered, the employee would be required to pay the new premium rates. Maintenance of health insurance policies which are not a part of the employing office's group health plan, as described in 825.209(a), are the sole responsibility of the employee. The employee and the insurer should make necessary arrangements for payment of premiums during periods of unpaid FMLA leave.

(b) If the FMLA leave is substituted paid leave, the employee's share of premiums must be paid by the method normally used during any paid leave, presumably as a payroll deduction.

(c) If FMLA leave is unpaid, the employing office has a number of options for obtaining payment from the employee. The employing office may require that payment be made to the employing office or to the insurance carrier, but no additional charge may be added to the employee's premium payment for administrative expenses. The employing office may require employees to pay their share of premium payments in any of the following ways:

(1) Payment would be due at the same time as it would be made if by payroll deduction;

(2) Payment would be due on the same schedule as payments are made under COBRA or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable;

(3) Payment would be prepaid pursuant to a cafeteria plan at the employee's option;

(4) The employing office's existing rules for payment by employees on leave without pay would be followed, provided that such rules do not require prepayment (i.e., prior to the commencement of the leave) of the premiums that will become due during a period of unpaid FMLA leave or payment of higher premiums than if the employee had continued to work instead of taking leave; or

(5) Another system voluntarily agreed to between the employing office and the employee, which may include prepayment of premiums (e.g., through increased payroll deductions when the need for the FMLA leave is foreseeable).

(d) The employing office must provide the employee with advance written notice of the terms and conditions under which these payments must be made. See 825.300(c).

(e) An employing office may not require more of an employee using unpaid FMLA leave than the employing office requires of other employees on leave without pay.

(f) An employee who is receiving payments as a result of a workers' compensation injury

must make arrangements with the employing office for payment of group health plan benefits when simultaneously taking FMLA leave. See 825.207(e).

825.211 Maintenance of benefits under multi-employer health plans.

(a) A multi-employer health plan is a plan to which more than one employing office is required to contribute, and which is maintained pursuant to one or more collective bargaining agreements between employee organization(s) and the employing offices.

(b) An employing office under a multi-employer plan must continue to make contributions on behalf of an employee using FMLA leave as though the employee had been continuously employed, unless the plan contains an explicit FMLA provision for maintaining coverage such as through pooled contributions by all employing offices party to the plan.

(c) During the duration of an employee's FMLA leave, coverage by the group health plan, and benefits provided pursuant to the plan, must be maintained at the level of coverage and benefits which were applicable to the employee at the time FMLA leave commenced.

(d) An employee using FMLA leave cannot be required to use banked hours or pay a greater premium than the employee would have been required to pay if the employee had been continuously employed.

(e) As provided in 825.209(f) of this part, group health plan coverage must be maintained for an employee on FMLA leave until:

(1) The employee's FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted;

(2) The employing office can show that the employee would have been laid off and the employment relationship terminated; or

(3) The employee provides unequivocal notice of intent not to return to work.

825.212 Employee failure to pay health plan premium payments.

(a)(1) In the absence of an established employing office policy providing a longer grace period, an employing office's obligations to maintain health insurance coverage cease under FMLA if an employee's premium payment is more than 30 days late. In order to drop the coverage for an employee whose premium payment is late, the employing office must provide written notice to the employee that the payment has not been received. Such notice must be mailed to the employee at least 15 days before coverage is to cease, advising that coverage will be dropped on a specified date at least 15 days after the date of the letter unless the payment has been received by that date. If the employing office has established policies regarding other forms of unpaid leave that provide for the employing office to cease coverage retroactively to the date the unpaid premium payment was due, the employing office may drop the employee from coverage retroactively in accordance with that policy, provided the 15-day notice was given. In the absence of such a policy, coverage for the employee may be terminated at the end of the 30-day grace period, where the required 15-day notice has been provided.

(2) An employing office has no obligation regarding the maintenance of a health insurance policy which is not a group health plan. See 825.209(a).

(3) All other obligations of an employing office under FMLA would continue; for example, the employing office continues to have an obligation to reinstate an employee upon return from leave.

(b) The employing office may recover the employee's share of any premium payments

missed by the employee for any FMLA leave period during which the employing office maintains health coverage by paying the employee's share after the premium payment is missed.

(c) If coverage lapses because an employee has not made required premium payments, upon the employee's return from FMLA leave the employing office must still restore the employee to coverage/benefits equivalent to those the employee would have had if leave had not been taken and the premium payment(s) had not been missed, including family or dependent coverage. See 825.215(d)(1)-(5). In such case, an employee may not be required to meet any qualification requirements imposed by the plan, including any new preexisting condition waiting period, to wait for an open season, or to pass a medical examination to obtain reinstatement of coverage. If an employing office terminates an employee's insurance in accordance with this section and fails to restore the employee's health insurance as required by this section upon the employee's return, the employing office may be liable for benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable relief tailored to the harm suffered.

825.213 Employing office recovery of benefit costs.

(a) In addition to the circumstances discussed in 825.212(b), an employing office may recover its share of health plan premiums during a period of unpaid FMLA leave from an employee if the employee fails to return to work after the employee's FMLA leave entitlement has been exhausted or expires, unless the reason the employee does not return is due to:

(1) The continuation, recurrence, or onset of either a serious health condition of the employee or the employee's family member, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, which would otherwise entitle the employee to leave under FMLA; or

(2) Other circumstances beyond the employee's control. Examples of other circumstances beyond the employee's control are necessarily broad. They include such situations as where a parent chooses to stay home with a newborn child who has a serious health condition; an employee's spouse is unexpectedly transferred to a job location more than 75 miles from the employee's worksite; a relative or individual other than a covered family member has a serious health condition and the employee is needed to provide care; the employee is laid off while on leave; or, the employee is a key employee who decides not to return to work upon being notified of the employing office's intention to deny restoration because of substantial and grievous economic injury to the employing office's operations and is not reinstated by the employing office. Other circumstances beyond the employee's control would not include a situation where an employee desires to remain with a parent in a distant city even though the parent no longer requires the employee's care, or a parent chooses not to return to work to stay home with a well, newborn child.

(3) When an employee fails to return to work because of the continuation, recurrence, or onset of either a serious health condition of the employee or employee's family member, or a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember, thereby precluding the employing office from recovering its (share of) health benefit premium payments made on the employee's behalf during a pe-

riod of unpaid FMLA leave, the employing office may require medical certification of the employee's or the family member's serious health condition or the covered servicemember's serious injury or illness. Such certification is not required unless requested by the employing office. The cost of the certification shall be borne by the employee, and the employee is not entitled to be paid for the time or travel costs spent in acquiring the certification. The employee is required to provide medical certification in a timely manner which, for purposes of this section, is within 30 days from the date of the employing office's request. For purposes of medical certification, the employee may use the optional forms developed for this purpose. See 825.306(b), 825.310(c)-(d) and Forms A, B, and F. If the employing office requests medical certification and the employee does not provide such certification in a timely manner (within 30 days), or the reason for not returning to work does not meet the test of other circumstances beyond the employee's control, the employing office may recover 100 percent of the health benefit premiums it paid during the period of unpaid FMLA leave.

(b) Under some circumstances an employing office may elect to maintain other benefits, *e.g.*, life insurance, disability insurance, *etc.*, by paying the employee's (share of) premiums during periods of unpaid FMLA leave. For example, to ensure the employing office can meet its responsibilities to provide equivalent benefits to the employee upon return from unpaid FMLA leave, it may be necessary that premiums be paid continuously to avoid a lapse of coverage. If the employing office elects to maintain such benefits during the leave, at the conclusion of leave, the employing office is entitled to recover only the costs incurred for paying the employee's share of any premiums whether or not the employee returns to work.

(c) An employee who returns to work for at least 30 calendar days is considered to have returned to work. An employee who transfers directly from taking FMLA leave to retirement, or who retires during the first 30 days after the employee returns to work, is deemed to have returned to work.

(d) When an employee elects or an employing office requires paid leave to be substituted for FMLA leave, the employing office may not recover its (share of) health insurance or other non-health benefit premiums for any period of FMLA leave covered by paid leave. Because paid leave provided under a plan covering temporary disabilities (including workers' compensation) is not unpaid, recovery of health insurance premiums does not apply to such paid leave.

(e) The amount that self-insured employing offices may recover is limited to only the employing office's share of allowable premiums as would be calculated under COBRA, excluding the two percent fee for administrative costs.

(f) When an employee fails to return to work, any health and non-health benefit premiums which this section of the regulations permits an employing office to recover are a debt owed by the non-returning employee to the employing office. The existence of this debt caused by the employee's failure to return to work does not alter the employing office's responsibilities for health benefit coverage and, under a self-insurance plan, payment of claims incurred during the period of FMLA leave. To the extent recovery is allowed, the employing office may recover the costs through deduction from any sums due to the employee (*e.g.*, unpaid wages, vacation pay, *etc.*), provided such deductions do

not otherwise violate applicable wage payment or other laws. Alternatively, the employing office may initiate legal action against the employee to recover such costs.

825.214 Employee right to reinstatement.

General Rule. On return from FMLA leave, an employee is entitled to be returned to the same position the employee held when leave commenced, or to an equivalent position with equivalent benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. An employee is entitled to such reinstatement even if the employee has been replaced or his or her position has been restructured to accommodate the employee's absence. *See also* 825.106(e) for the obligations of employing offices that are joint employers.

825.215 Equivalent position.

(a) *Equivalent position.* An equivalent position is one that is virtually identical to the employee's former position in terms of pay, benefits and working conditions, including privileges, prerequisites and status. It must involve the same or substantially similar duties and responsibilities, which must entail substantially equivalent skill, effort, responsibility, and authority.

(b) *Conditions to qualify.* If an employee is no longer qualified for the position because of the employee's inability to attend a necessary course, renew a license, *etc.*, as a result of the leave, the employee shall be given a reasonable opportunity to fulfill those conditions upon return to work.

(c) *Equivalent Pay.* (1) An employee is entitled to any unconditional pay increases which may have occurred during the FMLA leave period, such as cost of living increases. Pay increases conditioned upon seniority, length of service, or work performed must be granted in accordance with the employing office's policy or practice with respect to other employees on an equivalent leave status for a reason that does not qualify as FMLA leave. An employee is entitled to be restored to a position with the same or equivalent pay premiums, such as a shift differential. If an employee departed from a position averaging ten hours of overtime (and corresponding overtime pay) each week, an employee is ordinarily entitled to such a position on return from FMLA leave.

(2) Equivalent pay includes any bonus or payment, whether it is discretionary or non-discretionary, made to employees consistent with the provisions of paragraph (c)(1) of this section. However, if a bonus or other payment is based on the achievement of a specified goal such as hours worked, products sold or perfect attendance, and the employee has not met the goal due to FMLA leave, then the payment may be denied, unless otherwise paid to employees on an equivalent leave status for a reason that does not qualify as FMLA leave. For example, if an employee who used paid vacation leave for a non-FMLA purpose would receive the payment, then the employee who used paid vacation leave for an FMLA-protected purpose also must receive the payment.

(d) *Equivalent benefits.* Benefits include all benefits provided or made available to employees by an employing office, including group life insurance, health insurance, disability insurance, sick leave, annual leave, educational benefits, and pensions, regardless of whether such benefits are provided by a practice or written policy of an employing office through an employee benefit plan.

(1) At the end of an employee's FMLA leave, benefits must be resumed in the same manner and at the same levels as provided when the leave began, and subject to any

changes in benefit levels that may have taken place during the period of FMLA leave affecting the entire work force, unless otherwise elected by the employee. Upon return from FMLA leave, an employee cannot be required to requalify for any benefits the employee enjoyed before FMLA leave began (including family or dependent coverages). For example, if an employee was covered by a life insurance policy before taking leave but is not covered or coverage lapses during the period of unpaid FMLA leave, the employee cannot be required to meet any qualifications, such as taking a physical examination, in order to requalify for life insurance upon return from leave. Accordingly, some employing offices may find it necessary to modify life insurance and other benefits programs in order to restore employees to equivalent benefits upon return from FMLA leave, make arrangements for continued payment of costs to maintain such benefits during unpaid FMLA leave, or pay these costs subject to recovery from the employee on return from leave. *See* 825.213(b).

(2) An employee may, but is not entitled to, accrue any additional benefits or seniority during unpaid FMLA leave. Benefits accrued at the time leave began, however, (*e.g.*, paid vacation, sick or personal leave to the extent not substituted for FMLA leave) must be available to an employee upon return from leave.

(3) If, while on unpaid FMLA leave, an employee desires to continue life insurance, disability insurance, or other types of benefits for which he or she typically pays, the employing office is required to follow established policies or practices for continuing such benefits for other instances of leave without pay. If the employing office has no established policy, the employee and the employing office are encouraged to agree upon arrangements before FMLA leave begins.

(4) With respect to pension and other retirement plans, any period of unpaid FMLA leave shall not be treated as or counted toward a break in service for purposes of vesting and eligibility to participate. Also, if the plan requires an employee to be employed on a specific date in order to be credited with a year of service for vesting, contributions or participation purposes, an employee on unpaid FMLA leave on that date shall be deemed to have been employed on that date. However, unpaid FMLA leave periods need not be treated as credited service for purposes of benefit accrual, vesting and eligibility to participate.

(5) Employees on unpaid FMLA leave are to be treated as if they continued to work for purposes of changes to benefit plans. They are entitled to changes in benefits plans, except those which may be dependent upon seniority or accrual during the leave period, immediately upon return from leave or to the same extent they would have qualified if no leave had been taken. For example if the benefit plan is predicated on a pre-established number of hours worked each year and the employee does not have sufficient hours as a result of taking unpaid FMLA leave, the benefit is lost. (In this regard, 825.209 addresses health benefits.)

(e) *Equivalent terms and conditions of employment.* An equivalent position must have substantially similar duties, conditions, responsibilities, privileges and status as the employee's original position.

(1) The employee must be reinstated to the same or a geographically proximate worksite (*i.e.*, one that does not involve a significant increase in commuting time or distance) from where the employee had previously

been employed. If the employee's original worksite has been closed, the employee is entitled to the same rights as if the employee had not been on leave when the worksite closed. For example, if an employing office transfers all employees from a closed worksite to a new worksite in a different city, the employee on leave is also entitled to transfer under the same conditions as if he or she had continued to be employed.

(2) The employee is ordinarily entitled to return to the same shift or the same or an equivalent work schedule.

(3) The employee must have the same or an equivalent opportunity for bonuses, and other similar discretionary and non-discretionary payments.

(4) FMLA does not prohibit an employing office from accommodating an employee's request to be restored to a different shift, schedule, or position which better suits the employee's personal needs on return from leave, or to offer a promotion to a better position. However, an employee cannot be induced by the employing office to accept a different position against the employee's wishes.

(f) *De minimis exception.* The requirement that an employee be restored to the same or equivalent job with the same or equivalent pay, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment does not extend to de minimis, intangible, or unmeasurable aspects of the job.

825.216 Limitations on an employee's right to reinstatement.

(a) An employee has no greater right to reinstatement or to other benefits and conditions of employment than if the employee had been continuously employed during the FMLA leave period. An employing office must be able to show that an employee would not otherwise have been employed at the time reinstatement is requested in order to deny restoration to employment. For example:

(1) If an employee is laid off during the course of taking FMLA leave and employment is terminated, the employing office's responsibility to continue FMLA leave, maintain group health plan benefits and restore the employee ceases at the time the employee is laid off, provided the employing office has no continuing obligations under a collective bargaining agreement or otherwise. An employing office would have the burden of proving that an employee would have been laid off during the FMLA leave period and, therefore, would not be entitled to restoration. Restoration to a job slated for lay-off when the employee's original position is not would not meet the requirements of an equivalent position.

(2) If a shift has been eliminated, or overtime has been decreased, an employee would not be entitled to return to work that shift or the original overtime hours upon restoration. However, if a position on, for example, a night shift has been filled by another employee, the employee is entitled to return to the same shift on which employed before taking FMLA leave.

(3) If an employee was hired for a specific term or only to perform work on a discrete project, the employing office has no obligation to restore the employee if the employment term or project is over and the employing office would not otherwise have continued to employ the employee. On the other hand, if an employee was hired to perform work for one employing office for a specific time period, and after that time period has ended, the work was assigned to another employing office, the successor employing office may be required to restore the employee

if it is a successor employing office. See 825.107.

(b) In addition to the circumstances explained above, an employing office may deny job restoration to salaried eligible employees (key employees, as defined in 825.217(c)), if such denial is necessary to prevent substantial and grievous economic injury to the operations of the employing office; or may delay restoration to an employee who fails to provide a fitness-for-duty certificate to return to work under the conditions described in 825.312.

(c) If the employee is unable to perform an essential function of the position because of a physical or mental condition, including the continuation of a serious health condition or an injury or illness also covered by workers' compensation, the employee has no right to restoration to another position under the FMLA. The employing office's obligations may, however, be governed by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and as made applicable by the CAA. See 825.702.

(d) An employee who fraudulently obtains FMLA leave from an employing office is not protected by the job restoration or maintenance of health benefits provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(e) If the employing office has a uniformly-applied policy governing outside or supplemental employment, such a policy may continue to apply to an employee while on FMLA leave. An employing office which does not have such a policy may not deny benefits to which an employee is entitled under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, on this basis unless the FMLA leave was fraudulently obtained as in paragraph (d) of this section.

825.217 Key employee, general rule.

(a) A *key employee* is a salaried FMLA-eligible employee who is among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the employee's worksite.

(b) The term *salaried* means paid on a salary basis, within the meaning of the Board's regulations at part 541, implementing section 203 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1313), regarding employees who may qualify as exempt from the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA, as made applicable by the CAA, as executive, administrative, and professional employees).

(c) A key employee must be among the highest paid 10 percent of all the employees—both salaried and non-salaried, eligible and ineligible—who are employed by the employing office within 75 miles of the worksite.

(1) In determining which employees are among the highest paid 10 percent, year-to-date earnings are divided by weeks worked by the employee (including weeks in which paid leave was taken). Earnings include wages, premium pay, incentive pay, and non-discretionary and discretionary bonuses. Earnings do not include incentives whose value is determined at some future date, e.g., benefits or prerequisites.

(2) The determination of whether a salaried employee is among the highest paid 10 percent shall be made at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave. No more than 10 percent of the employing office's employees within 75 miles of the worksite may be key employees.

825.218 Substantial and grievous economic injury.

(a) In order to deny restoration to a key employee, an employing office must determine that the restoration of the employee to

employment will cause substantial and grievous economic injury to the operations of the employing office, not whether the absence of the employee will cause such substantial and grievous injury.

(b) An employing office may take into account its ability to replace on a temporary basis (or temporarily do without) the employee on FMLA leave. If permanent replacement is unavoidable, the cost of then reinstating the employee can be considered in evaluating whether substantial and grievous economic injury will occur from restoration; in other words, the effect on the operations of the employing office of reinstating the employee in an equivalent position.

(c) A precise test cannot be set for the level of hardship or injury to the employing office which must be sustained. If the reinstatement of a key employee threatens the economic viability of the employing office, that would constitute substantial and grievous economic injury. A lesser injury which causes substantial, long-term economic injury would also be sufficient. Minor inconveniences and costs that the employing office would experience in the normal course would certainly not constitute substantial and grievous economic injury.

(d) FMLA's substantial and grievous economic injury standard is different from and more stringent than the undue hardship test under the ADA. See also 825.702.

825.219 Rights of a key employee

(a) An employing office that believes that reinstatement may be denied to a key employee, must give written notice to the employee at the time the employee gives notice of the need for FMLA leave (or when FMLA leave commences, if earlier) that he or she qualifies as a key employee. At the same time, the employing office must also fully inform the employee of the potential consequences with respect to reinstatement and maintenance of health benefits if the employing office should determine that substantial and grievous economic injury to the employing office's operations will result if the employee is reinstated from FMLA leave. If such notice cannot be given immediately because of the need to determine whether the employee is a key employee, it shall be given as soon as practicable after being notified of a need for leave (or the commencement of leave, if earlier). It is expected that in most circumstances there will be no desire that an employee be denied restoration after FMLA leave and, therefore, there would be no need to provide such notice. However, an employing office who fails to provide such timely notice will lose its right to deny restoration even if substantial and grievous economic injury will result from reinstatement.

(b) As soon as an employing office makes a good faith determination, based on the facts available, that substantial and grievous economic injury to its operations will result if a key employee who has given notice of the need for FMLA leave or is using FMLA leave is reinstated, the employing office shall notify the employee in writing of its determination, that it cannot deny FMLA leave, and that it intends to deny restoration to employment on completion of the FMLA leave. It is anticipated that an employing office will ordinarily be able to give such notice prior to the employee starting leave. The employing office must serve this notice either in person or by certified mail. This notice must explain the basis for the employing office's finding that substantial and grievous economic injury will result, and, if leave has commenced, must provide the employee a

reasonable time in which to return to work, taking into account the circumstances, such as the length of the leave and the urgency of the need for the employee to return.

(c) If an employee on leave does not return to work in response to the employing office's notification of intent to deny restoration, the employee continues to be entitled to maintenance of health benefits and the employing office may not recover its cost of health benefit premiums. A key employee's rights under FMLA continue unless and until the employee either gives notice that he or she no longer wishes to return to work, or the employing office actually denies reinstatement at the conclusion of the leave period.

(d) After notice to an employee has been given that substantial and grievous economic injury will result if the employee is reinstated to employment, an employee is still entitled to request reinstatement at the end of the leave period even if the employee did not return to work in response to the employing office's notice. The employing office must then again determine whether there will be substantial and grievous economic injury from reinstatement, based on the facts at that time. If it is determined that substantial and grievous economic injury will result, the employing office shall notify the employee in writing (in person or by certified mail) of the denial of restoration.

825.220 Protection for employees who request leave or otherwise assert FMLA rights.

(a) The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, prohibits interference with an employee's rights under the law, and with legal proceedings or inquiries relating to an employee's rights. More specifically, the law contains the following employee protections:

(1) An employing office is prohibited from interfering with, restraining, or denying the exercise of (or attempts to exercise) any rights provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(2) An employing office is prohibited from discharging or in any other way discriminating against any covered employee (whether or not an eligible employee) for opposing or complaining about any unlawful practice under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(3) All employing offices are prohibited from discharging or in any other way discriminating against any covered employee (whether or not an eligible employee) because that covered employee has—

(i) Filed any charge, or has instituted (or caused to be instituted) any proceeding under or related to the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA;

(ii) Given, or is about to give, any information in connection with an inquiry or proceeding relating to a right under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA;

(iii) Testified, or is about to testify, in any inquiry or proceeding relating to a right under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA.

(b) Any violations of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or of these regulations constitute interfering with, restraining, or denying the exercise of rights provided by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c). Interfering with the exercise of an employee's rights would

include, for example, not only refusing to authorize FMLA leave, but discouraging an employee from using such leave. It would also include manipulation by a covered employing office to avoid responsibilities under FMLA, for example:

(1) [Reserved]

(2) Changing the essential functions of the job in order to preclude the taking of leave; or

(3) Reducing hours available to work in order to avoid employee eligibility.

(c) The FMLA's prohibition against interference prohibits an employing office from discriminating or retaliating against an employee or prospective employee for having exercised or attempted to exercise FMLA rights. For example, if an employee on leave without pay would otherwise be entitled to full benefits (other than health benefits), the same benefits would be required to be provided to an employee on unpaid FMLA leave. By the same token, employing offices cannot use the taking of FMLA leave as a negative factor in employment actions, such as hiring, promotions or disciplinary actions; nor can FMLA leave be counted under no fault attendance policies. *See* 825.215.

(d) Employees cannot waive, nor may employing offices induce employees to waive, their rights under FMLA. For example, employees (or their collective bargaining representatives) cannot trade off the right to take FMLA leave against some other benefit offered by the employing office. Except for settlement agreements covered by 1414 and/or 1415 of the Congressional Accountability Act, this does not prevent the settlement or release of FMLA claims by employees based on past employing office conduct without the approval of the Office of Compliance or a court. Nor does it prevent an employee's voluntary and uncoerced acceptance (not as a condition of employment) of a light duty assignment while recovering from a serious health condition. *See* 825.702(d). An employee's acceptance of such light duty assignment does not constitute a waiver of the employee's prospective rights, including the right to be restored to the same position the employee held at the time the employee's FMLA leave commenced or to an equivalent position. The employee's right to restoration, however, ceases at the end of the applicable 12-month FMLA leave year.

(e) Individuals, and not merely covered employees, are protected from retaliation for opposing (e.g., filing a complaint about) any practice which is unlawful under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. They are similarly protected if they oppose any practice which they reasonably believe to be a violation of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or regulations.

Subpart C—EMPLOYEE AND EMPLOYING OFFICE RIGHTS AND OBLIGATIONS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA

825.300 Employing office notice requirements.

(a)(1) If an employing office has any eligible employees and has any written guidance to employees concerning employee benefits or leave rights, such as in an employee handbook, information concerning both entitlements and employee obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, must be included in the handbook or other document. For example, if an employing office provides an employee handbook to all employees that describes the employing office's policies regarding leave, wages, attendance, and similar matters, the handbook must incorporate information on FMLA rights and

responsibilities and the employing office's policies regarding the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Informational publications describing the provisions of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, are available from the Office of Compliance and may be incorporated in such employing office handbooks or written policies.

(2) If such an employing office does not have written policies, manuals, or handbooks describing employee benefits and leave provisions, the employing office shall provide written guidance to an employee concerning all the employee's rights and obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. This notice shall be provided to employees each time notice is given pursuant to paragraph (c), and in accordance with the provisions of that paragraph. Employing offices may duplicate and provide the employee a copy of the FMLA Fact Sheet available from the Office of Compliance to provide such guidance.

(b) *Eligibility notice.* (1) When an employee requests FMLA leave, or when the employing office acquires knowledge that an employee's leave may be for an FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office must notify the employee of the employee's eligibility to take FMLA leave within five business days, absent extenuating circumstances. *See* 825.110 for definition of an eligible employee. Employee eligibility is determined (and notice must be provided) at the commencement of the first instance of leave for each FMLA-qualifying reason in the applicable 12-month period. *See* 825.127(c) and 825.200(b). All FMLA absences for the same qualifying reason are considered a single leave and employee eligibility as to that reason for leave does not change during the applicable 12-month period.

(2) The eligibility notice must state whether the employee is eligible for FMLA leave as defined in 825.110. If the employee is not eligible for FMLA leave, the notice must state at least one reason why the employee is not eligible, including as applicable the number of months the employee has been employed by the employing office and the hours of service with the employing office during the 12-month period. Notification of eligibility may be oral or in writing; employing offices may use Form C to provide such notification to employees. The employing office is obligated to translate this notice in any situation in which it is obligated to do so in 825.300(a)(4).

(3) If, at the time an employee provides notice of a subsequent need for FMLA leave during the applicable 12-month period due to a different FMLA-qualifying reason, and the employee's eligibility status has not changed, no additional eligibility notice is required. If, however, the employee's eligibility status has changed (e.g., if the employee has not met the hours of service requirement in the 12 months preceding the commencement of leave for the subsequent qualifying reason), the employing office must notify the employee of the change in eligibility status within five business days, absent extenuating circumstances.

(c) *Rights and responsibilities notice.* (1) Employing offices shall provide written notice detailing the specific expectations and obligations of the employee and explaining any consequences of a failure to meet these obligations. The employing office is obligated to translate this notice in any situation in which it is obligated to do so in 825.300(a)(4). This notice shall be provided to the employee each time the eligibility notice is provided pursuant to paragraph (b) of this sec-

tion. If leave has already begun, the notice should be mailed to the employee's address of record. Such specific notice must include, as appropriate:

(i) That the leave may be designated and counted against the employee's annual FMLA leave entitlement if qualifying (*see* 825.300(c) and 825.301) and the applicable 12-month period for FMLA entitlement (*see* 825.127(c), 825.200(b), (f), and (g));

(ii) Any requirements for the employee to furnish certification of a serious health condition, serious injury or illness, or qualifying exigency arising out of active duty or call to active duty status, and the consequences of failing to do so (*see* 825.305, 825.309, 825.310, 825.313);

(iii) The employee's right to substitute paid leave, whether the employing office will require the substitution of paid leave, the conditions related to any substitution, and the employee's entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave if the employee does not meet the conditions for paid leave (*see* 825.207);

(iv) Any requirement for the employee to make any premium payments to maintain health benefits and the arrangements for making such payments (*see* 825.210), and the possible consequences of failure to make such payments on a timely basis (i.e., the circumstances under which coverage may lapse);

(v) The employee's status as a key employee and the potential consequence that restoration may be denied following FMLA leave, explaining the conditions required for such denial (*see* 825.218);

(vi) The employee's right to maintenance of benefits during the FMLA leave and restoration to the same or an equivalent job upon return from FMLA leave (*see* 825.214 and 825.604); and

(vii) The employee's potential liability for payment of health insurance premiums paid by the employing office during the employee's unpaid FMLA leave if the employee fails to return to work after taking FMLA leave (*see* 825.213).

(2) The notice of rights and responsibilities may include other information—e.g., whether the employing office will require periodic reports of the employee's status and intent to return to work—but is not required to do so.

(3) The notice of rights and responsibilities may be accompanied by any required certification form.

(4) If the specific information provided by the notice of rights and responsibilities changes, the employing office shall, within five business days of receipt of the employee's first notice of need for leave subsequent to any change, provide written notice referencing the prior notice and setting forth any of the information in the notice of rights and responsibilities that has changed. For example, if the initial leave period was paid leave and the subsequent leave period would be unpaid leave, the employing office may need to give notice of the arrangements for making premium payments.

(5) Employing offices are also expected to responsively answer questions from employees concerning their rights and responsibilities under the FMLA, as made applicable under the CAA.

(6) A prototype notice of rights and responsibilities may be obtained in Form C, or from the Office of Compliance. Employing offices may adapt the prototype notice as appropriate to meet these notice requirements. The notice of rights and responsibilities may be distributed electronically so long as it otherwise meets the requirements of this section.

(d) *Designation notice.* (1) The employing office is responsible in all circumstances for designating leave as FMLA-qualifying, and for giving notice of the designation to the employee as provided in this section. When the employing office has enough information to determine whether the leave is being taken for a FMLA-qualifying reason (e.g., after receiving a certification), the employing office must notify the employee whether the leave will be designated and will be counted as FMLA leave within five business days absent extenuating circumstances. Only one notice of designation is required for each FMLA-qualifying reason per applicable 12-month period, regardless of whether the leave taken due to the qualifying reason will be a continuous block of leave or intermittent or reduced schedule leave. If the employing office determines that the leave will not be designated as FMLA-qualifying (e.g., if the leave is not for a reason covered by FMLA or the FMLA leave entitlement has been exhausted), the employing office must notify the employee of that determination. If the employing office requires paid leave to be substituted for unpaid FMLA leave, or that paid leave taken under an existing leave plan be counted as FMLA leave, the employing office must inform the employee of this designation at the time of designating the FMLA leave.

(2) If the employing office has sufficient information to designate the leave as FMLA leave immediately after receiving notice of the employee's need for leave, the employing office may provide the employee with the designation notice at that time.

(3) If the employing office will require the employee to present a fitness-for-duty certification to be restored to employment, the employing office must provide notice of such requirement with the designation notice. If the employing office will require that the fitness-for-duty certification address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's position, the employing office must so indicate in the designation notice, and must include a list of the essential functions of the employee's position. See 825.312. If the employing office's handbook or other written documents (if any) describing the employing office's leave policies clearly provide that a fitness-for-duty certification will be required in specific circumstances (e.g., by stating that fitness-for-duty certification will be required in all cases of back injuries for employees in a certain occupation), the employing office is not required to provide written notice of the requirement with the designation notice, but must provide oral notice no later than with the designation notice.

(4) The designation notice must be in writing. A prototype designation notice is contained in Form D or may be obtained from the Office of Compliance. If the leave is not designated as FMLA leave because it does not meet the requirements of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, the notice to the employee that the leave is not designated as FMLA leave may be in the form of a simple written statement.

(5) If the information provided by the employing office to the employee in the designation notice changes (e.g., the employee exhausts the FMLA leave entitlement), the employing office shall provide, within five business days of receipt of the employee's first notice of need for leave subsequent to any change, written notice of the change.

(6) The employing office must notify the employee of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

If the amount of leave needed is known at the time the employing office designates the leave as FMLA-qualifying, the employing office must notify the employee of the number of hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement in the designation notice. If it is not possible to provide the hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement (such as in the case of unforeseeable intermittent leave), then the employing office must provide notice of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement upon the request by the employee, but no more often than once in a 30-day period and only if leave was taken in that period. The notice of the amount of leave counted against the employee's FMLA entitlement may be oral or in writing. If such notice is oral, it shall be confirmed in writing no later than the following payday (unless the payday is less than one week after the oral notice, in which case the notice must be no later than the subsequent payday). Such written notice may be in any form, including a notation on the employee's pay stub.

(e) *Consequences of failing to provide notice.* Failure to follow the notice requirements set forth in this section may constitute an interference with, restraint, or denial of the exercise of an employee's FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c).

825.301 Designation of FMLA leave.

(a) *Employing office responsibilities.* The employing office's decision to designate leave as FMLA-qualifying must be based only on information received from the employee or the employee's spokesperson (e.g., if the employee is incapacitated, the employee's spouse, adult child, parent, doctor, etc.), may provide notice to the employing office of the need to take FMLA leave). In any circumstance where the employing office does not have sufficient information about the reason for an employee's use of leave, the employing office should inquire further of the employee or the spokesperson to ascertain whether leave is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Once the employing office has acquired knowledge that the leave is being taken for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office must notify the employee as provided in 825.300(d).

(b) *Employee responsibilities.* An employee giving notice of the need for FMLA leave does not need to expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA to meet his or her obligation to provide notice, though the employee would need to state a qualifying reason for the needed leave and otherwise satisfy the notice requirements set forth in 825.302 or 825.303 depending on whether the need for leave is foreseeable or unforeseeable. An employee giving notice of the need for FMLA leave must explain the reasons for the needed leave so as to allow the employing office to determine whether the leave qualifies under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. If the employee fails to explain the reasons, leave may be denied. In many cases, in explaining the reasons for a request to use leave, especially when the need for the leave was unexpected or unforeseen, an employee will provide sufficient in-

formation for the employing office to designate the leave as FMLA leave. An employee using accrued paid leave may in some cases not spontaneously explain the reasons or their plans for using their accrued leave. However, if an employee requesting to use paid leave for a FMLA-qualifying reason does not explain the reason for the leave and the employing office denies the employee's request, the employee will need to provide sufficient information to establish a FMLA-qualifying reason for the needed leave so that the employing office is aware that the leave may not be denied and may designate that the paid leave be appropriately counted against (substituted for) the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. Similarly, an employee using accrued paid vacation leave who seeks an extension of unpaid leave for a FMLA-qualifying reason will need to state the reason. If this is due to an event which occurred during the period of paid leave, the employing office may count the leave used after the FMLA-qualifying reason against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement.

(c) *Disputes.* If there is a dispute between an employing office and an employee as to whether leave qualifies as FMLA leave, it should be resolved through discussions between the employee and the employing office. Such discussions and the decision must be documented.

(d) *Retroactive designation.* If an employing office does not designate leave as required by 825.300, the employing office may retroactively designate leave as FMLA leave with appropriate notice to the employee as required by 825.300 provided that the employing office's failure to timely designate leave does not cause harm or injury to the employee. In all cases where leave would qualify for FMLA protections, an employing office and an employee can mutually agree that leave be retroactively designated as FMLA leave.

(e) *Remedies.* If an employing office's failure to timely designate leave in accordance with 825.300 causes the employee to suffer harm, it may constitute an interference with, restraint of, or denial of the exercise of an employee's FMLA rights. An employing office may be liable for compensation and benefits lost by reason of the violation, for other actual monetary losses sustained as a direct result of the violation, and for appropriate equitable or other relief, including employment, reinstatement, promotion, or any other relief tailored to the harm suffered. See 825.400(c). For example, if an employing office that was put on notice that an employee needed FMLA leave failed to designate the leave properly, but the employee's own serious health condition prevented him or her from returning to work during that time period regardless of the designation, an employee may not be able to show that the employee suffered harm as a result of the employing office's actions. However, if an employee took leave to provide care for a son or daughter with a serious health condition believing it would not count toward his or her FMLA entitlement, and the employee planned to later use that FMLA leave to provide care for a spouse who would need assistance when recovering from surgery planned for a later date, the employee may be able to show that harm has occurred as a result of the employing office's failure to designate properly. The employee might establish this by showing that he or she would have arranged for an alternative caregiver for the seriously-ill son or daughter if the leave had been designated timely.

825.302 Employee notice requirements for foreseeable FMLA leave.

(a) *Timing of notice.* An employee must provide the employing office at least 30 days advance notice before FMLA leave is to begin if the need for the leave is foreseeable based on an expected birth, placement for adoption or foster care, planned medical treatment for a serious health condition of the employee or of a family member, or the planned medical treatment for a serious injury or illness of a covered servicemember. If 30 days notice is not practicable, such as because of a lack of knowledge of approximately when leave will be required to begin, a change in circumstances, or a medical emergency, notice must be given as soon as practicable. For example, an employee's health condition may require leave to commence earlier than anticipated before the birth of a child. Similarly, little opportunity for notice may be given before placement for adoption. For foreseeable leave due to a qualifying exigency, notice must be provided as soon as practicable, regardless of how far in advance such leave is foreseeable. Whether FMLA leave is to be continuous or is to be taken intermittently or on a reduced schedule basis, notice need only be given one time, but the employee shall advise the employing office as soon as practicable if dates of scheduled leave change or are extended, or were initially unknown. In those cases where the employee is required to provide at least 30 days notice of foreseeable leave and does not do so, the employee shall explain the reasons why such notice was not practicable upon a request from the employing office for such information.

(b) *As soon as practicable* means as soon as both possible and practical, taking into account all of the facts and circumstances in the individual case. When an employee becomes aware of a need for FMLA leave less than 30 days in advance, it should be practicable for the employee to provide notice of the need for leave either the same day or the next business day. In all cases, however, the determination of when an employee could practicably provide notice must take into account the individual facts and circumstances.

(c) *Content of notice.* An employee shall provide at least verbal notice sufficient to make the employing office aware that the employee needs FMLA-qualifying leave, and the anticipated timing and duration of the leave. Depending on the situation, such information may include that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job; that the employee is pregnant or has been hospitalized overnight; whether the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider; if the leave is due to a qualifying exigency, that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty), and that the requested leave is for one of the reasons listed in 825.126(b); if the leave is for a family member, that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities, or that the family member is a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness; and the anticipated duration of the absence, if known. When an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA. When an employee seeks leave due to a FMLA-qualifying reason, for which the employing office has

previously provided FMLA-protected leave, the employee must specifically reference the qualifying reason for leave or the need for FMLA leave. In all cases, the employing office should inquire further of the employee if it is necessary to have more information about whether FMLA leave is being sought by the employee, and obtain the necessary details of the leave to be taken. In the case of medical conditions, the employing office may find it necessary to inquire further to determine if the leave is because of a serious health condition and may request medical certification to support the need for such leave. See 825.305. An employing office may also request certification to support the need for leave for a qualifying exigency or for military caregiver leave. See 825.309, 825.310. When an employee has been previously certified for leave due to more than one FMLA-qualifying reason, the employing office may need to inquire further to determine for which qualifying reason the leave is needed. An employee has an obligation to respond to an employing office's questions designed to determine whether an absence is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Failure to respond to reasonable employing office inquiries regarding the leave request may result in denial of FMLA protection if the employing office is unable to determine whether the leave is FMLA-qualifying.

(d) *Complying with the employing office policy.* An employing office may require an employee to comply with the employing office's usual and customary notice and procedural requirements for requesting leave, absent unusual circumstances. For example, an employing office may require that written notice set forth the reasons for the requested leave, the anticipated duration of the leave, and the anticipated start of the leave. An employee also may be required by an employing office's policy to contact a specific individual. Unusual circumstances would include situations such as when an employee is unable to comply with the employing office's policy that requests for leave should be made by contacting a specific number because on the day the employee needs to provide notice of his or her need for FMLA leave there is no one to answer the call-in number and the voice mail box is full. Where an employee does not comply with the employing office's usual notice and procedural requirements, and no unusual circumstances justify the failure to comply, FMLA-protected leave may be delayed or denied. However, FMLA-protected leave may not be delayed or denied where the employing office's policy requires notice to be given sooner than set forth in paragraph (a) of this section and the employee provides timely notice as set forth in paragraph (a) of this section.

(e) *Scheduling planned medical treatment.* When planning medical treatment, the employee must consult with the employing office and make a reasonable effort to schedule the treatment so as not to disrupt unduly the employing office's operations, subject to the approval of the health care provider. Employees are ordinarily expected to consult with their employing offices prior to the scheduling of treatment in order to work out a treatment schedule which best suits the needs of both the employing office and the employee. For example, if an employee who provides notice of the need to take FMLA leave on an intermittent basis for planned medical treatment neglects to consult with the employing office to make a reasonable effort to arrange the schedule of treatments so as not to unduly disrupt the employing office's operations, the employing office may

initiate discussions with the employee and require the employee to attempt to make such arrangements, subject to the approval of the health care provider. See 825.203 and 825.205.

(f) Intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule must be medically necessary due to a serious health condition or a serious injury or illness. An employee shall advise the employing office, upon request, of the reasons why the intermittent/reduced leave schedule is necessary and of the schedule for treatment, if applicable. The employee and employing office shall attempt to work out a schedule for such leave that meets the employee's needs without unduly disrupting the employing office's operations, subject to the approval of the health care provider.

(g) An employing office may waive employees' FMLA notice requirements. See 825.304.

825.303 Employee notice requirements for unforeseeable FMLA leave.

(a) *Timing of notice.* When the approximate timing of the need for leave is not foreseeable, an employee must provide notice to the employing office as soon as practicable under the facts and circumstances of the particular case. It generally should be practicable for the employee to provide notice of leave that is unforeseeable within the time prescribed by the employing office's usual and customary notice requirements applicable to such leave. See 825.303(c). Notice may be given by the employee's spokesperson (e.g., spouse, adult family member, or other responsible party) if the employee is unable to do so personally. For example, if an employee's child has a severe asthma attack and the employee takes the child to the emergency room, the employee would not be required to leave his or her child in order to report the absence while the child is receiving emergency treatment. However, if the child's asthma attack required only the use of an inhaler at home followed by a period of rest, the employee would be expected to call the employing office promptly after ensuring the child has used the inhaler.

(b) *Content of notice.* An employee shall provide sufficient information for an employing office to reasonably determine whether the FMLA may apply to the leave request. Depending on the situation, such information may include that a condition renders the employee unable to perform the functions of the job; that the employee is pregnant or has been hospitalized overnight; whether the employee or the employee's family member is under the continuing care of a health care provider; if the leave is due to a qualifying exigency, that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty), that the requested leave is for one of the reasons listed in 825.126(b), and the anticipated duration of the absence; or if the leave is for a family member that the condition renders the family member unable to perform daily activities or that the family member is a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness; and the anticipated duration of the absence, if known. When an employee seeks leave for the first time for a FMLA-qualifying reason, the employee need not expressly assert rights under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, or even mention the FMLA. When an employee seeks leave due to a qualifying reason, for which the employing office has previously provided the employee FMLA-protected leave, the employee must specifically reference either the qualifying reason for leave or the need for

FMLA leave. Calling in “sick” without providing more information will not be considered sufficient notice to trigger an employing office’s obligations under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. The employing office will be expected to obtain any additional required information through informal means. An employee has an obligation to respond to an employing office’s questions designed to determine whether an absence is potentially FMLA-qualifying. Failure to respond to reasonable employing office inquiries regarding the leave request may result in denial of FMLA protection if the employing office is unable to determine whether the leave is FMLA-qualifying.

(c) *Complying with employing office policy.* When the need for leave is not foreseeable, an employee must comply with the employing office’s usual and customary notice and procedural requirements for requesting leave, absent unusual circumstances. For example, an employing office may require employees to call a designated number or a specific individual to request leave. However, if an employee requires emergency medical treatment, he or she would not be required to follow the call-in procedure until his or her condition is stabilized and he or she has access to, and is able to use, a phone. Similarly, in the case of an emergency requiring leave because of a FMLA-qualifying reason, written advance notice pursuant to an employing office’s internal rules and procedures may not be required when FMLA leave is involved. If an employee does not comply with the employing office’s usual notice and procedural requirements, and no unusual circumstances justify the failure to comply, FMLA-protected leave may be delayed or denied.

825.304 Employee failure to provide notice.

(a) *Proper notice required.* In all cases, in order for the onset of an employee’s FMLA leave to be delayed due to lack of required notice, it must be clear that the employee had actual notice of the FMLA notice requirements. This condition would be satisfied by the employing office’s proper posting, at the worksite where the employee is employed, of the information regarding the FMLA provided (pursuant to section 301(h)(2) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1381(h)(2)) by the Office of Compliance to the employing office in a manner suitable for posting.

(b) *Foreseeable leave—30 days.* When the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable at least 30 days in advance and an employee fails to give timely advance notice with no reasonable excuse, the employing office may delay FMLA coverage until 30 days after the date the employee provides notice. The need for leave and the approximate date leave would be taken must have been clearly foreseeable to the employee 30 days in advance of the leave. For example, knowledge that an employee would receive a telephone call about the availability of a child for adoption at some unknown point in the future would not be sufficient to establish the leave was clearly foreseeable 30 days in advance.

(c) *Foreseeable leave—less than 30 days.* When the need for FMLA leave is foreseeable fewer than 30 days in advance and an employee fails to give notice as soon as practicable under the particular facts and circumstances, the extent to which an employing office may delay FMLA coverage for leave depends on the facts of the particular case. For example, if an employee reasonably should have given the employing office two weeks’ notice but instead only provided one week’s notice, then the employing office may delay FMLA-protected leave for one

week (thus, if the employing office elects to delay FMLA coverage and the employee nonetheless takes leave one week after providing the notice (*i.e.*, a week before the two week notice period has been met) the leave will not be FMLA-protected).

(d) *Unforeseeable leave.* When the need for FMLA leave is unforeseeable and an employee fails to give notice in accordance with 825.303, the extent to which an employing office may delay FMLA coverage for leave depends on the facts of the particular case. For example, if it would have been practicable for an employee to have given the employing office notice of the need for leave very soon after the need arises consistent with the employing office’s policy, but instead the employee provided notice two days after the leave began, then the employing office may delay FMLA coverage of the leave by two days.

(e) *Waiver of notice.* An employing office may waive employees’ FMLA notice obligations or the employing office’s own internal rules on leave notice requirements. If an employing office does not waive the employee’s obligations under its internal leave rules, the employing office may take appropriate action under its internal rules and procedures for failure to follow its usual and customary notification rules, absent unusual circumstances, as long as the actions are taken in a manner that does not discriminate against employees taking FMLA leave and the rules are not inconsistent with 825.303(a).

825.305 Certification, general rule.

(a) *General.* An employing office may require that an employee’s leave to care for the employee’s covered family member with a serious health condition, or due to the employee’s own serious health condition that makes the employee unable to perform one or more of the essential functions of the employee’s position, be supported by a certification issued by the health care provider of the employee or the employee’s family member. An employing office may also require that an employee’s leave because of a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness be supported by a certification, as described in 825.309 and 825.310, respectively. An employing office must give notice of a requirement for certification each time a certification is required; such notice must be written notice whenever required by 825.300(c). An employing office’s oral request to an employee to furnish any subsequent certification is sufficient.

(b) *Timing.* In most cases, the employing office should request that an employee furnish certification at the time the employee gives notice of the need for leave or within five business days thereafter, or, in the case of unforeseen leave, within five business days after the leave commences. The employing office may request certification at some later date if the employing office later has reason to question the appropriateness of the leave or its duration. The employee must provide the requested certification to the employing office within 15 calendar days after the employing office’s request, unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee’s diligent, good faith efforts or the employing office provides more than 15 calendar days to return the requested certification.

(c) *Complete and sufficient certification.* The employee must provide a complete and sufficient certification to the employing office if required by the employing office in accordance with 825.306, 825.309, and 825.310. The em-

ploying office shall advise an employee whenever the employing office finds a certification incomplete or insufficient, and shall state in writing what additional information is necessary to make the certification complete and sufficient. A certification is considered incomplete if the employing office receives a certification, but one or more of the applicable entries have not been completed. A certification is considered insufficient if the employing office receives a complete certification, but the information provided is vague, ambiguous, or non-responsive. The employing office must provide the employee with seven calendar days (unless not practicable under the particular circumstances despite the employee’s diligent good faith efforts) to cure any such deficiency. If the deficiencies specified by the employing office are not cured in the resubmitted certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave, in accordance with 825.313. A certification that is not returned to the employing office is not considered incomplete or insufficient, but constitutes a failure to provide certification.

(d) *Consequences.* At the time the employing office requests certification, the employing office must also advise an employee of the anticipated consequences of an employee’s failure to provide adequate certification. If the employee fails to provide the employing office with a complete and sufficient certification, despite the opportunity to cure the certification as provided in paragraph (c) of this section, or fails to provide any certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave, in accordance with 825.313. It is the employee’s responsibility either to furnish a complete and sufficient certification or to furnish the health care provider providing the certification with any necessary authorization from the employee or the employee’s family member in order for the health care provider to release a complete and sufficient certification to the employing office to support the employee’s FMLA request. This provision will apply in any case where an employing office requests a certification permitted by these regulations, whether it is the initial certification, a recertification, a second or third opinion, or a fitness-for-duty certificate, including any clarifications necessary to determine if such certifications are authentic and sufficient. See 825.306, 825.307, 825.308, and 825.312.

(e) *Annual medical certification.* Where the employee’s need for leave due to the employee’s own serious health condition, or the serious health condition of the employee’s covered family member, lasts beyond a single leave year (as defined in 825.200), the employing office may require the employee to provide a new medical certification in each subsequent leave year. Such new medical certifications are subject to the provisions for authentication and clarification set forth in 825.307, including second and third opinions.

825.306 Content of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee’s own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

(a) *Required information.* When leave is taken because of an employee’s own serious health condition, or the serious health condition of a family member, an employing office may require an employee to obtain a medical certification from a health care provider that sets forth the following information:

(1) The name, address, telephone number, and fax number of the health care provider and type of medical practice/specialization;

(2) The approximate date on which the serious health condition commenced, and its probable duration;

(3) A statement or description of appropriate medical facts regarding the patient's health condition for which FMLA leave is requested. The medical facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave. Such medical facts may include information on symptoms, diagnosis, hospitalization, doctor visits, whether medication has been prescribed, any referrals for evaluation or treatment (physical therapy, for example), or any other regimen of continuing treatment;

(4) If the employee is the patient, information sufficient to establish that the employee cannot perform the essential functions of the employee's job as well as the nature of any other work restrictions, and the likely duration of such inability (see 825.123(b) and (c));

(5) If the patient is a covered family member with a serious health condition, information sufficient to establish that the family member is in need of care, as described in 825.124, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the leave required to care for the family member;

(6) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for planned medical treatment of the employee's or a covered family member's serious health condition, information sufficient to establish the medical necessity for such intermittent or reduced schedule leave and an estimate of the dates and duration of such treatments and any periods of recovery;

(7) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for the employee's serious health condition, including pregnancy, that may result in unforeseeable episodes of incapacity, information sufficient to establish the medical necessity for such intermittent or reduced schedule leave and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the episodes of incapacity; and

(8) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition, a statement that such leave is medically necessary to care for the family member, as described in 825.124 and 825.203(b), which can include assisting in the family member's recovery, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the required leave.

(b) The Office of Compliance has developed two optional forms (Form A and Form B) for use in obtaining medical certification, including second and third opinions, from health care providers that meets FMLA's certification requirements, as made applicable by the CAA. (See Forms A and B.) Optional Form A is for use when the employee's need for leave is due to the employee's own serious health condition. Optional Form B is for use when the employee needs leave to care for a family member with a serious health condition. These optional forms reflect certification requirements so as to permit the health care provider to furnish appropriate medical information. Forms A and B are modeled closely on Form WH-380E and Form WH-380F, as revised, which were developed by the Department of Labor (see 29 C.F.R. Part 825). The employing office may use the Office of Compliance's forms, or Form WH-380E and Form WH-380F, as revised, or another form containing the same basic information; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in 825.306, 825.307, and 825.308. In all instances the information on the form must relate only to the serious health condition for which the current need for leave exists.

(c) If an employee is on FMLA leave running concurrently with a workers' compensa-

tion absence, and the provisions of the workers' compensation statute permit the employing office or the employing office's representative to request additional information from the employee's workers' compensation health care provider, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the applicable workers' compensation provisions and information received under those provisions may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave. Similarly, an employing office may request additional information in accordance with a paid leave policy or disability plan that requires greater information to qualify for payments or benefits, provided that the employing office informs the employee that the additional information only needs to be provided in connection with receipt of such payments or benefits. Any information received pursuant to such policy or plan may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave. If the employee fails to provide the information required for receipt of such payments or benefits, such failure will not affect the employee's entitlement to take unpaid FMLA leave. See 825.207(a).

(d) If an employee's serious health condition may also be a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and as made applicable by the CAA, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the procedures for requesting medical information under the ADA. Any information received pursuant to these procedures may be considered in determining the employee's entitlement to FMLA-protected leave.

(e) While an employee may choose to comply with the certification requirement by providing the employing office with an authorization, release, or waiver allowing the employing office to communicate directly with the health care provider of the employee or his or her covered family member, the employee may not be required to provide such an authorization, release, or waiver. In all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave. See 825.305(d).

825.307 Authentication and clarification of medical certification for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member; second and third opinions.

(a) *Clarification and authentication.* If an employee submits a complete and sufficient certification signed by the health care provider, the employing office may not request additional information from the health care provider. However, the employing office may contact the health care provider for purposes of clarification and authentication of the medical certification (whether initial certification or recertification) after the employing office has given the employee an opportunity to cure any deficiencies as set forth in 825.305(c). To make such contact, the employing office must use a health care provider, a human resources professional, a leave administrator, or a management official. Under no circumstances, however, may the employee's direct supervisor contact the employee's health care provider.

For purposes of these regulations, *authentication* means providing the health care provider with a copy of the certification and requesting verification that the information

contained on the certification form was completed and/or authorized by the health care provider who signed the document; no additional medical information may be requested. *Clarification* means contacting the health care provider to understand the handwriting on the medical certification or to understand the meaning of a response. Employing offices may not ask health care providers for additional information beyond that required by the certification form. The requirements of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA) Privacy Rule, (see 45 CFR parts 160 and 164), which governs the privacy of individually-identifiable health information created or held by HIPAA-covered entities, must be satisfied when individually-identifiable health information of an employee is shared with an employing office by a HIPAA-covered health care provider. If an employee chooses not to provide the employing office with authorization allowing the employing office to clarify the certification with the health care provider, and does not otherwise clarify the certification, the employing office may deny the taking of FMLA leave if the certification is unclear. See 825.305(d). It is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with a complete and sufficient certification and to clarify the certification if necessary.

(b) *Second Opinion.* (1) An employing office that has reason to doubt the validity of a medical certification may require the employee to obtain a second opinion at the employing office's expense. Pending receipt of the second (or third) medical opinion, the employee is provisionally entitled to the benefits of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, including maintenance of group health benefits. If the certifications do not ultimately establish the employee's entitlement to FMLA leave, the leave shall not be designated as FMLA leave and may be treated as paid or unpaid leave under the employing office's established leave policies. In addition, the consequences set forth in 825.305(d) will apply if the employee or the employee's family member fails to authorize his or her health care provider to release all relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if requested by the health care provider designated to provide a second opinion in order to render a sufficient and complete second opinion.

(2) The employing office is permitted to designate the health care provider to furnish the second opinion, but the selected health care provider may not be employed on a regular basis by the employing office. The employing office may not regularly contract with or otherwise regularly utilize the services of the health care provider furnishing the second opinion unless the employing office is located in an area where access to health care is extremely limited (e.g., a rural area where no more than one or two doctors practice in the relevant specialty in the vicinity).

(c) *Third opinion.* If the opinions of the employee's and the employing office's designated health care providers differ, the employing office may require the employee to obtain certification from a third health care provider, again at the employing office's expense. This third opinion shall be final and binding. The third health care provider must be designated or approved jointly by the employing office and the employee. The employing office and the employee must each act in good faith to attempt to reach agreement on whom to select for the third opinion

provider. If the employing office does not attempt in good faith to reach agreement, the employing office will be bound by the first certification. If the employee does not attempt in good faith to reach agreement, the employee will be bound by the second certification. For example, an employee who refuses to agree to see a doctor in the specialty in question may be failing to act in good faith. On the other hand, an employing office that refuses to agree to any doctor on a list of specialists in the appropriate field provided by the employee and whom the employee has not previously consulted may be failing to act in good faith. In addition, the consequences set forth in 825.305(d) will apply if the employee or the employee's family member fails to authorize his or her health care provider to release all relevant medical information pertaining to the serious health condition at issue if requested by the health care provider designated to provide a third opinion in order to render a sufficient and complete third opinion.

(d) *Copies of opinions.* The employing office is required to provide the employee with a copy of the second and third medical opinions, where applicable, upon request by the employee. Requested copies are to be provided within five business days unless extenuating circumstances prevent such action.

(e) *Travel expenses.* If the employing office requires the employee to obtain either a second or third opinion the employing office must reimburse an employee or family member for any reasonable "out of pocket" travel expenses incurred to obtain the second and third medical opinions. The employing office may not require the employee or family member to travel outside normal commuting distance for purposes of obtaining the second or third medical opinions except in very unusual circumstances.

(f) *Medical certification abroad.* In circumstances in which the employee or a family member is visiting in another country, or a family member resides in another country, and a serious health condition develops, the employing office shall accept a medical certification as well as second and third opinions from a health care provider who practices in that country. Where a certification by a foreign health care provider is in a language other than English, the employee must provide the employing office with a written translation of the certification upon request.

825.308 Recertifications for leave taken because of an employee's own serious health condition or the serious health condition of a family member.

(a) *30-day rule.* An employing office may request recertification no more often than every 30 days and only in connection with an absence by the employee, unless paragraphs (b) or (c) of this section apply.

(b) *More than 30 days.* If the medical certification indicates that the minimum duration of the condition is more than 30 days, an employing office must wait until that minimum duration expires before requesting a recertification, unless paragraph (c) of this section applies. For example, if the medical certification states that an employee will be unable to work, whether continuously or on an intermittent basis, for 40 days, the employing office must wait 40 days before requesting a recertification. In all cases, an employing office may request a recertification of a medical condition every six months in connection with an absence by the employee. Accordingly, even if the medical certification indicates that the employee will need

intermittent or reduced schedule leave for a period in excess of six months (e.g., for a lifetime condition), the employing office would be permitted to request recertification every six months in connection with an absence.

(c) *Less than 30 days.* An employing office may request recertification in less than 30 days if:

(1) The employee requests an extension of leave;

(2) Circumstances described by the previous certification have changed significantly (e.g., the duration or frequency of the absence, the nature or severity of the illness, complications). For example, if a medical certification stated that an employee would need leave for one to two days when the employee suffered a migraine headache and the employee's absences for his or her last two migraines lasted four days each, then the increased duration of absence might constitute a significant change in circumstances allowing the employing office to request a recertification in less than 30 days. Likewise, if an employee had a pattern of using unscheduled FMLA leave for migraines in conjunction with his or her scheduled days off, then the timing of the absences also might constitute a significant change in circumstances sufficient for an employing office to request a recertification more frequently than every 30 days; or

(3) The employing office receives information that casts doubt upon the employee's stated reason for the absence or the continuing validity of the certification. For example, if an employee is on FMLA leave for four weeks due to the employee's knee surgery, including recuperation, and the employee plays in company softball league games during the employee's third week of FMLA leave, such information might be sufficient to cast doubt upon the continuing validity of the certification allowing the employing office to request a recertification in less than 30 days.

(d) *Timing.* The employee must provide the requested recertification to the employing office within the time frame requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the employing office's request), unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances to do so despite the employee's diligent, good faith efforts.

(e) *Content.* The employing office may ask for the same information when obtaining recertification as that permitted for the original certification as set forth in 825.306. The employee has the same obligations to participate and cooperate (including providing a complete and sufficient certification or adequate authorization to the health care provider) in the recertification process as in the initial certification process. See 825.305(d). As part of the information allowed to be obtained on recertification for leave taken because of a serious health condition, the employing office may provide the health care provider with a record of the employee's absence pattern and ask the health care provider if the serious health condition and need for leave is consistent with such a pattern.

(f) Any recertification requested by the employing office shall be at the employee's expense unless the employing office provides otherwise. No second or third opinion on recertification may be required.

825.309 Certification for leave taken because of a qualifying exigency.

(a) *Active Duty Orders.* The first time an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the covered active duty or call to covered active duty sta-

tus (or notification of an impending call or order to covered active duty) of a military member (see 825.126(a)), an employing office may require the employee to provide a copy of the military member's active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status, and the dates of the military member's covered active duty service. This information need only be provided to the employing office once. A copy of new active duty orders or other documentation issued by the military may be required by the employing office if the need for leave because of a qualifying exigency arises out of a different covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or notification of an impending call or order to covered active duty) of the same or a different military member;

(b) *Required information.* An employing office may require that leave for any qualifying exigency specified in 825.126 be supported by a certification from the employee that sets forth the following information:

(1) A statement or description, signed by the employee, of appropriate facts regarding the qualifying exigency for which FMLA leave is requested. The facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave. Such facts should include information on the type of qualifying exigency for which leave is requested and any available written documentation which supports the request for leave; such documentation, for example, may include a copy of a meeting announcement for informational briefings sponsored by the military, a document confirming an appointment with a counselor or school official, or a copy of a bill for services for the handling of legal or financial affairs;

(2) The approximate date on which the qualifying exigency commenced or will commence;

(3) If an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency for a single, continuous period of time, the beginning and end dates for such absence;

(4) If an employee requests leave because of a qualifying exigency on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis, an estimate of the frequency and duration of the qualifying exigency;

(5) If the qualifying exigency involves meeting with a third party, appropriate contact information for the individual or entity with whom the employee is meeting (such as the name, title, organization, address, telephone number, fax number, and email address) and a brief description of the purpose of the meeting; and

(6) If the qualifying exigency involves *Rest and Recuperation* leave, a copy of the military member's Rest and Recuperation orders, or other documentation issued by the military which indicates that the military member has been granted Rest and Recuperation leave, and the dates of the military member's Rest and Recuperation leave.

(c) The Office of Compliance has developed an optional form (Form E) for employees' use in obtaining a certification that meets FMLA's certification requirements. (See Form E). This optional form reflects certification requirements so as to permit the employee to furnish appropriate information to support his or her request for leave because of a qualifying exigency. Form E, or another form containing the same basic information, may be used by the employing office; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section.

(d) *Verification.* If an employee submits a complete and sufficient certification to support his or her request for leave because of a

qualifying exigency, the employing office may not request additional information from the employee. However, if the qualifying exigency involves meeting with a third party, the employing office may contact the individual or entity with whom the employee is meeting for purposes of verifying a meeting or appointment schedule and the nature of the meeting between the employee and the specified individual or entity. The employee's permission is not required in order to verify meetings or appointments with third parties, but no additional information may be requested by the employing office. An employing office also may contact an appropriate unit of the Department of Defense to request verification that a military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status (or has been notified of an impending call or order to covered active duty); no additional information may be requested and the employee's permission is not required.

825.310 Certification for leave taken to care for a covered servicemember (military caregiver leave).

(a) *Required information from health care provider.* When leave is taken to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness, an employing office may require an employee to obtain a certification completed by an authorized health care provider of the covered servicemember. For purposes of leave taken to care for a covered servicemember, any one of the following health care providers may complete such a certification:

- (1) A United States Department of Defense ("DOD") health care provider;
- (2) A United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider;
- (3) A DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider;
- (4) A DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or
- (5) Any health care provider as defined in 825.125.

(b) If the authorized health care provider is unable to make certain military-related determinations outlined below, the authorized health care provider may rely on determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as a DOD recovery care coordinator) or an authorized VA representative. An employing office may request that the health care provider provide the following information:

- (1) The name, address, and appropriate contact information (telephone number, fax number, and/or email address) of the health care provider, the type of medical practice, the medical specialty, and whether the health care provider is one of the following:
 - (i) A DOD health care provider;
 - (ii) A VA health care provider;
 - (iii) A DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider;
 - (iv) A DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or
 - (v) A health care provider as defined in 825.125.

(2) Whether the covered servicemember's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or, if not, whether the covered servicemember's injury or illness existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty;

(3) The approximate date on which the serious injury or illness commenced, or was aggravated, and its probable duration;

(4) A statement or description of appropriate medical facts regarding the covered servicemember's health condition for which FMLA leave is requested. The medical facts must be sufficient to support the need for leave.

(i) In the case of a current member of the Armed Forces, such medical facts must include information on whether the injury or illness may render the covered servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating and whether the member is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy;

(ii) In the case of a covered veteran, such medical facts must include:

(A) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is the continuation of an injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or

(B) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is a physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service-Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and that such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or

(C) Information on whether the veteran is receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness that is a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or

(D) Documentation of enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

(5) Information sufficient to establish that the covered servicemember is in need of care, as described in 825.124, and whether the covered servicemember will need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery, and an estimate as to the beginning and ending dates for this period of time;

(6) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis for planned medical treatment appointments for the covered servicemember, whether there is a medical necessity for the covered servicemember to have such periodic care and an estimate of the treatment schedule of such appointments;

(7) If an employee requests leave on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis to care for a covered servicemember other than for planned medical treatment (e.g., episodic flare-ups of a medical condition), whether there is a medical necessity for the covered servicemember to have such periodic care, which can include assisting in the covered servicemember's recovery, and an estimate of the frequency and duration of the periodic care.

(c) *Required information from employee and/or covered servicemember.* In addition to the information that may be requested under 825.310(b), an employing office may also request that such certification set forth the following information provided by an employee and/or covered servicemember:

(1) The name and address of the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for a covered servicemember, the name of the employee requesting such leave, and the name of the covered servicemember for whom the employee is requesting leave to care;

(2) The relationship of the employee to the covered servicemember for whom the employee is requesting leave to care;

(3) Whether the covered servicemember is a current member of the Armed Forces, the National Guard or Reserves, and the covered servicemember's military branch, rank, and current unit assignment;

(4) Whether the covered servicemember is assigned to a military medical facility as an outpatient or to a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients (such as a medical hold or warrior transition unit), and the name of the medical treatment facility or unit;

(5) Whether the covered servicemember is on the temporary disability retired list;

(6) Whether the covered servicemember is a veteran, the date of separation from military service, and whether the separation was other than dishonorable. The employing office may require the employee to provide documentation issued by the military which indicates that the covered servicemember is a veteran, the date of separation, and that the separation is other than dishonorable. Where an employing office requires such documentation, an employee may provide a copy of the veteran's Certificate of Release or Discharge from Active Duty issued by the U.S. Department of Defense (DD Form 214) or other proof of veteran status. See 825.127(c)(2).

(7) A description of the care to be provided to the covered servicemember and an estimate of the leave needed to provide the care.

(d) The Office of Compliance has developed an optional form (Form F) for employees' use in obtaining certification that meets FMLA's certification requirements. (See Form F). This optional form reflects certification requirements so as to permit the employee to furnish appropriate information to support his or her request for leave to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. Form F, or Form WH-385 (developed by the Department of Labor), or another form containing the same basic information, may be used by the employing office; however, no information may be required beyond that specified in this section. In all instances the information on the certification must relate only to the serious injury or illness for which the current need for leave exists. An employing office may seek authentication and/or clarification of the certification under 825.307. However, second and third opinions under 825.307 are not permitted for leave to care for a covered servicemember. Additionally, recertifications under 825.308 are not permitted for leave to care for a covered servicemember. An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(j) of the FMLA.

(e) An employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification, in lieu of the Office of Compliance's optional certification form (Form F) or an employing office's own certification form, invitational travel orders (ITOs) or invitational travel authorizations (ITAs) issued to any family member to join an injured or ill servicemember at his or her bedside. An ITO or ITA is sufficient certification for the duration of time specified in the ITO or ITA. During that time period, an eligible employee may take leave to care for the covered servicemember in a continuous

block of time or on an intermittent basis. An eligible employee who provides an ITO or ITA to support his or her request for leave may not be required to provide any additional or separate certification that leave taken on an intermittent basis during the period of time specified in the ITO or ITA is medically necessary. An ITO or ITA is sufficient certification for an employee entitled to take FMLA leave to care for a covered servicemember regardless of whether the employee is named in the order or authorization.

(1) If an employee will need leave to care for a covered servicemember beyond the expiration date specified in an ITO or ITA, an employing office may request that the employee have one of the authorized health care providers listed under 825.310(a) complete the Office of Compliance optional certification form (Form F) or an employing office's own form, as requisite certification for the remainder of the employee's necessary leave period.

(2) An employing office may seek authentication and clarification of the ITO or ITA under 825.307. An employing office may not utilize the second or third opinion process outlined in 825.307 or the recertification process under 825.308 during the period of time in which leave is supported by an ITO or ITA.

(3) An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k) when an employee supports his or her request for FMLA leave with a copy of an ITO or ITA.

(f) An employing office requiring an employee to submit a certification for leave to care for a covered servicemember must accept as sufficient certification of the servicemember's serious injury or illness documentation indicating the servicemember's enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers. Such documentation is sufficient certification of the servicemember's serious injury or illness to support the employee's request for military caregiver leave regardless of whether the employee is the named caregiver in the enrollment documentation.

(1) An employing office may seek authentication and clarification of the documentation indicating the servicemember's enrollment in the Department of Veterans Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers under 825.307. An employing office may not utilize the second or third opinion process outlined in 825.307 or the recertification process under 825.308 when the servicemember's serious injury or illness is shown by documentation of enrollment in this program.

(2) An employing office may require an employee to provide confirmation of covered family relationship to the seriously injured or ill servicemember pursuant to 825.122(k) when an employee supports his or her request for FMLA leave with a copy of such enrollment documentation. An employing office may also require an employee to provide documentation, such as a veteran's Form DD-214, showing that the discharge was other than dishonorable and the date of the veteran's discharge.

(g) Where medical certification is requested by an employing office, an employee may not be held liable for administrative delays in the issuance of military documents, despite the employee's diligent, good-faith efforts to obtain such documents. See

825.305(b). In all instances in which certification is requested, it is the employee's responsibility to provide the employing office with complete and sufficient certification and failure to do so may result in the denial of FMLA leave. See 825.305(d).

825.311 Intent to return to work.

(a) An employing office may require an employee on FMLA leave to report periodically on the employee's status and intent to return to work. The employing office's policy regarding such reports may not be discriminatory and must take into account all of the relevant facts and circumstances related to the individual employee's leave situation.

(b) If an employee gives unequivocal notice of intent not to return to work, the employing office's obligations under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to maintain health benefits (subject to COBRA requirements or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable) and to restore the employee cease. However, these obligations continue if an employee indicates he or she may be unable to return to work but expresses a continuing desire to do so.

(c) It may be necessary for an employee to take more leave than originally anticipated. Conversely, an employee may discover after beginning leave that the circumstances have changed and the amount of leave originally anticipated is no longer necessary. An employee may not be required to take more FMLA leave than necessary to resolve the circumstance that precipitated the need for leave. In both of these situations, the employing office may require that the employee provide the employing office reasonable notice (*i.e.*, within two business days) of the changed circumstances where foreseeable. The employing office may also obtain information on such changed circumstances through requested status reports.

825.312 Fitness-for-duty certification.

(a) As a condition of restoring an employee whose FMLA leave was occasioned by the employee's own serious health condition that made the employee unable to perform the employee's job, an employing office may have a uniformly-applied policy or practice that requires all similarly-situated employees (*i.e.*, same occupation, same serious health condition) who take leave for such conditions to obtain and present certification from the employee's health care provider that the employee is able to resume work. The employee has the same obligations to participate and cooperate (including providing a complete and sufficient certification or providing sufficient authorization to the health care provider to provide the information directly to the employing office) in the fitness-for-duty certification process as in the initial certification process. See 825.305(d).

(b) An employing office may seek a fitness-for-duty certification only with regard to the particular health condition that caused the employee's need for FMLA leave. The certification from the employee's health care provider must certify that the employee is able to resume work. Additionally, an employing office may require that the certification specifically address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job. In order to require such a certification, an employing office must provide an employee with a list of the essential functions of the employee's job no later than with the designation notice required by 825.300(d), and must indicate in the designation notice that the certification must ad-

dress the employee's ability to perform those essential functions. If the employing office satisfies these requirements, the employee's health care provider must certify that the employee can perform the identified essential functions of his or her job. Following the procedures set forth in 825.307(a), the employing office may contact the employee's health care provider for purposes of clarifying and authenticating the fitness-for-duty certification. Clarification may be requested only for the serious health condition for which FMLA leave was taken. The employing office may not delay the employee's return to work while contact with the health care provider is being made. No second or third opinions on a fitness-for-duty certification may be required.

(c) The cost of the certification shall be borne by the employee, and the employee is not entitled to be paid for the time or travel costs spent in acquiring the certification.

(d) The designation notice required in 825.300(d) shall advise the employee if the employing office will require a fitness-for-duty certification to return to work and whether that fitness-for-duty certification must address the employee's ability to perform the essential functions of the employee's job.

(e) An employing office may delay restoration to employment until an employee submits a required fitness-for-duty certification unless the employing office has failed to provide the notice required in paragraph (d) of this section. If an employing office provides the notice required, an employee who does not provide a fitness-for-duty certification or request additional FMLA leave is no longer entitled to reinstatement under the FMLA. See 825.313(d).

(f) An employing office is not entitled to a certification of fitness to return to duty for each absence taken on an intermittent or reduced leave schedule. However, an employing office is entitled to a certification of fitness to return to duty for such absences up to once every 30 days if reasonable safety concerns exist regarding the employee's ability to perform his or her duties, based on the serious health condition for which the employee took such leave. If an employing office chooses to require a fitness-for-duty certification under such circumstances, the employing office shall inform the employee at the same time it issues the designation notice that for each subsequent instance of intermittent or reduced schedule leave, the employee will be required to submit a fitness-for-duty certification unless one has already been submitted within the past 30 days. Alternatively, an employing office can set a different interval for requiring a fitness-for-duty certification as long as it does not exceed once every 30 days and as long as the employing office advises the employee of the requirement in advance of the employee taking the intermittent or reduced schedule leave. The employing office may not terminate the employment of the employee while awaiting such a certification of fitness to return to duty for an intermittent or reduced schedule leave absence. *Reasonable safety concerns* means a reasonable belief of significant risk of harm to the individual employee or others. In determining whether reasonable safety concerns exist, an employing office should consider the nature and severity of the potential harm and the likelihood that potential harm will occur.

(g) If the terms of a collective bargaining agreement govern an employee's return to work, those provisions shall be applied.

(h) Requirements under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), as amended and

as made applicable by the CAA, apply. After an employee returns from FMLA leave, the ADA requires any medical examination at an employing office's expense by the employing office's health care provider be job-related and consistent with business necessity. For example, an attorney could not be required to submit to a medical examination or inquiry just because her leg had been amputated. The essential functions of an attorney's job do not require use of both legs; therefore such an inquiry would not be job related. An employing office may require a warehouse laborer, whose back impairment affects the ability to lift, to be examined by an orthopedist, but may not require this employee to submit to an HIV test where the test is not related to either the essential functions of his or her job or to his/her impairment. If an employee's serious health condition may also be a disability within the meaning of the ADA, as made applicable by the CAA, the FMLA does not prevent the employing office from following the procedures for requesting medical information under the ADA.

825.313 Failure to provide certification.

(a) *Foreseeable leave.* In the case of foreseeable leave, if an employee fails to provide certification in a timely manner as required by 825.305, then an employing office may deny FMLA coverage until the required certification is provided. For example, if an employee has 15 days to provide a certification and does not provide the certification for 45 days without sufficient reason for the delay, the employing office can deny FMLA protections for the 30-day period following the expiration of the 15-day time period, if the employee takes leave during such period.

(b) *Unforeseeable leave.* In the case of unforeseeable leave, an employing office may deny FMLA coverage for the requested leave if the employee fails to provide a certification within 15 calendar days from receipt of the request for certification unless not practicable due to extenuating circumstances. For example, in the case of a medical emergency, it may not be practicable for an employee to provide the required certification within 15 calendar days. Absent such extenuating circumstances, if the employee fails to timely return the certification, the employing office can deny FMLA protections for the leave following the expiration of the 15-day time period until a sufficient certification is provided. If the employee never produces the certification, the leave is not FMLA leave.

(c) *Recertification.* An employee must provide recertification within the time requested by the employing office (which must allow at least 15 calendar days after the request) or as soon as practicable under the particular facts and circumstances. If an employee fails to provide a recertification within a reasonable time under the particular facts and circumstances, then the employing office may deny continuation of the FMLA leave protections until the employee produces a sufficient recertification. If the employee never produces the recertification, the leave is not FMLA leave. Recertification does not apply to leave taken for a qualifying exigency or to care for a covered servicemember.

(d) *Fitness-for-duty certification.* When requested by the employing office pursuant to a uniformly applied policy for similarly-situated employees, the employee must provide medical certification, at the time the employee seeks reinstatement at the end of FMLA leave taken for the employee's serious health condition, that the employee is fit for

duty and able to return to work (see 825.312(a)) if the employing office has provided the required notice (see 825.300(e)); the employing office may delay restoration until the certification is provided. Unless the employee provides either a fitness-for-duty certification or a new medical certification for a serious health condition at the time FMLA leave is concluded, the employee may be terminated. See also 825.213(a)(3).

SUBPART D—ENFORCEMENT MECHANISMS

825.400 Enforcement of FMLA rights, as made applicable by the CAA.

(a) To commence a proceeding, a covered employee alleging a violation of the rights and protections of the FMLA, made applicable by the CAA, must request counseling by the Office of Compliance not later than 180 days after the date of the alleged violation. If a covered employee misses this deadline, the covered employee will be unable to obtain a remedy under the CAA.

(b) The following procedures are available under title IV of the CAA for covered employees who believe that their rights under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, have been violated:

- (1) counseling;
- (2) mediation; and
- (3) election of either—

(A) a formal complaint, filed with the Office of Compliance, and a hearing before a hearing officer, subject to review by the Board of Directors of the Office of Compliance, and judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit; or

(B) a civil action in a district court of the United States.

(c) Regulations of the Office of Compliance describing and governing these procedures are found at www.compliance.gov.

825.401 [Reserved]

825.402 [Reserved]

825.403 [Reserved]

825.404 [Reserved]

SUBPART E—[RESERVED]

SUBPART F—SPECIAL RULES APPLICABLE TO EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS

825.600 Special rules for school employees, definitions.

(a) Certain special rules apply to employees of local educational agencies, including public school boards and elementary schools under their jurisdiction, and private elementary and secondary schools. The special rules do not apply to other kinds of educational institutions, such as colleges and universities, trade schools, and preschools.

(b) Educational institutions are covered by FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA (and these special rules). The usual requirements for employees to be eligible do apply.

(c) The special rules affect the taking of intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule, or leave near the end of an academic term (semester), by instructional employees. *Instructional employees* are those whose principal function is to teach and instruct students in a class, a small group, or an individual setting. This term includes not only teachers, but also athletic coaches, driving instructors, and special education assistants such as signers for the hearing impaired. It does not include, and the special rules do not apply to, teacher assistants or aides who do not have as their principal job actual teaching or instructing, nor does it include auxiliary personnel such as counselors, psychologists, or curriculum specialists. It also does not include cafeteria workers, maintenance workers, or bus drivers.

(d) Special rules which apply to restoration to an equivalent position apply to all employees of local educational agencies.

825.601 Special rules for school employees, limitations on intermittent leave.

(a) Leave taken for a period that ends with the school year and begins the next semester is leave taken consecutively rather than intermittently. The period during the summer vacation when the employee would not have been required to report for duty is not counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. An instructional employee who is on FMLA leave at the end of the school year must be provided with any benefits over the summer vacation that employees would normally receive if they had been working at the end of the school year.

(1) If an eligible instructional employee needs intermittent leave or leave on a reduced leave schedule to care for a family member with a serious health condition, to care for a covered servicemember, or for the employee's own serious health condition, which is foreseeable based on planned medical treatment, and the employee would be on leave for more than 20 percent of the total number of working days over the period the leave would extend, the employing office may require the employee to choose either to:

(i) Take leave for a period or periods of a particular duration, not greater than the duration of the planned treatment; or

(ii) Transfer temporarily to an available alternative position for which the employee is qualified, which has equivalent pay and benefits and which better accommodates recurring periods of leave than does the employee's regular position.

(2) These rules apply only to a leave involving more than 20 percent of the working days during the period over which the leave extends. For example, if an instructional employee who normally works five days each week needs to take two days of FMLA leave per week over a period of several weeks, the special rules would apply. Employees taking leave which constitutes 20 percent or less of the working days during the leave period would not be subject to transfer to an alternative position. *Periods of a particular duration* means a block, or blocks, of time beginning no earlier than the first day for which leave is needed and ending no later than the last day on which leave is needed, and may include one uninterrupted period of leave.

(b) If an instructional employee does not give required notice of foreseeable FMLA leave (see 825.302) to be taken intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule, the employing office may require the employee to take leave of a particular duration, or to transfer temporarily to an alternative position. Alternatively, the employing office may require the employee to delay the taking of leave until the notice provision is met.

825.602 Special rules for school employees, limitations on leave near the end of an academic term.

(a) There are also different rules for instructional employees who begin leave more than five weeks before the end of a term, less than five weeks before the end of a term, and less than three weeks before the end of a term. Regular rules apply except in circumstances when:

(1) An instructional employee begins leave more than five weeks before the end of a term. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if—

(i) The leave will last at least three weeks, and

(ii) The employee would return to work during the three-week period before the end of the term.

(2) The employee begins leave during the five-week period before the end of a term because of the birth of a son or daughter; the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care; to care for a spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition; or to care for a covered service-member. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if—

(i) The leave will last more than two weeks, and

(ii) The employee would return to work during the two-week period before the end of the term.

(3) The employee begins leave during the three-week period before the end of a term because of the birth of a son or daughter; the placement of a son or daughter for adoption or foster care; to care for a spouse, son, daughter, or parent with a serious health condition; or to care for a covered service-member. The employing office may require the employee to continue taking leave until the end of the term if the leave will last more than five working days.

(b) For purposes of these provisions, *academic term* means the school semester, which typically ends near the end of the calendar year and the end of spring each school year. In no case may a school have more than two academic terms or semesters each year for purposes of FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. An example of leave falling within these provisions would be where an employee plans two weeks of leave to care for a family member which will begin three weeks before the end of the term. In that situation, the employing office could require the employee to stay out on leave until the end of the term.

825.603 Special rules for school employees, duration of FMLA leave.

(a) If an employee chooses to take leave for periods of a particular duration in the case of intermittent or reduced schedule leave, the entire period of leave taken will count as FMLA leave.

(b) In the case of an employee who is required to take leave until the end of an academic term, only the period of leave until the employee is ready and able to return to work shall be charged against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. The employing office has the option not to require the employee to stay on leave until the end of the school term. Therefore, any additional leave required by the employing office to the end of the school term is not counted as FMLA leave; however, the employing office shall be required to maintain the employee's group health insurance and restore the employee to the same or equivalent job including other benefits at the conclusion of the leave.

825.604 Special rules for school employees, restoration to an equivalent position.

The determination of how an employee is to be restored to an equivalent position upon return from FMLA leave will be made on the basis of "established school board policies and practices, private school policies and practices, and collective bargaining agreements." The "established policies" and collective bargaining agreements used as a basis for restoration must be in writing, must be made known to the employee prior to the taking of FMLA leave, and must clearly explain the employee's restoration rights upon return from leave. Any established policy which is used as the basis for

restoration of an employee to an equivalent position must provide substantially the same protections as provided in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, for reinstated employees. See 825.215. In other words, the policy or collective bargaining agreement must provide for restoration to an equivalent position with equivalent employment benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment. For example, an employee may not be restored to a position requiring additional licensure or certification.

SUBPART G—EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS, EMPLOYING OFFICE PRACTICES, AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS ON EMPLOYEE RIGHTS UNDER THE FMLA, AS MADE APPLICABLE BY THE CAA.

825.700 Interaction with employing office's policies.

(a) An employing office must observe any employment benefit program or plan that provides greater family or medical leave rights to employees than the rights established by the FMLA. Conversely, the rights established by the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, may not be diminished by any employment benefit program or plan. For example, a provision of a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) which provides for reinstatement to a position that is not equivalent because of seniority (*e.g.*, provides lesser pay) is superseded by FMLA. If an employing office provides greater unpaid family leave rights than are afforded by FMLA, the employing office is not required to extend additional rights afforded by FMLA, such as maintenance of health benefits (other than through COBRA or 5 U.S.C. 8905a, whichever is applicable), to the additional leave period not covered by FMLA.

(b) Nothing in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, prevents an employing office from amending existing leave and employee benefit programs, provided they comply with FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. However, nothing in the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, is intended to discourage employing offices from adopting or retaining more generous leave policies.

825.701 [Reserved]

825.702 Interaction with anti-discrimination laws, as applied by section 201 of the CAA.

(a) Nothing in FMLA modifies or affects any applicable law prohibiting discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, age, or disability (*e.g.*, Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Pregnancy Discrimination Act and as made applicable by the CAA). FMLA's legislative history explains that FMLA is "not intended to modify or affect the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, the regulations concerning employment which have been promulgated pursuant to that statute, or the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 [as amended] or the regulations issued under that act. Thus, the leave provisions of the [FMLA] are wholly distinct from the reasonable accommodation obligations of employers covered under the [ADA] . . . or the Federal government itself. The purpose of the FMLA, as applied by the CAA, is to make leave available to eligible employees and [employing offices] within its coverage, and not to limit already existing rights and protection." S. Rep. No. 3, 103d Cong., 1st Sess. 38 (1993). An employing office must therefore provide leave under whichever statutory provision provides the greater rights to employees. When an employer violates both FMLA and a discrimination law,

an employee may be able to recover under either or both statutes (double relief may not be awarded for the same loss; when remedies coincide a claimant may be allowed to utilize whichever avenue of relief is desired. *Laffey v. Northwest Airlines, Inc.*, 567 F.2d 429, 445 (D.C. Cir. 1976), *cert. denied*, 434 U.S. 1086 (1978).

(b) If an employee is a qualified individual with a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the employing office must make reasonable accommodations, *etc.*, barring undue hardship, in accordance with the ADA. At the same time, the employing office must afford an employee his or her FMLA rights. ADA's "disability" and FMLA's "serious health condition" are different concepts, and must be analyzed separately. FMLA entitles eligible employees to 12 weeks of leave in any 12-month period due to their own serious health condition, whereas the ADA allows an indeterminate amount of leave, barring undue hardship, as a reasonable accommodation. FMLA requires employing offices to maintain employees' group health plan coverage during FMLA leave on the same conditions as coverage would have been provided if the employee had been continuously employed during the leave period, whereas ADA does not require maintenance of health insurance unless other employees receive health insurance during leave under the same circumstances.

(c)(1) A reasonable accommodation under the ADA might be accomplished by providing an individual with a disability with a part-time job with no health benefits, assuming the employing office did not ordinarily provide health insurance for part-time employees. However, FMLA would permit an employee to work a reduced leave schedule until the equivalent of 12 workweeks of leave were used, with group health benefits maintained during this period. FMLA permits an employing office to temporarily transfer an employee who is taking leave intermittently or on a reduced leave schedule to an alternative position, whereas the ADA allows an accommodation of reassignment to an equivalent, vacant position only if the employee cannot perform the essential functions of the employee's present position and an accommodation is not possible in the employee's present position, or an accommodation in the employee's present position would cause an undue hardship. The examples in the following paragraphs of this section demonstrate how the two laws would interact with respect to a qualified individual with a disability.

(2) A qualified individual with a disability who is also an eligible employee entitled to FMLA leave requests 10 weeks of medical leave as a reasonable accommodation, which the employing office grants because it is not an undue hardship. The employing office advises the employee that the 10 weeks of leave is also being designated as FMLA leave and will count towards the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. This designation does not prevent the parties from also treating the leave as a reasonable accommodation and reinstating the employee into the same job, as required by the ADA, rather than an equivalent position under FMLA, if that is the greater right available to the employee. At the same time, the employee would be entitled under FMLA to have the employing office maintain group health plan coverage during the leave, as that requirement provides the greater right to the employee.

(3) If the same employee needed to work part-time (a reduced leave schedule) after returning to his or her same job, the employee

would still be entitled under FMLA to have group health plan coverage maintained for the remainder of the two-week equivalent of FMLA leave entitlement, notwithstanding an employing office policy that part-time employees do not receive health insurance. This employee would be entitled under the ADA to reasonable accommodations to enable the employee to perform the essential functions of the part-time position. In addition, because the employee is working a part-time schedule as a reasonable accommodation, the FMLA's provision for temporary assignment to a different alternative position would not apply. Once the employee has exhausted his or her remaining FMLA leave entitlement while working the reduced (part-time) schedule, if the employee is a qualified individual with a disability, and if the employee is unable to return to the same full-time position at that time, the employee might continue to work part-time as a reasonable accommodation, barring undue hardship; the employee would then be entitled to only those employment benefits ordinarily provided by the employing office to part-time employees.

(4) At the end of the FMLA leave entitlement, an employing office is required under FMLA to reinstate the employee in the same or an equivalent position, with equivalent pay and benefits, to that which the employee held when leave commenced. The employing office's FMLA obligations would be satisfied if the employing office offered the employee an equivalent full-time position. If the employee were unable to perform the essential functions of that equivalent position even with reasonable accommodation, because of a disability, the ADA may require the employing office to make a reasonable accommodation at that time by allowing the employee to work part-time or by reassigning the employee to a vacant position, barring undue hardship.

(d)(1) If FMLA entitles an employee to leave, an employing office may not, in lieu of FMLA leave entitlement, require an employee to take a job with a reasonable accommodation. However, ADA may require that an employing office offer an employee the opportunity to take such a position. An employing office may not change the essen-

tial functions of the job in order to deny FMLA leave. *See* 825.220(b).

(2) An employee may be on a workers' compensation absence due to an on-the-job injury or illness which also qualifies as a serious health condition under FMLA. The workers' compensation absence and FMLA leave may run concurrently (subject to proper notice and designation by the employing office). At some point the health care provider providing medical care pursuant to the workers' compensation injury may certify the employee is able to return to work in a light duty position. If the employing office offers such a position, the employee is permitted but not required to accept the position. *See* 825.220(d). As a result, the employee may no longer qualify for payments from the workers' compensation benefit plan, but the employee is entitled to continue on unpaid FMLA leave either until the employee is able to return to the same or equivalent job the employee left or until the 12-week FMLA leave entitlement is exhausted. *See* 825.207(e). If the employee returning from the workers' compensation injury is a qualified individual with a disability, he or she will have rights under the ADA.

(e) If an employing office requires certifications of an employee's fitness for duty to return to work, as permitted by FMLA under a uniform policy, it must comply with the ADA requirement that a fitness for duty physical be job-related and consistent with business necessity.

(f) Under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended by the Pregnancy Discrimination Act, and as made applicable by the CAA, an employing office should provide the same benefits for women who are pregnant as the employing office provides to other employees with short-term disabilities. Because Title VII does not require employees to be employed for a certain period of time to be protected, an employee employed for less than 12 months by the employing office (and, therefore, not an "eligible" employee under FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA) may not be denied maternity leave if the employing office normally provides short-term disability benefits to employees with the same tenure who are experiencing other short-term disabilities.

(g) Under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994

(USERRA), 38 U.S.C. 4301, *et seq.*, veterans are entitled to receive all rights and benefits of employment that they would have obtained if they had been continuously employed. Therefore, under USERRA, a returning servicemember would be eligible for FMLA leave if the months and hours that he or she would have worked for the civilian employing office during the period of absence due to or necessitated by USERRA-covered service, combined with the months employed and the hours actually worked, meet the FMLA eligibility threshold of 12 months of employment and the hours of service requirement. *See* 825.110(b)(2)(i) and (c)(2) and 825.802(c).

(h) For further information on Federal antidiscrimination laws applied by section 201 of the CAA (2 U.S.C. 1311), including Title VII, the Rehabilitation Act, and the ADA, individuals are encouraged to contact the Office of Compliance.

ENDNOTES

1. In contrast, the committee report accompanying the bill containing the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 complied with section 102(b)(3) of the CAA and contained a provision that indicated an intent to apply the ADA Amendments to the legislative branch. Committee on Education and Labor, H.Rpt. 110-730 § VII (June 23, 2008).

2. By regulation, the Board can require employing offices to provide the additional rights and protections for servicemembers and their families added to the FMLA since 1996. This is because, unlike executive branch agencies, the rulemaking power of the Board (after Congressional approval) is "an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate" under the Constitution. 2 U.S.C. §1431(1). The rulemaking power of Congress under the Constitution, U.S. Const. Art. 1, §5, cl. 2, is a "broad grant of authority" that allows each house of Congress to determine its own internal rules bounded only by "constitutional restraints and fundamental rights." *Consumers Union of U.S., Inc. v. Periodical Correspondents' Ass'n*, 515 F.2d 1341, 1343 (D.C. Cir. 1975); *United States v. Ballin*, 144 U.S. 1, 5 (1892).

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification of Health Care Provider
for Employee's Serious Health Condition**
(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable
by the Congressional Accountability Act)**Form A****SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA protections because of a need for leave due to a serious health condition to submit a medical certification issued by the employee's health care provider. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.306-825.308. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

Employing office name and contact: _____

Employee's job title: _____ Regular work schedule: _____

Employee's essential job functions: _____

Check if job description is attached: ☐**SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II before giving this form to your medical provider. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient medical certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to your own serious health condition. If requested by your employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA protections. Failure to provide a complete and sufficient medical certification may result in a denial of your FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.313. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form. OOC regulations at 825.305(b).

Your Name: _____
First Middle Last**SECTION III: For Completion by the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER**

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: Your patient has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the condition for which the employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests

as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e), or the manifestation of disease or disorder in the employee's family members, 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(b). Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.

Provider's name and business address: _____

Type of practice / Medical specialty: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____ Fax: (_____) _____ - _____

PART A: MEDICAL FACTS

1. Approximate date condition commenced: _____

Probable duration of condition: _____

Mark below as applicable:

Was the patient admitted for an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, dates of admission: _____

Date(s) you treated the patient for condition: _____

Will the patient need to have treatment visits at least twice per year due to the condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was medication, other than over-the-counter medication, prescribed? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was the patient referred to other health care provider(s) for evaluation or treatment (e.g., physical therapist)?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, state the nature of such treatments and expected duration of treatment: _____

2. Is the medical condition pregnancy? ☐ No ☐ Yes If so, expected delivery date: _____

3. Use the information provided by the employing office in Section I to answer this question. If the employing office fails to provide a list of the employee's essential functions or a job description, answer these questions based upon the employee's own description of his/her job functions.

Is the employee unable to perform any of his/her job functions due to the condition: ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, identify the job functions the employee is unable to perform: _____

4. Describe other relevant medical facts, if any, related to the condition for which the employee seeks leave (such medical facts may include symptoms, diagnosis, or any regimen of continuing treatment such as the use of specialized equipment): _____

PART B: AMOUNT OF LEAVE NEEDED

5. Will the employee be incapacitated for a single continuous period of time due to his/her medical condition, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of incapacity: _____

6. Will the employee need to attend follow-up treatment appointments or work part-time or on a reduced schedule because of the employee's medical condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, are the treatments or the reduced number of hours of work medically necessary? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate treatment schedule, if any, including the dates of any scheduled appointments and the time required for each appointment, including any recovery period:

Estimate the part-time or reduced work schedule the employee needs, if any:

_____ hour(s) per day; _____ days per week from _____ through _____

7. Will the condition cause episodic flare-ups periodically preventing the employee from performing his/her job functions? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Is it medically necessary for the employee to be absent from work during the flare-ups? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If so, explain: _____

Based upon the patient's medical history and your knowledge of the medical condition, estimate the frequency of flare-ups and the duration of related incapacity that the patient may have over the next 6 months (e.g., 1 episode every 3 months lasting 1-2 days):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours or _____ day(s) per episode

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: IDENTIFY QUESTION NUMBER WITH YOUR ADDITIONAL ANSWER.

[illegible]

Signature of Health Care Provider

Date _____

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification of Health Care Provider
for Family Member's Serious Health
Condition**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable
by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form B

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA protections because of a need for leave to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition to submit a medical certification issued by the health care provider of the covered family member. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.306-825.308. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees' family members created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

Employing office name and contact: _____

SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II before giving this form to your family member or his/her medical provider. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient medical certification to support a request for FMLA leave to care for a covered family member with a serious health condition. If requested by your employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA protections. Failure to provide a complete and sufficient medical certification may result in a denial of your FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.313. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form to your employing office. OOC regulations at 825.305(b).

Your Name: _____
First Middle LastName of family member for whom you will provide care: _____
First Middle Last

Relationship of family member to you: _____

If family member is your son or daughter, date of birth: _____

Describe care you will provide to your family member and estimate leave needed to provide care:

Employee Signature

Date

SECTION III: For Completion by the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee listed above has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for your patient. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts below. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the condition for which the patient needs leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests as defined in 29 C.F.R §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e). Page 3 provides space for additional information, should you need it. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.

Provider's name and business address: _____

Type of practice / Medical specialty: _____

Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____ Fax: (_____) _____ - _____

PART A: MEDICAL FACTS

1. Approximate date condition commenced: _____

Probable duration of condition: _____

Was the patient admitted for an overnight stay in a hospital, hospice, or residential medical care facility?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, dates of admission: _____

Date(s) you treated the patient for condition: _____

Was medication, other than over-the-counter medication, prescribed? ☐ No ☐ YesWill the patient need to have treatment visits at least twice per year due to the condition? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Was the patient referred to other health care provider(s) for evaluation or treatment (e.g., physical therapist)?

☐ No ☐ Yes If so, state the nature of such treatments and expected duration of treatment:_____
_____2. Is the medical condition pregnancy? ☐ No ☐ Yes If so, expected delivery date: _____

3. Describe other relevant medical facts, if any, related to the condition for which the patient needs care (such medical facts may include symptoms, diagnosis, or any regimen of continuing treatment such as the use of specialized equipment):

PART B: AMOUNT OF CARE NEEDED: When answering these questions, keep in mind that your patient's need for care by the employee seeking leave may include assistance with basic medical, hygienic, nutritional, safety or transportation needs, or the provision of physical or psychological care:

4. Will the patient be incapacitated for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of incapacity: _____

During this time, will the patient need care? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Explain the care needed by the patient and why such care is medically necessary: _____

5. Will the patient require follow-up treatments, including any time for recovery? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate treatment schedule, if any, including the dates of any scheduled appointments and the time required for each appointment, including any recovery period:

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

6. Will the patient require care on an intermittent or reduced schedule basis, including any time for recovery?
☐ No ☐ Yes

Estimate the hours the patient needs care on an intermittent basis, if any:

_____ hour(s) per day; _____ days per week from _____ through _____

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

7. Will the condition cause episodic flare-ups periodically preventing the patient from participating in normal daily activities? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Based upon the patient's medical history and your knowledge of the medical condition, estimate the frequency of flare-ups and the duration of related incapacity that the patient may have over the next 6 months (e.g., 1 episode every 3 months lasting 1-2 days):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours or _____ day(s) per episode

Does the patient need care during these flare-ups? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Explain the care needed by the patient, and why such care is medically necessary: _____

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: IDENTIFY QUESTION NUMBER WITH YOUR ADDITIONAL ANSWER.

Signature of Health Care Provider

Date:

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Notice of Eligibility Rights and Responsibilities**

(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form C

In general, to be eligible a covered employee must have worked for an employing office for at least 12 months and have worked at least 1,250 hours in the 12 months preceding the leave. While use of this form by employing offices is optional, a fully completed form provides employees with the information required by the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.300(b), which must be provided within five business days of the employee notifying the employing office of the need for FMLA leave. Part B provides employees with information regarding their rights and responsibilities for taking FMLA leave, as required by the Board's FMLA regulations at 825.300(b), (c).

[Part A – NOTICE OF ELIGIBILITY]TO: _____
EmployeeFROM: _____
Employing Office Representative

DATE: _____

On _____, you informed us that you needed leave beginning on _____ for:

- ☐ The birth of a child, or placement of a child with you for adoption or foster care;
- ☐ Your own serious health condition;
- ☐ Because you are needed to care for your ☐ spouse; ☐ child; ☐ parent due to his/her serious health condition.
- ☐ Because of a qualifying exigency arising out of the fact that your ☐ spouse; ☐ son or daughter; ☐ parent is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status with the Armed Forces.
- ☐ Because you are the ☐ spouse; ☐ son or daughter; ☐ parent; ☐ next of kin of a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness.

This Notice is to inform you that you:

- ☐ Are eligible for FMLA leave (See Part B below for Rights and Responsibilities)
- ☐ Are **not** eligible for FMLA leave, because (only one reason need be checked, although you may not be eligible for other reasons):
- ☐ You have not met the FMLA's 12-month length of service requirement. As of the first date of requested leave, you will have worked approximately _____ months towards this requirement.
 - ☐ You have not met the FMLA's 1,250-hours-worked requirement.

If you have any questions, contact: _____ or view the FMLA poster located in _____.

[PART B-RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TAKING FMLA LEAVE]

As explained in Part A, you meet the eligibility requirements for taking FMLA leave and still have FMLA leave available in the applicable 12-month period. **However, in order for us to determine whether your absence qualifies as FMLA leave, you must return the following information to us by _____.** (If a certification is requested, employing offices must allow at least 15 calendar days from receipt of this notice; additional time may be required in some circumstances.) If sufficient information is not provided in a timely manner, your leave may be denied.

- ☐ Sufficient certification to support your request for FMLA leave. A certification form that sets forth the information necessary to support your request is/ is not enclosed.
- ☐ Sufficient documentation to establish the required relationship between you and your family member.
- ☐ Other information needed (such as documentation for military family leave): _____

- ☐ No additional information requested

If your leave does qualify as FMLA leave, you will have the following responsibilities while on FMLA leave (only checked blanks apply):

- ☐ Contact _____ at _____ to make arrangements to continue to make your share of the premium payments on your health insurance to maintain health benefits while you are on leave. You have a minimum 30-day (or, indicate longer period, if applicable) grace period in which to make premium payments. If payment is not made timely, your group health insurance may be cancelled, provided we notify you in writing at least 15 days before the date that your health coverage will lapse, or, at our option, we may pay your share of the premiums during FMLA leave, and recover these payments from you upon your return to work.
- ☐ You will be required to use your available paid sick, vacation, and/or other leave during your FMLA absence. This means that you will receive your paid leave and the leave will also be considered protected FMLA leave and counted against your FMLA leave entitlement.
- ☐ Due to your status within the company, you are considered a "key employee" as defined in the FMLA. As a "key employee," restoration to employment may be denied following FMLA leave on the grounds that such restoration will cause substantial and grievous economic injury to us. We have/ have not determined that restoring you to employment at the conclusion of FMLA leave will cause substantial and grievous economic harm to us.
- ☐ While on leave you will be required to furnish us with periodic reports of your status and intent to return to work every _____. (Indicate interval of periodic reports, as appropriate for the particular leave situation).

If the circumstances of your leave change, and you are able to return to work earlier than the date indicated on this form, you will be required to notify us at least two workdays prior to the date you intend to report for work.

If your leave does qualify as FMLA leave you will have the following rights while on FMLA leave:

- You have a right under the FMLA for up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave in a 12-month period calculated as:

- ☐ the calendar year (January – December).
 - ☐ a fixed leave year based on _____.
 - ☐ the 12-month period measured forward from the date of your first FMLA leave usage.
 - ☐ a “rolling” 12-month period measured backward from the date of any FMLA leave usage.
- You have a right under the FMLA for up to 26 weeks of unpaid leave in a single 12-month period to care for a covered servicemember with a serious injury or illness. This single 12-month period commenced on _____.
 - Your health benefits must be maintained during any period of unpaid leave under the same conditions as if you continued to work.
 - You must be reinstated to the same or an equivalent job with the same pay, benefits, and terms and conditions of employment on your return from FMLA-protected leave. (If your leave extends beyond the end of your FMLA entitlement, you do not have return rights under FMLA.)
 - If you do not return to work following FMLA leave for a reason other than: 1) the continuation, recurrence, or onset of a serious health condition which would entitle you to FMLA leave; 2) the continuation, recurrence, or onset of a covered servicemember’s serious injury or illness which would entitle you to FMLA leave; or 3) other circumstances beyond your control, you may be required to reimburse us for our share of health insurance premiums paid on your behalf during your FMLA leave.
 - If we have not informed you above that you must use accrued paid leave while taking your unpaid FMLA leave entitlement, you have the right to have ____ **sick**, ____ **vacation**, and/or ____ **other leave** run concurrently with your unpaid leave entitlement, provided you meet any applicable requirements of the leave policy. Applicable conditions related to the substitution of paid leave are referenced or set forth below. If you do not meet the requirements for taking paid leave, you remain entitled to take unpaid FMLA leave.
- ☐ For a copy of conditions applicable to sick/vacation/other leave usage please refer to _____ available at: _____.
- ☐ Applicable conditions for use of paid leave: _____

Once we obtain the information from you as specified above, we will inform you, within 5 business days, whether your leave will be designated as FMLA leave and count towards your FMLA leave entitlement. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact: _____ at _____.

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Designation Notice**

(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act)

Form D

Leave covered under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), must be designated as FMLA-protected and the employing office must inform the employee of the amount of leave that will be counted against the employee's FMLA leave entitlement. In order to determine whether leave is covered under the FMLA, the employing office may request that the leave be supported by a certification. If the certification is incomplete or insufficient, the employing office must state in writing what additional information is necessary to make the certification complete and sufficient. While use of this form by employing offices is optional, a fully completed form provides an easy method of providing employees with the written information required by the regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.300(d), 825.301, and 825.305(c).

To: _____

Date: _____

We have reviewed your request for leave under the FMLA and any supporting documentation that you have provided. We received your most recent information on _____ and decided:

____ Your FMLA leave request is approved. All leave taken for this reason will be designated as FMLA leave.

The FMLA requires that you notify us as soon as practicable if dates of scheduled leave change or are extended, or were initially unknown. Based on the information you have provided to date, we are providing the following information about the amount of time that will be counted against your leave entitlement:

____ Provided there is no deviation from your anticipated leave schedule, the following number of hours, days, or weeks will be counted against your leave entitlement: _____.

____ Because the leave you will need will be unscheduled, it is not possible to provide the hours, days, or weeks that will be counted against your FMLA entitlement at this time. You have the right to request this information once in a 30-day period (if leave was taken in the 30-day period).

Please be advised (check if applicable):

____ You have requested to use paid leave during your FMLA leave. Any paid leave taken for this reason will count against your FMLA leave entitlement.

____ We are requiring you to substitute or use paid leave during your FMLA leave.

____ You will be required to present a fitness-for-duty certificate to be restored to employment. If such certification is not timely received, your return to work may be delayed until certification is provided. A list of the essential functions of your position ____ is ____ is not attached. If attached, the fitness-for-duty certification must address your ability to perform these functions.

Additional information is needed to determine if your FMLA leave request can be approved:

____ The certification you have provided is not complete and sufficient to determine whether the FMLA applies to your leave request. You must provide the following information no later than _____,
(Provide at least seven calendar days)
unless it is not practicable under the particular circumstances despite your diligent good faith efforts, or your leave may be denied.

(Specify information needed to make certification complete and sufficient)

_____ We are exercising our right to have you obtain a second or third opinion medical certification at our expense, and we will provide further details at a later time.

_____ Your FMLA Leave request is Not Approved.

_____ The FMLA does not apply to your leave request.

_____ You have exhausted your FMLA leave entitlement in the applicable 12-month period.

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification of Qualifying Exigency for
Military Family Leave**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form E

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency to submit a certification. Please complete Section I before giving this form to your employee. Your response is voluntary, and while you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.309.

Employing office name: _____

Contact Information: _____

SECTION II: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE: Please complete Section II fully and completely. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that you submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency. Several questions in this section seek a response as to the frequency or duration of the qualifying exigency. Be as specific as you can; terms such as “unknown,” or “indeterminate” may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Your response is required to obtain a benefit. OOC regulations at 825.310. While you are not required to provide this information, failure to do so may result in a denial of your request for FMLA leave. Your employing office must give you at least 15 calendar days to return this form to your employing office.

Your Name: _____
First Middle Last

Name of military member on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status:

First Middle Last

Relationship of military member to you: _____

Period of military member's covered active duty: _____

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency includes written documentation confirming a military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status. Please check one of the following and attach the indicated document to support that the military member is on covered active duty or call to covered active duty status.

___ A copy of the military member's covered active duty orders is attached.

___ Other documentation from the military certifying that the military member is on covered active duty (or has been notified of an impending call to covered active duty) is attached.

___ I have previously provided my employing office with sufficient written documentation confirming the military member's covered active duty or call to covered active duty status.

PART A: QUALIFYING REASON FOR LEAVE

1. Describe the reason you are requesting FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency (including the specific reason you are requesting leave):

2. A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a qualifying exigency includes any available written documentation which supports the need for leave; such documentation may include a copy of a meeting announcement for informational briefings sponsored by the military, a document confirming the military member's Rest and Recuperation leave; a document confirming an appointment with a third party, such as a counselor or school official, or staff at a care facility; or a copy of a bill for services for the handling of legal or financial affairs. Available written documentation supporting this request for leave is attached.

Yes ☐ No ☐ None Available ☐

PART B: AMOUNT OF LEAVE NEEDED:

1. Approximate date exigency commenced: _____

Probable duration of exigency: _____

2. Will you need to be absent from work for a single continuous period of time due to the qualifying exigency? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If so, estimate the beginning and ending dates for the period of absence:

3. Will you need to be absent from work periodically to address this qualifying exigency? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Estimate schedule of leave, including the dates of any scheduled meetings or appointments:

Estimate the frequency and duration of each appointment, meeting, or leave event, including any travel time (*i.e.*, 1 deployment-related meeting every month lasting 4 hours):

Frequency: _____ times per _____ week(s) _____ month(s)

Duration: _____ hours _____ day(s) per event.

PART C:

If leave is requested to meet with a third party (such as to arrange for childcare, to attend counseling, to attend meetings with school, childcare or parental care providers, to make financial or legal arrangements, to act as the military member's representative before a federal, state, or local agency for purposes of obtaining, arranging or appealing military service benefits, or to attend any event sponsored by the military or military service organizations), a complete and sufficient certification includes the name, address, and appropriate contact

information of the individual or entity with whom you are meeting (*i.e.*, either the telephone or fax number or email address of the individual or entity). This information may be used by your employing office to verify that the information contained on this form is accurate.

Name of Individual: _____ Title: _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ Fax: (____) _____

Email: _____

Describe nature of meeting: _____

PART D:

I certify that the information I provided above is true and correct.

Signature of Employee

Date:

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a
Current Servicemember –
for Military Family Leave**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form F

Notice to the EMPLOYING OFFICE

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYING OFFICE: The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a current servicemember to submit a certification providing sufficient facts to support the request for leave. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.310. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees or employees' family members created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

**SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the CURRENT
SERVICEMEMBER for whom the Employee is Requesting Leave**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE or CURRENT SERVICEMEMBER: Please complete Section I before having Section II completed. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that an employee submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a servicemember. If requested by the employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA-protected leave. Failure to do so may result in a denial of an employee's FMLA request. Board's regulations at 825.310(f). The employing office must give an employee at least 15 calendar days to return this form to the employing office.

**SECTION II: For Completion by a UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
("DOD") HEALTH CARE PROVIDER or a HEALTH CARE PROVIDER who is either:
(1) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (2) a DOD
TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (3) a DOD non-network
TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (4) a health care provider as defined
in the OOC regulations at 825.125.**

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee listed on Page 2 has requested leave under the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for a family member who is a current member of the Regular Armed Forces, the National Guard, or the Reserves who is undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy, is otherwise in outpatient status, or is otherwise on the temporary disability retired list for a serious injury or illness. For purposes of FMLA leave, a serious injury or illness is one that was incurred in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces or that existed before the beginning of the member's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of his or her office, grade, rank, or rating.

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA leave due to a covered servicemember's serious injury or illness includes written documentation confirming that the servicemember's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or if not, that the current servicemember's injury or illness existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces, and that the current servicemember is undergoing treatment for such injury or illness by a health care provider listed above. Answer, fully and completely, all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as

to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA coverage. Limit your responses to the servicemember's condition for which the employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e).

SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the CURRENT SERVICEMEMBER for whom the Employee Is Requesting Leave:

(This section must be completed first before any of the below sections can be completed by a health care provider.)

Part A: EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Name and Address of Employing Office (this is the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for the current servicemember):

Name of Employee Requesting Leave to Care for Current Servicemember:

Name of the Current Servicemember (for whom employee is requesting leave to care):

Relationship of Employee to the Current Servicemember:

☐ Spouse ☐ Parent ☐ Son ☐ Daughter ☐ Next of Kin

Part B: SERVICEMEMBER INFORMATION

- (1) Is the Servicemember a Current Member of the Regular Armed Forces, the National Guard or Reserves?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide the servicemember's military branch, rank and unit currently assigned to:

Is the servicemember assigned to a military medical treatment facility as an outpatient or to a unit established for the purpose of providing command and control of members of the Armed Forces receiving medical care as outpatients (such as a medical hold or warrior transition unit)?

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please provide the name of the medical treatment facility or unit:

- (2) Is the Servicemember on the Temporary Disability Retired List (TDRL)?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Part C: CARE TO BE PROVIDED TO THE SERVICEMEMBER

Describe the Care to Be Provided to the Current Servicemember and an Estimate of the Leave Needed to Provide the Care:

SECTION II: For Completion by a United States Department of Defense ("DOD") Health Care Provider or a Health Care Provider who is either: (1) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (2) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (3) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (4) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125.

If you are unable to make certain of the military-related determinations contained below in Part B, you are permitted to rely upon determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as a DOD recovery care coordinator).

(Please ensure that Section I above has been completed before completing this section. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page.)

Part A: HEALTH CARE PROVIDER INFORMATION

Health Care Provider's Name and Business Address:

Type of Practice/Medical Specialty:

Please state whether you are either: (1) a DOD health care provider; (2) a VA health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (5) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125:

Telephone: () - Fax: () -

Email: _____

PART B: MEDICAL STATUS

(1) The current Servicemember's medical condition is classified as (Check One of the Appropriate Boxes):

☐ **(VSI) Very Seriously Ill/Injured** – Illness/Injury is of such a severity that life is imminently endangered. Family members are requested at bedside immediately. (Please note this is an internal DOD casualty assistance designation used by DOD healthcare providers.)

☐ **(SI) Seriously Ill/Injured** – Illness/injury is of such severity that there is cause for immediate concern, but there is no imminent danger to life. Family members are requested at bedside. (Please note this is an internal DOD casualty assistance designation used by DOD healthcare providers.)

☐ **OTHER Ill/Injured** – a serious injury or illness that may render the servicemember medically unfit to perform the duties of the member's office, grade, rank, or rating.

☐ **NONE OF THE ABOVE** (Note to Employee: If this box is checked, you may still be eligible to take leave to care for a covered family member with a "serious health condition" under 825.113 of the FMLA,

as made applicable by the CAA. If such leave is requested, you may be required to complete the OOC's optional certification form (Form B) or an employing office-provided form seeking the same information.)

- (2) Is the current Servicemember being treated for a condition which was incurred or gravitated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (3) Approximate date condition commenced: _____
- (4) Probable duration of condition and/or need for care: _____
- (5) Is the servicemember undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for this condition?
☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please describe medical treatment, recuperation or therapy:

PART C: SERVICEMEMBER'S NEED FOR CARE BY FAMILY MEMBER

- (1) Will the servicemember need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, estimate the beginning and ending dates for this period of time:

- (2) Will the servicemember require periodic follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, estimate the treatment schedule: _____

- (3) Is there a medical necessity for the servicemember to have periodic care for these follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No.

- (4) Is there a medical necessity for the servicemember to have periodic care for other than scheduled follow-up treatment appointments (*e.g.*, episodic flare-ups of medical condition)? ☐ Yes ☐ No.

If yes, please estimate the frequency and duration of the periodic care:

Signature of Health Care Provider: _____ Date: _____

*Office of Compliance**advancing safety, health, and workplace rights in the legislative branch***Certification for Serious Injury or Illness of a
Veteran for Military Caregiver Leave**(Family and Medical Leave Act, as made applicable by the
Congressional Accountability Act)

Form G

Notice to the EMPLOYING OFFICE

The Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), as made applicable by the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), provides that an employing office may require an employee seeking military caregiver leave under the FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a covered veteran to submit a certification providing sufficient facts to support the request for leave. Your response is voluntary. While you are not required to use this form, you may not ask the employee to provide more information than allowed under the FMLA regulations issued by the Office of Compliance (OOC) Board of Directors (the Board) at 825.310. Employing offices must generally maintain records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications, or medical histories of employees or employees' family members, created for FMLA purposes as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, if the Americans with Disabilities Act and/or the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act apply, as made applicable by the CAA.

**SECTION I: For Completion by the EMPLOYEE and/or the VETERAN for whom the
employee is requesting leave**

INSTRUCTIONS to the EMPLOYEE and/or VETERAN: Please complete Section I before having Section II completed. The FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, permits an employing office to require that an employee submit a timely, complete, and sufficient certification to support a request for military caregiver leave under the FMLA leave due to a serious injury or illness of a covered veteran. If requested by the employing office, your response is required to obtain or retain the benefit of FMLA-protected leave. Failure to do so may result in a denial of an employee's FMLA request. OOC regulations at 825.310(g). The employing office must give an employee at least 15 calendar days to return this form to the employing office.

(This section must be completed before Section II can be completed by a health care provider.)

Part A: EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Name and address of employing office (this is the employing office of the employee requesting leave to care for a veteran):

Name of employee requesting leave to care for a veteran:

First	Middle	Last
-------	--------	------

Name of veteran (for whom employee is requesting leave):

First	Middle	Last
-------	--------	------

Relationship of employee to veteran:

☐ Spouse ☐ Parent ☐ Son ☐ Daughter ☐ Next of Kin ☐ _____ (please specify relationship):

Part B: VETERAN INFORMATION

- (1) Date of the veteran's discharge: _____
- (2) Was the veteran **dishonorably** discharged or released from the Armed Forces (including the National Guard or Reserves)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (3) Please provide the veteran's military branch, rank and unit at the time of discharge:

- (4) Is the veteran receiving medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for an injury or illness?
☐ Yes ☐ No

Part C: CARE TO BE PROVIDED TO THE VETERAN

Describe the care to be provided to the veteran and an estimate of the leave needed to provide the care:

SECTION II: For completion by: (1) a United States Department of Defense ("DOD") health care provider; (2) a United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("VA") health care provider; (3) a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider; (4) a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider; or (5) a health care provider as defined in the OOC regulations at 825.125.

INSTRUCTIONS to the HEALTH CARE PROVIDER: The employee named in Section I has requested leave under the military caregiver leave provision of the FMLA, as made applicable by the CAA, to care for a family member who is a veteran. For purposes of FMLA military caregiver leave, a serious injury or illness means an injury or illness incurred by the servicemember in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces (or that existed before the beginning of the servicemember's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces) and manifested itself before or after the servicemember became a veteran, and is:

- (i) a continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating; or
- (ii) a physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50 percent or greater, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave; or
- (iii) a physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment; or
- (iv) an injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran has been enrolled in the Department of Veterans' Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.

A complete and sufficient certification to support a request for FMLA military caregiver leave due to a covered veteran's serious injury or illness includes written documentation confirming that the veteran's injury or illness was incurred in the line of duty on active duty or existed before the beginning of the veteran's active duty and was aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty, and that the veteran is undergoing treatment, recuperation, or therapy for such injury or illness by a health care provider listed above. Answer fully and completely all applicable parts. Several questions seek a response as to the frequency or duration of a condition, treatment, etc. Your answer should be your best estimate based upon your medical knowledge, experience, and examination of the patient. Be as specific as you can; terms such as "lifetime," "unknown," or "indeterminate" may not be sufficient to determine FMLA military caregiver leave coverage. Limit your responses to the veteran's condition for which the

employee is seeking leave. Do not provide information about genetic tests, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(f), or genetic services, as defined in 29 C.F.R. §1635.3(e).

(Please ensure that Section I has been completed before completing this section. Please be sure to sign the form on the last page and return this form to the employee requesting leave (See Section I, Part A above). **DO NOT SEND THE COMPLETED FORM TO THE OFFICE OF COMPLIANCE.**)

Part A: HEALTH CARE PROVIDER INFORMATION

Health care provider's name and business address: _____

Telephone: (____) _____ - _____ Fax: (____) _____ - _____

Email: _____

Type of Practice/Medical Specialty: _____

Please indicate if you are:

- ☐ a DOD health care provider
- ☐ a VA health care provider
- ☐ a DOD TRICARE network authorized private health care provider
- ☐ a DOD non-network TRICARE authorized private health care provider
- ☐ other health care provider

PART B: MEDICAL STATUS

Note: If you are unable to make certain of the military-related determinations contained in Part B, you are permitted to rely upon determinations from an authorized DOD representative (such as, DOD Recovery Care Coordinator) or an authorized VA representative.

(1) The Veteran's medical condition is:

- ☐ A continuation of a serious injury or illness that was incurred or aggravated when the covered veteran was a member of the Armed Forces and rendered the servicemember unable to perform the duties of the servicemember's office, grade, rank, or rating.
- ☐ A physical or mental condition for which the covered veteran has received a U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Service Related Disability Rating (VASRD) of 50% or higher, and such VASRD rating is based, in whole or in part, on the condition precipitating the need for military caregiver leave.
- ☐ A physical or mental condition that substantially impairs the covered veteran's ability to secure or follow a substantially gainful occupation by reason of a disability or disabilities related to military service, or would do so absent treatment.
- ☐ An injury, including a psychological injury, on the basis of which the covered veteran is enrolled in the Department of Veterans' Affairs Program of Comprehensive Assistance for Family Caregivers.
- ☐ None of the above.

(2) Is the veteran being treated for a condition which was incurred or aggravated by service in the line of duty on active duty in the Armed Forces? ☐ Yes ☐ No

- (3) Approximate date condition commenced: _____
- (4) Probable duration of condition and/or need for care: _____
- (5) Is the veteran undergoing medical treatment, recuperation, or therapy for this condition? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, please describe medical treatment, recuperation or therapy: _____
- _____

PART C: VETERAN'S NEED FOR CARE BY FAMILY MEMBER

"Need for care" encompasses both physical and psychological care. It includes situations where, for example, due to his or her serious injury or illness, the veteran is unable to care for his or her own basic medical, hygienic, or nutritional needs or safety, or is unable to transport him or herself to the doctor. It also includes providing psychological comfort and reassurance which would be beneficial to the veteran who is receiving inpatient or home care.

- (1) Will the veteran need care for a single continuous period of time, including any time for treatment and recovery? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, estimate the beginning and ending dates for this period of time: _____
- (2) Will the veteran require periodic follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, estimate the treatment schedule: _____
- (3) Is there a medical necessity for the veteran to have periodic care for these follow-up treatment appointments? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- (4) Is there a medical necessity for the veteran to have periodic care for other than scheduled follow-up treatment appointments (e.g., episodic flare-ups of medical condition)? ☐ Yes ☐ No
- If yes, please estimate the frequency and duration of the periodic care: _____
- _____
- _____

Signature of Health Care Provider: _____ Date: _____

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2782. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General David R. Hogg, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2783. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2784. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Martha's Vineyard, Massachusetts [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0731] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2785. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; U.S. Army Exercise, Des Plaines River, Channahon, IL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0760] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2786. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Safety Zones Update [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1060] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2787. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations; Eighth Coast Guard District Annual and Recurring Marine Events Update [Docket No.: USCG-2013-1061] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2788. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Waddington Homecoming Fireworks, St. Lawrence River, Ogden Island, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0715] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2789. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; NOBLE DISCOVERER, Outer Continental Shelf Drillship, Chukchi Sea, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0248] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2790. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone — Oil Exploration Staging Area in Dutch Harbor, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0246] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2791. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones; Cleveland Dragon Boat Festival and Head of the Cuyahoga, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0082] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2792. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Upper Mississippi River MM 180.0 to 180.5; St. Louis, MO [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0704] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2793. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Incredoubleman Triathlon; Henderson Bay, Lake Ontario, Sackets Harbor, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0509] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2794. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Unexploded Ordnance Removal, Vero Beach, FL [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0737] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2795. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, Schuylkill River; Philadelphia, PA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0094] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2796. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zones and Regulated Navigation Area; Shell Arctic Drilling/Exploration Vessel and Associated Voluntary First Amendment Area, Portland, OR [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0543] (RIN: 1625-AA00; 1625-AA11) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2797. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation, Tennessee River 647.0 to 648.0; Knoxville, TN [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0337] (RIN:

1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2798. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Special Local Regulation; Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0568] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2799. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary interim rule — Special Local Regulation; Southern California Annual Marine Events for the San Diego Captain of the Port Zone; San Diego Bay, San Diego, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0738] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2800. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events, Wrightsville Channel; Wrightsville Beach, NC [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0663] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2801. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Perth Amboy, New Jersey [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0374] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2802. A letter from the Chair of the Board of Directors, Office of Compliance, transmitting a notice of proposed rulemaking to the rights and protections under the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993, as required by Sec. 304(b)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, and 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Education and the Workforce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 420. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules. (Rept. 114-261). Referred to the House Calendar.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 421. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide

for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and for other purposes. (Rept. 114-262). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 8. A bill to modernize energy infrastructure, build a 21st century energy and manufacturing workforce, bolster America's energy security and diplomacy, and promote energy efficiency and government accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology, Education and the Workforce, Oversight and Government Reform, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KIND, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3511. A bill to clarify the status of the North Country, Ice Age, and New England National Scenic Trails as units of the National Park System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SABLON, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. POCAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HECK of Washington, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. SWALWELL of California):

H.R. 3512. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify the Federal Pell Grant duration limits of borrowers who attend an institution of higher education that closes or commits fraud or other misconduct, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. SARBANES):

H.R. 3513. A bill to ensure greater affordability of prescription drugs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and the Judiciary, for a period to be

subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mr. POLIS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELAULO, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FARR, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. NADLER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. BROWN of Florida):

H.R. 3514. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. FRANKS of Arizona):

H.R. 3515. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit dismemberment abortions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. COLE, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. REED, and Mr. BOUSTANY):

H.R. 3516. A bill to amend the Social Security Act relating to the use of determinations made by the Commissioner; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3517. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code to enhance oversight of the American National Red Cross by the Government Accountability Office and Inspectors General at the Departments of Homeland Security, Treasury, and State, and require the Department of Homeland Security to conduct a pilot program with the American National Red Cross to research and develop mechanisms for the Department to better leverage social media to improve preparedness and response capabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Mr. AMASH):

H.R. 3518. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to prohibit the use of amounts from the Asset Forfeiture Fund for the Domestic Cannabis Suppression/Eradication Program of the Drug Enforcement Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3519. A bill to establish pilot programs to encourage the use of shared appreciation

mortgage modifications, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas (for himself and Mrs. CAPPs):

H.R. 3520. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish an inter-agency coordinating committee on pulmonary hypertension, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3521. A bill to authorize grants for data collection for use in stock assessments of red snapper and other reef fish species in the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3522. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require each State to implement a process under which individuals who are 16 years of age may apply to register to vote in elections for Federal office in the State, to direct the Election Assistance Commission to make grants to States to increase the involvement of minors in public election activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HONDA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3523. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to provide for the eligibility of Transportation Security Administration employees to receive public safety officers' death benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HONDA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3524. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to prohibit the use of consumer credit checks against prospective and current employees for the purposes of making adverse employment decisions; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3525. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a pilot program to award grants and loan guarantees to hospitals to carry out projects for the purpose of reducing energy costs and increasing resilience to improve security; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HONDA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr.

CARTWRIGHT, Ms. TITUS, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. FARR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SHERMAN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3526. A bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to extend the import- and export-related provision of that Act to species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under that Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 3527. A bill to designate the mountain at the Devils Tower National Monument, Wyoming, as Devils Tower, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3528. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to provide enhanced enforcement authority for occupational safety and health protections applicable to the legislative branch, to provide whistleblower protections and other anti-discrimination protections for employees of the legislative branch, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 3529. A bill to require the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to study the feasibility of constructing an aramid synthetic fiber aqueduct to transport water from Oregon to California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. HONDA, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. COHEN):

H.R. 3530. A bill to eliminate mandatory minimum sentences for all drug offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. LEWIS):

H. Con. Res. 77. Concurrent resolution recognizing the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERRY:

H. Res. 422. A resolution honoring the Red Land Little League Team of Lewisberry, Pennsylvania for the performance of the team in the 2015 Little League World Series;

to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ZINKE (for himself, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. JONES, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. MARINO, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. BABIN, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. McHENRY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. HILL, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. BYRNE, and Mr. PETERS):

H. Res. 423. A resolution expressing support for the designation of October 2015 as Special Operations Forces Appreciation Month in order to honor members of United States Special Operations Forces for their service and sacrifice on behalf of the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

129. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation allowing immigrants to serve in the military if they are eligible under the President's Executive Order for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or Executive Order for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

130. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18, urging the Congress of the United States to support H.R. 167, the federal Wildfire Disaster Funding Act; jointly to the Committees on the Budget, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 8.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 3511.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3512.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 3513.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3—To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3514.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3515.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the authority to protection unborn children under the Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3516.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 3517.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The U.S. Constitution, including Article I, section 8.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 3518.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution (relating to the general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3519.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1.

By Mr. BRADY of Texas:

H.R. 3520.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3521.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 3522.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 3523.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3524.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate foreign and interstate commerce) of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. ENGEL:
H.R. 3525.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;
Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and
Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3526.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8
By Mrs. LUMMIS:
H.R. 3527.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2: "The Congress shall have power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States;"

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3528.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California:

H.R. 3529.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:
H.R. 3530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills—and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 184: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 188: Ms. EDWARDS and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 209: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 265: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 300: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 306: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 317: Ms. LOFGREN and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 343: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 347: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 381: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 423: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 540: Ms. HAHN.

H.R. 546: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. ESTY, and Mr. DONOVAN.

H.R. 572: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 583: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 592: Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 665: Ms. PINGREE and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 702: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. TROTT, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 711: Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 748: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 765: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. NUNES, and Mr. RENACCI.

H.R. 771: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 816: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 842: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. WESTMORELAND.

H.R. 845: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.

H.R. 846: Mr. NORCROSS and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 869: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 879: Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 881: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 902: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 921: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 980: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 985: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1013: Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1062: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1086: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1133: Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1142: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1188: Mr. HARDY and Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1221: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1247: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 1258: Mrs. TORRES, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ASHFORD.

H.R. 1271: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1276: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1301: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 1383: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1384: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1391: Ms. MENG.

H.R. 1399: Mr. BARR.

H.R. 1422: Mr. GRAYSON.

H.R. 1427: Mr. MEEHAN and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1475: Mr. JOYCE and Mrs. LUMMIS.

H.R. 1478: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1490: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1492: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 1515: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1516: Mr. POMPEO and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 1526: Mr. HECK of Nevada and Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 1534: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1542: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1552: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 1566: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1600: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SINEMA, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 1608: Mr. DEUTCH and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1624: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. JONES, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1635: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1643: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 1644: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 1670: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 1671: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1686: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1692: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 1706: Mr. LANGEVIN and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1718: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1728: Ms. ESTY and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1752: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 1769: Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LANCE.

H.R. 1779: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1786: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SINEMA, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. COLE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FATTAH, and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.

H.R. 1859: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1941: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 1948: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1969: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2005: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2010: Mr. GIBBS and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 2050: Ms. SPEIER and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 2061: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2114: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. SERRANO.

H.R. 2156: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2169: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2209: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 2234: Ms. EDWARDS.

H.R. 2278: Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2293: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. LEVIN, and Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 2315: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2366: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 2404: Mr. REED, Mr. TAKAI, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 2460: Ms. GABBARD.

H.R. 2463: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 2510: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2520: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2521: Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2572: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 2595: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2602: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2622: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2639: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2675: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2698: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2715: Ms. ESTY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2726: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2737: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2738: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2739: Mr. JOLLY and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2752: Mr. BARR and Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 2763: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2769: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 2800: Mr. POLQUIN.

H.R. 2808: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.

H.R. 2811: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2824: Mr. CONNOLLY and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 2844: Mr. PALLONE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2850: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2855: Mr. HONDA and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2858: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 2861: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2867: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. NEAL.

H.R. 2901: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, and Mr. BARR.

H.R. 2903: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LONG, and Mr. BUCK.

H.R. 2909: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2915: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 2933: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2940: Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2948: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2972: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 2980: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 3011: Mr. HUELSKAMP.

H.R. 3033: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 3051: Mr. NADLER and Mrs. BEATTY.
 H.R. 3071: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3084: Mr. HANNA, Mr. NADLER, and Mr. JOYCE.
 H.R. 3108: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 3120: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3129: Mr. FORBES and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 3134: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 3137: Mr. VALADAO.
 H.R. 3141: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
 H.R. 3150: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN-GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. MENG, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. SWALWELL of California.
 H.R. 3202: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.
 H.R. 3221: Mr. SCHIFF.
 H.R. 3222: Mr. BARR.
 H.R. 3226: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3229: Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 3243: Ms. MATSUI and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3268: Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER.
 H.R. 3314: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 3338: Mr. PERRY, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. HILL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. DESANTIS.
 H.R. 3339: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.
 H.R. 3340: Mr. ROYCE and Mr. WILLIAMS.
 H.R. 3364: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
 H.R. 3378: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3381: Mr. LANCE and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H.R. 3423: Mr. LEVIN, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. WELCH, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 3428: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
 H.R. 3429: Mr. VALADAO, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. ROONEY of

Florida, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
 H.R. 3442: Mr. MEEHAN and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
 H.R. 3443: Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 3454: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.
 H.R. 3455: Mr. NADLER and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 3456: Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 3457: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. JONES, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. LATTI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. HILL, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. MARINO, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. YODER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. COLE, Mr. PERRY, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
 H.R. 3495: Mr. STEWART, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. FLORES.
 H.R. 3497: Mr. MEEKS, Mr. FARR, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 3504: Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mrs. ROBY, and Mr. BARTON.
 H.J. Res. 50: Mr. WESTMORELAND.
 H.J. Res. 66: Mr. ROUZER.
 H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. ROUZER.
 H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. GUINTA, Mr. HILL, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
 H. Res. 28: Mr. MCKINLEY.
 H. Res. 54: Ms. DEGETTE.
 H. Res. 111: Mr. FORBES.
 H. Res. 140: Ms. MATSUI.
 H. Res. 207: Mr. DENHAM, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Ms. KUSTER.

H. Res. 210: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H. Res. 267: Mr. VEASEY.
 H. Res. 277: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
 H. Res. 293: Mr. ZELDIN, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. SIREs, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 294: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.
 H. Res. 346: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. WEBER of Texas and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
 H. Res. 348: Ms. ESHOO, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. RICHMOND, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H. Res. 390: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
 H. Res. 392: Mr. SANFORD.
 H. Res. 393: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, and Mr. FOSTER.
 H. Res. 394: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. ENGEL.
 H. Res. 417: Mr. WESTMORELAND.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on Judiciary in H.R. 3504 do not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

The amendment to be offered by Representative GOODLATTE, or a designee, to H.R. 348, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING MR. EDWARD F.
MCELROY

HON. DANIEL LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 90th birthday of a Chicagoland icon, Mr. Edward F. McElroy. It is my pleasure to pay homage to a man who has entertained and informed residents of Chicagoland for almost 70 years.

Ed McElroy began his long and storied career in 1946 under the guidance of radio personality Bob Elson. His first opportunity to cover nationwide news and sports came with Eddie Hubbard on the Chesterfield Show for WIND, and in 1950, he joined WJJD, another local station in Chicago.

Over the last 70 years, Mr. McElroy has delivered news to Chicagoland on an incredible variety of platforms and his work continues today. He currently hosts the TV shows Community in Focus and the Ed McElroy Show where he interviews local newsmakers.

Outside of the enduring impact his work in broadcasting has had on the people of Chicago, Ed McElroy also deserves recognition for his outstanding service to his community. Mr. McElroy has always been willing to take time out of his busy schedule for those in need. He has entertained hospitalized veterans and underprivileged children at LaRabida Children's Hospital and he visits schools to teach students about patriotism.

Veterans in particular have benefited from the generosity of Ed McElroy. A veteran himself, Mr. McElroy served our country during World War II in the Army Air Corps and became involved in veterans issues shortly after his service. Among his long list of accolades, he has served as National Commander of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America, as well as State Commander for Illinois.

Finally, Ed McElroy has been consistently active with the Chicago Policy Department. His efforts to improve the welfare of Chicago Police Officers and their families have been recognized by police organizations across Chicagoland.

Mr. McElroy, father of three and grandfather of six, has had a hugely successful career and continues to have an impact on the day-to-day lives of Chicago area residents. I ask my colleagues to please join me in celebrating the 90th birthday of Edward F. McElroy.

REMEMBERING ELEANOR BENSON

HON. DAVID SCHWEIKERT

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, a woman from my community passed away. Her name was Eleanor Benson. We all have a handful of people who actually impact our lives, and this woman is partially responsible for why I'm behind this microphone. She changed my life. She had a passion and energy that could not be stopped, and she will be dearly missed by our community.

RECOGNIZING DR. CHRISTOPHER
PUTO

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Dr. Christopher P. Puto, who will be installed as the 37th President of Spring Hill College, the oldest Catholic college in the Southeast, on September 17. Spring Hill College is located in Mobile, Alabama, which is the largest city in Alabama's First Congressional District.

Dr. Puto will be returning to Spring Hill College, where he graduated in 1964 with a degree in economics. He then went on to earn a Master of Business Administration in marketing from the University of Miami followed by a Doctorate in Business Administration from Duke University, my own alma mater.

In 1998, as dean of the McDonough School of Business at Georgetown University, he introduced a new MBA program curriculum and initiated a curriculum redesign for the undergraduate business program. He also created a comprehensive strategic planning process for the school and raised \$80 million in the first three years of a \$150 million capital campaign.

From 2002 to 2014, Dr. Puto served as the dean and the Opus Distinguished Chair in the Opus College of Business at the University of St. Thomas, a Catholic college in Minnesota. At St. Thomas, Dr. Puto designed and introduced the university's first full-time MBA program and first full-time accountancy program.

In addition to his contributions to academia, Dr. Puto has also achieved success through industry and consulting experience. In fact, he started his career as an allied sales manager at Burger King Corporation, where he played a part in developing the "Have It Your Way" advertising campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to welcome Dr. Puto back to Southwest Alabama. Spring Hill College has long been a critical part of the local community, and I look forward to working with Dr. Puto in his new role.

HONORING JONATHAN DYER

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Jonathan Dyer who has achieved the Eagle Scout award, a Boy Scout's highest honor. This recognition is well deserved and represents these young men's commitment to public service.

Achieving the status of Eagle Scout is a huge accomplishment, and I commend Mr. Dyer for being a positive role model to young people across our great state and the nation through his commitment to community service.

Once again, congratulations to this young man for his outstanding accomplishment. I am very proud of him and wish him the best in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING HISPANIC
HERITAGE MONTH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise to celebrate National Hispanic Heritage Month and its 2015 theme, Honoring Our Heritage. Building Our Future. The people of the United States will once again celebrate the histories, cultures, and traditions of our Hispanic American brothers and sisters from September 15, 2015, through October 15, 2015.

Hispanic Heritage Month begins each year on September 15, the anniversary of the independence of five Latin American countries: Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Mexico and Chile observe their independence days on September 16 and September 18. Since its inception as National Hispanic Heritage Week in 1968, which later became National Hispanic Heritage Month in 1988, Americans have taken this time to not only pay tribute to the rich culture and traditions of Hispanic Americans, but also to reflect on the numerous contributions they have made that have led to improvements within their communities, and in turn, a better America.

Our nation's success is reliant upon the rich heritage and cultural diversity of its people. Hispanic Heritage Month celebrates the many Hispanic leaders and members of our communities who have added to the prosperity of the United States in every facet of society including medicine, business, arts and entertainment, sports, education, politics, and the military.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month. Throughout America's history, present, and future, the Hispanic community has played and continues to play a major role in enriching the quality of life and culture of our great nation, and for their outstanding contributions they are worthy of the highest praise.

IN HONOR OF THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF SEQUOIA NATIONAL PARK AND THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK

HON. TOM MCCLINTOCK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 125th anniversary of Sequoia National Park, and the 75th anniversary of Kings Canyon National Park. Both of these parks are located in California's Fourth Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent.

Having been established in 1890, Sequoia National Park is the nation's second oldest national park. It was created through the advocacy of nearby San Joaquin Valley residents, who wished to protect the magnificent Giant Sequoias for the enjoyment and inspiration of future generations.

In 1926, the park expanded to include Mount Whitney and the High Sierra backcountry. Today, it encompasses 39 Giant Sequoia groves, accounting for 40 percent of all native Sequoia groves in the world. In one of these groves, the Giant Forest, grows The General Sherman Tree. The General Sherman Tree is considered the largest living tree on earth and estimated to be approximately 2,000 years old.

Kings Canyon National Park was created in 1940 to include the glacially-formed Kings Canyon. It also serves to protect the headwaters of the Kings River for public recreation and enjoyment. The park features over 60 miles of the Pacific Crest Trail and the John Muir Trail, both of which pass through spectacular alpine scenery.

Together, the parks host over 1.5 million visitors annually, and contribute \$154 million to the local tourism economy. Visitors participate in a variety of outdoor recreation activities, including: hiking, camping, horseback riding, fishing, canoeing, and climbing.

Mr. Speaker, on this notable occasion, I rise to recognize the splendor of Sequoia and Kings Canyon National Parks, which I hope will inspire all Americans to visit and recreate among its natural wonders.

HONORING SHERIFF BILL OLDHAM

HON. STEPHEN LEE FINCHER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. FINCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate my friend, Sheriff Bill Oldham, on being selected as the 2015 Tennessee Sher-

iff's Association's "Sheriff of the Year." Sheriff Oldham received this prestigious award at the Tennessee Sheriff's Association conference in Sevierville on Friday, July 24, 2015. This award was much deserved and highlights Sheriff Oldham's lifelong dedication to the preservation of safety in the Shelby County community.

A native Memphian, Sheriff Oldham graduated from the Catholic High School for Boys and attended Memphis State University from 1967 to 1970. He advanced to the Memphis Police Academy, where, in 1972, he graduated as a member of the 33rd Session. Upon graduation, Sheriff Oldham began his career as a police officer.

Sheriff Oldham was elected as Secretary and Treasurer of the Memphis Metropolitan Association of Chiefs of Police in 1993, Vice President in 1994, and President of the Association in 1995. He rose as a natural leader through the ranks of the Memphis Police Department, earning Officer of the Year twice, and retired in 2000 as a director. In 2002, he was appointed as Chief Deputy of the Shelby County Sheriff's Office, and then was elected Sheriff of Shelby County in 2010. Sheriff Oldham has served the community on a national scale. In 1991, he was selected by the FBI as a member of the National Law Enforcement Budgeting Advisory Group, and in 1995 he graduated from the 21st Session of the FBI's National Executive Institute.

Sheriff Oldham worked tirelessly on many City, State, and National boards and commissions encompassing credit, education, and corrections. Sheriff Oldham received multiple appointments to correctional committees from Governor Bill Haslam. Sheriff Oldham is an active member of the MMACP, the International Association of Chiefs of Police, the Tennessee Sheriff's Association, the National Sheriff's Association, the Major County Sheriff's Association, and is a retired member of the Tennessee Chiefs of Police Association.

The Tennessee Sheriff's Association annually selects a "Sheriff of the Year" who has a dutiful career of dedication to law enforcement encompassed by commitment to public safety and selfless leadership.

On behalf of Tennessee's 8th Congressional District, I congratulate Sheriff Oldham on receiving the Tennessee Sheriff's Association's 2015 "Sheriff of the Year." I wish him the best of luck for all future endeavors.

HONORING CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETE AGUILAR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor California State University, San Bernardino as it celebrates its 50th anniversary. Established in 1965 as California State College at San Bernardino, the Inland Empire institution opened its doors to less than three hundred students. In 1984, it officially changed its name to California State University, San Bernardino.

From starting with nearly three hundred students in 1965, to educating and empowering more than 20,000 today, Cal State San Bernardino has become an integral part of the San Bernardino community. With bachelor's, master's, and doctoral programs in five colleges, it provides students from all walks of life with endless opportunities. Educating and training our students for our rapidly evolving world is critical for the Inland Empire today and tomorrow.

California State University, San Bernardino has been a powerful economic, social, and cultural force for decades. This can be seen through the thousands of graduates it sends into the workforce each year to the thousands of Inland Empire residents it employs. To date, the University has graduated more than 80,000 people since its establishment, enriching our community and culture with innovative and creative minds that will continue to make the Inland Empire a better place to live and raise a family for generations to come.

As we celebrate its 50th anniversary, we commend and thank the faculty, staff and students of California State University, San Bernardino of the past five decades for their contributions to our community.

SEPTEMBER IS NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH: HONORING HYUNDAI HOPE ON WHEELS

HON. MIKE KELLY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to observe National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month, and in doing so I wish to recognize Hyundai Hope on Wheels, a leading contributor to pediatric cancer research and the fight to permanently end childhood cancer.

Hope on Wheels has one wish—and it is one that I share as both a father and a grandfather: to help kids fight and beat cancer so that each and every child can live a long, healthy, and joyous life.

Each year, approximately 15,780 children and adolescents are diagnosed with cancer. Even with all of the advances in modern medicine, cancer is still the leading cause of death by disease among children in the United States. It does not discriminate among its victims; any child can become afflicted no matter how young or how small. It affects children from each gender and all nationalities, religions, and socio-economic backgrounds. In most tragic fact, a child is diagnosed with cancer every 36 minutes. No one and no family is immune from this devastating disease. But there is hope.

Blessedly, modern medical research and treatments have greatly improved the survival rate for children with cancer. As of 2010, there were approximately 380,000 childhood cancer survivors living across our country. This dramatic improvement is a result of an increased quality of care, early detection, and advances in innovative research—along with a growing wellspring of financial support beneath it all.

Hyundai Hope on Wheels is leading the way with its commitment to cancer research. In its 17th year of battling childhood cancer, Hope on Wheels will award \$10.5 million in research grants to hospitals across the United States during this September, National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. Hope on Wheels has been investing in pediatric cancer research since 1998, and this month they will surpass \$100 million in lifetime funding to this critical cause.

I express my most heartfelt congratulations and gratitude to everyone at Hyundai who has made this wonderful investment in our children a powerful reality.

This year, one of Hyundai Hope on Wheels' grants will be awarded to Pennsylvania's own Dr. James Anthony Graves at the Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh of UPMC, where he is researching neuroblastoma, the most common extracranial pediatric tumor. This award and others will allow doctors like Dr. Graves to continue to work on life-saving cancer therapies and new treatments for children in Pennsylvania and across our country.

Mr. Speaker, for working to improve the survival rate of our nation's children tragically diagnosed with cancer, I ask that my colleagues join with me today in recognizing the heroic work of Hyundai Hope on Wheels. Committed to winning the fight against pediatric cancer, this extraordinary organization is providing generations of American children with the hope of a healthy future.

COMMENDING THE RECIPIENTS OF
THE 2015 NIPSCO LUMINARY
AWARDS

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great respect and admiration that I rise to commend the recipients of this year's NIPSCO Luminary Awards. The Luminary Awards were created to honor individuals or organizations throughout the community that have displayed exemplary leadership in the areas of community leadership, economic development, education, environmental stewardship, and public safety. This year's honorees include Mayor Karen Freeman-Wilson, the Northeast Indiana Regional Partnership, Starke County Initiative for Lifelong Learning, Porter County Career and Technical Center, and the Tri-Town Safety Village. For their extraordinary contributions to their communities and throughout the region, the honorees will be recognized at a ceremony on Thursday, September 17, 2015, at NiSource Corporate Headquarters in Merrillville, Indiana.

Mayor Karen Freeman-Wilson was honored with the Community Leadership Award for her strong leadership skills, creativity, and dedication to improving and strengthening the City of Gary. On December 31, 2011, she became the first woman to lead Gary and the first African-American female mayor in the state of Indiana. Mayor Freeman-Wilson's passion for her home, the City of Gary, is unwavering. She is dedicated and continues to take on the

city's challenges with integrity and enthusiasm. Mayor Freeman-Wilson has been a true community leader and asset to the people of Gary, as well as Northwest Indiana and beyond. She is worthy of this prestigious honor.

Northeast Indiana Regional Partnership (NIRP) is the recipient of the Economic Development Award. The organization was formed in 2006 with the goal of helping to establish and develop a worldwide competitive economy in Northeast Indiana. The organization is a proven success and is one of the top performing regional economic development organizations in the nation. The NIRP is a truly inventive organization and is crucial in today's ever-changing economy.

Starke County Initiative for Lifelong Learning (SCILL) was honored with the Education Award. Created in 1996, the organization provides educational opportunities for industrial employees and continues to invest its efforts in developing a well-trained workforce within the regional community. For its exceptional dedication to empowering individuals through education and developing a strong workforce to promote economic growth within the community, SCILL is truly inspiring.

The Porter County Career and Technical Center (PCCTC) is the recipient of the Environmental Stewardship Award. The program started in 1971 and was formed with the purpose of providing a wide range of vocational and technical education programs to high school students. Throughout the years, the PCCTC has provided young people with the tools they need to succeed in their future endeavors. In addition, the organization has been a leader in the expansion of environmental education opportunities in the region and continues to develop the students' knowledge of environmentally sustainable energy sources. For educating our youth on the latest environmental challenges, innovations, and developments, the PCCTC is worthy of this special honor.

The Public Safety Award recipient is the Tri-Town Safety Village. This not-for-profit organization is directed by an eighteen member advisory board with representatives from the towns of Dyer, Schererville, and Saint John. The "Safety Village and Alive House" hands-on display teaches children about safety in and around their communities. For their dedication to providing and preparing our youth with safety education, they are to be highly commended.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you and my other distinguished colleagues to join me in commending these outstanding leaders and organizations. Their contributions to their communities, Northwest Indiana, and worldwide are immeasurable, and the honorees are worthy of the highest praise.

KELLEY TRUCKING INC.

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the employees of Kelley Trucking Inc. in Golden, Colorado for their heroic acts on June 3, 2015.

On Wednesday, June 3, 2015 while at his Kelley Trucking Inc. Offices, John Kelley went into complete cardiac arrest. The heroic acts of the other six employees that were with John not only brought quick aid to the scene, they ultimately saved John's life. In the following moments Mike Easley, David Seehafer, Luke Kelley, Cal Kelley, John's wife Kelly Dorothy Kelley (Dottie) and Con Cockrum each provided the help John needed to receive urgent medical care as well as providing life-saving assistance that astounded John's family, medical staff, and myself.

When John went into complete cardiac arrest, David retrieved the onsite Automated External Defibrillator (AED) within 30 seconds. During this time Mr. Easley and John's son Luke got John into the rescue position while Con called 911. Dottie attached the pads of the AED and upon analyzing his heart they found it was completely stopped and would need a defibrillator shock. Cal Kelley administered the shock, while Luke began CPR compression and Dottie administered mouth to mouth. Mike and Cal were able to keep clear heads as they focused on leading the compressions. After the first set of CPR another shock was administered, and with the second shock John's heart was miraculously restarted. By this time Nick and David had brought the ambulance and Fire Department to the correct location. It is fortunate that the people surrounding John that day not only knew what to do but were able to execute the steps quickly and correctly. This shows the importance of providing adequate CPR trainings and having an AED onsite.

While everything happened so fast that day, the care and speed in which the people surrounding John dealt with the situation is what made all the difference. I am inspired by the care that these coworkers have had for each other and by their actions that can be described as nothing less than heroic.

I extend my deepest thanks to the employees of Kelley Trucking Inc. for their actions that day and their service to John Kelley and his family. These employees' courageous acts show how dedication to service and quick thinking can save lives.

HONORING THE VETERANS WALL
OF FREEDOM

HON. PETE AGUILAR

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to the Veterans Wall of Freedom, a monument to be erected in Grand Terrace, California. This memorial will honor the service, sacrifice and spirit of our nation's veterans, hundreds of thousands of whom called the Inland Empire home.

This will memorialize the brave men and women who gave the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom and liberty. We will never forget what they did for our nation, risking their lives to keep us safe and free. For over two hundred years, brave Americans have put their lives in harm's way for the sake of our country. The Veterans Wall of Freedom will

allow us to pay tribute to those courageous souls, and to teach future generations of their selflessness and sacrifice.

The Veterans Wall of Freedom will serve as a constant reminder of the fearless Americans who lived beside us for decades and through multiple wars, and what they did to protect our families, communities and country.

MIKE BESTOR

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a true public servant and community leader. After serving more than 21 years as City Manager of Golden, Colorado, Mike Bestor is retiring.

Mike's work ethic, integrity and thoughtfulness made him an effective City Manager for the City of Golden for more than 21 years. Golden flourished under Mike's management. His efforts to develop biking and hiking trails, additional park space, Fossil Trace Golf Course, the community center and countless other projects have helped enhance Golden and the ability for residents and visitors alike to live, work and play there. Even during the recession, Mike was able to keep Golden strong despite difficult budget cuts. Mike's appreciation and dedication to the city and its employees and residents is evident in everything he accomplished.

Mike Bestor exemplifies the best in public service, and Golden was fortunate to have his leadership for 21 years. Congratulations on your retirement and thank you for all you have done for the City of Golden and our community.

RECOGNIZING MR. TAYLOR
LANCASTER

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the accomplishments of Taylor Lancaster, my constituent who just completed a cross-country trek to bring attention to the cause of proper labeling of food products containing GMOs. Taylor has devoted the past eight months of his life to traversing 2,700 miles by foot, in order to raise awareness for this important issue.

Taylor began his journey on January 5th of this year at the famous Santa Monica Pier. From there, he crossed our country's great deserts, mountains, and plains, to arrive on the banks of the Potomac, here in Washington, D.C. Taylor did not do this alone; he had help along the way. Kind people in diverse communities shared their homes, allied and affiliated organizations shared his story, and his sponsors supported him. Taylor also had the opportunity to meet with like-minded groups, politicians, and schoolchildren to share his message as he crossed the country.

Taylor, who is my constituent and a resident of Santa Barbara, California, has been a back-packer for more than 20 years. He has worked on an organic farm and tended to organic gardens and orchards at a monastery. It was during his time at the monastery that he decided to undertake a journey in support of something larger than himself.

Like Taylor and the majority of American consumers, I firmly believe consumers have the right to know what is in their food. Part of Taylor's mission is to bring awareness to, and oppose, proposed legislation that would prohibit any mandatory labeling of GMOs. I have consistently voted against this type of legislation and applaud Taylor and his efforts to spread this message he believes in.

I am pleased to recognize Taylor's achievements on behalf of consumers' right to know and wish him continued success in his future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE TOWN OF
HEBRON'S 125TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pride that I recognize the town of Hebron, Indiana, as town officials and the entire community celebrate the very special occasion of its 125th anniversary.

Prior to its incorporation in March of 1890, Hebron was originally known as the "Corners" based on the crossing of two roads at its location. Although the town's first three attempts at incorporation were unsuccessful, the area thrived and continued to grow, and the first school was constructed in 1842. The year of 1845 was significant in that the first constructed log house was completed within the community, while the petition for a local post office was also submitted by Reverend Wilson Blaine during that year. The petition would be approved within a year's time and named Hebron after Reverend Blaine's congregation. A new era arose in 1863 with the construction of the Pittsburgh, Chicago, and Saint Louis Railroad, linking the community by rail with Chicago's business and economic opportunities. Residents could now leave for business in Chicago in the morning and return in the evening. The years to come would mark an exciting time for Hebron and for all of Northwest Indiana.

Although it was not yet incorporated, the census taken in 1886 showed that the area had a population of 663. By its centennial year in 1990, Hebron had demonstrated a steady growth with a population of 2696 residents. This trend has continued throughout the years, as the latest census data indicates that Hebron's population has reached 3700.

In celebration of the town's 125th anniversary, festivities will be held in Hebron during the annual Block Party for the Town on Saturday, September 19, 2015. In commemoration of this milestone, there will be a walking tour of community homes built in the 1800s, and the town's museum will be open for residents, visitors, and friends to reflect on the rich his-

tory of Hebron. In addition, entertainment and a grand fireworks display will take place for all to enjoy. A time capsule will also be buried near the Hebron clock tower to mark this special anniversary. For their devotion to their town's memory and prosperity, I would like to take the time to acknowledge Town Council President Don Ensign, Vice President Dave Peeler, council members, Pete Breuckman, Mike Mantai, and Keith Cunningham, Clerk-Treasurer Terri Waywood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in honoring the 125th anniversary of the town of Hebron, Indiana. For 125 years, the people of Hebron have demonstrated a level of pride in and service to their community that is unmatched. The town and its people have been an integral part of the Northwest Indiana community for generations, and I have been proud to serve as their representative.

PIE CONSULTING AND
ENGINEERING

HON. ED PERLMUTTER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pie Consulting and Engineering in Arvada, Colorado for being honored by Colorado Companies to Watch (CCTW).

CCTW is a unique awards program that recognizes and celebrates the contribution, innovation and energy of diverse second-stage companies that exemplify strong management, and community service involvement. While there are many outstanding companies in Colorado, Pie was chosen based on their positive impact on economic growth and the way they empower the innovation of their clients, staff and the community around them.

Pie Consulting & Engineering began in 1999 and has grown to be a leading forensic engineering and building sciences firm with offices throughout the nation. Pie's team of building science engineers and consultants provide enclosure consulting and services nationally and internationally for a variety of department of defense, federal, institutional, commercial, religious, medical, resort, mission-critical and mixed-use facilities. Their clients include the Marriott at Denver International Airport, and Pearl Place, the new Google complex.

The spirit of Pie's organization is fueled by strong company core values of ownership, community, integrity, respect, optimism and an emphasis on charitable giving. The high level of devotion Pie has shown to their community speaks to their quality of service. Pie takes pride in positively impacting the community of Arvada by hosting charity events and offering a Charitable Time Off program for employees to support charitable causes and non-profits that are important to them. Pie Consulting and Engineering is a great community asset and I'm proud of the service they provide our community. I am certain their service will continue to benefit our communities for decades to come.

HONORING THE LATE
CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the late Congressman Lou Stokes loved life and loved his family. He loved Cleveland, and he loved the political process. He was a giant of a man who embodied a quiet dignity that still inspires me today to do more for those who don't have a voice.

It was my privilege to attend the funeral service of Congressman Stokes on August 25, 2015. While many family members and friends paid special homage to a great public servant, the remarks of Congresswoman MARCIA FUDGE rung particularly true to all who were able to hear them. It is those comments that I would like to share with you now.

EULOGY OF LOUIS STOKES

(By Marcia Fudge)

I rise today to perform one of the most heavy-hearted duties to which I have ever been assigned. Lou Stokes himself was the assigner. He asked me several weeks ago to, on behalf of the political community, to deliver a discourse in commemoration of his lifetime of public service. Lou Stokes was the first African American elected to represent this community in the House of Representatives. I was blessed to have first a mentor/mentee relationship. Later, he became my colleague and my friend. That friendship continued without interruption until the day of his death. Make no mistake, my friends, we mourn this day, the loss of no ordinary man.

Napoleon I as the story goes was crossing the Alps, when he saw a lone peasant woman along the side of the road. "Where are you going on this bright morning?" And she answered "I am heading through the pass to hopefully see the Emperor." It was obvious she did not know who he was, so he went on and said "why would you be interested in seeing the Emperor, than his majesty from the House of Bourbon. It seems to me that you have exchanged one politician for another." The peasant spent a few minutes and said, "The Bourbons were the rulers for the rich and famous. Napoleon is our ruler." In this holy place, we have assembled to pay respect to the cherished and honored Louis Stokes, because no matter how many degrees he possessed, no matter how many world leaders he knew by first name, no matter how many Presidents sought his counsel, he was the Congressman for the peasant, the pauper, the passed over, and yes the populace.

Louis Stokes, thank God, never embraced the shallow notion that he should be like everyone else. Had he done so, he would never have reached his extraordinariness. He was a gifted orator, a writer of atypical ability, a lawmaker with legendary legislative savvy, and a statesman of sterling examples of civility. As the drama of history unfolds, Congressman Stokes will be ranked as one of the all-time greats, and to be sure, his greatness will endure. Because of Louis Stokes' staying power, I make it a practice to never praise the one hit wonders. Such ephemeral leaders are like the meteors that flash across the heavens, just long enough to announce the dark oblivion into which they soar. I, perhaps like many of you, prefer stars that

don't burn out so quickly. Lou's star still shines.

There are millions of things that do not last. Such things are magnificent for a moment, and then like a mighty gust of wind, they're gone. The majority of men and women who served in Congress served and never left a trace. Deft winds hold no such victory over Louis Stokes. He was a man of good works. Remember, good works are inspired by God, and receptive to his people. Eternal life is the fruitage of good works. Yes I'm saying that if Lou Stokes is not in heaven, most of us can forget about it. I'm not a preacher, or a theologian, so I can't present a picture of Lou in heaven—but in the vernacular of the House of Representatives—the gentleman from Ohio has been appointed to an unknown committee, holding hearings in an unknown location, but orchestrated by a well-known, all-knowing chair.

RECOGNITION OF GOLDEN GOOSE
AWARD RECIPIENT, DR. CHRISTOPHER SMALL

HON. MARK POCAN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Golden Goose Award, which recognizes researchers whose federally funded research has returned significant benefits to society.

In particular, I rise to celebrate one of this year's Golden Goose Awardees and fellow alum of the University of Wisconsin-Madison, in my district: Dr. Christopher Small. With funding from the National Science Foundation, Dr. Small, an earth scientist, and his colleague, Dr. Joel E. Cohen, a mathematical population biologist, pursued what seemed like a simple curiosity: how many people live at any given altitude on Earth? The result was the first global map of how the human population is distributed in altitude—an important factor in our exposure to risk, our human health and even how computers function.

While Drs. Small and Cohen were particularly interested in populations near coastlines, where they are at risk from natural disasters and sea-level rise, companies like Intel, Proctor & Gamble, and Frito-Lay have all consulted with them about populations at high altitudes. In fact, Dr. Small got what he calls the "biggest surprise of [his] scientific career" when he received a phone call from Frito-Lay representatives, interested to learning if there was a sufficient high altitude market to justify designing packaging that could sustain large differences in pressure from sea level up to the Rockies or the Himalayas.

Beyond working with industry to examine the potential of high altitude markets, the two have worked with biomedical researchers and public health professionals to help them understand the magnitude of altitude-related impacts on human health.

Without federal support, Drs. Small and Cohen may never have had the incentive to pursue their curiosity and develop game-changing insights into how the human population is distributed—insights that inform everything from microchip manufacturing to food

production and packaging and from biomedical research to the treatment of human disease.

I rise today to congratulate my fellow Badger in receiving this important recognition and applaud those supporting the Golden Goose Award which continues to highlight the importance of federal investments in research. These investments help grow our economy and improve the quality of our life and future generations.

HONORING THE LIFE OF BERNARD
T. GATES, JR.

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of a special man from Kentucky's Sixth District, Bernard T. "Bud" Gates, Jr. Mr. Gates was a successful business owner and a leader in the automotive industry.

Mr. Gates was born in 1924 in Indianapolis, Indiana. He graduated from Indiana University, where he played football. Mr. Gates served his country as a member of the United States Army Air Corps. He was a well-known and successful race car driver. He was also a local television personality in Indianapolis.

Mr. Gates began his automotive career at the age of ten when he began working at his father's Chrysler-DeSoto dealership. He went on to own and operate Bud Gates Chrysler, Bud Gates Chevytown, one of the largest General Motors dealerships in the midwest, and Bud Gates Toyota, Indiana's first Toyota dealership. He was most recently an associate with his son Steve Gates at Toyota South in Richmond, Kentucky. Gates served on the National Automobile Dealers Councils for Chrysler, Chevrolet, and Toyota.

Bud Gates was a leader in the automotive industry and a great American. He died on September first. He will be deeply missed, especially by his daughter and two sons, his grandchildren, and his great grandchildren.

CONGRATULATING RAMER SCHOOL

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, James A. Garfield said that "Next in importance to freedom and justice is education, without which neither freedom nor justice can be maintained". Even though President Garfield's presidency was short, he proclaimed the value of and set standards for better education in our nation. Being a former teacher he valued the public education system.

A strong education base in Elementary, Middle and High School is essential for continuous growth. Educators, students, and communities who accomplish academic achievement and growth should be recognized. I am honored to congratulate Ramer School for being named a "Reward School" for the 2014-15 academic school year. To be one of

only 5% in the state and one of only six in rural west Tennessee to achieve this status is an accomplishment for any school. And to make it more newsworthy, this is the second time in four years for Ramer to receive this award. We celebrate the hard work and dedication of your students, teachers, parents, and administrators.

Ramer School, you are building a great foundation in the lives of future contributing adults. I congratulate you.

TRIBUTE TO MAXINE LYON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Maxine Lyon on her retirement as the organist at the First United Presbyterian Church in Atlantic, Iowa. Maxine recently retired after serving over 66 years as the church organist.

Maxine directed the children's choir, adult choir and bell choir for many years. She is well known in the Atlantic area for performing with other area musicians and accompanying community choirs. Maxine taught piano lessons for 40 years primarily to advanced students. After graduating from Parsons College in 1939, she began a distinguished career teaching music in several different school districts. Maxine and her husband, Walt, moved to Atlantic in 1948 and raised two daughters, Pat and Judy.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate Maxine for her many years of dedicated and devoted service to the First United Presbyterian Church and to the Atlantic community. I am proud to represent her in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Maxine and wish her and her family nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING STEVEN HALL

HON. JEFF DENHAM

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge and honor Patterson Fire Department and West Stanislaus Fire District Chief Steven Hall, who announced his retirement after serving 25 years in Patterson.

Chief Hall's career in firefighting started in 1990 when he came on as a volunteer firefighter. He worked full-time at Costco throughout his 11-year tenure as a volunteer for the Patterson and West Stanislaus fire departments. During that time, he took emergency medical technician training, served as an engineer and became the local training officer. In 1998, Hall became the area's first sworn-in arson investigator, which was still a volunteer position at the time.

During Steven's 11 years as a volunteer firefighter, he was also earning an education.

He obtained his associate's degree in fire science from Modesto Junior College and, shortly after, attained his bachelor's degree in occupational studies from CSU Long Beach. Through the Grand Canyon University in Arizona, Steven earned a master's degree in leadership, with an emphasis in emergency preparedness and executive fire leadership.

In 2001, Hall finally accepted a paid position with the Patterson Fire Department as the Fire Marshall/Division Chief. At that time, then-Chief Richard Gaiser, Division Chief James Kinnear, and Hall were the only career staff of the West Stanislaus district and Patterson Fire. The Patterson department later doubled in size in 2005 when Mike Ambrosino and Michael McLaughlin joined as the first career firefighters.

In 2011, Steven was promoted to Fire Chief. As Chief, he helped guide the department from a fully volunteer organization to one that now has both career and volunteer men and women. His priority as chief has been personnel development as well as establishing a new way of promoting the men and women from within the department. Under Chief Hall, Patterson Fire Department has seen many advances such as its first strategic plan which instituted a community emergency response team and fire prevention programs, all while staying under budget for the last four years. With the advancements and improvements of the Patterson Fire Department, the city's public protection classification has been reduced from a Class-4 to a Class-2, with a Class-1 being the best, by the Insurance Services Office.

Chief Hall may be resigning from the Patterson Fire Department but his career is far from over. He has accepted the assistant fire chief position at the Central Fire Protection District in Santa Cruz County. This move will give him and his wife April, the opportunity to spend more time with their children and new grandchild.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring and commending the outstanding contributions made to the Patterson Fire Department and West Stanislaus Fire District by Chief Steven Hall and hereby wish him continued success.

TRIBUTE TO INTERSTATE 35 TELEPHONE COMPANY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Interstate 35 Telephone Company of Truro, Iowa. The company has reached an important milestone this year and I join them in celebrating their 50th anniversary of providing communication services to Iowa's 3rd Congressional District.

The Interstate 35 Telephone Company was incorporated in 1965 when Dale Mauer repurchased the Truro exchange from Continental Telephone Company. In 1965, St. Charles was added to the exchange, and in 1970, St. Mary's was added. Changes have been constant in this company since then as digital

service, cable services and cell phone technology has improved. As a result, the number of employees has increased from 6 in 1980, to over 50 today. In many of the small towns they serve, the telephone company is one of the main businesses and a hub for a number of community projects.

Mr. Speaker, it's an honor to represent Interstate 35 Telephone Company and its hard working employees in the United States Congress. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on their 50th anniversary and wish them nothing but continued success.

HONORING AND CELEBRATING JAZZ LEGEND LUQMAN HAMZA ON HIS 84TH BIRTHDAY

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, the 1930s and 1940s produced the names of jazz legends like Count Basie, Charlie Parker, Miles Davis, Dizzy Gillespie, and Mary Lou Williams, who either began their careers or played in Kansas City's storied 18th & Vine District, which I proudly represent. Among those legends was Luqman Hamza, who honed his musical skill listening and playing alongside these extraordinary musicians.

Originally born in St. Louis, Missouri on September 15, 1931, Hamza's mother passed away when he was only 6 years old. He was blessed to have been raised by foster parents, Isaiah and Elizabeth Cummings, a Christian minister and his wife, in Kansas City, Missouri. Hamza once related how impactful his foster father was, comparing his life to a history book. Cummings' father had been a slave and his mother a Native American Indian, which helped shape Hamza during his formative years.

Hamza grew up in Kansas City's 18th and Vine District, surrounded by music. Just a stone's throw away lived Charlie Parker and dozens of clubs were located within the district's six-block area. Hamza began singing for pocket change around his home when he was only a young child. From age 11 until he was 17, Hamza studied voice and piano under the Reverend John S. Williams. Williams, a minister and choir director at the Bethel Church, was also a music teacher at Lincoln High School and is known to have helped educate many of Kansas City's finest musicians. At the age of 12, Hamza, along with boyhood friends Sonny Kenner, Lucky Wesley and various other artists, formed a group known as the Four Steps and later renamed to the Five Aces. This group would play at several clubs in the 18th and Vine District, including Scott's Theater and the Chez Paris. The young band won a statewide high school talent contest in 1948, which allowed them to play on the Bob Hope show at Municipal Auditorium Music Hall. They would also land a live radio broadcast on KIMO every Sunday for several weeks. Hamza co-wrote his first chart-hitting release, When You Surrender, with Ted Battaglia when he was only 19 years old.

Hamza's experiences included playing with Charlie Parker when he was in town, and later with Miles Davis. By 1954, Hamza would venture out of Kansas City to continue his professional development. He returned to St. Louis, where he found work at the Glass Bar and the Toast of the Town. He then moved on to Chicago, where he thrived while the jazz scene was at its zenith. He lived and "gigged" in Chicago for over a decade, playing at numerous established clubs, such as the Black Orchid and the Playboy Club.

Although Hamza was raised in a Christian household, he began to explore Islam while in Chicago and became a Muslim in the mid 1960s. He grew up with the name of Larry Cummings, but adopted the name Luqman Hamza during this time. He held that name in great reverence, as it held personal significance and he felt it should be treated with respect and honor. The name Luqman was mentioned in the Quran as the wise man, and the name Hamza was that of the Prophet Mohammad's uncle.

In 1971, Hamza returned to Kansas City to raise his own family. His music career would continue to thrive as he became the featured performer at Kansas City's Playboy Club until it closed a few years later. Hamza continued to play around Kansas City at various clubs until he ventured to St. Louis in 1992, before returning to Kansas City just five years later.

In 2000, at the age of 69, Hamza released two nationally acclaimed recordings, *With this Voice* and *When a Smile Overtakes a Frown*, which received strong praise. Hamza was honored with the American Jazz Museum Lifetime Achievement Award in 2008 when they highlighted his work with the Five Aces, amongst other achievements.

In addition to a successful personal career, Hamza has also committed himself to mentoring and tutoring future musicians at his alma mater, Lincoln High School. He still performs regularly, oftentimes in a quartet that includes his lovely wife and songstress, Raynola. Hamza once commented, "I love music, and it doesn't matter to me about being no star. I'm blessed to be at my age and be able to sing, play and make people enjoy, that makes you rich."

Mr. Speaker, please join me and our colleagues in honoring and celebrating Mr. Luqman Hamza on his 84th birthday for a lifetime of devotion to the melodies of jazz. His music, his voice, his teachings have served as inspiration to generations of artists and peaceful enjoyment for the thousands who have listened to him.

CONGRATULATING SUPER-INTENDENT QUINTON LEE MARSHALL SR. ON HIS PASTORAL RETIREMENT

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing Supt. Quinton L. Marshall Sr. on his pastoral retirement after 25 years of service.

Supt. Marshall was born and raised in Flint, Michigan. In 1975, he graduated from Flint Southwestern High School. For decades after, he has been an authority for the improvement of those in his community. In 1990, he founded New Life Tabernacle Ministries. In 1997, Supt. Marshall married his lovely wife, Missionary Queen Esther Marshall.

In 2006, Supt. Marshall was elected president of Genesee County Church of God in Christ Alliance. Under his leadership, the GCCA continued to build upon the foundational principals of having a central hub to exchange information, enhance churches fellowship, and to address the social needs and issues concerning parishioners and the community within the Genesee County area.

Supt. Marshall had a vision to bring economic development to Flint and thus started the Genesee County Black Business Expo. It originated as an annual Black History Month event to connect area entrepreneurs. This February, the fourth annual Genesee County Black Business Expo attracted an estimated 600 to 700 people and showcased 63 businesses.

Additionally, Supt. Marshall is a proud father, grandfather, an accomplished athlete and business man, author, singer and songwriter, organist, voice for the community in political circles and respected leader amongst his Clergy brethren.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud Supt. Quinton L. Marshall Sr. and extend my deepest appreciation to him for his years of service to the community.

NUCLEAR DEAL WITH IRAN

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today, on the fourteenth anniversary of the September 11th terrorist attacks, and the third anniversary of the Benghazi attacks to join the bipartisan opposition to the president's unverifiable, unenforceable, and unconscionable Iran deal.

This deal will lift sanctions that will unleash billions to Iran and reward those who chant "Death to America"—those who are the world's leading state sponsor of terror.

In March, I signed a bipartisan letter with 367 of my colleagues saying, "A final . . . agreement must constrain [Iran] . . . so that [it] has no pathway to a bomb . . .".

On this floor, Republicans and Democrats alike have explained how this deal will lead to a nuclear Iran in a dozen to 15 years or earlier.

Will a nuclear Iran make the world a safer place? When I spent a week in Israel in August, the answer I heard from civilian and military leaders across the political spectrum was resoundingly "NO" to this deal.

Iran's neighbors are among those most opposed.

The senior Democratic Senator on the Foreign Relations Committee has said, "If Iran is to acquire a nuclear bomb, it will not have my name on it."

I urge my colleagues to add their names to the bipartisan opposition to this dangerous deal with Iran.

TRIBUTE TO TILLIE HEIM

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Tillie Heim from the Tri-Center Varsity Cheer team, as she has been honored with the status of All-American at the Tri-Center cheer camp.

To achieve this status, Tillie had to try out in front of the entire camp, demonstrating her knowledge and skill in all areas of cheer. Tillie has dedicated her time and talents to achieving a single goal and I commend her for her hard work and determination.

Mr. Speaker, the example set by Tillie demonstrates the rewards of dedication and hard work. I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress. I know all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating Tillie on a job well done, and wish her nothing but continued success.

THE INTRODUCTION OF THE CONGRESS LEADS BY EXAMPLE ACT OF 2015

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today, I introduce the Congress Leads by Example Act of 2015, to subject Congress and the rest of the legislative branch to the federal whistleblower and antidiscrimination laws that now protect employees in the private sector and the executive branch. Congress should abide by the laws it imposes on the American people, American businesses, and others. Congress made that promise when it passed the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (CAA).

The CAA was an important first step in making the legislative branch accountable for its employment practices, but it did not finish the job. The CAA did bring the legislative branch under 13 major civil rights, labor and workplace safety and health laws, but it exempted the legislative branch from important notice and training provisions, and altogether omitted important substantive and administrative protections.

The Congress Leads by Example Act of 2015 is a necessary follow-up bill to our 2010 investigation concerning staff complaints of conditions at the Capitol Visitor Center (CVC) and to the ongoing recommendations from the Office of Compliance (OOC), which found a gap in OOC's authority to enforce the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (OSHA) provisions against the legislative branch. In the 111th Congress, as chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Economic Development,

Public Buildings, and Emergency Management, I held a hearing examining claims by OOC, which was created by the CAA, of an estimated 6,300 safety hazards in the U.S. Capitol complex, as well as complaints by CVC tour guides that they were compelled to work in uniforms that were inappropriate for outdoor work in the summer and winter, and that there were limits placed on their water consumption. Our hearing demonstrated that many of the serious safety hazards in the Capitol complex had been resolved, and the Architect of the Capitol testified and offered evidence that it was continuing to correct the outstanding hazards with due speed. Eventually, the formation of a union with AFSCME Local 658 by CVC tour guides, aided by our hearings, helped speed up specific improvements in uniform and water consumption practices and policies.

However, in its annual report for fiscal year 2014, OOC identified additional provisions of federal workplace laws and standards that should be applicable to the legislative branch. OOC's recommendations include laws that grant the OOC General Counsel subpoena power, provide whistleblowers with protection from retaliation, and require the maintenance of employment records. The OOC report presents the successes and shortcomings of the CAA by tracking the trends in legislative branch employee complaints and workplace safety hazards in fiscal year 2014. This bill takes into account the OOC report, and seeks to both apply the standard of fairness to employees in the legislative branch that Congress requires for other employees and to provide a safer work environment for Congress, Capitol Hill employees, and visitors by bringing the legislative branch in line with the legal requirements of private sector employers and the executive branch.

Legislative branch employees have no way to report misuse of federal funds and other violations without fear of retaliation. This bill provides general whistleblower protections, and makes applicable additional OSHA provisions to the legislative branch, including providing subpoena authority to OOC to conduct inspections and investigations into OSHA violations, and requiring the posting of notices in workplaces detailing employee rights to a safe workplace under OSHA.

This bill also furthers the CAA's mission to prevent discrimination in legislative branch offices by prohibiting the legislative branch from making adverse employment decisions on the basis of an employee's wage garnishment or involvement in bankruptcy proceedings pursuant to the Consumer Credit Protection Act (CCPA) and Chapter 11 of the bankruptcy code. This bill requires legislative branch employers to provide their employees with notice of their rights and remedies under the CAA anti-discrimination provisions through the placement of signage in offices highlighting relevant anti-discrimination laws, including Title VII of the Civil Rights Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and the Age Discrimination in Employment Act. This bill also requires legislative branch offices to provide training to employees about their CAA rights and remedies. Adding the CCPA and bankruptcy provisions will deter economic discrimination, while the notice and training provisions will empower

legislative branch employees with full knowledge of their rights.

Finally, this bill bolsters the CAA's record-keeping requirements. It extends to the legislative branch the obligation to maintain accurate records of safety information and employee injuries, as otherwise required by OSHA, as well as employee records necessary to administer anti-discrimination laws. The enhanced recordkeeping requirements will facilitate better enforcement of laws.

By passing this bill, Congress will help restore the trust of the public in this institution by redoubling our efforts to exercise leadership by example. I urge bipartisan support for this important measure.

CONGRATULATING THE NEW JERUSALEM GOSPEL BAPTIST CHURCH AND THE INSPIRATIONAL VOICES OF NEW JERUSALEM ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. DANIEL T. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask the United States House of Representatives to join me in recognizing The New Jerusalem Full Gospel Baptist Church and the Inspirational Voices of New Jerusalem on the occasion of their 50th anniversary.

New Jerusalem is renowned in the City of Flint for its history of perseverance in the face of tragedy and its contributions to the Flint community throughout the last 50 years.

On October 15, 1965, a council of men and women met at the home of Rev. L.W. Owens to organize a new Baptist Church in the city of Flint. Seven days later, they began their mission at 1033 E. York Street, where people from all walks, talents and gifts began to join the congregation.

In December 1967, seeing the need for future expansion, the membership relocated to 1024 Holtslander Avenue with a membership of 350. Throughout the following thirteen years, the church opened three additional buildings to welcome hundreds more members to service throughout the week.

In July 1991, with membership flourishing over two thousand, New Jerusalem's edifice was destroyed by a fire. Over \$650,000 in damages was done, but the congregation was not deterred. By the following Sunday, services were relocated to C.A.R.E. Inc. while the church was rebuilt.

The membership decided to take this tragedy and create an opportunity to benefit their community. They constructed a new educational center/fellowship hall and founded "Operation Blessing" to provide clothing and food for the needy on the site of the burned-out facility.

For five decades as of October, New Jerusalem has worked tirelessly to help those in the community most in need. Residents in the area have come to rely on the church for their contributions to the Soup Kitchen, scholarship funds, and other service projects.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the tenacity of The New Jerusalem Full Gospel Baptist Church

and the Inspirational Voices of New Jerusalem and thank them for the service they have provided to the City of Flint and surrounding communities.

IN RECOGNITION OF
MR. TAL ESICK

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Tal Jimmy Eslick for his service to my office and the 21st Congressional District of California over the past three years.

Mr. Eslick was born in Spokane, Washington to parents Tal and Candice Eslick. After moving to Clovis, California as a child and attending Buchanan High School, Mr. Eslick went on to receive his Bachelor of Arts from California State University, Fresno in 2006. While attending Fresno State, he developed an interest in politics and began volunteering on local campaigns. He also spent a summer in Washington, D.C. as a Congressional intern. After earning his Bachelor's Degree, Mr. Eslick began working for Congressman DEVIN NUNES as a Field Representative and, later, as District Director.

In April of 2012, Mr. Eslick adopted a six-year old cat named Mason. On May 25, 2013, Mr. Eslick married Rachel Azevedo. They currently reside in Clovis, California.

Mr. Eslick has been a member of my team since 2010, first as my Chief of Staff in the California State Assembly and now as my Chief of Staff in the United States House of Representatives. He brought a wealth of legislative experience and professionalism to my team and has been a very dependable and resourceful advisor and friend. Throughout his career, Mr. Eslick has been an invaluable asset to Team Valadao and the people of the Central Valley.

In February 2015, Mr. Eslick returned to Fresno State in pursuit of a Master's in Business Administration for Executives.

On September 27, 2015, Mr. Eslick's time in my office will come to an end. Mr. Eslick will be moving on to a new chapter of his life. While I know he is very excited about this opportunity, he will be greatly missed as a member of my team.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Tal Eslick for his public service to the people of the Central Valley and wishing him well in this next chapter of his life.

TRIBUTE TO RILEY LONSDALE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Riley Lonsdale of Greenfield for receiving a state 4-H communication project award. Riley is the daughter of Martin and Maureen Lonsdale.

A state 4-H project award is the highest achievement one can receive in the 4-H project work category. Project awards are given to youth who demonstrate leadership, communication, and volunteerism in certain project areas. A total of 152 youth from 55 counties competed for these project awards on the state level. Achieving this honor is a true testament to Riley's perseverance and dedication to serve others, and I commend her for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, Riley's actions embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Riley on her achievement and I wish her and her family nothing but continued success.

HONORING MRS. CAROLYN FISH

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Carolyn Fish, who has spent her life as a vocal advocate for women in Rockland County, New York.

Carolyn's activism began in the 1970s when she attended an early planning meeting for the Rockland County Chapter of the National Organization for Women (NOW). She helped organize Rockland NOW's first conference at Rockland Community College, a pivotal moment in the growth of the women's rights movement in the county. Following the conference Carolyn continued to organize and plan events highlighting women's issues, eventually becoming vice president of Rockland NOW in 1977.

Since 1978 Carolyn has been the Executive Director of the Rockland Family Shelter (RFS), leading its growth from a small shelter to a full-service violence and sexual assault agency. The shelter provides residential and non-residential services that encompass all the needs of survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault. Under her leadership, RFS has focused on addressing oppression and integrating awareness of racism and sexism to better meet the needs of the women and children RFS serves.

During her tenure RFS has received numerous awards, including the Eleanor Roosevelt Award for Community Service in 1985, the Distinguished Housing Award from the State of New York in 1986, and the Pinnacle Award for Outstanding Achievement by a Non-Profit Organization from the Rockland Business Association in 2004.

Carolyn has also lectured throughout the nation on the causes and effects of domestic violence and has served on a statewide task force to develop the New York State Domestic Violence Policies for Counties, the New York State Crime Victims' Board Advisory Council, and the New York State Coalition Against Domestic Violence. For her hard work and dedication, she has received numerous awards and honors, including the Outstanding Victim Advocate Award from the New York State Crime Victims Board in 1999, and a Women of

Distinction Award from the New York State Senate, also in 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Carolyn Fish for her lifetime of work on behalf of women in Rockland County, New York, and across the country. I urge my colleagues to join me in applauding her achievements.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. THOMAS S. FOSTER

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of a very special man from Lexington, Kentucky. Dr. Thomas S. Foster was a pharmacy educator and a pioneer in pharmacology research.

Dr. Foster earned his Doctor of Pharmacy degree from the University of Kentucky's College of Pharmacy in 1973. He had a long and successful career at the University of Kentucky. Dr. Foster served as a Professor of Pharmacy, where he inspired generations of pharmacy students who have gone on to be successful in their profession. He motivated students to achieve more than they thought possible. Dr. Foster's clinical pharmacy research involved investigational drugs and drug administration systems. His research efforts led to the development of numerous products that improved the health of Americans and others around the world.

Dr. Foster served in many professional organizations, including the American Association of Colleges of Pharmacy, the American Pharmacists Association, and the United States Pharmacopeial Convention. Foster chaired Kentucky's Drug Formulary Council, the Drug Management Review Board, and the Kentucky Board of Pharmacy. He was a consultant to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration as well as the Office of Human Research Protection of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. He was elected to fellowship in the American Pharmacists Association, the American College of Clinical Pharmacology, and the American College of Clinical Pharmacology.

Dr. Foster and his wife Marijo had a daughter, a son, and six grandchildren. Dr. Foster contributed greatly to the pharmacy profession. He loved his work and left a legacy of education and research. The many accomplishments of Dr. Thomas S. Foster are renowned and he will be greatly missed.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONOR FLIGHT OF OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 27 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial this Saturday in Washington, D.C. through Honor Flight of Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state

and country, we welcome these heroes to our nation's capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are as follows: Robert E. Corey, Army; Robert P. Hamilton, Army; Edward N. Kaser Jr., Army; Fred A. Puckett, Army; Harold V. Werner, Army; Victor T. Zeller, Army; Harold F. Barger, Army Air Forces; Perry L. Peterson, Army Air Forces; Edgar F. Pomeroy, Army Air Forces; John L. Weakland, Army Air Forces; Fred H. Thornberg, Coast Guard; James O. Catt, Navy; Charles W. Filipowicz, Navy; Frederick L. Hisaw, Navy; John F. Martin Jr., Navy; Alva Q. Mizer, Navy; Marshall E. Scott, Navy; John F. Spring, Navy; Joseph M. Stone, Navy; Martin G. Tonissen, Navy; Dean M. Wilcox, Navy; Donald A. Yeamans, Navy; Mary R. Yeamans, Navy; S. Tony Zarbano, Navy; Jack R. Merkle, Marine Corps; Charles F. Paul, Marine Corps; and William E. Robinson, Marine Corps.

These 27 heroes join the estimated 20,000–25,000 veterans who will travel to Washington DC from their home states in 2015, adding to the 138,800 veterans who have been honored through the Honor Flight Network of volunteers nationwide since 2005.

I would also like to recognize the twelve escorts traveling on this trip who have also served our country: Steven N. Barger, Army; William L. Daniels, Army; Lloyd Frasier, Army; Anthony L. Zarbano, Army; John D. Filipowicz, Coast Guard; Aaron L. Tonissen, Coast Guard; Jeffrey H. Weakland, Marine Corps; Edwin A. Montgomery, National Guard; Allan A. Auge, Navy; Robert L. Hamilton, Navy; Daniel M. Lowe, Navy; and Robert E. Walker, Navy.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these brave Americans who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country.

CONGRATULATING CARLISLE BELTS ON THE SALE OF ITS ONE BILLIONTH POWER TRANS- MISSION BELT

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate auto part manufacturer, Carlisle Belts of Springfield, Missouri, on reaching the milestone sale of its one billionth power transmission belt.

As a staple of Springfield since 1959, this is not only a triumph for Carlisle, but for the entire community. Each of its belts is American made and represents a dedicated team of engineers, technicians, and craftsmen that take pride in their product. This rare achievement represents the sound efficiency of Carlisle employees through more than five decades, and is an example of exemplary hard work—commonplace among the people of southwest Missouri.

On September 26th, Carlisle will celebrate this momentous occasion with festivities for workers—current and retired—and their families. It is my pleasure to help recognize Carlisle for this great achievement and wish its workers a joyous and well-earned celebration of their success. By creating jobs, delivering top-class products, and exhibiting exemplary work ethic for more than 50 years, Carlisle and its manufacturing team have made southwest Missouri a better place to live. It makes me proud to serve them, and all of Missouri's Seventh Congressional District.

CELEBRATING NANCY BOSTON

HON. JOHN R. CARTER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the vision, leadership, and quarter century of political activism of Nancy Boston of Bell County, TX. Her dedication to both her nation and her Party are no small part of the reason the Lone Star State is friendly territory for Republicans.

Political parties thrive off the efforts of dedicated volunteers and individuals who take time from their busy lives to devote themselves to a larger cause. It's rarely glamorous work. Party soldiers stuff envelopes, walk door-to-door for candidates, and devote long hours in the most elemental parts of the electoral process. Through the years, Nancy has never shied away from this hard work and was always ready to help.

Like many Republicans, Nancy's political fires we're ignited during Barry Goldwater's 1964 presidential campaign. But it was during the aftermath of Watergate that Nancy took her committed activism to a new level by becoming a part of the Central Texas Republican Women's Club where she wore many hats and became an indispensable part of that critical organization. Over the years, she's provided excellent service in a variety of elected and appointed positions. Elected Chair of the Bell County Republican Party in 1990, Nancy has shepherded that organization into a position of prominence in both Texas and the Nation.

Nancy has been a mentor and role model to other activists and leads the Party with dedication, honesty, and integrity. Her wisdom and experience have been relied upon countless times and she's always been a source of sound guidance and leadership.

Some people live an entire lifetime and wonder if they have made a difference in the world; Nancy Boston doesn't have that problem. I join her family, friends, and colleagues in saluting her great work and wish her nothing but the best in the years ahead.

TRIBUTE TO FLORENCE NOLTE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Florence

Nolte on the celebration of her 100th birthday. Ms. Nolte celebrated her 100th birthday on July 17th, 2015 in Stuart, Iowa.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Ms. Nolte's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones, and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet Communism and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Ms. Nolte has lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Ms. Nolte in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Ms. Nolte on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her continued health and happiness in the years to come.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,061,535,754.50. We've added \$7,524,184,486,841.42 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

HONORING MEMORIAL TABERNACLE CHURCH

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Memorial Tabernacle Church, located in Oakland, California upon its 90th Anniversary as a strong religious pillar in the East Bay community.

Memorial Tabernacle Church was founded in 1925 by Bishop Judge & Sarah King, a married couple from Louisiana. They moved to California in search of a better life, free from prejudice. The church was established in a two-story house on Seventh Street in West Oakland. Despite the area's reputation, Bishop Judge and Sarah preached in all areas of the community, including street corners and in front of bars.

To accommodate their growing numbers, the congregation moved to a larger building in West Oakland. But in 1960, the United States Postal Service purchased several blocks of land and property on Seventh Street to build the main Post Office before finally moving to their current home in North Oakland.

Following the passing of Bishop Judge in 1945, his son, Bishop Ulysses S. King was named senior pastor. Bishop Ulysses was active in the community. He was a member of the Center for Urban Black Studies, an affiliate center of the Graduate Theological Union. He later received an honorary Doctor of Divinity. In 1972, Bishop Ulysses took the message of salvation to the cities of Lagos and Uyo, Nigeria. In 1976, Bishop Ulysses helped establish an affiliate church in Uyo.

Now under the leadership of Pastor Stephen King, Memorial Tabernacle Church has continued to thrive through its various ministries in the East Bay community. The church facilitates programs such as the Embracing Our Community, Health Ministry, and Community Garden Ministry. All of these programs are responsible for maintaining contact with the community and working to serve those in need.

Memorial Tabernacle Church also hosts ministries for groups of all ages and areas of need. The Young People Ministry helps educate the young people about God's Word and how to better serve their community. The Music Ministry guides people in expressing praise, prayer, and gratitude to God via musical instruments, singing hymns, guest musicians and soloists.

On behalf of the residents of California's 13th Congressional District, I extend my sincerest congratulations to Memorial Tabernacle Church on the special occasion of its 90th anniversary. I wish Memorial Tabernacle Church many more years of faithful and compassionate service.

TRIBUTE TO MIKE DAILEY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Mike Dailey, principal at Southeast Polk Junior High School for receiving the 2015 ITAG (Iowa Talented and Gifted) Administrator of the Year award.

This honor is awarded annually to recognize an Iowa building-level or district office administrator who supports and advances ITAG's mission in his/her school district. The organization's mission is to "recognize, support, and respect the unique and diverse needs of talented and gifted learners through advocacy, education, and networking."

Mike was nominated for this award by Laurie Wyatt, Southeast Polk's Learning Supports Coordinator. Ms. Wyatt cited Mike's support of gifted junior high students, which is reflected in his willingness to collaborate and cooperate with other staff. He has also been a driving force behind the growth in his building's Iowa Assessment scores.

Mike's tireless dedication to all junior high students is highly valued by Southeast Polk. His efforts exemplify the district's priority of high academic achievement, and its vision to help students reach success in college, career, and civic life.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Mike for this award and for providing the youth

in Iowa's 3rd Congressional District the education that they will need to be successful in the future. I am proud to represent him, his family and his fellow teachers and students in the United States Congress. I know that my colleagues join me in congratulating Mike and wishing him nothing but continued success.

HONORING VFW POST 1294, COMMANDER EDDIE BRAY, AND THE LADIES AUXILIARY

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, people who serve their country in the military without regard for their own safety to safeguard our way of life are truly heroes. Some of these heroes come home to continue to serve their neighbors, their communities and fellow veterans. Today I am pleased to congratulate and honor a group of these great heroes.

To the Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 1294, Commander Eddie Bray, and the Ladies Auxiliary: I am amazed at your accomplishments and pleased that you have been recognized with the First Place status in the state of Tennessee for the second consecutive year.

Some of your other outstanding awards include:

The post was named National Community Service Post for the second year

Commander Bray was awarded the Outstanding Recruiter of the year

The post was awarded a plaque for 100% membership

Awarded Honor Post status for exceeding 100% membership

Named All State and the Commander and Quartermaster were named Co-Captains of All State Teams

One of only 139 out of 6,999 posts to be named an All American Post

Commander Bray named All American Commander

I am pleased to have the honor to congratulate you in person and to thank you for your continued service.

HONORING PROFESSORS WALTER MISCHER, JOEL COHEN, AND CHRISTOPHER SMALL—FOR RECEIVING THE 2015 GOLDEN GOOSE AWARD

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor three New York scientists—Professors Walter Mischel, Joel Cohen and Christopher Small—for receiving the 2015 Golden Goose award for research within their respective fields.

Founded in 2012, the Golden Goose Award recognizes researchers whose obscure, federally funded research has returned significant benefits to society. This annual contest was

inspired by my friend, Representative JIM COOPER of Tennessee, as a way of highlighting the tremendous human and economic benefits of federally funded research.

Dr. Mischel of Columbia University, in conjunction with Drs. Philip Peake and Yuichi Shoda of Stanford University, were recognized for their "Marshmallow Test." This project measures human behavior, specifically our self-control, by offering children one marshmallow immediately or two if they could wait just 15 minutes alone with their potential treat. The project revealed the importance of self-control and how the trait can be cultivated to appropriately teach our children. Dr. Mischel's work was made possible by funding from the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Drs. Cohen and Small received the 2015 Golden Goose award for their study on population densities at various altitudes. Working out of the Lamont Doherty Earth Observatory in my district, Drs. Cohen and Small developed the first global map of human population distribution with respect to Earth elevation. This innovative way of looking at population density will help us understand how events such as natural disasters or sea-level rise impact population distribution and health. Their work was made possible by funding from the NSF.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Professors Walter Mischel, Joel Cohen and Christopher Small for receiving the 2015 Golden Goose Award. Their projects symbolize the importance of federal funding for scientific research and the creativity that research fosters. I urge my colleagues to join me in commending them for their hard work.

TRIBUTE TO SKYLER RAWLINGS

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Skyler Rawlings of Greenfield, Iowa, for receiving a state 4-H citizenship project award. Skyler is the son of Sieanna Rawlings of Greenfield, Iowa.

A state 4-H project award is the highest achievement one can receive in the 4-H project work category. Project awards are given to youth who demonstrate leadership, communication, and volunteerism in certain project areas. A total of 152 youth from 55 counties competed for these project awards on the state level. Achieving this honor is a true testament to Skyler's dedication to serving others, and I commend him for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, Skyler's actions embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Skyler on his achievement and I wish him and his family nothing but the best moving forward.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONOR FLIGHT OF EASTERN AND PORTLAND OREGON

HON. GREG WALDEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 50 World War II veterans from Oregon who will be visiting their memorial today in Washington, D.C. through Honor Flight of Oregon. On behalf of a grateful state and country, we welcome these heroes to the nation's capital.

The veterans on this flight from Oregon are as follows: Robert Bortvedt, Army; Eldon Dyer, Army; John Fellas, Army; Donald Ford, Army; RD, Sr. Fortner, Army; Clyde Harrop, Army; Donald Kiser, Army; Everett Lee, Army; Patrick O'Brien, Army; Lawrence Torrey, Army; Donald Bean, Army Air Forces; Donald Cresap, Army Air Forces; Harold Goff, Army Air Forces; Lawrence Kissinger, Army Air Forces; Francis Marvel, Army Air Forces; Raymond Morgan, Army Air Forces; Leo Morstad, Army Air Forces; James Riopelle, Army Air Forces; James Sperling, Coast Guard; Stanley Wheeler, Coast Guard; Harold Englet, Merchant Marines; Charles Kempf, Merchant Marines/Army; Kenneth Anderson, Navy; William Birkeland, Navy; Douglas Carer, Navy; Thomas Christman, Navy; Raynold Deluca Sr., Navy; Rupert Fixott, Navy; Donald Fowler, Navy; Ralph Grassmuck, Navy; Roland Halberg, Navy; Marvin Johnson, Navy; Robert Kahl, Navy; Kenneth Kerns, Navy; Harold Lay, Navy; Gerald Midbust, Navy; Clinton Peck, Navy; George Prusynski, Navy; Leo Schammel, Navy; Raymond Stahly, Navy; Earl Uptegrove, Navy; Murray Watts, Navy; Lyle Wescott, Navy; Merrill Williams, Navy; Robert Zimmerman, Navy; Joe Bruer, Marine Corps; Earle Costello, Marine Corps; Robert Miller, Marine Corps; Juanita Price, Marine Corps; and John Anderson, Navy Reserve.

These 50 heroes join the estimated 20,000–25,000 veterans who will travel to Washington DC from their home states in 2015, adding to the 138,800 veterans who have been honored through the Honor Flight Network of volunteers nationwide since 2005.

Mr. Speaker, each of us is humbled by the courage of these soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who put themselves in harm's way for our country and way of life. As a nation, we can never fully repay the debt of gratitude owed to them for their honor, commitment, and sacrifice in defense of the freedoms we have today.

My colleagues, please join me in thanking these veterans and the volunteers of Honor Flight of Oregon for their exemplary dedication and service to this great country. I especially want to recognize and thank Dick Tobiason for his tireless work as president of Honor Flight of Oregon and trip leader Erik Tobiason for his efforts.

RECOGNIZING THE MONTH OF MAY AS SYRINGOMYELIA AWARENESS MONTH

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize May as Syringomyelia Awareness Month, with the hope that increased awareness of this disease will bring improved care to individuals bravely battling the disease and a cure.

Syringomyelia is a progressive disease of the spinal cord and has no known cure at this time. Thousands of men, women and children all over the world are affected by Syringomyelia and they can suffer from chronic severe pain, widespread symptoms, paralysis and even death. It is imperative that we educate the public and medical communities in order to find a cure for this disease.

I ask all my colleagues to join me and all those impacted with this rare disease, not just today but every day, in the mission to educate the world about Syringomyelia. With more research on the disease and developments of treatments and even a cure, we can decrease mortality for individuals all over the world.

TRIBUTE TO CALVIN AND KAREN LARSEN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Calvin and Karen Larsen of Underwood on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. Calvin and Karen were married in 1965 and are lifelong residents of Southwest Iowa.

Calvin and Karen's commitment to each other, their children, Nancy and Lind, as well as their grandchildren truly embodies their Iowa values. I congratulate this devoted couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion. I wish them and their family all the best moving forward.

HONORING THE WORLD WAR II HEROES OF LISTER-KNOWLTON POST 9389 VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS IN CARIBOU, MAINE

HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I'm honored by the opportunity to acknowledge the great sacrifices made by our World War II heroes of Lister-Knowlton Post 9389 Veterans of Foreign Wars in Caribou and our Veterans throughout

Maine's Second District. This commemoration celebrates a monumental victory for the United States these brave Americans helped achieve. Our World War II Veterans changed the world by answering the ultimate call of duty in defense of freedom and democracy.

I'm humbled by the opportunity to honor and thank all of our brave Maine Veterans who helped achieve this immeasurable triumph. Your immortal accomplishments will continue to inspire Maine generations to come.

I stand with your fellow Mainers in thanks for all that you have given to our Country. We will never forget your bravery.

CELEBRATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DONNA SMALLWOOD ACTIVITIES CENTER & PARMA OFFICE ON AGING

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Donna Smallwood Activities Center and Office on Aging in Parma, Ohio. The agency celebrates its 50th birthday today.

In 1965 the Parma 60+ Club began meeting weekly. Parma Jaycees wives volunteered to coordinate activities led by Donna Smallwood. Donna Smallwood was later hired as the first director when the City of Parma decided to increase services in 1968. Five years later, in 1973, the Sixty Plus Center opened in the newly expanded Memorial Hall with services and activities five days a week. 1973 also marked the founding of the Parma Office on Aging to address the needs of Parma's older adults through an array of supportive services. Finally, in 1991 the Center's current building was constructed. City officials christened the building in 2009 as the Donna Smallwood Activities Center & Parma Office on Aging.

Over 6,000 members belong to the Center. Though primarily for Parma residents, the agency also serves older adults in any community in the region, with partnerships developed with the nearby cities of Parma Heights and Seven Hills.

From its small beginnings to the thousands of people served today, the Donna Smallwood Activities Center & Parma Office on Aging has become an integral part of both people's lives and the community in Parma. Focused always on offering a warmhearted and cheery place to meet, learn, be entertained and find help, the Donna Smallwood Activities Center & Parma Office on Aging is truly a home away from home for area seniors. We commend the caring service of its directors and staff both past and present, congratulate its membership on achieving this milestone birthday, and look forward to the future.

I am pleased to join the membership of the Donna Smallwood Activities Center & Parma Office on Aging and the community of Parma, Ohio in celebrating this joyous occasion. Onward.

TRIBUTE TO SHELBY SOPER

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Shelby Soper of Adair for being chosen for State 4-H Council Membership for 2015-16. Shelby is the daughter of Clint and Mindy Douglas of Adair.

State 4-H Council membership is given to youth who demonstrate exceptional leadership and communication skills. A total of 40 youth are chosen for this council on the state level. Achieving this honor is a true testament to Shelby's dedication to serving others, and I commend her for her hard work.

Mr. Speaker, Shelby's actions embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent her in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Shelby on this achievement and I wish her and her family nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING HABITAT FOR HUMANITY OF GREATER NASHVILLE'S SUPERVISORS ON SITE

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Habitat for Humanity of Greater Nashville's Supervisors on Site and the impact they make on affordable housing in Nashville, Tennessee.

In 1985, Nashville leaders decided to be a part of the extraordinary ministry of the national Habitat for Humanity movement. With only a handful of volunteers, it often took up to a year to complete one house, but the positive effects were clear and the volunteer passion was unwavering.

Now, in its 30th year of service, Habitat for Humanity of Greater Nashville annually completes more than 30 new home construction projects in Davidson, Dickson, Cheatham and Wilson counties. This would not be possible without the dedicated corps of Habitat's Supervisors on Site.

The Supervisors on Site are not just volunteers who come out to swing a hammer. They are leaders who guide more than 6,000 volunteers each year and provide hands-on training to help them build quality affordable homes alongside the Habitat Partner Families. The Supervisors on Site are the spirit of the volunteer corps and the backbone of the volunteer experience, having helped change the lives of more than 675 hardworking, low-income families through the Habitat for Humanity Homeownership Program.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege today to salute the Habitat for Humanity of Greater Nashville's Supervisors on Site for their dedicated service as champions of affordable housing. They effect true change in the lives

of not just the Habitat homeowners, but the entire community. They make our district and the state of Tennessee proud.

CONGRATULATING JOHN
CHANDLER

HON. MARSHA BLACKBURN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, as part of the "Faith it Forward" initiative, I recognized and became more aware of some of the outstanding work and accomplishments of people in my district.

Today I am pleased to congratulate Mr. John Chandler and to personally thank him for the work he continues to do with the youth of McNairy County.

John teaches his students to give back to the community and to help those in need. He organizes student prayer breakfasts, devotionals, youth camps and mission trips. At Christmas, his youth group participates in the "Shoe Box" ministry and usually packs over 400 boxes. He leads the youth to give, visit and serve by example.

In addition to his community service, John shows tireless support for his students in their own endeavors in sports and academics, sends prayer cards and texts during tough times, surgeries and recovery, and sponsors and creates entertainment for the youth of this rural community. John is truly a servant to his community and his youth.

"I am just a servant that has answered the call that God has placed on my heart and pours out through my life. To Him all the glory be given."—John Chandler, Youth Minister, Selmer First Baptist Church

Thank you, John Chandler, for continuing to make a difference in the lives of the youth of McNairy County.

TRIBUTE TO HEATH DOWNING

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Heath Downing of Creston, Iowa, for receiving a state 4-H food and nutrition project award. Heath is the son of Steve and Karen Downing of Creston.

A state 4-H project award is the highest achievement one can receive in the 4-H project work category. Project awards are given to youth who demonstrate leadership, communication, and volunteerism in certain project areas. A total of 152 youth from 55 counties competed for these project awards on the state level. Achieving this honor is a true testament to Heath's perseverance and dedication to serve others, and I commend him for his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, Heath's actions embody the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that all

of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating Heath on his achievement and I wish him and his family nothing but the best moving forward.

GOLDEN GOOSE AWARD WINNER

HON. JIM McDERMOTT

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Golden Goose Award, which recognizes researchers whose seemingly obscure, federally funded research has returned significant benefits to society.

In particular, I rise to celebrate 2015 Golden Goose Awardees Drs. Walter Mischel, Philip Peake, and Yuichi Shoda for their research using the now famous Marshmallow Test. Their work—funded by the National Institutes of Health and National Science Foundation—has had a significant impact on how we understand human behavior, how we educate our children, and even how we save for retirement.

These researchers used a simple test to measure pre-schoolers' self-control, offering children one marshmallow now or two if they could wait 15 minutes alone in a room with a single marshmallow. Their research showed that how children performed on this simple, silly-sounding test correlated with the children's future SAT scores, their propensity for obesity or drug addiction, and even the very chemistry of their brains.

Far from a story about fixed fates, their study showed the importance of self-control and provided an understanding of how it can be cultivated. Our increased understanding of self-control has transformed how we teach our children and helps us recognize the potential that lies in all of us. They have helped usher in a new age of understanding of human development and behavior. Our lives are the better for it. I am proud to stand in recognition of their work.

I also believe it is important to highlight the government funding that made their research possible. Basic scientific research is often misunderstood because it may not appear to have an immediate pay off, but the research using Marshmallow Test highlights the profound impact it can have on our lives. We must continue to invest in basic and applied scientific research if we are going to tackle the problems of the 21st century.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION
FUND

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support reauthorization of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF). This crucial program has traditionally enjoyed bipartisan support and over the

course of its 50-year existence has conserved iconic landscapes in every state. Investing in public parks and recreational areas is one of the most direct and effective steps we can take to ensure that future generations are able to enjoy the natural beauty of our country.

Indeed, my public service began with a fight to preserve the beautiful beech-maple trees of Hart's Woods outside of Rochester, New York. Developers had targeted this magnificent forest for commercial development, but my neighbors and I worked together to delay their plans. Every time I return home and pass by the trees we were able to save, I am reminded of the importance of preservation.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are few better ways to conserve and protect our nation's wilderness and environment than by supporting the LWCF. Since its creation during the Johnson Administration, the LWCF has preserved national forests, recreation areas, parks, wildlife refuges, Civil War battlefields, and historic sites across our country. This program also provides matching funds to support countless state park and recreation projects.

These investments not only directly preserve our nation's natural beauty, but also contribute to our economy. Access to open space drives economic development, boosts property values, and provides healthy outdoor recreational opportunities for residents and tourists alike. Ensuring recreational access to existing public lands for hunters, anglers, and other outdoors recreationists is one of the important successes of this program and all of these activities support local economies. In my home state of New York alone, outdoor recreation generates \$33.8 billion in consumer spending and \$12.4 billion in wages and salaries.

Importantly, the LWCF accomplishes all this at little cost to the taxpayer as the program is funded through fees paid by companies drilling offshore for oil and gas. It is hard for me to believe that this body would fail to reauthorize such a valuable program that creates so many tangible benefits at such little cost.

I strongly support the LWCF. I urge all of my colleagues to ensure that the LWCF is reauthorized so that we can continue to preserve open spaces not only for all those who rely on these natural resources for their livelihood, but also for the benefit of our children and grandchildren.

THE SAFE AND ACCURATE FOOD
LABELING ACT (H.R. 1599)

HON. BETTY McCOLLUM

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, every family should have access to the information they need to make informed choices about the food they consume. For many consumers, understanding what products are considered genetically modified organisms (GMO) is important when buying food for their families. Unfortunately, right now there is no standard federal definition for GMO. Instead, a patchwork of different definitions exists, leading to confusion and misinformation.

Consumers have the right to know how their food was produced and that begins with establishing a consistent, standard federal definition of GMO. I voted in favor of the Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act (H.R. 1599) to provide families in Minnesota and across our country with the information they want. H.R. 1599 is not perfect, but it is an important first step to ensure families have safe and accurate labeling of genetically modified organisms (GMOs).

For years, I fought for a standard definition of "gluten-free" products. Additionally, last year I reaffirmed my support for the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) national voluntary certified "organic" labeling system when Congress passed the 2014 Farm Bill. This voluntary system ensures a mother buying bread for her family can be confident that it is "organic" whether she sees this label in Minnesota or Vermont. Similarly, H.R. 1599 calls on USDA to establish a national voluntary labeling system for "GMO-free" products. I hope this federal definition and voluntary labeling system can ultimately help us move towards nationwide mandatory labeling for GMOs.

Finally, H.R. 1599 instructs the Food and Drug Administration to create a definition for the word "natural". This rulemaking process, which will be fully transparent and open to the public, will help clarify one of the most confusing terms used in food marketing today.

The Safe and Accurate Food Labeling Act marks the beginning, not the endpoint, of much-needed policy discussion on the reliable consumer information we all deserve. The current status quo—which does not provide consumers any information about GMO products—is unacceptable for Minnesota families and farmers. Instead of settling for no standard definition for GMO, I voted to continue this conversation and ensure families have access to the information they want about their food.

Mr. Speaker, we all deserve accurate and safe food labels. As a nation, it is important that we continue this discussion and work to ensure that consumers have the information they need to make informed choices for themselves and their families.

IRANIAN NUCLEAR DEAL

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the nuclear deal with Iran that was negotiated and endorsed by President Obama and sent to Congress for review. Last week, I was encouraged that House Republicans and principled Democrats voted against approval of the deal and to pass other measures requiring the president to provide information regarding every aspect of the deal negotiated with Iran.

If this deal is implemented, it will almost certainly lead to a nuclear-capable Iran in the near future. While the President insists on trusting this dangerous state sponsor of terrorism, he is recklessly jeopardizing the safety and security of America and our allies.

While the House followed appropriate steps in response to the Iranian nuclear deal, I am disappointed that the Senate didn't allow a vote on it at all. Certainly, an agreement of this magnitude with such dire consequences to our national security deserves a vote in both chambers. In a matter of this importance, the American people deserve to know where all their elected officials stand.

Nevertheless, it is clear that the President has chosen to disregard the opinion of a bipartisan majority of the House and the Senate, as well as the overwhelming majority of the American people, and press ahead with the ill-considered and deeply flawed agreement with Iran. The President and his allies in Congress now bear sole responsibility for the adverse consequences that the agreement will have for the United States, for our friends and our allies in the region and for those threatened by Iranian-sponsored terrorism around the world.

IN SUPPORT OF THE PRE-REGISTRATION OF VOTERS EVERYWHERE (PROVE) ACT—TO EXPAND ACCESS TO VOTER REGISTRATION

HON. DONALD S. BEYER, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, September is National Voter Registration Month, and in honor of this occasion I am introducing legislation to allow young Americans to preregister to vote in federal elections.

Nothing is more important to representative government than choosing our leaders through free and fair election. But right now too many young people are not participating in the electoral process.

In the 2014 election cycle only 39 percent of 18–24 year-olds were registered to vote. And of those, only 16 percent actually cast a ballot on Election Day.

That is why today I am introducing the Pre-Registration of Voters Everywhere Act, or the PROVE Act, to allow young Americans to preregister to vote in federal elections and increase access to voter registration. Once these future voters are registered and in the system, they can be automatically added to the voting roles so they can vote once they turn 18.

Already in 20 states and the District of Columbia young people are able to preregister to vote prior to the age of 18. In those states young people are more engaged and more likely to vote.

Mr. Speaker, voting is habit forming; when people vote, they are likely to vote again. The PROVE Act is an effective way to engage young people early on and encourage lasting participation in elections.

TRIBUTE TO MARION ASHLEY'S 80TH BIRTHDAY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and pay tribute to an individual whose commitment and contributions to the community of Riverside County, California are exceptional. Riverside County has been fortunate to have dynamic and dedicated community leaders who willingly and unselfishly give their time and talent and make their communities a better place to live and work. Marion Ashley is one of these individuals. On Wednesday, September 16, 2015, my good friend Marion Ashley is celebrating his 80th birthday.

Marion Ashley is a dedicated family man. He has been married to his wife Mary for 54 years. Together they have six children, 19 grandchildren and three great-grandchildren. As a lifelong resident of Riverside County, Marion has had an extensive and decorated career of public service working tirelessly to improve the lives of his fellow citizens and local communities.

After years working in the private sector in both real estate and accounting, Marion started his journey of public service by serving as a Riverside Planning Commissioner in 1973. He then brought his talents over to the Eastern Municipal Water District when he was elected in 1992. In 2002, he was elected to Riverside County Board of Supervisors where he has been serving for the past 13 years. While overseeing the 5th District in Riverside County, Marion has worked to enact public policy for the 2.3 million people he serves and manages a \$4.7 billion budget.

Marion has brought his expertise over the years to four very crucial areas of public policy in the state of California including water, jobs, transportation, and forward planning. His hard work and dedication has not been unnoticed by the communities he serves and his peers. Marion is the only County Supervisor that has had the honor of being chosen as the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, the Western Riverside Council of Governments, and the Coachella Valley Association of Governments.

In addition to his many years of public service to the Riverside County community, Marion and his family have donated hundreds of acres of land in the hills close to the city of Perris, California to become a permanent nature preserve.

I am proud to call Marion a close friend, fellow community member and great American. And today, I add my voice to the many who will be congratulating him on the celebration of his 80th birthday.

CONGRATULATING SPENCER
ROBARGE ON HIS 2015 U.S. BOWL-
ING CONGRESS JUNIOR GOLD
CHAMPIONSHIP NATIONAL TITLE

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Spencer Robarge of Springfield, Missouri on winning the 2015 United States Bowling Congress Junior Gold Championship National Title for the 12-and-under class.

Nearly 3,200 bowlers played in the 2015 Junior Gold Championships this year. Spencer outscored a rival from New York State, 390–332, to take the gold. He won his class' competition at age 12, about a decade after rolling his first bowling ball down the lane at age two. He walked away from the competition with not only a win, but ranked third nationally in the Under 12 boys scratch division. He has also won a prize at every tournament he has played to-date this year.

Years of practice and experience has led him to out-bowl the competition and roll faster toward success. I have no doubt Spencer is a bowler to watch as he strikes his way to the top and toward the big leagues. I am proud to have young people with such bright futures in Missouri's Seventh District.

HONORING HENRY J. CAMOSSE,
JR. FOR HIS YEARS OF SERVICE
TO WORCESTER AND CONGRATU-
LATING HIM ON HIS ROLE AS
GRAND MARSHAL OF THE 2015
WORCESTER COLUMBUS DAY PA-
RADE

HON. JAMES P. McGOVERN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Henry J. Camosse, Jr., who will be the Grand Marshal of the Columbus Day Parade in Worcester, Massachusetts and honored as the Outstanding Italian.

Henry has been a pillar of the Worcester community and is a true family man. He is the oldest of six siblings and has three sons with his wife, Pamela Anne. Growing up, Henry and his family would always have spaghetti and even though his mother was Polish, the recipe was Italian. His grandfather was originally from Fano, Italy and came to the U.S. in the 1900s with his brother, Leo, and his sister, Grace.

One of the proudest traditions of Henry's family is Camosse Masonry Supplies, the family-owned business that is now in its third generation of family ownership, and 4th generation of family management.

Founded by his father in 1948 as a manufacturer of concrete block, Camosse Masonry Supply has grown into a full line landscape and masonry supply house. Today, they're helping homeowners, local businesses, and construction companies across Worcester County get the supplies they need for projects big and small.

As a business leader in Worcester, Henry is currently serving in leadership roles with the New England Concrete Masonry Association, the Worcester Better Business Bureau and the Bay Path Education Foundation.

Henry has also served in a variety of other roles to support our local businesses through organizations like the Worcester County Homebuilders Association, the National Concrete Masonry Association, Skills-USA.

As an active member of the Worcester community, Henry has also contributed through his work with the Charlton Little League and the Boy Scouts Pack 338. Henry's support for great programs like these that give Worcester families and their kids a chance to build friendships and strengthen our community are another example of the great impact he has had.

I want to thank Henry and his family for all that they have done and continue to do to support our local economy and keep Worcester strong.

TEXANS FINDING CURES

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate James Allison, Ph.D for receiving the Lasker-Debakey Clinical Medical Research Award.

Dr. Allison pioneered research on a new class of cancer treatment that allows for a patient's immune system to continuously attack cancerous tumors itself. The research expands the ability to provide patients with less invasive treatments to fight all different types of cancer. Dr. Allison's discovery is a massive breakthrough for cancer research and outstanding news for those who are unfortunately diagnosed with the disease.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to James Allison, Ph.D for receiving the prestigious Lasker-Debakey Clinical Medical Research Award. Thank you for your work to find a cure.

IN SUPPORT OF GROWTH AWARENESS WEEK

HON. DENNY HECK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Growth Awareness Week.

How much a child grows is a major sign of his or her overall health. If a child is failing to grow, it could mean that they are developing serious medical problems. A child's height (either too much or too little for their age) is one of nature's early warning signs—a visual alarm for parents and physicians. According to the Pictures of Standard Syndromes and Undiagnosed Malformations (POSSUM) database, more than 600 serious diseases and health conditions cause growth failure.

Many conditions which interfere with children's growth are treatable, but according to the MAGIC Foundation for children's growth, unfortunately 48% of children in the U.S. who were evaluated with the two most common causes of growth failure went undiagnosed.

The longer a child with growth failure goes undiagnosed, the greater the potential for damage and higher costs of care. Early detection and diagnosis are crucial in ensuring a healthy future for a child with growth failure.

Last year I was pleased that Congress recognized "Growth Awareness Week" as the third week in September 2014. So today I ask my colleagues to join me in permanently recognizing the third week in September as "Growth Awareness Week" and to continue to raise public awareness of growth failure to improve the lives and health of children.

COMMEMORATING THE CENTEN- NIAL ANNIVERSARY OF OKALOOSA COUNTY, FLORIDA

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the Centennial Anniversary of Okaloosa County, Florida, located in Florida's First Congressional District.

Okaloosa County is situated along Florida's Gulf Coast and was established in 1915 through legislation sponsored by then-Florida State Representative William Mapoles from Laurel Hill. It is the 52nd county in Florida, flanked by Santa Rosa and Walton counties, and was carved out of portions of both counties. Sharing the namesake of a steamboat, "The Okaloosa," meaning "Black Water" in Choctaw, Okaloosa County once consisted of small outposts and pioneers in Florida's wilderness, and its main economic drivers at the time of its founding were lumber, turpentine, and fishing.

Over the course of the last 100 years, Okaloosa County, while still true to its agricultural roots, has transformed from a sparsely populated, simple, and rural pioneer county into a top tourist destination, with white pristine beaches and world-class fishing, and an essential area of support for our Nation's defense, which is due in large part to a local businessman and airplane enthusiast, James E. Plew. Plew's vision for the area at the height of the depression was one of opportunity and one that saw the advantages of attracting the military to the county.

Plew proposed to donate 1,460 acres to the U.S. government for a bombing and gunnery range, which was accepted in 1937. A few short months later, the U.S. Army Air Corps mandated that the Valparaiso Bombing and Gunnery Base be renamed "Eglin Field" after Lt. Col. Frederick Irving Eglin. Upon establishment of the U.S. Air Force, Eglin Field would then bare the name of its present day, Eglin Air Force Base. Eglin Air Force Base, which extends across three counties is one of the world's largest Air Force bases and home today to several military major commands, including the 7th Special Forces Group, the Air

Armament Center, the Air Force Special Operations Command, and the 33rd Fighter Wing.

The residents of Okaloosa County, including the thousands of military servicemembers and veterans who call it home, are a resilient people, and even through the most challenging of times, they have united as a community to develop and maintain its place as a key area for business and tourism in the State of Florida and throughout the entire Gulf Coast region.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, it gives me great pleasure to commemorate the Centennial Anniversary of Okaloosa County, Florida. My wife Vicki joins me in congratulating all of those who are fortunate to call Okaloosa County home on its 100-year history and its proud achievements and continued success.

CREATING LEADERS AND
EARNING GOLD

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Allison Carpenter for receiving the Girl Scout Gold Award, the highest honor in Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development.

Allison, a junior at Katy High School, has continually showed her commitment to changing society and helping her community. She was awarded the Gold Award after partnering with the You Can Academy to serve academically at-risk children who attend a local elementary school. She created and led curriculum workshops to teach students how to respect others, follow the rules, and stay on task. We are proud of Allison's commitment to education and look forward to seeing her future accomplishments.

I am proud to represent such an impressive young Girl Scout who possesses a strong commitment to service. On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Allison for earning this distinguished award.

PRISONERS OF CONSCIENCE IN
VIETNAM

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Vietnam's religious persecution of its citizens is nothing new. I have spoken before about prisoners of conscience held in Vietnam; in fact just this time last year, I spoke on the release of Pastor Duong Kim Khai.

Unfortunately, Vietnam is still carrying on with this egregious practice. I have been made aware of yet another example of human rights violations by a country the State Department has perpetually refused to include as a Country of Particular Concern for religious freedom.

On February 11, 2014, Mr. Nguyen Van Minh and approximately 20 other religious freedom activists were arrested by police officers in the Dong Thap province. Mr. Minh and the others were viciously beaten and had their personal belongings confiscated.

The activists were detained nearly 40 hours before some of the group was released. Mr. Minh and two other activists continued to remain detained and were not charged until approximately a week later on February 20th.

Mr. Minh was charged with "disturbing public peace" and while awaiting trial he was tortured and isolated from his family and lawyers. Mr. Minh withstood the brutal tactics and refused to sign any report against him.

His trial was "open to the public," which in Vietnam means closed to the approximately 100 people who showed up to support him and the 15 of the 18 witnesses called by his defense.

Then on August 26, 2014, Mr. Minh was sentenced to serve 2.5 years in prison.

A few months later, the Supreme People's Court of Vietnam upheld the ruling from the preliminary trial, finding him and the other two activists, guilty of disturbing the public peace. This form of government sponsored religious persecution has no place in any nation.

In the Bill of Rights, freedom of religion is listed first because it is the most important. This was no mistake by our Founding Fathers.

Freedom of worship is a basic human right, and one that all countries should recognize.

I urge the State Department to do its job and recognize Vietnam as a Country of Particular Concern.

And that's just the way it is.

POLYCYSTIC KIDNEY DISEASE
AWARENESS DAY

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, September 3, was PKD Awareness Day. Throughout the country, ordinary citizens took the time to make their neighbors aware of a little-known disease affecting thousands of people in the United States.

Polycystic Kidney Disease or PKD is a genetic disease that eventually leads to kidney failure. Parents have a 50 percent chance of passing the disease to each of their children. However, 10 percent of the people diagnosed with PKD have no family history of the disease. More alarming, PKD is the fourth leading cause of kidney failure, and more than 50 percent of people with PKD will develop kidney failure by age 50.

Unfortunately, there is no treatment to stop or slow the growth of the cysts that develop and enlarge in both kidneys. The only remedy at this time for kidney failure or end stage renal disease (ESRD) is dialysis or a kidney transplant. While ESRD patients are less than one percent of the Medicare population, they account for nearly seven percent of the Medicare budget—totaling nearly \$35 billion annually.

PKD Awareness Day helps to bring attention to this debilitating disease and the con-

stant challenges people impacted by PKD face. Advocates joined together across the country this year to highlight the need for research and innovation that could help PKD patients and their families.

I stand in support of these tireless advocates to help find better treatments, but more importantly, a cure for PKD. It is essential to raise awareness about PKD in the hopes of bringing relief to the more than 20 million Americans with kidney disease.

NURSING EXCELLENCE IN TX-22

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Memorial Hermann Katy Hospital's nursing staff for earning the Pathway to Excellence designation from the American Nurses Credentialing Center.

The American Nurses Credentialing Center awards hospitals that create flourishing work environments for their nurses. These nurses are committed to providing Katy residents with high-quality and safe patient care. The nurses' efforts to create a positive work environment makes this hospital one of the best places for nurses to work. This award recognizes what a strong and dedicated staff the nurses are at Memorial Hermann Katy. We are lucky to have such an incredible team of nurses so close to home.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Memorial Hermann Katy Hospital's nursing staff for earning the Pathway to Excellence designation.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND SELFLESS SACRIFICE
OF STAFF SERGEANT FORREST
B. SIBLEY

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with both profound sadness and deep gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen decorated American hero. On August 27, 2015, Staff Sergeant Forrest B. Sibley, who was assigned to the 21st Special Tactics Squadron, 720th Special Tactics Group, 24th Special Operations Wing, Pope Army Airfield, North Carolina, tragically succumbed to wounds received during an attack the day prior while conducting operations in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel near Camp Antonik, Afghanistan. SSgt Sibley was 31 years old, but lived a lifetime marked by and full of service.

Although a Louisiana native, born in Shreveport in 1983, Pensacola, Florida, would become home to Forrest. By all accounts of his loved ones, he lived his life to the fullest and always savored spending time with friends and family along the beautiful coastline of Pensacola Beach. After Hurricane Ivan struck Northwest Florida in 2004, Forrest and his friends

worked to clean up the destruction in its devastating aftermath, helping neighbors rebuild and recover, with his jovial nature intact.

Answering the call of duty, Forrest entered into the United States Air Force and upon completion of basic training in 2008 became an Air Force Combat Controller, serving alongside some of our Nation's most elite. Among his qualifications, SSgt Sibley was a military static line jumper, free fall jumper, an Air Force combat scuba diver, and a joint terminal attack controller. SSgt Sibley's military career would include four deployments to some of the most critical and sensitive areas of operation. His awards include four Bronze Stars, one with Valor Device, the Purple Heart, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, Air Force Commendation Medal, and the Air Force Combat Action Medal.

As exemplified by his extraordinary heroism, SSgt Sibley's life stands as a testament that freedom is not free, and his legacy will echo in time as an example of the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom. My wife, Vicki, joins me in praying that God is with Forrest's parents, Brent and Susan, and all of the beloved family and friends he held so dear, and we ask that God continue to bless them and the United States of America.

KENTUCKY STATE TROOPER JOSEPH PONDER

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. POE or Texas. Mr. Speaker, another peace officer has been targeted and killed.

Late Sunday night, Kentucky State Trooper Joseph Cameron Ponder made a routine traffic stop. He pulled over the suspect who as it turns out was driving with a suspended license. The trooper was going to arrange for an overnight stay for the man and his fellow passengers, which included two children, but this plan never came to fruition.

This stop would prove fatal. Suddenly, the driver sped away and the chase began.

For nine miles, Trooper Ponder pursued the criminal. Then, the criminal's car made a hasty and abrupt stop. The trooper's vehicle smashed into the back of the criminal's getaway car.

The criminal emerged from the vehicle and fired intently at the officer. Bullets scattered around the hood and windshield and hit the officer.

Ponder was struck multiple times.

The armed criminal fled, this time on foot.

And a manhunt was underway for the killer.

Helicopters manned the sky as officers and canines manned the ground and wooded areas.

The criminal was spotted. He refused to drop his weapon and instead hatefully pointed it straight at police. The criminal was taken down.

The trooper passed away at the hospital later that night.

This story is becoming all too common. Officers are being targeted just because of the car they drive and the uniform they wear. This war on police must stop.

Trooper Ponder graduated from the police academy in January and was working in Trigg County.

He was a Navy veteran and just 31 years old.

On the Kentucky State Police Facebook page, tributes fill the comment section.

One stands out, from Ponder's sister.

It reads:

"Thank you for all the kind words. My brother was the best man in the world and did not deserve what happened to him. Please pray for us, this was an enormous loss."

A loss that is felt around the country, as our nation continues to mourn fallen peace officers.

Kentucky State Trooper Joseph Ponder will not be forgotten.

As I have said many times before, those who wear the badge—the shield over their heart—represent the best of our communities.

Our gratitude goes to Trooper Ponder for his selfless service both to our country and our community.

We continue to pray for police. They are the silent safe guardians who protect our cities, neighborhoods and schools. They are the men and women of the thin blue line between the law and the lawless.

And that's just the way it is.

BUILDING A BIGGER FORT BEND

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Ryko Development for being recognized as Developer of the Year by the Texas Association of Builders.

Ryko Development earned this prestigious award because of its outstanding work establishing the Lakes of Bella Terra community. This community brings new families and businesses to Fort Bend County every day. Through Lakes of Bella Terra, Ryko Development created an ideal living environment for families and has earned a reputation as a premier developer in the Houston area.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to Ryko Development for being named Developer of the Year. Thanks for bringing Lakes of Bella Terra to Fort Bend.

WELCOME, KATHERINE LEE WILSON

HON. JOE WILSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to congratulate my daughter-in-law and son, Joy and Julian Wilson of Lexington, South Carolina, on the birth of their new baby girl. Katherine Lee Wilson who was born at 8:09 a.m., on Monday, September 14, 2015, weighing 8 pounds and measuring 20 and 5 inches long at Lexington Medical Center

in West Columbia, South Carolina. Katherine joins an older brother, Jack Wilson, and older sister, Sally Wilson. She has been born into a loving home where she will be raised by parents who are devoted to her well-being and bright future.

I would also like to congratulate Sally's grandparents Gary Strickland and Sherry Strickland of Nichols, South Carolina, and my wife, Roxanne Wilson of Springdale, South Carolina. Additionally, are proud great-grandmothers, Martha Dusenbury, Lilly Strickland, and Sally Willoughby. I am so grateful for this new addition to the Wilson family.

CELEBRATING THE NINETIETH BIRTHDAY OF NORTHWEST FLORIDA'S BELOVED OAKLAND ARD

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is my great honor and pleasure to wish a very happy birthday to Northwest Florida's beloved Oakland Ard on the occasion of his 90th birthday and to congratulate him on his many achievements and recognize his service to Northwest Florida and our great Nation.

Born and raised in Geneva County, Alabama, Oakland answered the call of duty, while in high school, joining the United States Army in December 1943. After completing basic training, Oakland deployed to Europe, where he joined his brother as a member of the 2nd Armored Infantry Division, 41st Armored Infantry Regiment, seeing combat in France, Belgium, Holland, and Germany. While engaged in battle with German forces, Oakland's company came under heavy mortar fire, and his brother, Dalton, was tragically killed in action. Despite this devastating loss, however, Oakland continued to serve with honor and distinction until injuries sustained from severe frostbite forced him to be called back to the United States. After recovering from his injuries, Oakland continued to serve our Nation as a heavy machine gunner instructor at Fort Knox until his discharge on May 10, 1946.

Oakland's military career proved to be a harbinger of many more years of selfless service to the Lord, his family, friends, community, and Nation. Following his discharge, he returned home and started working as a farmer to help put two of his siblings through school, and when his brother, Herman, was called to active duty to serve in Korea, Oakland moved to Port St. Joe, Florida, to fill his brother's position at the St. Joe Paper Company. In Port St. Joe, Oakland met his first wife, Marian and remained in the area until his brother returned from his military duties.

In 1957, Oakland gained employment at the Container Corporation of America and settled in Jay, Florida. The Ards quickly planted strong roots in the Jay community, where they raised their two sons, Freddy and Ronnie. Oakland would remain at the Container Corporation for nearly four decades, until his retirement in 1996. While working, Oakland

helped establish and lead several organizations including the Eastpoint Employees Federal Credit Union, where he served as both President and Vice President, and the Brewton CCA Federal Credit Union, where he served a term as president and many decades as a board member and treasurer.

Outside of his working life, Oakland was also a leader in his church and civic communities. As a longtime member of Jay First Baptist Church, he served in countless positions, including Sunday School Director, Training Union Director, Brotherhood Director, and Church Treasurer, among many others.

Oakland also contributed to the Northwest Florida community in myriad other ways. He was appointed by the Florida Legislature to the Board of Directors of Jay Hospital, served nearly two decades as a board member of the State Housing Initiative Program, and was a longtime member of the Board of Directors of the Santa Rosa County Chamber of Commerce. In addition, the people of Jay also elected him to the Jay City Council, where he served for four years.

Still, all of these impressive accomplishments are only a small reflection on Oakland's selfless character and dedication to family, faith, and community. A dedicated family man, for more than 50 years, Oakland was a loving husband to Marian, until her passing from cancer. Today, Oakland enjoys spending time with his children, grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and his wife, Jackie, and he has always been around to lend a hand to his neighbors in times of need.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States Congress, I am honored to recognize Oakland Ard on his 90th birthday. My wife Vicki and I wish him and the entire Ard family all the best.

FORT BEND CARES

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Fort Bend Cares for its dedication to improving the lives of the children in Fort Bend County.

Since the beginning, Fort Bend Cares has worked to improve the lives of our local children. Their latest project is a new playground located in Community Park in Rosenberg. Fort Bend Cares, with assistance from other local businesses, will work with a local playground manufacturer to ensure that the children of the community have a safe and fun place to relax and play. We are all looking forward to the playground's completion.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, thank you to Fort Bend Cares for leaving such a positive impact on the lives of so many children here in Fort Bend County.

HONORING THE DEDICATED SERVICE AND SELFLESS SACRIFICE OF CAPTAIN MATTHEW D. ROLAND

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with both profound sadness and deep gratitude that I rise to pay tribute to a fallen decorated American hero. On August 27, 2015, Captain Matthew D. Roland, who was assigned to the 23rd Special Tactics Squadron at Hurlburt Field, located in Florida's First Congressional District, tragically succumbed to wounds received during an attack the day prior while conducting operations in support of Operation Freedom's Sentinel near Camp Antonik, Afghanistan. Captain Roland was 27 years old, but lived a lifetime marked by and full of service.

Born December 24, 1987, at Ellsworth Air Force Base, Rapid City, South Dakota, Captain Roland is described as an avid outdoorsman, who enjoyed hiking, camping, and fishing, as his childhood saw him following his father's Air Force career across the country. After graduating high school, he continued in his family's footsteps of service and entered the Air Force Academy, graduating in 2010. Upon his commissioning, then-Second Lieutenant Roland entered the Special Tactics Officer Program attached to the 23rd Special Tactics Squadron and served as a team leader.

Among his qualifications, Captain Roland was a military static line jumper, free fall jumper, an Air Force combat scuba diver, and a joint terminal attack controller. His military career would include leading his teams on three deployments, two to Afghanistan and one to Africa, and by all accounts he fulfilled his duties with the utmost selflessness. Among his many awards and accolades are the Meritorious Service Medal, Air Force Achievement Medal, Air Force Organizational Excellence Award, National Defense Service Medal, Afghanistan Campaign Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, and Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border.

As exemplified by his extraordinary heroism, Captain Roland's life stands as a testament that freedom is not free, and his legacy will echo in time as an example of the ultimate sacrifice in the name of freedom. My wife, Vicki, joins me in praying that God is with Matthew's parents, Mark and Barbara; his sister, Erica; his niece, Willamina; and all of his family and friends during this time of great mourning, and we ask that God continue to bless them and the United States of America.

MUSIC TO OUR EARS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Seven Lakes High School's

Symphony Orchestra for being selected as the 2016 Honor Full Orchestra by the Texas Music Educators Association (TMEA).

The Seven Lakes Symphony Orchestra received this recognition because of its ability to master some of the most advanced music literature. This is an especially high honor for Seven Lakes High School, which is only 10 years old. This achievement would not have been possible without the dedication of all of the talented musicians and their directors, Desiree Overree and Damon Archer. We all look forward to hearing the Symphony Orchestra perform at the TMEA Convention in February.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations again to the Seven Lakes High School Symphony Orchestra for being selected as the 2016 Honor Full Orchestra.

HONORING DR. JOHN C. WARMAN

HON. BARBARA COMSTOCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mrs. COMSTOCK. Mr. Speaker, the raucous Gonzaga fight song was sung quietly for the first time in a long time on Tuesday, September 1st when Dr. John C. "Doc" Warman's coffin was borne from a packed St. Aloysius church in Washington, DC where men and women met to mourn the passing of a legend.

A lover of the classics, a supremely gifted musician, and a director of plays and musicals at Gonzaga College High School, Warman began teaching Latin and Greek at the all-boys Catholic institution on Eye Street and North Capitol, just a few blocks from the Capitol, in 1967.

Born to Frank and Louise Warman on October 18, 1939, Warman began playing the piano when he was still in diapers and could quote the classics from memory by the time he was seven years old.

Warman's recitations from the classics could bring a dead language to life. "Arma virumque cano," he would begin before launching into Virgil's Aeneid. For those who don't know, that means "I sing of arms and of a man," in other words, a Warman.

Warman was the valedictorian of his class at Gonzaga in 1957 and later graduated from Georgetown University with honors. He became "Doc" in 1986 when Georgetown conferred upon him the degree of Doctor of Humane Letters.

"Doc's sense of optimism would lift us up when times were tough," said William J. Wilson, Jr., both a student and colleague of Warman's, of the Gonzaga he knew as a student—a school of dwindling enrollment in the late 1960s and early 1970s, threatened with potential closure.

The 1968 riots in DC following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. had left many parents worried and looking to other schools outside of the city to send their children. Doc's dedication to Gonzaga and support of his students helped usher the school through this difficult time.

Warman was also well known for his formal dress in and out of the classroom. Students at

Gonzaga testified that they had only ever seen Doc dressed in a suit and tie or the tuxedo he would don during his theater performances.

"Sometimes I wondered whether Doc was born wearing a suit," said Wilson.

It was in a suit and tie that he passed quietly of heart failure before classes began on August 25, 2015.

While the Gonzaga community mourns the passing of Warman, over these past weeks many kind and joyful memories of Doc have been shared by students, colleagues, family, and friends. The legacy of Doc Warman lives on through the indelible impression he left on the entire Gonzaga community.

The back wall of Gonzaga's Sheehy Theater, which is nearly 120 years old, is spattered with graffiti, and among the etched-in autographs there, "Warman '57" looms large—"the heart of the Gonzaga stage" that bears his name. He piloted more than 350 performances from the pit piano where he was a fixture, and he served as a producer, associate producer, director, or musical director in 83 productions.

"Gone, but not forgotten," said Ra'Mond Jamar Shephard Hines. Hines, a recent student from Gonzaga's class of 2014, said at the funeral that "The way the Latin and the Greek flowed off his tongue was like poetry in and of itself."

Warman never married, and having no biological children, he instead devoted his life to his "Men of Eye Street." All classes were canceled on the day of his funeral—a beloved teacher, colleague, mentor, and friend's last gift to his students.

REACHING MARS

HON. PETE OLSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 16, 2015

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Carlos Gonzalez of Katy, Texas for being selected a NASA High School Aerospace Scholar.

Carlos, a student at Seven Lakes High School, was one of only 261 high school juniors from across Texas selected to participate in this elite NASA program. As a High School Aerospace Scholar, Carlos completed various assignments throughout the school year. He was then invited to Johnson Space Center for a one-week summer internship where he and his fellow scholars worked with NASA scientists and engineers to plan a mission to Mars. Carlos certainly makes his parents, teachers, and the rest of our community proud. We look forward to seeing all he accomplishes in the future.

On behalf of the Twenty-Second Congressional District of Texas, congratulations to Carlos for being named a NASA High School Aerospace Scholar. Shoot for the stars, Carlos.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, September 17, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 22

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine United States Middle East policy.

SH-216

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine improving VA accountability, focusing on examining first-hand accounts of Department of Veterans Affairs whistleblowers.

SD-342

10 a.m.

Committee on Foreign Relations

To hold hearings to examine the nomination of Susan Coppedge Amato, of Georgia, to be Director of the Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking, with the rank of Ambassador at Large, Department of State.

SD-419

Committee on the Judiciary

Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights

To hold hearings to examine consolidation in the health insurance industry and its impact on consumers.

SD-226

SEPTEMBER 23

11 a.m.

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs

Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management

To hold hearings to examine the use of agency regulatory guidance.

SD-342

POSTPONEMENTS

SEPTEMBER 22

2:30 p.m.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Subcommittee on Consumer Protection, Product Safety, Insurance, and Data Security

To hold hearings to examine consumer product safety and the recall process.

SR-253

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 17, 2015

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 17, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable RICK W. ALLEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

IN MEMORY OF CAMERON PONDER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Kentucky State Trooper Cameron Ponder of Rineyville, Kentucky.

I believe many people watched or saw with horror the news that spread across this country that another one of our public service officers was killed this week. Only 31 years old, Cameron was shot and killed during an on-duty traffic stop earlier this week.

Known by his peers and in the community as an athlete, Cameron was an all-State performer in track and was the kicker on the football team in high school. After graduating from North Hardin High School near Fort Knox, Cameron joined the U.S. Navy, turning down a track scholarship.

More personally, Cameron was a son, an uncle, and a fiance. Cameron graduated from the Kentucky State Police Academy in January and had been a trooper for less than 9 months.

Among the many condolences that have been shared are those of his former Navy colleagues, who talked about his devotion to our country.

While Cameron was taken far too soon, his commitment to service and community has not gone unnoticed. I join with all of Kentucky's Second District in sending prayers to Cameron's family, friends, and his Kentucky State Police brethren. We will miss him and are thankful for his service.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND PUBLIC HEALTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. QUIGLEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when climate change was a concern for future generations, a time when we focused on predicting the possible problems and brainstorming the possible solutions, a time when the threat was real, but we still had time to act. We had not come face-to-face with our tipping point.

That time has passed. President Obama put it best when he said: "We are the first generation to feel the impacts of climate change, and the last generation that can still do something about it."

The time to act is now, and the call to action cannot be any clearer. Despite the fact that more than 12,000 peer-reviewed scientific studies are in agreement that climate change is real and humans are significantly to blame, my colleagues continue to debate its validity. Well, if the devastating global and environmental threats aren't proof enough, let me share some of the negative impacts climate change is having on our air quality and public health now.

Simply put, climate change and air pollution make a dangerous pair. In fact, air pollution is among the most serious, indirect health effects of global climate change. The same power plants that release harmful carbon dioxide into our atmosphere also create dangerous levels of soot, smog, and ground-level ozone. The result is a combination of ozone and fine particles that can have devastating health impacts. In all, 147 million people in the U.S., nearly half of this Nation—our Nation—are breathing unhealthy air. And the news is far worse in Beijing, where a new study claims that the air in Beijing is so polluted, breathing it does as much damage to the lungs as smoking 40 cigarettes a day. That is simply unacceptable.

To make matters worse, the warmer temperatures from climate change are only increasing the frequency of days

with unhealthy levels of ground-level ozone. If emissions of air pollutants remain fixed at today's levels until 2050, warming from climate change alone could increase the number of red ozone alert days by 68 percent in the 50 largest Eastern U.S. cities.

Studies have also linked breathing and ozone pollution to an increased risk of premature deaths and difficulty breathing. If there are no changes in regulatory controls, the CDC predicts up to 4,300 additional premature deaths in the United States by the year 2050 from combined ozone and particle health effects.

The good news is that air quality has improved dramatically in many American cities over the past 40 years due to the Clean Air Act. The Clean Air Act has a track record of cutting dangerous pollution and has prevented more than 400,000 premature deaths. In fact, it has helped to cut ground-level ozone by more than 25 percent since 1980 and reduced mercury emissions by 45 percent since 1990. If that isn't enough, the economic value of these improvements is estimated to reach almost \$2 trillion by the year 2020.

The recently announced Clean Power Plan offers us the opportunity we need to continue to better protect public health. It is projected to contribute to significant ozone pollution reductions, resulting in important benefits including avoiding up to 3,600 premature deaths, 90,000 asthma attacks in children, and 1,700 heart attacks.

However, the continued effects of climate change and our inability to act are impairing our continued progress. Climate change is creating conditions that make it harder for us to clean up our air and reduce pollution. Without addressing one problem, we eliminate our progress on another.

Unfortunately, Members of this body use every opportunity possible to attack the Clean Air Act and now the Clean Power Plan. These unprecedented assaults block, weaken, or delay a host of long overdue clean air safeguards. As my colleagues continue to stand in our own way, we are harming the environment and ultimately hurting ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, climate change is a direct threat to humanity, and it is time we reexamine how we can think about it, talk about it, and respond to this growing problem. We may be part of the problem, but we also have the unique opportunity to become part of the solution.

I think Pope Francis put it best when he said: "Yet all is not lost. Human

beings, while capable of the worst, are also capable of rising above themselves, choosing again what is good, and making a new start.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to heed these wise words and make a choice to act on climate change to protect our health. We cannot afford to wait any longer.

FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HARDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express my deep concern and disapproval of how the Obama administration has continued their assault on Federal and private contractors.

Since taking office, the President has signed a total of 13 executive orders that directly focus on Federal contracting, all of which establish new labor requirements and impose additional financial burdens on contractors. When you also include the 16 new regulations that have been created from these orders, a large portion of contractors who were once able to compete for Federal contracts are now being forced out due to these new hurdles.

In fact, the number of small contractors who submit bids for Federal contracts have declined by more than 100,000 since 2013. This is unacceptable. While these mandates range from forcing contractors to provide additional employee benefits to being required to report additional information during the bidding process, the one thing that each of these new directives has in common is that it will make it more difficult for small contractors to compete for Federal contracts. A prime example is the executive order known as the Fair Pay and Safe Workplaces, which the President signed in July 2014. While intended to award Federal contracts only to responsible contractors who have not committed recent labor violations, the actual outcome will lead to additional reporting requirements, increased administrative costs, and the potential for a contractor to be blacklisted from bidding on Federal contracts while they prove that they are innocent from the accused infraction.

Mr. Speaker, by using executive orders to bypass congressional authority, this is nothing more than an attempt by this administration to implement their agenda without regard for the negative impact it will have on businesses and industries. But, unfortunately, this agenda extends beyond Federal contractors. The recent National Labor Relations Board ruling in the Browning-Ferris Industries case, which is more widely known as the joint employer decision, will have a massive impact on the business rela-

tionships between contractors and their subcontractors, franchisors and franchisees, and other contract labor relations.

In one politically motivated decision, the NLRB completely redefined the definition of “joint employer” when they determined that a company could be held liable for a labor violation committed by a subcontractor or a staffing agency that they hired, even if this company doesn’t have direct supervision over those workers.

This sharing of responsibility is nothing more than an attempt to force both parties into collective bargaining, but the result will be much worse. Franchisors may decide that it is in their best interest to assert more authority over their franchisees to make sure that labor violations are less likely to occur, but then other franchisors may decide it is more cost effective to end their relationship as a way to avoid potential issues. Essentially, the same results could occur with companies who hire staffing agencies or independent contractors to provide them with temporary employees or contractors who hire subcontractors to perform skilled labor.

As a small business contractor for more than two decades, I understand the unique relationship between a contractor and a subcontractor. In the end, the joint employer decision will disrupt this relationship and potentially discourage future contract arrangements.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for my colleagues to join with me in demanding this administration to stop continually adding burdens to our Federal and private contractors.

RACISM AND VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I rewatched recently one of my favorite movies. “Selma” tells the story of the fight to register voters in Selma, Alabama, culminating in the march from Selma to Montgomery, led by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in 1965. Spoiler alert: After being turned around, threatened, beaten, tear-gassed, and killed, Black people got to vote in America.

A young and handsome JOHN LEWIS is depicted in the pivotal role of the community organizer who helps lead the movement. Another spoiler alert: JOHN is a Member of this body and serves with distinction from the State of Georgia.

It is among the highest honors of my life to know JOHN LEWIS and to work with him. In fact, I have marched with him and gotten arrested with JOHN LEWIS outside this Capitol Building in our fight for immigration reform.

I highly recommend the movie, and I want every citizen—and every person

who lives here and hopes to become a citizen one day—to watch and learn from the movie “Selma.” It is a moment in history when voting and citizenship were literally life-and-death struggles—and it was only 50 years ago.

And just yesterday, the NAACP completed a historic 1,000-mile march from Selma to Washington to remind us how we must always stand up to bullies and official inaction using nonviolence and community organizing and empowerment techniques.

The way to respond to racism is to vote. I have been thinking a lot about that recently as the Republican Presidential field of candidates has fallen in line with a bully who spews racism and is leading among his party’s primary voters.

What can Americans do when the tail wagging the dog of the Republican Party is saying that most Mexicans are murderers and rapists?

What can we do as a nation when candidates blame unrest in reaction to police violence in Baltimore and Ferguson on Mexican and Central American immigrants.

What can we do when thousands of people cheer when a candidate proposes building a great wall of America on our southern border, and the response from other candidates is to say that we should build another wall opposite Canada as well?

Well, in the movie “Selma,” Oprah Winfrey didn’t just get mad; she fought back by making sure she could register to vote. We have all learned what the Republican Party seems to be forgetting: Appeals to a narrow Republican electorate with over-the-top racism and below-the-belt immigrant bashing will not get you to the White House.

□ 1015

President Romney—oh, I’m sorry. Governor Romney got more White votes than any candidate in the history of the United States, but he couldn’t overcome the demographic reality that the country is more diverse and so are its voters.

Appeals to racism and immigrant bashing are creating a predictable backlash in the neighborhoods of my district in Chicago. People are calling and coming into my office, asking what they can do to push back.

Very specifically, those who are not yet citizens are asking: How do I become a citizen? Those who have not registered to vote are asking how to get that done.

In Latino and Asian communities and in every community that thinks that calling most Mexicans “rapists” is not the kind of political rhetoric that should go unchallenged, people are becoming citizens.

My office in Chicago is known as a place to go if you want information on the citizenship process. In total, more than 50,000 American citizens have

come to our office for help in figuring out the process.

The demand for information on citizenship has grown so much in my district that, this Saturday, from 9:00 to noon, at the Instituto Del Progreso Latino, I will join my staff and local advocates and the local office of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services for a free workshop on applying to become a citizen.

Not only will people get help in understanding the process, but we will also help them figure out if they qualify for a fee waiver so that the \$680 application fee that people have to pay is not a barrier.

Think about it. There are roughly 8.8 million immigrants with green cards who have lived in the U.S. for 5 years or more or who have been married to a U.S. citizen for 3 years or more, and they can pass a background check and qualify for citizenship today.

So what I am proposing is that, instead of renewing your green card, if you are one of those 8.8 million people, and you get it for \$450 for 10 years, you apply for permanent citizenship, with a fee waiver, and become a citizen for free. That is right.

Apply for citizenship, and you can vote for whomever you want to vote for. You can even vote against the guy who called your whole ethnic group "rapists," "murderers," and "drug dealers." That kind of ugly, un-American attack is moving people to apply for citizenship and moving citizens to become voters.

Mr. Speaker, today is Citizenship Day, and there are hundreds of citizenship workshops and activities across the country. I am looking forward to meeting with the hundreds of people who will be working towards their citizenship this Saturday in Chicago.

The way to respond to racism is by voting, and in Latino and immigrant communities, we are getting that message loud and clear.

OZONE REGULATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reject a proposal from the Environmental Protection Agency that would increase compliance measures in dealing with ozone. This proposal has been met with bipartisan opposition in Pennsylvania from local, State, and, yes, Federal elected officials.

As a result of these regulations, three counties in my district—Erie, Centre, and Clearfield—would fall out of compliance with Federal law. This comes at a time when Pennsylvania's ozone emissions have declined for decades.

Let me repeat that. This comes at a time when the ozone emission levels in

Pennsylvania have been in decline for decades. This is an EPA-Obama administration political solution in search of a problem.

The new regulations would trigger an implementation procedure for counties which would make State and local officials answer to the EPA for basic permitting and planning decisions.

The regulations would threaten the State's ability to open new manufacturing facilities and, by the way, the jobs that would go with that. They would threaten the State's ability to expand current businesses and invest in new roadways.

They would also threaten agriculture through restrictions on animal feeding operations due to emissions from animal waste, along with limits on pesticide use.

This proposal comes at a time when ozone emissions across Pennsylvania have been in decline, again, for decades. With the State's economy still on the rebound from the Great Recession, now is the wrong time for new, stringent, and, I would argue, unnecessary rules from the EPA that could kill jobs.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, this proposal is the latest in a series of overreaches by the EPA, including the Clean Power Plan, which was announced earlier this summer by President Obama.

That plan will work hand in hand with these proposed ozone limits to kill good-paying jobs and to stifle economic development in Pennsylvania and across the Nation.

Furthermore, recent studies have called into question the claim that ozone levels lead to health issues, including asthma, especially among children.

With that in mind, these proposed regulations, which could be the costliest in the history of this Nation, may not have any impact on the health of our citizens.

There is still time for the EPA to reconsider the stringent regulation proposals for ozone and coal power plants.

As the Representative of a largely rural district which depends on agriculture, I understand how important it is that we be good stewards of the environment.

However, that stewardship must be balanced with the protection of industries and jobs, which have powered our communities for generations.

DROUGHT AND WILDFIRES IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the devastating wildfires that are sweeping throughout the Western States and, particularly, in much of California.

Last week, we had over 22 wildfires at one time that were in various parts of California. Because of the incredible 4 consecutive dry years, what once was a seasonal issue now seems to be year round.

Obviously, the drought conditions facing California played a big role in the ability to manage these wildfires, and the devastation that has occurred as a result of that has been great.

These last 4 years have been among the driest 4 years we have had, climatologists say, in 1,200 years in California and in the Western States.

Over 70 percent of California is facing what is considered to be extreme and exceptional drought conditions, which are among the highest categories that you can face under drought conditions.

California is not new to managing wildfires. It is part of living in that State as well as in other Western States, but these dry conditions over the last 4 years have made it worse; therefore, we need to try to figure out different ways to address this.

The Rough fire in Fresno County, which is part of the county I represent, has burned over 140,000 acres. Yesterday, finally, we got up to 67 percent contained.

This fire has lasted over a month, and it has closed one of our great national parks, Kings Canyon National Park. Last week, when I was home, literally, ashes were raining on our communities. Governor Jerry Brown has announced a state of emergency for northern California.

The Valley and Butte fires have been significant, affecting both Congressman MCCLINTOCK's and Congressman THOMPSON's districts.

Congressman THOMPSON has lost over 600 homes, and the fires are threatening thousands more. He has stayed there to protect his district and assist with the fires. At this point, the Valley fire is only 30 percent contained. The Butte fire has taken 233 homes.

As a result of these devastating fires, sadly, two firefighters have lost their lives, three civilians have been killed, and four firefighters have been hospitalized due to receiving severe burns. Literally, we have thousands and thousands of men and women who are out there manning these fires.

So the question is: What should we do about it as these numbers, sadly, continue to rise?

We need to better manage our forests. We need to help alleviate and cut down on the fuel that is there through the brush that has made these fires spread incredibly fast in conditions that were never foretold. Wildfire suppression and better managing our forests is a key to doing this.

The funding that we provide for natural disasters, like to FEMA for hurricanes and for earthquakes, ought to go toward putting out these fires.

We have exceeded over \$1 billion in the U.S. Forestry Department's budget, and we have completely overrun our ability to provide funding.

Currently, money the U.S. Forest Service has allocated for forest cleanup in order to prevent fires is being used to put the fires out.

We must put our political differences aside and pass legislation that will alleviate this crisis in Western States and in California.

In addition to getting legislation passed that will provide funding for putting fires out, we need to put legislation together that would, in fact, in the future, manage our forests better.

In July, I, along with Congressman VALADAO, introduced legislation, the Western Water and American Food Security Act.

This is part of a larger effort to deal with this issue. This legislation is the first step toward passing a bill that will provide additional tools for California to manage drought. This bill addresses a number of solutions to fix California's broken water system.

They include improved operations that are governed by the latest science, which will allow us to move more water when water is available in the system; additional water storage capacity; increased water recycling and reuse; improved water efficiency; and a conveyance solution that minimizes the use of an ecosystem as infrastructure and that balances the water needs for all of California.

This is but one of the tools that we need to address. We have legislation in the House, and we have legislation in the Senate. This fall, I hope we will be able to work together in a bipartisan fashion to pass this important legislation.

Certainly, these wildfires tell the public—and the public tells us—that we must do something about this. It must be a priority that we get something signed into law this year, before the rainy and snowy seasons begin. Lord knows, we hope it rains and snows this winter.

People in California, people in our valley, which has been ground zero for the drought impacts, and people in the West want Congress to act.

I urge my colleagues to take the appropriate action and pass much necessary legislation affecting the drought conditions in California and in the Western States.

DAVID C. HYDE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Speaker, throughout our lives here on Earth, God places in our path certain people who influence our lives, who help shape who we are, and who ultimately help us to understand our purpose.

A couple of years ago, I met someone whose optimism, faith, and valor in the face of difficulty has had a great influence on me, on my family, and on our entire community.

I met Mr. David Hyde in 2013, who at that time was a small business owner in Cartersville, Georgia. At that time, I was a relatively unknown candidate for Congress, who was promoting the idea that America's days are still ahead of us if we define where we are going and aggressively set a course to get there. David quickly became a supporter and a friend.

Although many had lost hope in restoring America's greatness, David was a breath of fresh air. His patriotism was inspiring; his optimism was infectious; and his energy invigorated me with a willingness to fight on.

David and I share a vision: to restore our struggling Nation to one that is free, safe, and full of opportunity. We both believe that we can turn the tide and give our grandchildren a nation better than the one we inherited, but, of course, it will take a lot of hard work.

Within 2 weeks of our introduction, David was given the news that he had esophageal cancer and that it was rapidly spreading. Now, after nearly 2 years of, quite literally, putting up the fight of his life, the cancer is quickly taking David's life. The time my friend has left with his wife and children is no longer measured in months or weeks, but in days.

In realizing that any day could be David's last, I recently asked: David, if you had the ability to speak to the American people, what would you say?

Mr. Speaker, in response to that question, David sent me the following words of encouragement to give to the people of this great Nation. David wrote:

I recently had the honor of going to lunch with a friend just days before he shipped off to join the Navy.

As we sat enjoying our meal, I saw in the eyes of my friend a young man who was proud to be given the opportunity to serve his country.

The more we talked, the more he reminded me of another young man who, 35 years earlier, had also left home and family to join the Navy. The similarities between the two of us were not lost on me, and it reminded me of all that America held for a young man like me back then.

While my vision of sailing the high seas and protecting the land of the free may have been somewhat jaded by the old black and white movies I grew up watching, the dream of doing something that really mattered was alive and real to me. While America may have gotten off course, the goal of why we served has never changed.

We have lost many of the freedoms we once held, but I believe we are not so far from those days that, with hard work, sacrifice, and turning our eyes back to God, they cannot be restored.

My life is a living example of God's restoration powers.

It doesn't appear God will heal my sick body, but I know that, in the land I am soon

going to enter, I have already been granted a new body—a perfect one—which I will have for eternity. That, my friends, is restoration.

Just as He will restore me, I believe He can restore our Nation to the greatness it once saw, but it will only be possible if we turn our affections back to Him. The road to restoration is not easy, as I can personally attest. It is hard, painful, and discomforting. But when your eyes are upon God, not your problems, the path is much easier to endure.

□ 1030

He has set out a clear plan with guidelines that aren't hard to follow. As our Founders understood, we may have some battles to overcome and a wilderness to cross, but we must not be paralyzed by fear of the unknown, for it is "In God We Trust."

When leading the Israelites from bondage, Moses had to lift his rod over the Red Sea in complete trust before God parted the waters for safe passage. He trusted God and forged on.

Although he faced insurmountable odds, the fear of the unknown didn't stop Joshua from forging on.

During the darkest hours of the American Revolution at Valley Forge, Washington didn't give up, but dug in and put his faith in the providence of God.

Leaders who are willing to do what is difficult or even what seems to be impossible are the ones who carry the team forward.

We must honor God and know that his plans for us include only one thing, His glory. If we are in it for Him, we win. If we are in it for ourselves, we lose.

Just as my young friend went out to serve in the U.S. Navy without a clearly defined path or step-by-step guidelines, but fully relying on his authorities to lead him, we must know that, if we are to return to our country's traditional values, we need to study our history, find men and women willing to adhere to those founding principles, and tighten ourselves for a brighter future led by our intelligently chosen authorities.

Who is your leader?

My best advice, as a man looking backwards with 20/20 vision, is to decide now whom you will serve and proceed in a manner worthy of your calling.

David C. Hyde, Jr.

Thank you, David, for these words of inspiration and hope. God bless you, my friend, as you forge ahead in faith and trust in God almighty.

NO SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, we have 6 legislative days until the Government of the United States shuts down for lack of funding.

Why? It is because the Republican leadership here in the House has failed to bring forth critical appropriations bills to fund the government. As a result of that, we are faced with the need to pass a continuing resolution to fund the government; yet we have leading Members of the Congress here threatening to shut down the government rather than to put forth on the House of Representatives here a bipartisan

bill for a continuing resolution to fund the government.

Instead, we have partisan after partisan after partisan legislative measures brought before the House here under closed rules that the leadership knows isn't going to go anywhere, but it is introduced for the perceived notion of partisan gain.

The hard simple truth is that the American people want the Congress to put their partisanship aside and to go to work, start fixing things, finding common ground, rebuilding the middle class, creating jobs, and restoring the American Dream. They surely don't want another government shutdown that puts people's jobs, families, our government, and our national security at risk.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, the Congress of the United States needs to come to Washington and to go to work. If the Congress doesn't do its job and get its work done, then Congress shouldn't get paid. The working men and women of America don't get paid when they don't come to work, why should the Congress get paid?

That is why I have introduced the No Government No Pay Act to prohibit Members of Congress from getting paid during a shutdown of the Congress' own creation—because people in this country, they don't want a shutdown.

They want to see the Congress go to work, find common ground, fix things, get things done, rebuild America with a transportation bill, not another kick-the-can-down-the-road, short-term fix. They want jobs with good-paying benefits, not a Trans-Pacific Partnership agreement that sends their good-paying jobs overseas.

The American people want accessible health care for our veterans, as indeed they should be receiving, not a trip to "kingdom come" every time a veteran needs some medical care.

The American people, they want to see protection from Social Security and for Medicare and the recognition these are not entitlements, that these are benefits that people worked hard for and started paying for the first day that they ever went to work. They surely don't want to see those benefits turned over to Wall Street and to the big insurance companies.

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, if the Congress doesn't go to work, it shouldn't get paid.

More importantly, the Congress needs to go to work and bring these measures under open rules before the full House of Congress because that is how you find common ground, that is how you get things done, that is how you fix things in America.

The American people want it; they deserve it, and they have every right to expect it.

PROTECTING LIFE BY DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, like the majority of the American people, I was disgusted and angered by the recent videos showing Planned Parenthood officials apparently willing to sell the tissues and organs of aborted babies. That is right; I said "babies," not a glob of tissue as some would suggest.

I have always been unapologetically pro-life, and the mere thought of such horrific actions is beyond words. That is why I come to the floor today to urge my colleagues to support the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, which will cut all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood until the House conducts a complete and full investigation into the organization's abortion practices.

I am also pleased that this legislation will reallocate Federal funds currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion services to community health centers and other clinics that help provide preventative care to women without performing abortions.

Women's health is extremely important, and it is my belief that the funding currently being used to fund Planned Parenthood's abortion agenda will be better used by helping our local clinics provide vital women's health services without promoting the malicious practice of abortion.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the majority of my constituents in the Third Congressional District of West Virginia want to see a culture of life promoted in Washington, not a culture of barbarity and lack of respect for life.

My constituents deserve to know that their taxpayer dollars are going to organizations that represent their values and beliefs, not to organizations that are determined to push their own agenda that goes against the will of the American people.

I urge my colleagues to support the passage of Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and to promote the sanctity of life and listen to the American people and my constituents when they say they have had enough of their hard-earned tax dollars being spent to promote Planned Parenthood's pro-abortion agenda.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address a very important issue that continues to trouble the American people, and that is the Republican obsession of denying a woman and families' access to certain healthcare services like birth control.

Republicans' outdated views on family planning do nothing to empower women and nothing for families in their success in the 21st century. The latest round in the Republicans' battle against women's access to health care is, yet again, an attempt to eliminate Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

This debate has been riddled with lies and deliberate misinformation designed to shock the American people, while needlessly demonizing one of the Nation's leading women's healthcare providers.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that we talk about a few things and clear up some issues and talk about the facts in this. Since its inception, Planned Parenthood has empowered millions of women nationwide by providing affordable access to contraception. Cutting off funding would cripple Planned Parenthood's ability to provide this crucial service for our Nation's women.

The two primary sources of Federal funding for Planned Parenthood come from two programs, Medicaid and Title X Family Planning. These programs were created as a safety net to provide low-income individuals with access to critical medical services that they would otherwise be forced to forego due to their high cost, such as birth control.

Together, these programs account for over 40 percent of Planned Parenthood's operating budget. Stripping these dollars would severely decrease Planned Parenthood's ability to provide care for 2.7 million people that they serve every year.

Let me tell you what this means. This means millions of the Nation's poor women would not only be at risk of losing affordable contraceptive services and counseling, but also their access to breast and cervical cancer screenings, as well as testing and treatment for STDs.

It is important to understand that, for those who are uninsured, this is the only way to get this lifesaving care. This would mean 400,000 fewer pap smears for women, 500,000 fewer breast exams, and 4.5 million fewer STD tests and treatments nationwide.

Let me be clear. It is not just Democrats' districts that will be affected. If you go outside of the Dallas/Fort Worth metroplex, these smaller cities and suburban areas and rural areas, those are Republican districts; they have low-income women, and they will be cut off from this funding and this treatment.

All this is at risk because of Republicans' objections to Planned Parenthood providing safe and legal access to abortions. This is less than 3 percent of what this organization does. In accordance with Federal law, no Federal funds go to cover abortion services.

Another faulty argument made by Republicans is that the Nation's community healthcare centers could absorb the work that Planned Parenthood currently does.

I love community health centers, and I appreciate the work that they do because they really do serve the underserved, but the idea that these facilities would be able to provide adequate services to nearly 3 million additional people who would suddenly be without care is simply unimaginable.

Community health centers rely on other sources for affordable care to alleviate the strains of residents' needs, sources like Planned Parenthood. This is not imagined. I have seen it in the State of Texas.

I have visited community healthcare centers in the district that I serve, and they are very overwhelmed as a result of the void for healthcare services purposely created by the Republican State legislature. One of the things you always hear Republicans hollering about is how much they want to save taxpayers money.

Let me tell you something. What happened in my State of Texas in 2012, Governor Rick Perry and the Republican State legislature banned Planned Parenthood from participating in the Medicaid Women's Health Program, a joint initiative that saved Texas millions of dollars in Medicaid prenatal and delivery costs through the prevention of unplanned pregnancies.

Today, 30,000 fewer women are receiving that care, Medicaid claims are down by 26 percent, and Texas taxpayers are now paying the full price to support the State's community health centers. Republicans wasted lots of money.

Where does that leave us today? I will tell you a lot of these antiabortion groups and their political allies have created this partisan debate by releasing a series of deceitfully edited "undercover" videos casting Planned Parenthood in a negative light.

Let me tell you that these videos are a sham; they are lies, and they do absolutely nothing to help increase access to the critical services that Planned Parenthood provides for women.

Documents and testimony submitted to the Energy and Commerce Committee during a wasteful and unnecessary investigation show that absolutely no evidence exists to substantiate claims that Planned Parenthood violated the law in any way. In fact, their fetal tissue donation program is not only compliant with Federal law, but goes well beyond the law's requirements.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to cease their fruitless fight against birth control—because we know that this is really what this is all about—and Planned Parenthood and women's health and get to the job of governing.

We all want women to have access to the health care they need to stay healthy for their family because, let me tell you, in my family and in families around the country, that if mom is not healthy, the rest of the family is not healthy.

That is why I choose to put people before politics and stand with women, families, and all the people of Texas and America in my support of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1045

OUR STRATEGY AGAINST ISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOLLY. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago this month, the President of the United States addressed the Nation proposing his strategy for a war against ISIS. He struggled with what the mission was. Were we as a nation engaging to degrade ISIS, to defeat ISIS, to destroy ISIS? And then the question arose in this body, at what level do we engage? Do we consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force, something that is proper under our constitutional authority?

Yet 1 year later, we have not considered an Authorization for Use of Military Force. We have not had the debate over what is the role of this body and our current foreign policy and our current national security strategy against ISIS. The only portion that we were willing to touch was the request to arm and train Syrian rebels; and this body, I believe wrongfully, authorized and appropriated half a billion dollars—\$500 million—to train Syrian rebels. Yesterday, we heard from the top commander of our forces in the Middle East that there are either four or five individuals engaged as Syrian rebels confronting ISIS—\$500 million, five people.

The President's strategy against ISIS has failed. ISIS continues to grow geographically, continues to be enriched. Russia's hand is strengthened. Iran has increasing leverage every single day. Mr. Speaker, the architects of terror today are emboldened. But they are emboldened not only by the failure of this administration's policy; they are emboldened by the failure of this Congress to do our job.

Where are we in this debate? Where is this Congress on whether or not we are going to consider an Authorization for Use of Military Force? Where are we today on the \$500 million that has now trained five people? Do we stand behind that decision as a body? I hope we do not.

The bigger question we have to ask, and it is a hard question: Are we a nation at war today with ISIS or are we not? If we are, are we willing as a nation to accept the human and economic consequences that come with conflict?

The frustration you hear in my voice is the frustration we hear in the voices of the American people across the Nation every single day. It is a frustration about what this body does not do. We should be having a debate over the Authorization for Use of Military Force. I don't know how that debate turns out.

Nobody wants to go into conflict. We don't get to choose the threats that come our way. We only choose our response, and 1 year later we have no response. All this is through the lens of an agenda that we continue to fail to do.

Let's give voice to the American people on issues like border security and immigration reform, on transportation, on a budget that finally balances. The frustration is not that we haven't achieved these things; it is that we haven't even engaged in a legislative fight to begin to advance the agenda that is right for the American people.

We are elected to be custodians of the public trust, and we fail that public trust every day we fail to consider the issues that are of most significance to the American people, to honor the constitutional responsibility we have under article I. We have spent the last 2 years cloaking ourselves in the article I authority of the Congress every time the President overreaches, and we have rightfully done so; but just as we cloak ourselves in the article I authority, we have to recognize article I brings responsibility.

We have failed to honor the responsibility that we have under article I. We have an obligation to have a very hard debate about whether or not we are a nation at war with ISIS and whether or not we are doing anything in the face of the President's failed policy to actually confront the audible threat of terror of a regime that wishes to bring harm and destroy the United States of America. This body has failed to engage in that debate.

Mr. Speaker, I ask with the utmost conviction of this Member but, frankly, the people who give me the honor to represent them in this House. Let's give voice to the American people. Let's give voice to the people that we represent here in this body, and let's finally have that debate.

WE CANNOT STAND IDLY BY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to denounce the unjust sentence of almost 14 years that was handed to human rights activist Leopoldo Lopez in Venezuela. Leopoldo is pictured here in this poster with his slogan, which says, "Wanting a better Venezuela is not a crime." Liberate Leopoldo.

Sentenced along with Leopoldo as human rights activists were Cristian Holdack, Angel Gonzalez, and Demian Martin, three students whose charge sheets include public instigation, damages to property, and arson—all false charges. Their crimes were nothing more than standing up to the regime—the corrupt, illegitimate regime—of Nicolas Maduro in Venezuela and demanding a better country that would have respect for human rights, that would have freedom of the press, and that would have free and fair elections and other universally recognized rights.

As this says, demanding a better Venezuela is not a crime, except it is in Venezuela. Democracy advocates are harassed; they are abused; they are imprisoned; they are beaten; and some are even killed—yes, killed. We cannot stand idly by while democracy and due process are trampled on in our own hemisphere.

Democracies like Brazil, Mexico, Colombia, and Chile should join the U.S. in advocating for democracy and stability for Venezuela, and freedom for the many political prisoners who are languishing in Maduro's gulags. I urge the Obama administration to immediately sanction the judge, prosecutors, and those who led this politically motivated kangaroo court against Leopoldo Lopez, against these students, and against so many.

The President can use the power granted to the executive branch when we passed here in the U.S. House of Representatives and in the United States Senate the Venezuelan sanctions legislation last year. The President must act. Mr. Speaker, let's hope that he does.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to denounce so many human rights violations that are occurring throughout the hemisphere, whether it is in Venezuela or my native homeland of Cuba. As the Pope prepares for his historic trip to Cuba this weekend, he should meet with those people, like the political prisoners who share common interests of peace and justice with the Catholic Church. The church stands for liberty; it defends the freedoms of oppressed people, the freedoms to pursue one's goals and dreams without having to live in fear.

The Castro regime stands for the complete opposite. It stands for oppression, for violence, for hatred, for injustice, and I would urge His Holiness to meet with those who truly defend the values for which the church stands; people like this young man, a graffiti artist, a young man who has only known Communist Cuba as his government. His name is El Sexto. It means the sixth one, in reference to some other charges.

El Sexto has been behind bars for nearly 9 months. He has been on a hunger strike to protest the brutal Castro regime. What did he do? This is what

he did. He had a picture of two farm animals, and he put the names of Fidel and Raul on them. For that, he has been imprisoned with no contact with the outside world.

In January, another young man, a Cuban rapper named El Dkano, was sentenced to a year in prison just because he used music to criticize the Castro regime, a regime which has not unclenched its fist against the Cuban people.

Yesterday, pro-democracy leader Jorge Luis Garcia Perez, also known as Antunez, and 10 of his activists of the organization National Civic Resistance Front announced that they have begun a fast in an attempt to get a meeting with His Holiness to raise the plight of the suffering Cuban people.

These are just a few of the prisoners, Mr. Speaker, who have received harsh sentences after President Obama signed and announced this ill-fated deal with the Castro regime on December 17.

Reports indicate that the Castro regime is planning on releasing more than 3,000 prisoners in advance of the Pope's visit to Cuba, and you will think, hey, that sounds like a good idea, but let's remember this: Many of those prisoners should have never been in jail in the first place. By the way, political prisoners like El Sexto, for doing an artwork, will not be included in that number. No political prisoners will be freed, but that is not anything new, Mr. Speaker.

In 1978, Fidel Castro released almost 3,800 political prisoners ahead of Jimmy Carter's visit; in 1998, Fidel Castro released 300 prisoners ahead of Pope John Paul's visit; in the year 2011, Raul Castro released nearly 3,100 ahead of Pope Benedict's visit; yet the Castro regime has detained an unprecedented number of Cubans this year. With all of these people being freed, this year, there has been an unprecedented number of arrests in Cuba of political activists.

We can be sure that before the Pope's visit, during the Pope's visit, and after the Pope's visit, more innocent Cubans will be detained—like El Sexto—by the regime and thrown into Castro's gulags. This tactic is nothing new, and it is not indicative of a change of policy by the evil, despotic, sadistic Castro regime. It is just a political propaganda farce.

Will the Pope see this cynical move for what it is? We shall soon see, Mr. Speaker.

INVESTIGATIONS INTO PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am here this morning to speak about

the investigations into Planned Parenthood and to the sale of fetal tissues. We are beginning this process in our Committee on Energy and Commerce; and we are approaching this in a thoughtful manner, beginning these investigations as we look at life rights and focus on the lives of these unborn children and the mothers who have gone through this process.

It is so interesting to me, as we have this discussion of fetal tissue sales and what all has transpired in the selling of these tissues, that we look to science. What science has shown us is that these are not blobs of tissue; these are babies.

This weekend, I had the opportunity to go to a baby shower, and a very excited grandmother showed me the sonogram, the picture of her unborn granddaughter already named and being celebrated. As we looked at it, we could distinguish these features of this child yet unborn, but this child fully formed and developing and sleeping in her mother's womb.

There was great excitement to celebrate this arrival, and we know that this is a fight worth having and a process worth ending as we look at the selling of these fetal organs and what has transpired.

Now, everyone is familiar with what happened with Kermit Gosnell in his house of horrors, and we know there was a conviction, but what we have learned is those convictions are very rare. We have moved now to the video footage that The Center for Medical Progress released, and we see that this is absolutely sickening, abhorrent.

□ 1100

These videos have raised a lot of suspicion about what has transpired in these Planned Parenthood affiliates and clinics and questions as to whether they have systematically and repeatedly broken laws.

Obtaining informed consent for fetal tissue donation, how was that approached? Killing infants born alive after an attempted induced abortion, who are the persons entitled to legal protection here?

As you look at a botched abortion and you have a child born alive, all of a sudden you have got two patients there that you are considering.

Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Medical Services for Planned Parenthood Federation of America, describes harvesting human tissues. In one of the videos, she talks about crushing this part or the other part of the baby in order to get a good specimen.

To listen to her callous description and her casual manner is sickening, but it also may violate some of the Federal laws which prohibit alteration of abortion procedures to obtain fetal tissue.

In another video, a technician says:

I'm sitting here and I'm looking at this fetus, and its heart is beating, and I don't know what to think. I don't know if that constitutes it's technically dead or it's alive.

Imagine that. This baby, if it had arrived in a hospital with a NICU and doctors surrounding it, there would have been a rush to make certain that life was saved.

And God bless those NICU specialists who work with these preemie babies. We have all spent time with them and are grateful that they are there.

The cheap veneer of the left, the defense of abortion as a matter of reproductive choice, is wearing thin. Reproductive rights?

As I said, let's talk about life rights. Let's discuss life rights. It is Constitution Day, the right to life, liberty, pursuit of happiness.

We have got several bills that our Members are bringing forward, which I will submit for the RECORD, along, Mr. Speaker, with those Democrats that voted for the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, which was passed in this House by a voice vote.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD BILLS

H.R. 3134, THE DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015 (BLACK)

Bill would impose a one-year moratorium on all federal funding to Planned Parenthood or any of its affiliates while investigations are conducted unless they certify they will not perform abortions or provide funds to other entities that perform abortions.

Restriction does not apply in cases of rape, incest or woman's health concerns.

H.R. 3429, THE PROHIBITING THE LIFE-ENDING INDUSTRY OF FETAL ORGAN EXCHANGE ACT OR THE PRO-LIFE ACT (YODER)

This bill amends the Public Health Service Act to prohibit the transfer of fetal tissue in exchange for valuable consideration, including payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.

H.R. 3494, THE PROTECTING INFANTS BORN ALIVE ACT (BLACKBURN)

Draft legislation I have authored to strengthen and improve the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 became law on August 5, 2002 and requires that any reference to person, human being, child or individual include every infant born alive.

1ABoth Ellmers and Blackburn bills will ban any provider proven of violating either of these existing laws from participating in Medicare, Medicaid, and CHIP and will allow states that suspect any violation of these existing laws to ban those suspected from the state's Medicaid program.

H.R. 3495, THE WOMEN'S PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT (DUFFY)

The bill amends the Medicaid law to allow states the flexibility and discretion to be able to exclude abortion providers like Planned Parenthood from Medicaid. States that have tried to defund Planned Parenthood have been blocked by the federal Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services assertion that states must fund Planned Parenthood under what is known as the "free choice of qualified provider" provision in Medicaid. Since the release of the under-

cover videos by Center for Medical Progress three states (Louisiana, Alabama and Arkansas) have sought to terminate Planned Parenthood's Medicaid contracts and are now embroiled in lawsuits.

H.R. 3504, THE BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT (FRANKS)

Bill mandates that infants born alive during abortions are legal persons entitled to all the rights and protections allowed to other legal persons, including needed medical care and attention. This legislation requires the same care for a child born alive during an abortion as a naturally premature baby born in a hospital. Any violation to this rule is a federal offense and must immediately be reported to law enforcement.

The bill also provides for criminal penalties for providers who fail to provide care to baby.

H.R. XX, THE PROTECT INFANTS FROM PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION ACT (ELLMERS)

Legislation will bolster the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003.

The Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2003 amends the Federal Criminal code to ban partial-birth abortions except in the interest of the life of the mother

H.R. 3515, SMITH DISMEMBERMENT ABORTION BAN ACT

The Born Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002 (P.L. 107-207) passed the House by voice vote and the Senate by UC. The following is a list of Democrats who were serving when these votes took place.

DEMOCRATIC SENATORS

Tammy Baldwin*, Barbara Boxer, Sherrod Brown*, Benjamin L. Cardin*, Maria Cantwell, Tom Carper, Dick Durbin, Dianne Feinstein, Patrick Leahy, Edward J. Markey*, Robert Menendez*, Barbara Mikulski, Patty Murray, Bill Nelson (FL), Jack Reed, Harry Reid, Chuck Schumer, Debbie Stabenow, Tom Udall (NM)*, Ron Wyden.

*served in the House during the 107th Congress.

DEMOCRATIC HOUSE MEMBERS

Xavier Becerra, Sanford D. Bishop Jr., Earl Blumenauer, Robert A. Brady, Corrine Brown, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, James E. Clyburn, John Conyers Jr., Joseph Crowley, Elijah E. Cummings, Danny K. Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, Rosa L. DeLauro, Lloyd Doggett, Michael F. Doyle, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo.

Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Gene Green, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Alcee L. Hastings, Rubén Hinojosa, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Steve Israel, Sheila Jackson-Lee, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Marcy Kaptur, Ron Kind, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Nita M. Lowey, Stephen F. Lynch.

Betty McCollum, Jim McDermott, James P. McGovern, Carolyn B. Maloney, Gregory W. Meeks, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Frank Pallone Jr., Bill Pascrell Jr., Donald M. Payne, Nancy Pelosi, Collin C. Peterson, David E. Price, Charles B. Rangel, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Bobby L. Rush, Loretta Sanchez, Janice D. Schakowsky.

Adam B. Schiff, Robert C. Scott, José E. Serrano, Brad Sherman, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Bennie G. Thompson, Mike Thompson, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Maxine Waters.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Brondon Reems, Center of Hope Community Church, Oakland, California, offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy name in all the Earth. We honor You. We beseech thee in behalf of these, our United States and Congress.

Heavenly Father, we depend on You for skillful and Godly wisdom, to enter into the hearts and minds of those in authority. Only You know the rightness of their cause, their purpose, and their plans.

To thee, do they now look up, realizing that their help comes from You. They look to You for Your approval and for Your support. They look to You for favor that only You can give.

We thank You, Heavenly Father, for Your mercy as we seek peace in all of these United States and the world. We give thanks for the leaders You have given to us. We thank You for Your love and protection that surrounds them.

We ask that You continue to bless, strengthen, and preserve those they represent. We believe in Your Word that declares blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GARRETT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. GARRETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND BRONDON REEMS

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to welcome Pastor Brondon Reems to the House floor this morning after delivering such a powerful prayer.

Pastor Reems is the senior pastor of the Center of Hope Community Church in Oakland, California, a church founded by his mother—a great woman of faith, who has broken so many glass ceilings for women, especially for African American women—Bishop Ernestine Reems.

His wife, Pastor Maria, who is also here with us today, is his partner in ministry and has helped to grow the church into a vibrant and strong pillar of faith and community in the East Bay.

Pastor Reems accepted his call to ministry at 10 years old, and he has flourished into a strong spiritual leader.

From ministering youth in juvenile hall to assisting families coping with substance abuse and emotional disabilities, Pastor Reems serves the East Bay community with a genuine heart and compassion.

He is the cofounder of the Oakland's Potters House for Young Men, a 24-hour residential care facility for young teens who have become wards of the State.

I thank Pastor Reems for his spiritual leadership, his wisdom, and his service. He embodies and exemplifies a living faith. He is a wonderful pastor, a great mentor, and a committed and powerful civic leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZINKE). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

CONSTITUTION DAY

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, as founder of the Congressional Constitution Caucus, today marks the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution.

Unlike other revolutions, the Constitution was not imposed on the people. It was submitted to the people for their approval. If the people were to judge the Constitution, they were expected to understand the Constitution.

The Federalist Papers, a series of essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, argued for ratification and served as an invaluable guide to the Constitution. Education was integral to the Constitution's success.

Today, I commend all those who follow in the footsteps of our Founders by accepting the duty to educate the pub-

lic on the ideals of human liberty. It is they we must thank for the preservation of the Constitution today.

NATIONAL CITIZENSHIP DAY

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate National Citizenship Day.

America would not be the great country that it is without its immigrants. One of our greatest strengths is our Nation's diversity—the ability of this country to absorb and integrate the most entrepreneurial minds that this world has to offer and to make them our own. In fact, immigrants or their children have founded more than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies.

However, there is a dangerous anti-immigrant sentiment perpetuated by those who fail to recognize the strength derived from our diversity. Even today, laws are being proposed to deny the constitutional right of citizenship to those born in America. Proposals like these are both appalling and un-American.

In Congress, we must continue to fight against these anti-immigrant proposals and to push for comprehensive immigration reform, and we must work to ensure that every person who is eligible for naturalization understands the process that it takes to become a U.S. citizen and has a voice in our great democracy.

CONGRATULATING JEFF HERRALA

(Mr. EMMER of Minnesota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate Jeff Herrala of Andover for being named the 2015 Cadet of the Year.

Jeff graduated first in his class from Anoka High School, where he excelled in both academics and athletics.

Due to Jeff's stellar accomplishments both inside the classroom and out, my predecessor, Michele Bachmann, awarded Jeff with both the Congressional Certificate of Merit and an appointment to the United States Air Force Academy in 2012.

Jeff currently attends the Air Force Academy in Colorado, where he is studying aeronautical engineering.

It is clear that Jeff truly embodies one of the Air Force's core values: excellence. Throughout Jeff's life and academic career, he has demonstrated nothing short of excellence, and he is beyond deserving of this award.

Jeff, I am proud to recognize you here today, and I look forward to seeing what the future has in store for you.

INCREASE FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, thousands of Americans are on Capitol Hill today to attend the Rally for Medical Research and to demand increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.

The NIH supports 400,000 American jobs. In fact, 82 percent of its budget supports research conducted in every State in this Nation, and every dollar of NIH funding generates \$2.21 in local economic activity.

The effects are, obviously, not only economic. Thanks in large part to the National Institutes of Health, deaths from heart disease are down 50 percent over the last 40 years, deaths from cancer are down 20 percent since 1991, and the cure rate for childhood cancer is now 80 percent.

From 1997 to 2003, Congress doubled funding for the National Institutes of Health, but, since then, it has fallen by 25 percent when accounting for inflation.

Just yesterday, the National Cancer Institute released a report that identifies research that won't be conducted unless Congress restores its purchasing power with sustained annual funding increases over the next decade. We must not let that happen.

I urge this House to give the NIH the resources it needs to conduct the work our Nation deserves.

SERVING OUR SAVIOR

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, during the August work period, Smith Phillips Building Supply hosted a customer appreciation day and supplier showcase that I attended in Winston-Salem.

While I was there, I had the pleasure of speaking with Jack Shearin, who founded a ministry called Serving our Savior, and Harry Underwood, who chairs the ministry.

Since 2000, this group has been assisting the disabled in Forsyth County by building handicap ramps at their homes. All the work is performed by volunteers, who build 70 to 80 ramps each year.

Since the organization's inception, more than 700 ramps have been built. Serving our Savior does not charge for their ramps. Instead, the organization allows the recipients to pay what they can, and if they are unable to pay, funds are provided by Serving our Savior.

This ministry is a wonderful example of the difference a small group of people can make in its local community, and I applaud their selfless work on behalf of those who need a helping hand.

CONFECTIONERS

(Ms. SPEIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that says you can catch a lot more bees with honey than with vinegar. It turns out that that is true in business, too.

The confectioners industry employs a whopping 55,000 busy worker bees in the United States—that is 55,000 people who are working directly in the confectionery industry—and indirectly supports another 400,000 jobs in other industries from retail to trucking.

Every confectionery job created in the United States supports another seven; but Congress continues to maintain an unbelievably wrongheaded policy that is destroying these jobs.

The Department of Commerce found that protectionist provisions in the 2008 farm bill destroyed three jobs for every job they saved. They have cost consumers and businesses as much as \$14 billion since 2008, and they have cost taxpayers over \$300 million in subsidies.

We have lost over 125,000 jobs in sugar-related industries since 1997. We cannot continue to hurt our own workers and consumers alike. This is not a sugar high. This is a sugar low.

I urge Congress to pass the bipartisan Sugar Reform Act so we can provide relief to small- and medium-sized businesses.

CHUCK HAUPTMAN

(Mr. ZINKE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Speaker, today I rise to pay tribute to a Billings resident, a World War II veteran, and a fabled member of the Army 10th Mountain Division K Company, Chuck Hauptman.

Seventy years ago, the young lieutenant was crawling on his belly up Mount Belvedere under the cover of darkness. The K Company was charged with leading the allied assault on the Germans through the minefields—set up along the steepest peak—and driving the Germans out of Italy.

On one February night, they battled snow, darkness, vertical climbs, freezing temperatures, and booby traps, all while under the heavy machine gun fire of the Nazis.

The K Company was in combat for 110 days against Nazi forces in the Italian Alps. During this time, Lieutenant Hauptman was shot and wounded in battle while assaulting a machine gun nest. Like many young men, he went back to battle.

It is easy to forget the young men who were sent to the battle in World War II. We look at our veterans and the aging today of our World War II veterans.

Remember, as our young men go to battle, that our Nation asks our youngest men and women to go to battle and fight for this country, and we should never forget the sacrifice.

When we go to war, we send our Nation's best. I am proud to recognize Chuck Hauptman as one of our Nation's best. He represents the best of Montana, the best of our country, and the best of our youth.

□ 1215

5,000 ROLE MODELS OF EXCELLENCE PROJECT

(Ms. WILSON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Madam Speaker, almost a half century ago, while serving as an elementary school principal in Miami, I sensed a void in the lives of the boys who were always being sent to my office because of disruptive behavior.

The one thing they all had in common was the lack of an adult male to love them and guide them along life's often tricky paths. I founded the 5,000 Role Models of Excellence Project to rescue these boys of color from futures fueled by drugs, poverty, or prison.

The 5,000 Role Models of Excellence is recognized by President Obama's My Brother's Keeper initiative. It is an in-school program in Florida's public schools. These boys have earned more than \$10 million in college scholarships, and so many have returned and now serve as role models to the 10,000 boys now in the program.

There are 109 chapters in Miami-Dade County schools, the fourth largest school district in the Nation, 30 chapters in Pinellas County/St. Petersburg schools, and 10 chapters in Duvall County, Jacksonville, Florida.

Please welcome the Miami Northwestern Senior High School chapter who are up in the gallery today. I love you, and I am so proud of each and every one of you.

Welcome to Washington.

HONORING VILLAGE OF PINECREST POLICE OFFICER EDISON CRUZ

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Officer Edison Cruz for being named the officer of the second quarter of 2015 of the police department at the Village of Pinecrest, my hometown.

Officer Edison is an invaluable member of the Pinecrest police DUI enforcement program and is highly regarded for his knowledge in this important area of policing and community safety

work. Officer Edison's leadership is further exemplified by his role in the coordination of the department's training regarding new DUI blood warrants requirements.

In addition to this most recent honor, Officer Cruz has received two awards from Mothers Against Drunk Driving, MADD, for his successful efforts to protect the public from the terrible crime of drunk driving.

I thank Officer Cruz for his dedication and important work in the service of the people of the place I am so proud to call my home, the Village of Pinecrest.

Congratulations, Officer Edison Cruz.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. DAVIS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it is September, it must mean another shutdown on the horizon. The same small band within the House majority is demanding another shutdown of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen this movie before. In the mid-1990s, conservatives shut down the Federal Government, demanding cuts to Medicare, threatening the healthcare security of seniors.

Just 2 years ago, the government was shut down as conservatives demanded an end to the Affordable Care Act, threatening the healthcare security of millions of Americans. This time, the demand is to end funding for Planned Parenthood, threatening the healthcare security of millions of women, many of them low income.

A recent poll showed that more than 7 out of 10 Americans want Congress to do its job and reach a budget agreement, but like a bad horror movie franchise, the GOP keeps turning out shutdown sequel after shutdown sequel.

Guess what—the American people don't get to walk out on this sequel. They have to sit and suffer through it.

DON SHAW'S RETIREMENT

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a faithful servant of the people of Missouri, Mr. Don Shaw. Don has served the members of Missouri's rural electric cooperatives for 40 years in a variety of capacities, from his start as an electrical engineer to his most recent post as general manager and CEO of Central Electric Power Cooperative.

Don is an outspoken leader in protecting reliable, affordable sources of electricity. His vision and foresight allowed him to take advantage of new technologies, giving high priority to innovative and cost-effective methods to better serve members.

Don has created programs to help alleviate or minimize outage shortage during extreme weather and other natural disasters. In addition, Don helped to build a robust network of fiber optic services to assist the rural membership in staying up to date with an increasingly connected world.

Don has been an active and effective spokesman here at Capitol Hill and back in the Missouri State House. I know this is not the end of service he will provide to his community, State, and country, but merely the end of one more chapter in an extraordinary life.

I would, again, like to thank Don Shaw for his service and wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors.

IMPROVING AIR TRAVEL

(Ms. HAHN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in support of long-suffering airline passengers. All of us know that air travel is becoming more and more uncomfortable.

At a time when airlines treat passengers so poorly, subjecting us to decreased legroom, cramped planes, more seats in each row, charging extra fees for luggage or snacks, and many other inconveniences, many people are understandably upset that a CEO of a major airline will receive a golden parachute with up to \$20 million in compensation and free first-class airline tickets for life.

The airline industry is expected to double its profits this year as compared to last year, and even though the fuel prices have dropped 50 percent, ticket prices have barely budged, but what has changed is smaller seats and less legroom.

Since 9/11, the traveling public has complied graciously and patiently with all the new regulations, but once they board the airplane, they are squeezed at every side.

I will soon be introducing legislation that improves the flying experience for the flying public. I think Congress needs to look out for the consumer.

CHIWAUKEE PRAIRIE ILLINOIS BEACH LAKE PLAIN

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain for being designated as a Ramsar Wetland of International Importance.

As the 38th Ramsar Wetland in the United States, this designation recognizes the Lake Plain for its globally significant contribution to biodiversity and importance to human health and economy.

Mr. Speaker, wetlands are among the Earth's most diverse and productive ecosystems, providing flood control, food, and freshwater. The Lake Plain protects diverse natural communities, including globally rare wetlands, while still being open to the public. This gives our community the chance to experience and enjoy nature, while learning about biodiversity and how to conserve our natural resources.

I specifically want to congratulate the many groups that made this conservation effort possible, including the Lake County Forest Preserve District, the Chiwaukee Prairie Preservation Fund, and the Illinois Department of Natural Resources.

This honor is only the beginning for the Chiwaukee Prairie Illinois Beach Lake Plain. I look forward to seeing what else they will accomplish in the future.

OPPOSING A GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN AND RENEWING THE CALL TO CREATE JOBS

(Ms. ESTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, we have only 6 legislative days left to avoid a reckless and unnecessary government shutdown. I come to the floor to, once again, urge the leadership of this House to focus on jobs.

We need to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank, and we need to pass a long-term highway bill and to invest in America's infrastructure, but this House is busy attacking women's health care instead of defending America's economy.

Instead of creating jobs with a highway bill to rebuild America, the majority is fixated on misguided attempts to defund Planned Parenthood. Instead of creating jobs by supporting manufacturers who export to the world, this House is pushing companies to export American jobs.

It is time for this House to focus on rebuilding America and to support American businesses by getting back to the business of the American people.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR'S FIDUCIARY RULE

(Mr. DUFFY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DUFFY. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express great concern about the Department of Labor's fiduciary rule. This is a rule that is going to have a substantial impact on lower-income and middle-income savers, the men and women and the families that we want to get good advice from advisers so they can save and plan for their retirement. This rule is going to make it

harder for American families to save for that eventual day of retirement.

For decades, my constituents in Wisconsin have been served by well-regulated financial institutions, and they include the mutually owned cooperatives and the fraternal membership organizations. These organizations only do well if they serve their customers and their clients well, and if they don't serve them, the clients walk down the street, and they go somewhere else.

This Department of Labor fiduciary rule is going to take the advice away from folks who need the most advice when they are saving. It is an idea that Washington knows best and that people with full disclosure can't make the right decisions for their families.

This rule is a disaster, and my concern is less people are going to save, which means more people are going to be reliant on the Federal Government. That is a wrong approach. Let's not let this rule go through.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. BERA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, in 6 legislative days, our government will shut down. This is a bad idea.

Last time the government shut down, our economy lost more than \$20 billion, \$4 billion in tax refunds were delayed, 20,000 veterans disability claims per week were delayed, and \$140 million in small business loan applications were not processed. If you look at the analysis, over those 2 weeks, 120,000 fewer jobs were created. This is a bad idea.

In Sacramento County, my home community, thousands of employees of the VA, Department of the Interior, and other agencies were threatened. This hurts American families.

It doesn't have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. We could come together, put together a budget, keep the government open, and get people back to work. That is what we are sent here to do.

Let's work together, Democrats and Republicans. Let's avoid a government shutdown, and let's put America back to work.

DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleague Representative RYAN COSTELLO in celebrating the life of and remembering DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

If you have a Deka battery in your car, your motorcycle, or tractor, it is the offspring of a product manufactured by his company, East Penn Manufacturing, and developed by DeLight and his business partner, Karl Gasche.

DeLight started his business with his father at the age of 20. He and his father, DeLight, Sr., worked tirelessly, both at their small company and at part-time jobs, to help make ends meet. Through their tenacious talent, DeLight grew a business that now employs over 7,000 people in Berks County, Pennsylvania, and beyond.

I just wanted to say it was an honor for me to know this great man. He drove me around his battery empire. He showed me his farmhouse, and I said: "How did this business begin, DeLight?"

He said: "Well, my father sent me out in the backyard to fix the battery in the tractor."

I said: "DeLight, I am just glad he didn't send you out there to go shovel manure. We would have a fertilizer empire right here in this community."

Nevertheless, he was an extraordinary man, generous, kind, caring. He supported universities—like Moravian College—Lehigh Valley Hospital, and so many other charities.

I wanted to pay tribute to the life and memory of DeLight Breidegam, Jr.

AIR FORCE CELEBRATES 68TH ANNIVERSARY

(Ms. GRAHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, this week, we are celebrating a very special birthday; the United States Air Force is turning 68.

The anniversary is especially important to me because of the men and women I represent at Tyndall Air Force Base in Panama City.

Since my election to Congress, I have gotten to know a great many of them, from three star generals to newly enlisted airmen, and I could not be prouder of their service to our Nation.

Today, the F-22 Raptor from Tyndall's 95th Fighter Squadron are deployed in Europe, supporting the NATO Baltic air patrol mission.

On this momentous anniversary, our grateful Nation says thank you to the 95th Fighter Squadron and all the men and women serving in the United States Air Force around the world.

Aim high. Fly, fight, win.

□ 1230

HONORING DELIGHT BREIDEGAM, JR.

(Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with my colleague Mr. DENT to thank and honor a Berks County innovator for his leadership and dedication to the community.

Mr. Speaker, DeLight Breidegam, Jr., passed away last week at the age of 88.

He was cofounder and chairman emeritus of East Penn Manufacturing. Under his leadership, East Penn grew to be Berks County's second largest employer.

The company is nothing short of an American success story. East Penn began as a dream of the Breidegam family following World War II. DeLight frequently cited the shortage of batteries during the war as the spark to start the business. Along with his father, they soon started their battery business in a small, one-room creamery. Since then, the Breidegam family has been committed to producing batteries.

I had the good fortune to meet with DeLight about a month ago. The value that he placed on his employees was palpable in speaking with him. I must say that it is a very, very special thing when you hear someone speak about their employees in the way that he spoke so lovingly of his, still calling and speaking with them every single day.

He will be missed. He is a tremendous, tremendous asset, as is his company, to the Berks County community; and while we are sad for his passing, Mr. DENT and I wish to recognize him for all his great and positive accomplishments in the community.

LET'S WORK ON KEEPING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT OPEN

(Mr. POLIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, we are 2 weeks away from a shutdown of the Federal Government. What does that mean for communities like the one I represent in Colorado? Our Federal labs funding Federal research, funding for our universities, our national parks.

When you hear about something like our national parks closing, many people think, okay, maybe it means I delay our vacation. What does it mean to the thousands of people who live in Estes Park and our communities in Grand County, supported almost entirely by Rocky Mountain National Park, which millions of Americans enjoy every year? If they curtail their season by several weeks, they can't afford the rent for their store and can't afford to put their kids through college.

I also want to draw attention to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. After 50 years as one of our country's most successful recreation and conservation programs, funding needs to be reauthorized by September 30 or it could be lost forever.

There are so many things we could be discussing with only 14 days until a government shutdown. Instead, this body is about to go into debating two bills which the President will veto

which don't fund a single thing with regards to keeping the Federal Government open.

Let's focus on what we need to do. Let's get to work. Let's make sure we can grow our economy and keep the Federal Government open.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 17, 2015.
Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 17, 2015 at 9:05 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 70.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 73.

That the Senate agreed to without amendment H. Con. Res. 74.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 420 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 420

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of

Rules Committee Print 114-26. That amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on House Resolution 420 currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, where are the jobs? The question resonates throughout our Nation. It is the driving force behind every solution the Republican majority has offered to this body and every solution this administration has rejected.

I am pleased to bring forward this rule on behalf of the Committee on Rules. This rule provides for consideration of H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, and H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015.

The Committee on Rules met on this measure yesterday evening and heard testimony from a Republican member of the Committee on the Judiciary and two Democratic members of the Committee on the Judiciary. The Committee on Rules solicited amendments for both these measures, but no amendments were submitted for the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, making the rule closed. There were 11 amendments submitted for the RAPID Act by both Republican and Democratic Members. This rule makes 10 of those in order. Let me repeat that: 11 amendments submitted, and 10 of those amendments are on the floor. Both the RAPID Act and the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act went through regular order in the Committee on the Judiciary, including robust amendment debate.

This rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary for each piece of legislation.

I appreciate the hard work of the Committee on the Judiciary chairman, Mr. BOB GOODLATTE, and his full committee and subcommittee staffs in bringing forward these key reforms. It would take more than 60 minutes to list all the ways Republicans have worked to encourage economic growth and create jobs in the 114th Congress. We have worked tirelessly to pass litigation reforms that would promote access to court and ensure the cost of litigation isn't being used to force settlements.

I am a proud cosponsor of the RAPID Act because men and women across the Nation are ready to go back to work. Republicans are committed to giving job creators the confidence to take projects off the drawing board and onto the worksite.

A 2012 U.S. Chamber of Commerce study of proposed projects in just one sector of the economy, the energy sector, found that if a modest number of these projects were allowed to move forward and begin construction, the direct and indirect economic benefits would be tremendous—hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars annually.

Hundreds of thousands of jobs and billions of dollars are in the pipeline, and Republicans believe we should streamline the approval process so that

these projects are either approved or denied, not left languishing year after year after year.

Americans need jobs now. They have bills to pay and families to feed. The RAPID Act is one of a number of solutions offered by House Republicans that would break down unnecessary Federal barriers and allow employers to break ground on the projects that offer Americans jobs and economic growth.

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, NEPA, was designed for an important purpose, one that should be preserved. The Committee on the Judiciary has done important work exploring the original goals of NEPA and hearing from experts in the field and academic scholars. The facts are clear: The NEPA process we have today is far removed from what the authors intended. It is normal for the review process to take years and years, and in some cases over a decade. Imagine how the world has changed in the past 10 years. It is absolutely mind-boggling that a review process for any project would take a decade.

We live in a world where technology has made the impossible possible. There is no excuse for relying on old methods or overly complex regulatory frameworks. It is time for Federal regulators to stop tying up capital and prioritizing endless paper pushing over job creation.

We can do better as a nation. Our economy and our families depend on us doing better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 348, the RAPID Act, is an attempt to limit flexibility and eliminate the public's role in environmental review and decisionmaking processes. H.R. 758 would force judges to impose sanctions against any claim that appears to lack support or involve a novel legal theory.

These are no doubt important issues to debate and discuss, and we will have that time on the floor, but I want to address what this body is failing to address. Though the subject matter of these two bills couldn't be different, neither one of them relates to the fact that we are 6 legislative days before a job-killing, money-wasting shutdown of government.

Now, when we hear 6 legislative days, let me translate that for normal days that Americans have. That is actually 14 days. We are 14 days until we risk the government shutting down. Of the next 14 days, Congress is only scheduled to work 6. Now, by the way, we should thank Pope Francis for that, because before Pope Francis scheduled his visit, Congress was scheduled to work 4 of the next 14 days.

Now, if everything were going wonderfully and this body was a model of keeping the government open and fulfilling its responsibilities, I think the American people would say: "Well, guess what, Congress. You deserve a vacation." But that is not what I hear from my constituents. They are not saying that we should be on vacation 8 out of the next 14 days when we are facing a government shutdown.

Not only are we facing a government shutdown now, but we are 76 days after the expiration of the Export-Import Bank, which already has lost at least 500 jobs here in our country. We are 41 days until authorizing legislation to maintain our Federal highway systems expire. We have already passed that deadline twice and done short-term extensions.

In my August townhall meetings—and I had a number of them across the district—I do not recall any of my constituents telling me their family's top concerns are we start eliminating environmental reviews and public health standards.

While we are wasting unconscionable time on issues when we are only 6 legislative days or 14 real days from a shutdown, we wonder why this body is losing popularity every day among the American public and will continue to.

To my friends across the aisle, I want to work with you. My Democratic colleagues want to work with you. We want to work to avoid a government shutdown. We want to work with you to reauthorize the Federal highway bill.

These are not Democratic or Republican principles. Both parties believe in a Federal Government; both parties believe in highways and investment in infrastructure. So let's do that. I think we should do that all 14 days, or at least 12 of the next 14 days rather than 6, but at least let's get to work and do it.

I think we share many of the same domestic and foreign policy interests, and hopefully we can agree upon our priorities. The average American family in my district and across our country has no interest in grandstanding on display. They have no desire to send their hard-earned dollars in taxes to a body that continues to govern crisis by crisis, sometimes after the fact.

□ 1245

So I implore my colleagues to use the next 14 days—or, if they want to take 8 of them off, 6 days—to consider the threat we are facing and the hardship a shutdown would cause in districts like mine that rely on two major universities to receive Federal funding; Federal labs; national parks that support countless local businesses that would close if the Federal Government is closed; the Centers for Disease Control, with a strong presence in Fort Collins; and the many other secondary and ter-

tiary effects that a Federal shutdown would have.

Let's find a way to avert it. There is still time. Let's not wait until it is 2 days or 1 day or zero days or negative 1 day or just hours remaining on the countdown clock. Let's pass a bipartisan bill to fund government. Let's reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Let's make a long-term commitment to our Federal highway system and infrastructure to keep our economy growing.

After we fulfill these basic needs, these self-created crises that Congress is presented, then let's have a discussion about limitation of irregular lawsuits or eradication of environmental reviews on public projects. We can have our disagreements. We can debate them. But let's get our priorities right. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we just got back after spending time in our districts, and I know, in my case, one of the reasons that we are back today dealing with regulatory issues is just a couple of examples that just continue to come up in conversations.

There were always questions about, frankly, what are we doing in Washington, what are we not doing in Washington, but there was a common theme when I went to small business, factories, and when we do roundtables. The common theme was: Why is Washington constantly keeping me from doing what I can do or need to do in my business? Why are we continuing to get regulation after regulation after regulation that keep us from expanding our business?

I had a businessowner tell us in a roundtable that right now there were several businesses he knew that would be willing to hire upwards of 20, 30, 40 folks, but right now they are bound by the caps that they find under the healthcare law. They don't want to go over a certain number—that magic 49. They don't want to get involved in other areas that are keeping them constricted to this point.

So when we look at these packages of bills that we are looking at, frankly, we are looking at everyday moms and dads; we are looking at businessowners; we are looking at the folks who are the economic engines of the United States; and we are saying the government should not be the inhibitor of your company. The government should not be the part that is stopping you from creating jobs, from getting that next big idea, from having that next product that hits the market that takes us to that different level or hiring that next person who has that spark, that creative energy to say: "Here's the next idea that changes even how we are here today."

So when we deal with this and we look at it, the question really is: What

drives jobs? The House majority, the Republican majority, constantly has looked at what it means to be an entrepreneur and to have people that you employ. What does it mean? It means giving someone a chance.

This summer, I had the awesome fun or joy, if you will, of watching my son get his first job. He started to work at a grocery store, and I can remember at first he was all excited. He went through all the process and he got that job. The best day was when he actually came home after working and he was tired, but yet it was payday. He came in and he looked at me and he said: "Dad, I got my paycheck."

And for a moment, regardless of how much that check was—this is not a story about seeing taxes for the first time; my son has lived in my house and he understands the burden of taxes, so it was not any of that—it was just the joy in his eyes that someone had given him a job and that he went to work. It was that pride of having money that he could spend. There is a new person in the economic engine.

That is why we continue to bring these bills forward, so that government can be out of the way and be its proper role, not the roadblock to job creation. When we do that, then the people of the United States can look at this House Republican majority and know our best interests are with those who get up every day looking to make life just a little bit better.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I first would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado for the time to speak on this important issue.

I rise today in opposition to the previous question in order to give House Members an opportunity to vote on reauthorizing the charter of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, it is well past time to end the ideologically driven shutdown of the Export-Import Bank that has prohibited this critical agency from continuing to support United States businesses and their workers.

For almost 2 years, Democrats have been sounding the alarm that a shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank would be devastating for American businesses and their workers. Since Republicans in Congress let the Bank's charter expire in June, companies around the country have been preparing to lay off employees, and many have stopped expansion plans because they now lack the critical financing tools that Ex-Im provides.

In fact, just last week, General Electric announced that, due to the GOP shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank, more than 500 jobs will be shipped to places like France and China. Last month, Boeing told its workers that it expected to cut as many as several hundred jobs at its southern California-based satellite factory after a multi-million-dollar contract was scuttled due to uncertainty about the future of the Export-Import Bank.

Republican obstructionism is also having a direct impact on countless small businesses around this country, many of which are set to lose their Ex-Im-backed insurance policies in the coming weeks.

Mr. Speaker, a majority of this House supports reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, but if we don't give Members the opportunity to vote up or down on reopening the Bank's doors today, the self-inflicted shutdown of the Ex-Im Bank may continue for months on end.

If that scenario plays out, the damage to our businesses, their workers, and our economy will only get worse. The consequences for average taxpayers would get worse as well. Because the Bank generates income through fees it charges for its services, failure to reauthorize the Bank means throwing away billions of dollars that would otherwise be transferred to hard-working American taxpayers. Accordingly, we should reauthorize the Bank. If we did, we could raise billions of dollars in profit for U.S. taxpayers over the coming years. The House should take a position.

Mr. Speaker and Members, we have too many Republicans, our friends on the opposite side of the aisle, claim they support small businesses. They want to do everything that they can to get rid of the regulatory obstacles to small businesses being able to grow and expand. They talk about this with community banks. They talk about this with all kinds of businesses. But look what they are doing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. They have absolutely stood in the way of reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

And where does that place this country? It places us in a position where we

cannot compete with other countries who fully support the export opportunity. So I would ask my colleagues to please vote on this bill at this time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK), a leader in the effort to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. HECK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we might indeed take up legislation to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Because I think the gentleman from Georgia has it exactly right, the question before this Chamber, before this Congress, before the President, before the American people is: Where are the jobs?

Now we know where the jobs, in part, have come from over the last 8 years. In fact, about 1.5 million of them have come through the activity of the Export-Import Bank, where they supported \$200 billion in exports spread out across 7,300 companies. And we know where the jobs have not come from since July 1, when the charter of the Export-Import Bank expired, at which time there were 116 deals frozen, constituting \$9.3 billion in activity.

Who were they?

Norwest Ingredients is a company in my home State that sells mint flavoring for the manufacturers of candy and oral care. The company currently employs about a dozen employees. It is a small business.

Without Ex-Im, many small businesses like Norwest aren't going to be able to extend terms to foreign buyers, and they will have to ask for cash in advance. When they do, they will lose their business to other countries who have export credit authorities.

By way of reminder, every single developed nation on the face of the Earth has an export credit authority right now, except the United States of America.

Combustion Associates in California, they spent 3 years closing a deal for a new power project in Nigeria that would generate \$39 million in revenue and create 30 new American jobs. The deal is on hold, along with two other projects that would have been worth nearly \$50 million in revenue and 100 jobs.

GE, the gentlewoman from California shared the sad news of the 500 jobs that are leaving these shores as a consequence of our failure to reauthorize the Ex-Im.

Digital Check, an Illinois company, sells check scanning equipment to clients in nearly 100 countries. Tom Anderson is the family-run company's chief executive. He says: We're losing now a quarter million in sales in British markets and around \$300,000 in India. And that half-million-dollar hit is causing the company to reevaluate

whether they will suspend, altogether, their scanner leasing services.

FirmGreen—Steve Wilburn, president of FirmGreen and, I might add, a proud and highly decorated marine—laid off 10 of its 17 employees last year because the company lost \$60 million in contracts during our latest period of uncertainty.

They are now, right as we speak, right as we are attempting to answer the question of where are the jobs, competing for a \$300 million project in the Philippines, and it hinges on securing export credit financing from the Ex-Im. Without it, that business is going to likely go to a South Korean rival and, with it, the 400 jobs he would have added.

Boeing, again, the gentlewoman made mention of layoffs in El Segundo, California. That was not the first but the second satellite sale to a foreign company and country that we lost as a consequence of the uncertainty surrounding the Export-Import Bank.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HECK of Washington. The outgoing CEO, Mr. MCNERNEY, said: "We never would have considered that before this craziness on Ex-Im. We love making and designing airplanes in the U.S. We are now forced to think about doing it differently."

Ladies and gentlemen of the House, we have now moved beyond the theoretical and the abstract. We are now in the phase of this debate where real people with real jobs and real families are losing their livelihood. The question is right: Where are the jobs? The answer is: In reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Defeat the previous question so that we might do what a majority of this body wants to do, which is continue to compete in a global economy.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the will of the majority is being thwarted in this House, the people's House. Mr. BOEHNER, our Speaker, said when he took his office as Speaker that the House worked best when the House was allowed to work its will. Mr. Speaker, let the House work its will.

□ 1300

We are about to take a vote on whether this House should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands—thousands—of jobs that Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in

America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets—in other words, making goods here with American workers and selling them abroad. That is what we need to be doing. The Export-Import Bank facilitates that happening. It has over 300 votes out of 435 on this floor, but we cannot vote if it is not brought to the floor.

When the Speaker and majority leader allowed the Bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass and will pass with strong, bipartisan support if brought to the floor. Now, we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, to some of my colleagues who may be new, that voting down this rule, defeating the previous question is a vote to open the Export-Import Bank.

Now, I know some of you will say: Well, it is a procedural vote. My party makes me do this.

Well, if you have that answer, look in the eye those who are losing their jobs and say: I had to do this for my party, not my country, not the competitiveness of America, not for American jobs, not for American businesses, but I voted for the previous question for my party.

Sometimes, my friends, party demands too much. When you raise your hand, it is to defend the Constitution and laws thereof, but in a real sense, it is to defend and make America better.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Let me repeat that. That is Tom Donohue, president of the Chamber of Commerce. The Republican Party used to be a party of business, the party that wanted to grow jobs. We talk about that all the time.

Well, my friends on the Republican side of the aisle, you have an opportunity to do that on this upcoming vote. Don't do as Tom Donohue today said you might do, a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, General Electric announced it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure of this Congress to pass the Export-Import Bank reauthorization. There are over 300 votes for that on this floor.

The American people think we are dysfunctional. They are right. They don't trust us because they don't think their board of directors is doing the job they sent us here to do. They are right. They are angry. They are anxious.

Let us for once, this day—we haven't funded the government yet; hopefully,

we will get that done—but at least this day, given the opportunity on this previous question, say that we are going to make America competitive and we are not going to unilaterally disarm.

This is something the Business Roundtable wants us to do. It is something the Chamber of Commerce wants us to do. It is something the National Association of Manufacturers wants us to do. It is something that organized labor wants us to do.

In the face of unity of purpose, in the face of a majority of votes on this floor, party regularity still says: Tough. Tough. Yes, there may be 300 votes on this bill, but we are not going to allow it to come to the floor.

Ladies and gentlemen in your offices or on this floor, America expects you to do better. America expects you to be responsible. America does not want you to be simply partisan. America does not want you to be cowed by a small minority of this House and by radical groups outside this House who threaten Members they will spend a million or \$2 million or \$3 million to defeat them in a primary.

America wants us to do the right thing. America wants us to have the courage of our convictions. America expects this House to reflect the majority opinion, not be dictated to by a small minority.

Mr. Speaker, allow your Members to vote against the previous question. If you do so, we will bring to this floor the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank; and, ladies and gentlemen of this House—and all Americans ought to know as well—it will pass.

Bring the Export-Import Bank bill reauthorization to this floor so America can continue to be competitive and create jobs here in America. That is what our constituents want us to do.

Vote against the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, we are about to take a vote on whether this house should move to reopen the Export-Import Bank and save thousands of jobs that even Speaker BOEHNER has admitted will be lost without our action.

The Export-Import Bank is a critical tool that supports job creation here in America by helping American businesses compete in foreign markets.

When the speaker and majority leader allowed the bank's authorization to expire in June, they did so with the full knowledge that a reauthorization has the votes to pass—and will pass with strong bipartisan support—if brought to the floor.

Now we have a chance to defeat the previous question and bring that bill to the floor today.

Let's end the uncertainty that has already caused businesses to hold back investment in job creation and to move American jobs overseas.

Let's refuse to engage in what Chamber of Commerce CEO Tom Donohue today called a "unilateral disarmament in the face of other governments' far more aggressive export credit agencies."

Last week, general electric announced that it would be moving 500 jobs from New York, Texas, South Carolina, and Maine to Europe and China because of the failure to keep the export-import bank open.

Congress has a responsibility to help grow jobs here—not send them overseas.

It's time to reopen the export-import bank.

Defeat this previous question.

Bring the export-import bank up for a vote.

And let's complete the task that America's workers and their employers have asked us to do for months.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of my friend: Do you have any more speakers? Or are you prepared to close?

Mr. POLIS. We have a lot of Democrats that want to talk about keeping government open. I hear no Republicans here.

With good respect to my friend from Georgia, where are the Republican ideas to keep government open?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Well, I am trying to get an answer to a question. That means you do not have any more speakers on this. Are you ready to close?

Mr. POLIS. We are ready to use all of our time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the Speaker how much time remains on both sides?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado has 9½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Georgia has 23 minutes remaining.

Mr. POLIS. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if he plans to use his 23 minutes?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. That is why I was asking the gentleman from Colorado if he is prepared to close. I have no other speakers.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I will use our 9 minutes. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, shortly, I will be offering an amendment to the rule. The amendment will waive the two-thirds requirement to consider a rule on the same day as reported from the Rules Committee on the legislative days of September 24 and September 25, 2015.

This will provide the flexibility necessary during the Pope's visit to ensure the House completes its business on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Again, I think it is clear. We have had many Democrats coming to the floor talking about what we should be doing. I think the gentleman from Georgia might be the only Republican in the Chamber. Maybe there is one other in the back. I don't have my glasses on.

We have a lot of ideas for keeping government open. Mainly, let's pass a

continuing resolution to do it now. Let's work more than 6 days out of the next 14. Let's stay here until we can keep government open, until we can reauthorize the transportation and infrastructure bill.

It sounds obvious to me; yet there just didn't seem to be any interest from the other side. No Republicans have approached me about keeping government open. I hope you do, Mr. Speaker. I hope you encourage your colleagues to. There is no one here in the Chamber talking about what we can do to avoid a job-crushing government shutdown, which we are 14 days away from.

Instead, we are talking about unrelated bills. Now, I don't deny that these bills deserve their day in the sun. I just question whether, when we are 6 legislative days from a job-crushing shutdown, it is the time to discuss whether we should amend requirements set out by the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, that would reduce the role of public input and turn the idea of NEPA on its head by eliminating any illusion of objective or scientific analysis by allowing private sponsors to write parts of their own environmental reviews.

Now, look, we can discuss that. I am strongly for reforming the NEPA process. As an example, if we can make it easier to site renewal energy projects, I am a sponsor of a bill to expedite the NEPA process for solar and wind infrastructure projects.

Look, there are people who support this terrible bill in its current form; I completely understand that, but this bill does nothing to avert a job-destroying government shutdown that we are only 6 legislative days from reaching.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned this, what we call a martial law amendment. With this amendment that he is proposing with this rule—we just got notice of it last minute here on the floor—he is offering an amendment that will allow any bill to be brought up under martial law next week.

Now, in honor of Pope Francis' visit, I hope that they have a bill that they plan to bring to the floor under martial law to reduce our carbon emissions and finally do something to impact climate change, which I hope that Pope Francis will be addressing.

I also hope that, under martial law, they will bring forward a bill to replace our broken immigration system with a humane system, with a pathway to citizenship that replaces the chaos we have, with the rule of law, border security, and a pathway to normalization and citizenship for hard-working, aspiring Americans who are already here.

Now, I am not going to bet the ship that that is what they are going to do with this martial law, but the fact of the matter is, from a process perspec-

tive, we—myself, my colleagues, and I think most of the Republican rank and file—simply don't know what they are going to do with that authority.

This is going around the normal rules of the House to establish a mechanism to avoid the normal process, avoid the normal process through Rules Committee and, through martial law, bring some sort of bill. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill. I don't think it is.

Based on what we are seeing this week, it will probably be some NEPA bill or some—I don't know—some other bill that doesn't avoid a government shutdown to the floor of the House.

Maybe it will be a bill that is a Republican funding bill that will have a Presidential veto threat over it. That doesn't avoid a shutdown. Remember, the only way we can avoid a shutdown is the House, the Senate, and the President of the United States are on the same page for legislation to avoid a government shutdown.

Let's give them the benefit of the doubt, and we will be back next week, and I will hold my criticism. I hope it is an immigration reform bill. I hope it is a climate change bill.

I hope we honor Pope Francis by bringing forward two of his top priorities in a week that is appropriate, and if that is the case, I will support martial law for those two efforts, and I hope that that is what we will do.

I will withhold judgment until we see what the Republicans attempt to do with this procedural bypass of our normal mechanisms that they have scheduled for next week.

Look, these are bad bills under this rule. They are bad bills today. They would be bad bills if they were appropriate to consider. I believe they are inappropriate to consider in light of a job-crushing government shutdown occurring in 6 legislative days.

The RAPID Act, which would turn the idea of NEPA on its head, is a one-size-fits-all approach. It is not the right approach to NEPA reform.

There are thoughtful, bipartisan ideas that we could put together after we avoid a government shutdown. I am happy to do that.

The LARA Act is even worse. Our country tried a similar framework to LARA in the eighties and early nineties, and there is broad consensus that the experiment failed. Instead of reducing lawsuits, there was an explosion of litigation, causing delays and wasting judicial resources. Why on earth are we giving these failed ideas a second try?

The LARA Act would have prevented landmark decisions like *Brown v. Board of Education*, which desegregated schools; *Griswold v. Connecticut*, which established constitutional protections for right to privacy; and *Loving v. Virginia*, which ended bans on interracial marriage.

Rather than "preventing abuse," this bill would actually promote civil rights

abuses and weaken the courts' ability to crack down on people who seek to discriminate illegally at work or school or at the voting booth, and Congress should not pass this bill, now or ever.

I think it is particularly offensive, when a job-crushing government shutdown is looming, to even be talking about these other items rather than discussing how we can avoid a job-crushing government shutdown.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I am clear. These issues we should discuss. Natural resources. The World Health Organization estimates that 2 million people a year are killed because of air pollution. But putting forth these bills now does nothing to eliminate or deal with a job-crushing government shutdown.

Over just 16 days in 2013, our country lost \$24 billion in economic growth, hundreds of thousands of Federal workers were furloughed, contractors and subcontractors were not paid. It is an avoidable scenario. It is a crisis created by Congress. We wonder why people don't like Congress. It is a crisis of our own making.

Why are we threatening the critical, everyday services Americans rely on, the millions of people that work for contractors and subcontractors of the Federal Government?

A small-R republic is a system of governance in which people exert influence over their elected officials, and those representatives are supposed to listen and act upon those requests.

We need to listen to the American people and take the responsible course, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to join me on this commonsense mission before it is too late.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule and the underlying legislation. We need to reinstate a legislative agenda that aligns with the desires and wills and aspirations of the American people and American businesses.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear, just to clear up a couple of things here. One, let me be clear that nothing in this rule or the amendment waives the normal Rules Committee hearing process.

It simply provides us with the flexibility to consider bills on the floor sooner while the Pope is here. It does nothing to waive the normal committee process for bills that should go to Rules, just to clear up that.

I do appreciate the gentleman from Colorado's concern about our speakers and the fact that he was counting today. I was glad to see that he had three people come to speak on the rule that had nothing to do with the bills in the underlying rule. So that was pretty impressive.

I will stand with one person speaking on the rules and the truth of the fact that regulatory burden has a crushing role on business. I will stand, one, by myself all day.

And then in just a few hours, when we discuss this in the debate process, we will have plenty of people to discuss the actual bills themselves.

So let me close up by talking about what we are here for. My friends across the aisle want to portray House Republicans as being against things and against people.

Yes, it is true we have said “no” to bad policies and priorities of the administration. We have refused to turn a blind eye to those who exploit our legal system.

We have said “no” to the Federal regulators who are indefinitely delaying projects that would put Americans back to work.

We have said “no” to the tax more, spend more, save less, Big Government, job-killing machine that is crushing the American spirit and our economic growth.

But this majority says “yes” to solid, principled legislation that protects Americans’ personal and economic liberties. Later today, we will say “yes” to life.

We will vote to protect the babies born alive despite the efforts to abort them. Regardless of the circumstances in which a baby is born alive, they are a person just like you or I. To fail to recognize their humanity is to deny our own.

This House majority says “yes” to fiscal responsibility, “yes” to the commonsense principle that our Nation should have a budget and actually stick to it.

We say “yes” to responsible oversight efforts because we understand, as our Founding Fathers did, that Americans’ rights and liberties are only safe while the Federal Government is held within the bounds of the Constitution.

We say “yes” to free market principles because we recognize that economic growth is rooted in the ingenuity of America’s entrepreneurs, not government programs.

We have replaced government with growth and regulations with reform. We have restored transparency and trust. We have given our Nation reason to believe that one day our children won’t be looking for a job because government has crushed them. They will be creating jobs.

House Republicans have heard the cries of the American people, and today, tomorrow, and every day to come we will continue to fight for them. We will fight so that they can realize their hopes, their dreams, and their ambitions.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS OF
GEORGIA

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. The requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII for a two-thirds vote to consider a report from the Committee on Rules on the same day it is presented to the House is waived with respect to any resolution reported on the legislative day of September 24, 2015, or September 25, 2015.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, does this amendment to the rule mean that Members of this body will have less than 24 hours to review any bill we consider next week?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the meaning of the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe the meaning is very straightforward. That is exactly what it means.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 420 OFFERED BY
MR. POLIS OF COLORADO

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1031) to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1031.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon’s Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker’s ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here’s how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler’s Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority’s agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 421 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 421

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon passage of H.R. 3134 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 764 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3134, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 4. Upon passage of H.R. 3504 the House shall be considered to have: (1) stricken all after the enacting clause of S. 1603 and inserted in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 3504, as passed by the House; and (2) passed the Senate bill as so amended.

SEC. 5. House Resolution 408 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentlewoman from North Carolina is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, House Resolution 421 provides closed rules for consideration of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, and H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

Today, Madam Speaker, we provide for consideration of two vital pieces of legislation addressing one of the most important issues of our time.

On many previous occasions, my colleagues and I have spoken on the issue of abortion and the tragedy it is that unborn children are not safe and protected.

We are not here today, though, debating the policy of abortion on-demand. We are debating specific legislative reactions to horrific wrongs that have come to light: the deliberate dismemberment of unborn children to receive compensation for their organs and other body parts and the failure of abortion facilities to care for children born alive during failed abortions. Even some who support elective abortion agree that those practices are barbaric and must be stopped.

The horrific reality of these practices in the abortion industry have become clear over the past few months, as undercover videos have been released of Planned Parenthood's leaders and affiliates discussing painstakingly dismembering unborn children for compensation.

In these days of 3-D ultrasounds and high-definition screens, it is impossible to hide the humanity of these child victims. They have fingers and toes, heartbeats, and organs developed enough that tissue collectors will pay \$60 a specimen for them.

In light of the serious questions raised by these videos, the House Committees on Energy and Commerce, Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform have each launched investigations.

While Planned Parenthood does not receive direct Federal funding for abortions, these investigations are warranted, as a recent report from the Government Accountability Office shows that the organization receives an average of \$500 million taxpayer dollars each year for other lines of business. Money is fungible, and the Fed-

eral funds that Planned Parenthood receives ultimately subsidize their abortion services.

Given the serious allegations that have been raised about Planned Parenthood's abortion practices related to the procurement and sale of tissue and organs from aborted, unborn children, it is appropriate for Congress to pass H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, placing a 1-year moratorium on all Federal funds while Congress conducts its investigation.

No organization that performs divisive practices like abortion, particularly in such a gruesome, profitable manner, should receive taxpayer dollars, and this legislation advances that principle.

In addition, the examples of Kermit Gosnell's convictions for murdering children born alive at his house of horrors and separate reports of unborn children may have been born alive or "intact" prior to being sold to tissue collectors have exposed the need for strengthening the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act.

The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which became law in 2002, extended critical legal protections to babies who are born alive after a failed abortion attempt. That bill passed the House Judiciary Committee with only two dissenting votes and was passed by the Senate by unanimous consent.

The legislation before us today, H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, goes one step further to protect these vulnerable lives by requiring healthcare practitioners present at the time of birth to administer professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child.

This small, but important, step ensures the protection and preservation of precious, newborn life by providing for criminal penalties when that life is lost as a result of negligence.

These tiny, precious, vulnerable lives deserve the protection afforded all other persons under the law, and this bill ensures that their lives are protected.

□ 1330

Madam Speaker, I commend this rule and both the underlying bills to my colleagues for their support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina, my good friend, Dr. Foxx, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in very strong opposition to H.R. 3134 and H.R. 3504 and in very strong opposition to the underlying closed rule.

Today, the House should be debating a bill to keep the government open before funding runs out at the end of the

month. We have just 6 legislative days before there is a government shut-down—6 legislative days—and instead of tackling this, we are once again debating another Republican attack on women's health.

In 6 legislative days, the government might shut down; and I am worried because, judging from recent events within the Republican caucus, the right hand doesn't know what the extreme right hand is doing. They can't seem to get along with each other, and I am afraid yet there will be another catastrophe and everything will come to a halt, and the people that will suffer will be the people of this country whom we are supposed to represent.

Madam Speaker, in fact, the Republicans were in such a hurry to waste our time with this destructive legislation that one of the bills we are considering, H.R. 3504, had no hearings—not one, none—no markup, and this is the first time we are seeing the bill—and no amendments, by the way. Nobody can offer an amendment. It is totally closed.

Whatever happened to regular order? This process, Madam Speaker, stinks, and it is indefensible.

Of all the measures that have come before the Rules Committee, more than 75 percent have completely ignored regular order and were rushed to the floor without a legislative hearing and markup, denying the people's elected representatives the opportunity to hear the experts and speak up for their constituents. Well, when you look at the politically motivated legislation that regularly comes before this body, I guess it is easy to see why. This is not how the people's House is supposed to work.

Late last night, the Republican majority of the Rules Committee took another shortcut through a process called self-executing that let them slip an amendment offered by Mrs. ELLMERS into today's legislation to redirect funding away from Planned Parenthood facilities. Under regular order, this amendment would have required three waivers—three. It would require three waivers from the committee to be considered on the House floor.

On top of that, the Ellmers amendment would have also violated section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act, which prohibits the consideration of legislation that exceeds a committee's allocation of budget authority. But the Republican-controlled Rules Committee said: Who cares? We are in charge. We don't care about the rules. We don't want to be fair. We don't want to be open. We don't want to be transparent. We are in charge, and we can do whatever we want.

Madam Speaker, this is just another attempt by the House majority to shut out debate on important issues and ignore the House rules when it is convenient for them. During this Congress

alone, 118 waivers have been granted; 115 of those waivers, 97 percent, have been for Republicans. Instead of the House Rules Committee, we should be known as the House Break-the-Rules Committee, because that is all the Rules Committee seems to do. It breaks rules, goes around rules, and tries all kinds of trickery to be able to force legislation to the floor that limits debate and doesn't allow Members to offer amendments.

This legislative process in this House has become a joke. It is shameful, and this is not serious legislating.

With one bill after another, Republicans have repeatedly hurt our country's most vulnerable families, and these bills today are just the latest chapter. This is nothing new.

One of the first acts of the Republican House majority in 2011 was to drive us to the brink of a government shutdown over Planned Parenthood. In October 2013, Republicans did shut down the government by insisting on defunding the Affordable Care Act. Now, 2 years later, they are right back to threatening a Republican government shutdown over Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3134, the so-called Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, is a bad and a backward-thinking bill. In the 114th Congress, the House has already taken four anti-women's health votes and today sets the stage for us to take two additional votes to restrict women's access to women's health care. Incredibly, this is already twice the number of anti-women's health votes than at this same point in the 113th and 112th Congresses—and this Congress is not even half over.

In this Republican Congress, facts don't matter. We don't talk about facts. They are inconvenient and they are a nuisance—especially when they get in the way of their extremist political agenda.

The fact is that Planned Parenthood plays a critical role in protecting and providing access to critical health services for both women and men. One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, and Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million patients each year. One of the most important statistics that my Republican friends like to ignore is that more than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does nationally is preventive care, including cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and family planning—not abortion services.

I just came from a luncheon a few minutes ago where we were honoring individuals who were leaders in the cancer prevention field, people who have advocated that it is important for all of us to be able to get checkups on a regular basis in order to prevent cancer; and here we are about to vote on a bill that, if the Republicans get their

way, would limit and would eliminate access to lifesaving cancer screenings for countless individuals across this country.

What are you thinking? This is not the way we should be proceeding.

Add to this the fact that Planned Parenthood clinics are often one of the few affordable healthcare options available for many women—nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood clinics have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—and it is easy to see why a majority of Americans don't think Federal funding should be eliminated. In one recent poll, 63 percent of voters, including 72 percent of Independents, do not agree with my Republican friends that Federal funding for Planned Parenthood should be eliminated.

Madam Speaker, we have also heard very little from my friends on the other side of the aisle about the consequences that defunding for Planned Parenthood would have for families across the country. One of the biggest myths perpetrated by Republicans is the idea that our Nation's community health centers—which I love, adore, respect, and support—could somehow magically pick up the slack overnight if Planned Parenthood is defunded.

For the millions of low-income women who depend on Planned Parenthood clinics, this scenario would mean the loss of affordable and accessible contraceptive services and counseling, as well as breast and cervical cancer screenings and testing. The idea that our community health centers could, overnight, suddenly step up and cover millions of new patients is simply wrong and shows a fundamental misunderstanding by Republicans of how our country's healthcare system works.

In fact, the Guttmacher Institute recently found that, in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood health center, Planned Parenthood is the only safety net family planning provider. The report also states: "In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety net family planning center."

This makes clear just how devastating it would be for these communities to recklessly cut funding for these vital health services for the people who need them most.

Everyone here in this Congress, every single one of us, with the snap of our fingers, can get health care; but with today's bills, Republicans seem to be saying that for families who are poor or who live in rural areas or where this is the only option for preventive care where they live are simply out of luck. Talk about cruel.

Madam Speaker, I have a recent article from the Health Affairs Blog, titled, "Planned Parenthood, Community Health Centers, and Women's Health: Getting the Facts Right." It says: "a claim that community health centers readily can absorb the loss of Planned Parenthood clinics amounts to a gross misrepresentation of what even the best community health centers in the country would be able to do were Planned Parenthood to lose over 40 percent of its operating revenues overnight as the result of a ban on Federal funding."

I will enter the full article into the RECORD.

[From Health Affairs Blog, Sept. 8, 2015]

QUANTIFYING PLANNED PARENTHOOD'S CRITICAL ROLE IN MEETING THE NEED FOR PUBLICLY SUPPORTED CONTRACEPTIVE CARE

(By Jennifer Frost)

Over the past few months, legislative attempts to defund Planned Parenthood have flared at both the federal and state levels; these moves are clearly an attempt to shutter Planned Parenthood health centers, potentially depriving women of the contraceptive services and counseling, sexually transmitted infection (STI) testing and treatment, and breast and cervical cancer screening that they provide.

Although proponents of closing Planned Parenthood argue that other providers would be easily able to fill the hole torn in the safety net, credible evidence suggests this is unlikely. In some areas, Planned Parenthood is the sole safety-net provider of contraceptive care. And even where there are other safety-net providers, they, on average, serve far fewer contraceptive clients than do sites operated by Planned Parenthood.

As this debate swirls, the Guttmacher Institute received a request from the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) regarding the publicly supported contraceptive care provided by Planned Parenthood health centers across the country. To respond, Guttmacher staff conducted special tabulations of our Contraceptive Needs and Services 2010 report (the most recent year for which these data are available).

Our analysis shows unequivocally that Planned Parenthood plays a major role in delivering publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies to women who are in need of such care nationwide. In two-thirds of the 491 counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood health centers serve at least half of all women obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers. In one-fifth of the counties in which they are located, Planned Parenthood sites are the sole safety-net family planning center.

Further, the average Planned Parenthood health center serves significantly more contraceptive clients each year than do safety-net centers run by other types of providers, such as federally qualified health centers (FQHCs) or county health departments. As a result, Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than any other type of provider. And, Planned Parenthood sites are more likely to make contraceptive care quickly and easily accessible to the women who need it.

CONTRACEPTIVE CARE BY THE NUMBERS

Below are the key takeaways from Guttmacher's findings related to Planned Parenthood's provision of publicly supported contraceptive care.

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a considerable proportion of all clients obtaining contraceptive care from safety-net health centers.

In 2010, 36 percent of the 6.7 million U.S. women receiving contraceptive care from safety-net family planning health centers were served at Planned Parenthood centers. And there are some areas of the country where women rely particularly heavily on Planned Parenthood: In 18 states, Planned Parenthood health centers serve more than 40 percent of women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net family planning health center. In 11 of those 18 states, Planned Parenthood serves more than half the women obtaining contraceptive care from a safety-net health center.

Planned Parenthood health centers often serve most or all of the safety-net contraceptive clients in their county.

In 68 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (332 counties out of 491), these sites serve at least half the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center. And in 21 percent of counties with a Planned Parenthood site (103 counties), Planned Parenthood serves all of the women obtaining publicly supported contraceptive services from a safety-net health center.

The majority of women who need publicly supported contraceptive care live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center.

Almost two-thirds (64 percent) of the 19 million women in need of publicly supported contraceptive services and supplies live in counties with a Planned Parenthood health center. Moreover, 30 percent of these women live in counties where Planned Parenthood serves the majority of those obtaining publicly supported contraceptive care from the family planning safety net. (Women are considered to be in need of publicly supported contraception if they have ever had sex; are aged 13-44; are able to become pregnant; are not pregnant, postpartum, nor trying to become pregnant; and either have a family income below 250 percent of the federal poverty level or are younger than age 20.)

Planned Parenthood health centers serve a greater share of safety-net contraceptive clients than do any other types of providers.

Although Planned Parenthood health centers comprise 10 percent of publicly supported safety-net family planning centers, they serve 36 percent of clients who obtain publicly supported contraceptive services from such centers. By contrast, centers operated by health departments serve 27 percent of safety-net contraceptive clients, FQHCs serve 16 percent, sites operated by hospitals serve 8 percent, and sites operated by other agencies serve 13 percent.

On average, Planned Parenthood health centers serve many more contraceptive clients per year than do other types of safety-net providers. Planned Parenthood health centers serve an average of 2,950 contraceptive clients per year, many times more than any other type of publicly supported health center. By contrast, those operated by hospitals serve an average of 770 contraceptive clients, health departments serve an average of 750, FQHCs serve 330, and centers operated by other types of agencies serve 680 contraceptive clients each year.

Planned Parenthood health centers are more likely to facilitate women's timely access to a wide range of contraceptive services and supplies.

Planned Parenthood sites are considerably more likely to offer a broad range of contraceptive methods than sites operated by other

types of agencies. Specifically, 91 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer at least 10 of 13 reversible contraceptive methods, compared to between 48 percent and 53 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies.

Moreover, Planned Parenthood sites are particularly likely to help women who choose oral contraceptives to get their pills without having to make an additional trip to a pharmacy: 92 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer oral contraceptive supplies and refills on-site, as do 86 percent of health department sites. Considerably smaller proportions of sites operated by FQHCs and other types of agencies—37 percent and 55 percent, respectively—do so.

Finally, women are often able to get the care they need more quickly from Planned Parenthood than from other types of safety-net providers. Sixty-three percent of Planned Parenthood health centers offer same-day appointments, compared to between 30 percent and 40 percent of sites operated by other types of agencies. And the average wait for an appointment at a Planned Parenthood health center is 1.8 days, whereas wait times at sites operated by other types of agencies range from 5.3 to 6.8 days.

LOOKING AHEAD

We cannot predict whether or to what extent health centers operated by other providers could fill the significant gap in the family planning safety net that would be created if Planned Parenthood health centers were defunded—and therefore lost to the communities they serve. Certainly in the short term, it is doubtful that other providers could step up in a timely way to absorb the millions of women suddenly left without their preferred source of care and whether those providers could offer the same degree of accessible, quality contraceptive care offered by Planned Parenthood. (Indeed, Texas offers a cautionary tale; the state's family planning program for low-income women served far fewer women after Planned Parenthood health centers were cut out of the effort.)

What we do know is that women nationwide rely on Planned Parenthood health centers for the contraceptive services and supplies they need—and for women in many areas of the country, losing Planned Parenthood would mean losing their chosen provider and the only safety-net provider around.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Here are some more facts.

For every patient served by a community health center today, nearly three residents of low-income communities remain without access to primary health care. By voting for a sudden cutoff in funding, we would create an immediate healthcare access crisis for millions of women, placing an enormous strain on community health centers and other providers.

Community health centers offer women's health services as part of comprehensive primary care programs. They simply cannot put their other responsibilities aside. With so many of our Nation's community health centers already struggling to meet the needs of our most vulnerable communities, the last thing we should be doing is trying to make their jobs harder.

Now, on top of all of this, Senator MCCONNELL has already said that Senate Republicans do not have the votes

to pass this bill and it will never reach the President's desk. So what are we doing here? This is not a rhetorical question. We are literally, as I said earlier, 6 legislative days away from another government shutdown; and instead of talking about how we are going to keep the doors open, how we are going to do what the people of the country have sent us here to do and keep government running, we are wasting time with this politically driven legislation that does nothing to make the country better.

Madam Speaker, the other bill before us, H.R. 3504, is not a simple restatement of the current born-alive law, by the way, which passed by a voice vote in 2002, no. Just so my colleagues understand, this bill fundamentally interferes with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and undermines doctors' clinical judgment and tells them how to provide medicine, or else they will face criminal penalties.

Madam Speaker, this bill is a solution in search of a problem. We already have strong Federal and State laws to protect babies born alive. The bottom line is that these anti-women's health bills would limit women's access to safe, legal, reproductive health care.

Congress should be governing responsibly and working to solve the real issues our country is facing. We should be focused on growing our economy and creating jobs. I think you may have forgotten that that is an important priority of the American people because my friends never like to mention the word "jobs."

But we ought to be focused on creating jobs. We ought to be protecting access to health care, increasing college affordability, and building a better future. Instead, 30 conservative House Republicans have decided to take government funding hostage, and that is what we are here for.

The American people deserve better.

Finally, let's be clear. Let's all kind of clear the air and be honest about one thing. The debate we are having today really isn't about the quality of care provided by Planned Parenthood. That is really not what is at the heart of all this. This is an effort by my friends on the Republican side to kind of pursue their agenda of criminalizing and outlawing abortion in every circumstance.

Many of my colleagues on the other side have been very vocal about the fact that they want to criminalize abortion, even in cases of rape or incest. They would make a woman who is a victim of rape or incest a criminal. They would criminalize the doctors. That is what this is all about, trying to force their narrow agenda down the throats of the American people.

I would say to my colleagues that we ought to reject this and get down to the business of governing this country. This is not what we should be doing here today. This is an insult, I think,

to women. This is an insult to the good people who work at Planned Parenthood who provide excellent care to millions of people across this country, and, quite frankly, it is an insult to the American people that, with 6 legislative days left before you shut the government down, this is what you choose to bring to the floor and not a bill to keep the government open.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, if my colleagues would like to use parliamentary terms like "regular order," "self-execute," or "waivers" to hide from debate over the gruesome practices of abortionists, that is their prerogative.

They ignore what one key Planned Parenthood abortionist said: "We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, so I'm not gonna crush that part. I'm gonna basically crush below, I'm gonna crush above, and I'm gonna see if I can get it all intact."

□ 1345

Republicans will continue to bring the truth to Americans and prevent taxpayer dollars from going to organizations that dismember children.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

Mr. BYRNE. Madam Speaker, by now, we have all seen the appalling videos which depict Planned Parenthood officials talking about how they crush babies in certain ways to preserve certain organs and then bargaining over the price of those organs.

I want to be crystal clear. The loss of any human life is a tragedy, but the casual nature in which the Planned Parenthood officials talk about killing a baby is simply heartbreaking and appalling. It is unconscionable that any American could be that cold and callous.

Let me tell you about the Planned Parenthood clinic in my hometown of Mobile, Alabama. They were cited by the Alabama Department of Health for performing two abortions on a 14-year-old girl in a span of 4 months without their complying with State laws that require the reporting of possible sexual abuse. This is the type of organization we are talking about.

Congress cannot simply sit on the sidelines and wait for someone else to respond. These egregious actions require a response.

Madam Speaker, I do not believe the Federal Government should be spending a single penny on Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3134 would make that a reality. I urge my colleagues to support this rule.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to say to my colleague from North Carolina that I am not hiding behind procedural rules.

In fact, in the way that my Republican friends have brought this bill to the floor, you won't allow us to debate amendments. We can't. You have stifled debate.

So I guess I would ask you: What are you afraid of? Why can't we have a more open process on legislation that didn't even go through the committees of jurisdiction? You ought to open this place up. A little debate is not a bad thing. A little openness is a good thing.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the report by the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Democratic members and staff, basically that refers to the heavily edited videos that my colleagues refer to.

I will just read one line here:

To date, the committee has received no evidence—underline "no evidence"—to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood is engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit.

Furthermore, the committee has received no evidence to support the allegation that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research.

Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates to ensure compliance with all State and Federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual cost.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
Washington, DC, September 9, 2015.

MEMORANDUM

To Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations Democratic Members and Staff
From Committee on Energy and Commerce Democratic Staff

Re Update on the Committee's Ongoing Investigation of Planned Parenthood Federation of America

I. INTRODUCTION

This memorandum serves as an update on the Committee's ongoing investigation into claims regarding the alleged sale of fetal tissue by affiliates of Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) to tissue procurement organizations (TPOs). The review has included bipartisan briefings by Planned Parenthood officials as well as representatives from StemExpress, Novogenix Laboratories, and Advanced Bioscience Resources—three TPOs that partner with Planned Parenthood affiliates and other healthcare providers to collect specimens to supply to researchers working with fetal tissue.

In addition to these briefings, the Committee has received documents and written responses to a series of questions it posed in writing to PPFA regarding its "practices relating to fetal tissue collection and sale or donation." To date, the Committee has received no evidence to substantiate the allegations that Planned Parenthood has engaged in the sale of fetal tissue for profit.

Furthermore, the Committee has received no evidence to support the allegations that fetal tissue was procured without consent, that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purposes of obtaining fetal tissue, or that Planned Parenthood physicians performed intact dilation and evacuation in order to preserve fetal tissue for research. Thus far, the investigation has revealed that PPFA requires all affiliates to ensure compliance with all state and federal laws and that specific PPFA guidance requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement for fetal tissue is limited to actual costs.

The Committee received evidence that the individuals making these unsubstantiated claims misrepresented themselves in order to gain access to Planned Parenthood personnel and facilities, and that the videos released by the Center for Medical Progress (CMP) are incomplete, selectively edited, and intentionally misleading.

II. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD OR ITS AFFILIATES HAVE VIOLATED ANY FEDERAL OR STATE LAWS

A. PPFA REQUIRES ALL AFFILIATES TO COMPLY WITH ALL STATE AND FEDERAL LAWS, INCLUDING LAWS PERTAINING TO THE DONATION OF FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

i. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Regarding Human Fetal Tissue Donation Specifically Advises That It Is Illegal to Receive “Valuable Consideration” for Fetal Tissue, and Requires Affiliates to Ensure that Reimbursement Represents Actual Costs

The NIH Revitalization Act of 1993 established the legal standards governing fetal tissue donation. The law states, “It shall be unlawful for any person to knowingly acquire, receive, or otherwise transfer any human fetal tissue for valuable consideration if the transfer affects interstate commerce.” The law further provides: “The term ‘valuable consideration’ does not include reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage of human fetal tissue.”

Current PPFA guidance on fetal tissue donation tracks federal law, and it clearly and explicitly prohibits affiliates from receiving valuable consideration for fetal tissue. The guidance also requires affiliates to ensure that reimbursement represents actual costs incurred by the affiliate. The current PPFA guidance, revised in May 2015, provides as follows:

Federal law prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is federally funded or not.

There are limited exceptions that allow reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue. If an affiliate chooses to accept reimbursement for allowable expenses, it must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs. PPFA recommends that an affiliate consult with CAPS [Consortium of Abortion Providers] about steps to take to document and demonstrate actual cost. [emphasis in the original]

The guidance also advises affiliates that “there are federal, and frequently, state laws that govern these activities, as well as ethical considerations. Great care must be taken to assure that these programs are above reproach in all respects.”

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Raegan McDonald-Mosley, the Chief Medical Officer of PPFA, explained that PPFA ac-

credits its affiliates. Affiliates are autonomous legal entities, with their own separate boards, executive personnel, and legal counsel.

Dr. McDonald-Mosley further described how PPFA oversees its affiliates and verifies their compliance with its fetal tissue donation guidance. Each affiliate is independently responsible for ensuring compliance with the guidance, as well as with all applicable state and federal laws.

PPFA oversees its affiliates through an accreditation process, whereby each affiliate is reviewed at least once every three years. Affiliates are evaluated on a range of hundreds of possible elements of performance, including, as of 2013, compliance with PPFA’s fetal tissue donation guidance. Accreditation involves both offsite reviews of affiliate documentation as well as onsite reviews that include interviews with staff and direct observation of patient care. Non-compliance with PPFA required standards may affect an affiliate’s accreditation status and result in actions that jeopardize that affiliate’s ability to continue to use the Planned Parenthood trademark.

Although the precise language of PPFA’s fetal tissue guidance has been revised over the years, affiliates have always been required to ensure that their tissue donation programs are in compliance with all state and federal laws, including the prohibition on receiving valuable consideration. For example, an earlier version of the guidance from 2001 provided to the Committee instructs affiliates that federal laws “forbid the payment or receipt of valuable consideration for fetal tissue. However, they permit ‘reasonable payments associated with the transportation, implantation, processing, preservation, quality control, or storage’ of fetal tissue.” This guidance was reissued to affiliates in 2011.

Several years ago, PPFA undertook an effort to revise their Manual of Medical Standards and Guidelines (the Manual) by removing those sections not directly related to clinical care. According to Dr. McDonald-Mosley, the Manual is a desk reference for clinicians for directing medical care. It is intended to assist practitioners in providing regular care for a patient and is revised on a two-year cycle. As a result of this revision effort, the fetal tissue guidance was separated from the Manual and is now a standalone document. It is distributed to affiliates through the PPFA intranet. Dr. Deborah Nucatola, who is PPFA’s Senior Director for Medical Services and has had primary responsibility for the Manual since July 2009, explained to Committee staff that guidance on fetal tissue donation was removed from the Manual as part of this process to streamline and remove non-clinical information.

As of November 6, 2013, affiliates are now permitted to facilitate fetal tissue donation without prior approval from PPFA. PPFA distinguishes between “core services,” which all affiliates are required to provide, such as well-women visits and education and prescribing for all FDA-approved methods of contraception, and services which are voluntary or optional for affiliates to offer. Earlier versions of the fetal tissue guidance instructed affiliates to “submit a written request to initiate an aborted tissue and/or blood donation program to PPFA for review and approval.” According to PPFA, it “implemented this policy change as part of a broader effort to reduce the administrative burden on affiliates and support affiliate service expansion.

This overhaul affected other services besides facilitation of tissue donation; PPFA

no longer requires prior approval for an affiliate to offer certain other non-core services.”

ii. PPFA Guidance to Affiliates Includes Additional Requirements Pertaining to Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research, Although This Is Not Required by Law

Federal law imposes additional requirements on providers and on researchers when the donated tissue is used in federally funded research involving the transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes. Under the statute, human fetal tissue may be used in federally funded research on the transplantation of fetal tissue if the attending physician declares in writing 1) that the woman’s consent for abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent to donate the fetal tissue for research; 2) that the timing, method, or procedure used to terminate the pregnancy were not altered in order to obtain the tissue; 3) that the abortion was performed in accordance with applicable state law; and 4) the woman has been fully informed of the physician’s interest, if any, in the research, and of any medical or privacy risks associated with the tissue donation.

According to the National Institutes of Health (NIH), the federal government has not funded any fetal tissue transplantation research since 2007. The federal rules relating to the timing and method of abortion are therefore not applicable to any recent fetal tissue donations in the United States. However, PPFA’s fetal tissue donation guidance nonetheless incorporates these requirements as recommended practices for affiliates. The 2015 PPFA guidance provides:

Federal law establishes additional requirements applicable whenever the research involving fetal tissue is conducted or supported by the federal government. PPFA recommends that these requirements be adhered to without regard to whether the tissue donation program is federally supported or not. These requirements are:

1. That the client’s consent to donate not be sought until after she has decided to have an abortion and has signed the consent form for the abortion.

2. That the client acknowledge that the blood or tissue is being donated as a gift and that she will not be paid.

3. That the client acknowledge that she has not been told and that she has no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

4. That there will be no changes to how or when the abortion is done in order to obtain the blood or tissue.

The guidance further instructs affiliates that “It must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue.”

Similarly, earlier versions of the PPFA guidance required the clinician to make a notation that: “[a]borted tissue was donated,” “[c]onsent for the abortion was obtained prior to requesting or obtaining consent for the tissue donation,” and “[n]o substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the tissue.” Previous versions of the guidance also required specific language in consent forms used for tissue donation. These versions were issued under the previous system, in which affiliates were required to seek service approval from PPFA for tissue donation programs.

Appended to PPFA’s May 2015 guidance is a recommended sample consent form, which

prompts the patient who is donating tissue to affirm the following statements:

Before I was shown this consent, I had already decided to have an abortion and signed a consent form for it.

I agree to give my blood and/or the tissue from the abortion as a gift to be used for education, research, or treatment.

I understand I have no control over who will get the donated blood and/or tissue or what it will be used for.

I have not been told the name of any person who might get my donation.

I understand there will be no changes to how or when my abortion is done in order to get my blood or the tissue.

I understand I will not be paid.

I understand that I don't have to give my blood or pregnancy tissue, and this will not affect my current or future care at (affiliate name).

Earlier versions of the guidance included a substantially similar consent form, although use of the consent form was required rather than recommended under the previous system of service approvals by PPFA, and substantive deviations from the consent form required approval from PPFA Medical Services.

B. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD AFFILIATES KNOWINGLY RECEIVED VALUABLE CONSIDERATION IN EXCHANGE FOR FETAL TISSUE

The Committee has received no evidence that any Planned Parenthood affiliate or employee ever received any "valuable consideration" for donated fetal tissue. The information and the documentary evidence received by the Committee support Planned Parenthood's assertions that the few affiliates that have participated in fetal tissue donation comply with the requirement to limit reimbursement to reasonable payments associated with facilitating tissue donation.

In an August 27, 2015, letter to congressional leaders, PPFA President Cecile Richards listed the reimbursement rates at affiliates that are currently or were recently participating in fetal tissue donation. At present, only two out of PPFA's 59 affiliates are participating in fetal tissue donation, and only one affiliate is receiving any reimbursement for costs. An additional four affiliates facilitated fetal tissue donation for research in the past five years. The California affiliate that is currently participating receives a reimbursement of \$60 per tissue specimen from a TPO. The other four affiliates, which had participated in fetal tissue donation programs in the past five years, either sought no reimbursement or had reimbursement rates ranging from \$45 to \$55 per tissue specimen. The letter states, "[i]n every case, the affiliates report that these amounts were intended to recover only their costs, as allowed under the federal law and our guidance." The evidence received by the Committee during the course of this investigation supports this assertion.

The May 2015 tissue donation guidance notes that affiliates "must be able to demonstrate the reimbursement represents its actual costs." Dr. McDonald-Mosley explained that the way that each affiliate determines cost is fact-specific to that affiliate. Dr. Nucatola stated that fetal tissue donation is not a revenue stream for affiliates, and that reimbursement should generally be reasonable for the impact it has on the clinic.

Both the statute governing fetal tissue donation and Planned Parenthood's May 2015 guidance on pregnancy tissue donation outline the exceptions for reimbursement. The

types of costs that may arise for clinics facilitating tissue donation include staff time to identify patients who are interested in donating fetal tissue, staff time spent explaining fetal tissue donation and securing consent, staff time spent drawing maternal blood samples, space in the pathology lab, storage of supplies, sterilization of equipment, and other related costs.

In a briefing with the Committee, Cate Dyer, the Chief Executive Officer of StemExpress, stated that it is her understanding that the valuable consideration requirement applies to all fetal tissue her company obtains. The contracts between StemExpress and two Planned Parenthood affiliates state, "The reasonable costs associated with the services specified in this Agreement shall be fifty-five dollars (\$55.00) per POC [product of conception] determined in the clinic to be usable." According to Dyer, the reimbursement covers the space and storage at the Planned Parenthood facility, particularly within the lab and pathology departments, sterilization of equipment, and staff participation in consent and facilitating involvement in the clinic. Additionally, clinic staff is also involved in obtaining maternal blood samples for StemExpress, so that the company can screen for infectious diseases. Dyer stated that she believed Planned Parenthood is losing money on fetal tissue donation, given the amount of staff time involved and space StemExpress takes up at the clinics.

In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. Ben Van Handel, the Executive Director of Novogenix Laboratories, confirmed that at the affiliate where Novogenix has a contract, Planned Parenthood set the price of \$45 for services rendered on a per specimen basis. The contract between Novogenix and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states, "Novogenix will reimburse [the Planned Parenthood affiliate] for reasonable administrative costs associated with the identification of potential donors, as well as the obtaining of informed consent."

Similarly, in a briefing with Committee staff, Advanced Bioscience Resources (ABR) confirmed that the reimbursement rate at the Planned Parenthood affiliate with which they partner is \$60 per patient product of conception. The contract between ABR and the Planned Parenthood affiliate states:

[Affiliate] will provide, and ABR will pay the reasonable costs for, services and facilities . . . associated with obtaining consents and with the removal of fetal organs and tissues from POCs [products of conception], and their processing, preservation, quality control, transportation, and storage; including appropriate space in which ABR employees can work, disposal services for non-used portions of cadaveric materials, and for seeking consent for donation of tissues and organs from appropriate donors, and maintaining records of such consents so that verification of consent can be supported.

C. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS CONDUCTED INTACT DILATION AND EVACUATION TO PRESERVE FETAL TISSUE

To date, the Committee has received no evidence that any physician employed by Planned Parenthood affiliates has performed an "intact" dilation and evacuation (D&E) to preserve fetal tissue for research. CMP claims suggesting that Planned Parenthood physicians are violating the Partial Birth Abortion Act in order to preserve fetal tissue for research appear to have no basis in fact.

There are three primary methods of surgical abortion: D&E, induction of labor, and

hysterotomy. D&E is the only method available at Planned Parenthood facilities. In a briefing with Committee staff, Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated to the Committee that the confusion over "intact" fetuses is the result of deceptive video editing by CMP, and that she believes that the "intactness" that Planned Parenthood staff are referring to is the intactness of the tissue and specific organs. She noted that during most procedures, such as a D&E, the fetus is not delivered intact. She stated there is no evidence that Planned Parenthood staff are removing the fetus in an intact manner.

Similarly, Dr. Nucatola explained that it would be rare for a patient to be sufficiently dilated to deliver an intact fetus. When questioned whether it was possible to do a D&E resulting in an intact fetus, she stated that while possible, no Planned Parenthood physician would intentionally perform such a procedure because to do so would be illegal.

Representatives of all three TPOs also stated to the Committee that the donated fetal tissue specimens they receive do not include intact fetuses.

D. THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THAT PLANNED PARENTHOOD PHYSICIANS ALTERED THE TIMING, METHOD, OR PROCEDURE SOLELY FOR THE PURPOSE OF OBTAINING FETAL TISSUE FOR RESEARCH

To date, the Committee has not obtained any evidence that Planned Parenthood physicians altered the timing, method, or procedure of an abortion solely for the purpose of obtaining fetal tissue for research. The law requires physicians to certify that "no alteration of the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate the pregnancy was made solely for the purposes of obtaining the tissue." Although this section of the law applies only to federally funded research involving transplantation of human fetal tissue for therapeutic purposes, Planned Parenthood has voluntarily incorporated the principles of the law into its tissue donation guidance. The PPFA May 2015 guidance instructs affiliates that "[i]t must be documented that no substantive alteration in the timing of terminating the pregnancy or of the method used was made for the purpose of obtaining the blood and/or tissue."

There are limited methods of abortion. At Planned Parenthood affiliates, there are two methods of an early abortion: (1) a medication abortion, and (2) surgical abortion involving mechanical or manual aspiration. For abortions after approximately 13 weeks gestation, the only surgical abortion method available at a Planned Parenthood facility is D&E. A physician's decision about which method to use is made in consultation with the patient.

PPFA has not identified any cases in which changes in methods for abortions were made for the purposes of fetal tissue donation. It is reasonable for providers to make small adjustments in technique for clinical reasons, and such small adjustments would not constitute a change in method or procedure. As is common across the medical profession, techniques are different for each physician, and physicians commonly make clinical judgments to adjust their approach in the course of a surgery.

Dr. Nucatola confirmed that changing the position of the fetus is not a change in the method or procedure; instead, it often needs to be done for patient safety. Although she does not personally change the position of the fetus in her practice, she believes that some physicians may need to convert the fetus to breech position in order to perform the abortion procedure safely; it is a matter of skill and experience.

All Planned Parenthood staff emphasized that patient safety is their top priority. Dr. McDonald-Mosley stated, "The ultimate goal is the safety of the patient." Dr. Nucatola said, "Patient safety comes first." PPFA's August 27, 2015, letter reiterated the same message: "Our patient's health is our paramount concern."

Mr. MCGOVERN. These heavily edited videos that my friends keep on referring to, again, I think is just a cover for what really is behind all of this, and that is their attempt to criminalize and outlaw abortion in all circumstances.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding me the time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in defense of Planned Parenthood, an organization that for nearly 100 years has been the only accessible and affordable health care for millions of Americans, men and women.

Yet again, we find ourselves debating a bill that has no chance of becoming law, that attacks women and their healthcare decisions, and that distracts from what we should be doing: a budget to keep the government funded, which the majority shows no interest in moving forward.

Instead, we are rehashing old bills that we have seen many times before. These Republican broadsides fly in the face of the millions of women across the country and undermine the health and well-being of poor and rural women, who, in most cases, have no place else to turn except to Planned Parenthood for basic medical treatment.

Need I remind the Chamber that one in five American women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime, as my colleague said, more than 90 percent of which is for preventive care: cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer screenings, and even HIV counseling?

There is no other medical procedure so furiously debated. Do we spend years here debating whether men can get vasectomies during their reproductive years? Maybe we should do that because, obviously, we have cloaked ourselves in the medical field so that we can make those priceless decisions that people should make for themselves. Do we threaten to shut down the government over access to Viagra? No, we don't.

This week, I received an email from a local Planned Parenthood affiliate about a woman who, when she was 19 years old, went to Planned Parenthood to get a prescription for birth control. During a routine screening, the doctor found a cluster of abnormal cells that could have turned into life-threatening cancer.

The woman wrote: "Early detection and treatment . . . allowed me later in

life to have a healthy baby who is the light of my life. Planned Parenthood is the provider I know and trust. Why should politicians tell anyone where they can and cannot go for care? Planned Parenthood was there for me when I needed affordable, quality health care, and I don't know what I'd have done without their services."

That is what is at stake. In spite of these pleas, Republicans continue their obsession with attacking women's health—I would think, by now, they would know better—and co-opting the most personal decisions of a woman's lifetime.

Legislatures across the country, including this one, waste valuable time in pretending to be doctors instead of doing their jobs. Legislators do not spontaneously become medical professionals upon their elections.

These constitutionally protected decisions are for women with the advice of their doctors, their families, and anyone she wants to consult, be it her priest or rabbi or pastor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. What terrible decisions there are to be made between medical personnel and the patient. I don't want anybody to have to say: I have to wait until LOUISE SLAUGHTER gets here because Congress has the last word in whether we live or die.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, this debate is not about any one organization that receives tax dollars. This isn't about Republicans versus Democrats. It is not even about pro-life versus pro-choice. The issue before us today, Madam Speaker, is about defending the most vulnerable among us.

It is about a fundamental question: Will we allow and, indeed, give the people's money to an organization that takes a tiny baby outside the womb—with a beating heart, with lungs that function—and takes a scalpel and cuts open the head so that the brain can be extracted and sold for profit?

That is gruesome—I am sorry—but watch the video. Or are we going to say: Let's suspend the funding to this organization while we investigate? That is a reasonable position.

Any organization that receives Federal funds and that is being investigated for breaking the law ought to have its funds suspended.

My wife, Renee, and I are expecting our first child in just a matter of days. So this is an issue that is very personal to me.

I would just say to my colleagues: Let's support this legislation and make sure that no baby is ever again cut into pieces and sold for scrap parts in this country.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Ms. MATSUI. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to stand with millions of American women and men who receive essential health services from Planned Parenthood.

These attacks against Planned Parenthood threaten access to health care across this country, particularly for low-income women and men who already face barriers to access.

For many of our Nation's underserved populations, Planned Parenthood is the only source for vital services, such as contraceptive services and counseling and breast and cervical cancer screenings.

If the majority succeeds in its effort to defund Planned Parenthood, millions of Americans will be stripped of access to health care, in turn, creating hardships for American families.

More troubling still is the majority's willingness to shut down the government in order to deny health care to millions of women. Women's health should not be used as a bargaining chip for political messaging.

I urge my colleagues to put aside partisan politics driven by purposefully misleading videos. Attacking Planned Parenthood is a dangerous distraction to the real issues facing American women and families.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Utah (Mrs. LOVE).

Mrs. LOVE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3134, to defund Planned Parenthood, and H.R. 3504, which requires that babies born alive during abortions get the same medical treatment as any other child.

It is crucial that we stand for those who cannot speak for themselves: the unborn. These bills are critical to curtailing the horrific practices that include harvesting fetal tissue while babies are still alive.

We, as Americans, value human life. We are fighting terrorists in Iran because we value the lives of people. Fighting for the unborn is no different.

I demand a full investigation into Planned Parenthood's donation of fetal tissue and the removal of taxpayer funding for the organization.

My colleagues will try to distract, distort, and divide us into thinking that this is all about women's health issues. This is, in fact, about saving American lives.

Let me remind my colleagues that Black Americans make up 12 percent of the population and that the fetuses that are being aborted make up 78 percent of who is being aborted.

We must act to protect life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. I know my job. Please do yours.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. WELCH. I thank the gentleman.

Madam Speaker, there are two issues that are very contentious: abortion and fetal research. I support the right of a woman to choose. I support medical research that is legal under our laws so we can get cures for diseases like Alzheimer's and diabetes. I also respect those who disagree with me, but this bill is terrible.

Here is why: It is unfair to women who are not part of this debate and whose access to Planned Parenthood is about getting preventive health care, 16,000 women in our State. The second reason is that this bill, as designed, is destructive to the institution we represent.

Here is how it is designed: One, take the money away and then investigate. In a fair society, we do it the opposite way.

Second, it eliminates access to care for innocent people, who have nothing to do with this, as I mentioned, 16,000 in Vermont.

Three, it is a prelude to the shutdown, resorting to the tactic of, unless you get your way, we are shutting down the entire government.

Four, it is part of the "dump the Speaker" campaign, as though, if the Speaker resists a shutdown, his job should be taken away.

Bad for women. Bad for the institution.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I stand today in support of the innocent and the unborn. I strongly believe now is the time for Congress to stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves.

The videos that have been released that expose the appalling acts committed by Planned Parenthood are horrifying.

These are despicable acts that are on par with the sickest of criminals who are behind bars, and that is exactly where these people belong: in prison, behind bars. These videos have given everyone insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood.

Taxpayer funds should never be used to fund or to offset the cost of providing abortions; and it is especially unacceptable when these illegal and horrific practices, like the selling and trafficking of unborn fetal tissue, are happening.

As a father and a grandfather, I believe we must seek justice for these crimes that have been committed.

I urge Federal law enforcement to execute a full criminal investigation into these alleged actions by Planned Parenthood.

These two bills being debated today, of which I am a cosponsor, are the necessary next steps. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and to support life.

□ 1400

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, let's be clear. This is not a debate about abortion. There are different points of view on that question, but it is a settled question by the U.S. Supreme Court. Those who want to make this about something that it is not need to look at the legislation that they are supporting.

This is about whether or not families have access through Planned Parenthood to preventative health care, to lifesaving cancer screenings, to basic health care that ought to be available in every possible way. This bill would have an extreme and devastating impact on access to those fundamental services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Here we are, 7 legislative days before this government shuts down; and what is preoccupying the floor of the House of Representatives today? An ideological debate that everyone on both sides of the aisle acknowledges will not become law.

Everyone acknowledges it will not become law, but we are taking time to pander to some of the voices that simply oppose women's healthcare choices instead of taking up the questions that the American people sent us here to do. Where is the budget? Where are the budget negotiations? Where is the discussion about roads and bridges?

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY).

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, no taxpayer should be forced to fund an organization that aborts more than 350,000 unborn babies every year. This is a commonsense truth that even pro-abortion activists have a hard time arguing.

Guess what—they changed the argument. They pretend that abortion doesn't exist and that Planned Parenthood is the only place where low-income women can get health care. Taking away taxpayer funding from Planned Parenthood means denying women access to health care, they say.

That is untrue, and anybody spreading that should be ashamed. There are more than 13,000 federally qualified and rural health centers throughout this country offering low-cost health care to women. They outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics 20 to 1.

If this was really about making sure women had access to health care, we could all agree right now that supporting these community health centers is the right thing to do; but that is not what this is about.

It is because community health centers don't perform abortions; Planned Parenthood does. That is what this is about. It is about preserving a pipeline of funding to the Nation's largest abortion provider. We all get this. Let's drop the phony women's health charade.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO).

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and the underlying bill. With this bill, the majority has declared war on the health and well-being of millions of women.

Planned Parenthood serves 2.7 million Americans every year with lifesaving services, like pap tests, breast exams, screenings for sexually transmitted infections. For many low-income families, Planned Parenthood is their only option.

The majority claims that other clinics can take up the slack, but just listen to Dr. Mark DeFrancesco, the president of the American Congress of OB/GYNs: "If Planned Parenthood went away, there are a good number of patients just in my service area that no longer will have a doctor. If they start calling my office, it is going to be 'we could take you, but it might be 2, 3 months down the road.' And if they call other places, it might be 'we can't even take you.'"

This bill creates chaos, and in that chaos, people's lives will be put at risk. This bill is spiteful; it is mean spirited, and it is cruel. It tells millions of low-income Americans: Forget your health. You can just die.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to vote against this bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, there are many more options for women's health care than the discredited abortion provider, Planned Parenthood.

While Planned Parenthood is only approximately 665 clinics, federally qualified health centers, FQHCs, and rural health centers, RHCs, provide over 13,000 publicly supported locations, providing alternatives for women's health care. This means there are 20 federally funded comprehensive care clinics for every one Planned Parenthood.

This bill does not change the availability of funds for women's health. It simply establishes a safeguard so that the Nation's largest abortion chain is not the one providing such services.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Madam Speaker, there comes a time when we must face the truth, regardless of how disgusting or offensive that truth is. As much as we dislike where we are and the shame the harvesting of baby parts has brought on our Nation, we are the ones who must face this truth and take action.

Some who oppose this bill and other actions this Congress may take state

that defunding this or other organizations will not completely stop these horrific acts, and that may be true.

Did our involvement in World War II against Hitler end anti-Semitism? No, it didn't. Did our government's decision to take out Osama bin Laden end terrorism? No, it didn't. How many innocent lives were spared because we did take action?

The question before us is not whether our actions will stop this evil, but if this government will continue to fund it, sanction it, and tolerate it.

For years, William Wilberforce fought against the evil of slavery, and he challenged his fellow countrymen with these words: "You may choose to look the other way, but you can never say that you did not know."

If we know the truth, which we do, and decide not to respond, we will, in part, share the blame, share the responsibility, and share in the judgment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition.

These bills today are the direct result of a series of videos that have been found to be purposefully misleading, alleging misdeeds that never happened that will result in the punishment of millions of women who have absolutely nothing to do with it.

In many areas of this country, Planned Parenthood clinics are one of the few affordable healthcare options for women.

During the Senate debate on defunding, a letter was introduced from California's community health centers, stating in no uncertain terms that defunding the Planned Parenthood clinics would place untenable stress on the community healthcare providers, but our Republican colleagues are indifferent to the experts.

Truth, as usual, is the first casualty when they wage their cultural wars; and all that matters is the theater, their bizarre kabuki theater, of ritualized outrage.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule and on the underlying bill.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank VIRGINIA FOXX, who is a tremendous leader for life and a great leader in this Congress, for yielding.

Mr. McGOVERN said we are wasting our time. Mr. KILDEE talked about pandering, which I think is an insult.

I would just like to ask Mr. McGovern: Yes or no, has the gentleman watched the videos?

Mr. McGOVERN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The gentleman has?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Okay. It is disappointing then that the gentleman is not moved to compassion over the terrible inhumanity displayed on those videos by the Planned Parenthood personnel.

Madam Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die, but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace.

Subsidized by half-a-billion dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every 2 minutes, snuffing out the lives of over 57 million infants since 1973, a staggering loss of life, a staggering loss of children.

Madam Speaker, now, because of undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby parts, turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted facade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership, not interns or lower-level employees, show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

This begs the question: Do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues and has President Obama watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, senior director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late-term abortionist herself says on camera:

We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below. I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact. . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps.

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood's medical directors council president, Dr. Mary Gatter, appears on the video nonchalantly talking about utilizing "less crunchy" abortion methods, again, to preserve body parts.

Regarding the price tag for baby body parts, she says, "Let me just figure out what others are getting and, if this is in the ballpark, then, it is fine. If it is still low, we can bump it up," that is, the price. "I want a Lamborghini," she says.

Planned Parenthood's national director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers, Deborah VanDerhei, says, "We are just trying to figure out as an industry"—abortion is an industry—"how we are going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster"—concern for making money and avoiding bad press, no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood, says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent for these baby body parts to be trafficked.

She says on the video, "Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore, potential specimens." They think of the pregnancy test as a way of getting more specimens, so it is just taking advantage of the opportunity.

O'Donnell also says how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. "She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like," she says on tape.

H.R. 3134, made in order under this rule, authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress, DIANE BLACK of Tennessee, places a yearlong moratorium on funding for Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

Madam Speaker, the videos have also brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortions.

Dr. Savita Ginde, vice president and medical director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains, confesses:

Sometimes we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they, the baby, are intact.

That means born alive. That means born alive.

"The fetus just fell out," she says. It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out. What happens to that baby? Tragically, we know what happens. They are killed, and some of their organs are stolen.

The second bill made in order by the rule—the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, authored by pro-life champion TRENT FRANKS—simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, authored by STEVE CHABOT, by ending important enforcement prohibitions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just 2 years ago that the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing children, as well as women in his clinics, but children who were born alive after an attempted abortion.

The grand jury report describes his practice—and I read the entire report;

you ought to read it—Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies he delivered. He killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." He called it "snipping."

Support these two bills, I say to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, human dismemberment is a painful and absolutely frightening way for anyone to die but in Planned Parenthood clinics across the country, such violence against children is commonplace and usual.

Subsidized by half a billion taxpayer dollars annually, Planned Parenthood kills a baby every two minutes, snuffing out the lives of over seven million infants since 1973—a staggering loss of children.

Now, because of undercover videos by the Center for Medical Progress, we know Planned Parenthood is also trafficking in baby body parts—turning babies into human guinea pigs while making the abortion industry even richer than before.

Although much of the media continues to ignore this scandal, Planned Parenthood's meticulously crafted façade of care and compassion has been shredded. Caught on tape, Planned Parenthood's top leadership—not interns or lower level employees—show callous disregard for children's lives while gleefully calculating the financial gain.

Which begs the question: do Americans really know what horrors are done to children in Planned Parenthood clinics? Have congressional colleagues—has President Obama—watched the videos yet?

In one clip, Dr. Deborah Nucatola, Senior Director of Planned Parenthood Federation of America's Medical Services and a late term abortionist herself says on camera: "We have been very good at getting heart, lung, liver, because we know that, I am not going to crush that part. I am going to basically crush below, I am going to crush above, and I am going to see if I can get it all intact . . . I would say a lot of people want liver; and for that reason, most providers will do this case under ultrasound guidance, so they will know where they are putting their forceps."

In other words, crush the baby to death, but do it in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Planned Parenthood Medical Directors' Council President Dr. Mary Gatter appears on a video nonchalantly talking about utilizing a "less crunchy" abortion method—again to preserve baby body parts. Regarding the pricetag for baby body parts she says: "let me just figure out what others are getting, and if this is in the ballpark, then its fine, if it's still low, then we can bump it up. I want a Lamborghini."

Planned Parenthood's National Director for the Consortium of Abortion Providers Deborah VanDerhei says "we're just trying to figure out as an industry . . . how we're going to manage remuneration because the headlines would be a disaster". Concern for making money and avoiding bad press—no concern whatsoever for the child victim.

Holly O'Donnell, a tissue procurement technician for StemExpress, a biotech company that partners with Planned Parenthood says some women undergoing abortions did not give consent: ". . ." there were times when they would just take (the body parts) what

they wanted. And these mothers didn't know. On the video, Ms. O'Donnell says: "Pregnancy tests are potential pregnancies, therefore potential specimens. So it's just taking advantage of the opportunities."

O'Donnell also tells how her supervisor told her to cut through the face of a baby in order to get brain tissue. "She gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe what that feels like" she says.

H.R. 3134 authored by an extraordinarily caring and compassionate Member of Congress DIANE BLACK of Tennessee places a yearlong moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood and redirects withheld monies to other facilities that provide women's health.

At the instruction of Speaker BOEHNER, several committees of congress have launched probes into this baby body parts trafficking scandal.

I suspect that if the President watches at least one of the videos, he'd at least demand real answers concerning Planned Parenthood's inhumane behavior. Or at least I hope he would.

Mr. Speaker, the videos have again brought into sharp focus the fact that some babies actually survive abortion.

Dr. Savita Ginde, Vice President and Medical Director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains confesses that "Sometimes, we get—if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure then they (the baby) are in intact . . ." A fetal tissue broker describes watching a "fetus . . . just fell out."

It just fell out. It, the baby, fell out, she says. And then what happened to that baby?

Tragically, we know what happens to these victimized babies—they are killed and some have their organs stolen.

So the second bill made in order by the rule—The Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (H.R. 3504)—authored by pro-life champion Trent Franks, simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. The new bill builds on the landmark Born Alive Infant Protection Act of 2002 authored by Steve Chabot by adding important enforcement provisions.

I would remind my colleagues that it was just two years ago the infamous Philadelphia abortionist Kermit Gosnell was convicted of murder for killing children who were born alive after an attempted abortion. The Grand Jury report described his practices, "Gosnell had a simple solution for the unwanted babies he delivered: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it "ensuring fetal demise." The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors into the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called that "snipping."

Gosnell's grisly after-birth abortion practices were only exposed when he was investigated for illegal drug charges and, in the words of the Grand Jury "the search team discovered fetal remains haphazardly stored throughout the clinic—in bags, milk jugs, orange juice cartons, and even in cat-food containers. Some fetal remains were in a refrigerator, others were frozen."

Last week Gianna Jessen an abortion survivor, told the House Judiciary Committee:

"My biological mother was seven and a half months pregnant when she went to Planned

Parenthood, who advised her to have a late-term saline abortion.

"This method of abortion burns the baby inside and out, blinding and suffocating the child, who is then born dead, usually within 24 hours.

"Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother's womb, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles on April the 6th, 1977. My medical records state: "Born alive during saline abortion" at 6 am.

"Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live.

"I did. I was later diagnosed with Cerebral Palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And Cerebral Palsy is a great gift to me.

Gianna asked the committee,

"If abortion is about women's rights, then what were mine? You continuously use the argument, 'If the baby is disabled, we need to terminate the pregnancy,' as if you can determine the quality of someone's life. Is my life less valuable due to my Cerebral Palsy?

"You have failed, in your arrogance and greed, to see one thing: it is often from the weakest among us that we learn wisdom—something sorely lacking in our nation today. And it is both our folly and our shame that blinds us to the beauty of adversity."

Gianna Jesson's reminds us that we have a duty to protect the weakest and most vulnerable.

□ 1415

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, let me just state three facts here: We know that these videos that have been mentioned have been selectively edited; we know for a fact that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive care, including screenings for cervical cancer, nothing to do with abortion; and we know for a fact, because it is the law, that no taxpayer dollars can be used to pay for abortion.

Having said that, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bills. This closed rule makes in order misguided legislation that would seriously limit access to crucial healthcare services, like cancer screenings, and limit access to contraception that would prevent unwanted pregnancies.

We are talking about defunding Planned Parenthood? How counterproductive. In my home State of Oregon, more than 72,000 patients were served by Planned Parenthood in 2013 alone. We are talking about real women and men who received compassionate, preventive care. I have heard from Oregonians like Stacy, who went to Planned Parenthood and got a life-saving cancer screening when she had no insurance.

It is unfortunate that the House is using its limited time to debate legislation that harms women, but it is downright irresponsible to even consider shutting down the government over access to these vital services. There is no evidence that Planned Parenthood has broken any laws.

We have seen proposals like this before. It is time to end these attacks on women's constitutional reproductive rights. I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and other legislation that limits access to vital healthcare services.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My colleagues have asked for an investigation into The Center for Medical Progress, which released these videos. The Center for Medical Progress does not receive half a billion in taxpayer dollars every year; Planned Parenthood does. It is the role of Congress to exercise oversight on those who receive taxpayer dollars. It is also appropriate for Congress to cease funding a scandal-ridden organization.

It is extremely interesting to hear my colleagues across the aisle talk about investigating the creators of these videos. If only there was such enthusiasm for oversight on other issues, such as ObamaCare implementation, immigration executive orders, and Hillary Clinton's refusal to share her actions on Benghazi.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, I would not be here on the floor to lend suspicion to the faithfulness of anyone, but as evidenced by what we have been hearing from our friends on the other side of the aisle, this is nothing but a politically charged debate and an undermining of women's health care.

We made it very clear in the Committee on the Judiciary that *Roe v. Wade* is the law of the land. We know that because the Texas Supreme Court, in 2014 and 2015, rolled back the Texas law that was going to close a number of clinics evidencing and providing for women's health care. Planned Parenthood provides for 378,000 pap tests and 487,000 breast exams. 87,000 women found out they had cancer through Planned Parenthood.

As it relates to the fetal tissue, we know that there are laws in place that do not allow the sale of such, but we also know the fetal tissue research has generated spinal cord, neurological research and cures.

Therefore, let me say to my colleagues, the law of the land is *Roe v. Wade*. This is a protracted political fight, and I would only say, ask the person who filmed these particular videos. He stole the identity of his high

school classmate to do this underhanded work. That shows you that this is a political effort.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the Rule and the underlying bills.

I strongly oppose this latest attempt by the Republican House majority to defund Planned Parenthood and undermine women's right to make their own choices regarding their reproductive healthcare.

Instead of spending time fueling a politically-charged attack on America's leading provider of reproductive health care services for women, and attempting to roll back women's constitutionally protected rights, this House should be advancing legislation that will reform our truly broken immigration and criminal justice systems.

We are brought here today to examine the practices and procedures of Planned Parenthood. Yet, tellingly, the Majority has failed to reach out or obtain any direct information or witnesses from Planned Parenthood.

The bills before us are offered not for the purpose of exposing any wrongdoing of Planned Parenthood, but simply to sensationalize opposition to abortion and serve as a political decoy to shut down our government.

The United States Supreme Court ruled over 40 years ago, in *Roe v. Wade* (410 U.S. 113 (1973)), that a woman's constitutional right to privacy includes her right to abortion.

Since this landmark decision, abortion rates and risks have substantially declined, as have the number of teen and unwanted pregnancies.

Restricting all access to reproductive and women's health services only exacerbates a woman's risk of an unintended pregnancy and fails to accomplish any meaningful overthrow of *Roe v. Wade*.

In recent years, state policymakers have passed hundreds of restrictions on abortion care under the guise of protecting women's health and safety. Fights here in Congress have been no different.

In my state of Texas a law that would have cut off access to 75 percent of reproductive healthcare clinics in the state was challenged before the U.S. Supreme Court in 2014 and 2015.

On October 2, 2014, the Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional a Texas law that required that all reproductive healthcare clinics that provided the full range of services would be required to have a hospital-style surgery center building and staffing requirements.

This requirement meant that only 7 clinics would be allowed to continue to provide a full spectrum of reproductive healthcare to women.

Texas has 268,580 square miles, only second in size to the state of California.

The impact of the law in implementation would have ended access to reproductive services for millions of women in my state.

In 2015, the State of Texas once again threatened women's access to reproductive health care when it attempted to shutter all but 10 healthcare providers in the state of Texas.

The Supreme Court once again intervened on the behalf of Texas women to block the move to close clinics in my state.

It seems every month we are faced with a new attack on women's access to reproductive

health care, often couched in those same terms.

And in fact we are here today supposedly to talk about the safety of medical care provided by Planned Parenthood.

But we know that's not really the case.

If my colleagues were so concerned about women's health and safety, they would be promoting any one of the number of evidence-based proactive policies that improve women's health and well-being.

Instead, they are attacking Planned Parenthood in a back-handed attempt to ban abortion.

That is their number one priority. This is certainly not about protecting women's health, it's about politics.

Just as the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel (or the Blue Ribbon Commission) sought to separate the question of ethics of abortion from the question of ethics of using fetal tissue from legal elective abortions for medical research when laying the foundation for the 1993, NIH Health Revitalization Act (which passed overwhelmingly with bipartisan support), we must separate the personal views of abortion from the legal issues of federal compliance.

Namely, the NIH Health Revitalization Act prohibits the payment or receipt of money or any other form of valuable consideration for fetal tissue, regardless of whether the program to which the tissue is being provided is funded or not.

A limited exception, and crux of the applicable issue of legality, lies with the provision allowing for reimbursement for actual expenses (e.g. storage, processing, transportation, etc.) of the tissue.

Planned Parenthood repeatedly maintains and supports that their affiliates involved with fetal tissue research comply with this requirement.

In fact, of the 700+ affiliate health care centers across the country, only 4 Planned Parenthood affiliates currently offer tissue donation services and of those 4, only 2 (California and Washington) offer fetal tissue donation services—that's 1 percent of all Planned Parenthood service centers.

The California affiliate receives a modest reimbursement of \$60 per tissue specimen and the Washington affiliate receives no reimbursement.

It is worth noting that fetal tissue has been used for decades.

Since the 1920's researchers have used fetal tissue to study and treat various neurological disorders, spinal cord injuries, diabetes, immune deficiencies, cancers and life-threatening blood diseases.

One of the earliest advances with fetal tissue was to use fetal kidney cells to create the first poliovirus vaccines, which are now estimated to save 550,000 lives worldwide every year.

The most widely known application in the field of human fetal tissue transplantation has been the treatment of Parkinson's disease.

Many of our other common vaccines, such as polio, measles, chicken pox, rubella and shingles, have been developed through the use of fetal tissue or cell lines derived from fetal tissue.

When looking at the 1 percent of health care providers involved in fetal tissue donation

and research, and no clear credible proof of illegal activity, it is obvious that attacks on Planned Parenthood are wholly misguided.

Planned Parenthood has one of the most rigorous Medical standards and accreditation processes in the country.

It is the only national provider that has developed a single set of evidence-based Medical Standards and Guidelines that define how health care is provided throughout the country.

Guidelines are developed and updated annually by a group of nationally-renowned experts, physicians, and scientists, including medical experts from Harvard and Columbia.

Planned Parenthood affiliates must submit to accreditation reviews that include 100 indicators (or high level areas of review) and over 600 individual Elements of Performance (or measures for review). Half of these relate to the provision of medical care and patient safety.

Planned Parenthood has strict requirements regarding compliance with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations. A specific area of compliance is with mandatory reporting laws and regulations regarding reporting in instances where the welfare of a minor is endangered.

All staff with patient contact are rigorously trained regarding compliance with federal, state and local laws and regulations governing service to minors.

Violations of mandatory reporting regulations are subject to disciplinary action, up to and including termination.

It is no secret that the Center for Medical Progress is an extreme anti-choice organization with a goal of outlawing legal abortion procedures in this country.

To achieve that goal, they have shamelessly targeted Planned Parenthood and the funding that provides healthcare services to millions of women every year.

They continue to use deceptive tactics and secret videos to try and undermine Planned Parenthood.

Just like Live Action, the Center for Medical Progress is not a group that can be taken credibly.

The Center for Medical Progress is simply recreating a history of doctoring and manipulating video intended to create misimpressions about Planned Parenthood.

It is a coordinated effort by anti-choice forces—not only on Planned Parenthood or a woman's right to choose, but on women's health care across the board.

At the same time, national media is reporting about a major coordinated push by anti-choice groups and Members of Congress to defund Planned Parenthood.

This coordinated effort to defund Planned Parenthood is an assault on all progressive health care, service, and advocacy organizations who aim to

provide vital care and services to women and men across this country.

The public is standing by Planned Parenthood, which plays a vital role in defending women's health and rights.

Hundreds of thousands have already spoken up, including leading groups and communities such as the growing voice of our millennial generation.

My colleagues should be doing more to connect our youth and women to services that help them reduce their risk of unintended pregnancies and STD's, and improve their overall health through preventative screenings, education and planning, rather than restricting their access to lawfully entitled family planning and private health services.

I urge all Members to vote against the rule and the underlying bills.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. May I inquire of the gentlewoman from North Carolina how many more speakers she has on her side?

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I am expecting one more speaker that I am trying to accommodate. However, if the gentleman is prepared to close, then I will do my best to do that also.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question. If we do, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up legislation that would treat wildfires like similar major natural disasters and eliminate the need to transfer funds from forest management and conservation programs for fire suppression. It is time to make common-sense changes to the Federal wildfire budget.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous materials, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, the bills that the rule will make in order that are before us today, these bills and others are ongoing attacks that are part of the Republican drumbeat for a government shutdown over women's healthcare choices. It isn't enough to attack women's health. Republicans are now willing to take down the entire Federal Government in their political attacks.

As I mentioned at the outset in my opening statement, the facts are the facts; and I know for some of my colleagues, they are inconvenient and they like to avoid talking about them, but the reality is that these videos that my colleagues are referring to have been selectively edited.

We also know that 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventive

care: cervical cancer screenings, important lifesaving procedures that benefit women. They do preventive care that benefits men as well.

It is also important for my colleagues to realize that there are no Federal funds, no taxpayer dollars that go to fund abortion. That is illegal. That is the law of the land. That is the Hyde amendment.

To shut down these important preventive healthcare services, to kind of advance this agenda that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have, which is to criminalize abortion under all circumstances—including, many of my colleagues advocate no exceptions even for rape or incest. A young girl who was a victim of rape or incest would be a criminal if she had an abortion.

This is all about taking away a woman's right to choose. That is what this is all about. Planned Parenthood happens to be the pawn, the latest pawn in this debate.

It is interesting. I watched the Republican debate last night. It was really quite entertaining. I heard Donald Trump and MARCO RUBIO and TED CRUZ say that they would be open to putting civil rights activist Rosa Parks on the \$10 bill, but Republicans might be surprised to learn that Rosa Parks sat on the national board of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, the organization that my Republican friends, including the people who invoked her name last night, are now trying to defund.

This is about preserving access to good, quality health care, and I really regret the fact that this has become such a political wedge issue in this Congress, but I get it. I know where my colleagues are coming from. That you would take up the time of this House to do this, which the Senate won't take up and which the President wouldn't sign even if they did, at a time when we have 6 legislative days left before the Federal Government shuts down, I don't know what my colleagues are thinking.

Part of what your job is is to keep this government running; and instead of doing that, we are doing these right-wing message bills that don't even go through regular order, that committees of jurisdiction don't even have a chance to consider, when every Member, Republican or Democrat, is told you can't even amend any of this stuff no matter what kind of idea you have.

This whole process is disgraceful. We need to get our priorities in order here. We ought to protect women's healthcare services; we ought not to be defunding an organization like Planned Parenthood, which does good work all across this country; and we ought to be bringing a bill to the floor to keep this government running.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and defeat the

previous question and vote “no” on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last evening when I spoke on this legislation in the Committee on Rules, I mentioned that this is a very emotional issue for those of us who value life so much. One of my colleagues has already spoken to the fundamental issue of life, but I think we always should have time to talk about our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution.

Particularly as it relates to this issue, it is the Declaration of Independence which says: “We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all Men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness—That to secure these Rights, Governments are instituted among Men.”

Madam Speaker, that is what we are talking about here today. We are talking about what our government should be doing in the light of knowing that the most vulnerable among us are being destroyed, and that without life, there is nothing else.

Our colleagues keep saying there are things that are more important for us to be debating today. Madam Speaker, I would purport that there are few things more important than this debate over the trafficking of hearts and other body parts of unborn children, some of whom may have been born alive.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle claim that this legislation is part of a war on women, but in reality it is designed to stop the war on children that is going on in abortion facilities across this country.

Large majorities of Americans believe their tax dollars should not go to fund abortions. They felt this way even before learning that, during those abortions, children are dismembered and sold piece by piece. It is unfathomable that we have to debate stopping the provision of tax dollars to organizations participating in such activities. It is also unbelievable that we do not immediately pass, by unanimous consent, legislation ensuring that children born alive, breathing and crying, like each of us was on our first day outside the womb, deserve the same medical care that any child born in a hospital would receive.

What is heartening, in the face of this contentious debate, is the principle that the truth always comes out. Abortionists can no longer hide in the dark back rooms of their facilities and sell unborn children piece by piece under an illusion that no one will ever know their crimes.

Our debate today and the videos that have been released have shattered that darkness and exposed the callousness

of the abortion industry toward life and the consequences of accepting abortion on demand as acceptable. Both of these bills, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and the Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, contain commonsense provisions addressing the barbaric actions that have come to light in the abortion industry, and I commend the underlying bills in this rule providing for their consideration to all of my colleagues for their support.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 421 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 6. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 167) to provide for adjustments to discretionary spending under section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to support wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, and the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 7. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 167.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that

“the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Ms. FOXX. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 420 and the amendment thereto;

Adopting the amendment to House Resolution 420, if ordered; and

Adopting House Resolution 420, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION
OF H.R. 348, RESPONSIBLY AND
PROFESSIONALLY INVIGORATING
DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2015; PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
H.R. 758, LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUC-
TION ACT OF 2015; AND PRO-
VIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF
MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE
RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the amendment and on the resolution (H. Res. 420) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 348) to provide for improved coordination of agency actions in the preparation and adoption of environmental documents for permitting determinations, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 758) to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 179, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 497]

YEAS—238

Abraham	Brooks (AL)	Costello (PA)
Aderholt	Brooks (IN)	Cramer
Allen	Buchanan	Crawford
Amash	Buck	Crenshaw
Amodel	Bucshon	Culberson
Babin	Burgess	Curbelo (FL)
Barletta	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Barton	Calvert	Denham
Benishek	Carter (GA)	Dent
Bilirakis	Carter (TX)	DeSantis
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	DesJarlais
Bishop (UT)	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Black	Clawson (FL)	Dold
Blackburn	Coffman	Donovan
Blum	Cole	Duffy
Bost	Collins (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Boustany	Collins (NY)	Duncan (TN)
Brady (TX)	Comstock	Ellmers (NC)
Brat	Conaway	Emmer (MN)
Bridenstine	Cook	Farenthold

Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rogers (KY)
Fleischmann	Latta	Rohrabacher
Fleming	LoBiondo	Rokita
Flores	Long	Rooney (FL)
Forbes	Loudermilk	Ros-Lehtinen
Fortenberry	Love	Roskam
Fox	Lucas	Ross
Franks (AZ)	Luetkemeyer	Rothfus
Frelinghuysen	Lummis	Rouzer
Garrett	MacArthur	Royce
Gibbs	Marchant	Russell
Gibson	Marino	Ryan (WI)
Gohmert	Massie	Salmon
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Sanford
Gosar	McCaul	Scalise
Gowdy	McClintock	Schweikert
Graves (GA)	McHenry	Scott, Austin
Graves (LA)	McKinley	Sensenbrenner
Graves (MO)	McMorris	Sessions
Griffith	Rodgers	Shimkus
Grothman	McSally	Shuster
Guinta	Meadows	Simpson
Guthrie	Meehan	Smith (MO)
Hanna	Messer	Smith (NE)
Hardy	Mica	Smith (NJ)
Harper	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)
Harris	Miller (MI)	Stefanik
Hartzler	Mooren	Stewart
Heck (NV)	Moore (WV)	Stivers
Hensarling	Mullin	Stutzman
Herrera Beutler	Mulvaney	Thornberry
Hice, Jody B.	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Hill	Neugebauer	Tipton
Holding	Newhouse	Trott
Hudson	Noem	Turner
Huelskamp	Nugent	Upton
Huizenga (MI)	Nunes	Valadao
Hultgren	Olson	Walberg
Hunter	Palazzo	Walden
Hurd (TX)	Palmer	Walker
Hurt (VA)	Paulsen	Walorski
Issa	Pearce	Walters, Mimi
Jenkins (KS)	Perry	Weber (TX)
Jenkins (WV)	Pittenger	Webster (FL)
Johnson (OH)	Pitts	Wenstrup
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)	Westerman
Jones	Poliquin	Whitfield
Jordan	Pompeo	Williams
Joyce	Posey	Wilson (SC)
Katko	Price, Tom	Wittman
Kelly (MS)	Ratcliffe	Womack
Kelly (PA)	Reed	Woodall
King (IA)	Reichert	Yoder
King (NY)	Renacci	Yoho
Kinzinger (IL)	Ribble	Young (AK)
Kline	Rice (SC)	Young (IA)
Knight	Rigell	Young (IN)
Labrador	Roby	Zeldin
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Zinke
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	

NAYS—179

Adams	Cooper	Green, Al
Aguilar	Costa	Green, Gene
Ashford	Courtney	Grijalva
Bass	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Beatty	Cuellar	Hahn
Becerra	Cummings	Hastings
Beyer	Davis (CA)	Heck (WA)
Bishop (GA)	Davis, Danny	Higgins
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Himes
Bonamici	DeGette	Hinojosa
Boyle, Brendan F.	Delaney	Honda
Brady (PA)	DeLauro	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	DelBene	Huffman
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Israel
Butterfield	Deutch	Jackson Lee
Capps	Doggett	Jeffries
Capuano	Doyle, Michael F.	Johnson (GA)
Cardenas	Duckworth	Johnson, E. B.
Carney	Edwards	Kaptur
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Keating
Cartwright	Engel	Kelly (IL)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kennedy
Castro (TX)	Esty	Kildee
Chu, Judy	Farr	Kilmer
Ciavilline	Fattah	Kind
Clark (MA)	Foster	Kirkpatrick
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Kuster
Cleaver	Gabbard	Langevin
Clyburn	Gallego	Larsen (WA)
Cohen	Garamendi	Larson (CT)
Connolly	Graham	Lawrence
Conyers	Grayson	Lee
		Levin

Lewis	Norcross	Serrano
Lieu, Ted	O'Rourke	Sewell (AL)
Lipinski	Pallone	Sherman
Loebach	Pascrell	Sinema
Lofgren	Payne	Sires
Lowenthal	Perlmutter	Slaughter
Lowey	Peters	Speier
Lujan Grisham (NM)	Peterson	Swalwell (CA)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Pingree	Takai
Lynch	Pocan	Takano
Maloney, Carolyn	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Maloney, Sean	Price (NC)	Titus
Matsui	Quigley	Tonko
McCollum	Rangel	Torres
McDermott	Rice (NY)	Tsongas
McGovern	Richmond	Van Hollen
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Vargas
Meeks	Ruiz	Veasey
Meng	Ruppersberger	Vela
Moore	Rush	Velázquez
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Visclosky
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez, Linda T.	Walz
Nadler	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Napolitano	Schakowsky	Schultz
Neal	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Nolan	Schrader	Watson Coleman
	Scott (VA)	Welch
	Scott, David	Wilson (FL)
		Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—16

Barr	Frankel (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Bera	Granger	Thompson (PA)
Bustos	Jolly	Wagner
Clay	Pelosi	Westmoreland
Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	
Fincher	Smith (WA)	

□ 1458

Mr. MILLER of Florida changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 497, had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

Mr. BERA. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to cast a vote on rollcall vote No. 497, ordering the previous question, because I was at the Pentagon Ceremony Recognizing the Heroism and Valor of Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Specialist Alek Skarlatos, and Mr. Anthony Sadler. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE
HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 11, 2015.

Hon. JOHN BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a facsimile copy of a letter received from Mr. Steven S. Sandvoss, Executive Director, State Board of Elections for the State of Illinois, indicating that, according to the preliminary results of the Special Election held September 10, 2015, the Honorable Darin LaHood was elected Representative to Congress for the Eighteenth Congressional District, State of Illinois.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk.

Enclosure.

STATE BOARD OF ELECTIONS,
STATE OF ILLINOIS,
Springfield, IL, September 11, 2015.

Hon. KAREN L. HAAS,
Clerk, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MS. HAAS: This is to advise you that the unofficial results of the Special Election held on Thursday, September 10, 2015, for Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois, show that Darin LaHood received 35,213 votes or 75% of the total number of votes cast for that office.

It would appear from these unofficial results that Darin LaHood was elected as Representative in Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of Illinois.

To the best of our knowledge and belief at this time, there is no contest to this election.

As soon as the official results are certified to this office by all 19 jurisdictions involved, an official Certificate of Election will be prepared for transmittal as required by law.

Sincerely,

STEVEN S. SANDVOSS,
Executive Director.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE DARIN
LAHOOD, OF ILLINOIS, AS A MEMBER OF THE
HOUSE

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, as the dean of the Illinois delegation, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable DARIN LAHOOD, be permitted to take the oath of office today.

His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest and no question has been raised with regard to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Will Representative-elect LAHOOD and the members of the Illinois delegation present themselves in the well.

All Members will rise, and the Representative-elect will please raise his right hand.

Mr. LAHOOD appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter, so help you God.

The SPEAKER. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the 114th Congress.

WELCOMING THE HONORABLE DARIN LAHOOD TO
THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, DARIN LAHOOD is a central Illinois native who was born and raised in Peoria, Illinois. He comes to the U.S. Congress after serving over 4 years in the Illinois

State Senate. Before that, he was a State and Federal prosecutor; an assistant United States attorney; an assistant State's attorney in Cook County in the narcotics unit; and a felony prosecutor in Tazewell County. He is known for his work fighting terrorism and making America safer.

On a personal note, DARIN's dad was former Member of the House Ray LaHood.

I would just like to hasten to add that I can't think of a Member of the House that I love or care for more than Ray LaHood. And I just want to say to his son, everybody keeps saying: Who is the new Congressman? Everybody says: Well, that is Ray LaHood's son. Well, pretty soon—I want to make everyone know—he is going to be known for a lot more than that. But what a wonderful beginning.

I yield to my colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. I thank my colleague.

I don't have much to add. We are glad to have DARIN here as a new Member of the 114th Congress. Obviously, he is joined by his dad. Also who we had hoped was going to be here—but I know he is watching—is former Minority Leader Bob Michel, who is really part of the LaHood clan, and we think of him as we swear in DARIN.

DARIN has already hit the ground running, and I can speak for all my colleagues here, DARIN, that we will do all we can to help you be successful.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that I can't wait to work with him. And I know very soon that former Congressman Ray LaHood is going to be known as his father.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to now welcome the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. I thank Speaker BOEHNER for swearing me in today.

Mr. Speaker, it is a true honor to be here. I am humbled and honored to be a part of this body. And I want to thank my colleagues—Congressman SHIMKUS, Congressman GUTIÉRREZ, and the rest of the Illinois delegation—for being here today. I look forward to working with them and being a productive Member of this body.

I would just like to thank my constituents that voted for me in this special election. We worked hard over the last 6 months in this race, and I am proud to be entrusted with the responsibility that 710,000 people gave me in my district in Illinois. I am proud of that district, and I am proud of my record in the State Senate. Again, I look forward to bringing the values that I have had in Illinois to this body.

I also want to thank my family. The family is the pride and joy of who I am. I have my three boys up here today—McKay, who is 13; Teddy, who is 8; Lucas, who is 11—and my wife Kristen, who is in the gallery. I couldn't do this without her.

Kristen, please stand up.

I guess I would just say that I look forward to working hard in this body, to meeting my colleagues, doing a lot of listening, and doing a lot of learning to be the best Member of Congress I can be.

I also want to thank my mom and dad and my extended family for being here.

I am proud to be the son of Ray and Kathy LaHood and the values that they instilled in me: faith, family, working hard, remembering where you came from, doing the best job you can for the people you represent, and staying grounded in your district.

I couldn't be prouder to be here today with the legacy in this district going back to Abraham Lincoln; and Bob Michel for 38 years, who I am sorry couldn't be here today. When I think about Bob Michel and think about 71 years ago he began his service to this country on the beaches of Normandy and spent 38 years in this body representing Peoria, and then he, during his time when Reagan was here, ushered in Reagan's values to help change this country, to have that legacy means so much.

I know I have got a lot to learn. I look forward to hitting the ground running, being the best Member of Congress that I can, and working hard for my district.

Thank you very much.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the administration of the oath to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the whole number of the House is 435.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. ROBY). The gentleman from Colorado will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, does this martial law amendment mean that any bill next week can be brought up without the 24-hour notice that we normally have to read a bill directly to the floor?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will not interpret the pending proposition.

Mr. POLIS. Well, Madam Speaker, that is the plain language of this amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the adoption of the amendment to House Resolution 420 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 237, noes 187, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 498]

AYES—237

Abraham	Guinta	Pearce
Aderholt	Guthrie	Perry
Allen	Hanna	Pittenger
Amodei	Hardy	Pitts
Babin	Harper	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harris	Poliquin
Barton	Hartzler	Pompeo
Benishek	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bilirakis	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Reichart
Black	Hill	Renacci
Blackburn	Holding	Ribble
Blum	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Bost	Huelskamp	Rigell
Boustany	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brat	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Issa	Rokita
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jolly	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Royce
Chabot	Katko	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (IA)	Sanford
Cole	King (NY)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Labrador	Sessions
Cook	LaHood	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Shuster
Cramer	Lamborn	Simpson
Crawford	Lance	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Denham	Love	Stewart
Dent	Lucas	Stivers
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Thornberry
Dold	Marchant	Tiberi
Donovan	Marino	Tipton
Duffy	McCarthy	Trott
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Upton
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Valadao
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walberg
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walorski
Fleischmann	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Messer	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mica	Westerman
Fox	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wittman
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gibbs	Mullin	Woodall
Gibson	Mulvaney	Yoder
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Young (IA)
Gosar	Newhouse	Young (IN)
Gowdy	Noem	Zeldin
Granger	Nugent	Zinke
Graves (GA)	Nunes	
Graves (LA)	Olson	
Graves (MO)	Palazzo	
Griffith	Palmer	
Grothman	Paulsen	

NOES—187

Adams	Amash	Bass
Aguilar	Ashford	Beatty

Becerra	Garamendi	Nadler
Bera	Graham	Napolitano
Beyer	Grayson	Neal
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nolan
Blumenauer	Green, Gene	Norcross
Bonamici	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Pallone
F.	Hahn	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Hastings	Payne
Brooks (AL)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Peters
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Peterson
Bustos	Hinojosa	Pingree
Butterfield	Honda	Pocan
Capps	Hoyer	Polis
Capuano	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cárdenas	Israel	Quigley
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Jones	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Cicilline	Keating	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kildee	T.
Cleaver	Kilmer	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Kind	Schakowsky
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Connolly	Kuster	Schrader
Conyers	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Costa	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Courtney	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Crowley	Lee	Sherman
Cuellar	Levin	Sinema
Cummings	Lewis	Sires
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Speier
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Swalwell (CA)
DeGette	Lofgren	Takai
Delaney	Lowenthal	Takano
DeLauro	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DeSaulnier	(NM)	Tonko
Deutch	Lujan, Ben Ray	Torres
Doggett	(NM)	Tsongas
Doyle, Michael	Lynch	Van Hollen
F.	Maloney,	Vargas
Duckworth	Carolyn	Veasey
Edwards	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Ellison	Massie	Velázquez
Engel	Matsui	Visclosky
Eshoo	McCollum	Walz
Esty	McDermott	Wasserman
Farr	McGovern	Schultz
Fattah	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Meng	Welch
Fudge	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Gabbard	Moulton	Yarmuth
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	

NOT VOTING—10

Barr	Posey	Wagner
Dingell	Sanchez, Loretta	Westmoreland
Fincher	Smith (WA)	
Pelosi	Thompson (CA)	

□ 1517

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 238, noes 183, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 499]

AYES—238

Abraham	Grothman	Pearce
Aderholt	Guinta	Perry
Allen	Guthrie	Pittenger
Amodei	Hanna	Pitts
Babin	Hardy	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Harper	Poliquin
Barton	Harris	Pompeo
Benishek	Hartzler	Posey
Billrakis	Heck (NV)	Price, Tom
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Reichert
Blackburn	Hill	Renacci
Blum	Holding	Ribble
Bost	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Boustany	Huelskamp	Rigell
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Roby
Brat	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Rohrabacher
Buchanan	Issa	Rokita
Buck	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Burgess	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Byrne	Johnson, Sam	Ross
Calvert	Jolly	Rothfus
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Joyce	Royce
Chabot	Katko	Russell
Chaffetz	Kelly (MS)	Ryan (WI)
Clawson (FL)	Kelly (PA)	Salmon
Coffman	King (IA)	Sanford
Cole	King (NY)	Scalise
Collins (GA)	Kinzinger (IL)	Schweikert
Collins (NY)	Kline	Scott, Austin
Comstock	Knight	Sensenbrenner
Conaway	Labrador	Sessions
Cook	LaHood	Shimkus
Costello (PA)	LaMalfa	Shuster
Cramer	Lamborn	Simpson
Crawford	Lance	Smith (MO)
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Culberson	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Curbelo (FL)	Long	Smith (TX)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Denham	Love	Stewart
Dent	Lucas	Stivers
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Stutzman
DesJarlais	Lummis	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Thornberry
Dold	Marchant	Tiberi
Donovan	Marino	Tipton
Duffy	McCarthy	Trott
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Turner
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Upton
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Valadao
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walberg
Farenthold	McMorris	Walker
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	Walorski
Fleischmann	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Fleming	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Flores	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Messer	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Mica	Westerman
Fox	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Franks (AZ)	Miller (MI)	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gibbs	Mullin	Womack
Gibson	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Gohmert	Neugebauer	Yoder
Goodlatte	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gosar	Noem	Young (IA)
Gowdy	Nugent	Young (IN)
Granger	Nunes	Zeldin
Graves (GA)	Olson	Zinke
Graves (LA)	Palazzo	
Graves (MO)	Palmer	
Griffith	Paulsen	
Grothman		

NOES—183

Adams	Blumenauer	Capuano
Aguilar	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Amash	Boyle, Brendan	Carney
Ashford	F.	Carson (IN)
Bass	Brady (PA)	Cartwright
Beatty	Brown (FL)	Castor (FL)
Becerra	Brownley (CA)	Castro (TX)
Bera	Bustos	Chu, Judy
Beyer	Butterfield	Cicilline
Bishop (GA)	Capps	Clarke (NY)

Clay	Johnson (GA)	Peters
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson
Clyburn	Jones	Pingree
Cohen	Kaptur	Pocan
Connolly	Keating	Polis
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Price (NC)
Costa	Kennedy	Quigley
Courtney	Kildee	Rangel
Crowley	Kilmer	Rice (NY)
Cuellar	Kind	Richmond
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Ruiz
Davis, Danny	Langevin	Ruppersberger
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Rush
DeLaney	Larson (CT)	Ryan (OH)
DeLauro	Lawrence	Sánchez, Linda
DeBene	Lee	T.
DeSaulnier	Levin	Sarbanes
Deutch	Lewis	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
Doyle, Michael	Lipinski	Schrader
F.	Loebuck	Scott (VA)
Duckworth	Lofgren	Scott, David
Edwards	Lowenthal	Serrano
Ellison	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
Engel	Lujan Grisham	Sherman
Eshoo	(NM)	Sinema
Esty	Lujan, Ben Ray	Sires
Farr	(NM)	Slaughter
Fattah	Lynch	Speier
Foster	Maloney,	Swalwell (CA)
Frankel (FL)	Carolyn	Takai
Fudge	Maloney, Sean	Takano
Gabbard	Massie	Thompson (MS)
Gallo	Matsui	Titus
Garamendi	McCollum	Tonko
Graham	McDermott	Torres
Grayson	McGovern	Tsongas
Green, Al	McNerney	Van Hollen
Green, Gene	Meeks	Vargas
Grijalva	Meng	Veasey
Gutiérrez	Moore	Vela
Hahn	Moulton	Velázquez
Hastings	Murphy (FL)	Visclosky
Heck (WA)	Nadler	Walz
Higgins	Napolitano	Wasserman
Himes	Neal	Schultz
Hinojosa	Nolan	Waters, Maxine
Honda	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Hoyer	O'Rourke	Welch
Huffman	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Israel	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Jackson Lee	Payne	
Jeffries	Perlmutter	

NOT VOTING—13

Barr	Fincher	Thompson (CA)
Clark (MA)	Mulvaney	Wagner
Conyers	Pelosi	Westmoreland
DeFazio	Sanchez, Loretta	
Dingell	Smith (WA)	

□ 1524

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I unfortunately missed the vote on adoption of H. Res. 420. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

LAWSUIT ABUSE REDUCTION ACT OF 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 420, I call up the bill (H.R. 758) to amend rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLEISCHMANN). Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 758

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ATTORNEY ACCOUNTABILITY.

(a) SANCTIONS UNDER RULE 11.—Rule 11(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "may" and inserting "shall";

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking "Rule 5" and all that follows through "motion." and inserting "Rule 5."; and

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking "situated" and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting "situated, and to compensate the parties that were injured by such conduct. Subject to the limitations in paragraph (5), the sanction shall consist of an order to pay to the party or parties the amount of the reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the violation, including reasonable attorneys' fees and costs. The court may also impose additional appropriate sanctions, such as striking the pleadings, dismissing the suit, or other directives of a non-monetary nature, or, if warranted for effective deterrence, an order directing payment of a penalty into the court.".

(b) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or an amendment made by this Act shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws, or under the Constitution of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on H.R. 758, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, would restore mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits filed in Federal Court. Many Americans may not realize it, but today, under what is called rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, there is no requirement that those who file frivolous lawsuits pay for the unjustified legal costs they impose on their victims, even when those victims prove to a judge the lawsuit was without any basis in law or fact. As a result, the current rule 11 goes largely unenforced, because the victims of frivolous lawsuits have little incentive to pursue additional litigation to have the

case declared frivolous when there is no guarantee of compensation at the end of the day.

H.R. 758 would finally provide light at the end of the tunnel for the victims of frivolous lawsuits by requiring sanctions against the filers of frivolous lawsuits, sanctions which include paying back victims for the full costs of their reasonable expenses incurred as a direct result of the rule 11 violation, including attorneys' fees.

The bill also strikes the current provisions in rule 11 that allow lawyers to avoid sanctions for making frivolous claims and demands by simply withdrawing them within 21 days. This change eliminates the free pass lawyers now have to file frivolous lawsuits in Federal Court.

□ 1530

The current lack of mandatory sanctions leads to the regular filing of lawsuits that are clearly baseless. So many frivolous pleadings currently go under the radar because the lack of mandatory sanctions for frivolous filings forces victims of frivolous lawsuits to roll over and settle the case because doing that is less expensive than litigating the case to a victory in court.

Correspondence written by someone filing a frivolous lawsuit, which became public, concisely illustrates how the current lack of mandatory sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits leads to legal extortion.

That correspondence to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit states, "I really don't care what the law allows you to do. It's a more practical issue. Do you want to send your attorney a check every month indefinitely as I continue to pursue this?"

Under the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, those who file frivolous lawsuits would no longer be able to get off scot-free; and, therefore, they could not get away with those sorts of extortionary threats any longer.

The victims of lawsuit abuse are not just those who are actually sued. Rather, we all suffer under a system in which innocent Americans everywhere live under the constant fear of a potentially bankrupting frivolous lawsuit.

As the former chairman of The Home Depot company has written, "An unpredictable legal system casts a shadow over every plan and investment. It is devastating for start-ups. The cost of even one ill-timed abusive lawsuit can bankrupt a growing company and cost hundreds of thousands of jobs."

The prevalence of frivolous lawsuits in America is reflected in the absurd warning labels companies must place on their products to limit their exposure to frivolous claims.

A 5-inch brass fishing lure with three hooks is labeled "Harmful if swallowed." A Vanishing Fabric Marker warns it "Should not be used . . . for

signing checks or any legal documents, as signatures will . . . disappear completely."

A household iron contains the warning "Never iron clothes while they are being worn." A piece of ovenware warns "Ovenware will get hot when used in oven." A hair dryer warns "Never use while sleeping."

A cardboard car sun shield that keeps sun off the dashboard warns "Do not drive with sun shield in place." Not to be outdone, a giant Yellow Pages directory warns "Do not use this directory while operating a motor vehicle."

Here are just a couple of examples of frivolous lawsuits brought in Federal court in which judges failed to award compensation to the victims:

A man sued a television network for \$2.5 million because he said a show it aired raised his blood pressure. When the network publicized his frivolous lawsuit, he demanded the court make them stop.

Although the court found the case frivolous, not only did it not compensate the victim, it granted the man who filed the frivolous lawsuit an exemption from even paying the ordinary court filing fees.

In another case, lawyers filed a case against a parent, claiming the parent's discipline of his child violated the Eighth Amendment of the Constitution, which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment by the government, not private citizens. One of the lawyers even admitted to signing the complaint without reading it.

The court found the case frivolous, but it awarded the victim only about a quarter of its legal costs because rule 11 currently doesn't require that a victim's legal costs be paid in full. The Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would change that.

In his 2011 State of the Union Address, President Obama said, "I'm willing to look at other ideas to . . . rein in frivolous lawsuits."

Mr. President, here it is: a one-page bill that would significantly reduce the burden of frivolous litigation on innocent Americans.

I thank the former chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Congressman LAMAR SMITH, for introducing this simple, commonsense legislation that would do so much to prevent lawsuit abuse and to restore Americans' confidence in the legal system. I urge my colleagues to support it today.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I was duly impressed with the statement and position of my chairman, but I find it hard to believe it is on this bill because this bill is not a bill that should be passed.

This bill is an affront to the judges of this country, to the Judicial Conference, and to the American Bar Association.

The American Bar Association, a conservative organization, has come out against it. The Judicial Conference, made up of predominantly appellate judges, headed by Chief Justice Roberts—mostly of Republican-appointed judges—came out against it because it is not necessary.

It will clog the courts with unnecessary litigation, cost money, and make it more difficult to get your cases disposed of. It is just unnecessary.

Indeed, it would amend rule 11, but in such a way that it could have a serious deleterious effect on civil rights claims as well as to increase the volume and cost of litigation. If this House were a court and not a legislative body, rule 11 sanctions could apply here.

These concerns are not hypothetical. They are based on actual experience. From 1983 to 1993, there was a version of rule 11 that this law would reinstate.

So all you have to do and all any legislative body ought to do is go back and look at what happened in history. These rules were in effect from 1983 to 1993, taking a judge's discretion away.

Judges can order sanctions. They can make sure that those cases that were brought up about reading a phone book and having a wreck are out, gone. They can do that.

This takes their discretion away, and they have got to give costs and compensation to the other side's lawyers. And then there are hearings and all of that stuff.

Presently, the court has discretion, and there is a 21-day safe harbor provision where an attorney can withdraw or correct any alleged submissions that were wrong.

This requires the courts to award reasonable attorneys' fees and other costs. It does not leave it to the discretion of the court.

Currently, such awards are entirely at the court's discretion, and they are limited to deterrence purposes, not for the compensation of lawyers.

Simply put, H.R. 758 will have a deleterious impact on the administration of justice for these reasons:

First, civil rights. Think about *Brown v. Board of Education*. When it came before the court, it was a novel case, and a judge in certain places, especially in the South in 1954, might have said: Sorry, lawyer. You are out of here.

The judge would have had no option under this but to grant costs against the attorney who brought the case, Mr. Marshall, and we might not have ever had *Brown v. Board of Education*.

Civil rights cases comprise 11 percent of Federal cases filed, but more than 22 percent of the cases in which sanctions have been imposed for civil rights cases. H.R. 758 would restore this problem. Just imagine that result. There are other cases that are similar.

The legal arguments in landmark cases where certain novel arguments

are made that are not based on then-existing law would be affected. Litigation would be prolonged and may be too expensive to continue.

Secondly, H.R. 758 will also substantially increase the amount, cost, and intensity of litigation. Experts in civil procedure are virtually unanimous on this point.

By making sanctions mandatory and having no safe harbor, the 1983 rule spawned a "cottage industry" of litigation. There were financial incentives to file rule 11s.

Prior to the 1983 rule taking effect—this really gets me—there had been only 19 rule 11 proceedings over the course of 45 years, but in the decade that this rule was in effect, which this bill wants to reinstate, there were 7,000 proceedings in 10 years—11 in 45 years and 7,000 in 10 years. So we are talking about a lot of litigation and clogging up of the courts.

One-third of all Federal lawsuits were burdened by these satellite litigations that came about because of this rule. It strips the judiciary of discretion, and it utterly ignores the thorough process by which the Federal court rules are usually amended.

H.R. 758 overrides this judicial independence by removing the discretion to impose sanctions and to determine which sanctions might be appropriate. It circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process that Congress itself established 80 years ago.

The 1993 amendments to rule 11 have been a tremendous success. That is what this would throw out. As documented by the Judicial Conference of the United States, these amendments resulted in a "marked decline in rule 11 satellite litigation without any noticeable increase in frivolous filings."

H.R. 758, however, would undo this. That is why the American Bar Association and the Judicial Conference oppose it.

It is also opposed by the Alliance for Justice, the Center for Justice & Democracy, the Consumer Federation of America, the Consumers Union, and Public Citizen.

This is a deeply flawed bill that addresses a nonexistent problem. We have this bill, and we have a bill on abortion. It seems like today's actions in Congress are Shakespearean, first, "kill the lawyers," but, this time, it is "kill the judges." The other one is "kill the doctors."

Congress knows the answer. We can tell the judges what they need to do because they are not doing it, and we will tell the doctors what they need to do, and we will tell the women what they need to do. Unfortunately, that is what we have come down to, a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say to the gentleman from Tennessee that no

judges have to find a frivolous lawsuit to be a frivolous lawsuit. They have that discretion in every case.

But once they find it to be a frivolous lawsuit, it is injustice to not award attorneys' fees under rule 11 to those who have been wronged by being the victims of a frivolous lawsuit.

What about the burden on the court?

When the mandatory rule 11 sanction provision was in effect for almost 10 years between 1983 and 1993, the number of rule 11 court proceedings was easily manageable by the courts.

The number of rule 11 court proceedings during that time amounted to 7.5 reported rule 11 cases per Federal district court per year, or one reported decision for each Federal district court judge per year, one per judge per year. That is not an unreasonable burden on our Federal judiciary to see justice done.

Quite frankly, if that were done more often today, we would see a lot fewer frivolous lawsuits to begin with and, therefore, fewer requests for attorneys' fees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the author of the legislation, the former chairman of the House Judiciary Committee and the current chairman of the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, let me thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for bringing this legislation to the House floor.

I appreciate all of his efforts to do so, and I appreciate his taking the initiative on this and on so many other issues as chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, known as LARA, is just over one-page long, but it would prevent the filing of hundreds of thousands of pages of frivolous lawsuits in Federal court.

For example, frivolous lawsuits have been filed against The Weather Channel for failing to accurately predict storms, against television shows people claimed were too scary, and against fast food companies because inactive children gained weight.

In other cases, prison inmates have sued alcohol companies, blaming them for a life of crime. A teacher sought damages from her school district based on her fear of children. A father demanded \$40 million in compensation after his son was kicked off the track team for excessive absenteeism. There are many, many more examples.

Frivolous lawsuits have simply become too common. Lawyers who bring these cases have everything to gain and nothing to lose under current rules, which permit plaintiffs' lawyers to file frivolous lawsuits, no matter how absurd the claims, without any penalty whatsoever. Meanwhile, defendants are often faced with years of

litigation and substantial attorneys' fees.

These cases have wrongly cost innocent Americans their reputations and their hard-earned dollars. They amount to legalized extortion because defendants must settle out of court rather than endure a more expensive trial.

According to the research firm Towers Watson, the annual direct cost of American tort litigation now exceeds over \$260 billion a year, or over \$850 per person.

Before 1993, it was mandatory for judges to impose sanctions, such as orders to pay for the other side's legal expenses when lawyers filed frivolous lawsuits.

Then the Civil Rules Advisory Committee, an obscure branch of the courts, made penalties optional. This needs to be reversed by Congress.

□ 1545

As Chairman GOODLATTE noted, even President Obama has expressed a willingness to limit frivolous lawsuits. If the President is serious about stopping these meritless claims, he should support mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits to avoid making frivolous promises.

LARA requires lawyers who file frivolous lawsuits to pay the attorneys' fees and court costs of innocent defendants. It reverses the rules that made sanctions discretionary rather than mandatory.

Further, LARA expressly provides that no claim under civil rights laws would be affected in any way, and I trust this will address the concerns expressed by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN). I would like to direct his attention to page 2 of the bill, lines 18 to 23, which explicitly protect civil rights lawsuits.

Opponents argue that reinstating mandatory sanctions for frivolous lawsuits impedes judicial discretion. This is patently false. Under LARA, judges retain the discretion to determine whether or not a claim is frivolous. If a judge determines that a claim is frivolous, they must award sanctions. This ensures that victims of frivolous lawsuits obtain compensation, but the decision to find a claim frivolous still remains with the judge.

A report earlier this year from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts found that civil lawsuits increased by tens of thousands last year. Such an increase makes this legislation necessary in order to discourage abusive filings, which further strain court dockets with lengthy backlogs.

The American people are looking for solutions to obvious lawsuit abuse. LARA restores accountability to our legal system by reinstating mandatory sanctions for attorneys who file these frivolous lawsuits. Though it will not stop all lawsuit abuse, LARA encour-

ages attorneys to think twice before filing a frivolous lawsuit.

I want to, again, thank Chairman GOODLATTE for bringing this much-needed legislation to the House floor, and I ask my colleagues who oppose frivolous lawsuits and who want to protect hard-working Americans from false claims to support the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Now, furthermore, Mr. Speaker, similar bills to this have passed in the last several Congresses, and I hope this legislation will be approved today.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I have great respect for Mr. SMITH, as I do for Mr. GOODLATTE, but I would submit that the rule of construction, nothing in this act or an amendment made by this act, shall be construed to bar or impede the assertion or development of new claims, defenses, or remedies under Federal, State, or local laws, including civil rights laws or under the Constitution of the United States.

That is the same thing as the committee having—if they would have accepted the amendment that we offered to specifically exempt civil rights laws. That was not accepted.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. This particular rule of construction was a bipartisan effort led by BOBBY SCOTT, a former member of the Judiciary Committee, to avoid the problem that you are concerned about, and that is that this bill in any way would seem to dampen or prohibit civil rights legislation.

Again, this rule of construction was put in there to address the very problem that the gentleman is concerned about.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, I would submit the rule of construction is not the same thing as if the committee would have accepted the amendment offered that said specifically civil rights laws would not be affected by this because you could still offer a rule 11 under this. It just says nothing in this action will be construed to borrow or impede the assertion.

It doesn't borrow or impede the assertion of a new claim, but it doesn't say the court cannot find a rule 11 violation and then the mandatory imposition of costs would take place. It doesn't do what you are submitting, I would suggest.

The bottom line is the court felt that this wasn't necessary. The court said, in all those cases he talked about that seem so absurd—I don't understand—and particularly as lawyer—why a lawyer would waste his time doing it because there is no chance of success and no chance of remuneration in cases like that.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT), who can explain easily and in a very facile fashion why those arguments are not good.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I will say, with due deference to respected colleagues from Virginia and Texas, this is a misguided piece of legislation.

I speak as not only a Member of this House, but also as somebody who has practiced civil litigation for the last 25 years. I have represented companies, consumers, defendants, and plaintiffs in all sorts of civil litigation; and I have done this before and after the 1993 changes that led to the current rule 11.

Where I come out on it is that this really is an attack on the Federal judiciary. Yes, they have discretion on whether to decide whether there has been a rule 11 violation of in initio, but this is something that encourages rule 11 motion litigation.

It encourages rule 11 motion practice, and that is why the Federal judges oppose it. The Judicial Conference surveyed the Federal judges of this Nation, and fully 87 percent of United States district judges prefer the current version of rule 11. After all, it already allows monetary sanctions for silly lawsuits.

I think something of a false picture was presented a little bit earlier, the implication that Federal judges don't have the power to impose monetary sanctions. Court costs and legal fees of the so-called victims of frivolous lawsuits, that is in the current practice of rule 11. They can do that now.

If a Federal judge decides that he or she thinks that a lawsuit has been frivolous and dismissed, on that basis, they can fully award all defense costs and defense fees. As a result, this is completely unnecessary and superfluous legislation. It offends the Federal judiciary. After all, we are talking about limiting the discretion of Federal judges.

Federal judges are folks that are appointed. We work very, very hard here on Capitol Hill in making sure that we appoint only the Federal judges who will exercise good discretion, Federal judges that are completely vetted, who are interviewed, who go through hearing after hearing and are very carefully selected here by the United States Congress.

To say that we cannot and we should not repose full discretion in our Federal judges is what is being said here, and I think it is a misguided attempt to take away the discretion of our Federal judges.

Not only that, it leads to unnecessary litigation. Everybody in court who ever won a motion or threw out a case thinks that the opposition's position was frivolous.

When you say rule 11 sanctions are mandatory, it creates this compulsion to follow up a motion victory with a rule 11 motion: Not only did I win the case, but I want you to pay my attorney's fees and costs.

When you make it a mandatory sanction like this, you create this compul-

sion to file rule 11 motions, and I don't say that out of theory, Mr. Speaker.

The truth is that we did have, in that 10-year period, 7,000 rule 11 motions. This is the type of a rule that we lived under for 10 years that this legislation would go back to that spawned all this extraneous litigation. You say: Your position was frivolous, so I am filing a rule 11 motion.

Guess what—rule 11 motions themselves are subject to rule 11 so that they could be frivolous so that the receiving end says: Well, your rule 11 motion was frivolous, so I am filing my own rule 11 motion against you.

That is something that happened.

In fact, a United States district judge from the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, Robert S. Gawthrop, in the suburban Philadelphia area, he termed that "zombie litigation." That is something that gets spawned by this type of litigation. We don't need zombie litigation in this country.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would just ask the gentleman this: What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—prove in court, but be denied damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I am afraid I am not following the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. It is a simple question. What other sorts of legal claims should a victim be able to prove in court—because they are allowed to do this under rule 11—prove that they have suffered damages in court, but be denied those damages by the judge?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. This is not something that is denied. Judges have discretion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COHEN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that this is misguided legislation.

More ominously, it disproportionately hurts the people filing claims—civil rights claims, consumer rights claims—and it has a chilling effect on legal innovation. It was legal innovation on the part of Thurgood Marshall to come up with *Brown v. Board of Education*. Who are we to chill that kind of legal innovation in this Chamber?

For those reasons, I oppose this legislation.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was not able to identify a single other sort of legal claim where the victim would be able to prove their damages in

court, but still be denied those damages by the judge.

What I am getting at is that in no other area of the law can a person prove to a judge that they are a victim under the standards that define the wrong they have suffered, yet the judge retains the discretion to refrain from compensating the victim of the legal wrong.

All this bill does is provide equal treatment by allowing victims of frivolous lawsuits, who prove the lawsuit against them was frivolous, the right to compensation for the harm done to them, just like every other victim of a legal wrong.

I would continue to ask: In what other area of the law can a person prove to the judge they were the victim of a legal wrong and still be denied compensation by the judge?

This only occurs after the judge has already found that the lawsuit was frivolous, which would not apply to some of the great cases through history where courts have found merit to the case. They are not going to find it frivolous.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The answer is that, every time somebody with damages proves his or her case in front of a jury, the jury has the discretion to award whatever they think is proper damages. For example, if they accept some of the damages and reject other parts of the damages, they don't award the full amount, and that is the kind of discretion a Federal judge should retain.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the judge has that discretion under current law, has that discretion under this bill, but they don't have the discretion to say they are not going to award any damages where the case is found to be frivolous and, in fact, damages have been incurred.

Obviously, the judge has a discretion to determine what those actual damages are, but he doesn't have the discretion to simply say: I am not going to award damages, even though I found the case to be frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD), a member of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 758, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act, commonly called LARA, sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Texas, Mr. LAMAR SMITH. The legal system in the United States needs to be driven by justice, not by dollars.

Right now, there are too many lawyers out there throwing their money at frivolous lawsuits to manipulate and abuse the system. No one should be able to abuse our system.

It is simple to file a lawsuit, and you can cost the defendant hundreds of thousands of dollars on a frivolous claim going through discovery and going through all of the legal processes. That simply isn't right.

LARA ensures that judges impose monetary sanctions against lawyers who file these frivolous lawsuits, including the costs of attorneys' fees incurred by their victims. It prevents bad lawyers from using the judicial system as a weapon and provides justice for those who have been abused by these attorneys.

By passing LARA, these attorneys will no longer be able to exert power over their victims with these suits that are not based on facts or in law, but are merely intended to scare or extort money out of the victims.

I remember when I was in law school in Congressman SMITH's hometown of San Antonio, Texas, and one of the professors in one of my classes said something that has stuck with me for all these years about a lawsuit: You may be able to beat the wrap, but you can't beat the ride.

□ 1600

LARA helps with that. You are not going to be able to stop the emotional roller coaster ride the defendant and his family, his partners, his employees, his friends all go through as a result of the lawsuit that is frivolous, but you will be able to beat some of the cost of that ride by holding the attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits responsible for that. That is what we need to do.

Frivolous lawsuits drain victims of their money and damage their reputations. Let's stop them before they start by putting the lawyers at risk for filing frivolous lawsuits.

In many countries, there is a loser pay system. We are not proposing we go that far here in the United States, but we do want justice for those who are victims of clearly frivolous lawsuits, and this legislation will make sure that that happens. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH), who was a distinguished barrister before becoming a Congressman.

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

Today, Mr. Speaker, is Constitution Day. How is the House GOP celebrating Constitution Day? By trampling on our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary as one of three separate but equal branches of government.

The Framers of our Constitution established an independent judicial

branch because they believed the judges should be able to interpret the law without interference. They believed that only when judges were shielded from the influence of politicians and pundits and special interests could they issue rulings fairly and impartially. In short, they worked to create a system that shielded judges from efforts like the one behind today's Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act.

This legislation, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more—I repeat, this legislation is nothing more—than a giveaway to corporate special interests that seek to price Americans out of their day in court. The bill restores a rule, reimposes a rule that our independent judiciary system abandoned over 20 years ago because it unfairly disadvantaged workers and consumers and other Americans that dared to take on big corporations in court.

Our judges put in place this rule—or kept this version that we use today of this rule—20 years ago, and they remain strongly in support of it today. That is because today's rule, Mr. Speaker, gives judges the flexibility to determine when to apply sanctions against attorneys who file frivolous lawsuits.

This legislation flies in the face of our Framers' vision of an independent judiciary. It strips our judges of their discretion, imposing congressionally mandated rules that drove up costs and clogged our courts when these were the rules before.

We don't have to debate the harmful consequences of this legislation because history has already shown us how the 1983 version of rule 11 tipped the scales of justice in favor of those with the deepest pockets.

Mr. Speaker, too often everyday Americans feel that they have got the cards stacked against them in our economy and in our elections. Let's give them a fighting chance in the courtroom and reject this frivolous bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 758.

This is not an attack on the Federal judiciary. This is an attack on those unscrupulous lawyers and con artists who are bilking the American people out of hundreds of millions of dollars that they have had to earn and work hard in order to achieve. Our system is out of whack today, and today we find our honest citizens exposed to this type of threat. This would take care of that somewhat.

First, I would like to thank my good friend from Texas, LAMAR SMITH, for his bill, which I believe is so important, as many small- and medium-sized businesses like we have in California are hit every year with frivolous and abusive lawsuits.

I would also like to thank my friends Chairman TRENT FRANKS from Arizona and especially Chairman BOB GOODLATTE from Virginia for their leadership on this much-needed legislation.

Frivolous lawsuits have cost honest Americans hundreds of millions of dollars by encouraging lawyers and scam artists to attack honest citizens, expecting that these honest citizens will opt for a settlement. This is what we call a legal shakedown, and it must be ended, which is what H.R. 758 intends to do.

Let us note that giving in when someone reaches a settlement rather than trying to fight people who have more resources than they do, even though it is a frivolous lawsuit, encourages more people to have more lawsuits and encourages certain lawyers to go down a route where they are only aimed at trying to use their leverage against honest citizens to enrich themselves.

I would note that this legislation will go a long way in these specific areas in terms that threaten all Americans, honest citizens, but it especially will take care of another concern that I have had, of course, and Chairman GOODLATTE and Chairman SMITH have had, and that is it takes care of patent trolls, who are scam artists who use claims of patent infringement in their frivolous lawsuits.

Other proposed approaches to this problem deal with the problem in a way that would hurt legitimate inventors—this is where we have a little disagreement—but this solution will help these inventors and help all enterprisers and entrepreneurs. H.R. 758, combined with the actions of the FTC and other States on bad faith demand letters, gives small-business owners the tools they need to fight scam artists, including patent trolls who attempt to use our judicial process to extort America's job creators.

I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 758. Support those people who are creating jobs throughout our society. Support those people who deserve the protection and are not trying to scam our system.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, should those filing a frivolous lawsuit be held accountable to the victims of that frivolous lawsuit? I think most people would say yes. There are hard-working Americans and small businesses across this country spending tens of thousands of dollars, collectively millions of dollars every year defending themselves from frivolous lawsuits.

A frivolous lawsuit, as it is defined, has no basis in fact or in law, no basis

whatsoever. A judge can make a determination—must make a determination—whether a lawsuit is frivolous or not upon the question being presented and yet not award damages even upon a finding of a frivolous lawsuit. That just doesn't make sense, and it is not fair to the victims of frivolous lawsuits.

The bill that we are voting on here stands for something very basic. A judge shouldn't be allowed to deny damage awards to the victim of a frivolous lawsuit. A vote for this bill is a vote to reduce the filing of frivolous lawsuits; a vote for this bill is a vote to protect the integrity of the judicial system; and a vote for this bill is a warning shot to anyone who thinks that filing a frivolous lawsuit is a way to extort money.

It has been said—and I practiced law—what is the nuisance value of this claim? In other words, what would you advise your client to just pay the other side to make a frivolous lawsuit go away because of how costly it is and how much time you spend worrying and preparing?

Lawsuits can be very intimidating to a defendant, and those who have a good faith claim will litigate it out, and the judge won't find there to be anything frivolous about it; but when it is frivolous, those filing it should have to pay. This is very, very common sense.

A vote for this bill is standing on the side of small business and preserving the integrity of our judicial system.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First, I just want to go back to the Judicial Conference of the United States and their committee on rules of practice and procedure, which came out against this. They were just against it totally. In a letter signed by Judge Jeffrey Sutton and Judge David Campbell, they said it is going to cost money, going to impede justice, and is not necessary.

Now, we have heard this is common sense and all these frivolous cases and how absurd it is and how wrong it is and how terrible it is. Well, the two judges that wrote this letter to Mr. GOODLATTE and said that this was unnecessary, that we should just keep the rule we have got, that the rule that we are adopting was an error in 1983 to 1993, it cost a lot of money in frivolous litigation, satellite lawsuits, explosion of satellite litigation, and it just didn't work.

Judge Sutton was appointed to the bench by President Bush after clerking for Justices Scalia and Powell. I would assume that if you were appointed by President Bush, approved by the United States Senate, and you clerked for Justices Scalia and Powell, you are not some kind of a big supporter of frivolous lawsuits in the plaintiffs' bar.

The other gentleman is Judge Campbell from Arizona, also appointed by

President Bush. They were pretty adamant that this was a bad idea. They took some surveys, and 80-some-odd percent of folks said it was a bad idea. The bar association said it was a bad idea. The bar association had a group of 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics who participated in the 2010 conference at Duke University Law School convened by the advisory committee to search for ways to address the problem. Not one of the 200 people proposed a return to the 1983 version. So 200 lawyers, litigants, judges, and academics met, and none of them suggested this type of bill.

The Judicial Conference, headed up by two people appointed by President Bush, conservative judges, said this is a very bad idea. The bar association says it is a terrible idea. Yet we are to come here and think that Congress has got the best idea, better than all these specialists. That is one of the things that is wrong with this Congress. People realize that we are not respecting logic, expertise, and history.

In their letter, the judges said that this was a return to previous attempts to amend this rule, that it would eliminate this provision adopted in 1993, and their concerns that they expressed here mirrored the views expressed by the Judicial Conference in 2004 when the Republicans, I believe, had both Houses, the House and Senate, but they certainly had the House.

In 2005, this bill came up, and they came out against it. The Republicans had the House and maybe the Senate, I don't know. The bill came up again in 2011 and 2013. So this bill has been here in 2004, 2005, 2011, and 2013, and the Judicial Conference, the judges, the lawyers, and the experts almost two to one have said it is a bad idea. I know it is throwback Thursday, but that is no reason to bring this bill forward.

□ 1615

I find it hard to be against my good friends, Mr. SMITH and Mr. GOODLATTE. They are fine gentlemen. Mr. ROHR-ABACHER was here. He is my buddy. But it is a bad bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. I thank Chairman GOODLATTE for yielding.

A couple of things. First of all, we have found in the past that the judiciary, of course, always opposes anyone else changing these rules except for themselves. That is no surprise, that they object to this change that we propose today.

That doesn't mean the change isn't a good one, but that is their history. If they didn't think of the change, they don't like it. Clearly, this is good for the American people because it reduces the number of frivolous lawsuits.

The gentleman from Tennessee mentioned a poll a few minutes ago. I

would like, first of all, to mention a poll that was taken when this rule was in effect in 1990.

At that point, 751 Federal judges responded to that survey, and they overwhelmingly supported a rule 11 with mandatory sanctions.

The gentleman mentioned, I believe, a 2005 survey. In that survey, only 278 judges responded. Over half of the judges who responded had no experience under this stronger rule 11 because they were appointed to the bench after 1992.

So the 2005 survey tells us very little about how judges actually view the stronger versus the weaker rule 11.

It is just amazing to me to hear individuals try to justify these frivolous lawsuits. There is no effort in this bill to deny individuals the right to file lawsuits if they have legitimate claims.

But to try to justify frivolous lawsuits and lawsuits that are found to be frivolous by judges, to me, is so contrary to the best interest of Americans who are innocent of these charges. I just don't understand the opposition to this bill.

Innocent Americans sacrifice reputations. They sacrifice money. They oftentimes lose their livelihoods to frivolous lawsuits. I think we ought to do everything we possibly can to reduce the number of these frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I respect Mr. SMITH and understand what he is saying about judges wanting to control their own courtrooms and control the system, but they have the expertise.

The bar association is not the judges. The bar association is against this, too. So you have got the bar association and the Judicial Conference, both of which are conservative organizations, against it.

In the study, yes, some of those folks might not have been there in 1983 to 1993, but they still knew what the rule was and they were able to study and they were able to understand things.

They weren't there when cases were filed. They didn't know the facts of the case. They learned. They have got minds that are capable of absorbing information, analyzing it, synthesizing it, and coming to decisions.

You didn't have to be alive when slavery was around to know slavery was bad. You didn't have to be on the bench from 1983 to 1993 to know that rule 11 was working and that this bill which brings back that old rule would be a failure.

So I think there is deference you should give to the bar association and to the Judicial Conference, both of which have come out against this.

There are motions for summary judgment. They talk as if there is no way to get rid of a frivolous lawsuit. If you bring a frivolous lawsuit, you are going

to get a motion for summary judgment. A court can order that. It can find a motion to dismiss. You don't even have to go into discovery.

The courts are the ones that suffer the most. You said that, sure, sometimes the defendants do from defending these cases, but the courts have to put up with it.

The courts don't want frivolous litigation at all. They probably are one of the first groups that don't want frivolous litigation.

I know some people that serve in this Congress who have been judges. They are outstanding men. They understand how important judges are and that their opinions should be revered and respected.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just say that sometimes I see Mr. ROHRBACHER and I think about the fact that we have traveled some together. One of the things I have learned on those travels is the thing people in foreign countries appreciate most about the United States of America is our justice system, the fact that you have got a system where you go in and get a case heard. That is one of the things that is best about our country.

What this is about is taking power from judges and giving financial incentives. The defendants have got the heavy pockets, and it will end up squeezing plaintiffs from bringing actions. If they are so frivolous, the judges will dismiss them on summary judgments or motions to dismiss.

The judges can still have sanctions and damages, but just not have all power taken from them. And there are other rules where they can have sanctions if you are just messing with discovery and violating the rules.

I just think this is going to help close our courts, and that is not the right way to go, particularly on Constitution Day.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Tennessee, who is my friend, that I was pleased that he cited as one of the credentials for the two judges that wrote to the committee on behalf of the Conference that they had been schooled by Justice Scalia.

Here is what Justice Scalia himself had to say about this. He specifically opposed the weakening of rule 11 when it occurred in 1993, writing that it would "render the Rule toothless, by allowing judges to dispense with sanction, by disfavoring compensation for litigation expenses, and by providing a 21-day 'safe harbor,'" entitling the party accused of a frivolous filing to escape with no sanction at all.

Justice Scalia further observed, "In my view, those who file frivolous suits

and pleadings should have no 'safe harbor.' The Rules should be solicitous of the abused (the courts and the opposing party), and not of the abuser. Under the revised Rule, parties will be able to file thoughtless, reckless, and harassing pleadings, secure in the knowledge that they have nothing to lose: If objection is raised, they can retreat without penalty."

So I also want to say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman from Tennessee and I agree on one of the great hallmarks of this country, and that is our judicial system. The hallmark of our judicial system is that, when you are victimized in this country, you have a place where you can go and seek justice.

That is exactly what Mr. SMITH's bill does. It allows people who are victimized by aggressive plaintiffs—abusive, frivolous, and fraudulent lawsuits—to be able to get justice themselves.

Because when you are the victim of an expensive, costly lawsuit that can damage your business, damage your reputation, cost you huge amounts of money, you are indeed a victim, if the court finds that that whole lawsuit was brought on a frivolous basis.

And, yet, I challenge again the other side of the aisle and those who oppose this legislation to name one other sort of legal claim—just one—where the victim is able to prove in court their damages and then be denied those damages by the judge.

They have not done that. They have not made their case in this court, the people's court. The elected representatives of the people today should pass this legislation and give justice to victims of frivolous lawsuits.

I urge my colleagues to support this great legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I oppose H.R. 758, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015."

This bill is substantially identical to bills that we considered in the 112th and 113th Congresses, and we have considered even earlier versions of this bill going back at least a decade.

H.R. 758, like its predecessors, is a solution in search of a problem that would threaten to do more harm than good if enacted.

H.R. 758 would restore the 1983 version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure by making sanctions for Rule 11 violations mandatory and by eliminating the current safe-harbor provision that allows a party to withdraw or correct any allegedly offending submission to the court within 21 days after service of such submission.

Moreover, the bill would go beyond the 1983 Rule by requiring a court to award reasonable attorneys' fees and costs related to Rule 11 litigation. Current Rule 11 makes such awards entirely discretionary.

Yet no empirical evidence suggests any need for a change to the current Rule 11.

In fact, there were good reasons why the Judicial Conference of the United States

amended the 1983 version of Rule 11. For these same reasons, H.R. 758 is ill-advised.

The 1983 Rule caused excessive litigation. Many civil cases had a parallel track of litigation—referred to as "satellite litigation"—over Rule 11 violations because having mandatory sanctions and no safe-harbor provision caused parties on both sides of a Rule 11 motion to litigate the Rule 11 matter to the bitter end.

The dramatic increase in litigation spawned by the 1983 Rule not only resulted in delays in resolving the underlying case and increased costs for the litigants, but also strained judicial resources.

In light of this history, it is clear that H.R. 758 will result in more, not less, litigation and will impose a great burden on the federal judiciary.

Ultimately, the type of Rule 11 sanctions regime that H.R. 758 envisions will only favor those with the money and resources to fight expensive and drawn out litigation battles.

H.R. 758 also threatens judicial independence by removing the discretion that Rule 11 currently gives judges in determining whether to impose sanctions and what type of sanctions would be most appropriate.

It also circumvents the painstakingly thorough Rules Enabling Act process, recklessly attempting to amend the rules directly, even over the Judicial Conference's objections.

Finally, we know that the 1983 Rule had a disproportionately chilling impact on civil rights cases, and there is no reason to think H.R. 758 would not have a similar chilling effect if it is enacted.

Civil rights cases in particular depend on novel arguments for the extension, modification, or reversal of existing law.

Not surprisingly, a Federal Judicial Center study found that the incidence of Rule 11 motions was higher in civil rights cases than some other types of cases when the 1983 Rule was in place, notwithstanding the fact that the 1983 Rule was neutral on its face.

Even the decision in *Brown v. Board of Education* arguably may have been delayed or stopped had H.R. 758's changes to Rule 11 been in effect at the time, given the novel nature of the plaintiffs' arguments in that case.

At a minimum, the defendants could have used Rule 11, as amended by H.R. 758, as a weapon to dissuade the plaintiffs or weaken their resolve.

H.R. 758 is a flawed bill for many reasons. I would urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a senior member of the Judiciary Committee and a strong defender of the civil rights and liberties of all Americans, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 758, the "Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015," which can more accurately be described as the "Denial of Access to Civil Justice Act."

This ill-considered and misguided legislation would rescind the current version of Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which has been in effect since 1993, and reinstate the disastrous 1983 version of the rule.

I strongly oppose H.R. 758 because it hampers the ability of federal district courts to deter frivolous litigation—while preserving access to the courts—by limiting the ability of judges to exercise discretion in imposing sanctions for Rule 11 violations.

Under H.R. 758, federal district judges would be required to impose sanctions for all violations of Rule 11, even in cases in which it would be manifestly inappropriate to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the reason the version of Rule 11(c) in effect from 1983–1993 was rescinded is because the results of its 10-year experiment proved conclusively that it did not work.

Instead of reducing frivolous litigation, mandatory imposition of sanction actually had the opposite effect of increasing litigation.

Indeed, according to the American Bar Association, “during the decade of that the 1983 version of the Rule requiring mandatory sanctions was in effect, an entire industry of litigation revolving around Rule 11 claims inundated the legal system and wasted valuable court resources and time.”

Studies by the Judicial Conference of the United States, the administrative arm of the federal judiciary, found that the 1983 version of Rule 11(c) quickly became a tool of abuse.

Aggressive filings of Rule 11 sanctions motions required expenditure of tremendous resources on Rule 11 battles having nothing to do with the merits of the case and everything to do with strategic gamesmanship.

Most importantly, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 758 would undermine civil rights cases.

During the decade between 1983 and 1993, mandatory sanctions under Rule 11 were disproportionately imposed in civil rights cases.

A leading study on this issue showed that although civil rights cases made up 11.4% of federal cases filed during this period, 22.7% of the cases in which sanctions had been imposed were civil rights cases.

If this bill were to be enacted, once again, as happened between 1983 and 1993, defendants in civil rights cases could wield Rule 11 as a weapon against legitimate plaintiffs, tying up civil rights cases in long and costly satellite litigation on Rule 11 and preventing legitimate civil rights cases from moving forward.

For these reasons, I urge all Members to vote against H.R. 758.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 758 the so-called “Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act of 2015” or LARA.

Congress has only seven legislative days left before the government shuts down and vital programs and departments are left unfunded. We should be debating and voting on budgetary measures to make sure that the government can still function and remains open. We are here instead, discussing a bill that has been introduced every Congress since 2011. Instead of voting on ways the government will stay open so we can continue to fund vital national priorities, we are here talking about legislation that does not solve any demonstrated need.

This bill seeks to fix the problem of frivolous lawsuits by enacting a law that used to exist and which judges themselves later rejected. A mandatory sanction of Rule 11 violations was an experiment that was tried in 1983 and was dismissed and abandoned just ten years later in 1993. Almost 100 percent of federal judges surveyed by the Federal Judicial Committee state that Rule 11 should not be altered in the way this Act envisions and 86 percent of judges think the existing rule is fine as is.

This bill will increase the cost and volume of cases and make it exponentially harder to ad-

vance civil rights suits. Landmark civil rights cases such as *Brown v. Board of Education*, *Griswold v. Connecticut*, and *Lawrence v. Texas* would not have survived if Rule 11 existed as this bill envisions. We should not put up barriers to continuing civil rights progress through the courts.

This bill is opposed by The American Bar Association, The Federal Judicial Center and countless other legal organizations. Their voices are clear: leave Rule 11 and judicial autonomy alone. Congress does not need to “fix” a problem that simply does not exist.

The Judiciary Committee report says that this law would “dispel the culture of fear that has come to permeate American society.” American society does not fear the existing process for Rule 11 sanctions. The American public is concerned about roads not being built, about the government shutting down, and about losing their health care coverage.

The American public does not want the government to shutdown. They have been there and done that. The last government shut down costs the American people \$24 billion dollars in lost economic output. That is why I introduced the Prevent a Government Shutdown Act of 2015. That is what we should be debating and voting on right now, Mr. Speaker. Not a law that was tried and rejected 22 years ago.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (H.R. 758). This misguided bill would reinstate procedural rules that failed thirty years ago, stripping federal judges of the ability to impose the sanctions they deem appropriate for bringing frivolous lawsuits. During the ten years the old rules were in effect, judges completely lost their discretion about whether or not to impose sanctions on attorneys and were forced to issue harsh penalties for even the smallest infractions. Heavy punishments under the old system lead to endless motions that clogged our already burdened legal system, preventing access to justice.

Moreover, had the provisions in this bill been law for all of the twentieth century, they would have prevented dozens of landmark civil rights cases from moving forward. Under this bill, both *Brown v. Board of Education*, which struck down school segregation, and *Loving v. Virginia*, which eliminated bans on interracial marriage, might not have made it into the courtroom. To rectify this situation, Congress in 1993 brought back the standards that existed during the Civil Rights Era, giving judges more flexibility and focusing on deterrence, rather than punishment. H.R. 758 would undo that work by abandoning our faith in judicial prudence. We should not repeat the mistakes of the past, and we should not allow this bill to become law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 420, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Ms. DELBENE. I am opposed, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. DelBene moves to recommit the bill H.R. 758 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add, at the end of the bill, the following:

SEC. 3. PROTECTING EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN.

This Act, and the amendments made by this Act, shall not apply in the case of any action brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws that ensure that women receive equal pay for equal work.

Ms. DELBENE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage as amended.

The so-called Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would turn back the clock to deter good-faith litigants seeking justice, like women who are denied equal pay for equal work.

The harmful effects of this bill are not speculative. We know this bill will undercut important civil rights and equal pay litigation because it would restore a version of rule 11 that was in effect from 1983 to 1993.

Under the version of rule 11 that this bill would resurrect, sanctions were disproportionately imposed against plaintiffs in civil rights and anti-discrimination cases. The old rule's onerous provisions created a chilling effect on civil rights litigation, created time-consuming and costly satellite litigation, and gave rise to needless delay and harassment in the courtroom.

This amendment would ensure the bill's harmful effects do not apply in cases brought under employment discrimination laws, including laws to ensure women earn equal pay for equal work.

When President Kennedy signed the Equal Pay Act into law 50 years ago, women, on average, made 59 cents for every dollar earned by men.

While we have made some progress since then, with women appointed to the Supreme Court and to executive leadership roles at Fortune 500 companies, we are still nowhere near the goal of equal pay for equal work.

Just as recently as 2007, the Supreme Court ruled against Lilly Ledbetter, making it nearly impossible for workers who suffered discrimination to seek justice.

Because she was prohibited from discussing her salary with coworkers, Lilly didn't find out she was making significantly less than her male counterparts until her retirement.

The court ruled that she waited too long to file her lawsuit. Luckily, in 2009, Congress intervened, passing the Lilly Ledbetter Fair Pay Act to reverse the Supreme Court's decision.

Unfortunately, stories like this are not unique. Women still make only 79 cents on the dollar, about 20 percent less take-home pay than their male counterparts.

That is why it is critical that Congress vote for this amendment: to ensure women can continue fighting for equal pay at work.

Because equal pay is not just good for women, it is good for families, businesses, and our economy. When women aren't paid what they deserve, middle class families and communities pay the price.

Families today rely on women's wages to put food on the table, save for retirement, and pay for their children's education. It is estimated that the pay gap costs a woman and her family more than \$10,000 in lost earnings each year, a significant number by any standards.

I recently spoke with a mother of three named Adriana. She told me that, while working her way through college as a waitress, she had to approach her manager after discovering her less-experienced male colleague made more than \$1 an hour than she did.

Adriana said she felt lucky that she worked for a small, family-run business. Otherwise, she might have been too intimidated to ask for equal pay.

She said it seemed "criminal and ridiculous" to pay people unfairly and that lawmakers should think about their wife, sister, or daughter and the effect this financial barrier would have on them. I agree. I hope everyone in this Chamber does as well.

For women seeking justice under employment discrimination laws, the Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act would be a disaster.

Women taking on huge corporations with limitless funds and armies of attorneys will face an uphill battle in court, at best, or may be completely deterred from even pursuing their day in court.

We have come a long way in expanding opportunities for women, but there is no question that we have a lot more to do. We cannot create more barriers to success than women and families already face in America today.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this motion to recommit and support the women and families in our

communities who we were sent here to represent.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1630

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit must be strongly opposed by anyone who understands that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are indeed victims.

No one who supports civil rights laws or the Constitution should support the filing of frivolous claims without penalty, but that is exactly what this motion to recommit would allow.

The base bill makes sanctions for filing frivolous lawsuits in Federal court mandatory. Under rule 11, a lawsuit is frivolous if it is presented for any improper purpose, such as to harass, cause unnecessary delay, or needlessly increase the cost of litigation if it is not warranted by existing law or if the factual contentions have no evidentiary support.

In other words, a lawsuit will only be found frivolous if it has no basis in law or fact.

Who here thinks that lawyers should be able to avoid any penalty when the lawsuit they file is found by a Federal judge to have been filed simply to harass or cause unnecessary delay or to needlessly increase the cost of litigation or when the Federal judge finds that the lawsuit is not warranted by existing law or has no evidentiary support?

If you think lawyers should be able to get off scot-free when they file those sorts of frivolous lawsuits, vote for this motion to recommit; but if you agree with me that the victims of frivolous lawsuits are real victims and that they have to shell out thousands of dollars; endure sleepless nights; and spend time away from their family, work, and customers just to respond to frivolous pleadings with no basis in law or fact, then you should oppose this motion to recommit and support the base bill, and join me in taking a clear stance against frivolous lawsuits.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and to support the underlying bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, ordering the previous question on House Resolution 421, and adopting House Resolution 421, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 179, nays 239, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 500]

YEAS—179

Adams	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Fudge	Nadler
Ashford	Gabbard	Napolitano
Bass	Gallego	Neal
Beatty	Garamendi	Nolan
Becerra	Graham	Norcross
Bera	Grayson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Pascarell
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Payne
Bonamici	Hahn	Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Perlmutter
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Peters
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pingree
Bustos	Hinojosa	Pocan
Butterfield	Honda	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Capuano	Huffman	Quigley
Cárdenas	Israel	Rangel
Carney	Jackson Lee	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Richmond
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Chu, Judy	Keating	Rush
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Kind	Schiff
Cohen	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Connolly	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Conyers	Langevin	Scott, David
Cooper	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Costa	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Courtney	Lawrence	Sinema
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cuellar	Levin	Slaughter
Cummings	Lieu, Ted	Speier
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Swalwell (CA)
Davis, Danny	Loebach	Takai
DeFazio	Loebach	Takano
DeGette	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
Delaney	Lowenthal	Titus
DeLauro	Lowe	Tonko
DelBene	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray (NM)	Tsongas
Deutch	Lynch	Van Hollen
Doggett	Maloney	Vargas
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Carolyn	Veasey
Duckworth	Maloney, Sean	Vela
Edwards	Matsui	Velázquez
Ellison	McCollum	Visclosky
Engel	McDermott	Walz
Eshoo	McGovern	Wasserman
Esty	McNerney	Schultz
Farr	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meng	Welch
Foster	Moore	Wilson (FL)
	Moulton	Yarmuth

NAYS—239

Abraham	Blum	Carter (GA)
Aderholt	Bost	Chabot
Allen	Boustany	Chaffetz
Amash	Brady (TX)	Clawson (FL)
Amodel	Brat	Coffman
Babin	Bridenstine	Cole
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Collins (GA)
Barton	Brooks (IN)	Collins (NY)
Benishek	Buchanan	Comstock
Bilirakis	Buck	Conaway
Bishop (MI)	Bucshon	Cook
Bishop (UT)	Burgess	Costello (PA)
Black	Byrne	Cramer
Blackburn	Calvert	Crawford

Crenshaw Joyce
Culberson Katko
Curbelo (FL) Kelly (MS)
Davis, Rodney Kelly (PA)
Denham King (IA)
Dent King (NY)
DeSantis Kinzinger (IL)
DesJarlais Kline
Diaz-Balart Knight
Dold Labrador
Donovan LaHood
Duffy LaMalfa
Duncan (SC) Lamborn
Duncan (TN) Lance
Ellmers (NC) Latta
Emmer (MN) LoBiondo
Farenthold Long
Fitzpatrick Loudermilk
Fleischmann Love
Fleming Lucas
Flores Luetkemeyer
Forbes Lummis
Fortenberry MacArthur
Foxy Marchant
Franks (AZ) Marino
Frelinghuysen Massie
Garrett McCarthy
Gibbs McCaul
Gibson McClintock
Gohmert McHenry
Goodlatte McKinley
Gosar McMorris
Gowdy Rodgers
Granger McSally
Graves (GA) Meadows
Graves (LA) Meehan
Graves (MO) Messer
Griffith Mica
Grothman Miller (FL)
Guinta Miller (MI)
Guthrie Moolenaar
Hanna Mooney (WV)
Hardy Mullin
Harper Mulvaney
Harris Murphy (PA)
Hartzler Neugebauer
Heck (NV) Newhouse
Hensarling Noem
Herrera Beutler Nugent
Hice, Jody B. Nunes
Hill Palazzo
Holding Palmer
Hudson Paulsen
Huelskamp Pearce
Huizenga (MI) Perry
Hultgren Pittenger
Hunter Pitts
Hurd (TX) Poe (TX)
Hurt (VA) Poliquin
Issa Pompeo
Jenkins (KS) Posey
Jenkins (WV) Price, Tom
Johnson (OH) Ratcliffe
Jolly Reed
Jones Reichert
Jordan Renacci

NOT VOTING—16

Barr Johnson, Sam
Carter (TX) Lewis
Cleaver Olson
Dingell Sanchez, Loretta
Fincher Sewell (AL)
Gutiérrez Smith (WA)

□ 1702

Messrs. POE of Texas, PALMER, ZINKE, NUNES, WITTMAN, KELLY of Pennsylvania, MULLIN, and BARTON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. HASTINGS, Ms. LEE, Messrs. PETERS and SCHRADER, Mses. KAPTUR and VELAQUEZ, and Mr. PASCRELL changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Blum
Bost
Boustan
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Hill
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 497–500, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on 497, 498, 499 and “no” on 500.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 185, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 501]

AYES—241

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Baretta
Barr
Barton
Benishek
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustan
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Hill
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott

Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—185

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard

Cleaver
Dingell
Fincher

NOT VOTING—8

Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1711

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3134, DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3504, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 421) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 243, nays 183, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 502]

YEAS—243

Abraham	Curbelo (FL)	Herrera Beutler
Aderholt	Davis, Rodney	Hice, Jody B.
Allen	Denham	Hill
Amash	Dent	Holding
Amodei	DeSantis	Hudson
Babin	DesJarlais	Huelskamp
Barletta	Diaz-Balart	Huizenga (MI)
Barr	Dold	Hultgren
Barton	Donovan	Hunter
Benishkek	Duffy	Hurd (TX)
Bilirakis	Duncan (SC)	Hurt (VA)
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (TN)	Issa
Bishop (UT)	Ellmers (NC)	Jenkins (KS)
Black	Emmer (MN)	Jenkins (WV)
Blackburn	Farenthold	Johnson (OH)
Blum	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bost	Fleischmann	Jolly
Boustany	Fleming	Jones
Brady (TX)	Flores	Jordan
Brat	Forbes	Joyce
Bridenstine	Fortenberry	Katko
Brooks (AL)	Fox	Kelly (MS)
Brooks (IN)	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (PA)
Buchanan	Frelinghuysen	King (IA)
Bucshon	Garrett	King (NY)
Burgess	Gibbs	Kinzinger (IL)
Byrne	Gibson	Kline
Calvert	Gohmert	Knight
Carter (GA)	Goodlatte	Labrador
Carter (TX)	Gosar	LaHood
Chabot	Gowdy	LaMalfa
Chaffetz	Granger	Lamborn
Clawson (FL)	Graves (GA)	Lance
Coffman	Graves (LA)	Latta
Cole	Graves (MO)	LoBiondo
Collins (GA)	Griffith	Long
Collins (NY)	Grothman	Loudermilk
Comstock	Guinta	Love
Conaway	Guthrie	Lucas
Cook	Hanna	Luetkemeyer
Costello (PA)	Hardy	Lummis
Cramer	Harper	MacArthur
Crawford	Harris	Marchant
Crenshaw	Hartzler	Marino
Culberson	Heck (NV)	Massie
	Hensarling	McCarthy

McCaul	Ratcliffe
McClintock	Reed
McHenry	Reichert
McKinley	Renacci
McMorris	Ribble
Rodgers	Rice (SC)
McSally	Rigell
Meadows	Roby
Meehan	Roe (TN)
Messer	Rogers (AL)
Mica	Rogers (KY)
Miller (FL)	Rohrabacher
Miller (MI)	Rokita
Moolenaar	Rooney (FL)
Mooney (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Mullin	Roskam
Mulvaney	Ross
Murphy (PA)	Rothfus
Neugebauer	Rouzer
Newhouse	Royce
Noem	Russell
Nugent	Ryan (WI)
Nunes	Salmon
Olson	Sanford
Palazzo	Scalise
Palmer	Schweikert
Paulsen	Scott, Austin
Pearce	Sensenbrenner
Perry	Sessions
Pittenger	Shimkus
Pitts	Shuster
Poe (TX)	Simpson
Poliquin	Smith (MO)
Pompeo	Smith (NE)
Posey	Smith (NJ)
Price, Tom	Smith (TX)

NAYS—183

Adams	Engel	Lynch
Aguliar	Eshoo	Maloney,
Ashford	Esty	Carolyn
Bass	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Beatty	Fattah	Matsui
Becerra	Foster	McCollum
Bera	Frankel (FL)	McDermott
Beyer	Fudge	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Gabbard	McNerney
Blumenauer	Gallego	Meeks
Bonamici	Garamendi	Meng
Boyle, Brendan	Graham	Moore
F.	Grayson	Moulton
Brady (PA)	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Brown (FL)	Green, Gene	Nadler
Brownley (CA)	Grijalva	Napolitano
Bustos	Gutiérrez	Neal
Butterfield	Hahn	Nolan
Capps	Hastings	Norcross
Capuano	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Cardenas	Higgins	Pallone
Carney	Himes	Pascarell
Carlson (IN)	Hinojosa	Payne
Cartwright	Honda	Pelosi
Castor (FL)	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Castro (TX)	Huffman	Peters
Chu, Judy	Israel	Peterson
Cicilline	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Jeffries	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Cleaver	Kaptur	Quigley
Clyburn	Keating	Rangel
Cohen	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Connolly	Kennedy	Richmond
Conyers	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kilmer	Ruiz
Costa	Kind	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kirkpatrick	Rush
Crowley	Kuster	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Langevin	Sánchez, Linda
Cummings	Larsen (WA)	T.
Davis (CA)	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davis, Danny	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Lee	Schiff
DeGette	Levin	Schrader
Delaney	Lewis	Scott (VA)
DeLauro	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
DeBene	Lipinski	Serrano
DeSaulnier	Loeback	Sewell (AL)
Deutch	Lofgren	Sherman
Doggett	Lowenthal	Sinema
Doyle, Michael	Lowey	Sires
F.	Lujan Grisham	Slaughter
Duckworth	(NM)	Speier
Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Ellison	(NM)	Takai

Takano	Vargas	Wasserman
Thompson (MS)	Veasey	Schultz
Titus	Vela	Watson Coleman
Tonko	Velázquez	Welch
Torres	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Tsongas	Walz	Yarmuth
Van Hollen		

NOT VOTING—8

Dingell	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine
Fincher	Thompson (CA)	Westmoreland
Sanchez, Loretta	Wagner	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1719

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 246, noes 179, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—246

Abraham	DeSantis	Hunter
Aderholt	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Allen	Diaz-Balart	Hurt (VA)
Amash	Dold	Issa
Amodei	Donovan	Jenkins (KS)
Babin	Duffy	Jenkins (WV)
Barletta	Duncan (SC)	Johnson (OH)
Barr	Duncan (TN)	Johnson, Sam
Barton	Ellmers (NC)	Jolly
Benishkek	Emmer (MN)	Jones
Billirakis	Farenthold	Jordan
Bishop (MI)	Fitzpatrick	Joyce
Bishop (UT)	Fleischmann	Katko
Black	Fleming	Kelly (MS)
Blackburn	Flores	Kelly (PA)
Blum	Forbes	King (IA)
Bost	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Boustany	Fox	Kinzinger (IL)
Brady (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Kline
Brat	Frelinghuysen	Knight
Bridenstine	Garrett	Labrador
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	LaHood
Brooks (IN)	Gibson	LaMalfa
Buchanan	Gohmert	Lamborn
Buck	Goodlatte	Lance
Bucshon	Gosar	Latta
Burgess	Gowdy	Lipinski
Byrne	Granger	LoBiondo
Calvert	Graves (GA)	Long
Carter (GA)	Graves (LA)	Loudermilk
Carter (TX)	Graves (MO)	Love
Chabot	Griffith	Lucas
Chaffetz	Grothman	Luetkemeyer
Clawson (FL)	Guinta	Lummis
Coffman	Guthrie	MacArthur
Cole	Hanna	Marchant
Collins (GA)	Hardy	Marino
Collins (NY)	Harper	Massie
Comstock	Harris	McCarthy
Conaway	Hartzler	McCaul
Cook	Heck (NV)	McClintock
Costello (PA)	Hensarling	McHenry
Cramer	Herrera Beutler	McKinley
Crawford	Hice, Jody B.	McMorris
Crenshaw	Hill	Rodgers
Culberson	Holding	McSally
Curbelo (FL)	Hudson	Meadows
Davis, Rodney	Huelskamp	Meehan
Denham	Huizenga (MI)	Messer
Dent	Hultgren	Mica

Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulvaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell

NOES—179

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Esty
Farr

Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shinkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman

Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez

Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Dingell
Eshoo
Fincher

Sanchez, Loretta
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)

Wagner
Westmoreland
Wilson (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1728

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PULMONARY FIBROSIS
AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, September is Pulmonary Fibrosis Awareness Month and a time to shine a light on a disease that is deadly. While some may not be familiar with pulmonary fibrosis, approximately 200,000 Americans suffer from the disease.

This serious illness takes the lives of 40,000 Americans every single year, which equates to about one death every 13 minutes. That is the same mortality rate as breast cancer.

There is no known cure for pulmonary fibrosis. There is no known treatment to extend the life of a patient or improve the symptoms. As a result, the median survival rate is just 2½ years, and as many as 80 percent of patients die within 5 years of diagnosis.

Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity to bring attention to this serious illness that affects so many. With more research and a renewed commitment, we will find a cure to this deadly disease, and I will keep working to make this a reality.

CONFECTIONERY INDUSTRY

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the confectionery industry directly employs 70,000 people in the United States and more than 400,000 jobs in agriculture, retail, transportation, and other industries that rely, in part, on the sale of confections for their livelihood.

For every job that is created in confectionery, another six are supported in related industries, which means that candy drives a multiplier effect of 6 to 1.

Chicago was once known as the candy capital of the world. However, due to an unfair sugar program, many

decent and good-paying manufacturing jobs are now located outside the United States.

The candy industry is comprised of hundreds of small- and medium-sized family-owned businesses, as well as the multinational companies with global brands that operate more than 1,000 manufacturing facilities in all 50 States.

The confectionery industry is doing its part to help address the ongoing conversation about food and nutrition, policy wellness, and food safety. NCA member companies are providing consumers with the information options and support they need to make the choices that are right for them.

Candy helps to make America just a little sweeter.

WELCOMING POPE FRANCIS

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, next week, the Holy Father, Pope Francis, will make his historic trip to the United States. I ask that all Americans join me in welcoming the Holy Father, both as Pope and as a man. This is Pope Francis' first visit to the United States ever and will be the first time in history that a pope will address a joint session of the Congress.

The Pope's message to fight against complacency and corruption and to help those in poor communities have resonated with the American people and invigorated Catholic communities throughout our country.

I am eager for the Pope to see the United States of America, her people at work and play, and I look forward to his visit and his words of inspiration to the people's House where the government for and by the people is practiced daily.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. MULVANEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MULVANEY. Mr. Speaker, as the House prepares next week to take up a discussion about Planned Parenthood, I want to speak very briefly to what the debate is not about. It is not about women's health.

The proposal that many of us are making to this House is that we simply take this money away from Planned Parenthood and move it to federally qualified healthcare clinics, clinics that provide better services and more services to women. There are 13,000 of these clinics versus 900 Planned Parenthood units, services that go to women that Planned Parenthood does not provide.

Planned Parenthood does not do mammograms; the clinics do. This debate is not about women's health care,

and anyone who wants you to believe that it is, is simply afraid to tell you what it is really about, which is whether or not we should give taxpayer money to an entity that sells pieces of dead children.

THE FIVE MERCENARIES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter stunned Congress and the country when he admitted that the administration's \$500 million program to train and equip so-called moderate Syrian rebels had resulted in the training of 60 individuals. The original goal was to have 5,000 within the first year, but they only had 60.

The information gets worse. Today, most of those 60 mercenaries have been killed, captured, or just gone missing.

Mr. Speaker, where, oh, where have the fighters gone? Where, oh, where could they be? Have they gone to fight with the enemy—which just leaves us how many? It is four or five, according to General Austin. Four or five fighters for a cost of \$500 million, is that the plan for the war in Syria to defeat ISIS?

The lack of a plan in Syria has created chaos. Thousands of people have panicked and are running from the Syrian turmoil. The U.S. needs to lead.

Expecting five mercenaries to defeat ISIS is disgraceful. The United States needs an aggressive strategy to defeat the enemy of civilization, ISIS.

And that is just the way it is.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. YOUNG of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YOUNG of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a father of four, a regular dad who loves my children more than I love my own life. I know I speak for millions when I say that my wife, Jenny, and I fell in love with our children before they were even born.

It is this love for my children that led me to the pro-life movement, to serve on the board of directors of a crisis pregnancy center, to offer free legal services for those who want to adopt.

It is in this spirit of love, informed by powerful life experiences, that I rise today in strong support of legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Now, Hoosiers have made it clear. They should not be forced to violate their own conscience so that Planned Parenthood can continue to operate.

Given the light that has recently been shed on Planned Parenthood's gruesome practices and procedures, can we not agree that taxpayers shouldn't have to foot the bill for these atrocities?

Now, if the best argument on the other side is that eliminating taxpayer subsidies for Planned Parenthood would create access problems, that is just not the case. The 73 federally qualified health centers, 63 rural clinics, and 24 community health centers in the State of Indiana, all of which provide women vital health services without providing abortions, prove otherwise.

Theirs is an empty argument, one I would encourage my colleagues, as a matter of integrity, to put to rest. Let's free Americans from participation in this morally reprehensible practice.

THREATS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. KILMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus to note the extraordinary damage done by wildfires in Washington State this summer.

It is a fact that our climate is changing. We just had one of the driest springs and summers in more than a century that led to trees and vegetation becoming kindling for the massive fires that we have seen.

The largest wildfire in our State's history hit central Washington, forcing thousands to flee and putting firefighters in harm's way. We have a wildfire that continues to smolder in Olympic National Park, a rain forest. From Washington to California, brave emergency responders have spent this summer on the front lines, battling flames, with no signs of abating.

I believe it is time we pay attention to these warning signs. If we want a better future for our kids, if we want to protect the communities in which we live, then we need to confront the threats of climate change.

INTERNATIONAL COASTAL CLEANUP DAY

(Mr. CURBELO of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Saturday, September 19, as International Coastal Cleanup Day. I encourage everyone nationwide to participate by visiting a local beach and assisting with this special event.

Ocean pollution is a serious problem that negatively impacts wildlife, humans, and our economy, including many small-business owners. Debris found in ocean water and on shores is detrimental to aquatic life and has the potential to injure water sports enthusiasts and beachgoers, as well as destroy boats and their propellers.

In 2012, more than 10 million pounds of trash were collected by 500,000 volun-

teers in 97 countries. Earlier this year, my staff and I spent a morning cleaning up the beaches on Stock Island in the Florida Keys and saw just how much trash washes ashore.

Unfortunately, this amount is just a snapshot of an even larger problem. Though International Coastal Cleanup Day happens annually, it is important that we make a stronger effort to protect our beaches more than once a year.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. WALKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, in America, the practice of abortion is now referred to as women's health care. Yes, in the 21st century, even with all the science, we refuse to ask the question: What about the baby?

The cavalier spirit and the cold-hearted callousness in taking a live baby and then cutting into her face to retrieve fresh body parts—can you imagine the national outrage if we were carving up puppies in the same manner?

We don't condemn these young mothers who have been convinced that no other options exist; yet we will be negligent if we stand silent over the atrocities of an abortion mill that goes by the name Planned Parenthood. Whether you are pro-life or not, surely, most Americans are appalled by the idea that our tax dollars are funneled to this organization.

I cannot look the other way. It is my belief, and I am thoroughly convinced that this is no longer a political issue. This is about a human rights violation that parallels other barbaric times throughout history. Ultimately, we will stand before almighty God.

The Psalmist David wrote:

For You, God, formed my inward parts. You wove me together in my mother's womb. I praise You because I am fearfully and wonderfully made.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. FLEMING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FLEMING. Mr. Speaker, graphic videos, personal testimony, and verbal assent reveal the true colors of Planned Parenthood.

There is probable cause to believe that America's largest abortion provider is altering abortion procedures to obtain uncrushed baby body parts; is performing partial-birth abortions; and is selling baby hearts, brains, and other fetal specimens for monetary value. This is atrocious.

Planned Parenthood staff doesn't want to lowball fees for baby body parts, and third parties are drooling

over intact unborn children. It is unimaginable how one can camouflage the humanity of a clinician's announcement of "another boy" and watch a baby's beating heart just before harvesting the baby's brain to sell; yet Federal funding continues to pour unabashed, unabated into the coffers of Planned Parenthood, America's number one killer of unborn babies. This must stop.

Mr. Speaker, I do not support this allotment of taxpayer dollars and will vote against any spending bill that funds Planned Parenthood.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. PEARCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, a nation, like an individual, is judged by the way it speaks for those who can't speak for themselves and by the way it treats those without total capacities.

It is in this regard that our Founders brought this Nation together with the core principles of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—life being the first of those.

It is a constitutional requirement that I think that we have to speak for the unborn. When we see the atrocities in the videos, the callousness of the organization that is trafficking in body parts from dead babies, we should react in horror and remove the funding for that.

The greatest argument the other side puts up is that they provide women other services. This chart shows the Planned Parenthood locations in New Mexico versus those providing other services. We simply seek to move the funding from them to here.

The coverage from our State is much broader and much better and would be a voice for those unborn who can't scream out for their own sake.

□ 1745

FUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the question we must ask ourselves today in light of recent revelations: Why does Congress insist on giving half a billion dollars of the taxpayer money to an organization that has such disregard for human life?

Considering the budget constraints currently imposed on our military, why are the American people's hard-earned money being diverted to Planned Parenthood, which reports more than \$127 million in excess revenue and more than \$1 billion in net assets?

When I was back home in Texas during the August recess, I had the pleasure of visiting the Austin Pregnancy Resource Center, a model women's health organization that can and should lead by example.

The APRC does a lot to support women's health and provide guidance on accessing women's health services. The APRC's slogan of building the culture of life is one that we should all be able to get behind, but there are many pro-life women's health organizations like APRC that take no Federal dollars.

Even so, some of my colleagues prefer to continue to send taxpayer dollars to Planned Parenthood, an organization that takes in money from aborted fetal parts, an organization that alters abortion procedures so they can harvest organs, an organization that, frankly, rips off the Federal Government.

Not only are the alleged actions of Planned Parenthood illegal under Federal law, they are morally reprehensible.

I am disgusted that an organization that is involved in such repulsive activity would promote itself as a protector of women's health. It is beyond hypocritical. It is deceitful and I believe fraudulent.

When I first ran for Congress, I promised that I would vote with my conscience and use God's word as my guide. For this reason, earlier I called for an end to Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

In God we trust.

MISINFORMATION ON THE PLANNED PARENTHOOD DEBATE

(Mr. JORDAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, the Congressman from South Carolina (Mr. MULVANEY) is exactly right. There is all kinds of misinformation about this Planned Parenthood debate. The biggest line is this: We are headed to a government shutdown. Are you kidding me?

We are going to fund the government at the levels the Democrats agreed to, Republicans agreed to, the levels outlined in the Ryan-Murray plan. We are going to fund it.

We are going to do one change, though, one simple, but important, change: Take the money from the organization engaged in the gruesome, horrific things that Planned Parenthood was caught doing and give it to organizations that weren't doing that and still meet women's health needs. That simple fact. The same levels, but move it from the bad organization to good organizations.

It is that basic. That is what this debate is about, and that is what the American people want us to do.

TAXPAYER DOLLARS SHOULD NOT SUPPORT TRAFFICKING OF ABORTED FETAL TISSUE

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, we have known for some time that Planned Parenthood is the largest provider of abortions in this country.

What we didn't know until recently was just how vile and disgusting they are willing to be in the trafficking of fetal tissue and the body parts of the unborn.

These actions uncovered from these videos have given the whole world insight into the inexcusable and horrific culture at Planned Parenthood. The heartlessness displayed represents an unraveling of the very moral fabric of our country.

The passage of the two bills before us is the appropriate action to address Planned Parenthood's illegal actions.

Taxpayer dollars should not be going to the killing of unborn babies. Taxpayer dollars should not go to organizations like Planned Parenthood that support the practice of abortion and trafficking of aborted fetal tissue.

I encourage my colleagues to support these two bills and to support precious, innocent lives of the unborn.

DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD WILL HAVE NO EFFECT ON WOMEN'S HEALTH

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that this is not simply an issue of whether Planned Parenthood broke the law by selling fetal body parts obtained through abortions.

The real tragedy we are confronted with today is that human beings have been reduced to mere commodities in this practice, and Federal dollars are contributing to it.

I do not want to contribute to a system that profits from someone's fate nor do I want to subject millions of taxpayers to supporting this violation of life.

It is often a temptation to boil this argument down to medical terms and ignore the real losses our Nation faces when we choose to reject someone before he or she has been given the chance to live.

For this reason, I do not support funding Planned Parenthood and its tragic influence on our Nation's future.

Defunding Planned Parenthood will have no effect on women's health. In the State of Idaho alone, there are 76 federally qualified health centers, and only 3 Planned Parenthood facilities. Women can and will receive health care in these facilities.

CONSTITUENTS SICKENED BY PLANNED PARENTHOOD VIDEOS

(Mr. PERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, debate over funding for Planned Parenthood has nothing to do with women's health care. I think we have just heard that on a couple counts.

Constituents on both sides are sickened and disgusted by the Planned Parenthood videos, videos that show officials discussing the killing of babies and harvesting of their organs like they were car parts out of a salvage yard.

American taxpayers are the single largest funder of Planned Parenthood, over \$500 million last year alone. No American should ever be forced, under penalty of imprisonment, mind you—if you don't pay your taxes, you are going to go to jail—to support this activity with their tax dollars, period.

I am a husband, a father to two little girls, a son, and a friend who cares deeply about women's health care, everybody's health care. That said, I cannot and I will not support the dismemberment and sale of the body parts of infants.

I cannot in good conscience, I can't in any conscience, support legislation that funds disgusting actions of those who conduct that practice.

THE RIGHTS OF THE UNBORN ARE BEING VIOLATED

(Mr. MOOLENAAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Mr. Speaker, on social media, a new generation of parents and grandparents are sharing the joy of new life, posting pictures of baby bumps and sonograms for friends and family to view.

Now more than ever, it is easier to see and understand that an unborn child in the womb is a person with tiny toes and fingers and a heartbeat, created equal and entitled to unalienable rights.

However, recent events have demonstrated that these rights are being violated and that the public's trust has been betrayed.

Millions of taxpayer dollars have supported the horrific practice of allowing babies to be taken apart, dismantled, and sold piece by piece.

In response, House investigations are underway, and more needs to be done to protect our most vulnerable citizens.

H.R. 3134 restores trust for American taxpayers. It provides more funding for qualified health centers that offer pediatric care, immunizations, mammograms, and more lifesaving healthcare services that protect mother and child.

These better options are worthy of taxpayer funding and will make a posi-

tive difference for women and children across our country.

PROTECT THE SANCTITY OF LIFE

(Mr. CARTER of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the two pieces of legislation aimed at fighting evil and protecting the sanctity of life.

I have seen the horrendous videos showing the grotesque practice of harvesting and selling preborn baby body parts that Planned Parenthood executives now condone and encourage. This evil practice must stop.

Taxpayers should not be responsible for funding an organization that aborts babies, negotiates deals to sell body parts, and lets babies that have survived abortion be left to die on the operating table.

As a former judge, I have dealt with countless murder cases, and this is murder in my book. Planned Parenthood received 40 percent of their total revenue from taxpayers.

How much longer are we going to permit Planned Parenthood to murder on the taxpayer dime?

Rest assured, the House is conducting an investigation on Planned Parenthood. We will do everything in our power to hold these criminals accountable for their actions.

I implore my colleagues to support these two bills and protect the sanctity of life before and after birth.

STAND UP FOR CALIFORNIA'S ALMOND INDUSTRY

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, the California almond industry has shouldered the brunt of the drought finger-pointing over the last year.

The reality is that almond trees use about the same, if not less, the amount of water of any fruit or nut in the State of California.

It is like the old story of the frog in the pot of boiling water. If the pot has no water, then you have no frog nor agriculture in California. We need to build water storage. That said, our almond industry employs over 100,000 people and brings in \$21 billion to the State each year.

In addition to being scapegoats on water, they also face a potential \$4 billion loss if the European Union chooses not to extend the maximum residue levels allowed on fosetyl-aluminum. This chemical is not even used in almonds and poses no health risk. Inaction to extend this MRL will prevent almonds from being exported into the EU, depressing prices worldwide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask Secretary Vilsack and the USDA to stand up for California and our agriculture and help obtain this critical extension.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD TARGETS MINORITY COMMUNITIES FOR DESTRUCTION

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this House, indeed ask the American people: Do you believe your taxpayer dollars should be used to fund racism? Do you think your hard-earned taxpayer dollars should be used to target minority communities?

Mr. Speaker, I have adopted children. They don't look like me. They look like average Americans of various ethnic minority backgrounds.

Without a doubt, if you look at Planned Parenthood's history, as well as its current practices, they target minority communities for destruction and elimination.

That is the history of Margaret Sanger. That is the history of Planned Parenthood. That is the history that is being funded.

That is the current day practice of Planned Parenthood, to target minority communities with abortion, with destruction, with elimination.

Without a doubt, in my mind, I think in the mind of the American people, it is time to stop funding racism with our tax dollars.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE AN ACCESSORY TO CRIMINAL ACTIVITY

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there are those who say you shouldn't shut down the government. We are not going to shut down the government. We are going to fund the government.

And I am hoping that we are actually going to fund women's health with more money than what the President or the Democrats were pushing for to be given to Planned Parenthood.

In the history of Planned Parenthood, they have never, ever, ever done one mammogram because they are not certified to do mammograms. They bring people in and refer them out to get their mammograms.

I have been married for 37 years to the same woman, and I have three daughters. I want good women's health care. Let's fund it, but let's give it directly to the facilities that will do the mammograms and not send it to Planned Parenthood for them to take their cut.

When you pay for the rent and the utilities and you know there is criminal activity going on, you are an accessory. Congress should not be an accessory.

PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCCLINTOCK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my deepest concerns for the health and safety of the women, children, all babies, and families in our great country.

Recent undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress unearthed some of the most alarming information that has been hidden from the American people for years. These videos deeply disturb me, and I know I am not alone.

The practices uncovered in the Planned Parenthood videos are repulsive. I never dreamed I would be standing before this body questioning if our own government is a willing enabler in the profiteering from the buying and selling of aborted baby parts.

It is wrong that Planned Parenthood continues to do as it pleases and that the American taxpayers are bankrolling that organization. We are spending \$450 million a year funding Planned Parenthood.

That is why I sent a letter along with 134 of my colleagues in the House of Representatives on July 27 that calls for a full investigation into Planned Parenthood by the Justice Department.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for the people that I am blessed to represent from the Second Congressional District in West Virginia. I am here to say that taxpayers should not fund abortions. Supporters of Planned Parenthood continually point to other services that they provide.

There is precisely one Planned Parenthood provider in all of West Virginia, located in Vienna, less than an hour outside of my district, right here. One. Does it even provide mammograms? No, it does not.

□ 1800

However, we have more than 300 federally certified women's care facilities in West Virginia that do provide these essential services. Taxpayers should not be forced to fund abortions through Planned Parenthood. We should defund that organization from taxpayer funding dollars right now.

Senior officials—on camera—were caught admitting to unethical, illegal activities in the selling of body parts.

Let's define what we are talking about here. This is a baby approximately 16 weeks after the moment of

conception. Human life begins at conception. This is a baby.

Some would like to define it as something else—call it anything but a baby. They will call it a fetus, a blob of tissue, cells; but they do not want to call this little boy or girl a baby. However, you couldn't sell baby body parts, such as lungs, hearts, livers, as Planned Parenthood was caught doing, unless it was a baby.

This is a baby. This is what he or she looks like. This is what taxpayers in this country—you, the taxpayers—are being forced to pay for, the killing of this baby and the buying or selling of her body parts. That is wrong. That is what we are standing against here in the U.S. House of Representatives, and we need your support in this.

The Federal Government needs to stop enabling this black market business immediately. That is why I have cosponsored several pieces of legislation to make sure that the taxpayers and thousands of unborn children are protected from the activities and horrendous actions of Planned Parenthood and other abortion providers.

H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, simply prohibits funding of Planned Parenthood for a year to allow for a full congressional investigation to take place.

H.R. 3197, the Protecting Life and Taxpayers Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit Federal funding of an entity that performs abortions, including Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3215, the End Trafficking of the Terminated Unborn Act of 2015—this bill will prohibit any transfer of fetal tissue from aborted babies for a purpose other than disposal. This will prevent both publicly and privately funded research involving the remains of unborn children who were aborted.

Finally, my bill, H.R. 816, the Life At Conception Act, would define life at the moment of conception, which is a biological fact.

The abortion issue, actually, in this bill defunding Planned Parenthood—which our goal is to defund Planned Parenthood—does not actually stop abortion. I wish we could. Abortion is the taking of a human life.

Defund Planned Parenthood is simply saying that taxpayers should not be forced to pay for those abortions. That is a widely accepted view of the majority of Americans, even those who may disagree with us pro-life advocates on the abortion issue. Many people think that abortion shouldn't be funded with taxpayer dollars.

All of these bills are crucial to making sure that the American taxpayer is no longer footing the bill or condoning the barbaric practices of Planned Parenthood or any other organization like them that traffics in aborted baby body parts.

I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for these four vital pieces of leg-

islation and remove taxpayer funding of abortion in the spending bills before us in Congress. That is our duty in the U.S. House of Representatives.

We control spending in this Chamber. No one can tell us what to do. We represent the people in the districts that voted us into office. I am calling on the folks in this Chamber and in America to support the defunding of Planned Parenthood now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

WILDFIRES AND FOREST MANAGEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to draw attention to wildfires and forest management.

Recent headlines show that our forests are in terrible shape: 8.8 million acres have burned this year; \$250 million was recently transferred from forest management accounts to fight fires, announced last week.

Emergency fire spending has already topped \$700 million this year and is still growing. We have a problem that is greatly decreasing and impairing the value of our forest for the next generation.

I worked with colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act, back in July. This bill was supported from Maine to Alaska by Democrats and Republicans. The bill ends the destructive practice of fire borrowing in a fiscally responsible manner. It creates a sub-account under the Stafford Act for wildfire. This ensures that resources to put out major fires are available when necessary.

This week, the Obama administration publicly called on the Congress to fix fire borrowing. While I appreciate the President's interest, I agree with him that we need to fix fire borrowing. I applaud the 19 Democrats who voted for H.R. 2647 that fixes fire borrowing.

Fixing fire borrowing alone won't solve the problem. Fixing fire borrowing alone simply is treating a symptom instead of a disease. It is like putting on a bandaid without cleaning out the wound.

Again, the House passed this bipartisan legislation back in July. We could be fixing these problems now, but the Senate hasn't acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time to stop playing politics with our Nation's forests, one of our most treasured resources. The House offered a solution. Let's embrace constructive governance and make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

I want to take a moment and look at what the Resilient Federal Forests Act does. We already talked about fire borrowing, but it also prevents future fires.

H.R. 2647 gives the Forest Service the tools it needs to better manage our national forests immediately after its passage. Our forests are overgrown, and therefore, they are fire prone. Fighting fires doesn't prevent future fires. That is why we need better management. Scientific thinning helps prevent future fires.

I would like to show some photographs from a forest in my home State of Arkansas. To some, this may look like a healthy, thriving forest because you see trees and you see a lot of greenery, but I am a forester, and when I look at that, I see an overstock stand of trees. I see too much undergrowth. I see too much dead and dying material on the forest floor. This is not a healthy forest, but this happens to be a control site in the middle of a healthy forest.

Next, I want to show how we get to a healthy forest on this particular side.

This area has been thinned, and there is controlled burns taking place. These burns take place on intervals of 3 to 5 years. They not only make the forest better to withstand potential forest fires; they also create better wildlife habitat. The biodiversity in this forest goes through the roof when these kind of management practices are put in place. We get healthy trees. We get an early successional habitat that is good for wildlife. It also is good for the soil; it is good for water quality, and it is good for air quality.

This last picture shows what a healthy forest in my district looks like. These trees are thriving. This is an early growth not too long after a fire. This is a great wildlife habitat. The biodiversity of wildlife and plant life is much higher in this photograph than what we saw in the previous photograph. This creates a win-win situation.

Now, this isn't the solution for everywhere across the country; this is what works in the forests in my district, but there are forest managers across this country that know how to manage their forests in their particular climate and in their particular setting to create healthy forests and forests that can withstand a fire. It would be almost impossible for a forest fire to destroy these trees.

The next thing that the Resilient Federal Forests Act does is it stops

frivolous lawsuits. You may ask: Why do we need to stop frivolous lawsuits?

Well, frivolous lawsuits hinder forest plans that are developed locally, using science, best management practices, and collaborative efforts that represent stakeholder values. The end result is a forest that is decreased and impaired in value for our next generation.

This bill discourages frivolous lawsuits by requiring those suing to stop collaborative projects to post a bond. If the plaintiff loses, they pay the taxpayer's legal bills. If they win, they get their money back.

This bill also aids in better land management planning. In the words of former U.S. Forest Service chief Dale Bosworth: "We do not have a fire problem on our Nation's forests; we have a land management problem. And it needs to be addressed quickly."

Delayed decisionmaking or, even worse, no decisionmaking at all, is hurting our forests. Forests are dynamic. They are a living, growing organism. When we say no action, we are actually taking action. Since forests are not static, scientific analysis should not be static.

This bill requires the Forest Service to critically analyze the impacts of no action, which often are overgrowth, increased wildfire, and diseases. Increases in future wildfire problems are often caused because of poor land management. It makes it difficult for reforestation, ultimately decreasing and impairing the value of forests.

This bill sets up requirements for salvage plans in response to catastrophic events. It requires environmental assessments for salvage projects to be completed within 90 days so that timber can be removed while it is still commercially valuable.

The USDA completed post-Hurricane Katrina NEPA on the De Soto National Forest within 90 days. They expedited it. They were successful at that. As a result, 80 percent of the timber was salvaged that was in moderate to heavily damaged areas.

The management actions laid out in this bill must comply with forest plans. It is not taking a shortcut. Despite what some folks say, this doesn't mean thousands of acres clearcut. It doesn't mean destruction of snag habitats that often become available after a large fire.

In my home State, clearcuts are restricted to 180 acres, at most. We are talking about thousands of acres of land that still have to follow forest management practices.

This bill rewards collaboration. It incentivizes collaboration and speeds up the implementation of collaborative projects. It safeguards a strong, timely environmental review process through categorical exclusions for forest management projects.

You may ask: What are collaborative projects? This is simply where local

land managers, environmentalists, citizens, and industry representatives come up with a plan. These groups spend hundreds if not thousands of hours working on a plan that is best for their local area. Why wouldn't we encourage this sort of compromise?

This bill encourages more collaborative projects. Passing this bill shows that we endorse commonsense plans that tend to local and ecological needs.

This bill creates greater reforestation after natural disasters. As a forester, this statistic is really disturbing to me. On average, less than 3 percent of an area is reforested after a catastrophic event on our national forests. This bill requires that 75 percent reforestation takes place within 5 years. This will revitalize our forests that are destroyed by fire or other natural events.

When we reforest an area, we have young trees that grow fast and sequester carbon faster than older, fully grown trees. If we want to sequester more carbon, then we should be planting more trees. We should demand that we reforest our land after the timber is destroyed in one of these catastrophic events.

We have to stop playing politics, and we need to pass this bill.

This bill creates greater roles for the tribes. Oftentimes, the Federal Government does not collaborate and work together with those who have expertise in forest health. This bill brings in State and tribal governments as strong partners in forest management.

It gives the Forest Service the authority to accept assistance from States willing to put money toward forest management.

□ 1815

It also reinforces existing tribal authority to assist in the management of national forest land adjacent to reservations.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act modernizes secure rural schools. This is an issue that is very important in my district. We have many rural areas near our national forests, and the schools are hurting because of the decreased funding because we are not keeping our forests healthy.

Rural communities not only depend on our forests for their sustenance, but they also provide emergency services, education, and support for the forests and residents who live near the forests. As forests lose value, communities suffer, and they will only suffer more in the future.

This bill gives counties flexibility to spend secure rural schools funding. It allows them to spend money on emergency services on Federal lands, and it puts 25 percent of stewardship contracts into the county treasury where the projects occurred.

This bill means more money for our schools and other public services, along

with the benefits of a healthy and resilient forest.

One more time, I want to look at the fire borrowing issue. This is one of the worst fire seasons we have seen. We know what good management practices are. We know how to implement those practices on the land.

The House has acted by passing H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forests Act. It solves fire borrowing. It completely reforms current bad management practices. And this is isn't just me saying this. We have letters from hundreds of groups that have endorsed this bill. Here is a list of just a few of them: the Forest Products Industry National Labor Management Committee, the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, the National Association of Counties, the National Association of Forest Service Retirees, the National Water Resources Association, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. There are hundreds more that have supported this legislation because it is good, commonsense legislation that is good for our country; it is good for our forests.

The House has acted. It is time for the Senate to act. It is time for the administration to stop playing politics with wildfire. It is time to make H.R. 2647 the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for bringing this subject up. It is a subject that all of us in the West deal with every year.

A couple of years ago, we had Tom Tidwell in New Mexico. He was there at a time when the Forest Service was in the process of burning down 255 homes in Ruidoso. The fire almost burned completely out of control and burned the entire town down. That is what the agency was surprised and frightened by.

These fires are caused by a lack of management. And instead of addressing the problem by reducing the number of trees in the forests, the Forest Service is saying, and Tom Tidwell himself said, that our policy is going to be to reintroduce fire into its natural habitat.

Introducing fire into the forest at this stage, with the years of no attention, with the years of fuel buildup, with the decades of drought that have put them in an explosive position in much of the West, is absolute lunacy. And yet this was the highest ranking Forest Service employee saying that we need to reintroduce fire into the wild.

I am sorry, but we need to clean up the forest first, then the fire can keep the forest healthy—but not until then. These raging wildfires are a natural conclusion to the management policies for the past decades, and so we can't

start and act like that policy has not been in place.

Another policy that the Forest Service is engaged in is letting fire achieve management objectives. If I were to take a look at, say, one of the large fires out in Grant County, in the Gila Wilderness area of New Mexico, you can see the daily reports where they are talking about, well, the fire is 300 acres, it is 600 acres, and it is achieving its management objective.

Well, there is one truth about New Mexico: If the wind is not blowing today, it is going to blow tomorrow. Letting those fires go, while they are supposedly monitoring them, and the fire then gets the push from the wind and grows from 300 or 800 acres to 10,000 to 30,000 acres is, again, a natural conclusion to the management policies of this Forest Service.

It is time for us to revise the way our forests are managed. Mr. WESTERMAN has a bill that is exactly right, H.R. 2647, and we should pass that bill, and that process should go forward.

Let's start cleaning the excess timber out of our forests. It is much simpler than what everybody wants to make it. It is much simpler than the Forest Service would allow.

So again, I appreciate the fact that you are bringing this issue up. I appreciate the fact that you have yielded time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express thanks to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) for leading this discussion tonight. It is very important to many of us in rural America.

Of course, my district, which includes seven national forests, has experienced increasingly devastating forest fires caused by overgrown, mismanaged, or even nonmanaged forests, and has been economically strangled by restrictions on forest management.

Our Nation has already lost over 8½ million acres to wildfire, and the year isn't yet over. We are on pace to exceed the record of 10 million acres burned back in 2006, and that is not a record we want to break.

Our rural communities, public lands, and the environment are being destroyed through neglect. The habitat is gone, erosion into our lakes and waterways goes unchecked, and the people's asset, the value of the trees, is wasted.

In light of Forest Service surveys finding that over 12 million Sierra Nevada trees have died in the last year, we cannot afford to wait another year.

That is why we need Mr. WESTERMAN's bill, H.R. 2647, which will return active management to our forests by increasing flexibility, cutting red tape, and, most importantly, acting to manage forests before fires occur, not afterwards.

Streamlining review process means that forest management can occur when it is actually needed to address dangerous conditions, not after years of legal roadblocks.

Allowing categorical exclusions for post-fire salvage and rehabilitation hastens forest recovery and prevents fuel buildup that can contribute to future fires.

Expanding local involvement in forest management will improve the data and know-how available for planning and also respect local priorities.

Finally, the budget impact of forest neglect can no longer be ignored. Just this week, the Forest Service diverted yet another \$250 million from forest management to fighting fire. That brings the Federal spending total so far this year on firefighting to \$700 million, money that, though we agree, needs to fight fire this year, could surely be used better if we properly managed forests in the future.

This bill will end the borrowing by funding fires, as we do hurricanes, earthquakes, and other disasters, making them eligible for FEMA disaster funds.

In California, over 1,000 homes have burned. Tens of thousands have been evacuated from their homes or communities. Firefighters have lost their lives, as well as some residents now. This is a needless loss of life, needless suffering in rural America.

Let's start by keeping H.R. 2647 moving in the process through the Senate and on to the President's desk.

I again thank Mr. WESTERMAN for his leadership and allowing me to speak on this important topic here tonight.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support to remind my colleagues in the Senate that the Western United States is on fire. We don't have time for inaction and more political pandering.

The House has passed the Resilient Federal Forests Act, which includes vital reforms that can be implemented tomorrow if our colleagues in the Senate take the bill up.

So why don't we do what is right for America? Why don't we come together and move the bill?

This wildfire season has been one of the worst in the last 10 years, and it has had enormous cost. Despite the cooler conditions in Montana, we have 35 fires that are continuing to burn, a total of 334,000 acres gone. That is equivalent to 522 miles, square miles. Two-thirds of this acreage belongs to the public, our national forests.

And it is not just the physical damage. We lost four firefighters in Washington, four that paid the sacrifice fighting forest fires, and we have to remember that.

I was at a fire in Glacier National Park. It was a reburn from a fire that occurred in 2003. The reburn happened to occur because of a threat of a lawsuit which prevented the Forest Service from doing the right thing. What they wanted to do was salvage timber. But because there was standing timber, ground crews couldn't get at it. And when ground crews couldn't get it, that means they had to fly aircraft at \$3,000 an hour to put out the fire. That is wrong. It is wrong for Montana, and it is wrong for America.

I know the firsthand value of our natural resources. I am a conservationist. But I also know the value of tourism in Montana. I also know the value of clean air. And when the smoke in Montana—which people travel all the way from across this country and the world to go to—is worse than Beijing, it has an impact.

It also has an impact on the elderly, the asthmatic. It is unhealthy. Worst of all, it is preventable.

The problem is real. Not only does the Forest Service lack the resources to adequately fight fires, it has a land management problem at the source.

Former Chief of the Forest Service, Dale Bosworth, his quote before the hearing was: "We do not have a fire problem . . . we have a land management problem."

This isn't from a political member. This is from a scientist. And yes, we need more scientists in the woods and less lawyers.

That is why I am proud of what we did in the House on H.R. 2647. We passed it back in July because we saw this problem coming, and so we crafted a solution. That is what we are all sent here to do. We were sent here for solutions, to look at the challenges ahead and make a difference.

So this bill addresses both the fire borrowing problem and the practices that have created the crisis that we now, unfortunately, have to bear. It does address lawsuits that are frivolous. The number one expense in the Forest Service is fighting forest fires, Number two is litigation, and if they have any money left, then that is what they use for management.

Why are we spending, this fire season, over \$600 million in August alone? Don't we all agree that \$600 million can be better utilized by preventing forest fires, by restoring habitat, by providing better public access, better recreational activities and opportunities on our public lands?

Unfortunately, we have lost this fire season, and still it burns.

Unfortunately, the Senate won't take up the bill. My fellow Montanan Senator STEVE DAINES has been a loud and vocal advocate of this bill. He understands, and I am asking his colleagues to stand and do the right thing: Take the bill up. If you don't like a provision in the bill, then show leadership and

put an amendment on it and we will work together to fix it. That is what leadership does. But to sit there and not take up the bill and have no action is unacceptable.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add that when we passed this bill in the House, we put amendments on it that were offered by Democrats. We were open. We listened. We wanted to do what is best for the forest.

I encourage the Senate to take up this bill. If there is something you don't like, let's talk about it. But let's do what is best for the forest. Let's make this bill the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

□ 1830

Mrs. LUMMIS. I join in thanking Representative WESTERMAN for this legislation and this Special Order tonight, explaining the extent to which these catastrophic wildfires are destroying the West and other areas of our country.

This year, over 9 million acres have burned in the West. It is a new record for catastrophic wildfires. This year, most of the damage has been in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and northern California.

You heard the gentleman from northern California earlier talk about the number of houses that have been destroyed; the lives that have been disrupted; the wildlife that has been destroyed; the habitat that has been destroyed; the carbon that has gone up in the air and the illness that has caused; the watersheds that are destroyed; the oxygen that is destroyed when you have ash running down hill-sides into streams, choking the oxygen out of the water, killing the fish.

The habitat destruction, the effects on people and ungulates and fish and resources, it is irresponsible. We have a stewardship obligation for these lands. We know how to manage these lands. This doesn't need to be happening.

Representative WESTERMAN is a professional forester and an engineer. He has spent his career studying the science of doing this right.

I have a photograph here of an example of how to do this right. He showed us some earlier from his State of Arkansas. I want to show you how his methodology works in the Black Hills that straddle the border between South Dakota and Wyoming.

You can't see this terribly clearly, but if you look at this vibrant green in the middle and compare it to the browns and yellows that you see down here—Black Hills National Forest—that has been thinned, that has been forested, that has been conservation logged.

It has created sunlight in places that were clogged and choked from sunlight.

It has created healthy underbrush, as opposed to a clogged underbrush that burns. It has allowed wildlife to graze. It allows snow to be stored and held longer in the forest into the spring and very early summer before it melts and goes downstream, thereby preventing flooding downstream. It is a natural hedge against flooding.

We know all of this. All we have to do is pass and implement Representative WESTERMAN's bill, and we can start preventing this.

The day to save a tree is yesterday, but this summer, because we have ignored this problem for so long, we let 9 million more acres go up in smoke in the West.

I spent the entire August work period in my State of Wyoming. Although Wyoming, thank God, wasn't on fire this summer—it has been in the past—but I can tell you, every day, when I woke up on the western side of the State of Wyoming, my eyes were burning from fires that were burning hundreds of miles west of me in Idaho, in Oregon, in Washington, and in northern California.

To ignore science, to ignore management practices, and to allow this to continue is abominable.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) has the answer. The House passed it. I urge the Senate to take it up.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his thoughtful contribution to the Congress of the United States by serving here.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for her comments, and I also thank her for pointing out that forest management is different in different parts of the country.

We have trained forestry professionals all over this country. We have good people working for the Forest Service that know how to do the right job, but their hands are tied. They can't use the things that they have learned in forestry school. They can't use the things that they have learned through practice. They can't practice the art of forestry and the science of forestry because of policy here in Washington, D.C.

We need to untie their hands so that they can implement these management procedures on the land to make it healthier.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking Congressman WESTERMAN for organizing this Special Order tonight and for his indispensable work on the Natural Resources Committee and its Subcommittee on Federal Lands.

Mr. WESTERMAN is a professional forester, schooled at Yale University, which the founder of the U.S. Forest Service, Gifford Pinchot, did so much to shape.

Mr. WESTERMAN's H.R. 2647 represents the first step toward restoring the sound, well-established, scientifically validated, and time-tested methods that, for generations, produced healthy, thriving, and vibrant forests.

These forest management practices prevented vegetation and wildlife from overgrowing the ability of the land to support them. Not only did this assure robust and healthy forests capable of resisting fire, disease, and pestilence, but it also supported the prosperous economy.

Revenues from the sale of excess timber provided a steady stream of revenues to the Treasury which could, in turn, be used to further improve the public lands.

About 45 years ago, we replaced these sound management practices with what can only be described as a policy of benign neglect. In 1970, Congress adopted the National Environmental Policy Act that opened a floodgate of ponderous and Byzantine laws, regulations, and lawsuits, with the explicit promise that they would "save the environment."

Well, after 45 years of these policies, I think we are entitled to ask: How is the environment doing?

Well, according to every scrap of evidence submitted to our subcommittee by a broad cross-section of experts, the answer is that these laws have not only failed to improve the forest environment; they have catastrophically harmed that environment.

Surplus timber harvested from our national forests as a result of these laws has dropped dramatically since the 1980s, while acreage destroyed by forest fire has increased concurrently and concomitantly. Wildlife habitats that were supposed to be preserved are now being incinerated.

Precipitation that once flowed to riparian habitats now evaporates in overgrown canopies or is quickly claimed in the fierce competition of densely packed vegetation. We have lost vast tracts of our national forests to beetle infestations, as weakened trees can no longer resist their attacks.

The U.S. Forest Service reports that in the Tahoe Basin in my district, there is now four times the vegetation density as normal, and trees that once had room to grow and thrive now fight for their lives against other trees trying to occupy the same ground.

Revenues that our forest management agencies once produced and that facilitated our forest stewardship have all but dried up. This has devastated mountain communities that once thrived from the forest economy, while precious resources are diverted for life-line programs like secure rural schools and PILT.

Despite a growing population, visitation to our national forests has declined significantly. We can no longer

manage lands to prevent fire or even salvage dead timber once fire has destroyed it.

Appeals, lawsuits, and especially the threat of lawsuits have paralyzed and demoralized the Forest Service and created perverse incentives to do nothing to manage our lands.

The steadily deteriorating situation is forcing managers to raid forest treatment and fire prevention funds to pay for the growing costs of wildfire suppression, creating a fiscal death spiral—the more we raid prevention funds, the more wildfires we have; the more wildfires we have, the more we have to raid our prevention funds.

Ironically, our private forest lands are today conspicuously healthier than the public lands, precisely because the private lands are free from so many of the laws that are tying the hands of our public foresters. These laws may be making environmental law firms rich, but they are killing our national forests.

H.R. 2647 is the first step toward restoring sound, rational, and scientific management of our national forests. It streamlines fire and disease prevention programs and assures that fire-killed timber can be quickly removed to create both the revenues and the room to restore fire-damaged lands. It protects forest managers from frivolous lawsuits.

In my district, comprising the Sierra Nevada mountains in California, two major forest fires are now raging. The Butte fire in Amador County has already killed two people, left hundreds homeless, and destroyed 72,000 acres of forest land. The Rough fire in Fresno County has destroyed 141,000 acres, and they are still burning tonight.

We have exhausted our firefighting budget, and, without relief, we will have to begin stripping funds intended for fire prevention.

Mr. WESTERMAN's bill would allow these catastrophic wildfires to be funded like every other natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very simple choice. We can continue the misguided environmental laws that, for 45 years, have become responsible for the destruction of hundreds of square miles of our national forests every year, or we can restore the sound forest management practices that will guarantee healthy and resilient forests for the next generation.

This bill has already passed the House. It is now sitting in the Senate, and it is essential that the Senate act soon to put it on the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from California and would also like to thank the gentleman for his tireless efforts on the Natural Resources Committee, the chairman of the Federal Lands Subcommittee.

This is something that—I am a freshman, and I have been working on for a small amount of time—but he has

spent years working on this issue. I thank him for his tireless efforts and his desire to see healthy forests not only in his home State but across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Speaker, sometimes overlooked in the debate surrounding wildfires is the importance of forestry practices intended to prevent the wildfires before they start.

The Resilient Federal Forests Act, authored by my friend from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), passed the House in July with bipartisan support. Since then, there have been multiple fires, major fires that are raging across the country.

This bill would simplify and streamline environmental process requirements and reduce the cost of forest management projects intended to prevent catastrophic wildfires. The bill would also allow for quick removal of dead trees to pay for reforestation after large fires and prevent the incidence of reburn.

As wildfires continue to burn in the Western United States, with tremendous costs to people and property, it is important to note that these fires are literally sending billions of dollars of Federal assets up in smoke, depriving State government, local government, and the Federal Government of billions in revenues not just in wood products, but in recreation revenues.

I am a small forest owner myself. I understand the value of a healthy well-managed forest.

Mr. Speaker, America has already lost 9 million acres in valuable forests this year. Our forests continue to burn and more will be burned unless we act on this legislation. I encourage my colleagues in the Senate to quickly pass this much-needed legislation and send it to the President's desk.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I thank the gentleman from Alabama. We are from Southern States, but good forestry management is very important to us as well. I have about 2.5 million acres of Federal forest in my district in Arkansas, and we want to see that land managed properly. We don't want to see it go up in smoke.

Mr. Speaker, we face a lot of contentious issues in this body and in Congress, but this shouldn't be one of them.

President Roosevelt, who was the father of our national forests, along with Gifford Pinchot, said that this is one of our most treasured natural resources. We need to leave it in better shape for the next generation than what we received it in.

Right now, we are not doing that. This is not a partisan issue. This is something that we need to look at the science, we need to work together, and we need to do what is right for America. We need to do what is right for forests because healthy forests create a winning situation on many levels.

We get better air quality. We get better water quality. We get a better economy. We get better wildlife habitat. We sequester more carbon.

□ 1845

There is not a downside to a healthy forest, but we have to get our act right here in Washington, D.C.

It is with that that I, again, plead with and encourage the Senate to take up this issue. Let's have a debate on it. Let's fix this and get ourselves back on the right path to healthy forests. We didn't get here overnight, and we are not going to fix everything overnight, but we have to start sometime. The sooner we start, the sooner we can have our forests back in a healthy condition and the sooner we can enjoy this national treasure that belongs to all of us in America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

VOTE "NO" TO DEFUNDING PLANNED PARENTHOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. CLARK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of talk about defunding Planned Parenthood. Some Republicans have made this such a priority that they are vowing to shut down our government, shut down our programs for veterans and hinder their ability to access services, WIC programs serving moms and babies, curtail services for domestic violence, and close our national parks and landmarks.

The last Republican shutdown cost our economy \$24 billion, but many of the GOP's Presidential candidates said in their debate just last night that defunding Planned Parenthood is a priority.

We are not talking about abortion here. We are talking about access to health care. Under current law, Federal money cannot be used for the coverage for abortion except in the most extreme circumstances of rape, incest, or the possibility of the death of the mother. Even though most Americans disagree with that restriction and believe firmly that decisions surrounding pregnancy should be between a woman, her doctor, and her faith, that is not the law of the land currently.

So if we are not talking about abortion, what are we talking about? What is this threat that will be stopped by cutting off all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood? What we are talking about is denying health care to the 2.7 million patients who received care just last year at Planned Parenthood.

More than 90 percent of what Planned Parenthood does is preventative care. This includes wellness exams, cancer screenings, contraception, prenatal care, and testing and treatment for STIs. Just last year, Planned Parenthood had over 2 million contraception patients, performed approximately 3.7 million STI tests, 370,000 Pap tests, and 450,000 breast exams. These are the types of services patients receive at Planned Parenthood, and this preventive health care is what the majority would like to get rid of by defunding it.

That is what is most important about this debate: the care that patients receive, the care that one in five American women will receive from Planned Parenthood at some point in their life.

I would like to welcome my colleague, at this point, from New Jersey's 12th District, Congresswoman WATSON COLEMAN. She is a strong voice for women and families. I am proud to call her a friend and a colleague, and I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, for the umpteenth time, men in Congress are leading the charge to limit women's access to health care, but now, instead of just wasting taxpayer dollars and time, they plan to take their outrageous tactics to a whole new level, perhaps shutting down the entire Federal Government if they don't get their way. As the gentlewoman from Massachusetts has already explained, that is absolutely ridiculous.

Rather than consider legislation that would fund repairs to our Nation's infrastructure or invest in our schools or create jobs for millions of Americans still out of work, we are considering legislation that would cut off support to an organization that provides vital health services to women and men who might not otherwise have access.

Mr. Speaker, Planned Parenthood is, first and foremost, an organization dedicated to women's health. What is more, despite the endless conservative rhetoric to the contrary, Planned Parenthood does not use a single dollar of Federal funds to provide abortions. This is really just a thinly veiled attempt to allow Congress to regulate a woman's uterus, and the end result won't be the end of very legal abortions. It will be the erosion of care, family planning, and medical treatment for thousands of women.

Wednesday's Washington Post offered a perfect example. It profiled a single

Planned Parenthood clinic in Ohio, a clinic that does not offer abortion services. According to The Post, that clinic sees 7,100 patients each year, most of them young and poor. They administer 3,400 pregnancy tests, they write 2,900 birth control prescriptions, and they provide 13,200 screenings for sexually transmitted infections.

Facilities like this make up nearly half of the Planned Parenthood centers nationwide. Cutting their funding will only result in more illness, more unplanned pregnancies, and more babies born to mothers unprepared to care for them.

In 2013, Planned Parenthood provided more than 71,000 patients with care in my State, the State of New Jersey. They provided almost 16,000 Pap tests to New Jersey women, and they conducted more than 33,000 breast exams.

In a shortsighted response to a series of questionably edited videos and false claims, we are going to take health care away from Americans with few, if any, alternatives. That is not what my constituents elected me for. That is not what they expected me to be doing in Congress. I am here to create jobs, to better educate our young people, and to reform our broken criminal justice system. By no means am I here to relitigate a woman's right to choose.

Quite frankly, I am not sure which I am more disgusted by: the fact that we are doing this again, or the fact that I have come to the floor of this House so many times before to express that disgust.

I urge my colleagues to consider taking up the work that really matters to the American people. I thank the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

I want to reiterate something that the Congresswoman said, that this is really a thinly veiled extremist position. What we are talking about is exactly as the gentlewoman from New Jersey put it. We are talking about relitigating rights that are established under the law and that have really nothing to do with abortion. They are having everything to do with the way that one in five American women receives her health care. And Planned Parenthood not only has a huge reach in the patients that they serve, but they historically serve low-income and underserved populations.

For example, in 2013, 78 percent of Planned Parenthood patients had incomes of 150 percent of poverty or less. To put that in real terms, that is an income of a little over \$36,000 dollars a year for a family of four. So not only does Planned Parenthood provide critical services to low-income families, but they also have a geographic reach to help ensure all patients have a healthcare access point.

Nationwide, they represent 54 percent of all health centers in rural

areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. And in some areas, they are even a larger part of the healthcare system. In Alabama, Washington, D.C., Delaware, Louisiana, Mississippi, Montana, Rhode Island, and Wyoming, they are 100 percent of the health centers in rural areas, medically underserved areas, and health provider shortage areas. That is why Planned Parenthood is so critical.

I am delighted to yield to my colleague from California's 33rd District. Congressman LIEU represents communities in Los Angeles. He is an Air Force veteran and Reservist, president of the freshman class of Democrats, and, as a California State senator, and now as a Congressman, he has had an unparalleled record on women's issues.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Thank you, Representative CLARK, for your great work on this issue.

Madam Speaker, I rise to stand with Planned Parenthood.

Last month, as it became more and more clear that Republicans were willing to shut down the Federal Government to defund Planned Parenthood, I received a letter from a constituent of mine in Los Angeles. She gave me permission to read her letter. It says:

Dear Congressman Lieu,

I grew up in a small desert town that had a very high teen pregnancy and high school dropout rate. I made very poor choices as a young teenager, and I was drinking, partying, and ditching school at 15. During this time, I met a boy I cared for and started having sex. I knew that I didn't want to end up pregnant like a lot of young girls in my town, so I went to the one place I knew would help: Planned Parenthood. They made me feel comfortable there. They performed a thorough exam and gave me birth control pills. They also contacted me confidentially to tell me I had an STD and would need to take antibiotics. Without treatment, this STD could have made me permanently infertile.

I thank God that I straightened my act out and, by the end of high school, I was getting straight A's. I went to a good college, graduated from medical school, and began my residency. I met a great guy, who is now my husband, and again went to Planned Parenthood for birth control pills, STD screening, and Pap smears. Several years later, I finally went off the birth control pills, and my husband and I got pregnant with our first of two healthy children.

I feel compelled to share my story because of everything that Planned Parenthood has done for me in my lifetime. Planned Parenthood allowed me to make good, healthy reproductive decisions and avoid ever having to make a decision as to whether or not to abort an unwanted pregnancy.

That letter is from one of many constituents and from millions of women across America that have benefited from Planned Parenthood.

The two bills on the floor today that are attacking Planned Parenthood are a direct attack on American women. In reality, a vote to defund Planned Parenthood is a vote to deny health care,

education, and opportunity to millions of Americans like my constituent.

I stand with American women and with Planned Parenthood in opposition to these two bills, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Thank you, Congressman LIEU. We appreciate your coming. The story that you shared is repeated over and over with the millions of women that count on Planned Parenthood for their healthcare services.

I would now like to yield to my colleague from Tennessee's Ninth District. Congressman COHEN is a champion on women's issues and a lifelong supporter of Planned Parenthood.

Mr. COHEN. Thank you very much for the time, and thank you for scheduling this important hour, Special Order.

Madam Speaker, this issue is extremely important to women, to men, to the Constitution, and to progress, and this week has been, unfortunately, very much an example of what the House has been doing throughout this session—messaging.

We are about to have a shutdown of government because of Planned Parenthood, and the cost to our economy and to people for a shutdown of the Federal Government is astronomical. The last shutdown, which I think was in 2013—it might have been 2011—cost hundreds of billions of dollars to the economy. The stock market fell, people lost jobs, lost income, and lost services all because of Planned Parenthood.

□ 1900

The bottom line is that Planned Parenthood is an outstanding organization that serves women in this Nation, in my State, and in my city—mostly low-income women and a lot of women of color.

There, they get their basic female healthcare services whether it is cervical cancer exams, breast cancer exams, sexually transmitted disease tests, family planning programs.

It is not about abortion. A very small part of it is abortion. It is not called "Planned Abortion." It is called "Planned Parenthood."

Madam Speaker, most people are in need of those services. To cut them out, as they talked about, and to give them to community health centers is not the answer. That doesn't work as it is going to disadvantage a lot of women.

What we have had this week is a bill—the most recent bill—did anybody discuss the fact that this second bill didn't go to committee? I guess it is called the "unborn baby bill," whatever it is. Has that been discussed?

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. No.

Mr. COHEN. That is the amazing thing. This bill that has come up—that will come up tomorrow, I guess—never went to committee. In fact, it was kind

of just sprung on us on Monday, and they didn't even get the language straight until maybe Tuesday.

Madam Speaker, in the Congress, we generally have committee meetings. You have a hearing on a bill almost always—that is what committees are for, is to have hearings—sometimes by a subcommittee and then, later, by a full committee—and a markup, sometimes by the subcommittee, always at least by the full committee. Then it goes to the Rules Committee, and then it comes to the floor.

When this Congress came about, the majority party made a big deal about how they were going to come in and change the way things were done and how there was going to be regular order.

Bills weren't going to be brought to the floor without any notice; committees would do their work; amendments would be offered; and people would get an opportunity to testify from the public.

This bill was given no markup in committee, no hearing in committee, no opportunity for the public to voice any concerns as to whether they were for it or against it, and no Congresspeople on the committee had a chance to voice their concerns.

In essence, it was sprung on the public. The bill will have a new definition of "abortion"—unknown before in Federal law. That is a pretty major thing—with no hearing, no notice, no opportunity to address the issue, no opportunity to maybe bring in somebody who is an expert to say: You might have missed this. You might have missed that. This is the way it ought to be. No.

Madam Speaker, this week in Congress, the Republican side has basically said: We don't want to hear from the public. We don't want to hear from doctors. We don't want to hear from women. We don't want to hear from them on another bill we had up today. We don't want to hear from judges on something that affects the Federal courts, where the judges, in reviewing it, voted by 85 percent "bad idea"—no judges, no lawyers, no doctors, no women, no public—because that side of the House knows how to do everything.

They know how to define "abortion." They know how to run the courts. They know how to run women's lives. Choice and reproduction should be a decision between a woman, her family, her conscience, and her doctor, not what this side wants.

What this side wants is to repeal Roe v. Wade. They want to do away with a woman's right to abortion. That is what this is about. They pick these other issues to talk about, but that is what they really want. If that happens, it is going to be no different than alcohol prohibition in the twenties and marijuana today.

Alcohol was illegal. So what happened? People got alcohol and they

drank, but they drank because organized crime supplied it for them—no taxes, lots of organized crime, lots of killings between organized crime.

Marijuana. Do people have problems getting marijuana? People don't have problems getting marijuana. It is everywhere. It was at George Bush's school. It is everywhere. It is not hard to get, but it gives the cartels a way to sell it. It happens.

Madam Speaker, when abortion was illegal in this country, wealthy women could afford to go to Mexico or wherever it was legal and get abortions. Poor people went to get abortions, but they had to go to somebody who maybe didn't have a clean area in which to do the procedure or the experience or the ability. Poor women went to back alleys and oftentimes had health detriments because of it and sometimes lost their lives.

So abortion is not going to be outlawed in this Congress, I don't think, but that is what they would like to do. Even if it is outlawed, it is still going to happen. If it happens, it is going to happen for the rich, and the poor are going to get the worst services.

You can't take your morality and tell the American public, when they want some service, some opportunity, some freedom, that they can't have it, because they will find it. It will just be through a roundabout way.

Madam Speaker, I thank Ms. CLARK for having this Special Order. I am going to always support *Roe v. Wade* and support Planned Parenthood. It does a lot for the women in my district. As I said, it is one of the best organizations in our country, and I believe that.

They help women with services they otherwise couldn't get. In a lot of States like mine, where the Affordable Care Act has not been extended through the expansion of Medicaid, it is even more difficult for poor women to get medical services and even life-saving services.

So thank you. We will continue to message and continue to fight and hope the American public realizes that what is going on here is shutting them out—no voice, no message—simply activity.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee for his words and for his commitment to women and their access to health care and for pointing out the confounding thing about defunding Planned Parenthood, which is that we are not even talking about abortion, as we have already restricted that Federal funding.

Madam Speaker, we are talking about access to health care to underserved women, to low-income women, who are trying to get general wellness checkups, who are trying to have cancer screenings, who are trying to access health care.

It is Planned Parenthood that fills that void in our underserved popu-

lations, in our rural areas. That is where they make a critical difference.

You are absolutely right in that the messaging that this is somehow about something else is completely hiding the fact that we are bringing bills to the floor without committee hearings, that we are not being transparent, and that we are misleading the American public about what this debate is about.

I am delighted that we also have another champion for working families and a great voice for the communities he serves.

I yield to my colleague from California's 36th District, Congressman RUIZ.

Mr. RUIZ. I thank the gentlewoman.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of a woman's right to choose, women's health, and Planned Parenthood.

You see, before I ran for Congress, I spent 9 years as an emergency medicine physician. A few years ago, a 55-year-old woman came into my emergency room with a gynecological hemorrhage.

After we stopped the bleeding in the ER, we admitted her for diagnosis and treatment. Sadly, as I suspected, she had advanced cervical cancer, and 5 months later, she died, leaving her family behind.

Until recently, cervical cancer was the leading cause of cancer deaths for women in the United States. However, over the past 40 years, we have dramatically reduced the number of deaths from cervical cancer.

According to the CDC, "This decline largely is the result of many women getting regular Pap tests, which can find cervical pre-cancer before it turns into cancer."

Madam Speaker, that is what is at stake in this debate.

In fact, 97 percent of Planned Parenthood's services are not abortion related. Planned Parenthood provides many health and wellness services, including STI testing, contraceptives, and cancer screenings to over 2 million women and men each year.

Opponents of Planned Parenthood's want to turn this into a debate about abortion, but it is not. Let's be clear. Defunding Planned Parenthood won't reduce the number of abortions at all.

This is a debate about cervical cancer. This is a debate about breast cancer. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to go undiagnosed and untreated. This is a debate about how many women we are going to allow to show up in emergency rooms like mine, with terminal cancer, too late to be saved.

In California alone, Planned Parenthood health centers have provided over 93,000 Pap tests for cervical cancer and 97,000 breast exams to help prevent death from breast cancer.

Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood saves lives.

Here is who actually loses if Planned Parenthood loses its funding: Women

in geographically underserved areas lose; uninsured and underinsured women lose; women on Medicaid lose; and low-income women lose.

Planned Parenthood fills that access gap and provides essential health services to those who need it the most. Cutting their funding will have a long-term, devastating effect on the overall health of women in our communities, worsening health outcomes and health disparities for women across our Nation.

To me, this isn't a political debate, because I have seen firsthand what happens when women don't have access to preventative care. Women die; children are left without their mothers; and families are torn apart.

It is for these reasons that I oppose this misguided, mean-spirited, politically driven measure, and it is for these reasons that I stand with Planned Parenthood.

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman from California for sharing his experience as a medical doctor and as someone who stands with Planned Parenthood.

Thank you for joining us.

Congressman RUIZ raises an interesting point about looking at our system of health care.

Part of the proposal from the Republicans is that this is easy, that we can simply take the money from Planned Parenthood and give it to community health centers, but there is simply not the capacity in the system to handle these extra patients.

Currently, more than half of Medicaid providers are not offering appointments to new Medicaid patients, but two-thirds of the States report difficulty in ensuring enough providers, including OB/GYN care.

Madam Speaker, this hurts low-income women especially hard because 60 percent of Planned Parenthood patients access care through Medicaid and/or Title X, and 35 percent of women view their OB/GYN as their main source of care.

So what we are talking about here is not abortion, but women's health care, preventative measures that save lives.

We know that over 90 percent of the services Planned Parenthood provides are preventative. We know that they serve underserved areas.

We know that there isn't enough capacity to see these patients in other settings and that eliminating funding for Planned Parenthood would mean over 390,000 patients would no longer receive health care.

If all of this sounds crazy to you, you are not alone. It is why I came down here tonight, and I thank my colleagues who joined me.

It is time that we reveal the falsehoods of this argument and defeat these efforts—these radical efforts—that are threatening to shut down our government in order to defund Planned

Parenthood, which carries so much of our healthcare system for women in this country and especially for low-income women.

It is time we stand up, debunk the lies and the mysteries that we are being told, and let women have the healthcare access that they need and deserve.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 719. An act to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1090. An act to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

S. 1580. An act to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

ADJOURNMENT

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 17 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 18, 2015, at 9 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23

Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 114th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

DARIN LAHOOD, Eighteenth District of Illinois.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2803. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing two United States Navy officers, Captain Shoshana S. Chatfield and Captain Cathal S. O'Connor, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2804. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [EPA-R06-2015-0070 RCRA; FRL-9933-79-Region 6] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2805. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Revision and 2014 Five-Year Progress Report [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0299; FRL-9933-84-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2806. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of NOx Emissions From Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0520; FRL-9934-00-Region 7] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2807. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report pursuant to Sec. 804 of

the PLO Commitments Compliance Act of 1989 [Title VIII, Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 1990 and 1991 (Pub. L. 101-246)], and Secs. 603-604 (Middle East Peace Commitments Act of 2002) and 699 of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, FY 2003 (Pub. L. 107-228); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2808. A letter from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's FY 2017 budget request for the Office of Inspector General of the Railroad Retirement Board, in accordance with Sec. 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2809. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [SATS No.: PA-159-FOR; Docket No.: OSM-2010-0017; S1D1S SS08011000 SX064A000 156S180110; S2D2S SS08011000 SX064A000 15XS501520] received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2810. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Exchange of Flatfish in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE023) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2811. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD996) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2812. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Bluefish Fishery; 2015 Atlantic Bluefish Specifications [Docket No.: 150126074-5655-02] (RIN: 0648-XD742) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2813. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries off West Coast States; Highly Migratory Fisheries; California Swordfish Drift Gillnet Fishery; Vessel Monitoring System Requirements [Docket No.: 140528460-5498-03] (RIN: 0648-BE25) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2814. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area

Closure for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XE073) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2815. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — International Fisheries; Pacific Tuna Fisheries; 2015 Bigeye Tuna Longline Fishery Closure in the Eastern Pacific Ocean [Docket No.: 130717632-4285-02] (RIN: 0648-XE085) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2816. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8; Correction [Docket No.: 140214145-5582-02] (RIN: 0648-BD81) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2817. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Mid-Atlantic Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 141125999-5362-02] (RIN: 0648-XE084) received September 11, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2818. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 120328229-4949-02] (RIN: 0648-XE079) received August 31, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2819. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Regulations. Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Off-Road Motor Vehicles [NPS-LAMR-18708; PPWONRADE2, PMP00EI05.YP0000] (RIN: 1024-AD86) received September 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2820. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Departmental Cases Hearings Division, Office of the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hearing Process Concerning Acknowledgement of American Indian Tribes [156A2100DD/AAK001030/A0A501010.999900 253G] (RIN: 1094-AA54) received September 10, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2821. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's

temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Cleveland National Air Show; Lake Erie and Cleveland Harbor, Cleveland, OH [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0718] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2822. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's temporary rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2823. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0282; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-168-AD; Amendment 39-18242; AD 2015-17-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2824. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; REIMS AVIATION S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3398; Directorate Identifier 2015-CE-031-AD; Amendment 39-18232; AD 2015-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2825. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-3325; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-15] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2826. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Kelso, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1133; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-8] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2827. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) (Airbus Helicopters) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0364; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-041-AD; Amendment 39-18234; AD 2015-17-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2828. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Restricted Areas R-3804A, R-3804B, and R-3804C; Fort Polk, LA [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0639; Airspace Docket No.: 13-ASW-20] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2829. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Toledo, WA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1135; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-9] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2830. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Santa Rosa, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1481; Airspace Docket No.: 15-AWP-1] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2831. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of VOR Federal Airways; Northeastern United States [Docket No.: FAA-2015-1650; Airspace Docket No.: 14-AEA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2832. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (Bell) Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0643; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-059-AD; Amendment 39-18235; AD 2015-17-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2833. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0492; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-232-AD; Amendment 39-18237; AD 2015-17-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2834. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D Airspace; Ogden, Hill AFB, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0691; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-6] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2835. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace, and Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Ogden-Hinckley Airport, UT [Docket No.: FAA-2015-0671; Airspace Docket No.: 15-ANM-5] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2836. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums

and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31032; Amdt. No.: 3656] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2837. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31031; Amdt. No.: 3655] received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2838. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final regulations and removal of temporary regulations — Integrated Hedging Transactions of Qualifying Debt [TD 9736] (RIN: 1545-BK98) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2839. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, Executive Office of the President, transmitting notification of the President's ongoing negotiations in the World Trade Organization aimed at eliminating tariffs on a wide range of environmental goods, in accordance with Sec. 107(b)(1) of the Bipartisan Congressional Trade Priorities and Accountability Act of 2015 (Trade Priorities Act of 2015); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2840. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's temporary regulations — Administration of Multiemployer Plan Participant Vote on an Approved Suspension of Benefits Under MPRA [TD 9735] (RIN: 1545-BM89) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2841. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — United States Property Held by Controlled Foreign Corporations in Transactions Involving Partnerships; Rents and Royalties Derived in the Active Conduct of a Trade or Business [TD 9733] (RIN: 1545-BJ49) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2842. A letter from the Chairman and Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's 2015 report for the FY ending September 30, 2014, pursuant to Sec. 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act and Sec. 12(1) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to include claims relating to a response under the Comprehensive Response,

Compensation, and Liability Act among those claims for which the Federal Tort Claims Act provides a remedy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLIQUIN (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. RIBBLE, and Mr. MESSER):

H.R. 3532. A bill to amend the fresh fruit and vegetable program under the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to include canned, dried, frozen, or pureed fruits and vegetables; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. COOPER):

H.R. 3533. A bill to reduce Federal, State, and local costs of providing high-quality drinking water to millions of people in the United States residing in rural communities by facilitating greater use of cost-effective alternative systems, including well water systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUINTA (for himself and Ms. SINEMA):

H.R. 3534. A bill to reduce the national debt and eliminate waste in Government spending, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3535. A bill to promote and ensure delivery of high quality special education and related services to students with visual disabilities or who are deaf or hard of hearing or deaf-blind through instructional methodologies meeting their unique learning needs; to enhance accountability for the provision of such services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia (for himself, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. LEWIS):

H.R. 3536. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe a motor vehicle safety standard requiring commercial motor vehicles to be equipped with a forward collision avoidance and mitigation braking system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DENT (for himself, Mr. HIMES, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. DOLD, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HANNA, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LANCE, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. KATKO, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 3537. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to clarify how controlled substance analogues are to be regulated, and for other purposes; to the Committee on En-

ergy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTINGER:

H.R. 3538. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. SHIMKUS, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas):

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against tax for clinical testing expenses for qualified infectious disease drugs and rapid diagnostic tests; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARDENAS (for himself and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3540. A bill to amend the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 to make improvements to the food safety education program carried out under such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3541. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act to modify the goals of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Open Market Committee; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542. A bill to provide support for pre-kindergarten education through an Early Education Trust Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LEE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. NADLER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 3543. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, Energy and Commerce, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. ESTY):

H.R. 3544. A bill to help keep law enforcement officers and communities safer by making grants to purchase body worn cameras for use by State, local, and tribal law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for replacement costs associated with certain imported corrosive drywall, and to amend the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to allow use of community development block grant amounts for repairs to housing constructed using such corrosive drywall, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California):

H.R. 3546. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 3547. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a task force on Agent Orange exposure; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3548. A bill to increase transparency of agencies by requiring a report describing any proposed conference; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINE (for himself, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. PAULSEN):

H.R. 3549. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. SENSENBRENNER):

H.R. 3550. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 3551. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to require additional reporting on crime and harm that occurs during student participation in programs of study abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide equitable treatment for residents of Puerto Rico with respect to the refundable portion of the child tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make residents of Puerto Rico eligible for the earned income tax credit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 3554. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to create a pilot program to award grants to units of general local government and community-based organizations to create jobs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. ADAMS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. LEE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. SABLON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H.R. 3555. A bill to provide tax relief for American workers and businesses, to put workers back on the job while rebuilding and modernizing America, and to provide pathways back to work for Americans looking for jobs; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Small Business, Education and the Workforce, the Judiciary, Transportation and Infrastructure, Financial Services, House Administration, Oversight and Government Reform, and the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GIBSON (for himself, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. DOLD, Mr. HANNA, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. LOBIONDO):

H. Res. 424. A resolution expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives to conservative environmental stewardship; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. NEUGEBAUER (for himself, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. MULLIN):

H. Res. 425. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 2015 as "National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SIREs, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ESTY, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. FARR, Mr. PIERLUISI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SABLON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MOUTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HARDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COSTA, Ms. BASS, Mr. SHERMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. TITUS, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr.

DESAULNIER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BEYER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 426. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. RENACCI, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LATTA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H. Res. 427. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HONDA (for himself and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN):

H. Res. 428. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to protect House employees from employment discrimination on the basis of actual or perceived sexual orientation and gender identity; to the Committee on Ethics.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. GABBARD, and Ms. GRAHAM):

H. Res. 429. A resolution congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. WESTMORELAND:

H.R. 3531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. POLIQUIN:

H.R. 3532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 empowers Congress to “regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.”

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GUINTA:

H.R. 3534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which states: The Congress shall have power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 (relating to the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia:

H.R. 3536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 3537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 3538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3. To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. The Congress shall have Power to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 3539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(a) Article I, Section 1, to exercise the legislative powers vested in Congress as granted in the Constitution; and

(b) Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, which gives Congress the authority “To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof;

By Mr. CÁRDENAS:

H.R. 3540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 3541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 3542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of article I of the Constitution and Amendment XVI of the Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 3544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 3545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: “The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

By Mr. JONES:

H.R. 3546.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution: “The Congress shall have the power. . . . To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes:”

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3547.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 Clause 1: Congress shall have power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3548.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. KLINE:

H.R. 3549.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This legislation provides the Secretary of Veterans Affairs the authority to waive a co-payment requirement if the Department of Veterans Affairs is the cause of an error that delays sending a bill to a veteran. Additionally, the bill requires the Department of Veterans Affairs to notify a veteran of how to get a waiver and establish a payment plan before they can collect payment when they does not bill a veteran in a timely manner. Specific authority is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution

(clauses 12, 14, and 16), which grants Congress the power to raise and support Armies; to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces; and to provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3550.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3551.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3552.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PIERLUISI:

H.R. 3553.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of the Congress to lay and collect taxes and to provide for the general welfare of the United States, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution; to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution such power, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution; and to make rules and regulations respecting the U.S. territories, as enumerated in Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3554.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 3555.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause and provisions to provide for the general welfare.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 38: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 167: Mr. YODER and Mr. PETERSON.

H.R. 169: Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 205: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 206: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 213: Mrs. LOVE, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 242: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 244: Mr. AMODEI.

- H.R. 267: Mr. VAN HOLLEN.
H.R. 270: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 344: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 390: Mr. BILIRAKIS.
H.R. 483: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 546: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi and Miss RICE of New York.
H.R. 581: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H.R. 592: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 600: Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 604: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 664: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 702: Mr. LIPINSKI.
H.R. 733: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 765: Mr. MEEHAN.
H.R. 767: Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 775: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. TAKAI, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 793: Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 814: Mr. MILLER of Florida.
H.R. 815: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 863: Mr. GUTHRIE and Mr. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 868: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 885: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DEFazio, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 921: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
H.R. 927: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 928: Mr. DONOVAN.
H.R. 985: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1061: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1145: Mr. HANNA.
H.R. 1150: Mr. BARLETTA.
H.R. 1151: Ms. GRAHAM.
H.R. 1153: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 1202: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 1211: Mr. VEASEY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 1218: Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KLINE.
H.R. 1232: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1258: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1270: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. HILL, Mr. SESSIONS, and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1292: Ms. GABBARD and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 1338: Mrs. ROBY.
H.R. 1343: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 1369: Mr. FLORES and Mr. LUETKE-MEYER.
H.R. 1399: Mr. KATKO.
H.R. 1401: Mr. DELANEY and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 1413: Mr. LAMBORN.
H.R. 1428: Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 1475: Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 1519: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H.R. 1528: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1550: Mr. ASHFORD and Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 1559: Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 1566: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1567: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. SHIMKUS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 1588: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 1604: Ms. ADAMS.
H.R. 1610: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.
H.R. 1624: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1671: Mr. BYRNE and Ms. MCSALLY.
H.R. 1683: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 1706: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
H.R. 1715: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 1736: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 1784: Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 1786: Mr. WALZ, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HULTGREN, and Ms. PLASKETT.
H.R. 1859: Mr. GRIFFITH.
H.R. 1893: Mrs. LOVE and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 1901: Mr. COLLINS of New York.
H.R. 1938: Mr. WALZ.
H.R. 1988: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2014: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2030: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2050: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 2083: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2087: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BEYER, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Ms. ESTY.
H.R. 2096: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H.R. 2205: Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 2255: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. YODER.
H.R. 2260: Miss RICE of New York and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 2264: Ms. MCSALLY and Mr. CONNOLLY.
H.R. 2280: Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 2313: Mr. LANCE.
H.R. 2320: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2342: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. COOK, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, and Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 2355: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 2391: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 2403: Mr. BEYER.
H.R. 2442: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2519: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 2567: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 2611: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2622: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 2640: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 2657: Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. NEAL, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 2671: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2672: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2673: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2674: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 2713: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2715: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2764: Ms. JUDY CHU of California and Mrs. DAVIS of California.
H.R. 2775: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Mr. FOSTER.
H.R. 2799: Mr. BUCHSON.
H.R. 2805: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 2849: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 2858: Mr. NOLAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. EDWARDS.
H.R. 2867: Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 2878: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 2903: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. BARR.
H.R. 2905: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 2911: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. REED, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. GUTHRIE.
H.R. 2915: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 2920: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. DEUTCH.
H.R. 2940: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. BABIN.
H.R. 2948: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.
H.R. 3011: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 3016: Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 3024: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 3036: Mr. KATKO, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3040: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3041: Mr. COHEN.
H.R. 3065: Mr. ELLISON and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3081: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3084: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3110: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 3126: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. HURD of Texas.
H.R. 3134: Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3136: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
H.R. 3166: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 3177: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER and Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 3183: Mr. HUDSON.
H.R. 3189: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3220: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 3221: Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 3222: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3248: Ms. BORDALLO.
H.R. 3268: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. HAHN, and Mr. PAULSEN.
H.R. 3285: Mr. VEASEY.
H.R. 3286: Mr. NUNES and Mr. HONDA.
H.R. 3309: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
H.R. 3314: Mr. MCCAUL.
H.R. 3338: Mr. LOBIONDO and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
H.R. 3339: Mrs. WALORSKI.
H.R. 3340: Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3355: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 3363: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Mr. FARR.
H.R. 3371: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3411: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3423: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. KUSTER.
H.R. 3427: Ms. ADAMS and Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 3439: Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California.
H.R. 3442: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3443: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.
H.R. 3457: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. BENISHEK.
H.R. 3473: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. MARINO, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
H.R. 3476: Mr. NORCROSS.
H.R. 3477: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3495: Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. MULVANEY.
H.R. 3504: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. MARCHANT.
H.R. 3511: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 3516: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 3517: Mr. PAYNE and Mr. RICHMOND.
H.R. 3521: Mr. NUGENT.
H.R. 3523: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Miss RICE of New York, and Mr. VEASEY.
H.J. Res. 11: Mr. SANFORD.
H.J. Res. 50: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
H.J. Res. 59: Mr. ASHFORD.
H. Con. Res. 17: Ms. PASTOR of Florida.
H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. PETERSON.
H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. ROKITA, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ISSA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. WALKER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KLINE, Mr. BARR, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. KING of Iowa.
H. Res. 12: Mr. HIMES and Mr. AMODEI.
H. Res. 82: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H. Res. 112: Ms. EDWARDS.
H. Res. 139: Mr. KLINE.
H. Res. 230: Ms. DUCKWORTH.
H. Res. 277: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. MCHENRY, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. BRAT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. ISSA, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, Mr. SALMON, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H. Res. 289: Mr. YARMUTH.

H. Res. 293: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. MENG, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TROTT, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Mr. VARGAS.

H. Res. 294: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H. Res. 383: Mr. KING of New York.

H. Res. 385: Mr. GOHMERT.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

26. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to propose, for ratification by special conventions held within the individual states, an amendment to the United States Constitution which would clarify that any agreement arrived at between the Presi-

dent of the United States and any foreign government or governments constitutes a “treaty” thereby necessitating a two-thirds affirmative vote of “concurrence” by the United States Senate as provided in Article II, Section 2, Clause 2 of the Constitution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, September 17, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's opening prayer will be offered by the Reverend Camille Murray, pastor of Georgetown Presbyterian Church.

The guest Chaplain offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we give You thanks for the many provisions of this day and for the simple and sustaining gifts which enrich our lives. We thank You for the beauty and bounty of this great Nation. We offer You praise for the heritage we share, the faith we cherish, and the freedoms we enjoy.

As Your grateful people, we ask that You would remind us of the callings You have placed upon our lives. We pray that we would be faithful to those callings and to those entrusted to our care. May those elected to lead be given a double portion of Your Spirit, that they may have vision and wisdom from above.

Gracious God, keep us pure in thought, honest in speech, and diligent in our pursuit of the common good, all for the glory of Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROUNDS). The Senator from Minnesota.

WELCOMING THE GUEST CHAPLAIN

Mr. FRANKEN. Mr. President, I want to thank Camille Murray for our opening prayer this morning.

Reverend Murray currently serves in our Nation's Capital as the 20th senior pastor of the Georgetown Presbyterian Church. The church was founded in 1780, and Reverend Murray is the first woman pastor.

Reverend Murray grew up in my home State, in Mahtomedi, MN. She holds degrees from Vanderbilt University, Princeton Theological Seminary, Oxford University, and Wesley Seminary.

Reverend Murray's congregation is nonpartisan, with the belief that God transcends that which divides us.

We are so happy that she led us today in prayer.

Thank you very much.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, the Democrats have chosen to deny the Senate a final vote on the President's deal with Iran. They made their choice, but that doesn't mean the discussion is over.

Today we will have another opportunity to address the lifting of congressionally mandated sanctions as called for in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action. Today we will have an opportunity to vote on a question of policy: Should Iran be left with a threshold nuclear program, one now recognized by the P5+1, and receive billions of dollars in sanctions relief without any linkage whatsoever to other aspects of its foreign policy adventurism. That is the question before us.

I will discuss that vote in greater detail in just a moment but first a reminder of how we got to this point.

Here is what we know about the nuclear deal with Iran. It is President Obama's deal with Iran, not America's deal with Iran, because the President did everything possible to cut the American people out and to block their elected representatives from having a say.

He refused a treaty, because as Secretary Kerry noted quite candidly, he wasn't interested in negotiating something an elected Congress could support. He then had to be persuaded that resisting legislation to allow Congress an up-or-down vote on it—just as he had to be persuaded when Congress passed sanctions legislation that helped bring Iran to the table in the first place—would be futile. In other words, he didn't want the legislation that gave us an opportunity to respond to the President's deal with Iran. It had so many supporters, he knew the veto would be overridden. Then he finally convinced his party, which had voted unanimously for the legislation that gave Congress an opportunity to weigh in on the President's deal, to then deny the American people the up-or-down congressional vote Democrats had promised. Our Democratic friends went to extreme lengths to protect the President politically. Because they did, Democrats ensured that this would be

not just Obama's deal with Iran but the Democratic Party's deal with Iran too.

It is a deal that allows Iran to grow stronger in any number of ways: diplomatically, militarily, in terms of trade, and in terms of its enrichment program. It is also a deal that achieves hardly any of the Obama administration's primary goals. Secretary Kerry once declared that an accounting of Iran's military-related nuclear activities “will be part of a final” deal. “If there is going to be a deal,” he promised, “it will be done.” But it isn't.

Secretary Moniz once declared that he expected we would have anytime, anywhere access to Iranian nuclear facilities. We will not.

President Obama once declared that “the deal we'll accept is they end their nuclear program—it's very straightforward”—or perhaps not quite so straightforward because this deal will not end Iran's nuclear program.

Because the President made clear his desire to secure an agreement at any cost, it became easy for the Iranians to exploit concession after concession after concession. It became possible for the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism to secure a deal that allows it to enrich uranium, to maintain thousands of centrifuges, and to become a recognized nuclear-threshold state, forever on the edge of developing a weapon. Iran was even able to secure a multibillion-dollar cash windfall that will allow it to strengthen terrorist groups such as Hezbollah and Hamas, along with Assad's bloody regime in Damascus—even the President basically admits as much.

The administration is now so invested in this deal that it is likely to veto any additional sanctions passed by Congress, even those against terrorism.

Presidents are able to secure stronger, better, and more durable outcomes when they seek constructive cooperation on matters beyond the water's edge.

Republicans stood proudly for more international trade jobs just a few months ago. The President agreed with us on the policy. We all fought in the same corner as a result. It was disappointing to then hear the same President dismiss honest intellectual disagreements on the Iran deal as reflexive opposition to him personally. What nonsense.

The President made a choice to turn this into a partisan campaign instead of a serious debate. He tried to cut out the American people and Congress at every single opportunity. Because he did, he has left his country and his

party with an Executive deal that has hardly any durability or popular backing. Because he handled it this way, he has left his country and his party with an Executive deal that has hardly any durability or any public support. The American people aren't sold on it. A strong bipartisan majority of the House has rejected it. A strong bipartisan majority of the Senate rejects it too.

The deal can and likely will be revisited by the next Commander in Chief, but its negative consequences promise to live on regardless and far beyond one President's last few months in office.

Those who follow in the White House and in Congress will have to deal with an Iran enriched by billions of dollars to invest in conventional weapons upgrades and further support to terrorist groups. Many of us will be here in the future, when we have the need to work with the next President to decide how best to deal with Iran's ambitions and the future of this nuclear program.

One reason Iran was able to negotiate so successfully was because of Russian support for a deal that would be antithetical to America's interests. No surprise then that just days after the deal was accounted, the commander of Iran's Quds Force reportedly flew to Moscow to secure Russian support for their mutual ally in Syria. No surprise then that as soon as the President had seemingly succeeded in securing the votes for a veto override, we heard that Russia was constructing a forward operating base to help prop up Assad. Iran's negotiating partner, Russia, will undoubtedly use its presence in Syria to attempt to leverage the Western powers to weaken sanctions crafted in response to the invasion of Crimea. That, my colleagues, is diplomatic linkage. Russia pursued it successfully; the Obama administration did not.

The administration attempted to negotiate this deal with a singular focus on ending Iran's nuclear program. Now we already know it failed in that regard, but that myopia also has other consequences as well, leading the administration to ignore many issues that should have been linked to the negotiations in the first place—everything from Iran's support for terrorism to its aggressive behavior across the Middle East, to its harassment of shipping vessels in the Persian Gulf—but not just those issues. The administration failed to negotiate to ensure the release of American citizens being held in Iranian custody. The administration failed to negotiate to ensure Iran's recognition of Israel's right to exist. But we can do something to link the freedom of American citizens being held in Iranian custody and the recognition of Israel to sanctions relief—something the administration should have done. We can say it has to be corrected before sanctions are lifted and billions

more flow into Iranian coffers to be used for terrorism. That is what today's vote is about.

When it comes to American citizens being held in Iranian custody, the Senate voted unanimously just a few months ago to call for Iranian leaders to release our American citizens. One is a journalist in prison for spreading "propaganda against the state." Another is a pastor who dared to attend a Christian gathering.

When it comes to Israel, Iran employs invective against Israel at every turn. It has already demonstrated both the will and the capability to strike out against the West and through proxies and cyber attacks at allies like Israel and Saudi Arabia.

What this deal will not do is alter Iran's behavior. What it will do is give Iran an even greater ability to follow through on these threats. So we cannot allow Iran to be empowered as a nuclear threshold state armed with billions in sanctions relief without at least providing some protection—some protection to Israel first, without at least demanding the release of Americans who have languished in Iranian custody for years first.

Let's at least agree on that. I understand there is strong division in the Senate—a bipartisan majority opposed, partisan minority in favor—over the broader Iranian deal. But at the very least, at the very least, we should be able to come together over the vote we will take today. So I would urge all of my colleagues to vote for it.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

NUCLEAR AGREEMENT WITH IRAN AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the Senate has already spoken and made it absolutely clear that the agreement with Iran will stand. Remember, an agreement to stop Iran from having a nuclear weapon is what it is all about. The issue has been decided. Instead of focusing on the critical issue of funding our government, Senator MCCONNELL has decided to waste an entire week on something that has already been decided, twice.

First, we are voting on the McConnell amendment, which would keep the President from being able to suspend or waive sanctions on Iran unless Iran frees all Americans and formally recognizes the State of Israel. All Senators, Democrats and Republicans, want all the Americans held by Iran or who have disappeared in Iran to come back home to their families as quickly as possible. We believe that Iran should recognize the State of Israel. We believe the other countries in that area

should join along. We are very happy with the arrangement between Egypt and Israel which has been going on for many, many years and has been very good for some degree of stability in the area.

What Republican colleagues are doing now is very, very cynical. They are taking serious issues and turning them into pawns on a political chess board. Here is what Senator STABENOW said yesterday. Remember, she is the Senator from Michigan. She has a person from Michigan who has been held in Iran for some time now. Here is what she said yesterday:

The Senate Republican leader is . . . playing politics with Amir's life. The imprisonment of this veteran—this American hero—is being used by the Senate majority leader in a transparent attempt to score some cheap political points . . . and it's appalling. No American should ever be used in this way.

Elaborating, she told me that his family wants us to stay out of it, progress is being made. Please stay out of it. That is what his sister said. This cynical tactic is a waste of the Senate's time. We should be focused on preventing a government shutdown. Senator MCCONNELL has decided that the Senate should vote not once, not twice, but a third time on the resolution of disapproval, which has already failed, as I mentioned before, on two separate occasions.

The results will be the same today. Yet Senate Republicans appear to be stuck and unable to move forward even in the face of a looming government shutdown. There are just a few legislative days until the government runs out of funding. Democrats have seen this coming for months and Republicans should have seen it also. Maybe they did but just ignored it.

That is why we have called for bipartisan budget negotiations. We are running out of time. That is an understatement. Last week, the Republican leader told this body:

We only have so much floor time in the Senate. We are going to try to use it on serious proposals that have a chance of becoming law.

I am sure he should read that to himself again today, yesterday, and maybe tomorrow. But after having made the statement, instead of voting on this key priority—that is, funding the government—we are spending time on cynical show votes even though everyone knows the result. Despite the fact that a shutdown looms in a matter of days, the Republican leader is turning the world's greatest deliberative body into the "show-vote" Senate.

Ensuring that the government has the funds it needs to operate is the basic responsibility of the Senate. That Republicans have let this crisis build instead of joining Democrats at the bargaining table is an embarrassment to this institution. The Republican leader and I don't see eye to eye on all

political issues, but we both support a clean bill to stop a government shutdown. That is what he wants. A clean bill is the only way to prevent a government shutdown, no riders, no tricky things in it at all.

Just yesterday, the Republican Leader said, the sequester-level spending caps should be lifted. Thank goodness he said that. I agree with him. I agree with Senator MCCAIN and Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM, who have talked about this on the Republican side. We all know how this ends. The Senate will pass a clean continuing resolution. I hope that is the ending we all see because that is what we should see.

When I say a clean bill, I mean no policy riders, no procedural loopholes, just a clean funding bill devoid of tricks. So what are we waiting for? Why are we dragging the country to the brink of another shutdown when the solution is staring us in the face? There is nothing to gain from delaying the inevitable and much to lose. The reality of the Senate is that the longer we wait, the more difficult the path forward will be. In the past, Republicans' inability to govern responsibly has amplified the voice of government shutdown advocates like the junior Senator from Texas. Every moment the Republican leader wastes increases the likelihood that one Senator's objection can raise enough procedural problems to force the entire government to shut down. I am not making this up, it happened 2 years ago.

Captains of chaos want nothing more than for the Republican leader to twiddle his thumbs. Every day we wait increases the leverage of those who want to shut down the government. We have seen this drama before. It happened 2 years ago. The Republican leader will need to file cloture at least twice if any single member of the caucus objects.

So if the Republican leader wants to avoid a government shutdown, he should start the process of bringing a bill to the floor by Thursday at the absolute latest. Time really is running out. Next week, Pope Francis will address Congress. We expect half a million people to come for the Pope's visit to Capitol Hill. The President of China will make his visit the very next day to the Nation's capital. It will be his first visit.

So there will be 3 or 4 days in session next week at the most. We are ready to move forward. There is no reason to wait any longer. It is time for Republicans to skip the manufactured drama, pass a clean funding bill today, and get something done around here for the American people. For months, Democrats have been clear about our priorities: First, any appropriations measure cannot be hijacked for ideological or special-interest riders. Second, any funding increase for the Pentagon must be matched by at least a dollar-for-dollar increase for domestic programs, including domestic anti-terror programs.

These are commonsense principles that should form the basis of any budget agreement, but Republicans have refused to negotiate. They are now focused on scoring political points at the expense of the American people. We voted twice. Why waste this time again on another vote? There will only be a few days of session next week.

When we return the following Monday, we will have just 3 days before the government funding expires. That is October 1. We should act now, pass a clean continuing resolution preventing a government shutdown, and then responsibly negotiate a compromise. It should be a short-term CR. Any other decision is a waste of precious time that we do not have.

HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE

Mr. REID. Finally, the number of Americans without health insurance dropped dramatically last year. All the press yesterday and this morning are reporting this, but this comes as no surprise. The good news happened as the Affordable Care Act's major coverage provisions took effect. This is further evidence the Affordable Care Act is working. The share of people without coverage dropped in every State in the Union in 2014. That is the first time in the history of the Census reports that every State has improved.

States that expanded Medicaid under the Affordable Care Act did better than those that did not. States that adopted the new law's Medicaid expansion had a 3.5-percentage-point drop in their uninsured rate. That is about 1½ times the 2.3-percentage-point decline in States that did not expand the program. Overall, the national uninsured rate dropped by 2.9 percentage points.

Now, all these numbers mean that the uninsured rate is now at the lowest in the history of our country—the lowest ever. Once again, the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is working.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2656 (to amendment No. 2640), to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2657 (to amendment No. 2656), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2658 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2659 (to amendment No. 2658), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2660, to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2661 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2660), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2662 (to amendment No. 2661), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, my calculation is there are about 36 minutes remaining before the vote. I ask unanimous consent on the Democratic side that I be given 3 minutes, Senator CARDIN 5 minutes, Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey 5 minutes, Senator CARPER of Delaware 5 minutes—Senator CARPER 3 minutes, and Senator KAINE 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator please restate those.

Mr. DURBIN. Yes, 3 minutes for myself, 5 minutes for Senator CARDIN of Maryland, 5 minutes for Senator MENENDEZ of New Jersey, 3 minutes for Senator CARPER, 2 minutes for Senator KAINE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, we listened to the comments of Senator MCCONNELL, the Republican leader. He has given us a "litany of horrors" when it comes to the conduct of the nation of Iran. He has given us fair warning that this is a country that we cannot trust because of past conduct. I think the point that needs to be made at this moment is I don't disagree with his premise or his conclusion. But I ask him and all others in his similar political position: How can Iran with a nuclear weapon be a better thing for this world, for the Middle East, or for Israel?

I think the answer is obvious. That is why the President, in league with our major allies and some not so frequent allies, has brokered an agreement to send in international inspectors to destroy the centrifuges which are building these nuclear weapons, to put a

concrete core in the reactor that produces the plutonium, and to continue the inspection of Iran nonstop so that they do not develop a nuclear weapon.

That to me is an ultimate positive outcome. Does it cure all of the horrors that have been listed by the Senator from Kentucky? Of course not. But how can he imagine that Iran with its record would be in a better position—or that we would be in a better position—if Iran had a nuclear weapon? I do not think so. That, I think, is the issue before us. I have to harken back to the statement made yesterday by my colleague from Michigan. She is in contact with the family of one of the prisoners being held there. They are concerned, I am concerned, that dramatizing these four prisoners as part of our political debate on the floor, which is what the Republicans have done with their amendment is a risky process. We want these prisoners to come home safely. We voted that way overwhelmingly.

Playing them as part of a floor strategy by the Republicans is risky. I wish we would not take the risk at their possible expense. So I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting against the cloture motion that is going to come before us at 11 o'clock to move forward on this particular amendment.

I will close by saying, the press reports last night explained why we are here wasting a week in the Senate: Because of the Republican presidential debate and because of the fact that even some of the Republican presidential candidates reserved a vial of venom to be used against the leader here, the majority leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House.

It is clear they are under immense pressure to show their Republican manhood. That is what this exercise is all about.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, the next vote we are going to take on the Iran agreement will fundamentally change the resolution before us. It is out of compliance with the review act. The Iran review act gives Congress three options: approve the agreement, disapprove the agreement or take no action. This amendment would provide conditional approval of the Iran agreement.

Let me make clear to our colleagues that the framework of the agreement is to provide Iran sanctions relief in exchange for stopping Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons state. That is the yardstick. It provides for inspections and enforcement, preserving our options if Iran participates in terrorism, human rights, and ballistic missile violations, and the bottom line is whether Iran is in better or worse shape to acquire a nuclear weapon under this agreement.

I reached my judgment on it, as did 100 Senators. I opposed the agreement, but this amendment takes us in a different direction. This amendment says that if Iran recognizes Israel and releases four hostages, that sanctions relief will be granted to Iran. I hope Iran does recognize Israel, but I must tell you I would have no confidence in their statement or trust in their statement if they issued a statement recognizing Israel.

Senator STABENOW has already talked about whether this is the most effective way to bring back our hostages. One can challenge that. So this conditional approval gives up any of the disapproval resolution on the nuclear part of the agreement. That makes absolutely no sense whatsoever.

Let me remind our colleagues that this is September 17. This is the 60th day of the congressional review, the last day of the congressional review. Quite frankly, this vote is a political exercise, and this issue is way too important for us to be engaged in a political issue on the review.

We have worked very hard over 60 days to get information. The committee has worked very hard. We are very proud of the record of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this regard. We shouldn't be participating in this political battle. It is clear this Iran agreement will be implemented.

Now it is time for this body to stop taking show votes and instead pivot to the serious work of addressing the problems with the deal. This means making sure we are working with the Government of Israel on a security package that will now enable Israel to defend against conventional and terrorist threats from Iran; it means making sure we are working with our partners in the Gulf Cooperation Council to make sure we are collectively prepared to counter destabilizing any Iranian activities; it means making sure we are prepared to counter Iranian terrorism, ballistic missile proliferation, and human rights abuses; it means making sure we are working effectively with our European allies to prepare for Iran potentially cheating on the deal.

Let's turn to the serious work we have in front of us and recognize that we all need to be together to prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons State. We stand for Israel's security, we stand for the return of our hostages, but let's also make sure we have the strongest possible decision to make sure we prevent Iran from becoming a nuclear weapons State. Let's work together.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise as an opponent of the Iran nuclear agreement, and I have set forth at length—both on the Senate floor and in a speech at Seton Hall University

School of Diplomacy and International Relations—my reasons why, but I am also an opponent to the McConnell amendment that would support the deal if Iran recognizes Israel and releases American hostages.

I have said on this floor—and will say again—that I have a problem with the underlying nuclear agreement. As much as I wish to see the hostages released—and have voted in a resolution that the Senate passed calling for Iran to do so—and have them come home to their families, and as much as I would like Israel to be recognized by Iran as a sovereign, independent nation, I am not certain I would want to give my imprimatur to the agreement even under those conditions, which this amendment would do. This, in essence, makes—if adopted—a conditional agreement. We in the Senate would be voting to say the agreement can move forward if the hostages are released and if Iran recognizes the State of Israel as a sovereign and independent state.

I must say I want the hostages back, as does everyone in this Chamber. I want Israel to be recognized as a sovereign and independent state, although I believe that any such recognition by Iran at this point in time would be temporal, at best, and can only be meaningful by actions, not just simply by such a declaration.

So at the end of the day, for all the reasons I have heard my colleagues on this floor talk about the consequences of the nuclear deal, surely you cannot be of the thought that as desirous as the releasing of the hostages is or the desire to have Israel recognized by Iran as a sovereign state, that that would then give you a clear sailing for the underlying nuclear agreement. That, in essence, is what this amendment would provide for.

We have many concerns as we move forward with Iran. We already see that. Even as this agreement is being moved forward, Iran has given its OK to Russia to overfly Iran and then Iraq, where we have spent so many lives and national treasure, to send military hardware into Syria to prop up the Assad regime—which Iran has also been a patron of—and at same time to maybe very well establish a military base for Russia. So there are going to be a lot of concerns, notwithstanding this agreement that we have with Iran, but I, for one, do not want to give any idea that we would support this agreement—as someone who opposes it—simply because the hostages would be released and Iran would recognize Israel.

Some might believe that will never happen, so therefore the agreement wouldn't move forward, but if the agreement is as good as so many of my colleagues have said it is for Iran, then it might not be a price they would find too high to pay in order to have the agreement move forward.

In any event, whether Iran thinks it is a good agreement for them and would do so, I simply do not want to support the underlying agreement by virtue of a sleight of hand on something that is desirable and, independently, this body would be united on—getting all of the hostages back and doing everything necessary to achieve that and at the same time making sure Israel is truly, truly recognized, not only in words but in deed. That is why I will be voting against the amendment.

There are far more serious things, such as renewing the Iran Sanctions Act, in the days ahead that I think are critical. Many of the things Senator CARDIN has been talking about in his proposed legislation will be critical to having the type of response we want in Iran against its hegemonic interests in the region as well as its nuclear ambitions. For that, I will be voting against the amendment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, going back to the elections of last November, there are three takeaways—enduring takeaways—for me from that election: No. 1, people want us to work together; No. 2, they want us to get things done; No. 3, they want us to find ways to further strengthen the economic recovery of our country.

Today the Department of Labor released the most recent weekly information on filers of unemployment insurance in this country. They do it every Thursday. They have been doing this for years. Today the number is 264,000 people. It sounds like a lot—well, compared to what?

The week that Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were inaugurated as President and Vice President, that number was not 264,000, it was 628,000. Anytime that number is over 400,000 we are losing jobs. Anytime the number is under 400,000 per week, we are adding jobs. That number has been under 300,000 for the last 28 straight weeks. I don't know that there has ever been a time when we have seen a number that low for that long.

We are strengthening the economic recovery. We ought to continue to do that. There are a number of things we ought to do on this floor to further strengthen the economic recovery. We need to avoid a budget shutdown. We need to put in place a responsible spending plan for the next year. Our country is under cyber attack 24/7—companies, businesses of all kinds and shapes. We need to have tax certainty. We need to put in place a tax plan for our country rather than stop and go. We need to fully fund a 6-year transportation plan. Those are just some of the things we can do to further strengthen the economic recovery.

Are we dealing with those? No, we are not. We are coming back again to vote—really—on the same thing we voted on before.

Let me just say, with all due respect, do I want the hostages released? You bet. Have I let the Iranian officials, senior officials whom I know, know that? You bet, every time I talk to them and meet with them.

The best way to make sure the hostages are released, the best way to hasten the day that Israel has a kind of relationship with Iran that they had not all that many years ago is to put in place and to fully implement the plan that is before us, one that will make it very difficult for the Iranians to develop a nuclear weapons program and ensure that if they do, we know about it.

My message to Zarif—the Foreign Minister of Iran who has been the lead point person on their negotiations for the last 2 years—this is my message to him and to the Iranian officials: No. 1, you could have a stronger economy; No. 2, you could have a nuclear weapons program. You cannot have both. There is a whole new generation of people who have grown up in that country, 78 million people. The average age is 25. Does the Revolutionary Guard like the agreement? No, they don't. They want to kill it.

How about the young people who have grown up in that country who like Americans, who want to have a better relationship with us, what do they want?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CARPER. They want us to take yes for an answer, and I would take no for an answer with the measure that is before us today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. President, I just wish to say a few words about the vote we are about to take and about this process.

I do not favor this agreement. I have indicated I would vote against it. I would like to get to a final vote on the subject and not just have endless cloture votes. It has been offered on the Democratic side that we would go to a final vote if the margin was set at 60. We have a 60-vote threshold. I say take it. Let's get to a final vote. We have seen the end of this movie already. The President has the sufficient votes to sustain the veto. Therefore, this would simply be an exercise to send something to the President that he would veto and then have that veto sustained. I see no value in doing that. There is no value to our allies to see that there is a split in Congress or between Congress and the Executive on this issue.

The President is in his last term, he is not hurt politically by this, and there is no reason to do that. So I don't know why in the world we want to go

through that exercise or insist on going through that exercise simply to force cloture.

I would like to send the disapproval motion to the President—that would be fine—but to not get to a final vote because we are insisting on doing that seems to me misguided. Let's agree and go to a final vote and set it at a 60-vote threshold. That would be fine. We know the end of this movie already.

With regard to the amendment itself, the text of it, we are talking about our desire to have the hostages who are in Iran released. Everyone would like that. Everyone would like to see Iran recognize Israel. But should a whole agreement be based on those two items? No. There are a lot of other things that need to be done as well.

As I said, I don't believe this was negotiated well. I think it could have been better. That is why I will vote against it if I have a chance.

But let's give the Members of this body that chance. Let's have a vote on the final product, the process that we set up with the Corker-Cardin legislation, and not insist on sending something to the President that would be sent back and that we know the result.

I want to register my support of having a final vote, regardless of where that vote threshold is.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. CARPER. Will the Senator from Arizona yield for a moment?

Mr. FLAKE. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARPER. First, let me thank Senator FLAKE for a very thoughtful statement. It reminds me a little bit of what Senator REID has been asking for by unanimous consent for a week or two; that is, to actually forgo cloture votes and that sort of thing. Let's just go to a final vote, but we want a 60-vote threshold. I think the expectation has been for months that there would be a 60-vote threshold.

If the Senator from Arizona is comfortable with forgoing all of this parliamentary procedure and to going to an up-or-down vote with a 60-vote threshold, I think that is the way to do it. That is the way we ought to do this. I applaud the Senator for what he said.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you. I do think that this is a serious matter. This is an agreement that is important, that is going to last beyond this administration and beyond the next one. Congress should be on record on this issue with more than just a procedural vote. I understand the desire to have a vote by simple majority—that would be the preference—but if we cannot get there, and this is a body of compromise, then let's have a vote, a final vote on the subject.

As to the matter of—let me just say, with these amendments, I will vote with my colleagues on this side of the aisle on a cloture vote to get to a final vote on these amendments, but if it comes to it, I will vote against those

amendments, not that I don't want the hostages released or Israel recognized, but the entire agreement should not be based on those two items. There are other important aspects of the agreement, and to pick two as a way to go forward doesn't make sense to me. So I will vote with my party on cloture to move ahead to vote on the amendment, but if it comes to that, I will vote against those amendments.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about President Obama's nuclear deal with Iran.

I have now cast multiple votes to proceed to an up-or-down vote on this nuclear deal. However, according to President Obama and his administration, Congress's review period ends today, even though there is still controversy about that.

I want to applaud the ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and the chairman—the ranking member, Senator CARDIN, who is here today, and Senator CORKER—for getting us to this point. In a unanimous vote in our committee, we got this bill, brought it to the Senate, and we had a 98-to-1 vote in a bipartisan effort to bring this before the American people. Today, we are here with a very small minority of Americans who actually support this deal.

This administration chose not to consider this as a treaty but as a non-binding political agreement. That means in a little over a year, our next President can determine whether he or she will abide by this deal with Iran.

My question is this: What can we do now—right now—in the Senate, over the next 14 months, to continue to fight this President's nuclear deal with Iran? I speak today to confirm that I will continue this fight, individually, if necessary. In the next 14 months I am committed to finding ways we can mitigate the effects of this dangerous deal with Iran.

We need to ratchet up sanctions on Iran for terrorism and human rights violations and continue to be vigilant in both of those areas. We need to be prepared with sanctions that can be snapped back swiftly when, not if, Iran cheats, even if that cheating is only incremental. We need a strategy to deal with the increase in terrorism and aggression we will see from Iran after they get over a \$60 billion payday from this deal. We need a plan to reassure our allies in the region and to counter the nuclear and conventional arms race this deal is sure to trigger.

I have been saying this for months, which is why I ensured the passage of an amendment in the State Department authorization bill that calls on the administration to produce such a strategy. I refuse to accept the world's deadliest weapons getting into the hands of this rogue regime.

Hearing this administration sell the Iran deal, I am so often reminded of President Clinton's deal in 1994. In 1994 President Clinton promised our country this nonbinding agreement with North Korea would make America and the world safer. Look at where we are today. Just 12 short years after Clinton's deal, North Korea completed its first nuclear detonation test. Today North Korea has a nuclear bomb, and it is cooperating with Iran on Iran's program. Just this week North Korea announced it is bolstering its nuclear arsenal and is prepared to use nuclear weapons against the United States of America.

I fear President Obama's deal with Iran will yield similar results. We cannot allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon—not now, not in 10 years, not ever. For the security of our children and our children's children, our country, our world, and our future, we absolutely have to make sure that Iran never becomes a nuclear weapons state.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, today we have a series of votes that I know may be difficult for the American people, who may be looking on, to understand. In the Senate we have a procedure called cloture, which signifies whether Members are ready to end debate and move on to the vote on the substance of the bill we are now discussing.

We have been on this now for 2 weeks. We have had 12 hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee, with my distinguished friend Senator CARDIN as the ranking member, and we have had all kinds of debate on the floor. Almost every Senator in the Senate has spoken. Yet we find ourselves in this place where a bipartisan majority of Senators wish to send a vote of disapproval to the President and 42 Senators are keeping us from doing so.

If I could just walk through this, first of all, in a strong bipartisan, almost overwhelming manner—almost four times since 2010—this body has put sanctions in place against Iran to bring them to the negotiating table. I want to commend people on both sides of the aisle for making that happen. My friend, BOB MENENDEZ, and MARK KIRK on our side, together with all the rest of us helped to make those things happen.

When this body saw that the President, after we helped to bring Iran to the table, was going to negotiate a deal that cut us out—that, in essence,

caused him to be able to go straight to the U.N. Security Council and cause a deal to be implemented—I worked with my friend Senator CARDIN, and others, and we put in place something called the Iran review act, which gave us this ability to have 60 days to look at the proposal, to go through it, and to voice our approval or disapproval. We have had that debate.

Unfortunately, because the President did not achieve what he said he was going to achieve—and by the way, if he had, there would be 100 Senators today voicing their approval. The President, when he began the negotiations, said he was going to end Iran's nuclear program. Unfortunately, from my perspective, he squandered—squandered—that opportunity.

We had a boot on the neck of Iran, a rogue nation. We had some of the greatest countries in the world involved in the negotiations to end their program. Instead, we capitulated and have agreed to the industrialization of their nuclear program. We have agreed to let them continue their research and development so they can do what they are doing in an even quicker manner. We have allowed them to continue their ability to deliver intercontinental ballistic missiles.

We all know they have no need for their program other than to develop a nuclear weapon. We know that. They have no practical need. So a strong bipartisan majority of this body wants to send to the President a resolution of disapproval. Yet today what is happening, I fear—for the third time—is that a minority—a partisan minority, I will say—of 42 Senators are going to block that from occurring.

Now, look, I understand procedures around here. I do. I understand the cloture vote. I knew that when we agreed to this bill. We agreed to it being dealt with under what is called “normal procedures.” We agreed to that. I just want to remind people, though, that back in the gulf war, this body decided it was going to support President Bush—the first President Bush, Bush 41—when he really didn't need to come to Congress. But he came to us for the authorization of the use of military force and that was passed on a 52–48 vote—52–48.

What we have happening today, though, is that we have 58 Senators here who disapprove of what the President has negotiated. They feel he squandered the opportunity given to him with our support. Instead of ending their program, he has allowed it to be industrialized. And so we have 58 Senators here who want to express themselves and to send to the President this resolution of disapproval. We have 42 Senators on a procedural vote who are keeping us from doing so—42 Senators.

In essence, they are saying, I guess, we haven't debated this enough. Almost every Senator has expressed

themselves. We have had 12 hearings in the Committee on Foreign Relations, with all kinds of classified briefings. The Committee on Armed Services had hearings, and the Select Committee on Intelligence had hearings.

I just want to say that I know many people spent a lot of time. I know the ranking member looked at this backwards and forwards before he came to his own conclusion. This, to me, really is taking on a tone of Members of this body protecting the President—protecting the President—from having to veto something this body would send to him, which is a resolution of disapproval.

So I am disappointed we are where we are. I am disappointed the Senate functions in the way it does today, where a majority of Senators who wish for something to happen cannot make it happen. In this particular case it is happening in a manner, in my belief, to really keep the President from having to veto this, which is what a majority of Senators in the Senate would like to see happen.

With that, I hope that at least a couple of Senators here will decide that we have discussed this long enough and that we will allow this body to vote on the actual underlying substance. That is, by the way, what the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act was about. On a 98-to-1 basis Senators in this body said they wanted the ability—98 of us; 1 Senator was missing or we would have had 99—to weigh in on this topic, and now that is not going to occur.

I believe my time is over. I understand the minority may have about 2 minutes left and then we will proceed to a vote. But I want to thank my good friend Senator CARDIN, who I think serves in a very distinguished way. I could not have a better partner. So I thank him for his comments as they are about to come and also for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, Senator CORKER and I have been in agreement for 53 days of the 60-day review. And he is absolutely correct that 58 Senators disapprove of this agreement and don't think it should go forward. He and I are in agreement on that. We both believe we could have done better and we should reject the agreement, but 42 Senators believe we should go forward.

I thought the colloquy that took place just a few moments ago on the floor between Senator CARPER and Senator FLAKE was the way we should have completed this issue, then have a final vote with a 60-vote threshold. That is where I thought we were headed when we went into the August work period.

We have understood the process, and Americans know where every Member of the Senate stands on this agreement. Americans also understand the

60-vote threshold in the Senate. And they certainly understand the 67 votes necessary to override a veto. This agreement is moving forward. We all know that. We should all be talking about how to move forward on the agreement.

What I don't understand is the next vote. I don't understand why the majority leader decided to bring forward an amendment to change a resolution of disapproval into a resolution of conditional approval. To me, that is totally inconsistent with the review act, and it is counterproductive for those who either support or disapprove of the agreement. It is not fitting and not consistent with the work done during the first 53 days of the review, where we worked very hard in committee so that every Member of the Senate could get as much information available to make their individual judgments whether to vote for or against the agreement. And 58 voted for, 42 against.

This vote I don't understand, and I would urge my colleagues—befitting the Iran review and the Senate's responsibilities here, we should be voting no on the amendment that is offered by the majority leader.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, I think I understand the frustration expressed by the ranking member. The ranking member knows I worked with him to ensure that when we had this debate, we stayed away from those issues that divide us. He knows I took multiple tough votes, as did others, to keep things in balance.

There are Members of this body who feel as if this amendment the Senator is talking about is one on which they would have liked to have expressed themselves. Since we are in a place where it appears that 42 Senators are going to keep us from actually being able to go forward with the vote on whether we agree or disagree—the Senator and I are in the same place on this. But since that has occurred, I think out of frustration and knowing there were a number of Members who wanted to express themselves on the way this next amendment is—I think that is the reason that has occurred.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator have an additional minute so he can yield to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. If the Senator will yield, do the people who are suggesting that this amendment be voted on recognize that they are making this a conditional approval vote and therefore that if Iran were to recognize Israel, if this were to become law and if Iran were to recognize Israel and release the four hostages, that the agreement

would go forward? Do they understand this is not one of the options provided under the Iran review act and it is inconsistent with the discussions I think we have always had as to what the votes would be on the floor of the U.S. Senate?

Mr. CORKER. Mr. President, if I could respond through the Chair, I think what people understand is that 42 Senators are causing a filibuster to take place and that we are not ever going to be able to get to that vote of conscience all of us have wanted to make. And since they know that, they understand this deal is going to go forward, and therefore, in order—since these people really never had the opportunity to express themselves in this manner—there never was an amendment during the debate relative to the amendment we now have before us. I think since they know it is going to go forward, since in essence the filibuster is underway that keeps this final vote from occurring and a motion of disapproval from going to the President, there is a divergence off of that to express themselves in a different way.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute for the chairman of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CARDIN. If the chairman will yield, I understand the frustration. There is a lot of frustration on not getting votes when we want to get votes. But I remind the chairman that every request for a vote on the Iran review act came from the Republican side of the aisle. There were none from the Democratic side of the aisle. We had votes on Republican amendments. If you recall correctly, it was a Republican effort that ultimately led to no option other than to cut off further amendments by the majority leader.

Let me also suggest that on two occasions we have attempted to allow for a final vote with a 60-vote threshold so that we wouldn't have to use any filibuster. The Democratic leader consented to a motion to proceed without the necessary cloture vote because we don't want this to be procedure, and I think everyone wants to vote and has voted their conscience.

Mr. CORKER. If I could, and I very much appreciate—first of all, I could not work with a more thoughtful, diligent Member of the U.S. Senate than the ranking member.

I think what the Senator's side needs to understand—and I have tried to articulate this—is that during these negotiations, we tried to set up a privileged motion where it was set up not unlike one, two, three agreements that we have. We understood that the minority leader—and I respect this—does not like privileged amendments, that the leaders like to control the floor, and in this case he wanted to be able to

control his side. So we were not able to set this up as a privileged vote. As the Senator knows, we then agreed to do it under regular order—regular order—and the Senator and I agreed to those negotiations.

What the Senator would be asking our side to do to move to a 60-vote debate is actually raise the threshold from a simple majority, which is the way regular order works. The Senator would ask us to raise the threshold to a 60-vote threshold, which is above and beyond regular order. So the Senator can understand how people don't understand why we would agree to raising that threshold.

So, look, we understand what is getting ready to happen. The Senator and I have a lot of business to do relative to Syria, relative to Iraq, relative to refugees and others.

I am disappointed that the Senate functions in the way it does. As I mentioned, back under the gulf war, back in 1991, instead of a filibuster, Members allowed us to vote on a—I wasn't here then, and I don't think the Senator was here then—on a 52-to-48 basis, people moved beyond the filibuster and allowed the majority to express themselves.

I hope at some point in time the Senate will move to a place where we allow the majority to express themselves. This is not happening on a significant vote of conscience. I am disappointed in that, but I understand what the outcome is going to be, and I look forward to working with the Senator on other issues.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2656.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2656, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. McCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FISCHER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 53, nays 45, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 266 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Ayotte	Fischer	Murkowski
Barrasso	Flake	Perdue
Blunt	Gardner	Portman
Boozman	Graham	Risch
Burr	Grassley	Roberts
Capito	Hatch	Rounds
Cassidy	Heller	Sasse
Coats	Hoeven	Scott
Cochran	Inhofe	Sessions
Collins	Isakson	Shelby
Corker	Johnson	Sullivan
Cornyn	Kirk	Thune
Cotton	Lankford	Tillis
Crapo	Lee	Toomey
Cruz	Manchin	Vitter
Daines	McCain	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	

NAYS—45

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schumer
Cardin	Leahy	Shaheen
Carper	Markey	Stabenow
Casey	McCaskill	Tester
Coons	Menendez	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Paul Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 53, the nays are 45.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION WITHDRAWN

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the cloture motion on H.J. Res. 61.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATOR COLLINS' 6,000TH VOTE

Mr. McCONNELL. Colleagues, before the next vote, Senator ANGUS KING and I wish to make a couple of observations for a few moments.

Former Maine Senator Margaret Chase Smith was once known for a nearly unbeatable attendance record. She hadn't missed a single rollcall vote in more than 13 years of service, but that came to an end one day in 1968 when Senator Smith narrowly missed casting her 2,942d consecutive vote. She had been recovering from surgery hundreds of miles away from here. So it was understandable. Yet I am not sure if surgery, a Tsunami or the most wicked Maine nor'easter could stop a woman who occupies Margaret Chase Smith's seat today because not only is the senior Senator from Maine a fierce admirer of her pioneering predecessor, she is also nearly unstoppable once she puts her mind to something, and we have all experienced that.

Since assuming her seat in 1997, one of those somethings that she is so fixated on has been to never miss a single vote. She blew past her idol's record nearly a decade ago. The senior Senator then marched on to 3,000 consecutive votes, 4,000, 5,000, and the next vote will be her 6,000th vote in a row. Only two other Senators have ever achieved a longer unbroken streak. Former Senator Proxmire took 10,252 consecutive votes, and our colleague, the senior Senator from Iowa, has voted more than 7,440 times in a row. This means our colleague from Maine hasn't missed a single vote during her entire Senate tenure. She has not had one sick day in more than 18 years. It is really remarkable, and so are the tales of what it took to get here. One time she twisted her ankle as she tore down a corridor, sprinting back to the Capitol from a ready-to-depart plane. Just ask her about the logistics of planning a wedding and honeymoon around the recess calendar.

Our colleague is willing to do just about anything to ensure that she is here in this Chamber representing the people of Maine.

I ask the entire Senate to join me in congratulating her as she celebrates this notable milestone.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Madam President, it is no surprise to me that SUSAN COLLINS is such a hard worker. She started as a young woman, digging potatoes for 30 cents a barrel at a neighbor's farm in Caribou, ME.

I have learned a lot about her over these years. I have served with her now for almost two full decades. Hard work and diligence is her byword. We have worked on some things together that have been extremely important for the country. Some of the things I won't bring up because they might not sit well with some of my Republican friends, but she is a person who is truly an independent Senator. I admire the work she has done. She, of course, has a good education.

I started out really thinking the world of her when she was first elected because I learned where she was trained. One of my favorite Senators whom I have served with here in the Senate has been Bill Cohen from Maine. He was a terrific Senator and a fine man. I am convinced that one of the reasons she is as good as she is because of what she learned in Senator Cohen's office.

I served under him. He was chairman of the Aging Committee. I served with him on other matters. He and I were both in the House of Representatives. We shared lockers, in that little room that they give us back there, for many years. I so admired him. I knew when she came here, her having worked there, that she would be good, and she has been really good.

I am also impressed with her ability to work with our Independent Senator, ANGUS KING. They have worked so well together. They don't always agree on issues, but they are always agreeable on every issue. I admire both of them, and I am so proud to join in lending my voice to congratulate this good woman, the senior Senator from the State of Maine.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, I know it is not the usual protocol to follow the two leaders who have spoken, but I wish to exercise a personal privilege of being the senior woman in the Senate and say that on behalf of all the women in the Senate, we congratulate Senator COLLINS on this enormous and significant milestone. She is certainly in the tradition of a very esteemed predecessor from the State of Maine, Margaret Chase Smith, who was, herself, a historic figure.

Senator Smith was known for her devotion to Maine, her advocacy for her constituents, her fierce independence, and for always being at the forefront of being an advocate for what is right. Senator COLLINS continues to do that.

We want to congratulate her because she is a fierce fighter for Maine. She is absolutely independent. For her, it is not about the other side of the aisle; for her, it is not about aisles, it is about building bridges.

I believe that if Margaret Chase Smith were alive today, she would walk over and give Senator COLLINS a great big hug and say: Keep at it. Keep at it. We say to Senator COLLINS: Keep at it for many more votes and for many more good years to come.

I yield the floor.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Mr. KING. Madam President, I rise to congratulate my colleague, my esteemed colleague, my esteemed senior colleague for this accomplishment. I think it is important to realize—we all know the logistical challenges of making every single vote. What she has done is symbolic of her service to this country and to the State of Maine. It is not just making every vote. It is symbolic of an intense, fierce commitment to this body and to this institution and to the country. I am delighted that the majority leader and the minority leader have recognized her today.

I had the occasion to sit next to her at a function in Maine when the vote record came out. It comes out about quarterly or every 6 months. I looked at mine. I had it in my hand. I leaned over to her and I said: Look, I have a 98.6-percent attendance record of voting in the Senate. She leaned back and said: You will never catch me. It is true.

Of course, as has been mentioned, she sits in the seat of Margaret Chase

Smith, one of Maine's important leaders of the mid-20th century, one of the most important Members of this body. Every day that Margaret Chase Smith appeared on the Senate floor, she had in her lapel a red rose. So in order to recognize Senator COLLINS today, I wish to present her with a rose symbolic of her kinship to Senator Margaret Chase Smith.

Senator COLLINS, what an accomplishment. Thank you on behalf of the people of Maine and the people of this country.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, quickly, before the next vote, there will be no more votes this week.

The next vote will be on cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, on Tuesday morning. The Senate will be in session on Monday to debate the pain-capable bill, and I hope all Members will be here to join in that discussion.

I yield the floor.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2640.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Roy Blunt, John Thune, Deb Fischer, John Barrasso, Roger F. Wicker, Michael B. Enzi, Shelley Moore Capito, Orrin G. Hatch, Rob Portman, Mike Crapo, Richard C. Shelby, Pat Roberts, Thad Cochran, Mike Rounds, David Perdue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on amendment No. 2640, offered by the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to H.J. Res. 61, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. PAUL) and the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 56, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 267 Leg.]

YEAS—56

Alexander	Boozman	Cassidy
Ayotte	Burr	Coats
Barrasso	Capito	Cochran
Blunt	Cardin	Collins

Corker	Hoeven	Risch
Cornyn	Inhofe	Roberts
Cotton	Isakson	Rounds
Crapo	Johnson	Sasse
Cruz	Kirk	Schumer
Daines	Lankford	Scott
Enzi	Lee	Sessions
Ernst	Manchin	Shelby
Fischer	McCain	Sullivan
Flake	McConnell	Thune
Gardner	Menendez	Tillis
Graham	Moran	Toomey
Grassley	Murkowski	Vitter
Hatch	Perdue	Wicker
Heller	Portman	

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Nelson
Bennet	Heinrich	Peters
Blumenthal	Heitkamp	Reed
Booker	Hirono	Reid
Boxer	Kaine	Sanders
Brown	King	Schatz
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Shaheen
Carper	Leahy	Stabenow
Casey	Markey	Tester
Coons	McCaskill	Udall
Donnelly	Merkley	Warner
Durbin	Mikulski	Warren
Feinstein	Murphy	Whitehouse
Franken	Murray	Wyden

NOT VOTING—2

Paul
Rubio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 56, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The majority whip.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, by twice denying this Chamber the opportunity for a simple up-or-down vote on the President's nuclear deal with Iran, our Democratic colleagues have all but assured that a bad deal—an executive agreement that many of them have also criticized—will go into effect without the American people having their say on this deal.

It is clear from public opinion polls and actually from counting noses here and in the House that a bipartisan majority of both Houses opposes this bad deal, but by using procedural blockades, our Democratic friends have prevented that up-or-down vote and the accountability that should go along with it. For what? For what? To protect the President.

As the majority leader has pointed out, the President is proud of this deal. This is about his legacy. He thinks this deal is perfect. So why are our friends on the other side of the aisle trying to protect the President from vetoing a piece of legislation he is proud of?

Well, during the debate, these very same colleagues who have filibustered this bill have stressed that although they support the President's deal, they remain deeply devoted supporters of the State of Israel. They say they remain deeply concerned about the plight of American citizens held hostage by an Iranian regime. But just a moment ago, these very same colleagues, when they had an opportunity to prove it, well, let's just say their actions speak louder than their words.

The vote we just had should have been a straightforward vote. The legislation the Democrats have filibustered

would have prohibited the President from providing any sanctions relief to the Iranian regime until two things happen: No. 1, the Iranian regime acknowledges Israel as a sovereign state, and No. 2, the regime releases U.S. prisoners it currently holds. But with only one exception, every Senator on the Democratic side of the aisle voted against both of those provisions. Well, to be sure, they are consistent about one thing: shielding the President, who is desperate to protect his legacy, from having to make tough decisions.

I don't see the President particularly shy about making a decision, even when it is not authorized by the law, when it exceeds his authority under the Constitution. This President has been the most reckless of any President I have read about or seen in my lifetime when it comes to observing the limitations and constraints based on the law and the Constitution.

To say the blockade of these important bills is a disappointment is an understatement.

I know that many of us will continue to work to promote the bilateral relationship with Israel—between the United States and Israel—over any sort of association with the world's foremost state sponsor of terrorism. Many of us—myself included—will continue to call on the administration to bring our citizens home safely from Iran. We are not giving up. We are not going to quit.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT

This Chamber does have a lot of important work ahead of us. For the remainder of my time, I would like to discuss how we can come together to protect the most vulnerable among us; that is, our unborn.

Earlier this summer, horrific videos were released depicting Planned Parenthood executives discussing the harvesting of organs from unborn babies. The most recent video was released just a few days ago. In these videos, the blatant disregard for human life was underscored by a cavalier attitude on full display by Planned Parenthood executives. They flippantly and callously discussed the selling of body parts from babies who never had a chance for life.

Without a doubt, these videos show a dark, ugly side to our humanity. How people could become so desensitized that they do not recoil in shock at these videos and what they depict is beyond me. All I can conclude is that people somehow have ignored the right to life and the potential for life these babies represent, under handy catch phrases like "choice." These videos rightly shock the conscience of many in our country, stirring even supporters of Planned Parenthood to publicly denounce them as "disturbing." And yes they are, but they are more than that.

As our Nation unites behind this very basic understanding of our moral man-

date to defend those who cannot defend themselves, we will have a unique opportunity to make an important stride to support an agenda that promotes life over death. Next week the Senate will consider a piece of legislation called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—legislation I cosponsored along with I believe 45 cosponsors in the Senate—that would prohibit nationwide nearly all abortions after a pregnancy has reached 5 months.

Many States, including my State, have a ban on abortions once the baby becomes viable outside the womb. A friend of mine who is a neonatologist has told me privately what anybody can find on the Internet or anywhere else, which is that roughly at about 20 weeks, the baby becomes viable outside of the womb. So this legislation will prohibit abortions after that baby becomes viable, which under this legislation is 5 months. At 5 months, an unborn child's fingerprints and taste buds are developing. It is at this stage that many doctors and experts believe an unborn child can experience pain. Banning nearly all abortions after 5 months—at the point unborn children can feel pain—should be an obvious moral imperative for all of us.

I understand that the issue of abortion divides our country and that some believe abortion should be available on demand at all points during a pregnancy. Well, we took an important step here in the Congress just a few years ago in banning the barbaric practice of partial-birth abortion—the actual delivery of a child alive and then literally killing the child as part of an abortion once they are born alive. Regardless of whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, hopefully we can come together and draw a line—a very clear line—at viability of that baby.

I would like to point out how vital this legislation is for those who, like me, believe we ought to be advancing a culture of life in this country. Very simply, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would save the lives of thousands of unborn children a year. That is why this legislation has garnered the support of groups such as National Right to Life and the Susan B. Anthony List.

This Chamber is long overdue in taking a hard look at the practices depicted by Planned Parenthood in these videos and examining our own conscience and our Nation's policies that affect the unborn.

It is important to point out that, contrary to what some in our country would believe, the United States has been one of the most liberal and most permissive countries in the world with regard to abortion. As a matter of fact, the commonsense consensus of most democracies, most civilized countries around the world, is that abortion after 5 months is unequivocally wrong. There are actually only seven coun-

tries in the world that allow abortions after 5 months, after viability of the fetus. Sadly, the United States is one of those seven. We should not be proud of the fact that we are right there alongside of China, North Korea, and Vietnam. Virtually almost all other civilized countries in the world—even if they allow elective access to abortion, they draw an important line at viability, at 5 months. America can and must do better than this. Every life is a precious gift of God, and we must protect those who cannot protect themselves.

At the same time the Senate will be considering this legislation, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—which, by the way, the House has already passed—the House will be voting on two additional pieces of legislation, I believe perhaps as early as tomorrow, one that would provide that children born alive during the process of abortion be protected—this is the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and I believe that will pass the House of Representatives and be available for the Senate to take up later—and also a defund Planned Parenthood bill introduced by Representative BLACK, which would put a 1-year moratorium on funding to Planned Parenthood while the investigation of their practices depicted on those videos is completed.

Right now there are four congressional investigations underway—the Senate Judiciary Committee, the House Energy and Commerce Committee, the House Judiciary Committee, and the House Oversight and Government Affairs Reform Committee. Those investigations are meticulous, they will be thorough, and we will be able to find out, No. 1, whether Planned Parenthood and their affiliates are complying with existing law, which prohibits profiteering from the sale of baby body parts, and whether the mothers, who presumably grant consent, actually know exactly what is happening to their unborn babies; that is, being sold for research and other purposes.

Just this year in the 114th Congress, we have also passed other important pro-life legislation: the Justice for Victims of Trafficking Act, where we preserved the Hyde amendment, which prohibits and has prohibited since 1976 the use of tax dollars to fund abortions, with some exceptions, and then the Medicare Access and CHIP Reauthorization Act of 2015, which reiterated the law of the land since 1976, the Hyde amendment—named for Henry Hyde, former Congressman from Illinois—that applies these types of protections to funding for community health centers.

These videos have perhaps reawakened the conscience of many of us and made some of us who were not aware of these barbaric practices depicted in

these videos—made it crystal clear to us that there are things we need to do in response, particularly for those who believe every human life ought to be treated with dignity and respect.

There should be no hesitation from either side of the aisle to ensure we are doing our very best to protect precious human life, so in addition to the ongoing investigations I mentioned, in addition to the legislation we have already passed to make sure tax dollars are not used to fund abortions, we must also respond with legislation like that which the House will pass either later this week or next week that I mentioned a moment ago and legislation like the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act which would fundamentally protect the rights of unborn children. Next week this Chamber will have the opportunity to make this the law of the land.

Mr. REID. Madam President, today marks the last day of the 60-day Congressional review period that was established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law. As has been noted numerous times, by supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed. In fact, it failed on three separate occasions. Thus, the agreement will go into force. This issue has been decided.

However, numerous Republicans have claimed on the Senate floor that because this historic international nuclear agreement with Iran is not a treaty, and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement, the deal will not carry into the next presidential administration. That could not be further from the truth.

Let's set the record straight: history has proven that international agreements are an essential element of diplomacy and have longevity far beyond a single administration.

Examples of recent nonproliferation agreements in place through more than one administration include: the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

It is absolutely clear that the Iran agreement can remain in force beyond the Obama administration, as have many other important executive agreements. The Senate has spoken on this issue and the Iran agreement will stand.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I concur with the statement of Democratic Leader REID.

The P5+1 agreement is an executive agreement that can remain in effect beyond this administration. In fact, portions of the agreement last 20 and 25

years, and others are forever binding on Iran.

The United States has concluded other international agreements, such as the Helsinki Final Act and the Missile Technology Control Regime, that have endured. The Comprehensive Joint Plan of Action between the P5+1 and Iran is no different.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, on July 14, President Obama announced a landmark agreement between key world powers and Iran, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, JCPOA, that removes Iran's path towards a nuclear weapon. This is a truly historic agreement that rolls back Iran's nuclear infrastructure, places severe limits and inspection on any such future work, and commits Iran to never build a nuclear weapon.

And while Iran's behavior in the region remains deeply troubling, particularly in terms of threats to Israel, this agreement ensures that such belligerence will not occur with a nuclear threat.

Per the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, the announcement of the agreement set in motion a congressional review period which ended today.

In the past week, the majority leader has tried three times to pass a resolution of disapproval and three times it failed. During these debates, I have listened to many of my Republican colleagues make some outlandish claims with regard to the Iran deal. And now, instead of accepting this fact, some in this body have taken their displeasure a step further by claiming that because the JCPOA is not a treaty, it will no longer be in force in a new administration.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

Throughout our history, the United States has entered into executive agreements, like the JCPOA, without congressional approval on a wide range of subjects, including nonproliferation, international security, and bilateral cooperation.

When President Nixon negotiated the Shanghai Communiqué in 1972 with China, which led to the normalization of relations with a country that was as mistrusted then as Iran is now, did anyone try and claim that it would no longer be valid once Nixon left office?

I also do not recall this argument being made just a couple of years ago when President Obama negotiated the Framework for Elimination of Syrian Chemical Weapons, another example of an executive agreement. And of course there are many other examples, including the Algiers Accords, numerous status of forces agreements, and the establishment of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe.

Claiming now that the JCPOA ends when President Obama leaves office is a terrible break from congressional

tradition and threatens to undermine American international credibility. Who would negotiate with the United States if they believed such agreements would be abrogated with a new President?

These statements are truly reckless. Let it be clear once and for all that this agreement can and will extend beyond the current administration.

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, today is the final day of the 60-day congressional review period that was established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015. By supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed not once, not twice, but three times. The agreement memorializes the commitments of the countries whose governments signed it. It will now go into force, and it is the solemn responsibility of each of the signatories to the agreement to fulfill their commitments.

However, many Republicans, as if singing from the same sheet of music, have suggested that because this nuclear agreement with Iran is not a formal treaty, and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement as opposed to defeating successive attempts to disapprove it, the deal will not continue into the next presidential administration. That is false.

There is a long history of international agreements signed by Republican and Democratic presidents that have longevity far beyond a single administration. If that were not the case, if the only way to negotiate commitments between countries was through the formal treaty process, our diplomacy would be in dire straits today. In fact, most international agreements are not treaties, yet they govern international relations on a wide range of critically important issues, from trade to public health to taxation to navigation, the list goes on and on.

If those who are now suggesting otherwise were correct, agreements signed one year, often after protracted negotiations to resolve matters of great complexity, would automatically become null and void soon thereafter. What would be the point? I doubt there is a Republican or Democratic administration in the history of this country that would subscribe to such an unworkable and illogical notion.

We asked the Department of State for examples of recent non-proliferation agreements that have carried on through more than one administration. It did not take long to get an answer. They include: the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

There are countless other examples of international agreements negotiated

throughout our history, by Presidents of both parties that have never received formal congressional approval. They continue in effect unless explicitly repudiated. To suggest that they automatically expire, or are no longer in effect, after the end of the administration that negotiated the agreement, would cause incalculable disruption to our international relations and global security.

In this case, that would mean that on January 21, 2017, Iran could immediately restart its nuclear weapons program and refuse international inspections. It is absolutely clear that the Iran agreement can and is designed to remain in force beyond the Obama administration. The Senate has also spoken on this issue. For these reasons, and historical precedent, it will continue in effect.

Ms. MIKULSKI. Madam President, Congress has been reviewing the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action for the last 60 days. This was the process set up by the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act of 2015, which the President signed into law and 98 Senators supported. We have now come to the end of that process. A resolution of disapproval, to stop the deal from going forward, failed three times here in the Senate. I know my colleagues and our constituents have very strong feelings on this issue. This was a very tough vote for me and one that I took very, very seriously. But now this issue has been decided.

But that is not enough. Now Republicans are saying that since the Iran agreement isn't technically a treaty, and because the Senate did not explicitly approve it, the deal doesn't carry forward into the next Administration. If history is any indication, we know international agreements are a critical part of diplomacy and many have lived on well after the President who signed them leaves office. This is how America conducts its foreign policy with its allies—and its adversaries.

Many other agreements have lived on through more than one Administration. These include the Helsinki Final Act, the Vienna Document, the Proliferation Security Initiative, and the Missile Technology Control Regime.

It is clear that the Iran agreement can and should remain in force beyond the Obama administration, just like other important agreements that have come before it. The Senate has spoken on this issue. The Iran deal blocks the paths for Iran to get a nuclear bomb and is the best available option on the table. It can and should remain in force through the next Administration.

Mr. REED. Madam President, I would like to echo the comments of the Democratic leader. As of today, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action goes into effect. As the leader said, it is also my assessment that this agreement is an enduring agreement that

will extend beyond the end of the Obama administration. The leader cites a number of critical nonproliferation agreements that both Republican and Democratic administrations have agreed to over the decade and they have endured the test of time and change of administrations.

Let's also remember that while this agreement's congressional review period is complete, there is much that needs to be done by Iran before any sanctions relief is provided to them. Iran must, as verified by the IAEA, demonstrate that it has implemented the necessary steps with respect to No. 1, the Arak heavy water research reactor; No. 2, its overall enrichment capacity; No. 3, its centrifuge research and development; No. 4, the Fordow fuel enrichment plant; No. 5, its uranium stocks and fuel; No. 6, its centrifuge manufacturing; No. 7, completing the modalities and facilities-specific arrangements to allow the IAEA to implement all transparency measures and the Additional Protocol and Modified Code 3.1; No. 8, its centrifuge component manufacturing transparency; and No. 9, addressing the past and present issues of concern relating to PMD.

I also want to reiterate one point that I have made previously: while rejecting the resolution of disapproval and other similar efforts was important for the future of this deal, it is effective, unrelenting implementation of the JCPOA that will be the real test, and it is where I hope the critics of this agreement will focus their attention. Holding Iran's feet to the fire under this agreement is the critical piece at this point, and it is critical that both the President and the Congress ensure that efforts to monitor and sustain the provisions of the agreement are unstinting. This will demand constant attention and ample funding for an extended period. In this vein, I would note that the State Department has appointed Ambassador Stephen Mull as Lead Coordinator for Iran Nuclear Implementation. Ambassador Mull is a professional with a long resume. I look forward to working with him moving forward.

I thank the Democratic leader for his comments and I appreciate working with him and my colleagues as we look toward the implementation phase of this agreement—both in the near term and beyond January 2017.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I want to concur with the statement of the distinguished Democratic Leader on the long-term durability of the Iran agreement.

Assuming Iran complies with the agreement and takes the key steps necessary to substantially reduce its stockpiles of enriched uranium, scale back its centrifuges, make changes to the Arak reactor to render it inoperable and unable to produce weapons-

grade plutonium, and takes the many other steps necessary to qualify eventually for sanctions relief next year—and then continues thereafter to comply with their obligations—this agreement can and should last for many years.

Today is the last day of the 60-day congressional review period established in the Iran Nuclear Agreement Review Act, which the President signed into law. As the leader noted, by supporting that legislation the Senate voted to consider three possible outcomes: no action at all, a resolution of approval, or a resolution of disapproval. Republicans brought a resolution of disapproval before the Senate and it failed. In fact, it has now failed on three separate occasions.

In recent days, many of my Republican colleagues have claimed on this floor that because this historic international nuclear agreement with Iran is not a treaty and because Congress did not expressly approve the agreement, it will not carry into the next Presidential administration. That is not true. While it is true that the next President could decide—even in the face of continued compliance by Iran and strong objections from our allies in the P5+1—explicitly to withdraw from the agreement, I don't expect that to happen. And unless and until that happens, the terms of the agreement and the obligations of the U.S. Government—and all other governments that are party to the agreement, including Iran's—to comply do not end when this administration ends in January 2017. Leader REID has outlined in his statement numerous similar agreements that have stood the test of time, from administration to administration, over the years. I commend Leader REID for his statement, and agree wholeheartedly with him.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Madam President, I rise today to express my dismay over the votes that took place earlier today on the Senate floor. The resolution of disapproval of the Iran nuclear agreement has now been voted on three times in the Senate, and it has failed to advance three times.

Likewise, the House has failed in its own efforts to move a resolution of disapproval. The fact of the matter is that the nuclear agreement with Iran is a done deal, and the President now has every right to move ahead with its implementation, period.

Yet we were on the Senate floor this morning, voting on a highly charged Iran amendment that the majority leader introduced. Unfortunately, the amendment was yet another political attempt to undermine the agreement. This amendment would prevent the President from providing sanctions relief to Iran—thereby scuttling the entire agreement—unless Iran does two things: recognize the State of Israel and release four Americans wrongfully imprisoned in Iran.

I voted no on cloture on this amendment, and I want to take a moment to explain why. To be clear, my vote does not mean that I endorse Iran's position on Israel nor does it mean that I don't care about the American prisoners in Iran. Just because I support this diplomatic agreement does not mean I support Iran's reprehensible policies.

In fact, I want nothing more than for Iran to recognize Israel as a sovereign state. I have always stood by Israel, and its security and future well-being are foremost in my mind. For those of us who are personally connected to Israel and care for her deeply, this vote is nothing more than an attempt to embarrass us and score political points.

It should be obvious to the American people that, of course, we all stand with Israel—Democrats and Republicans. Since 2008, we have provided more than \$25 billion to support Israel's defense. At \$3.1 billion per year, Israel is the largest annual recipient of U.S. military assistance, which can be used to purchase U.S. defense equipment and services. We've also provided \$3 billion specifically for missile defense systems, such as the Iron Dome, David's Sling, and Arrow. In fiscal year 2015 alone the Congress provided \$351 million for Iron Dome—twice the president's budget request.

We all want Iran to recognize Israel and stop threatening its existence. We all want Iran's support for terrorist proxies on Israel's doorstep to cease. We all are disturbed by the Ayatollah's calls for Israel's destruction. But the way to truly have Israel's back is not through this amendment.

On the prisoners currently held in Iran, it must be said and reiterated: No American, let alone any member of Congress, wants any of our citizens wrongfully imprisoned in Iran. These detainees deserve to be brought home, safe and sound, to their loved ones. But, again, a partisan amendment does not make that happen.

The vote today was nothing more than an attempt to extract a political price for our previous vote in support of the nuclear agreement. Playing politics with one of the most important national security votes of our time does nothing to actually support Israel, nor does it do anything to free the prisoners. If my counterparts truly wanted to enhance Israel's security and free the Americans, they would stop trying to undermine the nuclear agreement with Iran—which I believe is our best opportunity to begin to turn a new page with Iran.

I stand ready and eager to work with my Republican counterparts to achieve our shared goals of supporting Israel and getting our prisoners out of Iran. But we have a far better chance of achieving that through bipartisan cooperation and working together to make sure the nuclear agreement is fully implemented.

It is time to move past the repeated attempts to overturn the nuclear agreement. It is extremely unfortunate we had to take the vote today, especially given all the other pressing matters before the Senate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOLD KING MINE SPILL

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I want to speak today about a tragedy that hit the American people, the American West last month, and it is something that didn't get nearly as much attention as it should have. I am talking about what has been called the Gold King Mine spill. It happened on August 5. That was when the Environmental Protection Agency spilled 3 million gallons of toxic wastewater into a tributary of the Animas River in Colorado—3 million gallons.

This is water that contained toxic substances, such as arsenic and lead. The agency was doing some work on an old mine when water under high pressure started rushing out. This disturbing incident raises serious questions about how the EPA, the so-called Environmental Protection Agency, does business.

First of all, it raises significant questions about this agency's responsiveness. After the EPA had this accident, apparently it never occurred to them to immediately call the towns downstream and to let anyone know this toxic plume was headed their way. The Animas River connects to the San Juan River, which connects to the Colorado River and to Lake Powell. These are some of the most beautiful natural resources in all of America. It is the source of water for communities all along the way. They provide recreation, water for irrigation for crops and for homes.

This water that was polluted by the Environmental Protection Agency flows from Colorado to New Mexico and into Utah. It flows through the land of the Navajo Nation and the Southern Ute Indian Tribe. These waterways are a sacred part of the culture for Native Americans who live near them. So why didn't the EPA get on the phone? The Navajo Nation was not informed until a full day after the spill. It got the news from the State of New Mexico, not from the agency that caused the disaster—the EPA.

At first, EPA didn't even want to admit how bad the spill was. They said: Oh, it was a million gallons of wastewater. Days later they admitted they

had actually spilled three times the amount they said at first. Four days after the spill, the EPA still hadn't reported to Navajo leaders the presence of arsenic in the water—arsenic. It still hasn't reported it. It took 5 days for the agency to set up a unified command center in Durango, CO.

Yesterday, I chaired a hearing of the Indian Affairs Committee that looked at how this disaster affected tribes along the route. The agency's explanation was disappointing—very disappointing. The disaster happened over 6 weeks ago. The EPA is still not giving out detailed answers about what went wrong.

This tragedy also raises questions about the EPA's basic competence. According to a preliminary review by the agency, the EPA failed to take basic precautions—failed to take basic precautions. The agency never even checked how high the water pressure was in the mine, but the report did say the EPA knew about this risk—the risk of a blowout—14 months earlier, before it actually happened. They knew about it. They knew the risk and never bothered to figure out what the worst-case scenario would be and what they would do if water actually started rushing out. But that is what happened, and they knew it could.

The people who live along these rivers are frustrated by this agency's incompetence, but they are also frightened. People are afraid of what the long-term health effects might be for them and for their children. Farmers and ranchers are being devastated by the disaster. They are uncertain about whether the agency will be compensating them for their losses—losses that are the result of the EPA's own incompetence.

At our hearing yesterday we heard from Gilbert Harrison. He is a Marine Corps veteran, and he has a 20-acre farm on the Navajo reservation. He grows corn, alfalfa, watermelons, and other crops. He estimates he is going to lose 40 to 50 percent of some of his crops because he couldn't use the water to irrigate. The farmer told our committee yesterday:

This spill caused by the U.S. EPA created a lot of chaos, confrontation, confusion, and losses among the farming community.

This was a man-made disaster, and the Obama administration's EPA inflicted it upon Americans in these communities. I have spoken with tribal leaders who say the EPA has mishandled the spill, and the EPA's mishandling of the spill has seriously damaged their trust—the tribe's trust—of this agency. And I don't blame them.

Finally, the EPA's failure in this incident raises lots of questions about the agency's priorities. After all, the Obama Environmental Protection Agency has expanded its authority—expanded and seized control over one area after another. Look at its destructive

new rules on waters of the United States. This agency has declared that only Washington can be trusted to protect America's rivers and streams.

That is what the Environmental Protection Agency says: Only they can be trusted to protect America's rivers and streams. How then do they justify grabbing all of this new power when they can't even protect rivers from themselves? They caused this problem. Look at this photo I have in the Chamber. Does this look like the work of a bureaucracy that should be in charge of protecting America's precious waterways? Look at that before-and-after: beautiful blue water running through, then this—sludge, dirty, polluted, and toxic. The EPA caused this. Does this look like the work of a bureaucracy that should be in charge of protecting our national precious water?

The Obama administration has focused on its radical climate change agenda and has neglected its most basic responsibilities. This photo should not give anyone confidence that the Obama administration is up to the job. They are not.

Do we really think that Washington should have more control over rivers like this when they caused something like this? Does anybody in America believe that? Washington did this. The EPA did this. Washington poisoned this river this way. The Environmental Protection Agency—the so-called Environmental Protection Agency—must be held accountable.

When any private company is accused of violating the Clean Water Act, the EPA aggressively pursues civil fines against that company and any of the individuals involved as well. Even criminal prosecution occurs. If this were a 3-million-gallon toxic spill caused by private citizens, the EPA would act aggressively against those people. The EPA would never accept the kind of feeble, half apologies and explanations we have heard so far from this administration and from the Director of the EPA who testified yesterday. There is clearly a double standard between the way the EPA treats itself and the way it treats everyone else.

The EPA failed—it failed—to do the proper planning before it caused this disaster. I believe it has also failed to do the proper work before writing regulations, such as its waters of the United States rule and its so-called Clean Power Plan.

With this spill, the agency's careless approach has done terrible damage to Americans living along the Animas River and other waterways. Its reckless and irresponsible regulations will have a devastating effect on the jobs and the lives of millions of Americans all across the country.

At our hearing yesterday the EPA administrator continued to try to downplay the impact of its actions—downplay the impact of its actions.

The agency needs to step back and rethink its priorities. This disaster happened because the EPA is inept at its job. There should be no more trying to deflect attention from the failure of the EPA—no more trying to grab additional power that it can use to do more damage.

The Environmental Protection Agency has been out of control for far too long. It is time for Congress and President Obama to hold the EPA accountable for its failures, and it is time to rein in this runaway bureaucracy before it does more damage to our communities, to our economy, and to our country.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STRATEGY AGAINST ISIL

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise today to discuss our strategy against ISIL.

Yesterday at our Armed Services Committee, we held a hearing on this topic. Instead of reassuring me that our mission was on the right path, the testimony provided further evidence that the administration must change their approach. I agree with the President's stated goal of degrading and destroying ISIL, but the steps we have taken thus far will not achieve ISIL's defeat. Indeed, the root of the problem seems to be that our strategy does not connect with events on the ground. There is no better example of this than our plan to train and equip the so-called moderate Syrian troops.

At the end of last year, Congress approved the President's request of \$500 million for the purpose of building a force of moderate Syrian fighters. Testifying in September of last year, then-Secretary of Defense Hagel laid out the administration's plan to build a force of about 5,000 fighters in 1 year. General Dempsey, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, added his assessment that about 12,000 fighters would need to be trained for the force to have an effect on the battlefield.

Initial results were expected within 8 to 12 months. At that time, many Members, including myself, questioned whether those goals were attainable and whether this assumption—that we could fight a war without taking on significant risk because local partners would provide ground forces—was even realistic.

Let's consider where we are today, about 10 months later. According to public reports, the program produced about 60 fighters, and, upon their re-

turn to Syria, they were attacked by Al Qaeda-affiliated forces.

General Austin testified yesterday before our committee. In response to my questioning, he said that only four or five of those fighters remain. Again, we expected 5,000, and 4 or 5 remain. I wish I could say the complete failure of this strategy comes as a surprise. Unfortunately, I cannot. While ISIL has lost some territory in northeastern Syria, it has expanded its control in the western half of that country.

Iraq is a similar story. Recruits for U.S. training programs remain below expectations, with U.S. forces training just over half the number of Iraqis expected, and progress on the battlefield is uneven. It is plain to see why General Dempsey, our most senior uniformed military officer, has recently characterized the fight as "tactically stalemated."

The question is, What are we going to do? How will our approach change? What can we do to break that stalemate? What can we do to begin rolling back this tremendous threat?

I attended yesterday's hearing with those questions in mind, and I was extremely disappointed to hear that no real change was in order. To be fair, press reports indicate that changes are being considered, such as deploying graduates of our training program in groups larger than 50 or in safer areas of the country.

But even if such minor adjustments are made, they will not alter the basic fact that the idea of a new Syrian force is a complete fantasy under our current approach.

Perhaps in recognition of this, another report has surfaced that suggests the administration is no longer attempting to build a moderate ground force in Syria. Instead, they will simply train Syrians to direct U.S. air strikes and then embed them within existing rebel brigades.

If our experience thus far indicates that very few moderate groups remain on the battlefield, we will either be providing air support to a contingent too small to make a difference or we will be providing it to groups that are too extreme to currently warrant any support from us.

Again, I support the President's goal to destroy ISIL, but I don't see how anyone can believe this program is going to accomplish it. Instead of providing a new direction, the message this administration is sending is that they will stay the course. I admit I share the complete confusion expressed by some of my colleagues yesterday when we learned of this situation.

This White House acknowledges that the training programs in Syria and Iraq—the linchpins of our strategy—have vastly underperformed. They express moral outrage at ISIL's barbarity, as well as grave concern for the plight of the 4 million refugees that

have fled the country and sorrow for the 250,000 that have lost their lives. Our military characterizes the conflict as a stalemate. But, apparently, the administration feels no change is necessary. We are told the long-term trajectory is favorable, and ISIL's future, as General Dempsey put it, is "increasingly dim." I appreciate the fact that patience is required when it comes to military operations, but at the same time, patience doesn't fill the fundamental gaps in this administration's strategy. And the idea that we can wait ISIL out seems to overlook the death, destruction, and collateral damage its continued presence inflicts on the neighboring countries or to at least suggest that it is tolerable.

I have visited the region several times. Our allies there cannot sustain the strain of this conflict for years on end. I have visited a Syrian refugee camp in Turkey. Those people cannot wait there forever. Lest we forget, colleagues, this conflict has been raging for 4 years. Sadly, the flood of refugees reaching Europe was entirely predictable.

And how long before a divided Iraq becomes irreparable? As long as ISIL exists and continues to exercise initiative on the battlefield, it will draw recruits, expand its global network, and inspire those "lone wolf" attacks. Its ability to execute attacks against Europe and the United States will improve as more foreign fighters pass through its ranks and then return to their home countries. These are the very reasons Congress supported taking military action against ISIL in the first place, but I certainly did not support the deployment of forces to establish a stalemate.

When our soldiers are put in harm's way, we shouldn't be content to just "patiently" leave them there, with no strategy to achieve our goals. As my colleague Senator McCAIN—who has been a tireless advocate on this issue—has pointed out, there are a variety of options available to the President between the current approach and deploying large amounts of troops on the ground. With only a stalemate to show for the thousands of soldiers we have deployed, the 5,000 air strikes that we have conducted, and the past year we have spent training Syrians and Iraqis, I think these options deserve reconsideration.

The President has stated that "all wars must end" and that our country "must move off a permanent war footing." I believe the best way to do so is by crafting a strategy that plans for victory.

Before I yield the floor, I want to note my appreciation of Secretary Carter and General Austin for their frank testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee. Both men have come before our panel and they have provided honest assessments and also

specific figures about the results of the Syria training program, for which they have received significant media scrutiny.

The point of a public hearing is to provide the American people and their representatives in Congress with the information they need to know so we can make informed policy decisions. I sincerely hope more witnesses follow their example and justly uphold the valuable tradition of congressional oversight by not shying away from discussing these very difficult topics.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for up to 20 minutes as in morning business and to share the time with the Senator from Ohio, Mr. PORTMAN.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Mr. BROWN. Madam President, I am joined by my colleague on the floor today, both of us longtime friends of the now late Congressman Louis Stokes. Senator PORTMAN and I sat together at Congressman Stokes' funeral at Olivette Church in Cleveland just a couple of weeks ago. We both called Lou a friend. I wish to speak about him, and then I know Senator PORTMAN would like to speak about his friendship and his alliances and allegiances and work with Congressman Stokes.

He grew up in a Federal housing project in Cleveland. His father worked in a laundromat. His father passed away when Lou was 3, leaving his mother with two young sons to raise. A former sharecropper and descendant of slaves, she cleaned houses to support her sons and encouraged them to get an education.

Lou shined shoes to earn money for the family. He served in the Army during World War II—probably a pretty segregated Army. He served and went to college at Case Western at night on the GI bill.

From public housing, to public education, to public investment in our servicemembers, Congressman Stokes' life accomplishments show how government makes a difference in people's lives—something he passionately believed in—the partnership between government and communities, between the Federal Government and what we can do together as a country. In the 20th century, our country made great strides in that public investment and in expanding opportunity, paving the way for people like Congressman

Stokes to become national and community leaders. What this country gave to Lou Stokes he gave back many times over.

The seeds for his career of service were sowed in many places, in many fields, but particularly, he used to say, in the Army when he was stationed in the Deep South during the days of segregation. He was appalled by the inequalities he witnessed, even for those wearing the uniform and serving our country. He said once:

I remember being moved from Jefferson Barracks in St. Louis to Camp Stewart, Georgia, through Memphis. They stopped the train there to eat lunch. The first dining room was all white soldiers; the next dining room was German POWs. A black curtain separated the black soldiers from the German POWs. It was one of the first times it really hit me.

He would go on to dedicate his life to fighting those inequalities.

He and his brother Carl opened a law firm in Cleveland. The first cases were civil rights cases. Congressman Stokes took on cases both big and small, including the landmark stop-and-frisk Supreme Court case *Terry v. Ohio*. Again and again throughout his legal career, he fought for the interests of the powerless against the powerful—the same as he did in Congress.

In 1965 Louis and Carl Stokes represented the local NAACP in challenging Ohio's congressional map.

Around that time, Congressman Stokes' brother Carl was elected mayor of the city of Cleveland in a second attempt, and Cleveland then became the largest city in America which had elected a Black mayor.

The new district map created from the lawsuit I mentioned brought Ohio's first African-American majority district in 1968. Lou Stokes won that seat and became the first African American to represent Ohio in Congress. In only his second term in the House, he became the first African American in the Nation's history to serve on the House Appropriations Committee. He didn't use his success to seek glory for himself; he used his commanding position to expand opportunities not just in his own district in Cleveland—so important to those of us who live in Cleveland and those of us who represent Ohio—but he used his position to help African-American communities all over the country. He was immediately—and he earned it—more and more beloved in the Black communities in every city in Ohio, including from Mansfield, where I grew up, to Akron, to Columbus and Cincinnati, to Dayton and Toledo and the smaller cities.

He gave those who were too often ignored a voice in Washington, where it could make the most difference. He secured money for housing, urban development, health care, jobs programs, education, and for colleges primarily serving people of color.

He was a strong advocate for unions. He cared greatly about the trade union movement. He knew the trade union movement gave great opportunity to African Americans, especially in cities like Cleveland. He stood up for collective bargaining. He stood up for the rights of workers everywhere. And to give a permanent and powerful voice to people of color, he helped to form the Congressional Black Caucus.

Congressman Stokes' accomplishments are many. We honor him today with our words and with this resolution Senator PORTMAN and I are introducing. We should strive to honor and continue to honor him each day.

Here is how we do it, and I will close with this. On a Sunday night, 2 days before the 2008 elections, Senator Obama—a colleague of mine at the time in the Senate—was campaigning in Cleveland for President. It was two nights before the election.

As Senator PORTMAN and I remind our colleagues, Ohio is perhaps the Nation's No. 1 swing State. I know the Presiding Officer thinks they elect Presidents in her State, but we really do elect Presidents in the State of Ohio.

So then-Senator Obama came to Ohio the Sunday night before the election to a rally estimated at between 70,000 and 80,000 people. As Presidential candidates almost inevitably and invariably are at the end of campaigns, he was about an hour late. Bruce Springsteen took the stage. A number of us spoke at the rally.

Before Senator Obama arrived, I had the honor—and it became one of my greatest memories ever of public service—I stood beside and behind the grandstand and had a conversation of about 45 minutes to an hour with Congressman Stokes, who was retired at that point; Rev. Otis Moss, who delivered his eulogy a couple of weeks ago; and Mrs. Edwina Moss. I just listened to them for 45 minutes talk about what it meant to them that we were this close to electing an African-American President. They, frankly, didn't think it would happen in their lifetimes. They weren't even sure, the polls notwithstanding, that it was going to happen in 2008. The excitement and the sense of history and the awe and the depth of feeling Congressman Stokes and Edwina Moss and Reverend Moss exhibited during that 45 minutes—talking, reminiscing about memories, thinking of the future—to my wife Connie and me was something I will never forget.

Since then, Citizen Stokes—former Congressman—who cared so deeply about this, was so happy we passed the Affordable Care Act. He was so happy we did things such as the auto rescue to get our State's economy back and going again. He cared so much about voting rights. He was so troubled by the Supreme Court decisions. He was so

hopeful that our country could get back on track in a bipartisan way to build this economy, to pass voting rights, to do all of the things he devoted his life to first as a young lawyer, then as a Congressman, and then as one of Ohio's most prominent citizens, to continue to speak out on these issues that matter to all of us.

We should honor his life and legacy by continuing Congressman Stokes' work for equality and justice in the lives of others. We honor him. We considered him a friend, and I know Senator PORTMAN did too.

I am thrilled to be able to stand on the floor and speak for a few moments about my friend, the late Congressman Stokes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. PORTMAN. Madam President, I thank my colleague from Ohio for his remarks and for joining me here on the floor to talk about our former colleague and friend, Congressman Louis Stokes. He was an amazing guy. He was a true American success story and a true son of Ohio who dedicated his entire life to public service, whether he was in elected office or not.

I think my colleague Senator BROWN has done a really nice job speaking about his humble beginnings.

Lou Stokes grew up without the benefit of having a dad around. He grew up in a poor household but with a lot of pride. His mom pushed him to get an education and to be the best he could, as clearly she did with her other son, Louis's brother Carl.

After growing up in Cleveland, he spent a few years in the Army, which had a big impression on him. He then went to Cleveland-Marshall College of Law. He was a successful attorney and actually argued three cases before the U.S. Supreme Court. So he had a career in law that was distinguished even before getting into politics.

Senator BROWN talked about his brother Carl and the fact that when he was elected the mayor of Cleveland, it then became the largest city in America which had elected a Black mayor. Louis Stokes told me he saw that and that is what inspired him to think maybe he should get involved in public service in that way as well. So he ran for office. He got elected to the House of Representatives. He was the first African-American Congressperson from Ohio; that was in 1968. He would later become the first African American to sit on the Appropriations Committee. So a lot of firsts.

As Congressman, he served for 30 years. He became a very influential Member. Senator BROWN and I had a chance to serve with him there. He represented his district faithfully, but he also played a pivotal role in broader issues well beyond his district. His involvement in civil rights was mentioned, as well as certainly education and justice issues.

I was a proud cosponsor of a number of bills with him. We collaborated on one project in particular called the National Underground Railroad Freedom Center in Cincinnati, where he helped me tremendously. This was in my hometown, not in his town. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, he was critical to getting that freedom center up and going, which is a national center that resides today on the banks of the Ohio River.

We also wrote legislation to connect all the Underground Railroad sites around the country, many of which were in disrepair and in danger of being lost, and that is the Network to Freedom Act that continues today to get the Park Service involved in protecting these sites.

It was always a pleasure to work with him, and he was a loyal and trusted legislative partner.

He then went to the Squire Sanders law firm, and I was honored again to call him a colleague when I worked there after leaving government and before running for the Senate. So we had a chance to get to know each other better outside of the legislative branch. He had a great career, as Senator BROWN just said.

What I admired about him most was his interest and ability in getting to a result. He was not about giving fancy speeches or rhetoric. He was about coming up with solutions to help the people he represented in Cleveland, and I think in his heart well beyond Cleveland, and that is why he was so effective.

He didn't get sidetracked by the partisanship and political attacks. He kept focused, and he made a big difference. He had a meaningful impact on lives in his district and well beyond.

All you have to do is go through Cleveland to see his impact. It is hard not to see a landmark named after him or his brother Carl. Among those is the Louis Stokes Public Annex to the Cleveland Public Library, as well as the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center at Case Western Reserve University.

I remember going to his retirement party from the Squires Sanders law firm. I had rushed there from another meeting and had gone through town, and as I arrived I said: Let's just name the town after Lou Stokes, because I was on Stokes Street and went by the Stokes library and the Stokes Health Center. So those were all assessments of the impact he had on his community.

He was a very strong family man, a loving husband to his beautiful wife Jay of more than 50 years, and he was very proud of his kids. Each of them in their own right has gone on to distinguished careers. His grandchildren spoke at the funeral where Senator BROWN and I were, and, boy, were they

articulate. They were just really impressive. He had so much to be proud of.

I had the opportunity to visit him just before he passed, and the last thing he said to me is: I am so lucky, ROB. I am so lucky to have had a great family. That is what he talked about to me in our final moments together.

He was determined and he was successful, no question about it, but he did it in a gentlemanly way. He had a great smile, a good sense of humor. His laughter could light up a room, and it did. I was just very grateful to call him a friend and to have him as a respected colleague, to watch him as an effective leader. He has made an impression on me, and he has made an indelible impact on the State of Ohio. He will be missed as an effective leader, a great leader for Ohio, and a loyal friend.

I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOEVEN). The Senator from Washington.

BUDGET DEADLINE

Mrs. MURRAY. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, right now we are on a course for yet another Republican government shutdown in just 13 days. We know what this looks like and how damaging it is because we saw it 2 years ago when tea party Republicans dug in their heels and tried to use shutdown threats to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

We know that during the 16-day shutdown that followed the tea party tantrum, workers across our country didn't know when they would get their next paycheck, businesses felt the sting of fewer customers, and families across our country lost even more trust that elected officials in our country could even get anything done. After all that—after all the damage families and communities felt—we also know that the 2013 government shutdown actually did nothing to stop the Affordable Care Act.

Once that shutdown ended, I was proud to work with the Republican Budget chairman, PAUL RYAN, to do what we shouldn't have needed a shutdown to get done, and that was negotiate a 2-year bipartisan budget deal that prevented another government shutdown. It restored critical investments in priorities like education, research, and defense jobs, and it showed families their government can get something done when both sides are willing to come to the table and compromise.

I was hopeful that after the economy-rattling exercise in futility and the bipartisan deal that came out of it, Republican leaders would have learned a few lessons. Well, 2 years later, as our bipartisan deal is set to expire, here we are with another Republican government shutdown around the corner.

What are the leaders doing about this? What is their plan to avoid a re-

peat of 2013? Are they working with Democrats to keep government open and negotiate a budget deal as we have been pushing them to do for months? Unfortunately, the answer is no. Instead, just days away from a looming fiscal deadline, Republicans are back as far into their partisan corner as they can get and are focused on their political pastime—attacking women's health.

Instead of spending the coming weeks working to avoid a budget crisis, which is what we should be doing, Republicans are unbelievably planning to vote on yet another restriction on women's health and rights. This is transparent pandering that is bad for women, bad for our economy, and bad for our country.

People across the country are watching this, and they are appalled. This particular bill that is coming to the floor next week is an extreme, unconstitutional abortion ban, which would restrict a woman's constitutionally protected right to make her own choices about her own health and her own body. That bill would mean that if a young woman endures rape or incest, she would have to go to the police before getting the care she needs, and it would take away the right to choose from adult victims of incest entirely. Finally, that bill would allow politicians in Washington, DC, to get between a woman and her doctor by making it a crime for doctors to provide health care their patients need.

This kind of dangerous, extreme legislation might appeal to the tea party, but it is going nowhere. Voting on it certainly will not keep the government open and, just like the Republican attacks on the Affordable Care Act 2 years ago, this latest GOP effort to turn back the clock on women's health is a dead end.

A new report from the CBO shows that if Republicans get their way and Planned Parenthood loses funding, as many as 630,000 women will not be able to get birth control. Hundreds of thousands of women, many of whom do not have convenient access to health care clinics or providers besides Planned Parenthood, would experience reduced access to their health care.

It is appalling that in the 21st century, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are pushing to take health care away from women who need it.

Let me be very clear. Democrats are not going to allow Republican political pandering come before women's health and rights—not on our watch.

I want to be sure that families and communities across the country heard something that the majority leader did say yesterday. He said that "inevitably" Democrats and Republicans will have to work together to reach a bipartisan budget agreement.

Well, I think the workers and businesses who struggled through the last

government shutdown are wondering what the holdup is. Why do we need another round of drama and brinksmanship before we can work together? Why do we need to see countdown clocks—once again—counting down the days until another shutdown? And why, once again, do women and their health care have to come under attack before Republicans can do the right thing?

I am certainly wondering, and I know my Democratic colleagues are too. I think it is clear that Republican leaders have a choice. As their leader said, they inevitably will have to work with Democrats, now or later. The only question is how much pain they are willing to put workers and businesses through before they drop the politics, stop pandering, and come to the table.

Democrats are ready to get to work, and I hope that, finally, Republican leaders are as well.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I would like to discuss my bill, S. 2035, the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act.

I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE FAIR TREATMENT ACT

Mr. CARDIN. The legislation I have filed, S. 2035, the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act, will help alleviate some of the fears of Federal workers when the Federal Government shuts down. I am pleased to have Senators REID, BALDWIN, CARPER, GILLIBRAND, HIRONO, KAINE, LEAHY, MIKULSKI, SHAHEEN, and WARNER as original cosponsors.

The bill is simple and straightforward. It requires that all Federal workers furloughed as a result of any lapse in appropriations that may begin as soon as October 1 will receive their pay retroactively as soon as it is practicable. It is the right thing to do. It is the fair thing to do. Federal workers don't want government shutdowns. They don't cause government shutdowns. They are dedicated public servants who simply want to do their jobs on behalf of the American people. They shouldn't suffer because some Republicans want to shut down the Federal Government in the misguided notion that it will somehow prevent Planned Parenthood from providing health care services to low-income women and their families. Two years ago, these same individuals thought that shutting down the government would prevent the Affordable Care Act from being implemented. They were wrong then, and they are wrong now.

As the Congressional Research Service has reported, in "historical practice," Federal workers who have been furloughed as a result of a shutdown

have received their pay retroactively "as a result of legislation to that effect."

The language in the Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act is similar to the language used to provide pay retroactively to workers furloughed in previous shutdowns.

I am pleased that it is supported by the American Federation of Government Employees, the National Treasury Employees Union, and the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association.

The Federal Employee Fair Treatment Act includes a new provision that allows exempted employees, those who are required to work during a shutdown, to take authorized leave. They, too, would be paid retroactively as soon as possible after the lapse in appropriations ends. During previous shutdowns, exempted employees have been prohibited from taking leave for any reason, including planned surgery or major family events, such as a wedding, that may have been scheduled weeks or even months in advance, causing many of them to lose money on nonrefundable plane tickets, hotel deposits, et cetera.

I am using the process permissible under rule XIV of the Standing Rules of the Senate to place S. 2035 directly on the legislative calendar. I am doing that to expedite consideration of the bill so that the hardworking middle-class Federal employees know they will be treated fairly if there is another shutdown. They shouldn't have to worry about whether they will be paid when a partisan gridlock prevents them from doing their jobs.

Since 2011, Federal workers have contributed \$159 billion to deficit reduction. They have endured a 3-year pay freeze and two substandard pay increases since then, for a total of \$137 billion. They lost another billion dollars in pay because of sequestration-related furloughs. Federal employees hired in 2013 and since 2014 are paying an extra \$21 billion for their pensions. And each and every Federal worker is being asked to do more with less as agency budgets are frozen or cut. This is happening to hardworking, patriotic public servants, mostly middle class and struggling to get by like so many other Americans. Enough is enough.

Since the 1950s and 1960s, the U.S. population has increased by 76 percent and the private sector workforce has surged to 133 percent, but the size of the Federal workforce has risen just 11 percent. Relative to the private sector, the Federal workforce is less than one-half the size that it was in the 1950s and 1960s. The picture that emerges is one of a Federal civilian workforce, the size of which has significantly shrunk compared to the size of the U.S. population it serves, the private sector workforce, and the magnitude of Federal spending.

I would make the additional point that shutting down the government hurts veterans. Over 30 percent of the civilian Federal employees are veterans, as opposed to just 7.8 percent of the non-Federal workforce. In Texas, veterans comprise, for example, 37.5 percent of the civilian Federal workforce. In Kentucky it is 33.9 percent; in Florida it is 38.9 percent; in South Carolina it is 41.7 percent. Is this how we are going to honor the men and women who have stood in harm's way to defend our Nation, by telling them to stay home involuntarily and having them worry about whether they will be paid?

Preventing Federal workers from doing their jobs doesn't just harm them; it harms all Americans because Federal workers patrol our borders and make sure our air and water are clean and our food and drugs are safe. They support our men and women in uniform and care for our wounded warriors, they help our manufacturers compete abroad, they discover cures for life-threatening diseases, they prosecute criminals and terrorists, they maintain and protect critical infrastructure, they explore the universe, they process passport applications, they make sure Social Security, Medicare, and other social safety net programs are functioning properly.

When Federal workers do their job, they are helping each and every American live a safer and more prosperous life. Our tasks here in Congress are simple: We need to keep the government open for business and keep Federal workers on the job. Later this year, we will need to raise the debt ceiling so we can continue to pay our bills and maintain the full faith and credit of the United States Government.

We need to return to regular order around here and negotiate a comprehensive budget deal to replace the sequestration, a budget that maintains critical Federal investments while spreading the burden of deficit reduction in a fair way and holding Federal workers and their families harmless after subjecting them to so much hardship over the past several months and years.

One of the great attributes of the American character is pragmatism. Unlike what some other Federal workers actually do, here in Congress balancing the budget is not rocket science. We know the various options. Former President Lyndon Johnson was fond of quoting the Prophet Isaiah: "Come let us reason together." That is what we need to do. We can acknowledge and respect our differences, but at the end of the day the American people have entrusted us with governing, with being pragmatic. Let's do our job so Federal workers can continue to do their job on behalf of all Americans.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

228TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, today marks the 228th anniversary of the signing of the Constitution. Two hundred twenty-eight years ago, 39 brave and wise men set their names to the document that has guided our government and our politics ever since. With each passing year, I am increasingly astounded by the genius of those who framed our Constitution.

The world was a very different place back in 1787. There was no electricity, no railroads, no air conditioning. Crossing the Atlantic Ocean took months, and news traveled slowly on horseback. Our Nation, which today covers the continent, comprised only 13 States with a combined population of 4 million people. That is roughly the current population of Oklahoma today.

Despite these vastly different circumstances, the Framers created a system that has endured for over 200 years and has become an example to the world of stability and strength. They did so by enshrining in the Constitution certain fundamental principles about government and the source of rights, coupled with an objective, honest view of the failings of human nature.

The Framers recognized that our rights come from God, not government, and that it is the role of government to secure, not create, rights. They recognized that government unrestrained is a threat to liberty and that in order to protect citizens from government's constant tendency to expand its sphere, ambition must be made to counteract ambition. Parchment barriers, as Madison famously intoned, will never suffice.

Thus, the Framers created the separation of powers: federalism, checks and balances; an independent judiciary; a bicameral legislature; and an executive that, while unified, lacked the power of the purse. Each branch of government would have to share power with the others, just as States and the Federal Government would have to share power as well. By preventing any one branch or any one level of government from being able to act unilaterally in its affairs, the Constitution ensured that no one individual or group would be able to run roughshod over any other. And just as important, the Constitution ensured that no major policy change could occur without substantial support from large numbers of Americans at all levels of government and society.

The genius of the Constitution lies in its insight that prosperity requires stability. Temporary majorities come and go. Their favored policies may or may not be wise. Some years ago there was a great concern that the Earth was cooling. Now there is worry in the same quarters that it is warming. Policies that may have seemed wise at one point in time later reveal themselves to be foolish, even dangerous. By dividing power among branches, States, and Washington, our Constitution helps avert sudden, large mistakes even as it enables more modest improvements supported by broad coalitions.

The Constitution's division of powers also protects against the natural inclination toward self-aggrandizement. This inclination occurs both at the governmentwide level and at the individual level. An unchecked Federal Government bent upon remedying all of society's ills will tend naturally to swallow the States, each of which has far fewer resources than the Federal Leviathan. At the individual level, officeholders competing for power and prestige battle against each other as they try to enact their visions into law. Our constitutional system ensures that the Federal Government does not altogether consume the States by limiting and enumerating the Federal Government's powers and by promising that all powers not delegated to the Federal Government are reserved to the States. The Constitution also forces rival officeholders to work together in its design to prevent any one person from unilaterally making, changing or eliminating laws.

Madison famously said that "if men were angels, no further government would be necessary." He further posited that "if angels were to govern men, neither external nor internal controls on government would be necessary."

Well, as everybody knows, we are not angels, and we need controls on government to keep it in its proper sphere. The Constitution provides these controls by dividing and diffusing power and by forcing those who seek change to work with others who may not share their views.

Unfortunately, there are some who view the Constitution as an obstacle to overcome, a barrier to supposed progress. These individuals find fault with the fact that the Constitution makes change difficult and requires broad, long-lasting consensus in order to enact major reform. Surely the exigencies of the day, they argue, weren't by passing or even ignoring the separation of powers, federalism, and other elements of our constitutional structure. Although some of these individuals may be well-intentioned, they are fundamentally misguided.

The fact is that the Constitution is not an obstacle. It is a guide—a guide for how we should approach our con-

temporary problems, for how we should think about our roles as citizens and legislators, for how we should conduct ourselves as we debate the problems of the day.

The Constitution limits government in order to preserve freedom. It makes each branch the equal of the others and the States the equal of Washington, DC. It provides a check on all government action. It divides power among multiple sources because no one individual or office can be trusted with all authority, and it requires cooperation at all levels and all stages to ensure that changes in law are thoroughly vetted rather than rammed through by temporary majorities. These are the principles that should guide us as we seek solutions to our Nation's challenges.

These principles apply in any number of situations. A law that coerces States into coordinating or expanding programs against their will by threatening to cut off all funding for noncompliance makes States the subordinates, not equals, of the Federal Government. Executive action that purports to suspend vast swathes of our Nation's immigration laws does not honor Congress as a coequal branch, nor do state-ments threatening that if Congress does not act, the President will. The Constitution does not give the President a blank check. It requires him to work with Congress—a coequal branch—to move the ball forward. Executive hubris is the antithesis of fidelity to the Constitution. More in line with what the Constitution teaches is a willingness to reach out to include fellow officeholders. A President who works all levers of government to find broad agreement understands the lessons of the Constitution. President Reagan did this with tax reform and entitlement reform. President Bush did it with education reform and financial sector reform.

Legislation that preserves the separation of powers, rather than delegating vast lawmaking authority to an unelected bureaucracy, also honors the Constitution's teachings, and so do regulations that stay within the bounds of agency authority. When agencies exceed their statutory mandate, they actually do violence to the Constitution's careful system of checks and balances. They assume power that is not theirs to take and remove decisions from the give-and-take of the democratic process. This is particularly problematic when the obvious purpose of the agency action is to bypass Congress.

EPA's recent carbon rules are but one example. When the administration found itself unable to pass cap and trade, even through a Democratic Congress, it turned to administrative fiat. It mattered not that the Clean Air Act provides no authority for the administration's exceptional harsh rules—rules that will depress economic growth and

cause energy costs to soar, I might add. What mattered was the goal of reducing carbon emissions.

But the Constitution does not give the President power to right all wrongs, it requires him to work with Congress so the two bodies together can address our Nation's problems. Cooperation, the Constitution teaches, yields better results than imprudent unilateral action.

More generally, all laws that expand the government risk ignore the lesson of the Constitution. When we vote to expand government, we set ourselves against the very purpose of the Constitution to restrain the powers of the Federal Government. True, the Constitution created a more robust government to remedy the defects in the Articles of Confederation, but in creating a more robust government it placed check upon check upon check on that government. A government that can compel citizens to purchase products they do not want or to provide products repugnant to their most deeply held religious beliefs is a danger to liberty. Whenever we carve out new space for the Federal Government, we must be exceedingly careful not to upset the careful balance of the Constitution.

The Constitution also provides more subtle lessons on how we should conduct ourselves as Senators and elected officials. The overarching genius of the Constitution, as I have said, is its recognition that flourishing requires stability. Unchecked majorities are dangerous, not only because they tend to invade minority rights but also because in their enthusiasm for change, they may enact policies that cooler reflection would reveal to be unwise.

The ongoing debacle of ObamaCare is an example of this inaction. Flush with the Presidency, a majority in the House and their first filibuster-proof majority in the Senate in over 30 years, Democrats enacted fundamental changes to American health care that have forced millions of Americans off their own plans, caused premiums to skyrocket, and further insinuated government into decisions that should be made between doctors and patients.

Had my colleagues on the other side of the aisle paid greater heed to what the Constitution has to teach, they might not have rushed so headlong into these problems. The Constitution teaches the virtue of prudence and incremental reform. Rather than seeking fundamental changes, as President Obama promised during the 2008 campaign, Democrats should have focused on retaining those aspects of American health care that work well, including doctor choice, innovation, and quicker access for treatment, even while attempting to correct deficiencies.

A more modest package that sought to preserve what worked, rather than an anonymous bill so large no one had any time to actually read it, could

have avoided many of the problems ObamaCare is now causing. It might even have retracted some Republican votes. Instead, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle chose a party-line vote using an obscure legislative procedure that became necessary only after the people of Massachusetts—Massachusetts—elected Scott Brown, to block the bill. They did so in such a rush, as Speaker PELOSI so memorably revealed, that they didn't know what was in their bill. My colleagues across the aisle, along with the rest of America, are now paying the price for their improvements.

My remarks on this Constitution Day have focused on the lessons the Constitution has to teach, as well as the dangers we risk when we ignore its wisdom. I wish to close by calling upon my colleagues to pay greater heed to the lessons of the Constitution when writing and voting on legislation. There is an unfortunate tendency, in my view, to think of the Constitution as the courts' domain, to leave it entirely up to the courts to decide whether a law is constitutional. We in Congress just write laws; it is up to the courts to do the constitutional stuff.

This tendency to leave things to the courts diminishes our role in the constitutional system and misses the many lessons the Constitution has to teach. The judiciary's role in assessing constitutionality is a narrow one. Courts have not asked whether any law is consistent with the Constitution's overall spirit or the principles that animate it. Rather, they ask whether it satisfies some legal role announced in a previous case. Is the regulated activity commerce? Is the punishment for noncompliance a tax or a penalty?

But fidelity to the Constitution is about much more than narrow, legal reasoning. Honoring the Constitution involves looking to the principles that undergird it—values such as individual liberty, separation of powers, federalism, respect for civil society, and democratic accountability. In determining whether a given course of action is wise, all of these things are important.

ObamaCare again provides an example. ObamaCare, in my view, is unconstitutional, not only because it exceeds Congress's power under the Constitution but also because it violates many of the enduring principles made manifest in the Constitution. It invades liberty by compelling individuals to purchase insurance against their will and undermines federalism by coercing State governments to expand Medicaid. It dilutes the separation of powers by transferring vast legislative authority to the Executive—and on and on.

The same is true of the President's order suspending immigration laws for up to 5 million illegal immigrants. It attempts to transmute legislative authority to determine who may lawfully

enter our country into an unbounded Executive prerogative not to enforce the law, it end runs democratic accountability by ignoring the wishes of the people's duly elected representatives, and it undermines the respect for civil society by sanctioning conduct contrary to our laws.

Whether a law meets whatever legal test the Supreme Court has set forth does not end the inquiry for those of us who seek the Constitution as our guide. We would do well to revive what James Ceaser and others call political constitutionalism: the notion that it falls mostly to political actors such as ourselves making political decisions to protect and promote constitutional goals.

For some programs, such as ObamaCare, it means repealing the program root and branch and replacing it with one that is both more effective and more in line with our constitutional values. For other programs that have become more embedded in the fabric of American society, advancing the cause of constitutionalism will involve more incremental reform. All of our entitlement programs need improvement. We must think hard about how we can reform these programs to better serve those for whom they were intended.

James Madison called the Constitution a miracle. I think he was right on point. The Constitution is a miracle because it has endured for over 200 years. It is a miracle because of what it teaches about prudent government and the need to guard against human failings. It is a miracle because the lessons it provides are just as relevant today as they were 228 years ago. I have to say it is a miracle because well over 160 nations in this world have tried to copy it and under none of those nations does it work as well as this country.

In some ways we are starting to lose the Constitution because of some of the actions and activities of those who want to win at any cost. May we ever look to the Constitution for guidance and pay it increased fidelity as we discharge our duties here in Washington and across this great land.

I thank the Chair.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASSIDY). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, there has been a lot of talk around here about the Iran deal: It is over. We made our best effort. We have fully exposed exactly what is in this agreement. We

had hours and hours, days and days, and weeks and weeks of debates over this. It has been on our plate ever since the beginning of the negotiations.

Some of us started to express alarm and concern about the direction of those negotiations and what was potentially being given away, but we weren't sure until, fortunately, thanks to the Corker bill, Congress had a chance to weigh in and the administration was required to give us the ability to look at every word of this agreement, the annexes and everything attached to it.

Sometime later on, we found out there were two secret side agreements which we weren't able to see, and that alone, in my opinion, should have been enough to vote against this agreement. How can one enter into any kind of a contractual relationship with a nation or a car dealer if the person you are negotiating with says: Well, there are a couple of secret matters over here that you can't have access to, but don't worry—it really won't mess things up. No one is going to sign an agreement like that except the President of the United States and apparently the Secretary of State.

We made a valiant effort to defeat this. Many of us poured our heart and soul into this not just for days, not just for weeks, not just for months, but for years. And, yes, the American people have learned a lot more about this, a lot more than what has been marketed by the White House in terms of how good this is for the future of America, our national security, and the future of the world.

In many ways, I think we have exposed—and I have listed at least 10—major issues that we conceded. There were goals that we wanted to achieve going into the negotiations, and we conceded on every single point.

In the interest of time, I will not go back over that. All I am here to do is to say that I guess I am not ready to give up. Earlier on the floor, I quoted Yogi Berra: "It ain't over till it's over." Everybody said it is over, but the consequences of this are not over and the results of this are not over. We will be living this out for the duration of this agreement, and at the end of this agreement, Iran will have completed exactly the goal that it is trying to reach—in fact, they may complete it much earlier than that—and that is the legitimization of their possession of nuclear weapons and nuclear weapon capability.

This is a country that says: We only need to develop this for medical isotopes; to fuel a reactor that is going to produce electricity for our people—despite all the Sun, wind, and the unlimited amount of oil and gas underneath their soil which could provide that much cheaper than any other form. So there is no justification for their going forward except to achieve that one goal which we know they have worked on

for years. We know they have lied in terms of organizations that have been sanctioning this. And now we have simply given them a pathway to achieving this and a legitimatization of their achievement of this. Some say that all the consequences will be good because Iran will abide by every part of this agreement and throughout this process there is going to be a major change in Iran—the theocracy will be overthrown, and they will become a responsible neighbor and nation—and this is the pathway to achieving that—that is the vision of the President. That is the dream.

Frankly, I hope my assessment of this is wrong. For the sake of the future of the United States, for the sake of the future of Israel, and for the sake of the future of the world, I hope I am wrong. But there is nothing in this agreement and there is nothing that has been said or done by the Iranian regime that would give us any indication—any hint at all—of any kind of change in their behavior. In fact, as they deride our agreement, our negotiators, and embarrass our President day after day after day with “Death to America” and “Extinction of Israel.” What will be the consequences? As I said, I discussed at length what I think is wrong with this bill. I won’t go over that again today. It is already in the RECORD. But there will be consequences that I don’t think we have fully discussed, and I wish to lay out some of those.

For Iran, they will have liberation from all sanctions and will be back in business. They will become rich. They will become rich with the release of hundreds of billions of dollars, and they will be using that for any number of purposes.

Their oil industry is dominated by the Republican Guards. This is not Exxon Mobil, not Occidental Petroleum, it is not any of our international oil companies; this is the Republican Guards. A military organization that dominates that oil industry. They will be free to exploit one of the largest oil reserves in the world. Their national income will spike. State coffers will fill. And Iran’s terrorist adventures and proxy wars will be well funded.

We all know about Iran’s ambitions for dominance throughout the Middle East and to be recognized as a world nuclear power. They will have all the more money now to be able to feed their proxies fighting for them in Syria, in Yemen, in Lebanon, in Iraq, in a number of places throughout the Middle East, and their terrorist threats resonate across the globe.

After nearly a decade of international efforts to force Iran to give up on this dangerous and illegal nuclear activity, Iran now has a green light—a pathway built for them by U.S. concessions in this agreement—to reach nuclear weapons capability. We have en-

tirely conceded to Iran the right to create fissile material that can only have one use: nuclear weapons.

Now let’s look at the larger question: the region, and the strategic impact of this on the region. We haven’t really had a great deal of discussion on the strategic consequences. I discussed it briefly during some of my time earlier this week and last week, but the Iranian continuing revolution and regional misbehavior will affect the Middle East and will affect the world. It is dangerous and it is irresponsible.

Former Secretaries of State Kissinger and Schultz—well regarded for their experience and well recognized as global experts, international experts—discussed this broader strategic point in an important joint article that was released last April. Former Secretaries Kissinger and Schultz explained that the then-outlined deal was so weak that Iran would inevitably expand its power, Sunni States will inevitably proliferate in their response, and the United States will get dragged into Middle East wars—except, this time, the wars may be nuclear.

Let me quote from their statement. The Secretaries explained:

Previous thinking on nuclear strategy assumed the existence of stable state actors.

Iran is anything but stable.

These are wise words from wise people who have had a lifetime of experience.

Unfortunately, their views seem to have been largely ignored, if not completely ignored, by this administration, because it didn’t fit their purpose to complete a deal, no matter what. No matter what we had to give up, they wanted to complete this deal. In fact, the State Department’s spokesman was quoted as disparaging the two Secretaries of State, Kissinger and Schultz, stating that their words were just “big words and big thoughts” and that the two were “not living in the real world.” Not living in the real world. I think that statement applies much more to the President and the Secretary of State than it does to former Secretaries of State Kissinger and Schultz.

Let’s look at proliferation. Some of us have discussed the obvious proliferation dangers flowing from an agreement that puts Iran on the path of nuclear weapons. Despite the reluctant words of acquiescence that have been wrung out of others in the region, who can possibly argue that Iran now will never be permitted to develop these nuclear weapons technologies without a response from others.

If I were the King of Saudi Arabia, if I were the Prime Minister or the President of any major country in the Middle East, I am not going to stand by and watch Iran achieve nuclear dominance. They are going to take their own action.

We have now basically shredded the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

Let’s look at Syria and the impact on Syria. America’s appalling lack of effective response to the open wound that is Syria is one example of the paralysis born out of the single-minded obsession accommodating the Iranian regime. Iran is the principal prop for the brutal Syrian regime. Assad could not have remained in power these past 4 years of catastrophic disintegration of his country without Iran’s support. I fear our negotiations with Iran have taken on such an overwhelming priority with an administration obsessed with legacy that it helped freeze us into inaction on Syria. The administration claims the nuclear negotiations were about Iran’s nuclear misbehavior only and were never intended to address the rest of its regional brutality. That is true in some cases, but careful reading of the annexes and careful reading of the agreement—by doing so, we now know the administration went well beyond just discussing the nuclear capability issue. It did not address the hostages that were being held by the Iranian regime—the Americans. It did not address the ballistic missile development and proliferation. Those are two issues which had nothing to do with the agreement itself, according to the administration.

Negotiations between the Ayatollahs and the Great Satan—that is us, according to the Ayatollah—could not happen in a vacuum. Subjects not addressed by the negotiations nevertheless are affected by them, and our stupefying passivity on Syria proves the case.

Let’s look at Russia. Our problems with Russia have only grown and multiplied as we tried to ignore Russian misbehavior during our joint negotiations with Iran. But worse, our obsession with getting a deal has unleashed a Russia-Iran axis. Their new cooperation creates yet another threat to American interests.

Just days after concluding this deal, the commander of Iran’s elite Quds Force, General Suleimani, flew to Moscow—which he was sanctioned by the U.N. not to do, but he did anyway—reportedly to convince the Russians to step in to help shore up the crumbling Assad regime in Syria. It worked. The Russians are now in Syria in force, building barracks and bringing in trainers, tanks, and other heavy weapons. Iran and Russia together are Assad’s best friends—maybe his savior.

By ignoring Syria, empowering and enriching Iran, and making Putin’s Russia an actual negotiating partner, we have created the perfect storm. This is the price of dealing with the devil.

Lastly, let me speak about Israel because any discussion of consequences must return to what should be the core issue: the consequences for our only and best friend in the Middle East,

Israel—the only democratic ally in the region. We cannot ignore the major risks that will follow through with the often-repeated threats of obliterating the State of Israel—a threat repeated by the Supreme Leader in no uncertain terms just this week. Is this hyperbole or posturing as the administration claims? The Israelis don't think so, and I don't think so.

We have to assume that an extremist, violent state such as Iran, after decades of creating, arming, and guiding terrorist organizations devoted to Israel's destruction, will continue their assault one day, now we know, with nuclear weapons. One day, others may look back through the smoke and ashes created by this Iran deal and wonder how we could ever have been so blind. How could we ever have conceded to an agreement that violated every goal that the previous three Presidents and current President said we must not concede on—that is, it is totally unacceptable for Iran to have possession of nuclear weapons capability.

Two Democratic Presidents, two Republican Presidents, over three decades of time, have made that statement. It was the goal of the United States to do everything in its capability to prevent Iran from having a nuclear weapon, and we just signed an agreement that gave them the pathway to that nuclear weapon. Does it possibly delay their achievement of that? Yes. But does it reach the goal of preventing them from having it? No.

So after all the shouting and all the efforts and all the debate and all the examination of the agreements, we are told to give up. It is a done deal. The President used his "Executive authority" to deem this an agreement and not a treaty, which is a fallacy in itself. But now we are told we have to give it up. We have to move on. We have other things to do. You made your best effort. We won, you lost.

No, America lost. America lost, and we will be paying a price year after year after year as we watch the flow of money into Iran, the flow of oil out of Iran and money in return, supporting proxy wars throughout the Middle East, igniting a nuclear arms race in that tinder box of the region. We will regret the day—we will regret the day—the announcement was made that we have signed a deal with Iran.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—EXECUTIVE
CALENDAR

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I have come to make a unanimous consent request. I was going to tell the body why I was doing that and then make a unanimous consent request. But my colleague and friend from Texas, who is going to object to it, has a plane to catch, so I am going to make the unanimous consent request, let him object,

let him explain why he objects, and then I will explain why I was for it. It won't change the thrust of this.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 139, 140, and 141; that the Senate proceed to vote without intervening action or debate on the nominations in the order listed; that the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any related statements be printed in the RECORD; and that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and on behalf of Senator GRASSLEY, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, I would just briefly point out that during President Obama's term of office, the Senate has confirmed more judicial nominees than it had at this point in 2007. Our pace simply follows the standard set by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle established that year. In the Judiciary Committee, we have had more hearings and moved more nominees than we did last year.

In terms of the Executive Calendar, everyone knows that at the end of last year, during the lameduck session, our Democratic friends rammed through 11 Federal judges. Under regular order, these judges should have been considered at the beginning of this Congress. That is what happened in 2006 when 13 nominations were returned to the President. Had we not confirmed in the lameduck 11 judicial nominees during last year, we would roughly be on pace for judicial nominations this year compared to 2007.

So we are working at the usual pace, and on behalf of Chairman GRASSLEY, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I regret my colleague's objection. I hope they will change their minds. But once again I must rise to address the growing crisis of judicial vacancies in our Federal and district courts.

We all know it is the job of the Senate to responsibly keep up with the need for confirmed judges. Unfortunately, my friends on the other side of the aisle slowed the judicial confirmation process to a crawl. They did their best to slow the pace of confirmation when the Senate was under Democratic leadership and now are sluggishly moving on nominations even more so in the Senate they control. It has resulted in a nearly 10 percent vacancy in judicial positions throughout the United States. There are 31 districts that are considered judicial emergencies, mean-

ing they don't have enough judges to hear the caseload. The longer we wait to move judges through committee and to the floor, the worse the numbers will get.

Let me take the Western District of New York as an example to talk a bit about these vacancies and what they mean in practice. Western New York has the cities of Buffalo and Rochester and the surrounding areas. There is not a single active Federal district judge in the Western Federal District—not one. The district has one of the busiest caseloads in the country. It handles more criminal cases than Washington, DC, or Boston. It is on the Canadian border, making it particularly busy, and yet they don't have a single active Federal judge. The delays for civil trials are by far the worst in the country. It takes 5 years for a median case to go to trial. That is denial of justice, just about. It is un-American. If not for the efforts of two judges on senior status who are volunteering to hear cases in their retirement, the Western District of New York would be at a full standstill.

The lack of judges has real legal consequences. In the Western District of New York, Judge Skretny—on senior status—has admitted that he is encouraging all cases to settle in pretrial mediation in order to lower caseloads. Criminal trials are prioritized while civil trials languish in delay. The two retired judges, who are the only ones reading cases at the moment, are spending far less time on each individual case than they would under normal circumstances. And defendants may be inclined to settle, admit guilt, and take plea deals rather than wait out a lengthy trial process.

As many of my colleagues have said so eloquently, the harsh truth is that for these petitioners, companies, and communities, justice is being delayed and thus denied. And the same story line is playing out in courtrooms throughout the country. This is not how our judicial system is supposed to work, and it should be an easy problem to rectify.

Right now, there are 13 non-controversial judges on the Executive Calendar, and 3 more were reported out of committee today. Of those, three are highly qualified judges from New York, including one from the Western District. I know these nominees. They are brilliant people, experienced jurists, and above all they are moderate. This Senator believes in moderation in the choosing of judges. Larry Vilaro and Ann Donnelly are two whom I have recommended, and LaShann DeArcy Hall was recommended by a good friend, the junior Senator from New York, Senator GILLIBRAND. They should all be confirmed, but we don't know when they will come up for a vote. All of these nominees exceed my standards for judicial nominees. In his or her own

way, each brings excellence, moderation, and diversity to the Federal bench.

They are not the only outstanding nominees we have. We have judges pending from Missouri, California, and several other States—represented by Republican Senators as much as Democrats—which are experiencing the same judicial emergencies and heavy case-loads. These are nominees who have already moved out of committee, all with bipartisan support. I am not offending the traditional committee process by asking simply to move them off the floor and onto the bench where they belong.

I came to the floor last July to request that we move to confirm these nominees. Unfortunately, my request was blocked by my good friend the Senator from Iowa. In response to my request, I was basically told: The nominees are moving along just fine. Be patient.

Well, we are several months later and still we have no indication that these judicial nominees will ever be moved off the Executive Calendar for a vote.

I was told—and I am paraphrasing—that if one would only count all the judges Democrats confirmed at the end of the last Congress, the Republican record on judges wouldn't look so bad. With all due respect to my friend from Iowa, I don't believe he can take credit for our work like that. One cannot slice and dice the numbers to make the Republican record on judicial confirmations any better. Listen to this. The fact is that the Republican leadership has scheduled votes on only six Federal judges this whole Congress—six—less than one a month. There is no reason for that.

Even if we did give Republicans credit for the judges the Democrats approved at the end of last Congress, we would still be far behind the pace of confirmations in the past because by comparison, through the seventh year of President Bush's Presidency where there was a Republican President but Democrats controlled the Senate, 29 judges had been approved—6 compared to 29. How is that parity?

When Democrats controlled the Senate during the final 2 years of George W. Bush's Presidency, we confirmed 68 judges. When Republicans controlled the Senate during the 2 final years of President Clinton's Presidency, we confirmed 73 judges. How many confirmations have there been in these last 2 years when Republicans have controlled the Senate, having a Democratic President? Six. The comparison numbers are 73, 68, 6. Is that equal? Is that the same as they are always doing, as they say? Of course not.

The Republican majority is confirming judges at the slowest rate in more than 60 years, and as a result, the number of current vacancies has shot up nearly 50 percent and the number of

judicial emergencies has increased 158 percent. In no world is that a reasonable pace, as I have been assured by my colleagues.

There are no values more American than the speedy application of justice and the right to petition the government for a redress of grievances. Frankly, neither of these can be achieved without judges on the bench. The equal and fair application of justice is necessarily tarnished by a courtroom without a judge. It is as simple as that.

So today I moved that we move to New York's pending judicial nominations, but the request was rejected. I hope my colleagues will think this through. It is a blemish on this Congress. It is a blemish on the idea that we are getting things done. It is a blemish when our Republican leader says this Congress is doing things at a better pace than in previous years.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

DR. MICHELLE COLBY AND JONATHAN MCENTEE

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, literally every month of this year, I have come to the Senate floor to do something that one of our former colleagues, Ted Kaufman, who served as our Senator for 2 years after JOE BIDEN became Vice President—Ted used to come to the floor not on a monthly basis but even more frequently than that to talk about what was being done by any number of Federal employees across our country, to draw attention to the fact that these are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats, these are people who do important work for each of us in a variety of ways.

What I have tried to do in the last several months—I think most of this year—is to come to the floor to recognize the work not of the Federal employees at large but the work of a few of the many exemplary Department of Homeland Security employees and to thank them for their dedication to their mission and their service to our Nation, which is an important one. And the reason I have particular interest in this is that I have been the senior Democrat on homeland security the last couple of years, and I worked with Tom Coburn of Oklahoma. The two of us were privileged to lead the committee.

In June I spoke about several outstanding officers in the U.S. Coast Guard, one of them a petty officer, a woman named Joscelyn Greenwell, who is stationed at Coast Guard Station In-

dian River Inlet in southern Delaware, which is just a little bit north of Bethany Beach and just south of Rehoboth. In July I had the opportunity to actually visit Petty Officer Greenwell and 30 of her colleagues to learn more about how she and her unit serve and how they protect the rest of us. It is not just Delawareans who seek recreation—fish, boat, and swim—in the inland bays in Delaware or in the Atlantic ocean; people from all over the country and actually all over the world do that, and we are grateful.

But the devotion of Petty Officer Greenwell and her colleagues to their mission is shared by thousands of men and women serving with the U.S. Coast Guard and throughout the Department of Homeland Security. The Coast Guard used to be part of Treasury, as I recall, but today it is, since the creation of the Department of Homeland Security, part of DHS.

Well, today I want to just take just a few minutes to recognize the service of and say thanks to two other exemplary public servants who work at the Department of Homeland Security, not in the Coast Guard, but in this case, in the Science and Technology Directorate. While many at the Department of Homeland Security put their lives on the line along our borders, at our ports of entry, and our airports or in response to disasters, some are working behind the scenes to secure our homeland against new threats or better respond to those we face today.

This is what happens every day at the Science and Technology Directorate. They give their all to provide frontline personnel the best tools and tactics that are available. Essentially, the role of the Department's Science and Technology employees is to keep our homeland security efforts a step ahead of the ever-evolving threats we face as a nation. They do this through state-of-the-art research and development issues performed by some of our Nation's top engineers, top scientists, top researchers.

The product of their work is deployed across the Department. From cyber security, to biological defense, to border security, Science and Technology's research, development, and science work is truly vital to all of us. Science and Technology employees work closely with the trade and travel industry and with many academic groups as well. They also work closely with other research and scientific agencies across all levels of government to meet the needs of first responders, to enhance strategy and analysis, and to bolster operations and capability.

Among the threats that science and technology seeks to address are the threats to our agricultural system. Agriculture is, of course, vital to our Nation's economic stability and our security. In Delaware, agriculture remains one of the key industries at the heart

of the State's economic activity. I think of Delaware as a three- or four-legged stool—at least our economy sits on a three- or four-legged stool.

One of the strong legs, in Southern Delaware especially, is agriculture. In Sussex County Delaware, we produce more chickens than any county in America. In Sussex County, Delaware—we only have three counties. The biggest—Sussex County is the third largest county in Delaware, but they produce more chickens in Sussex County than any county in America. We raise more soybeans in Sussex County, Delaware, and we feed it to the chickens, along with corn and other things. But biological and manmade threats to our food, whether it is poultry, avian influenza, and so forth, whether manmade threats to our food or animal agriculture system could have devastating impacts to our economy and to our day-to-day lives. It certainly poses a great threat to the Delmarva Peninsula and other places where we raise poultry—and turkeys for that matter. That is why the Department of Homeland Security has a number of employees at Science and Technology whose mission is to prevent and protect against threats to our agricultural infrastructure. In July, I held a hearing, alongside my colleague, Homeland Security and Government Affairs Committee Chairman RON JOHNSON of Wisconsin. We held the hearing to examine the threat that avian influenza poses to public health and also to our poultry industry.

In recent months, parts of the poultry industry across our country have been grappling with the devastating outbreak of avian influenza. Although the spread of this disease has slowed, and most of the areas that were affected were in the central part of our country, including Wisconsin, including Iowa, many States have lost millions of chickens and turkeys to this disease. As a result, the economic losses our farmers and businesses are dealing with in those parts of the country are staggering.

The Presiding Officer probably does not know this—maybe he does—but there are roughly 300 chickens for every person in Delaware, as I said. I mentioned we raise more chickens in Sussex County than any county in America, but our poultry farmers create—ready for this—more than \$2.7 billion in State economic activity each year and account for about 70 percent of our State's agricultural exports. We have cows we milk, dairy cattle, we have pigs, we raise a lot of lima beans and that kind of thing, but poultry is the 800-pound gorilla in the room in our economy.

Luckily for our poultry farmers in the Delmarva Peninsula and across the country, public servants like Dr. Michelle Colby are working at the Department of Homeland Security on cut-

ting-edge research to protect against potential disease outbreaks like the avian influenza, the avian flu.

Here she is right now, Dr. Michelle Colby. I will talk a little bit about Michelle, if I may. She is the Branch Chief of Agriculture Defense at the Science and Technology Directorate. Her mission is to develop tools, including vaccines and diagnostics, to prevent livestock from natural and manmade disease threats. Michelle works closely with the Department of Agriculture to help develop and support research projects, track their progress, and stay ahead of existing and emerging threats.

She has also the critically important responsibility of making sure research and development programs across our Federal Government are well coordinated, not duplicated, and always ready to respond to disease outbreaks. A primary part of this woman's job is to make sure Science and Technology, where she works within DHS, uses the lessons learned from previous disease outbreaks to inform research and prevent or better control future outbreaks.

In fact, information gathered during the last few years as part of another project at Science and Technology is currently being used by Michelle's team to help the Department of Agriculture in its response to the avian influenza outbreak I just mentioned. Michelle and her team were also instrumental in helping combat another recent threat to our Nation's agricultural industry and to us, foot-and-mouth disease.

In May of 2012, they secured a conditional license to a Department of Homeland Security foot-and-mouth disease vaccine for use in cattle. This was the first foot-and-mouth disease vaccine ever licensed in the United States—ever licensed in the United States. The conditional license was renewed in May of last year and is now valid through I think May of next year. Michelle and her team's important work did not go unnoticed. They were finalists for the Partnership for Public Service to America Medal for their efforts.

According to her colleagues, Michelle is "one of the most respected scientists in the area of Veterinary Science." Her colleagues tell me she never loses sight of her critical mission and that she is a dedicated public servant of the highest integrity. Michelle earned her bachelor of science degree in animal science from the University of Maryland Eastern Shore. That is on the Delmarva Peninsula. She is our neighbor just to the south of us. She has also a doctor of veterinary medicine degree from Virginia-Maryland College of Veterinary Medicine. She also has a master of science in epidemiology from the University of Maryland College Park.

Interestingly enough, her graduate work focused on the Delmarva poultry industry. While some of the important work at—let me just say: Michelle, thank you for what you do, not just for Delmarva, not just for those who are involved in the poultry industry but thank you for what you do for our country and all of us who, frankly, enjoy eating poultry and for all of us who are involved in exporting and selling poultry around the world.

It used to be that 1 out of every 100 chickens we raised in America we exported, then it was 5 out of 100, 10 out of 100, and now it is 20 out of 100. We are negotiating a new transpacific trade partnership with 11 other countries that will encompass about 40 percent of the world's markets. We want to make sure on Delmarva, and frankly in a lot of other places around this country, that we can use this trade agreement to sell that which we are really good at; that is, raising chickens.

While some of the important work at Science and Technology happens in the lab, some scientists and engineers there team up with other agencies within the Department of Homeland Security to get a firsthand look at how to enhance capabilities and operations on the frontlines. For Jonathan McEntee—known as Jon—Jon's Science and Technology work has taken him into the field of joint missions with the Coast Guard, with Customs and Border Protection, and with Immigration and Customs Enforcement.

Public service is nothing new to Jon. In fact, it runs in his family. Jon was born on a U.S. Air Force base, not in Dover, DE, but in the United Kingdom of all places, in a place called Lakenheath, United Kingdom. He is the proud son of a retired linguist and the grandson of a 50-year GE chemical engineer and World War II veteran. He continues his family's history of service to our country today through his work ensuring the security and economic prosperity of the United States in his role at Science and Technology.

Since 2007, the last several years, Jon has worked at the Borders and Maritime Security Division at Science and Technology within the Department of Homeland Security. It is called Security Advanced Research Projects Agency. This component is responsible for the research, for the development, for the testing and evaluation needs for the Department's land borders, ports of entry, and maritime mission environments.

Since becoming the division's Deputy Director in 2011, Jon has managed several projects, developing maritime, border, and cargo security initiatives. He is responsible for managing the congressional, financial, and technical oversight of operations, along with its 30 employees. On any given day, Jon is

juggling 40 projects on a wide range of activities all across the Department.

According to his colleagues, Jon believes technology is the key to remaining competitive and relevant in an ever-changing global environment. So it is no surprise that he helped establish the technology innovation center within the Coast Guard, to help deliver technical capabilities for the Department's operators in a faster and more efficient process. Jon also helps in the efforts to build a more cohesive and unified Department of Homeland Security. They have a saying over there, "One DHS." He is part of that.

He regularly represents Science and Technology on Department-level projects to help improve coordination and make the best use of science resources. Efforts like Jon's are supporting Secretary Jeh Johnson's Unity of Effort Initiative, an effort to help the Department operate more efficiently and effectively. That is something I think we can all get behind.

Colleagues say that Jon looks at solutions to problems not only from a security aspect but also while thinking about how they impact the overall economic interest of our country. He believes all solutions must have a positive return on investment over existing methods and practices. Jon is well known for his let's-find-a-way attitude and always encourages his colleagues to be a part of the solution rather than add to the problem. I like to say: "No" means find another way.

The work ethic he embodies and his leadership can be credited for his work building partnerships to promote our Nation's economic growth. Specifically, he helped facilitate a partnership that included Customs and Border Protection, Mexican and Canadian Customs, General Motors, the Ford Motor Company, Honda Manufacturing, Pacific Union, and Ferromex Rail to successfully conduct a cargo security technology demonstration that operates four U.S.-bound supply chain routes originating from Mexico and originating from Canada.

That achievement earned him wide praise, including the Department of Homeland Security and Technology Under Secretary's Award in 2014. Jon earned his master's in business administration from Salisbury University and a bachelor of science degree in finance from Frostburg State University. He and his wife Heather, an Air Force veteran, have three children: Sage, Myra, and Jack.

I just want to say to Sage, Myra and Jack: Thank you for sharing not just your mom but your dad as well with the people of our country. Thank you.

The efforts of Michelle and Jon provide just a glimpse into the important work being done by hundreds of thousands of individuals across the Department of Homeland Security every single day. These men and women are

dedicated. They are exemplary public servants. They are unsung heroes who walk among us every day. More often than not, their good work goes unnoticed—not today. These are not nameless, faceless bureaucrats. These are people with great educations, a great desire to serve our country, and who every day make a difference for us in this country with the work they do.

Michelle and Jon, right here—Jon, thank you. For Michelle, whose picture was up here just a moment ago, we want to thank you for what you do. We want to thank as well the 200,000 men and woman you work with at the Department of Homeland Security. We are a safer country because of your service and I think we are a better country too. As we say in the Navy when people do especially good work, we say two words: One of them is "Bravo" and the other is "Zulu." So, Michelle and Jon, Bravo Zulu. God bless you.

JOB CREATION

Mr. President, if you will bear with me, I wish to talk for a little bit about another important issue, if I could, and I don't see anybody else on the floor, so I will forge ahead.

I actually said this earlier today when we were having a discussion on the Iran agreement, but it bears repeating. When I go back to the elections of last November, I have three messages that are takeaways that I continue to come back to.

The first takeaway for me last November was this: The American people are sending us a message. They said they want us to work together. The second message is they want us to get stuff done, things that we need to get done for the good of our country, and they especially want us to get things done that will help strengthen our economic recovery.

On the good-news side, the Department of Labor reported today that the number of people who filed for unemployment insurance this past week—this number comes out of the Department of Labor every Thursday that is not a Federal holiday, and they have been doing this for years. The week Barack Obama and JOE BIDEN were inaugurated as President and Vice President—that week in January of 2009—628,000 people filed for unemployment insurance. Anytime that number is over 400,000 people filing for unemployment insurance in a week, we are losing jobs.

At the beginning of 2009, we were losing a lot of jobs. We lost 2.5 million jobs in this country in the last 6 months of 2008. We lost 2.5 million more jobs in this country in the first 6 months of 2009. And as we went through 2009, that number—628,000 people filing for unemployment insurance every week—frankly didn't come down a lot. After a year or so, it began to trend down. Finally, it went down to

600,000, eventually to 500,000, and finally it dipped below 500,000 after a couple of years. Several years ago, that number came down to 400,000.

The reason 400,000 is an important number in terms of people filing for unemployment insurance is when that number drops on a weekly basis below 400,000, we are starting to add jobs back—or at least our economy is. For the last 28 straight weeks, the number of folks filing for unemployment insurance in this country has been under 300,000. One of the reasons we are adding, in most months, 200,000 to 250,000 is because not nearly as many people are losing their jobs, and that is a very good thing.

Even though the economy is arguably better than it was—I think the unemployment rate in this country in January of 2009 was heading toward 10 percent. The unemployment rate today is closer to 5 percent. Is that too high? Sure it is. Can we do better than that? We have to do better than that.

So one of the things I always focus on is trying to figure out how we—when I was Governor of Delaware and chairman of the National Governors Association, I always was interested in how we could create a more nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation. In the 8 years I was privileged to be Governor of Delaware, I am told that more jobs were created in those 8 years than any year maybe in Delaware history—any 8-year period in Delaware history. I didn't create a one of them. Governors don't create jobs. Mayors don't create jobs. Senators—however good we are—don't create jobs. Presidents don't create job. What we do is help create a nurturing environment for job creation.

What does that include? Access to capital. People starting businesses usually have to raise money. A world-class workforce with the kinds of skills that will help businesses be successful. Transportation to move people and business services where they need to go and when they need to go. Public safety. Reasonably priced energy. Reasonably priced health care. You name it. A lot of things go into creating a nurturing environment for job creation and job preservation.

(The remarks of Mr. CARPER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2051 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Still seeing no one else on the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POPE FRANCIS'S ADDRESS TO CONGRESS AND
CLIMATE CHANGE

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, last year I had the opportunity to travel to the Vatican. During my visit, I had the chance to overlook St. Peter's Square from a Vatican balcony. As I took in the view of that historic square, the Sun glinted off the future. Across the square, I saw the rooftop of Pope Paul VI Audience Hall on the Vatican grounds covered with solar panels. It was clear from that view that the Vatican takes climate change very seriously and had long been preparing to have a profound impact on this generational issue that touches every living creature on the planet.

I was at the Vatican as the only U.S. representative in a group of high-level legislators from around the world who are all working to address climate change in their own countries. We met with Cardinal Pietro Parolin and Cardinal Peter Turkson, the Vatican leaders responsible for writing the initial draft of Pope Francis's historical environmental encyclical, and shared the impact of climate change in our own home countries with the two cardinals who were going to be writing that encyclical.

The conversation then turned to what was happening in the countries of the legislators who were visiting. The lawmaker from the Philippines discussed the destruction that Typhoon Haiyan brought to parts of her country. Legislators from South Africa and Mexico shared the challenges their countries and regions face from drought. The representatives from Europe pointed to the damage from extreme heat waves and rainfall. I relayed my concern with the rising levels, temperature, and acidity of the ocean and the impacts on coastal communities. Rising sea levels are eroding our shores in Massachusetts and New England and across our country, increasing the damage in New England of nor'easters. In recent years, ocean temperatures in our part of the Atlantic ocean have been the hottest ever recorded. In one case, off of Cape Cod, it was 21 degrees warmer than normal this January, in Massachusetts, off of our coastline.

But all of us who had gathered at the Vatican were in agreement that the world's poorest people are suffering the worst consequences of climate change—extreme poverty, famine, disease, and displacement—which is why it should be no surprise that Pope Francis, a Jesuit trained in chemistry who is devoted to the poor and ensuring a just and better future for all mankind, would be the only Pope to devote an entire encyclical to humanity's relationship with the environment. In releasing his encyclical and giving us his message to protect what he calls "our common home," Pope Francis has also given us a common goal: We must

act now to stop climate change. But make no mistake—this Pope is looking for leadership. Pope Francis is looking for results. He is looking for all of us to lead to solve this problem.

Next week, we will have the honor of hosting Pope Francis here in Washington, DC, and hearing him address a joint meeting of the United States House of Representatives and the Senate—unprecedented—and the entire Nation will be watching the Pope as he speaks because we all need to hear Pope Francis's message of love, of compassion, of justice and action. And we need to join in the conversation he is calling the world to engage in about protecting people and our planet.

The science of climate change has been clear for decades. Global temperatures are warming, glaciers are melting, and sea levels are rising. Extreme downpours and weather events are increasing. The ocean is becoming more dangerously acidic. Last year was the warmest year ever recorded. Today, NOAA announced that this summer was the hottest summer since 1880. Increasing temperatures increase the risk for bad air days, in turn increasing the risk of asthma attacks and worse for people who actually have lung disease. Global warming is also a public health crisis.

The economic and security costs are now dangerously evident. Climate change is aggravating tensions around the world, especially where food and water security are at the heart of the conflicts. It is spawning new crises that are displacing millions of people and creating an era of refugees. This will require action by our diplomats and aid organizations, but every nation must do its fair share.

Pope Francis's address to Congress next week will offer us the opportunity to examine our own policies, their impact on not only the people of our Nation but on the entire planet, and our duty as leaders and as human beings to take action.

Pope Francis has brought this moral imperative to act on climate change just as the nations of the world are working to forge an international agreement in Paris this December as the world gathers to deal with this issue. The United States must lead this effort. The United States must heed the message of Pope Francis. The United States must be the nation in Paris in December saying to the rest of the world that we can and must do something to solve this problem.

We know that clean energy will be at the heart of meeting any of the goals which we have to establish here and across the planet in order to cut pollution. We must continue to improve the fuel efficiency of the automobiles and trucks we drive here in the United States. We must deploy more wind and solar energy and renew tax breaks for those projects.

By making a commitment to reduce the pollution imperiling our planet, we can engage in job creation that is good for all of creation. The United States can be the leader in the technological revolution to reduce the pollution imperiling our planet, and then we can partner with other nations to share this technology and protect the most vulnerable around the world.

Pope Francis said in his encyclical, "Today, in the view of the common good, there is an urgent need for politics and economics to enter into a frank dialogue in the service of life, especially life." We know that to agree on a course of action is no easy task in this Chamber, but if we harness the ambition of the Moon landing, the technological power of our workers, and the moral imperative of Pope Francis's message, we can leave the world a better place than we found it. We have done it before. We have the tools to do it again. Now we need to forge the political will in order to accomplish those goals.

We need more solar, we need more wind, and we need the batteries for the vehicles we drive in order to reduce the amount of polluting fossil fuels we send up into the atmosphere. We need to invest. We need to be the technological giants. We need to unleash the same kind of revolution in the energy sector as we did in the telecommunications sector in the 1990s. No one on the planet except the United States had a device like this on their person just 15 years ago. We invented telecommunications. We invented the way in which people not just here in America but all across the planet—Africa, Asia, South America—communicate with these wireless devices. We can do the same thing on energy. We can do the same thing with wind and solar. We can reinvent the kinds of vehicles we drive—cars, trucks, buses. We can do it. We have to have the will. We have to listen to the Pope. We have to play the role that the United States is expected to lead by the rest of the world in order to meet this moral imperative. And we can do it by creating millions of new jobs here in the United States. So that is our challenge.

The Pope is arriving next week. For me, as a boy who grew up going to the Immaculate Conception Grammar School, Malden Catholic, Boston College, and Boston College Law School—Catholic school every day for 19 years—this is just an incredible thrill, knowing that, in a way, when he is standing up on that podium, it is going to be a latter-day "Sermon on the Mount" that he delivers to us telling us what our job is today: to save this beautiful planet God has created while also avoiding the worst consequences for the poorest people on the planet if we do not solve the problem.

Let's work together in a bipartisan fashion in order to heed the message of Pope Francis.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SASSE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Mike Lee, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Patrick J. Toomey, John Boozman, David Perdue, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, James E. Risch, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, James Lankford.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

NOMINATION OF SIM FARAR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF SIM FARAR TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

NOMINATION OF WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL TO BE A MEMBER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nominations: Calendar Nos. 248, 301, 302, 303, and 304; that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc without intervening action or debate; that following disposition of the nominations, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nominations; that any statements related to the nominations be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action, and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nominations of Michael C. McGowan, of Delaware, to be United States Marshal for the District of Delaware, for the term of four years; Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015; Sim Farar, of California, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018; William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2015; and William Joseph Hybl, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States Advisory Commission on Public Diplomacy for a term expiring July 1, 2018?

The nominations were confirmed en bloc.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNIZING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF PASTOR CLINTON HOUSE AND DR. MARY L. HOUSE'S PASTORAL SERVICE WITH MOUNTAINTOP FAITH MINISTRIES

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary L. House and their 25 years of pastoral service with Mountaintop Faith Ministries.

Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary House began their ministry work at a small church in North Las Vegas with 13 members. Over the years, Mountaintop Faith Ministries outgrew its humble beginnings. In 1993, the church's congregation grew so much they had to open the doors of the church and put chairs in the lobby and out to the street. The church continued to grow, and eventually, they began holding services in the auditorium of Durango High School to accommodate churchgoers. Today, Mountaintop Faith Ministries has a church complex and upwards of 3,500 members.

Mountaintop Faith Ministries has continuously given back to the Las Vegas community. The Sunday services have provided spiritual guidance for thousands, and the church also offers midweek Bible classes and business fairs, where owners can share their businesses with church members following services. One Resurrection Sunday, they held a "dress down" Sunday on the football field at Durango High School. This community event brought buses of homeless to worship with them. After the service, church members provided food for the homeless, as well.

For the past 25 years, Pastor Clinton House and Dr. Mary House have touched the Las Vegas community through their dedicated work. I congratulate them on their many successes and wish them the best in their future endeavors.

228TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, today, we celebrate the 228th anniversary of the

signing of the Constitution of the United States. Some elected officials talk about their love of “the Constitution and the Bill of Rights”. That specific phrasing is interesting in that it somehow implies that the Constitution does not itself include the Bill of Rights, which of course it does. But it contains much more than those original 10 amendments. Each year, I remind Americans that we must celebrate not just the original Constitution of Washington, Hamilton, Madison, and the Founding generation but the whole Constitution, including its 27 amendments. This includes the 13th, 14th, and 15th Amendments, which many scholars have rightly described as our Nation’s Second Founding.

The Senate commemorated the Sesquicentennial or the 150th anniversary of the Second Founding earlier this year when the Senate passed a resolution raising awareness about this series of amendments, which provided the country with a new birth of freedom. Ratified by President Lincoln and his generation after the Civil War, these Second Founding amendments transformed our original charter—most fundamentally—by elevating the principle of equality to a central place in our constitutional order.

This year, the Supreme Court once again upheld the Constitution’s promise of equality when it ruled that the 14th Amendment of the Constitution protects the right of each American to marry the person they love, regardless of their sexual orientation or gender identity. Because of that ruling, LGBT children all across America will grow up knowing that they can love without fear, and that they are equal citizens of this great Nation.

Although the Constitution provides us with the promise of equality, we must never forget that it is up to all of us to advance and protect that intrinsic American value of equality. Each generation must do its part. This is true whether it is racial equality, gender equality, or equality based on a person’s sexual orientation or gender identity. We have come a long way in each of those areas, but we continue to have work to do.

On racial equality, too many of our citizens continue to face racial discrimination in voting. As a result of the Supreme Court’s dreadful ruling in *Shelby County v. Holder*, Americans across the country are now vulnerable to racially discriminatory voting laws that restrict the franchise without the full protections of the Voting Rights Act. On this 50th anniversary year of the March in Selma and of the Voting Rights Act, we must do all we can to restore and enhance the protections of that landmark legislation.

On gender equality, we continue to see women being paid less than men for doing the same job. We also continue to see partisan attacks on women’s

health care choices. From legislation blocking these choices to efforts defending critical health services for women, we clearly have a long way to go to ensure gender equality.

And while LGBT Americans are now able to marry the person they love, they continue to experience discrimination in other aspects of their lives. Achieving full equality means that LGBT individuals should be able to provide for their families without fear that they will be fired from their jobs or denied housing. It means that a restaurant should not be able to refuse to serve an LGBT couple because the owner disapproves of that couple’s relationship. New civil rights laws are needed to protect LGBT Americans so they can live their lives free from discrimination.

We must uphold this promise of equality for the vulnerable and the voiceless as well. We are a nation of immigrants with a long, proud history of opening our doors and welcoming people from around the world. After all, the Statue of Liberty has long proclaimed America’s welcome: “Give us your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. . . . Send these, the homeless, tempest-tost to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door.” That is what America has long stood for and what we should continue to represent. Instead, I have seen ugly partisan rhetoric about changing the 14th Amendment of our Constitution to remove birthright citizenship specifically to target immigrants. We should be a nation that embraces and lifts our most vulnerable, not a nation that acts out of spite or malice.

We must also fight for the voices of all Americans and not just corporations or the wealthy few. Our country has flourished because we have worked hard to ensure that more, not fewer, Americans can take part in the democratic process. Instead, our campaign finance laws have been eviscerated by a Supreme Court that views money as speech and refuses to place any limits on the ability of the wealthy and special interests to drown out hard-working Americans. The Court has also irrationally limited the definition of “corruption” in our campaign finance laws to just bribery. But unlike a narrow majority of the Court, the public understands that corruption is not just bribery; rather, corruption is the idea that money buys access and influences our democracy for a wealthy few. This cannot be allowed in our democracy. The size of your bank account cannot and should not determine whether and how the government responds to your needs. We must act to restore the First Amendment and to preserve those protections to ensure that all voices can be heard in the democratic process.

Constitution Day is an occasion to celebrate our founding charter and the historic democracy it has caused and

fostered. It is also a time to reflect on what we are doing as citizens to uphold the promises that the Constitution has provided. I encourage all Americans to mark this day by reading the whole Constitution and celebrating how it reflects the great progress we have made to become a more inclusive and stronger democracy.

REMEMBERING EDWARD W. BROOKE III

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. President, on March 11, 2015, at Washington National Cathedral, a memorial service was held for former Massachusetts Senator Edward W. Brooke III. Ed was one of the first African Americans to serve in combat during World War II. He was the first African American to be elected a State attorney general, and the first elected to the U.S. Senate by popular vote. In 2004, he was awarded the Presidential Medal of Freedom by President George W. Bush. In honor of his extraordinary life and service to our Nation, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the remarks made at Senator Edward W. Brooke III’s memorial service by Secretary of State John F. Kerry; Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON; Milton C. Davis and Edward W. Brooke IV.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SECRETARY OF STATE

JOHN F. KERRY

Good morning. It’s a privilege to share some thoughts about Ed Brooke.

I want you to think back half a century. Imagine a room in the 1960s where all the leading Massachusetts politicians are gathered—Kennedy, McCormack, O’Neill, Volpe, Brooke. Among them, one figure stands out as the courageous representative of an embattled minority; Ed Brooke; alone; undaunted; the only Episcopalian.

Imagine another room, the chamber of the U.S. Senate. Shortly after noon on January 10, 1967, a man of consummate dignity strides down the center aisle; Legislators rise and applaud; the gallery cheers. The first African-American popularly-elected to the Senate takes his seat. In that moment, Ed Brooke was not just a pioneer; he was an advance scout probing the soul of our country. Twenty-six years would pass before a second African-American would be elected.

Imagine a young man raised in Washington, joining the army immediately after Pearl Harbor, later deploying to Italy as part of a segregated infantry battalion. There, Lieutenant Brooke watched in anguish as his buddies were sent each morning to attack a heavily-fortified German position in the Apennines.

The young soldier soon became convinced that his men were being used as cannon fodder by racist commanders. He proposed a shift in tactics, an operation staged later in the day, when the enemy would be sleeping. The answer came back: “The colonel would never send a boy to do a man’s job.” Brooke persisted and the operation he organized went ahead, catching the enemy by surprise and driving them from the mountain. His

battalion suffered 1300 casualties and won 27 medals; its reward was to be dismantled and its personnel scattered to places where many could neither sit at a lunch counter nor vote. We must never forget that—as much as Ike, Patton and Marshall—Ed Brooke and the African-Americans who joined him in fighting Fascism were part of the greatest generation and we owe them an incalculable debt.

But this was just the beginning of Ed Brooke's journey.

As a legislator, Senator Brooke was always on the cutting edge—championing a woman's right to choose; taking on the tobacco industry when smoking was still considered cool; initiating a program to help minority businesspeople create jobs; guaranteeing women equal access to credit; and authoring an amendment that, to this day, enables tens of thousands of people each year to qualify for public housing and thereby escape shelters or the streets.

When President Nixon asked the Senate to confirm a Supreme Court nominee whose supporters argued—and I'm not making this up—that mediocrity deserved representation—Ed Brooke looked his party's leadership in the eye and said no—and did the same on two other Nixon nominees.

He also differed from the President by being right about the Vietnam War and voting to end it—a position that mattered a lot to many of his constituents, including me.

And when ideologues tried to gut the Civil Rights and Voting Rights laws: Ed Brooke used every instrument in the legislative tool box to stop them—declaring that liberties that took a century or more to secure must never again be denied. A vow that, as President Obama reminded us in Selma on Saturday, remains as timely now as ever.

For all of his career, Ed Brooke was his own man. As Attorney General, he was relentless in cracking down on corruption—which in Massachusetts in the early 1960s provided what we might call “a target-rich environment.” His electoral triumphs were astonishing in a state that was only 2 percent black, where school desegregation was an explosive issue, and where the face of prejudice might appear either ugly with anger or thinly masked by code words. In one early race he narrowly lost, his opponent, Kevin White, claimed to see no hidden message in campaign bumper stickers that read simply: “Vote White.”

Repeatedly, Brooke was urged by the political establishment not to run for higher office—to instead bide his time until Massachusetts was [quote-unquote] “ready.” Indeed, in 1962, when he ran for Attorney General, his opponent was the formidable Elliott Richardson, a man with deep connections to what were—socially and financially—the upper echelons of the Commonwealth. But Ed Brooke didn't back down, and because he didn't, a straight line can be drawn between his electoral victories and that of another African-American—this time in the national arena—some four decades later.

I was in high school when Ed Brooke first ran for statewide office, attracting so many Democratic voters to the Republican primary that our party had to work for months afterward reregistering them.

I had met Ed but didn't really know him until after I arrived in Washington. In my early years in the Senate, he would come by occasionally and talk about the job or the events of the day. Whenever I saw him, I was struck by his warmth and kindness and his interest in what I was doing. He was a charismatic man with a genuine laugh and a resonant voice and a ready willingness to an-

swer my questions. One topic we discussed was the parallels. After all, we had both gone from college to war to law school to a prosecutor's office to spend many years as the “junior” Senator from Massachusetts. We had each won and lost elections and guess what—we both agreed that winning was better.

Believe me, few public statements are harder to deliver than a concession speech after a closely-contested—even bitter—race. In 1978, I was indelibly struck by how Ed's remarks set a new standard for grace amid pain. He congratulated his opponent and paid tribute to allies who would, he said, carry on his work. He was flanked by one source of strength, his mother—and alluded to a second in saying: “When I was down in the valley, I didn't cry—I cried out—and you gave me the strength to move on.”

Early on, this proud son introduced me to Helen Brooke who, during my years in the Senate, embraced me as much as anyone in the city. Mother Brooke loved her family and her church; she loved to have a good time and she taught her son how to be a successful politician. “Always thank people,” she said, “and make them feel special.” That advice stuck. As one colleague observed, “When Ed Brooke looked at you, you felt he was not only thinking about you and only you, but that he probably hadn't thought about anyone else in weeks.”

Fifteen years ago, the state courthouse—just across from my own district office in Boston—was named after Ed Brooke—a tribute to the man and a regular reminder to all of his love for the practice of law. In Massachusetts, three charter schools are dedicated to his memory; and many of their students made the journey from the land of the seven-foot snowdrifts to be here with us today; there are also many students from Dunbar—his high school alma mater.

Senator Brooke shunned the title of trailblazer, but that's exactly what he was. He inspired thousands of young people—of every race—to enter public service. Some criticized him for not being more outspoken or for not being enough this or enough that—trying to mold him to their expectations—but he was always true to himself. He fought ceaselessly and with determination for the poor, for minorities, for women, and for what he felt was right. He was the embodiment of a style of legislating that valued substance over rhetoric and public needs over political agendas. Bipartisanship, to him, was never a four letter word.

So we are privileged to be here—family, friends, admirers—in celebration and thanksgiving, for this remarkable man. In recent years, as Ed Brooke received the highest civilian honors our nation can bestow—the Congressional Gold Medal and the Presidential Medal of Freedom—he reminded us that the work to which he had dedicated his own best efforts—remains unfinished.

Ed Brooke understood the ebb and flow of life. He endured great loss and enjoyed exuberant triumphs, saw the valleys and the mountain tops, and would be the first to tell us that he lived a full and blessed life. For him and for that—we will always be grateful.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSWOMAN ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

Anne, family, colleagues, public officials, friends all of Senator Edward William Brooke. You do not grow up desiring to be a United States Senator if you were born in the District of Columbia in 1919; not if you lived in one of the District's African American communities, LeDroit Park; not if you went to our segregated public schools and

graduated from Dunbar High School, and the Senator's class of 1936 is in the church today, and from Howard University; not even if you became a World War II hero and won the Bronze Star, leading your segregated unit in a broad daylight attack on an enemy bunker; and certainly not if your hometown had no elected self-government, much less senators.

Edward William Brooke was nurtured in a loving, closely knit, aspiring African American community in the District of Columbia. But it did not groom him to think of himself as a public official.

Senator Brooke owed much to a childhood spent in our city where children were raised to believe segregation did not for a moment mean you were inferior. But the man that became a natural politician, charismatic, charming, brilliant, and utterly approachable, invented himself and went on to become not only a public official, but a historic figure.

The Senate has always had its share of self-made men and women. Edward Brooke was a self-made senator. Many had thought of Barack Obama as a man ahead of his time, until the President came to the Capitol in 2009 to present the Congressional Gold Medal to Senator Brooke. After receiving the medal, Senator Brooke regaled us with remarks that must have been written in his head and his heart, because without so much as a note, he accepted the medal in a voice that resonated as it must have when he spoke in the Senate about the Brooke Amendment to the Fair Housing Act, which limited to 25% the portion of income a family must pay in rent for public housing.

Don't ask me how a black man without guide posts became one of the most popular politicians ever in Massachusetts, a state where only 2% of the population was black. I cannot explain the conundrum that was Edward Brooke. But I experienced the warmth and the talent that made him successful as a public man and dear as a friend. And I can tell you this: Edward Brooke never forgot where he came from, the city that nurtured his uniqueness. Without hesitation, he volunteered to talk with senators in his Republican Party when the Senate and the House both passed the D.C. House Voting Rights Act. He succeeded. The vote for the District was lost to an amendment that would have wiped out all of the District's gun laws in return for a vote in the People's House.

Senator Brooke's place in American history was sealed and delivered long before he died in January. His place as the first African American elected to the Senate with the popular vote and his extraordinary record as a senator are even more remarkable when you consider his origins here in the District of Columbia, which had no local government at all. The residents of his hometown continue to struggle for equal rights as American citizens and for statehood. But nothing could inspire our citizens more than a native son, born in a city without a vote or a local public official, who rose to cast votes in the Senate of the United States.

Thank you.

REMARKS OF MILTON C. DAVIS, THE 29TH GENERAL PRESIDENT OF THE ALPHA PHI ALPHA FRATERNITY

“God of justice, save the people from the clash of race and creed, From the strife of class and faction, make our nation free indeed; Keep her faith in simple manhood strong as when her life began, Till it find its full fruition in the brotherhood of man!”

This is a stanza from a favorite hymn of Edward Brooke which he often quoted in the speeches he delivered across the country and

the world. This stanza summarized his theme of life; his mission in life. Long before I ever met him in person, I came to know him through the pages of the history of Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, the world's first African American collegiate fraternity founded in 1906. This Alpha history book depicted a plethora of role models and heroes, the likes of W. E. B. Dubois, Thurgood Marshall, Martin Luther King, Jr., Jesse Owens and scores more, whose life and work inspires and advances a race of people and a nation. None stood out more dramatically than the life and achievements of Edward William Brooke. He was my hero; dignified, a scholar, charismatic, accomplished and fearless. Regular history books have yet to give him the credit he has earned.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity is in its 109th year of existence and for 77 of those 109 years, Edward William Brooke stood in the circle of our brotherhood. When Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity undertook the awesome twenty-seven year task of building the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial on the National Mall here in Washington DC., Edward William Brooke was first to come forward with significant resources and the use of his influence to help guide that process.

He was an active, contributing and esteemed member until his death.

The law served as his instrument, tool and weapon with which he sought to advance the cause of justice in the face of prejudice, discrimination and segregation which surrounded him as he grew up in the nation's capital not far from this place.

He fought against the tyranny of the Axis powers as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Army during World War II assigned to the segregated 366th all black infantry regiment where he earned a Bronze Star for valor on the battlefield.

Edward Brooke also served as an advocate for black soldiers who were charged with offenses in his regiment even though he was not then a trained, licensed attorney.

Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity, using its members who were lawyers in the 1940s and 1950s filed several major lawsuits seeking to dismantle segregation and battle racism in America. Among those cases filed and financed by the national fraternity was the case of Elmer Henderson vs. The United States; the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Southern Railway. The case challenged the Commerce Commission regulation which allowed segregation and discrimination in railroad dining cars in interstate commerce. In the dining car, black passengers were only allowed to occupy two tables nearest the kitchen and when occupied by black travelers a curtain had to be drawn to hide their presence from white passengers. If white passengers needed the two tables assigned to black passengers, the black passengers had to wait until the white passengers vacated the tables assigned to blacks.

Edward Brooke was recruited to join the Alpha legal team headed by then General President of Alpha Belford Lawson in filing briefs before the U.S. Supreme Court attacking these racial barriers and on June 5, 1950, four years before Brown v. the Board of Education major decision, after an eight year battle through the lower courts, the U.S. Supreme Court struck down the regulation which allowed segregation and discrimination in railroad dining cars due in part to the heroic efforts of Edward Brooke. Edward Brooke was a champion for equality and fairness, his standard and measure of a person was the world's standard of excellence. He

wanted only to be judged by the content of his character and his abilities rather than his racial background.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was initiated into Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity by Edward Brooke while King was a graduate student at Boston University stated the proposition that—Life's most persistent and urgent question is "What are you doing for others?"

Edward W. Brooke became an acknowledged national treasure by using his time, talent, influence, power and intellect demonstrating his commitment to uplifting others and assuring that in matters of fair housing, voting rights, education and justice that the promise of America to equality under law became more of a practical reality rather than just a lofty ideal.

In one of his campaigns, a Boston political writer wrote "Brooke was a carpetbagger from the South, a Republican in a Democratic State, a black in a white state, a Protestant in a Catholic state and he is poor. Edward Brooke replied: I pleaded guilty to all indictments and I continued to persevere in my campaign. Brooke won; America won.

That's what heroes do: They look reality in the face and persevere!

The Poet Robert Louis Stevenson aptly sums up my journey of friendship and brotherhood with Senator Edward W. Brooke with these words:

He has achieved success;

Who has lived well, laughed often, and loved much;

Who has enjoyed the trust and respect of intelligent men and women and the love of little children;

Who has filled his niche and accomplished his task;

Who has left the world better than he found it;

Who has always looked for the best in others;

And given them the best he had;

Whose life was an inspiration;

Whose memory a benediction.

REMARKS BY EDWARD W. BROOKE IV

On behalf of my family I would like to thank the distinguished speakers who preceded me for their thoughtful and deeply moving tributes. As they have so eloquently stated, and as most of you well know: my father lived one of The Great American Lives. It was my privilege to know him and to be a part of his life. It is my honor to be his son, and to be here with all of you today, in appreciation of a man whom I love so dearly.

The moments of the past are not gone from us, nor we from them. The light of each moment shines on through eternity as the light of distant stars travels through space and time to reach our eyes and touch our minds. And so the brilliant light of his great life shines on for us, that we may better find our way in the dark unknown.

When I was but a child, not so long ago, my father would always say, "Waste not; want not." Usually he would do this as he walked around turning off the lights in vacant rooms or pointing out the unused excess ketchup on my dinner-plate. I thought I understood what he meant. Though when I now consider the familiar saying in the full context of his life, it reveals a far more powerful truth: That if we never waste the opportunity to help each other live better lives, none among us would ever have to want for a life that could not be attained.

In this generous spirit, and leading by example, my father constantly strived toward the realization of a better world—a world in which the apparent differences between indi-

viduals would never again be mistaken as cause to deny justice, humanity, or dignity, nor to justify violence, exploitation, or disrespect. We must continue to work as he did, with faith in the possibility of the best imaginable outcome, and the assurance that fearfulness and cynicism cannot withstand the immeasurable kindness of which we are capable.

My father was a truly tender, sweet, and lovely man. He forgave my many errors and patiently helped me to learn from them. He taught me to read, to speak, and to think, to love and be loved. For all of this and so much more, I am forever grateful—grateful to him, and to his mother Helen and father Edward for raising up a man so entirely and strikingly unafraid to be the best possible version of himself; grateful to the ancestors who, surviving hardship and desolation, held intact the sacred vitality of which my father's life is a profound expression; and grateful to my mother, whose inspiring and unconditional love made our lives together so beautiful.

We know that he will always be with us, and pray for him eternal peace.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. LEHMAN

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize a true American patriot, a fellow naval aviator, and a close personal friend, former Secretary of Navy, the Honorable John F. Lehman.

Secretary Lehman served his country for over 30 years both in uniform in the United States Navy and as Secretary of the Navy during the Reagan Administration, from 1981–1987. His leadership and dedication to our country and to the Navy set a high mark unsurpassed to this day. It was Secretary Lehman who championed a "600-ship" Navy after the devastating post-Vietnam war cutbacks. He knew how important this naval investment was to rebuilding our global military and strategic power. Together with President Reagan, he offered the vision of strength that would ultimately bring an end to the Soviet Union. His tenure stands as a lesson of history that peace comes through strength and commitment, not weakness and retreat.

Secretary Lehman's impact on the country and our national security has not ended with the conclusion of his tour in the Pentagon. He continues to offer essential and trusted advice to decision makers throughout our national leadership. I am proud to call Secretary Lehman my friend, and I am honored to recognize him today. For these and many other reasons, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the citation in honor of Secretary Lehman's recently awarded National Defense Industrial Association Gold Medal.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOLD MEDAL FOR DISTINGUISHED SERVICE IS PRESENTED TO THE HONORABLE JOHN F. LEHMAN

For a lifetime of extraordinary leadership and dedication to a strong national security

of the United States of America, the Honorable John F. Lehman is hereby recognized for his superb service to our country, both in and out of uniform, and in both the United States Air Force and the United States Navy, serving with great distinction for over three decades in a succession of demanding leadership positions of ever-increasing authority and responsibility, including serving as the 65th Secretary of the Navy for six years, beginning at the age of 38. Never one to hold himself apart from those he leads, Secretary Lehman continued to concurrently serve as a Naval Aviator while serving as Secretary of the Navy. Throughout his illustrious career, Secretary Lehman has excelled in numerous top level positions supporting both the national security and foreign policy of the United States, including as a staff member to Dr. Henry Kissinger on the National Security Council, as a delegate to the Force Reductions Negotiations in Vienna, as Deputy Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and as a member of the 9/11 Commission. A lasting hallmark of Secretary Lehman's commitment to national security was his out-front leadership for the "600-ship Navy." This plan was integral to President Reagan's goal of winning the Cold War against the Soviet Union and to rebuilding the Navy's fleet of ships following post-Vietnam War cutbacks. Secretary Lehman also developed a critical strategic concept known as the "Lehman Doctrine." His plan, which called for a military response to any Russian invasion in Europe by invading the Soviet Far East, was an innovative strategic concept essential to our conventional deterrence of the Soviet Union. Even after so many accomplishments in public service, Secretary Lehman has continued to offer his advice and support to national security leaders to this day. In addition to his national security credentials, Secretary Lehman holds a B.S. degree from St. Joseph's University, B.A. and M.A. degrees from Cambridge University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania. He has enjoyed great success in business as a founding partner and Chairman of J.F. Lehman & Company, as the president of an aerospace consulting firm, and he is currently a director on a variety of corporate boards. He has authored numerous books, including 'On Seas of Glory', 'Command of the Seas', and 'Making War', and continues to write for the National Review on American Seapower for the 21st Century. Secretary Lehman serves as a member of a number of influential American think tanks to include serving as the Chair of Foreign Policy Research Institute's National Security Program. His visionary leadership, wise counsel and unparalleled service over the last 40 years in government and business have contributed immeasurably to sustaining a strong and successful U.S. national security posture. Secretary Lehman's extraordinary devotion to duty, clarity of purpose, and record of remarkable achievements are in keeping with the highest traditions of public and private service and reflect great credit upon him, the men and women in uniform, and the United States of America.

Given this day September 18, 2015 by:

ARNOLD L. PUNARO,
Major General, USMC
(RET), Chairman of
the Board.

CRAIG R. MCKINLEY,
General, USAF (RET),
President & CEO.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE LEESBURG "STOLEN GIRLS"

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, it is with a sense of solemnity that I recognize a low moment during the civil rights movement in my home State of Georgia 52 years ago.

During the height of the movement, Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., was arrested for protesting racial segregation in Albany, GA, on December 16, 1961, and held in the Sumter County jail. The arrest galvanized the community and Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, SNCC, efforts to establish the Sumter County movement. Largely comprised of preteen and teenage students, the movement repeatedly challenged segregation from 1963 to 1965. On July 15, 1963, a number of school-aged girls were arrested, transported to a jail in Dawson, GA, and held overnight. Early the next morning, they were transported to Leesburg, GA, without parental consent. The girls were held 20 miles from their homes in a Civil War-era stockade following their arrest for protesting, and they were not released until mid-September 1963, which is why I am addressing it today.

After a SNCC photographer revealed the terrible, unsanitary, and dangerous conditions, the young girls, dubbed the "Stolen Girls," gained national attention. However, the incident has not received the attention it deserves.

The young ladies who were jailed are ready to tell the stories of their untold mistreatment after 52 years. I encourage my fellow Georgians and Americans to learn more about the civil rights movement so that all might find healing.

CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I wish to commemorate in the RECORD the anniversary of the signing of the U.S. Constitution.

On this day in 1787, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention met for the last time to sign the U.S. Constitution. In the pursuit to form a more perfect union, the Framers of the Constitution created a document that not only solidified our fledgling Nation but inspired others across the globe to strive for liberty, too. Organizations such as Lions Clubs International, the Daughters of the American Revolution, the Georgia Federation of Republican Women, and others deserve a great deal of gratitude for their efforts to bring attention to this important day. In recognition of this momentous occasion in American history and in honor of Constitution Day, I encourage all Georgians and all Americans to read, study, and learn the contents of the U.S. Constitution.

I appreciate the efforts of our educators, elected officials, community leaders, and parents who teach our youth about the foundations of justice,

strength and equality upon which our great Nation was built. I never cease to be amazed at how the principles of the Constitution play out in our daily lives as Americans.

Today is an appropriate occasion for we the people of the United States, as well as the people's elected representatives in Congress, to renew our commitment to the principles of the U.S. Constitution. The Constitution's values—liberty, separation of powers, consent of the governed, and the principle that no one is above the law—are just as true and just as relevant today as they were when they were set to parchment more than two centuries ago.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND HISPANIC-SERVING INSTITUTIONS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, earlier this week I introduced two bipartisan resolutions that were adopted by unanimous consent: S. Res. 254, recognizing September 15 to October 15 as Hispanic Heritage Month, and S. Res. 255, designating the week of September 14, 2015 as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week.

These resolutions celebrate the immense contributions of Hispanic Americans to our great Nation and honor the critical work of more than 400 non-profit Hispanic-Serving Institutions for their important role in educating and empowering Hispanic youth.

Latinos have a long and decorated history in the United States, full of extraordinary contributions to America's past, present, and future. Latinos have proudly served, helped build, and defended our country for hundreds of years, honorably serving in every action since before the founding of the Nation.

Hispanics fought alongside patriots in the American Revolution and rallied in the Civil War, serving bravely in both the Union and Confederate armies. Latinos rode in Teddy Roosevelt's Rough Riders during the Spanish-American War, received Congressional Medals of Honor in both World Wars, and made the ultimate sacrifice for our country in Korea and Vietnam. As of July 31, 2015, more than 164,000 Hispanic Americans are actively serving with distinction in the United States Armed Forces.

Just as Latinos have defended our Nation, we have also helped shape and build it. That is why I also wish to recognize the exemplary institutions that are making vital investments in the next generation of Latino leaders.

Hispanic-Serving Institutions are colleges or universities where total Hispanic enrollment constitutes a minimum of 25 percent of the student body, and they serve more than half of all Latino students in the United States.

As a product of a Hispanic-Serving Institution in my home State of New Jersey, my experience is a living testimony of the important role that HSIs play in expanding opportunities for Latino students in 21 States across the U.S. and in Puerto Rico.

With these resolutions, we celebrate the contributions of all Latinos and the institutions that serve and enrich the Latino community in the United States. I look forward to celebrating the heritage and culture of Hispanic Americans who have and will continue to positively influence and enrich our Nation—not only during this special month and week, but throughout the year.

RECOGNIZING GROWTH DISORDER AWARENESS WEEK

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, on behalf of every child currently living with a growth disorder I wish to recognize this week—September 13–19, 2015—as Growth Disorder Awareness Week.

A child's growth is a strong indicator of that child's overall health status. According to the Pictures of Standard Syndromes and Undiagnosed Malformations, POSSUM, database, more than 600 serious diseases and health conditions can cause growth failure. These diseases range from nutritional disturbances and hormone imbalances to far more serious conditions that affect the kidneys or even lead to brain tumors. While these conditions affect a child's growth progress, a stunning 48 percent of children with the most common growth disorders go undiagnosed. To make matters worse, the longer a child with growth failure goes undiagnosed, the greater the potential for long-term health issues and higher costs of treatment. Early detection and diagnosis are, therefore, critical to ensuring a healthy future for these children.

This week, as we recognize Growth Awareness Week, I applaud the MAGIC Foundation for the tremendous work they do to further public awareness of growth failure and to improve the lives and health of the children whom they affect.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL LOBSTER DAY

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, this August the Senate unanimously passed a resolution designating September 25, 2015, as National Lobster Day. I was proud to cosponsor that resolution with my fellow Mainer, Senator ANGUS KING, and to be joined by our New England colleagues, Senators SHAHEEN and AYOTTE of New Hampshire, REED and WHITEHOUSE of Rhode Island, and MURPHY and BLUMENTHAL of Connecticut.

That day has arrived and will be celebrated with a special event at the Maine Maritime Museum in the City of

Bath. For more than a half-century, this outstanding museum has honored our State's seafaring heritage and the important role Maine plays today in global maritime activities.

Lobster fishing is central to that heritage. Since colonial times, it has served as an economic engine and a family tradition in New England, helping to support the livelihoods of thousands of families. Throughout the region, more than 120 million pounds of lobster are caught each year, making it one of our most valuable commodities.

More than 70 percent of this harvest is hauled in by Maine's 6,000 commercial license holders. Lobster is the backbone of Maine's prolific fishing industry, which produces more than \$1 billion in economic activity and supports 26,000 year-round jobs in such affiliated enterprises as boatbuilding and maintenance, trap-making, bait, fuel and other supplies. The Maine lobster industry is built upon thousands of owner-operated family businesses, where the generations work together, supporting themselves and sustaining their communities.

The hard-working men and women of the Maine lobster industry are the original conservationists. For more than 150 years, they have led the way in managing this precious resource through size restrictions and trap limits, and they are at the forefront of efforts to protect whales and other marine mammals. The economic activity they generate helps to preserve the working waterfronts that are essential to coastal communities.

The lobster industry represents the very essence of Maine—a deep respect for the environment and a dedication to hard work. I congratulate the men and women of the Maine lobster industry for upholding this centuries-old heritage and thank the Maine Maritime Museum for celebrating it.

REMEMBERING CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM HUBBS REHNQUIST

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, Thursday, September 3, was the 10th anniversary of the death of William Hubbs Rehnquist, the former Chief Justice of the United States Supreme Court. Rehnquist was an absolutely outstanding chief, one of the most influential Justices in the 225-year history of the Court. And the 10 years since his unfortunate passing have only served to increase the level of respect and admiration many have for him. This reverence is richly deserved, as Rehnquist spent over three decades—nearly two decades as Chief Justice—valiantly attempting to return the Court to this country's first principles, federalism being a primary one, in order to salvage our fundamental liberties. This is a goal the current Court would do well to remember and embrace.

Of course, I am slightly biased in this matter. I clerked for Rehnquist, after

all, and therefore spent an entire year learning at his side, while simultaneously embarrassing myself in his doubles tennis matches. But what is amazing about Rehnquist is how much esteem he was held in by those who often disagreed with him. Indeed, the respect he enjoyed from his colleagues was unparalleled. To give just one of many examples, Walter Dellinger, a former Solicitor General in the Clinton administration, wrote that “Rehnquist was a great leader and effective administrator of the Supreme Court and the national judiciary. He ran a tight ship. . . . Every justice with whom I have spoken in recent years has noted that the court was functioning well under his leadership.” Rehnquist didn't just treat his fellow lawyers well, either. He knew everyone's name who worked in the Court—from Justices, to police officers, to janitors—and he treated them all fairly and with dignity. Outside the Court, where he regularly strolled with his clerks, he would often graciously take pictures of tourists, who had no idea they had just asked our country's top judicial officer to assist with their family snapshot. These days, in the era of selfies, the tourists probably would not notice him at all. And Rehnquist would be fine with that. Humility was one of his defining characteristics.

In remembrance of Chief Justice Rehnquist's passing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a memorial article I wrote for the Harvard Law Review 10 years ago. This is not nearly as much as Rehnquist deserves, but it is more than a man like Rehnquist would ever request for himself. We miss you, Chief.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Harvard Law Review, Nov., 2005]

IN MEMORIAM: WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

(By R. Ted Cruz)

THE EDITORS OF THE HARVARD LAW REVIEW RESPECTFULLY DEDICATE THIS ISSUE TO CHIEF JUSTICE WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

A doll, a headdress, and a ship captain's wheel. All three enjoyed prominent placement in the Chief Justice's private chambers. Each was a gift from his law clerks, and each symbolized a different aspect of William Hubbs Rehnquist's tenure as Chief Justice of the United States.

Appointed to the Court in 1971, then-Justice Rehnquist found himself on a Court very much out of step with the rest of the nation. Five months after he arrived, in June of 1972, the Court issued *Furman v. Georgia*, striking down the death penalty across the country. Despite the fact that capital punishment is referenced explicitly in the text of Constitution, the Court concluded that it was nonetheless unconstitutional and with the stroke of a pen threw out the laws of virtually every state. Predicated upon what were termed “evolving standards of decency,” *Furman* asserted that five Justices were better arbiters of what was “decent” than the hundreds of millions of voters who had elected the legislatures that had widely adopted the death penalty.

Justice Rehnquist, of course, dissented. And four years later, the Court retreated from its decree that no state could “decently” choose to impose the death penalty. But Furman was emblematic. In the 1960s and 1970s, the Court consistently elevated the rights of criminal defendants, and, repeatedly, Justice Rehnquist dissented, often alone.

As in criminal law, so too across the gamut, especially concerning federalism and the Religion Clauses. For his first decade and beyond, Justice Rehnquist earned his “Lone Ranger” nickname. Thus, the first gift from the clerks—a twelve-inch adjustable Lone Ranger doll, which sat for some three decades on the bookshelf in his back office.

But the fiery dissents of the 1970s were not to be Justice Rehnquist’s entire legacy. In 1986, President Reagan made him Chief. Thus, the second gift—an elaborate Indian feather headdress, which sat next to the Lone Ranger doll on the bookshelf.

Beside both the doll and the headdress lay one of the most startling graphical representations of the different role Chief Justice Rehnquist was to play. Starting at the ceiling, his bound opinions from each Term stretched across the shelves. For the first fifteen years, each Term’s bound volume is consistently three to four inches wide. Then, in 1986, there is a sharp divide: from that point forward, each Term’s volume of collected opinions falls to one to two inches in width. That visual break was not the result of a sudden lack of verbosity. Rather, it was a physical manifestation of Chief Justice Rehnquist’s understanding of the very different task assigned a Chief Justice. No longer was his principal role to expound impassioned individual views; instead, it was to lead.

Thus, in 1996—his twenty-fifth anniversary as a Justice and his tenth as Chief—his third and most emblematic gift came from the clerks: a large ship’s captain’s wheel, which was mounted on the wall to commemorate his careful guidance of the Court over the decades.

The Chief steered the Court, carefully, steadily, over nineteen years at the helm. One result of that guidance, widely appreciated by lawyers, scholars, and public commentators, is that many of those 1970s-era Rehnquist dissents are now the law of the land. Indeed, there are few clearer legal arcs than the path from Rehnquist dissent to Court majority over these three decades.

Hence, the so-called federalist revolution, revitalizing an important structural safeguard to human liberty through the preservation of the real authority of sovereign states. “We start with first principles,” the Chief began in *United States v. Lopez*. “The Constitution creates a Federal Government of enumerated powers,” “few and defined,” in James Madison’s words, which “ensure[s] [the] protection of our fundamental liberties.”

Hence, the return to balance in the Court’s Establishment Clause jurisprudence, repudiating the hostility toward religion manifested by earlier decisions. Thus, in 2002, the Chief wrote *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, upholding the Cleveland school-choice program and making clear that the Constitution does not require the exclusion of religious schools from the options presented to children in need.

Fittingly, the Chiefs last opinion, handed down as the last opinion on the last day of the Term, was *Van Orden v. Perry*. Texas defended the Ten Commandments monument outside our State Capitol, and we won, 5-4.

In his plurality opinion, the Chief made clear that nothing in the First Amendment requires chisels and bulldozers to erase any and all public references to the Almighty. Rather, the Constitution embraces tolerance, not hostility, toward religion.

And hence the well chronicled retreat from the 1960s- and 70s-era overbroad protections for criminal defendants, restoring a jurisprudential approach that preserves constitutional liberties without unnecessarily frustrating good-faith law enforcement efforts.

That legacy of legal transformation has earned Chief Justice Rehnquist, in the judgment of President Clinton’s acting Solicitor General Walter Dellinger, a place—along with John Marshall and Earl Warren—among the three most influential Chief Justices in history.

Yet even so, the Chief’s skill in steering the Court, the care and diligence with which he achieved that legacy, is not widely understood. Indeed, many scholars, lawyers, and law students have misperceived the Chief’s jurisprudence—incorrectly deeming him, for example, significantly less conservative than Justices Scalia and Thomas—because they have failed to appreciate the distinct role of the Chief Justice, guiding the Court.

Take, for example, *Dickerson v. United States*, reaffirming *Miranda v. Arizona* as the law of the land. At the time of his death, eulogists pointed to *Dickerson* as an example of how the Chief had moderated his views, growing over time away from his Lone Ranger passion and toward an appreciation for elements of the status quo.

In my judgment, that view seriously misapprehends Chief Justice Rehnquist. Indeed, a careful examination of *Dickerson* can illuminate much of how he served as Chief. At the outset, *Dickerson* cannot be understood in isolation; instead, one must consider the entire course of the Chiefs criminal-law jurisprudence.

For decades before *Dickerson*, the Chief had been a vocal critic of *Miranda*. Beginning with *Michigan v. Tucker* in 1974, the Chief authored or joined dozens of opinions limiting *Miranda*’s reach. Viewed by many as one of the worst Warren Court excesses, *Miranda* combined an activist approach—mandating specific police warnings found nowhere in the Constitution—with unsettling outcomes—ensuring, in conjunction with a robust exclusionary rule, that demonstrably guilty criminals could go free on the barest of technicalities.

The predicate for all of the Chief’s efforts to cabin in *Miranda* was the notion that the specified warnings were not constitutionally required; rather, they were merely a “prophylactic” measure in aid of the broader constitutional value. Because *Miranda* was prophylactic—because the Constitution did not require its application in every respect—the Chief was able gradually to do much to mitigate its harmful effects.

Enter 18 U.S.C. §3501. Passed in the wake of *Miranda* and signed into law by President Lyndon B. Johnson, §3501, in effect, purported to overrule *Miranda* and return to the underlying constitutional standard of voluntariness for the admission of confessions. Yet, for three decades, §3501 lay dormant on the statute books, all but ignored.

In *Dickerson*, however, a federal court of appeals for the first time gave force to the words of the statute, admitting into evidence a voluntary confession notwithstanding the lack of properly administered *Miranda* warnings. Thus, the validity of §3501 was squarely presented.

If there was one thing the Chief knew, it was the minds of his colleagues; he had a re-

markable sense for what his Brethren were and were not willing to do. As a practical matter, there was no way that Justice O’Connor or Justice Kennedy would possibly be willing to overrule *Miranda*. It was too established, too much a part of the legal firmament, for either of them to hazard extinguishing it.

If there had been four votes to overrule *Miranda*, it is difficult to imagine that, given his decades of principled opposition, the Chief would not have readily provided the fifth. But the votes were not there.

In their place was genuine peril. Section 3501 was a statute passed by Congress and signed into law by the President; the only way it could be invalidated was for it to be declared unconstitutional. And, if it were unconstitutional, that would presumably be because *Miranda* was not mere prophylaxis, but itself required by the Constitution.

Had the Chief voted with the dissenters, the majority opinion would have been assigned by the senior Justice in the majority, in this case Justice Stevens. And Justice Stevens, of course, had a very different view of *Miranda* than did the Chief.

It is not difficult to imagine a Justice Stevens *Dickerson* majority, recounting the history of *Miranda* and §3501 and then observing something like, “Although we have often used the term ‘prophylactic’ to describe *Miranda*, over time it has become interwoven into the basic fabric of our criminal law; thus, today, we make explicit what had been implicit in our prior decisions: *Miranda* is required by the U.S. Constitution. Accordingly, §3501 is unconstitutional.”

That holding, in turn, would have undermined the foundation for most if not all of the previous decisions limiting *Miranda*, quietly threatening three decades of the Chief’s careful efforts to cabin in that decision appropriately. Therefore, in my judgment, the Chief acted decisively to avoid that consequence. He voted with the majority and assigned the opinion to himself.

With that backdrop, the majority opinion in *Dickerson* is, in many respects, amusing to read. Its holding can be characterized as threefold: First, *Miranda* is NOT required by the Constitution; it is merely prophylactic, and its exceptions remain good law. Second, 18 U.S.C. §3501 is not good law. Third, do not ask why, and please, never, ever, ever cite this opinion for any reason.

Although not what one would describe as the tightest of logical syllogisms, it was the best that could be gotten from the current members of the Court. A majority of Justices agreed with each of the first two propositions, and so therefore—even though the propositions are in significant tension with each other—pursuant to Justice Brennan’s famed “rule of five,” the Court declared both, and nothing more.

That leadership, I would suggest, is a hallmark of a great Chief Justice. The role of the Chief is unique, and Chief Justice Rehnquist understood his colleagues well. Consistently, he achieved the best legal outcome that could be reached in a given case, in aid of moving inexorably in the long term toward sound and principled jurisprudential doctrine.

For those of us who had the privilege of clerking for the Chief, we came to know a man of enormous intellect, principle, humor, and modesty.

Blessed with an eidetic memory, he seemed to know all the law that ever was. He would routinely amaze his clerks by quizzing them on the exact citation to some case or other; the clerks would, of course, never know the

cite, and—off the top of his head—the Chief always would. As his son James observed at the Chief's funeral, he would have said that his dad had forgotten more history than most of us will ever know, but he didn't think his dad had ever forgotten anything.

A Midwesterner, born of modest means, the Chief enlisted in the Army in 1943 at age eighteen. Law has too long been a profession of the privileged few, and it is fitting, and worth noting, that the Chief Justice was an enlisted man, serving as weather observer in North Africa.

Once a week, the Chief played tennis with his clerks. We would play on a public court, and no one ever recognized the older gentlemen playing doubles with three young lawyers. He would also have us over to his house to play charades. One of my favorite memories is his lying on his stomach on the floor, pantomiming firing a rifle and mouthing "pow, pow," as he acted out All Quiet on the Western Front.

He enjoyed simple tastes—his favorite lunch was a cheeseburger, a "Miller's Lite," and a single cigarette—and he had little patience for putting on airs. Once, when a law clerk asked him how he went about choosing law clerks, the Chief replied, "Well, I obviously wasn't looking for the best and the brightest, or I wouldn't have chosen you guys." Himself a former law clerk, he had no grand illusions about the job.

He was a kind and decent man. He knew everybody's name in the Court, every police officer and every janitor, and he treated them all with fairness and dignity. For that reason, the respect he enjoyed from his colleagues was unparalleled.

The Chief was beloved by his family, by his colleagues, by the thirty-four years' worth of law clerks whom he befriended, taught, and mentored. His views did not always prevail, but his steady hand at the helm—his vision, leadership, and unwavering principles—made this in every respect the Rehnquist Court.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNIZING SUSTAINABLE LUMBER CO.

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise in recognition of the achievement of Sustainable Lumber Co., located in Missoula, MT. JPMorgan Chase recently announced that Sustainable Lumber Co. has been awarded a \$100,000 grant and business trip to LinkedIn's California headquarters for an opportunity of learning and networking. This award further emphasizes Sustainable Lumber Co. as a fine tribute to the State of Montana, and their both transformative and responsible approach to operating their business has earned them the success they rightfully have achieved.

I also would like to applaud JPMorgan Chase for investing in small businesses, like Sustainable Lumber Co., through its Mission Main Street initiative. These investments in small businesses strengthen our local communities and work as a catalyst towards revitalizing the American Dream.●

TRIBUTE TO JACOB FRANCOM

• Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, I rise today in recognition of Jacob Francom, a top-tier educator from Troy, MT. Dr. Francom was recently honored as the 2015 Montana Principal of the Year and is an excellent example of the importance of education to the State of Montana.

Dr. Francom has not only succeeded in enhancing and tailoring the professional skills of his staff, but has made great advancements to the technological arenas at his school. He has also developed and improved the systems of instruction used with the students of Troy Junior and Senior High Schools.

What sets Dr. Francom apart is not only his leadership and pioneering at his own school, but his initiative in helping the schools in other parts of Lincoln County. His efforts are focused on aiding Troy, Libby, and Eureka with hopes to share in the milestones they reach.

At only 36 years old, he has earned a bachelor's degree from Utah State University, a master's degree from University of Arizona, and his doctorate, along with a second master's from The University of Montana. He started his career working at a boarding school in the Yaak, but in 5 short years became a rising star at Troy Junior and Senior High School. Three years later, he was serving as superintendent.

The characteristics that have made Dr. Francom a prime candidate for this award are not limited to his work in the education field. His humility and perseverance have made him a positive and inspiring example for our State. It is with great appreciation that I thank Principal Francom for his work in Troy and across our State.●

CONGRATULATING KATHERINE KELLEY

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to congratulate a true role model in the Nevada community, Ms. Katherine Kelley. Ms. Kelley was crowned both Miss Summerlin and Miss Nevada and recently competed in the Miss America competition. I am truly honored to congratulate her on these great achievements.

The Miss America pageant began in 1921 and is one of the world's largest scholarship providers to young women. The initiative focuses on creating change in the lives of others and contributes a great amount of charity work in communities across the country. This characteristic of giving exemplifies Ms. Kelley's everyday life as a teacher in the Las Vegas community, working to help children excel academically.

Ms. Kelley, a Madisonville, KY, native, moved to Las Vegas in May of 2014 and began working with Teach for America in hopes of helping with the

local teacher shortage. She is currently pursuing her master's degree at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, in the College of Education, studying secondary math education. Along with pursuing her master's degree, she is also a geometry instructor at Mojave High School. Her initial passion for teaching began when she spent time volunteering in the Alabama public school system. Her experience there drove her in her aspirations to create positive change. Through Miss America, Ms. Kelley has had the opportunity to bring light to the importance of school attendance in low-income communities, as well as encourage students of both genders in their science, technology, engineering, and math studies. The scholarships that Ms. Kelley has earned through Miss America will allow her to finish her master's degree debt free.

I know the citizens of the Silver State are proud to see a fellow Nevadan succeed in pursuing her dreams. Today, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Katherine Kelley on this incredible honor. I wish her the best of luck as she serves as an ambassador for our great State and thank her for her work in helping Nevada's students.●

RECOGNIZING HOWARD R. HUGHES COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING

• Mr. HELLER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, UNLV, Hughes College of Engineering for its incredible work in creating the Flexy-Hand 2 for 5-year-old Hailey Dawson. Hailey was born with Poland syndrome, making it extremely difficult to grip smaller items. The Flexy-Hand 2, a 3D-printed prosthetic device created by the UNLV engineering department, provides Hailey with new technology that addresses this difficulty, giving her the ability to participate in her favorite sport—baseball.

Hailey's mom, Yong Dawson, approached Brendan O'Toole, UNLV's chair of medical engineering, to ask if the department would be willing to create a prosthetic hand for her daughter. O'Toole was eager to take on the project, gathering students from UNLV and local high schools to help. The team has spent nearly 2 years working on the project and continues perfecting the device, including the addition of individual finger movement. Hailey's current Flexy-Hand 2 is the fourth version from the university. The technology fits her palm, connecting the fingers to her wrist, ultimately giving her control of her hand's grasping motion.

Hailey has now had two unique opportunities to show off her prosthetic hand, both throwing out the first pitch at a UNLV baseball game in March and at a Baltimore Orioles game in August. Hailey's mother contacted the Orioles

in pursuit of making her child's dreams a reality, asking them for a meet-up. In response, the team invited Hailey and her family to a game and allowed Hailey to throw the opening pitch. Before hitting the field, Hailey had the opportunity to meet Manny Machado and have her hand autographed.

I would like to congratulate Hailey on her participation in these unforgettable experiences and on an excellent first pitch. She is truly a shining example of positivity within the Las Vegas community.

I would also like to recognize UNLV's Howard R. Hughes College of Engineering and Brendan O'Toole for their hard work and dedication to improving the lives of others. This is an inspiring story and should stand as an example to the Nevada family. The team continues its work not only by fine tuning the Flexy-Hand 2 but also by connecting with other universities to raise awareness about the technology. I ask my colleagues to join me and all Nevadans in congratulating this incredible engineering department for its selfless work in helping a fellow Nevadan. I wish both the university and Hailey luck in all of their future endeavors.●

RECOGNIZING DR. YUICHI SHODA, DR. WALTER MISCHER, AND DR. PHILIP PEAKE

● Mrs. MURRAY. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Golden Goose Award, which recognizes researchers whose seemingly obscure, federally funded research has returned significant benefits to society.

In particular, I rise to celebrate 2015 Golden Goose Awardees Drs. Walter Mischel, Philip Peake, and Yuichi Shoda for the impact of their Marshmallow Test research. Their work—funded by the National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation—has had a significant impact on how we understand human behavior, how we educate our children, and even how we save for retirement.

These researchers used a simple test to measure pre-schoolers' self-control, offering children one marshmallow now or two if they could wait just 15 minutes alone with their prospective treat. They never expected to find that how children performed on this simple, silly-sounding test would be related to the children's future SAT scores, their propensity for obesity or drug addiction, and even the very chemistry of their brains.

In their followup study, Dr. Yuichi Shoda, now a professor at the University of Washington, found, based on reporting by parents and teachers, that children who had been able to wait longer for their extra treat at age 4 tended to show better adjustment in adolescence. They had more social and academic competence, were more able

to handle stress adeptly, and persisted better in goal pursuit in the face of frustration. The researchers, joined by many collaborators across an array of disciplines, have followed these children now for more than 30 years. They have documented correlations between the ability to delay and life outcomes as diverse as SAT scores, body-mass index, the frequency of drug abuse, and measurable differences in brain functioning, which are visible thanks to modern functional MRI techniques.

Today, Dr. Shoda is looking at how people can benefit from an awareness of the kinds of situations in which they excel at self-control and those in which they are most vulnerable to self-control failure.

Far from a story about fixed fates, their discoveries about the importance of self-control and how it can be cultivated today informs how we teach our children and helps us recognize the potential that lies in all of us. They have helped usher in a new age of understanding of human development and behavior. Our lives are the better for it. I am proud to stand in recognition of their work.●

RECOGNIZING MELANIE MASSEY PHYSICAL THERAPY

● Mr. VITTER. Mr. President, the folks who commit their lives to nursing people back to health provide tremendous benefit to their communities. Whether it is physical or speech therapy, providing community members with hope during a difficult time is a noble act, and one that is greatly appreciated, especially when those community members are children. This week's Small Business of the Week employs folks who provide therapy sessions to adults and children alike. I would like to recognize Melanie Massey Physical Therapy as Small Business of the Week for their commitment to providing exceptional health and therapy services to children in Monroe, West Monroe, Ruston, and Shreveport, LA.

Louisiana native Melanie Massey began her career as a physical therapist upon graduating from Louisiana State University School of Allied Health Sciences in 1993. Shortly after graduation, Melanie began working at LSU Medical Center in 1994, spending the majority of her time tending to wound and burn victims. However, she soon realized pediatric care was her passion. In 1995 with only 2 years of physical therapy experience, Melanie opened her own practice. Under the motto "Joyfully use your gifts to brighten the lives of others," Melanie began spending one-on-one time with her young patients, developing unique relationships with her clients and building a strong reputation attractive to patients and parents seeking top-notch therapy centers for their children. As her clientele grew, so did her

staff. Melanie has hired over 20 therapists and opened three more centers across north Louisiana within a few years of opening her business. Pediatric patients enjoy a multitude of events hosted by Melanie's clinics, such as boy's and girl's movie night and a summer camp that specializes in teaching handwriting, friendship building, and sensory integration. Today, the Melanie Massey Therapy team consists of full-time physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech therapists, as well as a full billing department that allows patients to receive the necessary care upon arrival worry free.

Melanie Massey Physical Therapy maintains a hopeful spirit and high-energy staff that continuously motivates their patients in reaching their recovery goals. Furthermore, Melanie encourages her staff to continue their education while employed in her physical therapy centers, ensuring her staff can be among the most highly trained therapists in north Louisiana.

The ability to help her patients overcome some of the most challenging hurdles in their young lives serves as an inspiration to all entrepreneurs who devote themselves to the well-being of their customers. Congratulations to Melanie Massey Physical Therapy and her team for being recognized as this week's Small Business of the Week.●

CONGRATULATING DENNIS AND RUTH DITCH

● Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I wish to offer my congratulations to Dennis and Ruth Ditch as they celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary on September 25. Dennis and Ruth are the parents of David Ditch, one of my staffers on the Budget Committee. They are also the parents of three daughters, Lori, Lynn, and Barbara, and have two grandchildren, Lana and Ginger.

Dennis and Ruth Ditch both grew up in western New York, and their five decades together demonstrate the best qualities of a married couple. They have supported one another in raising four children, moved cross country twice for work opportunities prior to settling in Bloomfield, NY, and spent 25 years operating a small business they started together. Their commitment to one another never wavered even during the trying period when Ruth underwent chemotherapy to overcome an aggressive form of lymphoma. In recent years, they have become leaders for Gideons International in their area.

As successful parents, entrepreneurs, and active members of their community, Dennis and Ruth Ditch exemplify the values that make America great, whether in my home State of Wyoming or in New York. I give them my best wishes for the future.●

REMEMBERING HARRY MCGRATH

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Mr. Harry P. McGrath, Sr., a Pennsylvanian and a close friend. Harry passed away unexpectedly on September 7, 2015.

Harry devoted his life to his family and to public service and advocacy. Following his graduation from Dunmore High School, where he was an outstanding student and athlete, and Kutztown University, he worked as a Special Agent in the U.S. Secret Service. During the 1980s he protected President Ronald Reagan and Vice President George H.W. Bush, earning commendations for his work in Grenada and the Khyber Pass. By the time he left the Secret Service to attend law school, he had earned special achievement and performance awards for his significant contributions to the agency's efficient operation.

After graduating cum laude from the Widener University School of Law, where he was a member of the Law Review, Harry continued his work in public service as a law clerk for Judge William J. Nealon in the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. He went on to become a distinguished lawyer in Northeastern Pennsylvania, admitted to practice law by the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals, and the U.S. District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania. He was a partner in the law firm of O'Malley, Harris, Durkin, and Perry PC and the founder of the McGrath Law Offices in Scranton. With his legal expertise, significant experience and sound judgement, Harry was an ideal person to serve as the chairman of my Judicial Selection for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

In addition to his work as a lawyer, Harry was also a strong advocate for Pennsylvania's children, as the solicitor for more than 30 years for the Scranton School District, representing students, parents, teachers, and administrators in matters of education and employment. He was passionate about his work on behalf of children with learning disabilities and other school-aged children in need. He was an early and strong supporter of the new Scranton High School Project and a past member of the Board of Directors of the Friendship House, an organization that provides quality programs and services designated to enhance the well-being of children and families in his community.

As much as public service and advocacy defined his career, politics was in Harry's blood. Named after his grandfather, the late Harry P. O'Neill, a U.S. Representative in the 1950s, Harry McGrath worked hard to elect candidates to public office, candidates in whom he believed. He served as Lackawanna County Democratic Party chairman and volunteered his time, talent,

and energy to countless campaigns throughout his life.

Despite his numerous accomplishments, the most important legacy Harry leaves behind is his family. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife of 33 years, Joell; their four children, Harry, Bob, Betsey, and Joe; his brothers and sisters; all of his nieces and nephews; and his many friends. I pray that God will give them strength and that Harry's life of family, faith, and service will continue to inspire them in the years ahead.●

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 12:32 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 23) to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 487. An act to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands.

H.R. 959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1214. An act to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1554. An act to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1949. An act to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia.

H.R. 2223. An act to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2791. An act to require that certain Federal lands be held in trust by the United States for the benefit of certain Indian tribes in Oregon, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, September 17, 2015, he had signed the fol-

lowing enrolled bill, previously signed by the Speaker of the House:

H.R. 720. An act to improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 487. An act to allow the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma to lease or transfer certain lands; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H.R. 959. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1214. An act to amend the Small Tracts Act to expand the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange small parcels of National Forest System land to enhance the management of the National Forest System, to resolve minor encroachments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

H.R. 1289. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire approximately 44 acres of land in Martinez, California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1554. An act to require a land conveyance involving the Elkhorn Ranch and the White River National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 1949. An act to provide for the consideration and submission of site and design proposals for the National Liberty Memorial approved for establishment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

H.R. 2223. An act to authorize, direct, expedite, and facilitate a land exchange in El Paso and Teller Counties, Colorado, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2915. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, notification of the Department's intent to close the Defense commissary store at Sugar Grove, West Virginia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2916. A communication from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs), Department of Defense, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2917. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of two (2) officers authorized to wear the insignia of

the grade of rear admiral (lower half) in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2918. A communication from the Acting Under Secretary of Defense (Personnel and Readiness), transmitting the report of ten (10) officers authorized to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general in accordance with title 10, United States Code, section 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2919. A communication from the Under Secretary of Defense (Acquisition, Technology and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, the quarterly exception Selected Acquisition Reports (SARs) as of June 30, 2015 (OSS-2015-1410); to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2920. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Venezuela that was originally declared in Executive Order 13692 of March 8, 2015; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2921. A copy of a complaint as required by section 403(a)(2) of the Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 2002 relative to the case of Republican Party of Louisiana, Jefferson Parish Republican Parish Executive Committee, and Orleans Parish Republican Executive Committee v. FEC; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2922. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park System, Lake Meredith National Recreation Area, Off-Road Motor Vehicles" (RIN1024-AD86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2923. A communication from the Deputy Director, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Pennsylvania Regulatory Program" ((SATS No. PA-159-FOR) (Docket No. OSM-2010-0017)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2924. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Kansas Regional Haze State Implementation Plan Revision and 2014 Five-Year Progress Report" (FRL No. 9933-84-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2925. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Control of NO_x Emissions From Large Stationary Internal Combustion Engines" (FRL No. 9934-00-Region 7) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2926. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmit-

ting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision" (FRL No. 9933-79-Region 6) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2927. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants for the Portland Cement Manufacturing Industry and Standards of Performance for Portland Cement Plants; Correction" ((RIN2060-AQ93) (FRL No. 9933-76-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2928. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New Hampshire; Nonattainment New Source Review and Prevention of Significant Deterioration Program" (FRL No. 9933-92-Region 1) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2929. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Carbon Pollution Emission Guidelines for Existing Stationary Sources: Electric Utility Generating Units" ((RIN2060-AR33) (FRL No. 9930-65-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2930. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standards of Performance for Greenhouse Gas Emissions from New, Modified, and Reconstructed Stationary Sources: Electric Generating Units" ((RIN2060-AQ91) (FRL No. 9930-66-OAR)) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 11, 2015; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2931. A communication from the Certifying Officer, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect Certain Debts Owed to States" ((RIN1530-AA02) (31 CFR Part 285.8)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2932. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Procedures for Requesting a Waiver of the Electronic Filing Requirements for Form 9955-SSA and Form 5500-EZ" (Rev. Proc. 2015-47) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2933. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Clarification of the

Coordination of the Transfer Pricing Rules with Other Code Provisions" ((RIN1545-BM72) (TD 9738)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2934. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "No-Rule on Certain Section 355 Transaction" (Rev. Proc. 2015-43) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2935. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revenue Procedure Applying the Controlled Group Rules to Certain Fund of Funds" (Rev. Proc. 2015-45) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2936. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Companion Notice to Rev. Proc. 2015-43 Announcing Issues Under Study and Requesting Comments" (Notice 2015-59) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2937. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Controlled Group Regulation Examples" ((RIN1545-BK96) (TD 9737)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2938. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Determination of Minimum Required Pension Contributions" ((RIN1545-BH71) (TD 9732)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 15, 2015; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2939. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1478); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2940. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Political-Military Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, an addendum to a certification of the proposed sale or export of defense articles and/or defense services to a Middle East country (OSS-2015-1479); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2941. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to revoking the designation of a group designated as a Foreign Terrorist Organization (OSS-2015-1480); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2942. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-091); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2943. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to

law, a report relative to sections 36(c) and 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act (DDTC 15-022); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2944. A communication from the Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2945. A communication from the Inspector General, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the Office of Inspector General's budget request for fiscal year 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2946. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on D.C. Act 21-148, "Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Support Act of 2015"; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-2947. A communication from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Board's 2015 Annual Report for fiscal year 2014; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2948. A communication from the Chief Impact Analyst, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Copayments for Medications in 2015" (RIN2900-AP15) received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 14, 2015; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

EC-2949. A communication from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Safety Zones; Cleveland Dragon Boat Festival and Head of the Cuyahoga, Cuyahoga River, Cleveland, OH" (RIN1625-AA00) (Docket No. USCG-2014-0082) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2950. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 7 Through No. 13" (RIN0648-XE020) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2951. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions No. 14 and No. 15" (RIN0648-XE054) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2952. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack" (RIN0648-XE028) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2953. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, De-

partment of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery" (RIN0648-XD984) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2954. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015" (RIN0648-BF03) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2955. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Purse Seine Fishing Restrictions During Closure Periods" (RIN0648-BF23) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2956. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Large Coastal and Small Coastal Atlantic Shark Management Measures; Final Rule" (RIN0648-BA17) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2957. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Omnibus Amendment to Simplify Vessel Baselines" (RIN0648-BB40) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 10, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2958. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coral, Coral Reefs, and Live/Hard Bottom Habitats of the South Atlantic Region; Amendment 8; Correction" (RIN0648-BD81) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 9, 2015; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1170. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the

United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-144).

By Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 2051. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GRASSLEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, without amendment:

S. 32. A bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. GRASSLEY for the Committee on the Judiciary.

Wilhelmina Marie Wright, of Minnesota, to be United States District Judge for the District of Minnesota.

John Michael Vazquez, of New Jersey, to be United States District Judge for the District of New Jersey.

Paula Xinis, of Maryland, to be United States District Judge for the District of Maryland.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELLER (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. HATCH, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BURR, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. BOOZMAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. SULLIVAN):

S. 2045. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on high cost employer-sponsored health coverage; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2046. A bill to authorize the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to issue an order continuing a stay of a hydroelectric license for the Mahoney Lake hydroelectric project in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2047. A bill to terminate the independent third-party program for sectors of the Northeast Multispecies Fishery unless the program is fully funded by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. HIRONO (for herself and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. 2048. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend authorities relating to homeless veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2049. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a continuing medical education program for non-Department

medical professionals who treat veterans and family members of veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical conditions common to veterans and family members of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. HEITKAMP:

S. 2050. A bill to provide for the establishment of a mechanism to allow borrowers of private education loans to refinance their loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2051. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. KLOBUCHAR (for herself and Mr. FRANKEN):

S. 2052. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to waive the requirement of certain veterans to make copayments for hospital care and medical services in the case of an error by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VITTER (for himself, Ms. BALDWIN, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2053. A bill to require the Secretary of Energy to award grants to expand programs in maritime and energy workforce technical training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 2054. A bill to improve Federal sentencing and corrections practices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. CASEY):

S. 2055. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to national health security; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 2056. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Volcano Early Warning and Monitoring System; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself, Mr. LEAHY, and Mr. PERDUE):

S. 2057. A bill providing for additional space for the protection and preservation of national collections held by the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. BURR (for himself and Mr. TILLIS):

S. 2058. A bill to require the Secretary of Commerce to maintain and operate at least one Doppler weather radar site within 55 miles of each city in the United States that has a population of more than 700,000 individuals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI:

S. 2060. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize and extend the Fetal Alcohol Syndrome prevention and

services program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mrs. ERNST (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BURR, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HELLER, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEE, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WICKER, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. MCCONNELL):

S.J. Res. 22. A joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. GARDNER):

S. Res. 257. A resolution congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. PETERS):

S. Res. 258. A resolution designating the week of September 20 through 26, 2015, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI,

Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER):

S. Res. 259. A resolution honoring the bravery and heroism of those who selflessly prevented a deadly terrorist attack and saved countless lives while aboard a passenger train bound from Amsterdam to Paris on August 21, 2015; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 32

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, a bill to provide the Department of Justice with additional tools to target extraterritorial drug trafficking activity, and for other purposes.

S. 258

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 258, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the 96-hour physician certification requirement for inpatient critical access hospital services.

S. 338

At the request of Mr. BURR, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 338, a bill to permanently reauthorize the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 563

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. SULLIVAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 563, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish the Physician Ambassadors Helping Veterans program to seek to employ physicians at the Department of Veterans Affairs on a without compensation basis in practice areas and specialties with staffing

shortages and long appointment waiting times.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. McCAIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) were added as cosponsors of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 865

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 865, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the disability compensation evaluation procedure of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for veterans with mental health conditions related to military sexual trauma, and for other purposes.

S. 901

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 901, a bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a national center for research on the diagnosis and treatment of health conditions of the descendants of veterans exposed to toxic substances during service in the Armed Forces that are related to that exposure, to establish an advisory board on such health conditions, and for other purposes.

S. 928

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 928, a bill to reauthorize the World Trade Center Health Program and the September 11th Victim Compensation Fund of 2001, and for other purposes.

S. 1056

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1056, a bill to eliminate racial profiling by law enforcement, and for other purposes.

S. 1099

At the request of Mr. SCOTT, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. BARRASSO) were added as cosponsors of S. 1099, a bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to provide States with flexibility in determining the size of employers in the small group market.

S. 1212

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Montana

(Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1212, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the Small Business Act to expand the availability of employee stock ownership plans in S corporations, and for other purposes.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1387

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1387, a bill to amend title XVI of the Social Security Act to update eligibility for the supplemental security income program, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1598

At the request of Mr. LEE, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1598, a bill to prevent discriminatory treatment of any person on the basis of views held with respect to marriage.

S. 1631

At the request of Mr. SANDERS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1631, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to multiemployer pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1632, a bill to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

S. 1867

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN) and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BOOZMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1867, a bill to protect children from exploitation by providing advance notice of intended travel by registered sex offenders outside the United States to the government of the country of destination, requesting foreign governments to notify the United States when a known sex offender is seeking to enter the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1890

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1890, a bill to amend chapter 90 of title 18, United States Code, to provide Federal jurisdiction for the theft of trade secrets, and for other purposes.

S. 1911

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, her name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1911, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1945

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) were added as cosponsors of S. 1945, a bill to make available needed psychiatric, psychological, and supportive services for individuals with mental illness and families in mental health crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BOOZMAN, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1966, a bill to amend the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act to require alternative options for program delivery.

S. 2001

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2001, a bill to phase out special wage certificates under section 14(c) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 that allow individuals with disabilities to be paid at subminimum wage rates.

S. 2015

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER)

were added as cosponsors of S. 2015, a bill to clarify the treatment of two or more employers as joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act.

S. 2032

At the request of Mr. HOEVEN, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2032, a bill to adopt the bison as the national mammal of the United States.

S. 2042

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 2042, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to strengthen protections for employees wishing to advocate for improved wages, hours, or other terms or conditions of employment and to provide for stronger remedies for interference with these rights, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 143

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 143, a resolution supporting efforts to ensure that students have access to debt-free higher education.

S. RES. 217

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the names of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 217, a resolution designating October 8, 2015, as "National Hydrogen and Fuel Cell Day".

AMENDMENT NO. 2656

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, a joint resolution amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, her name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2656 proposed to H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CARPER:

S. 2051. A bill to improve, sustain, and transform the United States Postal Service; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

Mr. CARPER. Mr. President, one of the factors in creating a favorable environment for job creation and job preservation is, of all things, something that has been around for 200 years to 225 years, and that is the U.S. Postal Service. Not many people think of the Postal Service as part of the engine that helps drive our economy, but it is.

There are 7 to 8 million jobs that flow directly from work directly involved or indirectly involved with the Postal Service—7 to 8 million jobs. For a number of years, the Postal Service has been losing money. There are a lot of questions about whether they will be able to make it, whether they will be able to survive, whether they are going to contribute or simply fold up and go away.

So I would note that another priority of mine for years has been postal reform. My dance partner on this for a number of years was Senator SUSAN COLLINS, a Republican and a very capable leader, and for the last several years Tom Coburn, a Republican from Oklahoma—Dr. Coburn—who retired at the end of last year. We have worked with a lot of folks—Democrats and Republicans in the House and Senate—in the last couple of years to try to find a way not just to make the Postal Service relevant but to enable them to be successful. And one of our real challenges has been how to take a 200-plus-year-old network—a legacy delivery network that goes to every mailbox in this country, business or residential—and enable them to make money in a digital age in the 21st century.

A lot of us are buying stuff differently than we used to. We are paying our bills differently than we used to. We don't send a whole lot of first-class mail the way we used to.

When I was a naval flight officer in Southeast Asia for three tours, the best day of the week was when the mail came. We would get all kinds of letters from home. We would get all kinds of postcards, birthday cards—you name it—Father's Day cards, and Valentine's Day cards. We would get magazines, and we would get newspapers. It was the best day of the week. Today, our folks in the Armed Forces are deployed to Afghanistan or other places around the world, and they still get mail, but it is not as important for them as it was for us because they have Skype, they have cell phones, and they have the Internet. They have other ways to communicate.

The challenge for the Postal Service has been, in a day and age where we communicate very differently than we did during the last war—than we do, say, in the war we have been involved in in Afghanistan for some time now—how do they make money? How do they remain relevant? They are starting to get it. The Postal Service today—I think it was at 3 a.m. this morning—

the Postal Service, in 33 ZIP Codes in San Francisco, delivered groceries. They use vehicles that otherwise would have been used between 3 a.m. and 7 a.m. The folks who work for the Postal Service have access to apartments and high rises to actually deliver groceries. And I think they are delivering for Amazon in those 33 ZIP codes. I think they have been trying it out for a while, and things are going pretty well. The Postal Service has turned around and has contacted 100 other grocery chains around the country. They said: This is what we are doing for Amazon, and we could probably do this for you and help you and help serve customers in a different kind of way.

This morning, in a place in Delaware, just around Middletown, DE, which is north of Dover, the Postal Service, literally during the middle of the night—or rather Amazon with the Postal Service in the middle of the night combined to take items from that Amazon distribution center in Middletown, DE, and literally drop off, all over the Northeast, the mid-Atlantic—all over the region—drop off items that are going to be delivered today. These are all kinds of products that were ordered through Amazon yesterday on the Internet, by phone, and so forth, and they are being delivered literally today. The Postal Service has a big hand in that.

Also, we have FedEx and UPS. A lot of folks think of FedEx and UPS as competitors of the Postal Service, and in a way they are, but they are also very good partners together. It works this way. FedEx doesn't want to deliver to every mailbox in the country, especially in the more rural areas where there is a lot of separation and, frankly, it is costly to do that. FedEx doesn't want to do it, and UPS doesn't want to do it. But guess who goes every day—6 days a week, sometimes 7—to pretty much every mailbox in the country? It is 6 days a week. Well, it is the Postal Service. So there has been a partnership for a number of years now where the Postal Service delivers for UPS and for FedEx the last mile, the last 2 miles, the last 5 miles, 10 miles, the last 20 miles. The Postal Service makes some money doing that, and it helps FedEx and UPS maybe save some money. And when the Postal Service sends its packages by air mail, it actually will partner with FedEx or UPS in order to be able to move its products around the country in an expeditious way.

So those are some things that are happening around the country that most people aren't thinking about or mindful about, some ways the Postal Service is becoming more involved in the digital age.

Christmas is still 3 months or so away, but as people start thinking about Christmas shopping, holiday shopping, in a lot of cases they are

going to get on the phone and get on the Internet and order. Those packages they are ordering are going to have to be delivered by somebody, and the Postal Service is one of those somebodies.

I think the last time we saw the numbers—while first-class mail continues to trend down by a couple of percent per year, what is going up—I think the last time we saw 12 to 14 percent a year—is delivery packages and parcels. So the Postal Service is finding out how to be relevant even in the digital age in ways they haven't thought about before.

There are other things they could do. Among those things is they could deliver wine and beer. UPS does that, and FedEx does that. The postal service does that in Australia. I think they make maybe \$5 billion a year doing that. I would like to say Australia doesn't have as many people as we do; they just drink more. But there is lots of money to be made by the Postal Service here, and I don't know of any reason why we shouldn't allow them to be involved in that business as well, with appropriate safeguards and as long as States approve of that activity.

Those are some things I would mention about the Postal Service.

The other thing I would say is that over the past couple of years, even though we found it difficult to pass legislation, one of the things the Postal Service has done on their own is they have tried to rightsize the enterprise to reflect the delivery—less—of first-class mail and the delivery of a little bit lower amounts of what we call standard mail, which could be nonprofits using the mail, it could be for-profits, it could be all kinds of stuff, but it is not first-class mail.

But one of the things the Postal Service has sought to do is to look at their workforce and say: In a day and age when we have to deliver a lot less mail, do we still need the same number of full-time employees?

They decided the answer is no, and I think their full-time equivalents are I would say down by a third from where it was about a decade ago.

The number of mail-processing centers across the country is down by about half, from maybe 600 to 300.

The number of post offices really hasn't changed a whole lot. They have over 30,000, maybe closer to 40,000 post offices around the country, some active, large, vibrant, and some small, rural, not a lot of activity, but important to those communities.

What the Postal Service has done with a number of their smaller post offices is basically they have said to the communities: You know, there is not a lot going on in your post offices. Are the amount of stamps and revenues generated by post offices really enough to make it worthwhile to run this post office 6 days a week, 8 to 10 hours a day?

What they have done is they have sort of presented a menu—the Postal Service has presented a menu to communities and said: You can't have a 6-day-a-week, 8- to 10-hour-a-day post office in your community, but you can have a post office if you want, maybe 4 hours a day, 6 hours a day.

The person running it would be maybe a contract employee, maybe not a full-time employee with full benefits but someone maybe making \$15 an hour. For some people, that is pretty good money. And then the communities would still end up with their post offices. Or maybe the post office should be a rural letter carrier driving around on his or her route in the rural part of a county or a State. It would literally be a post office on wheels, a little bit like a bookmobile was when I was a kid growing up. Everybody on that route would know that rural letter carrier was going to be here or there throughout the day and be there to take packages or to provide stamps or to send mail or to provide services that you would normally get in a post office in a more urban, suburban area.

But long story short, the Postal Service has done a fair amount to reduce—I am tempted to call it—the size of their enterprise and the cost of their enterprise. There are fewer full-time-equivalent employees, fewer mail-processing centers. And while they still have a lot of post offices, a number of them—maybe one out of every five or so, one out of every four—is a post office that may be open 2 hours a day, 4 hours a day, 6 hours a day instead of 8 hours a day or 10 hours a day.

Today I am introducing legislation that seeks to enable the Postal Service, which is still—actually, if you didn't consider one factor, which is that the Postal Service is required by law to put money aside to meet a liability that most private companies and almost every State and local government and the Federal Government, too, have not addressed, and that is the health care liability of their pensioners.

Back in the late 1990s when I was Governor of Delaware—we had worked for years—Governor Pete DuPont, Governor Mike Castle, and my administration—to move from the State with the worst credit rating in America to a State with an AAA credit rating. In my next to last year as Governor, 1999, Delaware—in 1977 we had the worst credit rating in the country, and in 1999 we earned AAA credit ratings across the board—Standard & Poor's, Moody's, and Fitch. It was a day of great jubilation. But even after they awarded us our AAA credit ratings, they said to us: You have a problem, Delaware. And as it turned out, so did 49 other States. That is because while we had a fully funded pension fund, we had not set aside any money for a significant cost of the pensioners, and

that is their health care costs once they reached the age of 65. And most employers in the country, those employers of any consequence, when their retirees reach the age of 65, and DuPont company is a great example—my wife had a wonderful 27-year career with them, but when DuPont's retirees reach the age of 65, the DuPont company doesn't say: To heck with you. We are going to forget you.

They still try to meet their moral obligation to provide their employees a pension and access to health care. Part of that is Medicare. DuPont, and frankly almost any company of any consequence, says to their employees reaching the age of 65: Alright, you are 65, you are eligible for Medicare Part A, Medicare Part B, Medicare Part D, and we expect retirees 65 or older to use it—to sign up and use it. It is a requirement. And if that doesn't cover all their medical needs—and it probably will not—a lot of companies will continue to provide a wraparound supplemental program to fill in the holes that are left unfilled by Medicare Part A, Part B, and Part D.

Well, as it turns out, postal retirees, when they reach the age of 65 and are eligible for Medicare, most of them sign up for Medicare Part A, a majority sign up for Medicare Part B—one of those is hospital care and the other inpatient and the other outpatient doctor care—but almost none of them sign up for Medicare Part D, as in "delta." Part D is a drug program for Medicare that has been around for close to 13, 14 years now. It has been a huge success—a huge success.

But while the postal service pays into Medicare, I think more than maybe any other employer in the country—they pay more money, I think, than any other employer in the country. I think the postal service is their No. 1 or No. 2 business in terms of full-time employees. And while they pay a ton of money into Medicare, they do not get full value. In fact, in effect, the postal service is actually overpaying to bring down the Medicare costs for other employers, including FedEx and UPS and DuPont, for that matter.

So the question is: Is that right? Is that fair? Is that equitable to the postal service? Is it fair to their employees and their pension? I don't think so, and neither did Dr. Coburn in the last Congress when we offered legislation that said this should be fixed. The postal service ought to be treated like other companies. They ought to be able to get full value for the contributions they make into Medicare.

That is something that should be part of postal reform legislation. It is part of the legislation I am introducing today, and it was part of the legislation we introduced a year ago.

Another important part of the legislation we are introducing today deals with the rates the postal service can

charge. There was something after the last recession called an exigent rate case. The postal service's businesses were badly damaged. A lot of businesses that used first-class mail fled first-class mail and found a way to use the Internet and to replace the use of first-class mail, which had a severely damaging impact on the postal service. The postal service asked for an exigent rate case, which gave them an opportunity or a way to raise their rates a bit. The question is, Is that going to be forever or is it going to go away?

We have been negotiating, with the help of a guy named John Kane, a member of our staff on the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, an agreement with the postal service and with some mailers and others that are interested in these issues to enable the exigent rate case to stay in place for a couple more years, and then we will go through a new process or an existing process to establish a new postal rate for the postal service to charge. But this provides some stability over the next couple of years.

I will not go through the whole bill, but let me just say that the idea behind our legislation is to enable the postal service to have reasonable revenues to be successful, to enable them to be treated fairly and I think equitably with respect to their payments into Medicare for their retirees, to also enable them to be more creative, and to find ways to use that 200-plus-year-old distribution network in order to make money—in order to make money.

There are lots of other ideas as well, with the kind of stuff that happened this morning in those 33 zip codes in San Francisco and the kind of work that will happen tonight at the Amazon distribution center in Middletown, DE, and a lot of other places on this side of the United States.

This is legislation I am introducing on my own. We have worked with stakeholders, which includes certainly the postal service, certainly includes a lot of the customers—not every one of their customers—and includes the employee groups—the unions, the groups that represent postmasters—and other people as well—regular customers, residential customers, business customers. So we are introducing legislation, and my hope is that it will serve as a catalyst for a good conversation and a much needed consensus to say this is where we are headed on postal reform in 2015 and beyond.

I have never introduced a perfect bill, and I am not introducing probably a perfect bill now. But I think it is a pretty piece of legislation. We have listened to a lot of folks, and we have listened to a lot of folks who serve here with us in the Senate—Democrats, Republicans, folks on the committee and off the committee—and it is my hope we will have a chance to kick the tires

on this new piece of legislation I have introduced and somewhere fairly soon be able to have a hearing so folks can come and say: This is what I like about it or don't like about the legislation, and they will decide ways to make it even better.

I like to say that everything I do I know I can do better. But as it says in the Constitution, “in order to form a more perfect union”—in the preamble of the Constitution, “in order to form a more perfect union”—our goal will be to form a more perfect postal service and hopefully form a more perfect piece of legislation. The real goal is to enable the postal service to be more successful—to enable them, and not be running them down all the time.

We have great people who work for the postal service. They deliver mail in my neighborhood and probably yours as well. There are folks who are going to work right now in the postal service. They will be up late tonight sorting mail and making sure it will be ready to be delivered tomorrow. We have people who will be working tomorrow and Saturday delivering the mail. We will have folks delivering some mail, priority mail, some of it on Sunday. The postal service is not just a 6-day operation today. They deliver a lot of packages and parcels now on Sunday.

Our legislation is designed to enable those folks to be more innovative, to unleash the innovative spirit within the postal service, and to bring ideas in from a lot of other folks to help the postal service in that regard.

I think that pretty well covers my talking points. Mr. President, I ask that, after you have had a chance to get a good rest this weekend, to maybe take a look. I will come and visit you, maybe tell you what we are doing here, and see if you would like to join us somewhere down the road as a cosponsor or at least be a constructive critic. Either role would be very welcome.

Today I am introducing the Improving Postal Operations, Service and Transparency Act of 2015, known as the iPOST Act. As my colleagues here in the Senate know, the way we communicate as a society has changed dramatically over the past 20 years. Instead of sending a letter to loved ones overseas, we send a Facebook message or Skype. Instead of sending our bills every month, we go online and enter our billing information. Instead of flipping through a catalogue, we visit the retail store's website. But while the way we communicate and conduct business has changed, we still require a vibrant, financially sound, and sustainable postal system. The United States Postal Service continues to be a critical enabler of communications and commerce that maintains a unique delivery network that connects every community, town, and city in this country and with posts around the world.

The Postal Service is a more than 200 year-old institution that today serves as the linchpin of a \$1 trillion dollar mailing industry employing more than 8.4 million people. It is the nexus between consumers and businesses as diverse as Hallmark, Amazon, small town newspapers, and mail-order pharmacies. Over the years, the Postal Service has been a resilient institution that has consistently adjusted with the times and adapting when necessary to remain a vital part of our Nation's economic infrastructure and really our everyday lives. Many would agree that, though much has changed in our country and our economy since the formation of the Postal Service, the need for an efficient and secure transfer of communications and goods has not. Nevertheless, the growing trend toward digital communication, the Postal Service's significant long-term financial liabilities, and the continued decline of First Class mail volume are threatening the future viability of this federal establishment enshrined in the Constitution. Thus, it is incumbent upon Congress to give the Postal Service the tools necessary to address its growing costs and modernize so it can remain relevant for generations to come.

Two American industries that have also undergone major disruption in the past and survived to live another day offer parallels to the Postal Service's current predicament. The U.S. freight rail industry faced disruption from the trucking industry and had significant overcapacity beginning in the 1950s. Three interrelated components helped the freight rail industry recover: a focus on improving productivity, containing costs, and generating revenue. Likewise, the U.S. auto industry has faced similar challenges: overcapacity, too many suppliers, and a declining market share. The freight rail and auto industries both have come roaring back to life and profitability. But it's important to note that they did so in part thanks to helpful legislative reform.

While containing costs, generating revenue, and improving productivity are certainly part of the postal reform equation and something postal management must continue to focus on, we must do our part to bring badly needed structural reforms to the Postal Service's business model and ensure long-term stability in the years to come.

Originally, the Postal Service was a federal department that required annual appropriations from Congress. In 1971, Congress passed legislation to make the Postal Service an “independent establishment of the executive branch,” designed to run as a self-sustaining entity that would cover its operating costs with revenues produced through sales, including postage and related products and services. Hence, the modern version of the Postal Service was born.

As time passed, Postal Service reforms became necessary to create stability in the agency and to ensure that the American taxpayer and the business community would continue to benefit from its products and services. In an effort to address these needs, Congress enacted the Postal Accountability and Enhancement Act of 2006, PAEA. When PAEA was signed into law a decade ago, First-Class Mail volume was peaking at 213 billion pieces, the postal workforce was composed of almost 700,000 career employees and the e-commerce market was in its infancy with a value of just over \$100 billion annually.

Unfortunately, passage of the PAEA came at the cusp of immense change in the mailing industry, and also our economy as a whole. The significant advancement in digital communication that continued through the recession, the steady decline in First-Class Mail and Standard Mail volume, and the rising costs associated with longstanding healthcare and retirement obligations created a tumultuous relationship between Postal Service revenues and costs.

In the decade since passage of PAEA, total Postal Service mail volume has fallen some 27 percent to 155 billion pieces, the career workforce is 30 percent smaller and the booming domestic e-commerce market is now valued at more than \$300 billion. The effects of the Great Recession in 2008 had a tremendous impact on the mailing industry, and by extension the Postal Service's bottom line. To combat these effects, the Postal Regulatory Commission approved a temporary emergency rate increase, which has been the primary reason for the Postal Service's positive operating income over the past 2 years.

I have worked on postal issues with various colleagues for a large part of my time in the United States Senate. Further, I have been working on postal reform diligently since 2010 when it became apparent that the future of the Postal Service was in jeopardy. Last Congress, former Senator Tom Coburn and I introduced a package that we felt moved the Postal Service forward and solved the long term problems that plague it. Unfortunately, that bill did not pass and in January the Postal Service was forced to change its delivery standards. Since then, service has noticeably declined.

I have worked diligently with my colleagues and a wide range of postal stakeholders including postal consumers, the mailing industry, postal labor unions, and Postal Service leadership for the last eight months on a compromise proposal. The legislation I have introduced is a starting point in making sure the Postal Service remains relevant in the digital age by achieving financial viability and better meeting our communication and com-

merce needs. I will continue to work with all interested parties, my colleagues in the Senate and the House, including Chairman RON JOHNSON of the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, and the Administration to build on, perfect, and revise this legislation going forward. I am confident that the Postal Service can turn this corner and remain relevant in the decades to come, but it is going to take collaboration, communication, and compromise from all stakeholders and Congress to make that happen.

The Improving Postal Operations, Service and Transparency Act, iPOST Act, will set the path to make solvency possible and fix the Postal Service's financial and other challenges for the long-term. In particular iPOST Act would ensure that our federal pension systems recognize the differences between the postal and non-postal federal workforce to prevent the Postal Service from paying more than it owes into the federal retirement systems, as has happened in the past.

The iPOST Act would restructure the way the Postal Service funds its remaining liability for retiree healthcare by scrapping the existing, unaffordable payment schedule and replacing it with a system with realistic payment goals that would allow the Postal Service to invest over the next 10 years in a more lucrative TSP-like account. Combined, these provisions would help the Postal Service and taxpayers by paying down the Postal Service's long-term retiree health obligations sooner.

The iPOST Act would create a Postal Service Health Benefits Program, PSHBP, within the Federal Employee Health Benefits Plan, FEHBP, and require that all Medicare-eligible postal annuitants and employees enroll in Medicare parts A, B, and D. This would ensure better coordination between PSHBP and Medicare than we see with FEHBP and Medicare today and allow the Postal Service to reap the full benefit of the resources it and its employees pay into Medicare.

The iPOST Act would require an independent analysis of the recent network changes put into place by the Postal Service and how service can be improved, particularly in rural areas. The bill further proposes a pause in the Postal Service's network optimization efforts for 2 years for plants and 5 years for post offices to ensure a stabilization of service for all postal customers.

The iPOST Act would provide customers big and small with better transparency into how the Postal Service performs for them regardless of whether they live in a large city, a suburban development, or a remote rural area.

The iPOST Act would make the current temporary emergency rate increase permanent while freezing any further rate increases until a new rate

system can be established by the Postal Regulatory Commission by January 1, 2018.

The iPOST Act would allow the Postal Service, based on meeting certain conditions, to introduce new non-postal products and services, ship beer, wine and distilled spirits, and partner with State and local governments in providing government services.

In introducing this bill, I invite all interested stakeholders from around the country, whether they happen to be residents of rural, urban, or suburban communities, businesses that use the mail broadly or individual customers of the Postal Service, to come to the table and work with Congress on a viable path forward. I encourage the mailing industry, the postal unions, and Postal Service management to continue to discuss reform measures and to view this bill as a possible path forward to consensus. To my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I look forward to working with you to make what I think is a good bill even better. Again, introduction is the first step in this process. I am committed to working together to find consensus on this legislation and fix the serious, but solvable challenges facing the Postal Service.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARDIN):

S. 2059. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income amounts received on account of claims based on certain unlawful discrimination and to allow income averaging for backpay and frontpay awards received on account of such claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act of 2015. I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague from Maryland, Senator CARDIN, in introducing this bipartisan bill.

This bill would change the taxation of awards received by individuals that result from judgments in or settlements of employment discrimination and civil rights cases, and would apply to victims in cases including racial discrimination, sexual discrimination, and whistleblower discrimination. These changes would correct an inequity in current law and are designed to promote the fair and equitable settlement of such claims.

In 2003, I introduced the Civil Rights Tax Relief Act. In 2004, Congress adopted the most important part of that bill, allowing successful plaintiffs in civil rights actions to deduct the portion of their awards covering attorneys' fees from their annual incomes. This provision eliminated the double-taxation of such fees, which are still taxable income to the attorney. Two important provisions from my 2003 bill, which I will describe in a moment, have yet to

be addressed, and the bill we introduce today would enact them.

The primary purpose of the bill we are introducing today is to remedy an unintended consequence of a 1996 law, which made damage awards that are not based on “physical injuries or physical sickness” part of a plaintiff’s taxable income. Because most acts of employment discrimination and civil rights violations do not cause physical injuries, this provision has had a direct and negative impact on plaintiffs who successfully prove that they have been subjected to intentional employment discrimination or other intentional violations of their civil rights.

Our bill would remedy the unfair method of taxation of civil rights victims’ settlements and court awards with respect to “frontpay” and “backpay,” and with respect to the taxation of noneconomic damages. By way of background, I should explain that awards of compensation attributable to the difference between what the employee was paid and the amount he or she should have been paid are known as “backpay.” “Frontpay” represents the future wages and benefits that would have been paid had the former employee not been terminated or had the employee not been forced to resign.

Our bill contains two important reforms: First, award amounts for frontpay or backpay would continue to be included as taxable income, but would be eligible for income averaging according to the time period covered by the award. This correction would allow individuals to pay taxes at the same marginal rates that would have applied to them had they not suffered discrimination. Income averaging more fairly takes into account the person’s financial standing apart from the lump sum of the award.

Second, the bill would also allow plaintiffs to exclude non-economic damages, amounts awarded for pain, suffering or other health effects, from their income, to treat employment and civil rights claims the same as claims that involve a physical injury.

The Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act would encourage the fair settlement of employment discrimination claims. Our legislation would allow both plaintiffs and defendants to settle claims based on the damages suffered, not on the excessive taxes that are now levied—taxation that adds insult to a civil rights victim’s injury and serves as a barrier to the just settlement of civil rights claims.

I invite my colleagues to join Senator CARDIN and me in support of this bipartisan, common sense legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT LAWYERS

ASSOCIATION,

SEPTEMBER 16, 2015.

Re: Introduction of the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act

Hon. SUSAN M. COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the National Employment Lawyers Association (NELA) we commend and thank you for your leadership in introducing the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act of 2015 (CJTFA). Your interest in this bill demonstrates the kind of vision that is increasingly rare—the vision that it is possible to find solutions to pressing problems that are beneficial to both America’s workers and employers.

Founded in 1985, NELA is the largest professional membership organization in the country comprised of lawyers who represent employees in labor, employment, and civil rights disputes. NELA advances employee rights and serves lawyers who advocate for equality and justice in the American workplace. With 69 circuit, state, and local affiliates, NELA has a membership of over 4,000 attorneys working on behalf of those who have faced illegal treatment in the workplace. There has been unanimity among our members for nearly 20 years that passage of the Civil Justice Tax Fairness Act is a top legislative priority.

The CJTFA has significant ramifications for people who have been harmed by illegal treatment in their workplace. No one starts a new job with any thought that they will find themselves in a subsequent legal dispute with their employer, yet this is unfortunately a reality for America’s workers. The CJTFA, which has been known as the Civil Rights Tax Fairness Act and the Civil Rights Tax Relief Act in prior Congresses, is a “win-win” for both employees and business. Previous versions of the CJTFA garnered widespread support by a broad-based coalition of business, civil rights, and legal organizations such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (USCC), the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM), the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (LCHHR), and the American Bar Association (ABA). At present, we have the support of the ABA and we know that many other organizations will be joining us in the near future.

The CJTFA will correct current inequities in tax treatment of settlements and awards received by individuals in employment and civil rights cases. Under current law, those who suffer noneconomic damages as a result of unfair employment practices pay taxes; those who suffer noneconomic damages as a result of physical injuries (such as from car accidents) do not. The CJTFA will correct this unfairness by excluding from gross income non-economic damages received in civil rights and employment cases.

Similarly, employees who have not lost wages pay taxes at the rates applicable to the actual wages they earned in each year. But if they receive back or front pay in a settlement or award, they must pay taxes on lump sum recoveries that represent multiple years of such pay—a patently unfair practice. The CJTFA will correct this unfairness by taxing lump sum recoveries as if they were received in the year earned and by providing an exemption from the alternative minimum tax (AMT) for any resulting tax benefit.

By making settlements less expensive and easier to achieve, the CJTFA will reduce the number of employment and civil rights cases that go to trial, freeing up valuable court re-

sources for other matters. The CJTFA not only benefits the parties to employment disputes, but also America’s taxpayers who must bear the costs associated with a less efficient judicial system.

On behalf of our 69 affiliates, 4,000 members, and the hundreds of thousands of employees they represent, we are extremely pleased that you are championing this important bipartisan, bicameral legislation. We look forward to working closely with you and your staff to gain passage of the CJTFA in the 114th Congress.

Sincerely,

TERISA E. CHAW,
Executive Director.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 257—CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN KRISTEN GRIEST AND FIRST LIEUTENANT SHAYE HAVER ON THEIR GRADUATION FROM RANGER SCHOOL

Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. BOXER, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. FISCHER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. HIRONO, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mrs. MURRAY, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. WARREN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. KIRK, Mr. TESTER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. WARNER, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FRANKEN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. COONS, Mr. THUNE, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. GARDNER) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 257

Whereas United States Army Rangers “Lead the Way!” and have played a decisive role in military engagements since before the Revolutionary War;

Whereas Ranger School prepares members of the Armed Forces to serve as leaders and members of elite combat forces tasked with dismounted infantry, airborne, airmobile, amphibious, and independent squad and platoon-size operations;

Whereas Ranger School is one of the toughest training courses for which a member can volunteer, with three phases testing a member’s ability to patrol, navigate, mountaineer, and execute combat arms functional skills;

Whereas students in Ranger School train to exhaustion, pushing the limits of their minds and bodies;

Whereas although many members apply to Ranger School, fewer than 45 percent, on average, possess the mental and physical toughness required to earn the highly coveted Ranger tab signifying graduation from the School;

Whereas Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver braved the rigors of Ranger School, becoming the first women to successfully earn the Ranger tab;

Whereas they stood shoulder-to-shoulder with their fellow members, carrying their own weight and, at times, the weight of others;

Whereas their personal courage, sacrifices, and extraordinary leadership skills establish

them as role models for women and men alike, proving that skill, not gender, determines military aptitude and success; and

Whereas, as graduates of the United States Military Academy, they exemplify the time-honored creed of "Duty, Honor, Country", and will continue to shape the future of our military and the Rangers in the years to come: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and recognizes the patriotism and historic contributions to the United States by Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver;

(2) commends their character, courage, and tenacity as the first women to earn the Ranger tab signifying graduation from Ranger School;

(3) recognizes that our military and our country are more battle ready as a result of their accomplishments;

(4) celebrates their service as they continue to "Lead the Way!" as our nation's newest United States Army Rangers; and

(5) congratulates them for their inspiring and groundbreaking accomplishments.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to honor and congratulate CPT Kristen Griest and 1LT Shaye Haver for their historic accomplishment of being the first two women soldiers to complete U.S. Army Ranger School and earn their highly coveted Ranger tabs.

Earning the right to wear a Ranger tab is not for the faint-hearted. The rigors of the course test even the strongest servicemembers. Many try; few succeed.

Through their grit and determination, Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver have demonstrated that character, courage, and tenacity, not gender, are the hallmarks of great servicemembers and leaders.

Just as teamwork and dedication are the benchmarks for military effectiveness, they are also the mandates of the U.S. Army Rangers who are tasked with our Nation's most challenging and difficult missions. Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, along with their fellow Ranger School classmates, braved the challenges and serve as role models for girls and boys—women and men—in the United States and around the world. This integrated class answered our Nation's call to service. They stood shoulder-to-shoulder, enduring the course's extreme mental and physical stress, together. Each carried his or her own weight, and at times the weight of others, proving that integration represents not just a lofty goal, but an achievable reality. Their collective and distinguished accomplishments embody the values of our Armed Forces and our Nation.

The journey toward integration, however, has been hard fought. Before them, the first African Americans and women who answered the call to service laid the foundation for making integration possible. These pioneers inherently understood the importance of their contributions to the realization of integration. They also recognized the undeniable truth that an integrated and balanced force is a successful force both on and off the battlefield.

The effectiveness of a military unit is almost always determined by the cohesion of its individual members, their dedication to the team, and their commitment to the mission. No individual servicemember can succeed by his or her efforts alone. Success is forged from equality and integration.

As we celebrate Captain Griest's and Lieutenant Haver's historic and inspiring achievements, we express our pride and gratitude for their personal courage and sacrifice. I am confident that the military and our country are more battle ready as a result. I am also confident that Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver will continue to serve with distinction as they "Lead the Way!" as our Nation's newest U.S. Army Rangers. As a result of their milestone achievements, they have inspired a nation.

With this in mind, I am pleased to offer this resolution with Senators MIKULSKI, AYOTTE, BALDWIN, BOXER, CANTWELL, CAPITO, ERNST, FEINSTEIN, FISCHER, GILLIBRAND, HEITKAMP, HIRONO, KLOBUCHAR, MCCASKILL, MURKOWSKI, MURRAY, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, WARREN, PERDUE, MURPHY, KIRK, TESTER, FLAKE, REED, DONNELLY, GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL, ISAKSON, WARNER, LEAHY, FRANKEN, RUBIO, HEINRICH, COONS, THUNE, and MERKLEY honoring and recognizing the patriotism and historic contributions to the United States by Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, and extend my best wishes and heartiest congratulations.

SENATE RESOLUTION 258—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF SEPTEMBER 20 THROUGH 26, 2015, AS "NATIONAL ADULT EDUCATION AND FAMILY LITERACY WEEK"

Mrs. MURRAY (for herself, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. REED, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. PETERS) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 258

Whereas the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development reports that approximately 36,000,000 adults in the United States lack the basic literacy and numeracy necessary to succeed at home, in the workplace, and in society;

Whereas the literacy of the people of the United States is essential for the economic and societal well-being of the United States;

Whereas the United States reaps the economic benefits of individuals who improve their literacy, numeracy, and English-language skills;

Whereas literacy and educational skills are necessary for individuals to fully benefit from the range of opportunities available in the United States;

Whereas the economy and position of the United States in the world marketplace depend on having a literate, skilled population;

Whereas the unemployment rate in the United States is highest among those without a high school diploma or an equivalent credential, demonstrating that education is important to economic recovery;

Whereas the educational skills of the parents of a child and the practice of reading to a child have a direct impact on the educational success of the child;

Whereas parental involvement in the education of a child is a key predictor of the success of a child, and the level of parental involvement in the education of a child increases as the educational level of the parent increases;

Whereas parents who participate in family literacy programs become more involved in the education of their children and gain the tools necessary to obtain a job or find better employment;

Whereas, as a result of family literacy programs, the lives of children become more stable, and the success of children in the classroom and in future endeavors becomes more likely;

Whereas adults need to be part of a long-term solution to the educational challenges faced by the people of the United States;

Whereas many older people in the United States lack the reading, math, or English-language skills necessary to read a prescription and follow medical instructions, which endangers the lives of the older people and the lives of their loved ones;

Whereas many individuals who are unemployed, underemployed, or receive public assistance lack the literacy skills necessary to obtain and keep a job, to continue their education, or to participate in job training programs;

Whereas many high school dropouts do not have the literacy skills necessary to complete their education, transition to postsecondary education or career and technical training, or obtain a job;

Whereas a large portion of individuals in prison have low educational skills and prisoners without educational skills are more likely to return to prison once released;

Whereas many immigrants in the United States do not have the literacy skills necessary to succeed in the United States; and

Whereas National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week highlights the need to ensure that each individual in the United States has the literacy skills necessary to succeed at home, at work, and in society: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of September 20 through 26, 2015, as "National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week" to raise public awareness about the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy;

(2) encourages people across the United States to support programs to assist individuals in need of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs;

(3) recognizes the importance of adult education, workforce skills, and family literacy programs; and

(4) calls upon public, private, and nonprofit entities to support increased access to adult education and family literacy programs to ensure a literate society.

SENATE RESOLUTION 259—HONORING THE BRAVERY AND HEROISM OF THOSE WHO SELFLESSLY PREVENTED A DEADLY TERRORIST ATTACK AND SAVED COUNTLESS LIVES WHILE ABOARD A PASSENGER TRAIN BOUND FROM AMSTERDAM TO PARIS ON AUGUST 21, 2015

Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. REID, Mr. ALEXANDER, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. BENNET, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. BURR, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CASEY, Mr. CASSIDY, Mr. COATS, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. COONS, Mr. CORKER, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. COTTON, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. ENZI, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. GARDNER, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HATCH, Mr. HEINRICH, Ms. HEITKAMP, Mr. HELLER, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KAINE, Mr. KING, Mr. KIRK, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEE, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. MARKEY, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. MENENDEZ, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MORAN, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. MURPHY, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. PETERS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. REED, Mr. RISCH, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SASSE, Mr. SCHATZ, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. SHELBY, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. TESTER, Mr. THUNE, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. UDALL, Mr. VITTER, Mr. WARNER, Ms. WARREN, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, and Mr. WICKER) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 259

Whereas, on Friday, August 21, 2015, United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and others selflessly risked their lives and forcibly subdued a gunman on a train carrying more than 500 passengers;

Whereas the gunman was armed with a Kalashnikov assault rifle, a handgun, a box cutter, and 9 magazines carrying hundreds of rounds of ammunition and could have killed and injured dozens of passengers had the gunman not been stopped;

Whereas Mark Moogalian, a 51 year old French-American professor and musician, courageously attempted to subdue the gunman and wrestled the Kalashnikov away from the gunman, but was shot by the gunman;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and British consultant Chris Norman took courageous action on their own initiative and forcibly subdued the gunman, rendering the gunman unconscious and tying up the gunman on the floor of the train with t-shirts;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone suffered serious injuries, including a partially severed thumb, from the gunman's box cutter;

Whereas, notwithstanding his own injuries, United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone treated the wounds and likely saved the life of French-American Mark Moogalian;

Whereas French President François Hollande awarded United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, and British consultant Chris Norman the highest civilian honor in France, the Legion of Honor, and pledged to do the same for French-American Mark Moogalian and Frenchman Damien A., who also helped thwart the attack;

Whereas the United States Air Force has stated that it will nominate United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone for the Airman's Medal, the highest award of the Air Force for non-combat bravery;

Whereas the United States Army has nominated Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos for the Soldier's Medal, the highest award of the Army for acts of heroism not involving actual conflict with an enemy;

Whereas the Department of Defense will honor United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone with the Purple Heart award and Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos and college student Anthony Sadler each with an award for courage and valor;

Whereas the city of Sacramento recognized the heroism of United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and college student Anthony Sadler through a Hometown Heroes Parade on the California Capitol Mall on September 11, 2015;

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, who is 23 years old and a resident of California, joined the United States Air Force nearly 3 years ago and serves as a medical technician stationed at Lajes Air Base in the Azores;

Whereas Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos is 22 years old and a resident of Oregon and had recently returned to Oregon after a 9 month deployment in Afghanistan;

Whereas Anthony Sadler is 23 years old, a resident of California, and is a student studying kinesiology at the California State University at Sacramento; and

Whereas United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and college student Anthony Sadler were childhood friends raised in the Sacramento area who were on vacation in Europe together at the time they courageously and selflessly thwarted a terrorist attack and saved countless lives: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors and commends the extraordinary bravery, courage, and heroism of United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, French-American Mark Moogalian, British consultant Chris Norman, and Frenchman Damien A., who selflessly risked their own lives to prevent a terrorist attack that could have killed dozens aboard a passenger train bound for Paris; and

(2) extends best wishes for a full recovery to all innocent individuals who were injured during the attack, including United States Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone and French-American Mark Moogalian.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2666. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2666. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. THUNE) proposed an amendment to the bill H.R. 719, to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 12, line 11, insert “and the Committee on the Judiciary” after “Transportation”.

On page 13, line 4, insert “and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs” after “Transportation”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SR-328A of the Russell Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Business Meeting.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE, AND TRANSPORTATION

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 9:45 a.m., in room SR-253 of the Russell Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 11:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled "State Department Processes in Establishing Tier Rankings for the 2015 Trafficking in Persons Report."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-430 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to conduct a hearing entitled "Biosimilar Implementation: A Progress Report from FDA."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 10:15 a.m., in room SD-226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 17, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HONORING THE BRAVERY AND HEROISM OF THOSE WHO SELFLESSLY PREVENTED A DEADLY TERRORIST ATTACK ON AUGUST 21, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of S. Res. 259.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 259) honoring the bravery and heroism of those who selflessly

prevented a deadly terrorist attack and saved countless lives while aboard a passenger train bound from Amsterdam to Paris on August 21, 2015.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I submitted this resolution recognizing and commending those who boldly prevented what could have amounted to an unspeakable tragedy aboard a high-speed train headed toward Paris, France, on August 21, 2015.

Those who took these courageous actions were: U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, California State University Sacramento student Anthony Sadler, French-American Mark Moogalian, Frenchman Damien A., and Chris Norman, a British citizen.

I would particularly like to recognize U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, and California State University Sacramento student Anthony Sadler, three childhood friends who grew up in California, and thank them for their fearlessness, commitment to one another, and swift action that saved countless lives.

That day, aboard the train carrying more than 500 passengers, a gunman armed himself with a Kalashnikov rifle, a pistol, a box cutter, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, and a container of gasoline, seeking to exact serious harm on innocent passengers.

In response to this threat, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos, college student Anthony Sadler, Mark Moogalian, Chris Norman, and Damien A. took action to protect other passengers.

They subdued the gunman, risking their lives for the safety of others and representing the type of courage that should inspire us all.

Initially, Damien A. and Mark Moogalian encountered the gunman and tried to disarm him. In the struggle, Mark Moogalian suffered a gunshot wound. We wish Mark Moogalian a full and speedy recovery from his wounds, and thank him for his courageous action.

Upon noticing the disruption, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone saw the gunman in the passenger car and immediately tried to subdue him.

He grabbed the gunman around the neck to prevent the gunman from shooting his weapon. U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone suffered multiple box cutter wounds while wrestling the gunman.

Oregon Army National Guard Specialist Aleksander Skarlatos quickly followed, as did Anthony Sadler and Chris Norman.

Ultimately, the gunman was subdued, rendered unconscious, and tied up on the floor of the train.

And, U.S. Air Force Airman First Class Spencer Stone, a medical technician himself injured by the attacker's box cutter, then treated Mark Moogalian's injuries and helped save his life.

The swift, decisive, and courageous actions of these men prevented what could have been the deaths of dozens of passengers.

Their heroism should be recognized as an inspiration by all Americans, including by this body, and I thank all of my Senate colleagues for cosponsoring the resolution to honor their bravery and heroic acts.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 259) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

WELCOMING KING FELIPE VI AND QUEEN LETIZIA OF SPAIN ON THEIR OFFICIAL VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Relations Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 253 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 253) welcoming King Felipe VI and Queen Letizia of Spain on their official visit to the United States, including visits to Miami and St. Augustine, Florida.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 253) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 15, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

EMERGENCY INFORMATION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 227, S. 1090.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1090) to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to provide eligibility for broadcasting facilities to receive certain disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1090) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1090

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Emergency Information Improvement Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ELIGIBILITY OF BROADCASTING FACILITIES FOR CERTAIN DISASTER ASSISTANCE.

(a) PRIVATE NONPROFIT FACILITY DEFINED.—Section 102(11)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5122(11)(B)) is amended by inserting "broadcasting facilities," after "workshops,".

(b) CRITICAL SERVICES DEFINED.—Section 406(a)(3)(B) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5172(a)(3)(B)) is amended by striking "communications," and inserting "communications (including broadcast and telecommunications),".

COMPETITIVE SERVICE ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 228, S. 1580.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1580) to allow additional appointing authorities to select individuals from competitive service certificates.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1580) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1580

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Competitive Service Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL APPOINTING AUTHORITIES FOR COMPETITIVE SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3318 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (b) and (c) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) OTHER APPOINTING AUTHORITIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—During the 240-day period beginning on the date of issuance of a certificate of eligibles under section 3317(a), an appointing authority other than the appointing authority requesting the certificate (in this subsection referred to as the 'other appointing authority') may select an individual from that certificate in accordance with this subsection for an appointment to a position that is—

"(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the 'original position'); and

"(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

"(2) APPLICABILITY.—An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

"(3) REQUIREMENTS.—The selection of an individual under paragraph (1)—

"(A) shall be made in accordance with subsection (a); and

"(B) subject to paragraph (4), may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

"(4) INTERNAL NOTICE.—Before selecting an individual under paragraph (1), and subject to the requirements of any collective bargaining obligation of the other appointing authority, the other appointing authority shall—

"(A) provide notice of the available position to employees of the other appointing authority;

"(B) provide up to 10 business days for employees of the other appointing authority to apply for the position; and

"(C) review the qualifications of employees submitting an application.

"(5) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71."

(b) ALTERNATIVE RANKING AND SELECTION PROCEDURES.—Section 3319 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

"(c) SELECTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—An appointing official may select any applicant in the highest quality category or, if fewer than 3 candidates have been assigned to the highest quality category, in a merged category consisting of the highest and the second highest quality categories.

"(2) USE BY OTHER APPOINTING OFFICIALS.—Under regulations prescribed by the Office of Personnel Management, appointing officials other than the appointing official described in paragraph (1) (in this subsection referred to as the 'other appointing official') may select an applicant for an appointment to a position that is—

"(A) in the same occupational series as the position for which the certification of eligibles was issued (in this subsection referred to as the 'original position'); and

"(B) at a similar grade level as the original position.

"(3) APPLICABILITY.—An appointing authority requesting a certificate of eligibles may share the certificate with another appointing authority only if the announcement of the original position provided notice that the resulting list of eligible candidates may be used by another appointing authority.

"(4) REQUIREMENTS.—The selection of an individual under paragraph (2)—

"(A) shall be made in accordance with this subsection; and

"(B) subject to paragraph (5), may be made without any additional posting under section 3327.

"(5) INTERNAL NOTICE.—Before selecting an individual under paragraph (2), and subject to the requirements of any collective bargaining obligation of the other appointing authority (within the meaning given that term in section 3318(b)(1)), the other appointing official shall—

"(A) provide notice of the available position to employees of the appointing authority employing the other appointing official;

"(B) provide up to 10 business days for employees of the other appointing authority to apply for the position; and

"(C) review the qualifications of employees submitting an application.

"(6) COLLECTIVE BARGAINING OBLIGATIONS.—Nothing in this subsection limits any collective bargaining obligation of an agency under chapter 71.

"(7) PREFERENCE ELIGIBLES.—Notwithstanding paragraphs (1) and (2), an appointing official may not pass over a preference eligible in the same category from which selection is made, unless the requirements of section 3317(b) and 3318(c), as applicable, are satisfied."

(c) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 3319(c)(2) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "3318(b)" and inserting "3318(c)".

(2) Section 9510(b)(5) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking "3318(b)" and inserting "3318(c)".

(d) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Personnel Management shall issue an interim final rule with comment to carry out the amendments made by this section.

TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 191, H.R. 719.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 719) to require the Transportation Security Administration to conform to existing Federal law and regulations regarding criminal investigator positions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "TSA Office of Inspection Accountability Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Consistent with Federal law and regulations, for law enforcement officers to qualify for premium pay as criminal investigators, the officers must, in general, spend on average at least 50 percent of their time investigating, apprehending, or detaining individuals suspected or convicted of offenses against the criminal laws of the United States.

(2) According to the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS IG), the Transportation Security Administration (TSA) does not ensure that its cadre of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection are meeting this requirement, even though they are considered law enforcement officers under TSA policy and receive premium pay.

(3) Instead, TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection primarily monitor the results of criminal investigations conducted by other agencies, investigate administrative cases of TSA employee misconduct, and carry out inspections, covert tests, and internal reviews, which the DHS IG asserts could be performed by employees other than criminal investigators at a lower cost.

(4) The premium pay and other benefits afforded to TSA criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection who are incorrectly classified as such will cost the taxpayer as much as \$17 million over 5 years if TSA fails to make any changes to the number of criminal investigators in the Office of Inspection, according to the DHS IG.

(5) This may be a conservative estimate, as it accounts for the cost of Law Enforcement Availability Pay, but not the costs of law enforcement training, statutory early retirement benefits, police vehicles, and weapons.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATION.**—The term “Administration” means the Transportation Security Administration.

(2) **ASSISTANT SECRETARY.**—The term “Assistant Secretary” means the Assistant Secretary of Homeland Security (Transportation Security) of the Department of Homeland Security.

(3) **INSPECTOR GENERAL.**—The term “Inspector General” means the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security.

SEC. 4. INSPECTOR GENERAL AUDIT.

(a) **AUDIT.**—Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Inspector General shall analyze the data and methods that the Assistant Secretary uses to identify Office of Inspection employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17), and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, and provide the relevant findings to the Assistant Secretary, including a finding on whether the data and methods are adequate and valid.

(b) **PROHIBITION ON HIRING.**—If the Inspector General finds that such data and methods are inadequate or invalid, the Administration shall not hire any new employee to work in the Office of Inspection of the Administration until—

(1) the Assistant Secretary makes a certification described in section 5 to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate; and

(2) the Inspector General submits to such Committees a finding, not later than 30 days after the Assistant Secretary makes such certification, that the Assistant Secretary utilized adequate and valid data and methods to make such certification.

SEC. 5. TSA OFFICE OF INSPECTION WORKFORCE CERTIFICATION.

(a) **CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.**—The Assistant Secretary shall, by not later than 90 days

after the date the Inspector General provides its findings to the Assistant Secretary under section 4(a), document and certify in writing to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate that only those Office of Inspection employees of the Administration who meet the requirements of sections 8331(20), 8401(17), and 5545a of title 5, United States Code, are classified as criminal investigators and are receiving premium pay and other benefits associated with such classification.

(b) **EMPLOYEE RECLASSIFICATION.**—The Assistant Secretary shall reclassify criminal investigator positions in the Office of Inspection as noncriminal investigator positions or non-law enforcement positions if the individuals in those positions do not, or are not expected to, spend an average of at least 50 percent of their time performing criminal investigative duties.

(c) **PROJECTED COST SAVINGS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Assistant Secretary shall estimate the total long-term cost savings to the Federal Government resulting from the implementation of subsection (b), and provide such estimate to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Such estimate shall identify savings associated with the positions reclassified under subsection (b) and include, among other factors the Assistant Secretary considers appropriate, savings from—

- (A) law enforcement training;
- (B) early retirement benefits;
- (C) law enforcement availability and other premium pay; and
- (D) weapons, vehicles, and communications devices.

SEC. 6. INVESTIGATION OF FEDERAL AIR MARSHAL SERVICE MISCONDUCT.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, or as soon as practicable, the Assistant Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate—

(1) materials in the possession or control of the Department of Homeland Security associated with the Office of Inspection's review of instances in which Federal Air Marshal Service officials obtained discounted or free firearms for personal use; and

(2) information on specific actions that will be taken to prevent Federal Air Marshal Service officials from using their official positions, or exploiting, in any way, the Service's relationships with private vendors to obtain discounted or free firearms for personal use.

SEC. 7. STUDY.

Not later than 180 days after the date that the Assistant Secretary submits the certification to Congress under section 5(a), the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security shall submit to the Committee on Homeland Security of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate a study—

(1) reviewing the employee requirements, responsibilities, and benefits of criminal investigators in the TSA Office of Inspection with criminal investigators employed at agencies adhering to the Office of Personnel Management employee classification system; and

(2) identifying any inconsistencies and costs implications for differences between the varying employee requirements, responsibilities, and benefits.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Thune

amendment to the committee-reported substitute amendment be agreed to, that the substitute amendment, as amended, be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2666) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require the Assistant Secretary to submit certain materials and information to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Inspector General of the Department of Homeland Security to submit a study to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs of the Senate)

On page 12, line 11, insert “and the Committee on the Judiciary” after “Transportation”.

On page 13, line 4, insert “and the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs” after “Transportation”.

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 719), as amended, was passed.

ORDERS FOR MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 2 p.m., Monday, September 21; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 2015, AT 2 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:20 p.m., adjourned until Monday, September 21, 2015, at 2 p.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 17, 2015:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

MICHAEL C. MCGOWAN, OF DELAWARE, TO BE UNITED STATES MARSHAL FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE, FOR THE TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE
UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DI-
PLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

SIM FARAR, OF CALIFORNIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE
UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON PUBLIC DI-
PLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018.

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEM-
BER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2015.

WILLIAM JOSEPH HYBL, OF COLORADO, TO BE A MEM-
BER OF THE UNITED STATES ADVISORY COMMISSION ON
PUBLIC DIPLOMACY FOR A TERM EXPIRING JULY 1, 2018.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN HONOR OF JOE CASEY,
GENERAL MANAGER OF SEPTA

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEEHAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Joe Casey, the general manager of the Southeastern Pennsylvania Transportation Authority, who is planning to retire at the end of September after 34 years of service, the last seven as general manager.

Mr. Casey began working for SEPTA in 1982, and his tenure has included various senior management positions before his appointment as general manager in 2008. Under his leadership, SEPTA has seen tremendous improvement in customer service, infrastructure, and financial soundness. Notably, SEPTA has received the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) Distinguished Budget Award for 10 consecutive years under Mr. Casey's authority as Chief Financial Officer and general manager, a testament to Mr. Casey's commitment to fiscal responsibility and leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Casey for his dedication to the Southeastern Pennsylvania community. The remarkable accomplishments and improvements SEPTA has achieved in recent years can be attributed to Mr. Casey's exceptional guidance. I applaud his efforts and wish him the best of luck in retirement.

TRIBUTE TO CONSTITUTION WEEK

HON. MIMI WALTERS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following proclamation:

Whereas: September 17, 2015, marks the two hundred twenty-eighth anniversary of the drafting of the Constitution of the United States of America by the Constitutional Conventions; and

Whereas: It is fitting and proper to accord official recognition to this magnificent document and its memorable anniversary; and to the patriotic celebrations which will commemorate the occasion; and

Whereas: Public Law 915 guarantees the issuing of a proclamation each year by the President of the United States of America designating September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week;

Now, therefore, I, MIMI WALTERS, by virtue of the authority vested in me as Representative of the 45th Congressional District of the State of California do hereby recognize the week of September 17 through 23 as Constitution Week;

And ask our citizens to reaffirm the ideals the Framers of the Constitution had in 1787 by vigilantly protecting the freedoms guaranteed to us through this guardian of our liberties, remembering that lost rights may never be regained.

RECOGNIZING FLORIDA'S 16TH
CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT FIRE
AND RESCUE AND EMS PER-
SONNEL

HON. VERN BUCHANAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize fire and rescue and EMS personnel who have provided distinguished service to the people of Florida's 16th Congressional District.

As first responders, fire departments and emergency medical service teams are summoned on short notice to serve their respective communities. Oftentimes, they arrive at scenes of great adversity and trauma, to which they reliably bring strength and composure. These brave men and women spend hundreds of hours in training so that they are prepared when they get "the call."

In 2012, years ago, I established the 16th District Congressional Fire and Rescue and EMS Awards to honor officers, departments, and units for outstanding achievement.

On behalf of the people of Florida's 16th District, it is my privilege to congratulate the following winners, who were selected this year by an independent committee comprised of a cross section of current and retired fire and rescue personnel living in the district.

Firefighter/EMT Michael Dunn of the Cedar Hammock Fire Recue was chosen to receive the Preservation of Life Award

Lt. Don Rossow of the Englewood Area Fire Control District was chosen to receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award

District Chief/Paramedic Robin Thayer of the Manatee County Emergency Medical Services was chosen to receive the Career Service Award

Lt. Jason Wilkins, Lt. Jamie Mann, Firefighter/EMT Nicholas Jones, Firefighter/EMT Sean Sponable and Firefighter/EMT Clayton Huber were chosen to receive the Unit Citation Award

Deputy Chief Brett Pollok of the West Manatee Fire and Rescue was chosen to receive the Career Service Award

Fire Investigator/Inspector Larry Betts of the Southern Manatee Fire and Rescue District was chosen to receive the Dedication and Professionalism Award.

CELEBRATING CONSTITUTION DAY

HON. SCOTT GARRETT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, on this date two-hundred and twenty-eight years ago, the delegates to the Constitutional Convention completed their arduous work and signed the document designed to restore liberty to the citizens of a new nation.

The American Republic was born out of a struggle against British tyranny and a monarchical system that our forefathers deemed incompatible with the rights of free men and women. Consistent with the principles espoused by the Spirit of '76 and enshrined in the Declaration of Independence, the United States Constitution was not imposed on the people. It was humbly submitted to the people for their approval.

A great national debate followed. If the people were to judge the Constitution, they were expected to understand the Constitution. The Federalist Papers, a series of 85 essays written by Alexander Hamilton, John Jay, and James Madison, responded to Antifederalist critics by serving as an invaluable guide to the Constitution's provisions. Their arguments proved decisive and, eventually, the requisite number of states ratified the Constitution. Education was integral to the Constitution's ratification.

At a time when the globe was dominated by kingdoms and empires, a skeptical world believed that a republic devoted to the ancient cause of liberty would inevitably fail. But the test of time has proven the wisdom, effectiveness, and durability of our great charter.

It has guaranteed our natural rights and preserved our cherished liberties.

It has inspired foreign peoples shackled by tyranny to seek to replicate what the Americans have accomplished.

It has resisted the waves of totalitarian ideologies that claimed human liberty to be a relic of antiquity.

On Constitution Day, Americans follow in the footsteps of the Founders, not only by recommitting ourselves to the Constitution's enlightened provisions, but also by accepting the duty to provide the education necessary for the survival of a free people.

I commend all those that take the opportunity this day provides to promote the American ideals of human liberty and renew our commitment to the preservation of the Constitution of the United States.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

RECOGNIZING MISSOURI PRESS
ASSOCIATION EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
DOUG CREWS ON HIS RETIREMENT

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Doug Crews for his 36 years of service to the Missouri Press Association.

Since 1990, Doug has led the Missouri Press Association as Executive Director. His service has been dedicated to promoting open government, in particular by advocating for the protection of state and federal Sunshine Laws. In addition, Doug has advocated on behalf of 75 North American press associations as President of the Newspaper Association Managers.

Doug's leadership has extended beyond the press community. A graduate of the University of Missouri School of Journalism, Doug served as President of the Mizzou Alumni Association and the State Historical Society of Missouri.

This February, Doug will join his wife Tricia in retirement. He can do so with great pride, knowing that in the span of his career he has accomplished so much and helped so many. While he will be missed in the communications world, I wish him the very best that retirement has to offer.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues to join me in congratulating Doug Crews for his service to the State of Missouri and to journalists everywhere.

HONORING POLICE CHIEF JOSEPH
COLLINS ON THE OCCASION OF
HIS RETIREMENT FROM THE
GILMANTON POLICE DEPARTMENT
AFTER 25 YEARS IN LAW
ENFORCEMENT

HON. FRANK C. GUINTA

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my congratulations to Chief Joseph Collins on his retirement after 25 years with various law enforcement agencies throughout New Hampshire, and thank him for the outstanding work he did during his career.

Chief Collins' continuous progression within the law enforcement ranks during his time exemplifies his intelligence, positive attitude, and commitment to protecting and serving his community with the utmost professionalism.

Although Chief Collins will now shift his focus from serving his community to his family and faith, it's clear he leaves behind an example of strong leadership and compassion for others to emulate in his absence.

It is with great admiration that I congratulate Chief Collins on his retirement, and wish him the best on all future endeavors.

HONORING POLICE SERGEANT
RANDALL BOGGS

HON. JOHN GARAMENDI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the service of Sergeant Randall Boggs, a man who has truly devoted himself to public service. Mr. Boggs was hired as a Police Officer by the Fairfield Police Department on September 18, 1989 and over the duration of his career worked in various capacities which included: Narcotic Investigations, Patrol, Special Operations, Major Crimes Investigation, Mobile Field Force, and the Fugitive Apprehension Team. On April 19, 2002 he was promoted to Police Corporal where he served for five years before being promoted to Police Sergeant on February 2, 2007.

As a Police Sergeant, Mr. Boggs consistently assisted City Management during changes in leadership and command staff, ensuring that the Fairfield Police Department upheld the highest operational standards during those times. Additionally, Mr. Boggs assumed the Police Lieutenant's position twice and managed Police Bureau operations.

Sergeant Boggs is a skilled team leader who has led numerous operations with exceptional professionalism and character. He has been a valued public servant in which his hard work and commitment to the public safety have made him a model representative of the law enforcement community.

CONGRATULATING CHAMOIS HIGH
SCHOOL ON ITS BRONZE MEDAL
AWARD

HON. BLAINE LUETKEMEYER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. LUETKEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Chamois High School on its Bronze Medal Award as a top Missouri High School from U.S. News and World Report.

This school's administration, teachers, and students should be commended for all of their hard work throughout the past year and for their commitment to education.

I ask you to join me in recognizing Chamois High School for a job well done.

CONGRATULATING AL AND LINDA
FOURNIER FOR THEIR DECADES
OF SERVICE AT FORT MCCOY,
WISCONSIN

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and thank Al and Linda Fournier for their combined 80 years of distinguished service at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin. The Fourniers, who met at

Fort McCoy and were married in 1991, will be retiring from federal service on October 3, 2015. Together, the Fourniers helped Fort McCoy become one of the most capable and desirable training installations in the Army.

Al Fournier began his tenure of dedicated service at Fort McCoy in 1971. Since 2002 he has served as Deputy to the Garrison Commander. Thanks to Al's outstanding leadership and strategic contributions, Fort McCoy has been transformed into one of the nation's premier training centers and a preferred Army force projection site. Some of Al's major accomplishments at Fort McCoy include: the writing and publication of the Fort McCoy Installation Management System Handbook, the Fort McCoy Strategic Planning Handbook, and the Fort McCoy Acquisition Management-Financial Management Planning Handbook. Al's other achievements and awards are too numerous to note here, but suffice it to say that he is a visionary whose legacy will have a lasting impact on Fort McCoy and its mission as a Total Force Training Center of unparalleled excellence.

Linda Fournier began working at Fort McCoy in 1978 and has served as Public Affairs Officer since 2000. She has been instrumental in conducting programs designed to inform both the military community and the general public regarding Army and Fort McCoy activities, events, missions and policies. She has been the force behind numerous Fort McCoy books and publications, the installation newspaper (The Real McCoy) and community outreach to ensure that Fort McCoy remains a great community partner and neighbor. Probably her most lasting impact at Fort McCoy is her role in the creation of the installation's Commemorative Area, History Center and Equipment Park. Under Linda's supervision, the Fort McCoy Commemorative Area was recognized with a Department of the Army Award of Excellence in the 2009 Major General Keith L. Ware Public Affairs Communications Competition and specifically cited for its Community Relations outreach.

It has been an honor for me to serve as U.S. Representative for Wisconsin's Third Congressional District during the Fournier's tenure at Fort McCoy. I know their leadership will be greatly missed at the base and surrounding communities, but I am thankful for their dedication and contributions to ensuring that Fort McCoy remains a shining star in the nation's military training infrastructure.

On behalf of my constituents in Wisconsin and a grateful nation, I would like to thank and commend Al and Linda Fournier for their decades of dedicated service with the U.S. Army Reserve at Fort McCoy and wish them the very best in their future endeavors.

CONGRATULATING DR. YUICHI
SHODA, GOLDEN GOOSE AWARDEE

HON. SUZAN K. DELBENE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate University of Washington Professor Dr. Yuichi Shoda on being recognized

this week as a recipient of the 2015 Golden Goose Award.

Created in 2012, the Golden Goose Award celebrates obscure science to show how basic research—even research that may sound odd—can lead to major breakthroughs and significant impacts on society.

Dr. Shoda's work with the "Marshmallow Test," first funded by the National Institutes of Health in the 1960s to test a child's self-control, is more than deserving of this honor. His test was seminal in interpreting human behavior and has impacted how we educate children and save for retirement today.

Each year, federal investments in research like this help push the boundaries of scientific knowledge, support new industries and address the challenges facing our country.

But to remain a world leader, we need to ensure our researchers and institutions continue to have the tools to explore new ideas and frontiers in research, as well as the funding opportunities to do so.

Unfortunately, research continues to face irresponsible funding cuts in Congress. When sequestration took effect two years ago, more than 1,000 grants at the National Science Foundation went unfunded, and NIH funding was slashed by \$1.6 billion.

It's time we learn that research isn't a spigot that can just be turned on and off. Breakthroughs come after years of incremental research, and cutting funds now could set us back for decades to come.

Through my post-graduate research work, I have also seen firsthand the economic impact of these investments in communities nationwide. In my home state of Washington, for example, funding for NIH supports more than 14,000 jobs.

I hope this week's recognition of obscure science by the Golden Goose Awards helps renew our commitment to research. We must support the tireless efforts of those who allow our country to continue to break new ground in scientific discovery.

Congratulations to Dr. Shoda and the other Golden Goose Awardees, and thank you for your continued contributions to our nation.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL NEUROBLASTOMA AWARENESS DAY

HON. MICHAEL T. MCCAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize September 20th as National Neuroblastoma Awareness Day. Neuroblastoma is a deadly pediatric cancer that primarily strikes infants and young children. Of the 15,780 new cases of pediatric cancer in the U.S. each year, approximately 700 are neuroblastoma diagnoses. About half of these children will have an advanced-stage, high-risk form of disease. Even with aggressive treatment, only 40 to 50 percent of high-risk patients will survive. Neuroblastoma is the most common extra-cranial solid tumor among children and the most common cancer in infancy. The cause of the disease is unknown but leads to abnormal cell growth during the development of the sympathetic nervous system.

I am pleased to inform my colleagues that we have seen significant progress this year in the fight against this devastating disease. In March, the Food and Drug Administration approved the first drug ever to treat children with high-risk neuroblastoma. In August, the same product received regulatory approval in the European Union. The drug, Dinutuximab (dinutuximab), is marketed by United Therapeutics Corporation. United Therapeutics was also granted a Pediatric Rare Disease Priority Review Voucher by the FDA. This innovative voucher program was established by the Creating Hope Act—legislation that I sponsored with my colleagues Congressman CHRIS VAN HOLLEN (D-MD) and Congressman G.K. BUTTERFIELD (D-NC). Enacted into law in 2012, the Creating Hope Act is designed to incentivize the pharmaceutical industry to invest in new therapies for rare childhood diseases.

Approval of this groundbreaking therapy is the result of a unique public-private partnership over many years. Originally developed by Dr. Alice Yu, University of California San Diego, the drug was tested in high-risk neuroblastoma patients in clinical studies conducted by the Children's Oncology Group through support from the National Cancer Institute (NCI). Manufacturing of the complex chimeric antibody was conducted by the NCI at its biopharmaceutical laboratory in Frederick, Maryland. In 2010, United Therapeutics entered into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement with the NCI where the company assumed responsibility for manufacturing the drug and moving it through the regulatory approval process.

According to Dr. Malcolm Smith, Associate Branch Chief, Pediatrics in the Cancer Therapy Evaluation Program at NCI, "The FDA approval of dinutuximab represents the culmination of a remarkably productive collaboration between researchers of the NCI-supported Children's Oncology Group, the manufacturing and clinical research groups of NCI, and the oncology team at United Therapeutics. Children with neuroblastoma will benefit from this collaboration, and the drug development pathway blazed by dinutuximab will likely be followed in the future to develop other novel agents directed against pediatric cancer therapeutic targets."

Mr. Speaker, I have the privilege of co-chairing the Congressional Childhood Cancer Caucus with Congressman VAN HOLLEN. Each September, the Caucus commemorates National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month by hosting a Childhood Cancer Summit on Capitol Hill. This event features pediatric cancer patients, advocates, physicians, industry partners and other key stakeholders. As part of this year's Summit on September 18th, we will hear from Casey and Lesley Ryan, the parents of Rex Ryan, a young neuroblastoma patient from my home state of Texas. We will also hear from Roger Jeffs, PhD, President and Co-Chief Executive Officer of United Therapeutics, Dr. Lee Helman from the National Cancer Institute, Dr. Michael Link of the Stanford School of Medicine, Dr. Amy Fowler of the Dell Children's Medical Center, and Danielle Leach of the St. Baldrick's Foundation.

As we recognize the progress that has been made in neuroblastoma treatment, we remain

focused on the many challenges that remain and the toll this disease has taken on so many families. One such family is the Lindbergs from Germantown, Maryland. Wendy and Gavin Lindberg lost their 7 year-old son Evan to neuroblastoma in 2010. He was their only child. Diagnosed at the age of 3, Evan waged a four-year battle against Stage IV neuroblastoma that defined courage. Evan was a remarkable little boy who inspired everyone he met with his bravery, compassion and joyful approach to life.

In his memory, Wendy and Gavin established The Evan's Victory Against Neuroblastoma Foundation to promote awareness of the disease, fund much-needed research, and support patient wellness programs for children in treatment. Since Evan's passing, the Foundation bearing his name has made and continues to make a real difference in the lives of children and families suffering from neuroblastoma. There are many other organizations doing wonderful philanthropic work in memory of children lost far too young to this terrible disease. Their strength in the face of adversity compels us to do all we can to help families facing the unthinkable.

So Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in recognition of September 20th as National Neuroblastoma Awareness Day and encourage my colleagues to join in the fight against all pediatric cancers. Our children's future depends on it.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CALVIN GEORGE MORET

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Calvin George Moret, the last surviving Louisiana member of the Tuskegee Airmen, a group of African-American pilots who fought in World War II and were the first African-American pilots in the United States military. Mr. Moret passed away on September 12, 2015, at the age of 90.

Mr. Moret entered the military in 1943 and trained as a military pilot at Tuskegee, Alabama, receiving his wings and commission as a Flight Officer on November 20, 1944. His preparation for overseas combat duty continued through the end of the war in Europe and then through the end of the war in the Pacific. He was discharged from military service on January 31, 1946.

Following his discharge from military duty he returned to the family printing business, Moret Press. To help the family business Moret needed to look outside of New Orleans for school, because segregation laws prohibited him from studying at Delgado Trade School. He was able to gain admission to the printing department at Southern University in Baton Rouge and completed the course.

Mr. Moret's flying experience did not stop upon discharge from the military. In the spring of 1949, he and his brother Adolph, who had learned to fly before the war, formed a flying club. Along with twenty other men, they purchased a 3-place Piper Super Cruiser airplane

and hangered it at Lakefront Airport in New Orleans until the summer of 1953, where they introduced members to the miracle of human flight.

On June 17, 2008, as a result of Hurricane Katrina and the flooding aftermath that decimated the city, Moret Press was destroyed and the family was separated for months. The business has not operated since the Friday before the hurricane struck.

Following the release of "The Tuskegee Airmen" movie in 1995, Mr. Moret frequently lectured about his experiences and promoting the proud history of African-American accomplishments in American life.

In 2007, Mr. Moret was present when the Tuskegee Airmen received the Congressional Gold Medal in the rotunda of the Capitol.

Mr. Moret was a trailblazer, clearing the path for countless men and women of color to enter the military and fight to defend their country. He will be sorely missed by his family, his friends, and all of those who are able to pursue their dreams because of his courage. His memory will serve an inspiration for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of Mr. Moret's courage, commitment and sacrifice, I celebrate his life and legacy, because he has made America a more perfect union.

HONORING WILLIS "WALLY"
WALLING

HON. MARK SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor and remember Willis R. Walling, who died on Wednesday, September 9, 2015, at the age of ninety-four. Affectionately known as "Wally" to me and many others, he will be missed.

Born in Newark, NJ, he was the son of the late Willis H. and Gladys R. Walling.

Those who knew Wally would say some of his fondest memories were of the time he spent serving as a fighter pilot in the U.S. Army Air Force during World War II. You might even call his adventures "legendary," with sixty-six missions in Europe and becoming the tenth Allied plane to land in France after D-Day. He was one of the greatest supporters of the Allied Forces through France and beyond.

After leaving the service, he and his wife, Peg, moved to New Jersey where he served as President of Swan Manufacturing in Rockaway, NJ. It was during his time in Rockaway that he and Peg became active in the New Jersey Republican Party where he served as chairman for a period of time.

As many Northerners do, he and Peg moved south after retirement. Lucky for us South Carolinians, they chose Pawleys Island as their new home. They both quickly became active in local politics. I had the pleasure of meeting Wally during my first run for Congress in 1994 and have since appreciated his kindness and hospitality. Of course, you appreciate everyone who joins you in the heat of battle on the campaign trail, but it is the ones

who are with you from the beginning who you hold closest to your heart. Wally was one of the loyal ones who would stick with you.

Loyalty, duty, respect, selfless service, honor, integrity, and personal courage are the seven values of the Army, and Wally was a man who exemplified every one of them. His surviving daughters, Susan Houser, Jeanne Auermuller (Bob), and Diane Dunham (Phil), eight grandchildren, and twelve great-grandchildren can be proud of the man they called "Dad" or "Grandpa," and I have no doubt that they would be. They will miss him dearly . . . and I will too.

IN RECOGNITION OF SEPTEMBER
18, 2015 AS THE UZEYIR
HAJIBEYLI MEMORIAL DAY

HON. PAUL A. GOSAR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Uzeyir Hajibeyli Memorial Day, celebrated on September 18, 2015.

Uzeyir Hajibeyli was born in the City of Agjabadi in Azerbaijan on September 18, 1885. He is recognized as the father of Azerbaijani classical music, as well as the founder of the first opera, Leyli and Majnun (1908), and first operetta The Cloth Peddler (1913) in the Muslim world. Arshin Mal Alan (The Cloth Peddler), is a romantic and musical comedy that delves into a young couple's struggle to live a modern lifestyle in the presence of restricting customs through pure love and women's rights.

In 1945, a cinematic version of the operetta was filmed in Azerbaijan and became an instant box office sensation. It remains today an important cultural touchstone across Eurasia, having been widely distributed in 86 languages and shown in 136 countries.

Uzeyir Hajibeyli was influential in both cultural and historical contexts. Hajibeyli was responsible for a new genre of music which evolved from the culmination of traditional Azerbaijani music and European classical opera. He is recognized as a leader in fighting illiteracy throughout the nation. As not only a musician but as a teacher and journalist, he inspired a new cultural movement throughout the nation that transcended the country's borders. Further, Hajibeyli is responsible for composing the first national anthem of Azerbaijan. Uzeyir Hajibeyli played an active role in the creation of the Azerbaijan Democratic Republic founded in 1918.

As today marks the 130th anniversary of Uzeyir Hajibeyli's birth, I am honored to recognize him today for his valuable contributions towards the world of music and to Azerbaijan.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF REVEREND JOSEPH C. PROFIT,
JR.

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Reverend Joseph C. Profit, Jr., a pastor of Stronger Hope Baptist Church, who passed away on September 4, 2015, at the age of 80.

Reverend Profit dedicated fifty years to the Stronger Hope Baptist Church and was a leading civil rights activist in New Orleans. He served as the fifth president of the Ideal Missionary Baptist and Educational Association, Inc. and Regional Vice President of the Louisiana Baptist State Convention. Rev. Profit also participated in the Baptist World Alliance in Stockholm, Sweden, as a delegate.

After Hurricane Katrina, Rev. Profit was a leader in rebuilding New Orleans—physically and spiritually. Although he evacuated to San Antonio, Texas, Reverend Profit drove to New Orleans every other weekend to hold service, and finally in 2008, he completely rebuilt The Stronger Hope Baptist Church with the help of his loyal congregation. The Church sits on the corner of South Galvez and First Street, where it has rested since 1937.

To honor Reverend Profit, who was a vital asset to the New Orleans community of faith, we acknowledge the importance of faith and culture in resilience. To commemorate Rev. Profit and his irreplaceable legacy, we remember his life-long contribution to the city of New Orleans and we strive to continue his messages of faith, hope, and unity.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of Reverend Profit's courage, dedication and undying faith, I celebrate his life and legacy, because he has made America a more perfect union.

HONORING THE LIFE OF
EDWARD L. FIRE

HON. TIM RYAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Edward L. Fire of Chagrin Falls, Ohio who passed away on Wednesday, July 1, 2015. Edward was the son of Frank and Pauline Fire. He was a 1954 graduate of Lowellville High School and attended Youngstown State University. Following his education, Edward served in the U.S. Navy shortly after graduation at age 17 in 1954 until 1958.

In addition to serving in the armed forces, Ed was an active force in labor. Ed's career as a union leader began in 1961 at Packard Electric in Warren, where he served in elected office for 40 plus years. His leadership roles included President of the 13,000 member IUE Local 717 at Delphi Packard, Vice President of the Ohio AFL-CIO, and Secretary-Treasurer of the 80,000 member IUE District 7, headquartered in Kettering, OH. Ed loved every aspect of his job helping people have

good jobs with good pay. The highlights of his career included leading the Union's bargaining teams with major corporations, GM, GE, and Delphi. He led IUE's efforts in the merger with the CWA. He also led the Union's political action efforts, including being actively involved in the campaigns of Presidents Lyndon Johnson, Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton as well as Ohio Governor Dick Celeste, Senators John Glenn, Howard Metzenbaum and SHERROD BROWN.

He is survived by his wife Margaret Fire of Chagrin Falls, three sons Dino (Pamela) Fire of Jenson, MI, Patrick Fire of Myrtle Beach, SC and Ted (Melissa) Fire of Stow, MA, three granddaughters Morgan and Lina Fire and Capri (George) Kandris, two grandsons Sam and Jake Fire, a sister Jeanette Farley of Warren and several nieces and nephews. He is preceded in death by his parents, a brother, Charles Fire and four sisters Margaret Fire, Ida Marino, Rosemarie Whalen and Ann Fire.

There is no doubt that Ed's effort helped to improve the lives of countless workers in Northeastern Ohio, and across the country. I was deeply saddened to hear of his passing, but I am honored to pay tribute to such a selfless man.

RECOGNIZING THE INAUGURATION OF DR. REBECCA CHOPP

HON. DIANA DeGETTE

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. DeGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor Dr. Rebecca Chopp on the occasion of her inauguration as the chancellor of the University of Denver. An advocate for education, inclusivity and community, Dr. Chopp brings decades of leadership experience and success to DU. As a first-generation college student, she understands the importance of access to college for all and the need to continue to mentor and nurture students for their success and that of their community.

After earning a BA from Kansas Wesleyan University and a Master of Divinity from St. Paul School of Theology, Dr. Chopp went on to receive her PhD from the University of Chicago. She has received six honorary doctorates from additional institutions and distinguished awards from each of her alma maters. Dr. Chopp has served as dean at Yale Divinity School, as provost and executive vice president for academic affairs at Emory University, and as president of Swarthmore College and Colgate University. She is also a widely published author.

While at Swarthmore, Dr. Chopp was committed to admitting the most highly qualified students without regard to financial circumstances, and she supported innovative ways to build new, inclusive communities motivated to contributing to the common good. Though she took the reins during the middle of the Great Recession, she steered Swarthmore through this time without cutting faculty or financial aid. Dr. Chopp was the first woman to serve in several of her previous roles and is the first woman chancellor for DU. She is a true role model and trailblazer.

Dr. Chopp joined the University of Denver in September of last year as its 18th chancellor.

Within her first 100 days she announced Imagine-DU, a community-wide effort that focused on transforming the student experience, expanding the design of knowledge, and engaging in new ways with the surrounding areas. Chancellor Chopp envisions the University of Denver as an institution capitalizing on the changes and opportunities that come of an institution invested in the 21st Century. In addition, she already has several new innovative projects including serving a more diverse student body and building the next generation of leaders with the establishment of the Latino Leadership Institute, addressing the needs of an aging population in the Knebel Center for the Study of Aging, and a new interdisciplinary approach to science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) with the Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science.

Dr. Chopp has been quoted as saying, "As in any university, the most important resource is its people." In her case, that could not be more true. She will be an invaluable resource to DU. Please join me in commending Dr. Rebecca Chopp for her continued commitment and passion for education and community. Her persistence and dedication are an inspiration to build a better future for all who live in Colorado.

RECOGNIZING THE RECIPIENTS OF THE 22ND ANNUAL PERSONAL ACHIEVEMENT AWARD FROM THE HEALTHSOUTH REHABILITATION HOSPITAL OF ALTOONA

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the 22nd annual Personal Achievement Award from the HealthSouth Rehabilitation Hospital of Altoona, given to encourage and reward those who have made an outstanding effort to deal with or overcome a disability. This year, I congratulate: Barbara Horne of Hollidaysburg, Larry Snyder of Hollidaysburg and Isaac Snowberger of Roaring Spring.

Barbara Horne is the recipient of a HealthSouth Personal Achievement Award. Barbara was a devoted wife, mother and grandmother until August 31, 2014, when tragedy struck and changed her life forever. Barbara was diagnosed with an acute brain stem stroke which caused her to have garbled speech, double vision and limpness on her right side. Shortly thereafter, she developed a urinary tract infection. She was dialysis dependent and was given a small percentage of survival. With hard work, determination and assistance from her family, she overcame these obstacles. Barbara actually walked out of HealthSouth's facility at discharge on November 5, 2014, and now walks without the assist of a device. She's been able to return to her active lifestyle.

Larry Snyder is also the recipient of a Personal Achievement Award. On April 3, 2013 Larry sustained a life-changing injury to his dominant right hand when it was crushed be-

tween the couplings of two railroad cars. Larry underwent a total of 7 surgeries to repair vascular, skin, bone, nerve, and tendon damage sustained in the accident. Surgeons were able to save Larry's hand, but had to amputate his thumb. He also lost much of the sensation to his remaining fingers, leaving his hand essentially non-functional. Larry was a year away from retirement, after a lifetime of work in the local railroad shops, when he sustained this injury. With the help of his family and friends, he has fought discouragement by keeping an optimistic and cheerful attitude, and learned to make his left hand the dominant one.

Isaac Snowberger is also the recipient of a Personal Achievement Award. For Isaac and his family, June 21, 2015 will be a day they will never forget. Normally healthy and active, Isaac collapsed at home due to an arteriovenous malformation in the brain. His parents were able to revive him, and he was taken immediately to Children's Hospital of Pittsburgh for surgery. Due to his injury, he had some weakness in his right side, balance issues, double vision and swallowing difficulties. But Isaac remained in good spirits and has made rapid progress in therapy. With his family's help, he is now walking well, and has achieved his main goals of returning to high school and participating in garden tractor pulling events.

Congratulations to Barbara, Larry and Isaac. Their accomplishments are a testament to us all that with hard work, persistence and a big heart, we can overcome any hardship. I honor each of them for their perseverance, and I wish them the best as they continue to overcome illnesses and disabilities while setting an example for the rest of the community.

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF ALICE THOMPSON

HON. CEDRIC L. RICHMOND

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Alice Marie Thompson, a civil rights icon and Freedom Rider, who passed away on August 24, 2015.

Alice was born on September 25, 1939, the sixth of eight children, born to Cora Mae Atlas and John Henry Thompson, Sr. and was the granddaughter of Susie Lee and Louis Balfour Atlas, Sr. and Alice Piercey and Norah Thompson. In 1944, Alice and her family moved from Lake Providence to New Orleans' Ninth Ward. Alice attended Lockett, V.C. Jones, McCarthy, and Joseph S. Clark schools and graduated from George Washington Carver High School in 1959. She later attended and graduated from Southern University in New Orleans with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Liberal Arts and Sciences. Alice worked for many years as a social worker until her retirement in 2002.

Between 1959 and 1960, Alice, and her sisters Jean and Shirley, became members of the Youth Council of the New Orleans branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). The Thompson Sisters, as they famously became

known, soon sought more direct action, and in 1960 joined the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) under the leadership of Rudy Lombard and later Oretha Castle Haley. Alice was active in countless pickets, sit-ins, and sit downs. She integrated a number of high-profile public places in the city, including McCrory's, Woolworths, the Loews Theater, and the City Hall Cafeteria.

In 1961, when the Interstate Commerce Commission outlawed segregation on buses, terminals, restrooms, restaurants, Alice's CORE members began testing the ruling throughout the Deep South. Their first test was in New Orleans at the Trailways bus terminal on Tulane Avenue. Alice and her comrades faced violence, intimidation and even imprisonment. In Poplarville, Mississippi, Alice was arrested and charged with breach of peace. She was placed in the same cell that Mack Charles Parker was placed in, taken from, and beaten two years earlier. In McComb, Mississippi, she and her fellow riders were viciously beaten. Alice volunteered for numerous projects during the U.S. Civil Rights Movement such as Mississippi and Louisiana Freedom Summer, and was present at the historic March on Washington on August 28, 1963. Alice was honored for her work by the State of Mississippi, the City of New Orleans, and by Oprah Winfrey during her show commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Freedom Riders.

In addition to her courageous civil rights advocacy, Alice was active in her community. She was one of the founding members of the Southern Organization for the Unified Leadership (SOUL), a founding member of the Lower Ninth Ward Development Association, an organizer of the New Orleans Health Corporation, and an organizer of the Copeland-Sanchez Center in the Lower Ninth Ward.

Alice loved to have a good time. She was always a centerpiece of family gatherings. With her signature beer in hand, she could always be seen recounting hilarious stories of her life and times, especially things that happened while she was in the Civil Rights Movement. She will be sorely missed by her family, her friends, and all of those who benefitted from her life's work—to bring freedom to all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as a beneficiary of the courage, commitment and sacrifice of Alice Thompson, I celebrate her life and legacy, because she made America a more perfect union.

TRIBUTE TO DR. MARY SANDERS

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, our lives have been touched by the life of this one woman, who gave of herself in order for others to stand; and

Whereas, Dr. Mary Sanders' work is present in DeKalb County, Georgia for all to see, where she was an unwavering advocate for the youth as an educator; a community leader

who worked tirelessly for the rights of our citizens in our district; and as a civic leader who volunteered as a Poll Officer in Gwinnett County, Georgia ensuring that the right to vote was administered to all that wanted to exercise their right; and

Whereas, this remarkable woman gave of herself, her time, her talent and her life; never asking for fame or fortune but only to uplift those in need; and

Whereas, Dr. Mary Sanders led by working behind the scenes, as well as front and center for the state of Georgia, DeKalb County NAACP, the Georgia Perimeter College Retirees Association Book Club, her beloved church, Antioch-Lithonia Baptist Church, and for her beloved Delta Sigma Theta Sorority, Inc.; and

Whereas, this virtuous Proverbs 31 woman was a wife, a mother, a sister, a daughter and a friend; she was a warrior, a matriarch, and a woman of great integrity; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to bestow a Congressional recognition on Dr. Mary Sanders for her leadership, friendship and service to all of the citizens in Georgia and throughout the Nation; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby attest to the 114th Congress that Dr. Mary Sanders of DeKalb County, Georgia is deemed worthy and deserving of this "Congressional Honor".

Dr. Mary Sanders, U.S. Citizen of Distinction in the 4th Congressional District of Georgia.

Proclaimed, this 10th day of August, 2015.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF MR. MICHAEL GODBEY

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding educator, Michael Godbey. Mr. Godbey leads Frankfort High School as its principal. Mr. Godbey's career as an educator spans twenty years. In this time he has served as an instructional assistant, bus driver, mathematics teacher, assistant principal, director of curriculum and instruction, and principal. Under Godbey's leadership, Frankfort High School has earned the classification of a Proficient and Progressing High School based on Kentucky's Next Generation Learner Accountability system. Frankfort High School was also ranked the Twelfth Best High School in the Commonwealth of Kentucky by U.S. News and World Report in 2014.

Mr. Godbey was recently selected as the 2015 Principal of the Year for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. This Award was presented by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). Godbey earned this award by his accomplishments in the education field over the years. His dedication to the education of his students is evident.

Godbey earned his B.A. in Secondary Education from the University of Kentucky and his M.A. in Education from Eastern Kentucky University. Prior to his tenure at Frankfort High School, Godbey worked in the Danville, Ken-

tucky Independent School district. He and his wife Claudia reside in Nicholasville, Kentucky with their sons Jared and Hayden.

Education of our nations' young men and women is critically important. Mr. Godbey has exemplified strong leadership and innovation and is very deserving of the recent Principal of the Year award. Mr. Speaker, I applaud his creative talents and dedication in the education field.

BLUE RIDGE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, for 25 years, Blue Ridge Christian School in Bridgewater, Virginia, has provided a high quality, value-based Christian education to students. I am proud to represent an excellent institution of learning like Blue Ridge Christian School in the U.S. House of Representatives. As their programs have expanded in size and scope, diversity in both denominations and heritage has also grown. Staying true to the principles of their founding families, Blue Ridge Christian School has continuously maintained a strong commitment to academic excellence.

Today, the school is preparing to expand their mission by constructing a new campus. At the same time they will create a new relationship with another Christian institution of learning in the Sixth Congressional District, Liberty University in Lynchburg, Virginia. This new partnership will be beneficial to the students and further expand the opportunities available through Blue Ridge Christian School.

I commend Blue Ridge Christian School as it marks its silver anniversary with an ambitious plan for growth that remains true to its Christian mission. I am hopeful that its next 25 years will be filled with fine opportunities for its students to make their mark on their hometowns, our nation, and the world beyond our borders. Go Bears!

TRIBUTE TO PASTOR MCKENZIE JONES

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, this year, Pastor McKenzie Jones is celebrating twenty (20) years in pastoral leadership at Zoe Baptist Church where he has provided stellar leadership to the church and community; and

Whereas, Pastor Jones under the guidance of God has pioneered and sustained Zoe Baptist Church as an instrument in our community that uplifts the spiritual, physical and mental welfare of our citizens; and

Whereas, this remarkable and tenacious man of God has given hope to the hopeless and is a beacon of light to those in need; and

Whereas, Pastor Jones is a spiritual warrior, a man of compassion, a fearless leader and a

servant to all, but most of all a visionary who has shared not only with his Church, but with our state and the nation his passion to spread the gospel of Jesus Christ; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside this day to honor and recognize Pastor McKenzie Jones, as he celebrates this milestone in pastoral leadership; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 30, 2015 as Pastor McKenzie Jones Day in the 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 30th day of August, 2015.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. RICHARD HUDSON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 495, I was unavoidably detained and missed the vote on H.R. 1214. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

IN RECOGNITION OF NAPPANEE MAYOR LARRY THOMPSON

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the honorable public service of Larry Thompson as he retires as Mayor of Nappanee, Indiana. As a five-term mayor, Mayor Thompson continues to represent the American spirit and his contributions are truly deserving of this body's recognition.

A devoted husband and proud father, Mayor Thompson has dedicated his life to serving his community. He and his wife Linda grew up in the Nappanee area and are both graduates of Northwood High School. He worked part-time in the funeral home business during high school and graduated from Indiana College of Mortuary Science in 1973. His dedication to public service was obvious early in his life, when he began serving as one of Nappanee's first Emergency Medical Technicians in 1973. Ten years later, he and his wife purchased what is now the Thompson-Lengacher & Yoder Funeral Home and he began serving as a local firefighter. Today, he and his family continue to run and operate their funeral home business, where they provide funeral services to the entire community. Mayor Thompson became involved in government affairs when he was appointed to serve on the Nappanee Park Board and ran in his first election, a successful bid for the Wa-Nee Community Schools Board of Education.

After several years of serving in those capacities, the mayor's position became open. Prodded to run, he ran against an opponent for the only time in his career. Every election since, Mayor Thompson has run unopposed.

Since 1995, Mayor Thompson has been instrumental in improving the structure and services of Nappanee. His support to create community development, economic expansion,

and job growth, made Nappanee one of the most vibrant communities in Indiana.

Mayor Thompson's tireless work to improve the community is nothing short of remarkable. His collaboration with local and regional partners to lobby for specific projects and funding for the city brought businesses like Martin's Super Market and Miller's Assisted Living to Nappanee. Mayor Thompson also helped establish the Boys and Girls Club of Nappanee and develop the East Side/Airport Industrial Park.

While Mayor Thompson should be commended for his business savvy, his training as a first responder proved helpful when an F-3 tornado struck Nappanee in 2007. During the aftermath, Thompson led a coalition of community leaders to help rebuild areas of Nappanee that had been destroyed or damaged.

The care and compassion the mayor had for his friends, neighbors and relatives who suffered loss and experienced trauma was abundantly clear. His business sense, integrity, and passion to restore people's lives were driving forces behind the recovery process for the town.

Mr. Speaker, once again, please join me in congratulating Mayor Larry Thompson on his retirement. It is my hope that my colleagues will join me in thanking him for his leadership and service to the City of Nappanee.

OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL DEBT

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,049,785,935.02. We've added \$7,524,172,737,021.94 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

TRIBUTE TO MR. MARION JORDAN

HON. HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following Proclamation.

Whereas, Sixty-five years ago on August 19, 1950 a tenacious man of God was born in Macon, Georgia; and

Whereas, Mr. Marion Jordan, served in the United States Military, worked for over forty years as a consummate professional in the insurance industry, and has devoted countless hours towards the betterment of his community; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan has shared his time and talents as a family man, sailor, and mentor to many, giving the citizens of the United

States an admired leader and person of great worth. A servant to all advancing the lives of others, through his service to our country in the U.S. Navy and being the ideal husband, father and grandfather; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan has been blessed with a long, healthy, happy life, devoted to God, family and community; and

Whereas, Mr. Jordan along with his family and friends are celebrating this day a remarkable milestone, his 65th Birthday, we pause to acknowledge a man who is a cornerstone in his professional industry; and

Whereas, the U.S. Representative of the Fourth District of Georgia has set aside these days to honor and recognize Mr. Jordan on his birthday and to wish him well and recognize him for an exemplary life which is an inspiration to all; now therefore, I, HENRY C. "HANK" JOHNSON, JR., do hereby proclaim August 19, 2015 as Mr. Marion Jordan Day, in Georgia's 4th Congressional District.

Proclaimed, this 19th day of August, 2015.

RECOGNIZING KEISER UNIVERSITY ON OPENING ITS FLAGSHIP CAMPUS

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Keiser University on opening its Flagship campus in West Palm Beach, located in my Congressional district. For a university that puts its students first, while serving the community and preparing professionals for the workforce, I am excited for the school's expansion.

The 100-acre campus will provide its ever growing student population with dormitories, athletic teams, and other amenities. This bold move will also support students by giving them access to even more degree programs. High school students from all across America seeking a traditional college experience now have an opportunity to enroll and enjoy a rich multidisciplinary institution.

Keiser University is the second largest member of the Independent Colleges and Universities of Florida and is a Level VI regionally accredited institution by Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The University serves a rich and diverse student body in traditional, nontraditional and online formats. The University was founded in 1977, with the lasting intention to serve adult learners seeking career-focused education. In 2001, the school had fewer than 4,000 students; it now has nearly 20,000 students. The acquisition of the Northwood University campus is just one of many ambitious ways Keiser University continues to expand and serve the hardworking students of South Florida.

Although the main campus is located in Fort Lauderdale, Keiser University now boasts 18 campuses located in Florida's major and mid-sized metropolitan areas and communities. The university has international sites beyond America's shores as well, with regionally accredited off-campus sites in San Marcos, Nicaragua and Shanghai, China. Keiser students

can also access learning centers in Moldova, Taiwan and Seoul, South Korea.

With over 3,500 talented and distinguished faculty and staff Keiser University has served nearly 60,000 hardworking alumni over the years. The university's committed philosophy of putting "students first" is reflected in its 60 programmatically-accredited academic offerings designed to prepare students for careers in business, criminal justice, health care, technology, hospitality, education, and career-focused general studies. Approximately 62 percent of students at Keiser University graduate in STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math) and healthcare fields. The university's students are pursuing degrees in over 100 doctoral, specialist, master's bachelor's, and associate fields as well as various continuing education programs.

Keiser University's goals include continually improving and ensuring effectiveness of its programs, building students' analytical and technical skills, as well as maintaining an unwavering devotion to powerful research at the doctoral level. These goals have led to successful students, an improved economy, and satisfied employers. Annually, Keiser University has made a statewide economic impact of over \$3 billion, as well as direct and indirect impacts for over 30,000 Florida jobs. It is no wonder that Keiser University is ranked 40th among colleges within the Southern Region of the United States.

Aside from changing the lives of its students and touting an impressive staff, Keiser University has consistently given back to the community. They have a major involvement in, among other things, food drives for primary schools, seniors citizen assistance, and major job fairs for those who want to find a role in America's and the international community's workforce. The U.S. News & World Report ranked Keiser 13th overall and 1st in Florida for the category of Regional Colleges South, specifically for its service to our nation's veterans. Moreover, Keiser University and the Keiser Mills Foundation have provided nearly \$44 million in scholarship funds to academic and needs-based US and international students.

Mr. Speaker, I once again want to congratulate the Board of Trustees of Keiser University, Chancellor Dr. Arthur Keiser, and Vice Chancellor Belinda Keiser, on opening their new Flagship campus. I wish them much success as they continue their perpetual dedication to students and commitment to quality, education and community service.

175TH ANNIVERSARY OF BETHEL
UNITED CHURCH OF CHRIST

HON. TIM WALBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 175th Anniversary of Bethel United Church of Christ in Freedom Township, Michigan.

In 1840, a young German minister, Rev. Friedrich Schmid, gathered 20 German immigrant farm families into a congregation named

The Evangelical German Bethel Congregation of Freedom Township. Holding their first services in a log building, the congregation built a wood frame church in 1857. The stone church used today by the congregation was constructed in 1909 with members providing the stones from their fields.

Eighteen pastors have shepherded Bethel UCC over the last 175 years, during which they have undertaken numerous mission projects for the benefit of those near and far away. For example, in the 19th century, clothing and blankets were sent to a Detroit hospital and orphan homes in three states. In the 20th century, several heifers were raised by the church and sent to Appalachia and Germany. The farmers in the congregation sent a rail car of wheat to help feed the hungry and quilts were made for veterans and those in hospitals. Today, quilts are still being sewn and the congregation also helps to feed the homeless locally and participates in a variety of projects that reach worldwide, keeping with the church's mission statement to "reach beyond these stone walls to impact communities both near and far."

In a stone church on a hilltop in rural Freedom Township, this congregation of more than 300 still gather to worship at Bethel, the "House of God." In January of this year, Bethel United Church of Christ began their year-long celebration and reflection on 175 years of sharing joys and sorrows together. On Sunday, November 8, descendants of those early pioneers will gather for a special worship service to acknowledge God's many blessings. I pray for a memorable celebration and for many more years of faithful witness of God's everlasting love in our community.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF
LAW IN THE REPUBLIC OF SERBIA

HON. CHRIS VAN HOLLEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on the occasion of the visit of Prime Minister Aleksandar Vucic to the United States and his meeting with Vice President Biden, to add my voice to the international criticism about human rights and the rule of law in the Republic of Serbia.

In December 2012, Miroslav Miskovic, the president of Delta Holding was arrested and charged with a crime based on an outdated, internationally discredited provision of the Serbian criminal code that is a relic of the nation's communist past. He was charged with "abuse of position by a responsible person" (Article 234) for allegedly receiving market rate interest payments on legitimate commercial loans to a Serbian road construction company that was privatized in 2005. This is not only legal, but common in other European Countries.

The State Department and the European Union have criticized Miskovic's arrest as an example of the ineffective judiciary, excessive use of pretrial detention and a denial of fair public trials. The State Department Human Rights Report states that Mr. Miskovic's pretrial detention was "contrary to the well-es-

lished position of the European Court of Human Rights on the issue, that custody must not only be lawful, but also reasonable and necessary." The European Union, as part of Serbia's EU accession process, has called on the government to reform the provision of the Serbian criminal code under which Mr. Miskovic and 4,168 other individuals are charged. Mr. Miskovic's arrest is indicative of the Serbian justice system's serious need for reform.

With Prime Minister Vucic's visit, the Serbian government is seeking to foster closer ties to the United States as it continues its efforts to join the European Union. While I share the U.S. government's appreciation for Serbia's contribution to Balkan stabilization, I believe any U.S. support for improved relations or for Serbian accession to the EU should depend on that country's commitment to political reform, the addressing of the lack of transparency in the government and genuine efforts to increase the independence of its judiciary. The repeal of Article 234 would go a long way toward establishing those goals.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
ROSARIO ANAYA

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on August 5th a beloved community leader, education and affordable housing advocate, and civil rights activist passed away in San Francisco. Rosario Anaya was a trailblazer and a pillar of San Francisco's Latino community, who dedicated her life to championing social and economic justice for the disenfranchised and underserved.

Rosario was born on October 7, 1944 in Cochabamba, Bolivia and moved to San Francisco in the early 1960s, where she earned her bachelor's degree in public administration and a master's degree in counseling and psychology from the University of San Francisco. She went on to the UCLA Anderson School of Business's Management Development for Entrepreneurs program.

From the start, she proved herself to be a formidable force in the struggle for civil rights. Soon after moving to our city, she became a leader within the Mission Coalition Organization, a diverse network of local agencies that advocated for employment, housing, and education reform.

For forty years, until her untimely passing, she directed the Mission Language and Vocational School, a nonprofit community organization that offers English as a Second Language, and a wide range of computer and vocational courses for all immigrants. Among her many accomplishments with MLVS, she established the flourishing Latino Cuisine Culinary Academy, which provides immigrant workers with expanded opportunities within the San Francisco food industry.

In addition to her commitment to MLVS, Rosario was a key leader in many campaigns and coalitions for social and economic justice, including the San Francisco Latino Voter Registration Project, Jesse Jackson's Rainbow

Coalition and the United Farm Workers, where she organized food caravans from San Francisco to UFW's headquarters in Delano, California. She campaigned to rename Army Street in San Francisco for legendary labor leader Cesar Chavez.

Mayor George Moscone appointed Rosario to the San Francisco Board of Education in the late 1970s. When she ran for a full four-year term in 1978, she became the first woman of Latin American descent elected to public office in San Francisco and subsequently served two more terms as School Board President.

More recently, in 2010 Mayor Gavin Newsom appointed her to the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in order to help plan and supervise the construction of affordable housing.

Rosario served on more boards and committees and received more commendations and honors than can be named for her work in San Francisco and the State of California, as well as receiving international recognition from the governments of Mexico and Venezuela.

Rosario Anaya's leadership improving the lives of immigrants and at-risk populations within the San Francisco community has inspired generations of activists. She epitomized dignity and grace, and she leaves a shining legacy of fighting injustice.

I extend my deepest sympathy and condolences to Rosario's family and friends during this sad time. I hope it is a comfort to them to know that Rosario's legacy will live on through the countless lives she touched and the numerous coalitions and programs she helmed in her efforts to create a more just and equitable world.

IN RECOGNITION OF PROGRESS AT
WEST LOS ANGELES VA MEDICAL CENTER

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to recognize the remarkable accomplishments being made at the VA West Los Angeles Medical Center by the Department of Veterans Affairs and Secretary Robert A. McDonald.

I will not be able to join Secretary McDonald in Los Angeles today as Congress is in session, but it is my pleasure to acknowledge the attention given and progress made at the West LA VA this year by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

The West LA VA is the largest VA Medical Center in the nation and it had faced unfortunate challenges for many years. In January 2015, Secretary McDonald quickly settled a lawsuit that had been holding back progress for Veterans in Los Angeles. Since that time, all of the parties involved have been following a Principles Document that has been driving a Strategic Homeless Initiative and the development of a Master Plan.

In addition to being the largest VA Medical Center, Los Angeles has the largest popu-

lation of homeless Veterans in the United States. We cannot solve homelessness nationwide without addressing it in LA. Secretary McDonald engaged me early this year and we have partnered on many initiatives to address the crisis in homelessness. He has demonstrated a serious commitment to addressing homelessness among Veterans in Los Angeles and to developing a roadmap to ensure the sprawling West LA VA campus is focused on uses and services to directly benefit our nation's Veterans.

In fact, since March 2015 almost 1,400 area Veterans have been placed into permanent supportive housing. The VA expanded capacity to care for homeless Veterans by providing \$30 million in additional Supportive Services for Veteran Families (SSVF) grants. Additional HUD-VASH vouchers have been awarded to our region, new beds have been added, and VA has hired more than 100 new employees prioritizing outreach and case management.

The VA has also actively forged relationships with every level of government, along with public and private partners to leverage resources in a truly unprecedented way.

We have a rare opportunity at this moment to solve homelessness among Veterans if we work together to make it happen. At the same time, we must also transform the West LA VA into a campus that serves our nation's Veterans with the dignity and integrity they so deserve. I am confident with our support and partnerships, Secretary McDonald will achieve this.

I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing gratitude to VA Secretary McDonald for dedicating an enormous amount of time and resources to restoring the trust of our Veterans at West Los Angeles and for delivering critical housing, programs, and services.

TAIWAN NATIONAL DAY

HON. STEVE STIVERS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Taiwan National Day, known as Double Tenth National Day and celebrated every year on October 10th.

Taiwan is a critical country in the Asia-Pacific region, and the people of Taiwan and the current President Ma Ying-jeou have been instrumental in improving relations between neighboring countries. President Ma has been a leader in finding peaceful solutions to the challenges they face, including building a cross-strait relationship between Taipei and Beijing as well as promoting the East China Sea Peace Initiative and the South China Sea Peace Initiative, both of which call upon the countries making claims in contested waters to share the natural resources in those waters.

Taiwan's role in trade has also grown significantly over the past 20 years. Taiwan now ranks as the 10th largest trade partner of the United States. The economic expansion in Taiwan has raised the country to become the 10th ranked country in trade volume among the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation economies and a leading supplier of intermediary goods in the region.

There is no doubt that Taiwan is leading by example in the Asia-Pacific region, and I am grateful that the United States and Taiwan remain close allies. I wish the people of Taiwan all the best as they prepare to celebrate Double Tenth National Day.

SAFER OFFICERS AND SAFER
CITIZENS ACT OF 2015

HON. JANICE HAHN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. HAHN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join my colleagues Senator TIM SCOTT and Senator CORY BOOKER in introducing the "Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015." This legislation will provide federal grant funding to outfit law enforcement officers with body cameras.

Police departments that use body cameras consistently have lower rates of complaints, show a reduced use of force, and have been shown to be a win-win for officers. A report conducted by the City of San Diego showed a 40% reduction in complaints filed by individuals, a 46% reduction in the use of force, and a 30% reduction in the use of pepper spray. A second study in Rialto, California showed a 60% reduction in force. These cameras make our streets safer for law enforcement and individuals.

Further, 785 federal, state, and local law enforcement agencies participated in a study of the effectiveness of body-worn cameras, and 85% agreed that these cameras reduce false complaints.

The bill I am introducing today with Congressman BILL FOSTER and Congresswoman ELIZABETH ESTY, which is the companion to the Senate bill recently introduced by Senators CORY BOOKER and TIM SCOTT, will provide these law enforcement agencies additional resources to equip their officers.

At a time of tension and eroding trust between law enforcement and the public in many communities, body cameras help hold police officers accountable and encourage them to act appropriately as they protect and serve. This legislation enables departments to purchase body cameras without cutting or diverting funds from other important programs including community outreach efforts.

The "Safer Officers and Safer Citizens Act of 2015," will provide \$100 million annually to state, local, and tribal law enforcement departments through a grant program to outfit officers with body cameras. I call on my colleagues in Congress to join me in this effort, and pass this bill.

CONGRATULATING DR. JEFF
REUTTER ON THE ANNOUNCEMENT
OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Dr. Jeff Reutter, pioneering and

indefatigable Director of the Ohio Sea Grant College Program, Stone Laboratory, Center for Lake Erie Area Research, and Great Lakes Aquatic Ecosystem Research Consortium, on the announcement of his retirement.

Dr. Reutter's name has become synonymous with Lake Erie. He has spent his career fighting to develop the foundational data sets to support Lake Erie's recovery. During that time, Dr. Reutter has distinguished himself as a scholarly and popular leader; he is the foremost expert on the health of Lake Erie and our Great Lakes endowment.

Dr. Reutter has tackled many issues facing Lake Erie during a distinguished career where he has witnessed the first Earth Day, the passage of the Clean Water Act in 1972, the return of nesting eagles to Lake Erie following a ban on DDT, and many other changes in our Great Lakes system.

More recently, since the mid 1990s, Dr. Reutter has concentrated his efforts on finding solutions for Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB), caused by high nutrient run-off in the Western Lake Erie Basin, the largest watershed in the Great Lakes. Dr. Reutter's commitment and service to the people of Ohio and our Great Lakes will be celebrated for years to come. His talents will continue to be applied to those endeavors to which he has dedicated his life.

I would like to extend my heartfelt appreciation for his years of service and his unparalleled dedication to a healthy Lake Erie, a restored Great Lakes ecosystem and clean water for those who count on this amazing freshwater abundance—collectively, the most important freshwater body on the face of the earth.

HONORING ROBBIE WILKIE

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Robbie Wilkie for his work as the Caldwell County Emergency Services Director and congratulate him on his retirement.

Mr. Wilkie began his career in 1983 as a volunteer firefighter with the North Catawba Fire Department, where he continued serving through 2004. During that time, he also served as a firefighter for the Lenoir Fire Department from 1988 through 2004, where he worked his way through the ranks to eventually become Fire Captain. After working as a Fire Marshal from 2004 to 2010, Mr. Wilkie was eventually promoted to the Emergency Services Director position in 2013. While serving in this role, his duties included handling all budgetary, administrative, and policy decisions for Caldwell County Emergency Services, while coordinating all fire rescue efforts for Caldwell County. Due to his faithful service, Mr. Wilkie has received multiple awards throughout his career, including Firefighter of the Year from both the North Catawba Fire Department in 1985 and the Lenoir Fire Department in 1998, and the Author H. "Ott" Dellinger Leadership Award in July 2006.

Mr. Wilkie has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to serving the people of Caldwell

County in emergency management. As such, I am proud to honor Mr. Robbie Wilkie for his faithful service to the people of Caldwell County and I wish him the best on his retirement.

GOLD STAR MOTHER'S DAY

HON. TOM RICE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our Gold Star Mothers.

As we honor the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation, we pay tribute to their families, who have made tremendous sacrifice for the sake of our country. On this day, we give due honor to those mothers whose sons or daughters have given their lives while defending our nation.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 115 of June 23, 1936 designated the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day."

Now, therefore, I, TOM RICE by virtue of the authority vested in me as representative of the Seventh District of the state of South Carolina, do hereby proclaim September 27, 2015 to be Gold Star Mother's Day. I encourage the American people to display the flag and hold appropriate ceremonies as an expression of our nation's sympathy and respect for our Gold Star Mothers.

IN RECOGNITION OF BISHOP PRESTON W. WILLIAMS II

HON. SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding Man of God who has provided sage counsel, wisdom, and guidance throughout Georgia, the United States of America, and the world, Bishop Preston W. Williams II. Bishop Williams is the Presiding Prelate of the Sixth Episcopal District, which spans the state of Georgia. After his term concludes in 2016, Bishop Williams will be retiring. A celebration will be held in his honor on Saturday, September 19, 2015 at Allen Temple African Methodist Episcopal Church in Byron, Georgia.

Bishop Preston W. Williams II was born in Willacoochee, Georgia and has worked tirelessly to spread the Word of God in the state throughout his life. He pastored several A.M.E. churches in Georgia, leaving a lasting mark on each through increased membership, improved worship facilities, and impactful community outreach. He also served as the Treasurer of the Sixth Episcopal District and Director of Communication in radio and television for the A.M.E. Church, where he was responsible for coordinating media outreach to more than 100,000 Georgians. He served as a member of the General Assembly of the World Council of Churches and was selected as the State of Georgia Distinguished Churchman.

From 2000 to 2004, Bishop Williams served as the Presiding Prelate of the Seventeenth Episcopal District, located in Central Africa. Under his leadership, the membership of the Seventeenth District expanded exponentially, necessitating that the district be split into two separate parts and leading to the formation of a new Twentieth Episcopal District. In fact, this trend of increasing membership would continue throughout the Bishop's distinguished career, with thousands of people inspired to give their lives to Christ by this charismatic leader's everlasting love and enthusiasm for God.

From 2004 to 2012, Bishop Williams served the Seventh Episcopal District, which consists of the state of South Carolina. There, Bishop Williams advocated for the implementation of Christian education by founding Youth Adult ministries, expanding the curriculum at Allen University, establishing scholarship funds for clergy members to pursue their Master of Divinity degrees, and increasing opportunities for seminary-level training. Moreover, Bishop Williams served the community at large by creating after-school programs dedicated to improving the lives of at-risk teens, among many other worthy contributions. Known to many, respected by all, he left an indelible mark on the Seventh Episcopal District.

In 2012, Georgia rejoiced at the return of Bishop Williams when he was appointed to lead the Sixth Episcopal District of the A.M.E. Church. From 2012 to 2016, Bishop Williams will continue to govern the 543 A.M.E. churches in the state of Georgia. He will also serve as Chairman on the Board of Turner Theological Seminary and Morris Brown College, both located in Atlanta, Georgia.

Bishop Williams has accomplished much for the Kingdom of Christ throughout his life, but none of this would be possible without the grace of God and the love and support of his wife, Wilma, and his children, Arnold Andre, Wilma Priscilla, Stella Jacinta, and Prestina Delores.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me today in recognizing Bishop Preston W. Williams II for his numerous invaluable contributions to Georgia, the United States of America, and the world. Bishop Williams has made a tremendous impact on communities across the globe. Even in his forthcoming retirement, I am confident that Bishop Williams will remain an esteemed and active member of the community, as his limitless enthusiasm and diligent work ethic knows no bounds.

RECOGNIZING THE NATIONAL COLLEGIATE HONORS COUNCIL

HON. DOUG COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the National Collegiate Honors Council and highlight its work to bettering the education of over 325,000 students in more than 800 member colleges and universities around the country.

I want to specifically commend my alma mater, the University of North Georgia, for its

prestigious honors program. I am proud to say that this university—which I believe to be one of the finest institutions of higher learning in the state of Georgia—is located in the beautiful town of Dahlonega in the Ninth District.

I attended the school when it was still known as North Georgia College, but I am glad to say that the school continues to grow. In 2013, North Georgia College and State University was consolidated with Gainesville State University and became the well-known institution we are honoring today—the University of North Georgia.

The University of North Georgia seeks to improve the quality of life for residents of the North Georgia region. They do this through excellence in academic performance, student research, student leadership, service learning, and study abroad programs. Additionally, the University of North Georgia is a premier senior military college and one of only six federally designated senior military colleges in the nation.

The Honors Program at UNG cultivates a community of engaged and academically motivated students who uphold the values of service and integrity, demonstrate global awareness, and exhibit strong leadership skills. Evidence of the program's success is exhibited by some of their outstanding alumni. One example among many is Sara Brubaker, class of 2010. Sara completed her Doctorate of Physical Therapy in 2013 and was one of just twelve physical therapists chosen for employment by the U.S. Navy. She now serves at the rank of Lieutenant as the Rehabilitation Department Head at the Naval Hospital in Beaufort, SC.

I am proud to recognize the accomplishments of Sara and other accomplished students and alumni of the University of North Georgia and to commend the University's successful honors program.

**HONORING PRINCIPAL CHIEF
MICHELL HICKS**

HON. MARK MEADOWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Principal Chief Michell Hicks of the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, who is retiring on September 26, 2015. I am proud to call Chief Hicks a good friend and thank him for his dedicated service as Principal Chief.

After graduating from Western Carolina University, Chief Hicks served for twelve years as the Principal Chief for the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians, and prior to that served eight years as the Chief Finance Officer for the Eastern Band. During his tenure as Principal Chief, Chief Hicks was instrumental in the completion of several vital service facilities, such as the Shawn Blanton Emergency Operations Center, the Snowbird Youth Center, the new Justice Center and Jail, and a new Cherokee Hospital, scheduled to open in October of this year.

Additionally, Chief Hicks spearheaded many educational efforts in the region. He developed and implemented a reading program for kin-

dergarten children in the region, he oversaw the development of a financial literacy program for Cherokee youth, and he helped rekindle an interest in the Cherokee language by including it as required curriculum at Cherokee schools.

Chief Hicks is known by his friends as a kind, compassionate man who, while cherishing the old Cherokee traditions, is a visionary for a better future for his people. His tremendous passion and vision earned him the Tribal Leader of the Year Award from the Native American Finance Officers Association.

The exemplary leadership and vision of Chief Hicks is something that all of us can admire and respect. As such, I am proud to honor Principal Chief Michell Hicks on his faithful service to the people of Cherokee and congratulate him on his retirement.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TOM COLE

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and not present for Roll Call vote number 495. Had I been present, I would have voted "YEA" on H.R. 1214, the National Forest Small Tracts Amendments Act.

CELEBRATING THE HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH AND THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE LATINO COMMUNITY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, since 1968, America celebrates the National Hispanic Heritage Month from September 15th to October 15th, 2015, to recognize the legacy of those whose ancestors came from Latin America and Spain. The beginning of the National Hispanic Heritage Month is very important because it is also the anniversary of independence for some Central American countries such as: Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Also, Mexico and Chile celebrate their independence days on September 16th and September 18th respectively.

We are fortunate to have in our district so many dedicated community leaders and organizations, such as CUNY Dominican Studies Institute, Dominican American National Roundtable, Hispanic Federation, Dominican Women Development Center, Mirabal Sisters Cultural and Community Center, Dominican Medical Association DMA, National Dominican Women Caucus, Dominican Bar Association, Latino Leadership Institute, East Harlem Preservation, Inc., Falu Foundation, El Museo del Barrio, Little Sisters of the Assumption Family Health Service, East Harlem Council for Community Improvement, Inc., Friendly Hands Ministry, VIDA Family Services, Inc., N.E.R.V.E., Inc., Teatro Moderno Puertorriqueno, Inc., Casabe Houses Development Fund, Com-

pany, Inc., Julia de Burgos Cultural Center, Latino Justice PRLDEF, Hispanic Federation, La Casa de la Herencia Cultural Puertorriquena, Borikén Health Center, Nuevo Caribe Democratic Club of El Barrio and Cataño Gardens and the Association of Progressive Dominicans, working tirelessly to improve the lives of people living in East Harlem, Inwood, Washington Heights and the Bronx. Pioneers such as Secretary Thomas Pérez, America's first Cabinet Secretary of Dominican descent and Justice Sonia Sotomayor who is of Puerto Rican descent and is the country's first Hispanic to be appointed to the Supreme Court, are not only role models for youths in our congressional district, but also symbols of the American Dream. They remind us that willingness to strive can help us to achieve great success, not only for ourselves but for America as a country.

Like all Americans, Latino families aspire to own a home, save for their children's higher education, and put aside enough money for a secure retirement. We need comprehensive immigration reform that will fix our broken system and allow millions of aspiring Americans to come out of the shadows. Every day we delay the issue of immigration reform is another day that our economy, our businesses, and our families lose out. I will continue to fight for comprehensive immigration reform and for the policies that will strengthen the Latino community and expand their opportunities to achieve the American Dream.

The United States of America is greater, thanks to the contributions of the Latino community, which is 55.4 million strong, and continues to grow and make a great impact throughout our country. Happy Hispanic Heritage Month.

IN HONOR OF BETTY HARDY

HON. KEVIN BRADY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, residents in Montgomery County are blessed to have non-profit organizations that provide a true safety net for struggling families and individuals.

One of those organizations is the Montgomery County Food Bank which has been helping families since 1985.

This food bank is an integral part of our community today because a group of individuals led by Betty Hardy saw a need and found a way to fill that need by partnering with other agencies.

Betty Hardy has put others first as long as any of us have known her. She is a blessing to our community. She went from helping people on the crisis hotline to ensuring families in need had a meal on the table.

Betty's passion to put others first is what led her to bring together several like-minded friends each week to organize and create food pantries, food drives and deliveries.

Out of her commitment—and her garage, trunk and backseat—grew the program we know as the Montgomery County Food Bank.

From the food bank's initial one-room office space this program has grown to service countless families.

The Food Bank went from serving nearly 18,000 meals in the first year to 400,000 annual meals just a short decade later.

In 2007, the food bank opened its first official warehouse with the help of a community development grant. Today, the food bank operates out of a 60,000 square foot facility that distributes several million pounds of food every year. They coordinate with a network of approximately 50 food pantries, soup kitchens, senior centers and other agencies to provide fresh produce, meat and non-perishables to more than 32,000 people each month.

Betty's dream of helping Montgomery County residents weather a crisis has evolved into the sixth largest food bank in Texas.

Betty Hardy is proof that one person's determination, dedication and willingness to roll up her sleeves can have a far reaching impact on individuals and families who need to know there is hope and support in their community.

Today, the Montgomery County Food Bank will hold its inaugural Food for Life Luncheon celebrating its past, present and future. That celebration begins with the accomplishments

of Betty Hardy and her efforts to fight hunger in our community.

HONORING LIEUTENANT GENERAL
PATRICIA D. HOROHO

HON. BRAD R. WENSTRUP

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 17, 2015

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, Primum Non Nocere: Above all, do no harm.

Today we honor the service of Lieutenant General Patricia D. Horoho, the United States' 43rd Surgeon General of the Army.

Lt. Gen. Horoho, the first woman and first nurse to serve in the role, boasts a remarkable record of service to our nation and the medical profession.

Serving at all levels of leadership of Army Medicine, her service includes deployments in Haiti and Kabul, Afghanistan. In the United States, she has served as Chief of the Army Nurse Corps among other roles.

Any recognition would be incomplete without highlighting her heroic service on September 11, 2001. Working in the Pentagon, she rushed to triage wounded victims in the immediate hours following the attack.

Lt. Gen Horoho's service is recognized with four of the highest honors awarded by the United States: the Distinguished Service Medal, the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, and the Army Meritorious Service Medal.

She exhibits the highest standards of integrity, moral character, and professional excellence. Also a recipient of the Order of Military Medical Merit Medallion, an award presented to those who demonstrate the in their service to the Army Medical Department.

For those in military medicine, Lt. Gen. Horoho says it best: "In every conflict the U.S. Army has fought, Army Medicine has stood shoulder to shoulder with our fighting forces, supporting those who are putting their lives on the line to defend our freedom."

Lt. Gen. Patricia Horoho, our grateful nation thanks you, and salutes you, for your service to us all.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Friday, September 18, 2015

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 18, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Once again, we come to ask wisdom, patience, peace, and understanding for the Members of this people's House. At a time when, once again, strong sentiments stand in opposition, we ask discernment for the Members, that they might judge anew their adherence to principle, conviction, and commitment.

Protect them from the deafness toward one another, lest they slide uncharitably toward an inability to work together to solve the important issues of our day.

Give them the generosity of heart and the courage of true leadership to work toward a common solution which might call for compromise, even sacrifice on both sides. In the end, may we all, as Americans, be proud of the processes of elective, democratic government.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. TSONGAS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

IRAN DEAL

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Madam Speaker, last week, the House of Representatives thoughtfully voted three times to oppose the Iranian nuclear deal. This bipartisan effort represented the will of the American people, where the majority oppose this deal. The first vote was a sense of Congress that the President failed to comply with the law to submit all agreements to Congress. The second vote was to defeat the deal, and the third vote was to prevent the President from lifting sanctions on Iran until 2017.

I am grateful to Chairman ED ROYCE for his leadership in holding hearings and advancing legislation to fight this dangerous deal. Sadly, they are blocked in the Senate by Democrats who fail to see the threats of "death to America," "death to Israel."

This is a historic mistake. The President is flooding billions of dollars to the Iranian regime to fund terrorist attacks and has paved the way for Iran to develop nuclear weapons. The President's legacy in the Middle East, failing to enforce the red line in Syria, has led to the refugee crisis and chaos, with children drowned at sea. American families deserve peace through strength.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President by his actions never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

HONORING MIKE HARPER ON HIS 88TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. ASHFORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ASHFORD. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor my friend, Mike Harper, on his 88th birthday. Mr. Harper served as the CEO of ConAgra, an

agricultural giant and Fortune 500 company headquartered in the heart of my district.

In 1975, Mike came to Omaha to take the helm at ConAgra and presided over a massive expansion of business in Nebraska. By 1987, though, Nebraska was emerging from the farm crisis and feared the loss of significant corporate presence. Mike personally spearheaded the effort to reform State taxes and regulations that made corporate investment burdensome.

Between 1975, when Mike took over as CEO of ConAgra, and 1987, the profits of ConAgra soared, as did the fortunes of business in Nebraska. Thanks to Mike's leadership in business and politics, Nebraska now has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the country. My district in particular enjoys a well-balanced economy, including manufacturing, agriculture, and a wide array of services.

On this day, I wish to rise to applaud this giant of the agriculture industry and a major contributor to the expansion and preservation of Nebraska's local economy.

Happy birthday to Mike Harper.

HONORING NAPPANEE MAYOR LARRY THOMPSON ON HIS RETIREMENT

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Madam Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Nappanee Mayor Larry Thompson on his retirement. A devoted husband and proud father, Mayor Thompson has dedicated his life to serving his community. He and his wife, Linda, grew up in the Nappanee area and, along with his two children, run their family funeral home business.

Since his election in 1995, he has been instrumental in making Nappanee one of the most vibrant cities in the State of Indiana. He helped establish the Boys and Girls Club of Nappanee and created the West Industrial Park.

In the aftermath of an F3 tornado that struck Nappanee in 2007, Thompson led a coalition of community leaders to help rebuild the parts of the city that had been destroyed or damaged.

In addition to his work in the public sector, Mayor Thompson is an active member of the community, involved with Kiwanis and the American Red Cross. He has dedicated his life to public service.

God bless you, Larry, in your retirement.

REPUBLICAN CALENDAR OF CHAOS

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Madam Speaker, House Republicans are giving us a fall calendar of chaos. We have 5 legislative days before they shut the government down.

Madam Speaker, this is a bad rerun of bad policy. Two years ago, people said they would never shut it down, and they did it. When they shut it down, it cost the economy \$24 billion, and 120,000 jobs were lost; and they are going to do it again in 5 days.

That is not the only deadline, Madam Speaker, in this calendar of chaos. They have missed a deadline for the highway trust fund, costing more jobs. We are careening towards another fiscal cliff with the debt ceiling. They missed the deadline for the Export-Import Bank, which cost a bunch of jobs, 500 lost jobs, as a result of this calendar of chaos.

And there is more. Madam Speaker, the American people, everyday Americans, do not deserve this Republican calendar of chaos.

FEDERAL WILDLAND FIREFIGHTER RECOGNITION ACT

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, this year, 8½ million acres so far have been consumed due to wildfire. This is approaching the record that we don't want to break of 10 million that happened in 2006.

Recently, the Forest Service in this year's wildland fire season has spent \$243 million just in the last week of August alone. We have 30,000 American firefighters deployed, as well as hundreds from Australia, New Zealand, and Canada. Despite this dedication, the current Federal firefighters are given erroneous job titles, such as wildland technician or forestry technician.

H.R. 3363, the Federal Wildland Firefighter Recognition Act, would give them the proper title of wildland firefighters and allows those who risk their lives to be recognized properly and given the respect they deserve. Let's pass H.R. 3363 to give them their proper title.

STOP PUTTING WOMEN'S HEALTH AT RISK

(Ms. TSONGAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. TSONGAS. Madam Speaker, we have less than 5 legislative days here in Washington before the end of this fiscal

year, but instead of funding the government, House majority leadership is focused on defunding Planned Parenthood.

For nearly a century, Planned Parenthood has been one of the Nation's leading providers of high quality, affordable health care for women. It has fundamentally changed attitudes towards women's reproductive freedom, which has been essential to women's health and given women more control over their health care decisions.

One in five women has relied on a Planned Parenthood health center for care in her lifetime. They are often one of the few affordable places for women to turn when they are searching for care. Cutting Federal funds to Planned Parenthood means taking away money for cervical cancer screenings, breast care screenings, and other types of necessary care.

Madam Speaker, I urge my friends on the other side of the aisle to come to the table and negotiate a way to fund the government and to stop these political games that put women's health at risk.

RECOGNIZING CHRISTOPHE JEANNIN AND HIS FAMILY ON BECOMING U.S. CITIZENS

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Madam Speaker, I rise today in honor of Citizenship Day, observed yesterday, September 17, to recognize all who have become citizens of our great Nation.

The 10th Congressional District in Illinois is a place where thousands of immigrants have started and grown their businesses, raised their families, and achieved the American Dream.

Madam Speaker, I believe America is a place where goals can be accomplished and the doors of opportunity are always open for those who work hard.

Earlier this week, I had the privilege of attending a Naturalization Oath Ceremony for some very good friends, the Jeannin family in Chicago. It was a ceremony in Judge Sam Der-Yeghiayan's chambers, and Christophe, Natalie, Audrey, and Alex all raised their right hand to swear allegiance to the United States of America.

Madam Speaker, Christophe came to the United States with his family in the late seventies. His mother and father—Gerard and Madeline—and his sisters—Dominique, Sophie, and Ann—were all here and were contributing members of our community. They have all since left, but Christophe has remained.

Madam Speaker, the Jeannin family is just one example of immigrants who have made a tremendous impact in our community. We are stronger and a

more diverse community because of immigrants that call our Nation home.

I want to congratulate Christophe, Natalie, Audrey, Alex, and all of the citizens this week that have become United States citizens. Congratulations.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Madam Speaker, last night, nearly 80 of my colleagues joined me in sending a letter to Speaker BOEHNER urging him to keep the House in session every day until we reach a solution that prevents a government shutdown.

In 2013, we saw how badly a shutdown damaged our economy: \$24 billion in lost economic activity, 120,000 fewer private sector jobs created during the shutdown, and 20,000 veterans disabilities claims per week that were stalled. And yet even though we have nearly 2 weeks left before a shutdown would happen, there are only 5 days of scheduled activity in this House Chamber.

The American people can't afford another self-inflicted Washington wound on our economy. The stakes are just too high to take even a day off. We owe it to working families, seniors, and veterans across our Nation to get the job done right now.

JUSTICE FOR VICTIMS OF IRANIAN TERRORISM ACT

(Mr. MEEHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MEEHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise to seek justice for victims of Iran's state-sponsored terror.

One of those victims is Chief Petty Officer Robert Stethem. In June 1985, Petty Officer Stethem, 23 years old, was murdered by Hezbollah terrorists aboard hijacked TWA Flight 847 in Beirut. He was executed when the hijackers realized he was a United States servicemember. They tortured him, and then they murdered him in cold blood before leaving his body on the tarmac below the plane.

Madam Speaker, Hezbollah is one of Iran's most lethal terrorist proxies. In 2002, a Federal judge ordered Iran to pay more than \$320 million to Stethem's family and other victims of Flight 847's hijacking. It is one of the more than 80 judgments that require Iran to pay \$43 billion to victims of its radical allies. Not one dime has been paid.

Despite Iran's refusal to compensate its victims, it will soon get a \$150 billion windfall from the end of the sanctions under the proposed nuclear deal. In short, Iran's hardliners will get a payday while their victims await billions of dollars in compensation.

Madam Speaker, I have introduced legislation, the Justice for Victims of Iranian Terrorism Act, which prohibits the removal of sanctions until Iran pays every penny it owes. It is the least we can do for victims like Chief Petty Officer Stethem and the families that suffered at Iran's hands, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 0915

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Madam Speaker, the GOP's dysfunction has real consequences for the hard-working Americans who elected us and who are trying to make ends meet for their families.

Rather than pass a long-term highway bill that invests in our crumbling infrastructure and creates jobs, Republicans instead keep catering to the most radical elements of their base.

Madam Speaker, this is irresponsible. The American people deserve better. It is time for the Republican Congress to come to its senses and for this Congress to come together for the good of the people who elected us.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 421, I call up the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a healthcare practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3504

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds as follows:

(1) If an abortion results in the live birth of an infant, the infant is a legal person for all purposes under the laws of the United States, and entitled to all the protections of such laws.

(2) Any infant born alive after an abortion or within a hospital, clinic, or other facility has the same claim to the protection of the law that would arise for any newborn, or for any person who comes to a hospital, clinic, or other facility for screening and treatment or otherwise becomes a patient within its care.

SEC. 3. BORN-ALIVE INFANTS PROTECTION.

(a) REQUIREMENTS PERTAINING TO BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS.—Chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 1531 the following:

"§ 1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors

"(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR HEALTH CARE PRACTITIONERS.—In the case of an abortion or attempted abortion that results in a child born alive (as defined in section 8 of title 1, United States Code (commonly known as the 'Born-Alive Infants Protection Act')):

"(1) DEGREE OF CARE REQUIRED; IMMEDIATE ADMISSION TO A HOSPITAL.—Any health care practitioner present at the time the child is born alive shall—

"(A) exercise the same degree of professional skill, care, and diligence to preserve the life and health of the child as a reasonably diligent and conscientious health care practitioner would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age; and

"(B) following the exercise of skill, care, and diligence required under subparagraph (A), ensure that the child born alive is immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

"(2) MANDATORY REPORTING OF VIOLATIONS.—A health care practitioner or any employee of a hospital, a physician's office, or an abortion clinic who has knowledge of a failure to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) shall immediately report the failure to an appropriate State or Federal law enforcement agency, or to both.

"(b) PENALTIES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined under this title or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.

"(2) INTENTIONAL KILLING OF CHILD BORN ALIVE.—Whoever intentionally performs or attempts to perform an overt act that kills a child born alive described under subsection (a), shall be punished as under section 1111 of this title for intentionally killing or attempting to kill a human being.

"(c) BAR TO PROSECUTION.—The mother of a child born alive described under subsection (a) may not be prosecuted under this section, for conspiracy to violate this section, or for an offense under section 3 or 4 of this title based on such a violation.

"(d) CIVIL REMEDIES.—

"(1) CIVIL ACTION BY A WOMAN ON WHOM AN ABORTION IS PERFORMED.—If a child is born alive and there is a violation of subsection (a), the woman upon whom the abortion was performed or attempted may, in a civil action against any person who committed the violation, obtain appropriate relief.

"(2) APPROPRIATE RELIEF.—Appropriate relief in a civil action under this subsection includes—

"(A) objectively verifiable money damage for all injuries, psychological and physical, occasioned by the violation of subsection (a);

"(B) statutory damages equal to 3 times the cost of the abortion or attempted abortion; and

"(C) punitive damages.

"(3) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR PLAINTIFF.—The court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee to a prevailing plaintiff in a civil action under this subsection.

"(4) ATTORNEY'S FEE FOR DEFENDANT.—If a defendant in a civil action under this subsection prevails and the court finds that the plaintiff's suit was frivolous, the court shall award a reasonable attorney's fee in favor of the defendant against the plaintiff.

"(e) DEFINITIONS.—In this section the following definitions apply:

"(1) ABORTION.—The term 'abortion' means the use or prescription of any instrument, medicine, drug, or any other substance or device—

"(A) to intentionally kill the unborn child of a woman known to be pregnant; or

"(B) to intentionally terminate the pregnancy of a woman known to be pregnant, with an intention other than—

"(i) after viability, to produce a live birth and preserve the life and health of the child born alive; or

"(ii) to remove a dead unborn child.

"(2) ATTEMPT.—The term 'attempt', with respect to an abortion, means conduct that, under the circumstances as the actor believes them to be, constitutes a substantial step in a course of conduct planned to culminate in performing an abortion."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 74 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item pertaining to section 1531 the following:

"1532. Requirements pertaining to born-alive abortion survivors."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 3504, currently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Millions of people have viewed videos of representatives of the organization Planned Parenthood, which performs some 40 percent of all abortions each year. Those videos, recorded undercover, include discussions of instances in which during the course of an attempted abortion a baby is born "intact."

As one doctor caught on tape said: "Sometimes . . . if someone delivers before we get to see them for a procedure, then they"—the babies—"are intact. But that's not what we go for."

Another business executive said: "If you had intact cases, which we've done a lot, we sometimes ship those back to our lab in its entirety."

A procurement manager says on a video: "I literally have had women come in and they'll go in the OR"—the operating room—"and they're back out in 3 minutes, and I'm going, 'What's going on?' 'Oh, yeah. The fetus was already in the vaginal canal whenever we put her in the stirrups. It just fell out.'"

A former employee of the same company told investigators that she was shown the results of one abortion by a

doctor, and she recalls: "This is the most gestated fetus and the closest thing to a baby I've seen . . . and she"—the doctor—"taps the heart and it starts beating . . . The nodes were still firing and I don't know if that means it's technically dead or it's alive. It had a face. It wasn't completely torn up. Its nose was very pronounced. It had eyelids . . . Since the fetus was so intact, she said, 'Ok. Well, this is a really good fetus and it looks like we can procure a lot from it. We're going to procure a brain . . . That means we're going to have to cut the head open.' She takes a scissors and she makes a small incision right here"—at the chin—"and goes, I would say, maybe a little bit through the mouth, and she's like, 'Ok. Can you go the rest of the way?'. . . And so she gave me the scissors and told me that I have to cut down the middle of the face. And I can't even describe what that feels like."

The House Judiciary Committee, which I chair, is undergoing a comprehensive investigation of the issues raised by these videos. But as that and other investigations continue, Congress must move immediately to protect any children born alive during the course of a failed abortion.

The bill before us today is simple, yet profound, insofar as it might be a reflection of the Nation's conscience.

Its operative provisions provide that, in the case of an abortion that results in a child's being born alive, any healthcare practitioner present must exercise the same degree of professional care to preserve the life of the child as he or she would render to any other child born alive at the same gestational age. The bill also provides that the child must be immediately transported and admitted to a hospital.

If a baby born alive is left to die, the penalty can be up to 5 years in jail. If the child is cut open for its body parts or some other overt act is taken, the punishment is that for first degree murder, which can include life in prison or the death penalty.

Babies are born alive during failed abortions. Just last week, the committee heard direct testimony by two grown women who, as babies, survived attempted abortions. The mother of one of them, Gianna Jessen, was advised by Planned Parenthood to have an abortion.

But, as Ms. Jessen testified, "Instead of dying, after 18 hours of being burned in my mother's womb, I was delivered alive in an abortion clinic in Los Angeles." Her medical records state clearly that she was "born alive" during an abortion.

She continued: "Thankfully, the abortionist was not at work yet. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die. Instead, a nurse called an ambulance, and I was

rushed to a hospital. Doctors did not expect me to live. I did. I was later diagnosed with cerebral palsy, which was caused by a lack of oxygen to my brain while surviving the abortion. I was never supposed to hold my head up or walk. I do. And cerebral palsy is a great gift to me."

Just think of that for a moment. Ms. Jessen says cerebral palsy is a gift to her because it came with the gift of life. Ms. Jessen presented a picture at the hearing, showing the results of the sort of abortion she survived.

Today, I ask the Nation to see in its collective mind the body of a baby, much like this one, on the floor, born alive during a failed abortion. I ask that we collectively reach down into our hearts and, also, reach down to the floor.

As we vote today, I ask that we, as a nation, grasp the value of life and, also, grasp that baby's back, lift its tiny body off the ground, and take it to a hospital—and not leave her with the abortionist.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Contrary to its misleading title, this bill is not about protecting children born alive. Its real intent is to further undermine a woman's right to choose, a right that has been constitutionally guaranteed for more than 42 years by *Roe v. Wade*.

Not only does this bill attempt to politicize women's health and to limit women's access to abortion, it would interfere with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and substitute a physician's best judgment with the judgment of a handful of politicians'.

We must not forget that this bill has come to the floor at the same time as the push to defund Planned Parenthood.

This attack on a venerable and respected provider of high-quality health care would have a devastating impact on women, especially women in rural communities, low-income women, and women of color, and it would deny women access to preventive care, life-saving cancer screenings, and family planning services.

Approximately one woman in five has relied on Planned Parenthood for health care at some point in her lifetime. It is a blatant attack on women and families to defund an organization that uses Federal funds to prevent abortions and to help families stay healthy and cannot even use Federal funding for abortion.

It would be the saddest of ironies that, by defunding Planned Parenthood's critical contraception and other reproductive health services in the name of opposing abortion, we would see more unintended pregnancies and, therefore, more abortions.

Among its flaws, H.R. 3504 proposes a standard of care for abortion providers

that could interfere with the ability of physicians to make medical decisions for their patients.

In doing so, the bill represents an unprecedented level of intrusion by the government into medical decisions.

For instance, the bill requires an abortion provider to immediately transport a fetus to a hospital in some cases even if the fetus is not viable under existing law and under the standards of care applicable to neonatal physicians.

This requirement is so broad and the penalties so severe—up to 5 years in prison—that one can only conclude that the real purpose of the bill is to intimidate abortion providers out of service.

The bill also requires doctors and employees of hospitals and clinics that provide abortion services to report any violations of the bill's standard of care to State or Federal law enforcement authorities.

Any person who fails to comply with these requirements is threatened with fines and up to 5 years in prison. This is not just the doctors but the cleaning crew and the receptionists.

On top of this, the language in this bill completely fails to distinguish between a viable and non-viable fetus, which is the constitutional line that separates abortions that may be performed without restrictions from those that may be regulated or prohibited.

The bill's vague and broad mandates, combined with severe penalties, will effectively intimidate doctors and ultimately drive them away from the abortion practice, which appears to be the true intent of this troubling bill.

This is why so many organizations are opposed to this bill, those like the National Women's Law Center, the AAUW, the ACLU, and Physicians for Reproductive Choice and Health.

In fact, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, which represents 58,000 physicians, opposes H.R. 3504 because it represents a gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician between a woman and her doctor.

By intimidating doctors and thereby making abortion unavailable as a practical matter, abortion opponents seek to accomplish, in fact, what they have not accomplished in the courts or in public opinion. Simply put, H.R. 3504 is yet another attack on women's health and rights.

When the Born-Alive Infant Protection Act, or BAIPA, became law 13 years ago, the bill's sponsors clarified that the law was not intended to affect abortion practice or a woman's right to choose.

We did not want to constrain or chill medical decisions regarding patient care. That is why Judiciary Committee Democrats voted to support it.

The bill before us today appears to directly contradict those assurances.

Let's not forget that politicians are not doctors.

We should be concerned about doing our jobs and fully funding high-quality women's health care instead of trying to keep doctors from doing theirs. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS), the chairman of the Constitution and Civil Justice Subcommittee and the author of this legislation.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. I thank the gentleman. I also thank the gentleman for his commitment to protecting these little babies.

Madam Speaker, the United States of America is an exceptional nation, whose unique core premise is that declared conviction that we are all created equal and that each of us is endowed by our Creator with the inalienable right to live.

Abraham Lincoln called upon all of us in this Chamber to remember those words of America's Founding Fathers and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that "when in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that 'their posterity'—that is us, Madam Speaker—"might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began."

□ 0930

Madam Speaker, the sincerest purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act is to renew that noble battle to respect and protect those little fellow human beings among us who are this moment being trodden on and degraded and imbruted by their fellows.

Not long ago, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and found a torture chamber for little born-alive babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

The grand jury report at that time said, "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years there were hundreds of 'snippings'."

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2 feet long

that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise and it "sounded like a little alien."

And now, in recent days, Madam Speaker, numerous video recordings have been released that demonstrate that Kermit Gosnell was just the tip of the iceberg of the abortion industry's unspeakable cruelty to these little children of God.

The veil has now been pulled back, and all of us now see the walls behind the abortion industry and the horrifying plight of its little human victims, who we must not forget, are also the least of these, our little brothers and sisters.

Our response, as a people and a Nation, to these horrors shown in these videos is vital to everything those lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to save.

The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, Madam Speaker, protects little children who have been born alive. No one in this body can obscure the humanity and the personhood of these little born-alive babies, nor can they take refuge within the schizophrenic paradox *Roe v. Wade* has subjected this country to, for now, more than 40 years.

The abortion industry has labored all these decades to convince the world that unborn children and born children should be completely separated in our minds, that while born children are persons worthy of protection, unborn children are not persons and are not worthy of protection.

But, Madam Speaker, those who oppose this bill to protect born-alive babies now have the impossible task of trying to join born children and unborn children back together again and then trying to convince all of us to condemn them both as inhuman and not worthy of protection after all.

To anyone who has not invincibly hardened their heart and soul, Madam Speaker, an honest consideration of this absurd inconsistency is profoundly enlightening.

Because, you see, this country has faced such paradox and self-imposed blindness before. There was a time that our own House rules banned any discussion or debate in this Chamber about the effort to end human slavery in America.

But, Madam Speaker, that debate did come and with it came a time when the humanity of the victims and the inhumanity of what was being done to them became so glaring even to the hardest of hearts that it moved an entire nation of people to find the compassion and the courage in their own souls to change their position.

Now, to this generation, Madam Speaker, that time has come again.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER),

an outstanding and leading member of our Judiciary Committee.

Mr. NADLER. Madam Speaker, God bless the United States Supreme Court for its *Roe v. Wade* decision that liberated the women of this country to make their own decisions, to exercise their own consciences in the most intensely private matter of whether they should carry a pregnancy to term.

Now, I recognize, of course, that there are those who hold the religious conviction that a one-celled organism—one cell, two cells—is a fully formed human being.

They are entitled to religious conviction. They are not entitled to impose that religious conviction on all the women of this country who may not share it. That is essentially the abortion debate.

We are not debating abortion today, although some people would like to. We are debating this ridiculous Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act.

Fifteen years ago, I stood on this floor and supported the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act. I said it was unnecessary. It simply repeated existing law.

It has always been the law that, if an infant is born, whether that birth was intentional or not is irrelevant, that that is a person. If you kill that infant, you are guilty of murder or manslaughter, as the case may be. You certainly may not do so intentionally.

The Born-Alive Infant Protection Act did not change that. It just added superfluous language to the law. Its only purpose was to try to paint people who support the right to choose and supporters of infanticide.

So we said, no, it is silly because it doesn't add anything to the law. It simply duplicates the existing law, but we will support it so we cannot be slandered that way.

Now we have this bill, which does essentially two things. One, it repeats, in different language, exactly the same provisions from 15 years ago.

It doesn't change the law that we enacted 15 years ago, and it doesn't change the law that preexisted in every State of the Union. If you kill a child, it is murder, period.

Dr. Gosnell, I would point out, is in jail for life because he committed multiple murders. Nobody, but nobody, supports what he does and nobody, except in some of their fantasies that Mr. FRANKS says, thinks that Planned Parenthood or anybody else supports such actions.

This bill, however, cannot be supported because it does one harmful thing. This bill says that the born-alive child must be given the same standard of care whether he is born alive in an attempted abortion or from a regular birth.

That is already the law. Of course, it is the law. It ought to be the law. It must be the law. It always has been the law.

What it also does is it says that, as soon as the doctor has given that child the proper standard of care, he must rush him to the hospital, regardless of whether that might be good or bad for the child, regardless of the standard of care, regardless of whether the nearby hospital has neonatal intensive care units.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. NADLER. Of course, everybody associated with the doctor, under existing law, has the duty of giving the best possible medical care under any circumstances. That may be to transport the baby to the hospital. It may be that the baby is too frail to transport.

But along comes this bill that says: We don't care about the real situation that doctor faces with that infant. We know how to practice medicine in every situation—we, in Congress—so we are going to say it must be brought to the hospital even if that might kill the child.

It is just stupid, and that is why this bill must be opposed, not because it changes the standard of law or has anything to do with born-alive infants, but because it mandates that a child be brought to the hospital when medical care might indicate that that child in that situation should not be brought to the hospital. It may kill children. That is why we must oppose this bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. Madam Speaker, as a physician, a father and a grandfather, let me first respond and say that, in the process of a birth, an abortion, there is no way one can tell whether that child is viable until you actually apply health-saving tools and techniques to that baby. So that argument that viability and all of that made in advance really makes no sense whatsoever.

Look, committing abortions is not health care for women. The baby dies a horrifically painful and ghastly death. Her tiny hands and feet, brain, and spinal tissues are dissected and sold to the highest bidder, and her mother is agonizing over the loss of a child.

What happens if a child survives this barbaric and inhumane murder attempt? Abortionists have been known to snip babies' spines, throw children into plastic bags, or leave the infant to die, away from a human touch and healing care.

Today's bill, however, will put a stop to the double murder attempt on a baby's life. It will protect children, infants, who are born alive, affording these tiny patients immediate medical attention.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY).

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to this punitive and intrusive bill. I am both disturbed and offended that this latest attempt to restrict women's access to reproductive health care is based on a series of videos that have been found to be grotesquely deceptive and purposefully misleading.

This is politics at its most manipulative, and politics should never be permitted to come between a patient and her doctor.

This bill attempts to criminalize legal medical care and punish millions of women by rolling back reproductive choices. It wages a kind of guerilla warfare against Roe v. Wade by threatening doctors with jail time for providing care to their patients.

The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists calls the vague requirements and drastic penalties—unnecessary requirements like going to the hospital—scare tactics that are unnecessary and wrong.

This bill would have the Federal Government threaten doctors who do their job taking care of their patients with up to 5 years' imprisonment.

To make it all even more outrageous, this bill is based on a series of unsupported allegations and it ignores the fact that there has been no evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood.

In fact, five States have now conducted their own investigations into the charges against Planned Parenthood and have found that no laws have been broken.

Instead, the backers of this bill rely on misleading, badly doctored videos released by an extreme antichoice group as the basis for a slew of legislation to decrease access to care for women in this country who can least afford it. Millions of women rely on Planned Parenthood for their basic health care.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. There is no choice in this country which has been guaranteed by our Supreme Court without access to choice. This bill attempts to stop the access to choice by putting doctors in jail by absurd requirements.

I urge my colleagues to respect the relationship between women and their doctors, respect their need for affordable and available health care, and vote "no" on this punitive and intrusive bill.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM).

Mr. ROSKAM. Madam Speaker, my heart is heavy with this debate. My heart becomes very heavy when I hear the descriptions of this awful procedure.

My heart becomes even heavier, Madam Speaker, when I listen to the twisted logic and the distortions of people who find themselves implicitly defending this.

President Obama has said that he will veto this because it is related to abortion services. Yet, Mr. NADLER moments ago said this has nothing to do with abortion, that everybody agrees that these babies are born and deserve the protections of the law. He says, basically, it is a sideshow. It is either one or the other, Madam Speaker, and they don't get to argue it both ways.

But I think we ought to be able to agree on this, that we are talking about people who are born, who are breathing, whose hearts are pumping, whose fingers are twitching, who have full feeling and deserve every benefit of the doubt and every protection of the law.

□ 0945

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. RUIZ), a leading physician in our Congress.

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, as an emergency physician I am deeply disturbed by the provisions in this legislation. The Born-Alive Infants Protection Act was signed into law in 2002. The pro-choice community did not oppose it, and it passed the House by a voice vote under suspension of the rules. It was consistent with the already high medical and ethical standards within the physician community.

This new bill, however, is unnecessary and dangerous. It criminalizes physicians who make serious and compassionate decisions based on their deep desire to do what is best for the mother, her health, and life. It creates a police state and forces healthcare staffs that do not have medical training to inform law enforcement of their nonmedical questioning of a physician's sound judgment under the threat of prosecution and imprisonment. This also gives anti-choice lawyers the ability to bully, threaten, and harm a physician's reputation and practice.

Infanticide is already illegal in this country. This bill is highly intrusive to the patient-doctor relationship. Let's be clear. This is yet another attempt by anti-choice bully politicians to restrict a woman's right to choose and doctors' ability to provide sound, compassionate, and safe care for women. It is an aggressive, bullish scare tactic that puts the relationship of the woman and her physician in jeopardy and forces politicians in the middle of decisions that they have no business being involved in.

I agree with the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists and other physician groups in opposing this legislation. I stand with the women across this great country that have continued to fight for decades to defend their legal right to choose.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), a champion of this cause.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, undercover videos by The Center for Medical Progress have again brought into sharp focus that some babies actually survive abortion.

Dr. Ginde, medical director of Planned Parenthood Rocky Mountains, says: "sometimes we get—if somebody delivers before we see them for a procedure that they are intact . . ." That is, Madam Speaker, born alive, breathing, crying, gasping for air. One fetal tissue broker describes in the video watching a fetus that just "fell out" and was left to die.

We have a duty to protect these vulnerable children from violence, exploitation, and death. Humanitarian due diligence requires that born-alive babies be taken to a hospital to obtain care and enhance his or her prospects of survival. Abortion clinics, to the contrary, do not have neonatal intensive care units. They are not equipped to protect those children. They are in the business of killing those children—not saving them.

The grand jury in the abortionist Kermit Gosnell case said: "Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies. He killed them." He euphemistically called "snipping" the born-alive baby's spinal cord "ensuring fetal demise."

Last week, Gianna Jessen, as BOB GOODLATTE noted earlier, an abortion survivor, told his Committee on the Judiciary she had survived a Planned Parenthood late-term, multihour abortion because "the abortionist had not yet begun the work. Had he been there, he would have ended my life with strangulation, suffocation, or leaving me there to die."

The Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, authored by pro-life champion TRENT FRANKS, simply says any child who survives an abortion must be given the same care as any other premature baby born at the same gestational age. This legislation builds on the landmark Born-Alive Infants Protection Act of 2002, authored by STEVE CHABOT, by adding important enforcement provisions.

Tragically, President Obama, the abortion President, has vowed to veto this pro-child, human rights legislation, a position that is extreme, antichild, inhumane, and indefensible.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), the ranking member of our Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Justice.

Mr. COHEN. Madam Speaker, these are very important bills—this bill and the next bill—to the women of this Nation and to the people in America because these are rights that are being under attack. There is this Born-Alive

bill, which came to the floor through the Committee on Rules, and the next bill, which stops funding of Planned Parenthood, but they are all part of the same thing. They are the same bill. They are the same message. Because what we are doing here in this Congress is messaging, and the message is the Republican Party wants to defeat Roe v. Wade. They think that that was a bad bill and that it is wrong to have legalized, in America, for women to have choice. Most of the Democrats don't think that.

Neither of these bills went through the committee process, which is really abhorrent. In fact, yesterday, we passed a bill about new and novel ideas, saying that you get sanctions, you would be sanctioned as a lawyer, if you brought some case that was frivolous and didn't really come through the proper procedures.

If we had that kind of rule in Congress, these bills wouldn't be allowed to be on the floor, because they are supposed to go through committee where the public has notice, the public has an opportunity to have a witness. The majority side has three witnesses; the minority side has one witness. There is a discussion; there are questions; there are answers; there are statements; there is thought; there is input; there is due process; there is petitioning grievances.

All of this has been abrogated—no due process, no regular order. These come straight to the floor because these are messaging bills for the American public. The Republican Party and parts of the Republican Party often say: We want our country back. What they want back is a country that is pre-1971, before Roe v. Wade. What they want is a country that is pre-Brown v. Board of Education. What they want is a country that is pre-Voting Rights Act, which has been limited by the Supreme Court and which has not been renewed by this Congress, nor has it gotten a vote. What they want is a country that is free of many of the immigrants who have come to this country and made it great, particularly from South America, the Caribbean—and that country is not going to come back.

In my State of Tennessee, the Republicans have filed a bill to declare the Supreme Court decision on same-sex marriage as illegal in Tennessee, nullification dripping from their lips, as George Wallace would say, in the courthouse door.

It is the same thing today: Take our country back—no Hispanics, no women's choice, no civil rights, no voting rights, Dwight D. Eisenhower's 1950 America. And Dwight D. Eisenhower wasn't at fault. He tried to bring us forward.

These bills are part of that same attack on the progress that we have made in America. They have not gone

through the proper process, and they are attempts to change America in a way that would affect American women adversely. This bill has a definition of abortion that is new, shouldn't be done.

I oppose both bills and the rule.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHABOT. Madam Speaker, a few years ago, a so-called doctor in Philadelphia by the name of Kermit Gosnell was killing babies—literally. He ran an abortion clinic there, and as can happen in these houses of horror, some of these innocent, unborn children were actually born alive before they could be exterminated in the womb.

So there you have a little now-born baby squirming, kicking, sometimes crying right there in front of you on the table. So what did Gosnell do? He would take a pair of scissors, plunge them into the baby, and sever his or her spinal cord. No care whatsoever about the pain involved. One of Gosnell's employees who witnessed this barbarism described the baby's scream as follows: "I can't describe it. It sounded like a little alien."

Well, this wasn't an alien. It was a human being, just like you and me, although in an earlier form of development. Gosnell, thank God, is in prison. But we have now learned that the largest abortion provider in this country, Planned Parenthood, is not only destroying the lives of little unborn children, but selling their body parts for profit.

I might add that Planned Parenthood aborts more babies each year in this country than the population of the city of Cincinnati that I represent. That is every single year, the population of a city, Cincinnati.

We have got to stop this slaughter. I introduced a bill called the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which was passed by the House and by the Senate and signed into law by President Bush back in 2002. It helped. The legislation before us today, introduced by Congressman TRENT FRANKS, improves that law and will protect more innocent babies.

Please, for God's sake, let's pass it today and protect those among us who cannot protect themselves.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to reiterate, this is a bill that has been introduced with virtually no process. This was introduced less than 48 hours ago, with no hearings and no expert testimony. In fact, those on the other side of the aisle are citing, as evidence, videos that have been shown to be highly edited, that are misleading and fraudulently obtained. There were 47 edits in the video that are shown. Even though Planned Parenthood doctors said 10 times that such procedures

were not done for profit, that was all edited out.

This is legislation based on sound bites and anti-choice rhetoric and not on facts.

I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. HUELSKAMP).

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Madam Speaker, earlier this year, many of my colleagues and I stood on this floor condemning abortionist Kermit Gosnell for his barbaric murder of babies born alive during attempted abortions. Instead of providing compassionate care for these precious little babies, Gosnell muffled their cries by snipping the back of their necks with scissors, and we have people on the floor today defending that.

No child should be treated with such violence, and no man or woman should be free to perform such heinous acts of murder.

As an adoptive parent of four incredible children, I cannot help but think of the countless couples across America who would have given anything to care for these babies.

This bill rightly affirms the humanity of all babies born alive, rightly affords them the full protection of the law, and punishes any abortionist who denies these infants their dignity and right to life.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Virginia has 12½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. STUTZMAN).

Mr. STUTZMAN. Madam Speaker, what does it say about this Congress that today we are here on the House floor debating the killing and harvesting of aborted babies? How can there possibly be two sides to this? I don't understand. How can we not take a step back and look at this objectively?

The gentlewoman from California mentioned that these videos were highly edited. I don't know if they have watched the videos, but if you watch the videos, how can you say that the doctor who is pulling salad from a salad bowl and mentions that she can take the babies and crush the top and the bottom parts of the babies and harvest the body parts in between is highly edited? This is not. These are not. This information on these videos shows the barbaric activity.

These bills before us today deal with this problem. Madam Speaker, I implore that this Chamber take a step

back and look at what is on these videos and the information that we have on these videos and realize that we must move forward on these two bills and stop this barbaric action.

□ 1000

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Madam Speaker, this is a fundamental American value. For our Founders, life was the first right. They understood that there is an order to things that even nature teaches us. They understood and fully embraced that the first and foremost right is life because, without life, there is no liberty; without life, there is no pursuit of happiness; without life, there is no discussion of a right to privacy or a right to choose; because, without life, there is nothing to choose.

Life presupposes and precedes all other rights. Our Founders understood this, but somewhere along the way to where we are now, we have gone from protecting the right that is the basis of all rights to deciding that unborn children and even children born alive can have their lives taken because their organs and tissues are more valuable than they are.

It is inconceivable that a nation founded on the idea that life is the indispensable right, the indisputable right, could be at this place in our history when living children in their mother's womb—and even some who have been born alive—can be killed with the callousness and cold-bloodedness that none of our forefathers would have dreamed could exist in America.

This decision whether to continue funding this barbaric practice is really about exposing the charade of the Federal Government supporting women's health care, when in fact it is really about subsidizing the killing and mutilation of babies with taxpayers' money. This has to stop.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERA), an outstanding doctor.

Mr. BERA. Madam Speaker, as a doctor, I find these bills troubling. The oath I took is to do what is best for my patients.

One of these bills that is coming up today criminalizes the practice of medicine and questions doctors' judgments. It attempts to intimidate doctors from providing safe, evidence-based medicine and from doing our job, which is to sit with our patients, answer their questions, and give them the best medical advice and let them make the decisions that affect their lives.

This is unprecedented. It sets a precedent where those without any

medical training can dictate medical practice and make choices for patients. This definitely oversteps any legal bounds. These are choices that should be made between doctors and patients.

Congressional interference into how we practice is overreach. It is a dramatic overreach, and it is dangerous because it sets a dangerous legislative precedent.

What makes the healthcare delivery system in America so great is that it is accessible to folks and that we understand and protect the doctor-patient privilege. That is at the very foundation of the oath we take when we enter the profession of medicine.

Now, the other bill that we are voting on today also dramatically restricts access. If you think about the number of women in America who get their care from Planned Parenthood, the preventive health services that Planned Parenthood provides is remarkable.

One in five women in this country have used a Planned Parenthood facility. It is a remarkably effective way for women to get their health care—and it is not just women; many men also use Planned Parenthood.

We should be having the exact opposite debate. We should be talking about how we can improve access to care, how we can make sure every American has access to all of their reproductive options. We should want to be talking about how we strengthen the doctor-patient relationship, how we take the government out of the exam room, how we leave some of the most intimate choices to the doctor and the patient.

Again, the oath that I took when I entered the profession was to sit with my patients, answer their questions, but then empower them to make the choices that fit their life circumstances. That is what we should be fighting for. Those are our principles. That is who we are as Americans with those freedoms.

Madam Speaker, let's talk about how we improve access to care. Let's talk about how we strengthen the doctor-patient relationship. This is about protecting people.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Madam Speaker, last week, the Judiciary Committee heard testimony from people who had survived abortions. They spoke as part of the House's ongoing investigation into the practices depicted in the horrific videos that we have all seen.

One of these people who spoke was Gianna Jessen. She told the committee that, when her biological mother was 7½ months pregnant, she went to Planned Parenthood, where they advised her mother to have an abortion. That is what her mother did.

By a miracle—and despite the best efforts to end her life—Gianna was born

alive; and because she was born before the abortionist had gotten into work, a nurse called an ambulance. Gianna was rushed to the hospital—and she lived—though she suffers from cerebral palsy because of the attempted abortion.

There are so many others who aren't as lucky as Gianna. The Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act—that is what we are voting on today—will help save the lives of those children. It would impose criminal penalties on any medical professional who fails to give the same medical attention to children born after an abortion as they would to any other premature newborn baby.

The simple fact is that, when a baby is born alive, it doesn't matter how he or she was born. They are living human beings who deserve our care.

We are also here today, Madam Speaker, to talk in particular about Planned Parenthood, the organization that tried to take Gianna's life. I think, for the purpose of this debate, it is very important to understand what this organization is.

Many on the other side say that they are just devoted to women's health. The facts say something different. In the last year on record, they performed 327,653 abortions. That was in 1 year. Anyone who tells you that they are not in the abortion business doesn't know that number.

Some defend them because they provide women's health services, but they don't have a monopoly on women's health. There are tens of thousands of alternatives all across the country for women, from community health centers to pregnancy health centers to maternity homes, medical clinics, and more. Community health clinics actually outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics by the thousands, and they offer the same health services to women, if not more.

If we know that this organization performs hundreds of thousands of abortions per year and we know that women have access to other sources for care, the question is: Should we force taxpayers to fund a business that spends its money aborting 372,653 children per year? Should we force taxpayers to fund an organization whose barbaric practices, as vividly shown in those videos, disregard and devalue the sanctity of the most innocent human lives?

The gruesome videos that we have seen opened the eyes of America. As we struggle to understand how something so barbaric could happen in this country, we need to get all the facts. Are patients giving sufficient informed consent? Were the body parts of babies sold for profit?

These—and more—are the questions we need to answer. While we find those answers, we have a moral responsibility to put a moratorium on the funding. There is no reason the American people should be forced to give their

money to such an organization. There is no reason—absolutely no reason—that we must choose between funding women's health and compelling taxpayers to support abortion.

As we approach this vote, I want every Member to ask themselves a simple question: In the face of these videos and with all the alternatives women have for health, why would you want to force your constituents to pay for something so evil?

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, to reflect on what the gentleman from California was saying, recalling the testimony last week of survivors of abortion, their stories are remarkable. They show the deep appreciation that they have for their lives, and they are so grateful to have survived the attacks on their life. So many others who did not survive will never have the chance to express such gratitude.

We also know that ultrasound technology allows us to see how unborn children grow and develop; their humanity is abundantly clear and so should be their right to life.

Our Declaration of Independence recognizes that the right to life is inalienable. It is given by our Creator. Indeed, President Kennedy, 54 years ago, pushed back against those who would undermine this fundamental precept of our Nation when he recognized that “the same revolutionary beliefs for which our forebears fought are still at issue around the globe—the belief that the rights of man come not from the generosity of the state but from the hand of God.”

Giving abortion survivors the same care and legal protection that any other child born at the same level of gestation would receive at birth is humane and essential. It also complies with the equal protection bedrock of our country.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MESSER), the chairman of the House Republican Policy Committee.

Mr. MESSER. Madam Speaker, Proverbs 31:8 calls us all to speak for those who can't speak for themselves. That is why I am here today.

I refuse to say nothing while Planned Parenthood executives are revealed casually putting a price tag on human life and haggling over the dollar value of an aborted child's lungs, kidneys, and heart. These actions are unthinkable.

This legislation is actually a modest proposal that would place an imme-

diate 1-year moratorium on all Federal funding of Planned Parenthood. It also funds women's health by taking the half-billion dollars that taxpayers send to Planned Parenthood every year and putting it instead in the hands of community organizations and health clinics that focus on saving lives, not ending them.

Madam Speaker, no matter where you fall on the abortion debate, we can all agree that no unborn child should be dismembered and sold part by part. Where that is happening, let's stop it and join together to speak for those who can't speak for themselves.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DEUTCH).

Mr. DEUTCH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to reject these bills and to get to work. The U.S. Federal Government is set to shut down in a matter of days. Shouldn't we be working together to stop a preventable crisis that will hurt our economy and tarnish our Nation's image? It is our job. That is what we are here to do.

Instead, we are debating a bill that is based on a false premise. I am not talking about some debunked and discredited viral videos on the Internet, nor am I talking about the lie that defunding Planned Parenthood will prevent Federal dollars from funding abortion.

□ 1015

As many of my colleagues have already pointed out, our laws have long prohibited Federal dollars from being used to pay for abortion.

What I am talking about, Madam Speaker, is the 28 men who wrote Speaker BOEHNER this summer demanding—demanding—that we either defund Planned Parenthood or stop funding the Federal Government: 28 men who, I guarantee you, have never relied on just one health provider in their community to get a Pap smear; 28 men who, I guarantee you, have never had to end a sentence about their educational goals or their financial or career aspirations with the phrase, “unless I get pregnant”; 28 men who hatched this plan to deny basic health care to millions of women—millions of women, I might add, that have been marginalized by this Congress. Their voices are not being heard today nor are they being represented, not in these bills.

Why?

Because Speaker BOEHNER would rather let 28 men set the agenda for this entire House than seek out bipartisan support needed to fund education programs, health care, veterans programs, and services for our seniors. That is what we should be doing.

Madam Speaker, these bills defund access to health care that has nothing—absolutely nothing—to do with abortion unless, Madam Speaker, I

should say that we are talking about the more than 350,000 abortions that Planned Parenthood prevents every year by providing contraception and health care and education.

I understand that my colleagues don't recognize the reproductive rights of women. I understand that is their view. I, Madam Speaker, recognize that women have those rights, and I urge my colleagues to reject these bills.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BABIN).

Mr. BABIN. Madam Speaker, we must pass this bill today, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act.

We have seen the gruesome videos. They are not doctored.

I dare say, none of these folks that we are hearing from the other side of the aisle have watched them all. How can they make a recommendation or an appraisal?

They show senior Planned Parenthood officials, former employees, and a tissue procurement company discussing the sale of "intact" unborn baby parts. This is disgusting. It is inhumane.

A society and culture that refuses to stand up and say this will not be tolerated is a society that is in grave danger.

A child born alive during an abortion procedure is the most vulnerable living human being on Earth, and they should be granted full legal protections. Medical practitioners who fail to provide necessary care for that baby must be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law, and this bill does just that.

While it is so sad that an act of Congress is required to ensure such compassionate care, we must do all we can to provide for the safety of babies that are born alive as a result of failed abortion procedures. It is absolutely necessary that we end this inhumane practice today.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in support today of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act. I would like to thank the chairman and Mr. FRANKS for their leadership on this issue.

This issue is very personal to me. My mother chose life, and I was adopted as a newborn.

When a baby is born alive after an abortion, healthcare professionals only have seconds to react. These children deserve the same level of commitment and care as a child facing any other medical emergency.

This bill holds healthcare professionals accountable for making the health and well-being of a baby who

survives an abortion their first priority and for making every effort to provide the resources needed to keep that child alive.

This bill should not divide us. It is about saving lives. We all talk about giving voice to the most vulnerable children in our communities and to the elderly with disabilities. Who is more vulnerable than a child whose life begins just as someone tries to end it?

My mother gave me the gift of life, and I believe every child should receive that same gift.

This is not about the "Wizard of Oz" strategy the other side wants to portray and that doesn't pay any attention to the man behind the curtain. This is about the true sense of protecting life.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FOXX). The gentleman from Virginia has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, my wife and I are adoptive parents. We have a family only because two women in very difficult situations chose life. So this issue of protecting the unborn is dear to me and my family, which is why, whether you are pro-choice or strongly pro-life, as I am, I think Americans can agree, we should never use taxpayer dollars to fund these abortions, and we should never use taxpayer dollars to reward organizations that harvest the unborn lives or tissues for profit or compensation. These are gruesome practices.

It is time to defund any organization, Planned Parenthood or others, and to begin to seek criminal penalties against those who profited from the sale of body parts of unborn children. This is the true human rights issue of our time, and those who defend this funding or these gruesome practices are on the wrong side of history.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I do thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and, again, I want to thank Chairman BOB GOODLATTE for doing such an extraordinarily effective job as chairman of the Judiciary Committee, a true human rights champion and a man who really understands these issues.

Last week's hearing with Gianna Jessen and another abortion survivor underscores the fact that there are abortion survivors. I remember, years ago, there was a Philadelphia Inquirer article, called, "The Dreaded Complication," and it was all about all of the children who survived later-term abortions.

And do you know what the response of the abortion lobby was? We need a better death ensuring method of abortion, a more effective and efficacious method, to destroy those babies. That was part of the genesis of the hideous partial-birth abortion method—a method that actually suctions out the brain tissue of a child before birth, thus ensuring there won't be a child born-alive.

Let me also say, people on the other side were talking earlier about the relationship between doctor and patient. What about the new patient, that unborn child who is now a newly born child? Where is the doctor-patient relationship to help that child?

Abortion clinics are in the business of exterminating children through dismemberment and chemical poisoning. That is what abortionists do. Getting this child to a hospital ensures that lifesaving care will be provided. Healers have a mindset that says we need to save these children, the means to do so, including intensive care capability. Abortionists believe abortion means dead baby—born or newly born.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with a heavy heart. Having spent over 30 years as a practicing OB/GYN physician, delivering almost 5,000 babies and trying to save every life of every mother and every baby, I don't see why this is not something that brings us all together.

Whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, if a baby survives an abortion, we should do everything we can to save that baby's life and to give it the same chance that everybody else has.

I am getting emotional here because it is an emotional issue for me. I cannot imagine, as a physician, standing beside a baby that has been delivered—no one in this room can; I don't believe there is another person in this room that has done what I have—and not try to save that baby's life.

I strongly support this bill. It should pass overwhelmingly, and it should be the law of the land.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I have just one speaker remaining, and I believe I have the right to close.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, I have one speaker remaining, and then I will be prepared to close.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Madam Speaker, I just want to say that there is the implication in the testimony and in the speeches that are made here that the other side of the aisle is somehow more concerned about the life of a child born alive, that somehow Democrats just don't care about that, and I just want to tell you I resent that so very, very much.

We unanimously voted to protect that life. And if, in fact, a baby is born into this world and can survive and is alive, it is considered homicide to kill that baby. There are laws. There are laws that would protect the life of an infant, a real child that is born that can sustain life.

I just want to tell you that somehow making this division about people who really care about a living person that is born is just false. And I think I am speaking for all people, for all Democrats and, clearly, for all Republicans, that we need to make sure that we protect that life. But I believe that we have every law in place.

What this bill does is go further and create fear among physicians, healers, people who are educated and committed to health and life, and put fear into them that if they don't provide for the exact procedures that you are talking about, that they could spend 5 years in jail for providing the healthcare services that a woman needs. That is, I believe, part of this ongoing effort to say that we should end the full range of health services that are available to women. This is a further attack on women's health.

We all agree on what the outcome should be, and let's not get into this ongoing fight against women's health.

□ 1030

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this bill politicizes women's health and limits women's access to abortion. It interferes with the sacred doctor-patient relationship and substitutes a physician's best judgment with the judgment of a handful of politicians—and, in fact, male politicians. I would note that not a single woman on the other side of the aisle has spoken on this bill.

Let me note, it is already illegal to fail to provide care to an infant born alive. There was a bill passed 13 years ago, the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, and that bill was not intended to affect abortion practices or a woman's right to choose. In fact, that is why Judiciary Committee Democrats voted to support it.

But what this bill does is to vilify abortion providers. This bill is so broad

and the penalties are so severe—up to 5 years in prison—that one can only conclude that the real purpose of this bill is to intimidate abortion providers out of practice.

This bill requires doctors and employees of hospitals and clinics that provide abortion services to report any violation of the bill's standard of care to State or Federal law enforcement authorities, and any person—remember, we are talking doctors, cleaning crew, receptionists—that fails to comply with these requirements is threatened with fines and up to 5 years in prison.

That is why the 58,000 physicians of the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists oppose this bill and says: "This legislation represents gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician between a woman and her trusted doctor."

Let us not forget, politicians are not doctors. We should be concerned about doing our jobs and fully fund high-quality women's health care instead of trying to keep doctors from doing theirs.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this dangerous bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the House majority whip for the purpose of closing our debate.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act offered by my friend and colleague from Arizona, TRENT FRANKS.

Madam Speaker, this bill is about standing up for the sanctity of life. Specifically, this bill deals with babies that are born alive.

Whether it was the result of an abortion or a normal birth, all people in this country deserve that same protection. Madam Speaker, why should a baby that is born alive be denied that same right?

Our Founding Fathers, in the Declaration of Independence, made it crystal clear: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Madam Speaker, the first unalienable right mentioned by our Founders—and these were not rights given to us by our Founders; they were given to us by our Creator—that first right is life.

If a baby is born alive, they ought to have that protection. That is what this bill is about. It is about giving that protection that is enumerated in the Constitution and in the Declaration of Independence itself to say they ought to have that protection in law, that if they are born alive, that they ought to have that same medical protection.

So, Madam Speaker, when you saw the President come out yesterday and say that he would veto this bill, how extreme can somebody be to say they would not stand up for a baby that is born alive to have the same protection that the Declaration of Independence enumerates as an "unalienable right"?

This should be a place where we can all come together, a place where we can all agree that we, as a House, can come together and stand up and give that protection in law to those babies that are born alive.

I would hope that all of my colleagues would join in, that we could send this bill over to the Senate, that they can have the same debate and agree to pass that on, and that, ultimately, the President would recognize that this is a bill that ought to become law.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3504, the "Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act."

Contrary to its misleading title, H.R. 3504 is not about protecting children born alive. Its real intent is to further undermine a woman's right to choose, a right that has been constitutionally guaranteed for more than 42 years by *Roe v. Wade*.

H.R. 3504 constitutes an unprecedented level of intrusion by the government into medical decision making.

It also completely fails to distinguish between a viable and a non-viable fetus, which is the constitutional line that separates abortions that may be performed without restriction from those that may be regulated or prohibited.

These restrictions, in conjunction with the bill's draconian criminal penalties, will effectively intimidate doctors, thereby making abortion services unavailable as a practical matter.

Further yet, there is absolutely no need for this legislation. No evidence has been uncovered that necessitates congressional interference in the doctor-patient relationship.

Even if wrongdoing were to occur, many federal and state laws already protect babies "born alive."

In truth, abortion practice is safe, legal, and humane and any evidence of wrongdoing can and should be handled under existing law. For example, the criminal Kermit Gosnell, who ran an illegal abortion front in Philadelphia, was prosecuted under existing law and is rightfully in prison serving multiple life sentences.

In sum, the bill's vague and broad mandates, combined with its severe penalties, will undermine the ability of women to access safe affordable abortion services, which unfortunately appears to be the underlying intent of this flawed legislation.

As the Administration, in its Statement of Administration Policy, warns "H.R. 3504 would impose new legal requirements related to the provision of abortion services in certain circumstances, which would likely have a chilling effect, reducing access to care."

In addition, this legislation is opposed by Planned Parenthood, which states that H.R. 3504 would "add new criminal penalties

against doctors and clinicians as a scare tactic that serves the sole purpose of scaring women away from seeking safe, legal, abortion."

Further, NARAL Pro-Choice America correctly observes that H.R. 3504 is "part of an unprecedented assault on reproductive rights."

And, the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists explains that this "legislation represents gross interference in the practice of medicine, inserting a politician in between a woman and her trusted doctor."

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing H.R. 3504, an anti-choice, anti-woman, and thoroughly unnecessary measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

DEFUND PLANNED PARENTHOOD ACT OF 2015

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 421, I call up the bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the amendment printed in House Report 114-262 is adopted and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3134

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) State and county health departments, community health centers, hospitals, physicians offices, and other entities currently provide, and will continue to provide, health services to women. Such health services include relevant diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postpartum care, immunization, family planning services (including contraception), cervical and breast cancer screenings and re-

ferrals, and sexually transmitted disease testing.

(2) Many such entities provide services to all persons, regardless of the person's ability to pay, and provide services in medically underserved areas and to medically underserved populations.

(3) All funds that are no longer available to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. and its affiliates and clinics pursuant to this Act will continue to be made available to other eligible entities to provide women's health care services.

(4) Funds authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, by section 4 are offset by the funding limitation under section 3(a).

SEC. 3. MORATORIUM ON FEDERAL FUNDING TO PLANNED PARENTHOOD FEDERATION OF AMERICA, INC.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to subsection (b), no funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any purpose to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., unless such entities certify that Planned Parenthood Federation of America affiliates and clinics will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion during such period.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

(c) REPAYMENT.—The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture shall seek repayment of any Federal assistance received by Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., if it violates the terms of the certification required by subsection (a) during the period specified in subsection (a).

SEC. 4. FUNDING FOR COMMUNITY HEALTH PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, \$235,000,000 for the community health center program under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b), in addition to any other funds made available to such program, for the period for which the funding limitation under section 3(a) applies.

(b) LIMITATION.—None of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be expended for an abortion other than as described in section 3(b).

SEC. 5. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to reduce overall Federal funding available in support of women's health.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce or their designee.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 3134.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong support of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

Madam Speaker, we all remember the images of Kermit Gosnell killing babies who were born alive after a botched abortion.

We know that those are sickening, and we know that they have renewed the demand for accountability from the American people. That is why we come before you today with H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

New documentation of these heinous practices that we have seen in videos, videos that have come out of Planned Parenthood abortion clinics of harvesting the body parts of babies as part of the abortion process, have raised serious questions about the possible systematic and repeated violation of State and Federal laws.

H.R. 3134 provides a 1-year moratorium, a freezing—a freezing—on the Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America and all of its affiliates while investigations are ongoing regarding the practices of the abortion industry.

Madam Speaker, most people think that is common sense. If there is reason to investigate, then there is reason to withhold taxpayer dollars during that period of time. Those dollars would be given to other facilities that provide women's health services.

The American taxpayer has been very clear for a long time that they do not want taxpayer money spent on abortion; 68 percent of Americans oppose it. What is so interesting to me is that we know that 71 percent of all millennials oppose this.

I would remind my colleagues, Madam Speaker, there is no difference between men and women on this. There is bipartisan opposition from men and women to this practice. Additionally, the majority of Americans are opposed to the sale of body parts of babies obtained after abortion.

So the discussion today is not about videos or women's health access. We know there are other ways to get that access. It is about our most basic right. It is about the right to life.

It is also about doing what the taxpayers sent us to D.C. to do. It is also about continuing the process to protect our most vulnerable citizens, innocent little babies.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the “Deny Women Health Care Act.”

Madam Speaker, congressional approval ratings are at an all-time low, and here is another example of why:

Republicans in Congress have failed to fulfill their fundamental responsibility to our great Nation again.

Republicans have pushed America to the brink of another government shutdown, and we are a mere 5 legislative days away.

Republicans in Congress have refused to sit down and negotiate a bipartisan appropriations plan despite the urging of Democrats, business leaders, military servicemembers, and citizens all across America.

The bill brought to the floor today is an attempt by Republican leaders to distract the American public from their failure to do their job.

Last spring, we urged Republicans in Congress to sit down and hammer out an appropriations plan. They refused.

Instead, the Congress adjourned at the end of July. Nothing happened in August. Nothing has happened since the Congress has returned after Labor Day.

Now the Republican dysfunction in this House will have very serious consequences for our neighbors back home.

A Republican shutdown would hurt thousands of disabled veterans, disadvantaged children, small businesses, working families, and taxpayers.

The last time Republicans shut down the government for 16 days, the economy lost \$24 billion and 120,000 private sector jobs.

Here is what happened: The Republican shutdown stalled veterans disability claims, creating additional needless delays for our heroes seeking help.

Hundreds of critically sick Americans were prevented from enrolling in the NIH clinical trials, with 98 percent of the National Science Foundation, nearly three-quarters of NIH, and two-thirds of CDC employees furloughed.

Head Start grantees, serving thousands of children, were forced to close. American entrepreneurs and small businesses were cut off from millions of dollars in SBA loans.

Small businesses with government contracts faced abrupt payment delays and cutbacks. Almost \$4 billion in IRS refunds were delayed.

The Republican Congress’ continuing dysfunction and inability to govern are having real impacts on hard-working Americans. The American people are tired of their relentless failure to govern and the culture of crisis.

Again and again Republicans have chosen to put their radical special interest agenda ahead of the priorities of hard-working Americans.

The American people deserve better, especially in this case, because the Deny Women Health Care Act is a cynical attack on the ability of women across America to receive the health services that they need at trusted Planned Parenthood clinics.

□ 1045

I know many are passionate about these personal issues. That is why the Republicans advance this bill on this topic. They know it is sure to inflame passions. But to date, despite congressional inquiries into these false videotapes, there has been no wrongdoing uncovered whatsoever, no evidence to substantiate the allegations. What has emerged since the false videos were posted on YouTube is a coordinated, broad-based smear campaign based upon false, manufactured videos that are full of distortions and misinformation.

The bill is one more assault in the long list of Republican assaults on women’s health care over the last two decades because simply defunding Planned Parenthood would leave millions of American women without key preventative services, including birth control, family planning, lifesaving cancer screenings, testing and treatment of infections, well-women exams, and advice on family planning.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I was beginning to think that we were off on a different bill there for just a moment.

Madam Speaker, I yield 15 seconds to myself to respond.

Madam Speaker, we are not on a bill about a government shutdown. We are on a bill that will make certain that women have access to health care, H.R. 3134. I will remind my colleagues that it does remove the funds from Planned Parenthood, and it does enable them to go to women’s health clinics.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK), who is the author of this legislation and has been such an advocate for addressing women’s healthcare needs.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Speaker, as a nurse for more than 40 years and a believer in the God-given purpose of every human being, I am passionately pro-life. But do you know what? You don’t have to agree with me to support this bill. No matter our views on abortion or the party label beside our name, we should all have an interest in ensuring that laws are followed and that the taxpayer dollars are spent responsibly. If a law is broken, particularly by those receiving government money, that should be remedied. That is not a political statement. That, quite literally, is our job here in Congress.

Two months ago, Madam Speaker, a series of undercover videos were re-

leased implicating Planned Parenthood in the illegal trafficking of aborted baby tissue and organs. Now, some of my colleagues have tried to dismiss these videos even without ever watching them. I get it. It is easier to try to discredit the source than to defend what is happening on these tapes.

Well, Madam Speaker, I did watch these videos, and I saw full conversations of Planned Parenthood employees in their own words discussing potentially lawbreaking activities. Congressional investigations are underway, but there are more than enough lingering questions to stop the flow of money—taxpayer dollars—to this abortion giant until our work is complete.

For this reason, I have introduced the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015. This legislation enacts a 1-year moratorium on all Federal money going to Planned Parenthood. It does not reduce women’s health funding by a single dime. As a matter of fact, we actually increase women’s healthcare funding by over \$200 million. Instead, this legislation reallocates the funding to more than 13,500 facilities nationwide that provide true preventative care to those who need it the most, and they do not perform abortions.

What is more, Planned Parenthood can get their money back. Read the bill. They can get their money back if they fully commit to what they talk about in doing women’s health care and stop performing abortions for this year.

Madam Speaker, if there exists even a possibility that Planned Parenthood violated our laws, as I believe they did, then pro-life and pro-choice Members of Congress alike must act to reallocate the funds now so that we are not trying to chase down the taxpayer dollars that already went out the door later on. This is ensuring that our laws are followed, that Americans know how their money is being spent, and that the conscience rights of taxpayers are respected.

Madam Speaker, I urge a “yes” vote on H.R. 3134.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I will reiterate again, there is no evidence whatsoever of any wrongdoing, and I maintain that this is a distraction from the Republican’s fundamental failure to pass a budget 5 legislative days before a government shutdown.

Madam Speaker, I am honored to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), the ranking member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I listened to the previous Republican speaker, and the deception that she poses to this Congress is unbelievable in my opinion.

First of all, she talks about these videos which we know have been misleading—edited, all kinds of changes

have been made to them. The accuracy of them is totally unacceptable. They are not accurate. Then she says, well, just because they may be accurate that we should pass this bill defunding Planned Parenthood.

Well, when did this Congress get into the business of saying, well, before we decided whether you have actually broken the law and before we have any evidence that you have done so, we are just going to shut you down? That is not the way we operate. That is not due process. That is not the American way.

Then, Madam Speaker, she suggests that somehow this money is going to be given to other providers. I think she is probably talking about community health centers. Well, I will tell you, from my own experience with community health centers, that they don't have the ability to provide the women's health needs that are being proposed here that are actually provided by Planned Parenthood. That is not going to happen. Those women are going to be deprived of health care.

So let's not continue with this deception about what is actually going on here. The Republicans just want to shut the government down if we don't defund Planned Parenthood. That is what they are all about.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. GUTHRIE), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and vice chair of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3134.

This bill would defund Planned Parenthood and its clinics for 1 full year. This summer, a series of disturbing videos shined a light on the gruesome practice being done in clinics across the country. No one has ever disputed that the employees of Planned Parenthood said what they said in the video. These videos have shocked and appalled countless Americans.

Federal dollars should not be going to an agency that is involved in such a horrific and disturbing practice. I have voted in the past to defund Planned Parenthood, and I will do so again today.

Madam Speaker, life is a precious gift, and I firmly believe we should do all we can to advance and support it. Today, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to stop Planned Parenthood from continuing these practices.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. We are here because some have again chosen to reignite the same tired battles of years past—and bring our government to the

brink of shutdown—to restrict women's control over their own health and bodies. I should not be deciding what is best for a woman's health. She should, and her doctor should.

That we are even having this debate—based on contrived, unsubstantiated allegations—about an organization that provides critical care to more than 2 million Americans is not only outrageous, it is downright irresponsible.

More than half of Planned Parenthood centers are in rural or medically underserved areas where access to health care is already too limited. Yet my colleagues want to make it even harder for women and men there to access HIV and STI tests, breast cancer screenings, cervical cancer screenings, and other lifesaving services.

Madam Speaker, this attempt to demonize Planned Parenthood is disgraceful.

Again, it is important to underscore that Federal insurance coverage of abortion is already restricted, so to defund Planned Parenthood is to defund the preventative services that keep our constituents healthy. I urge a “no” vote.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 10 seconds to myself to respond.

Again, Madam Speaker, refocusing us on the bill, we are talking about being certain that there is access to health care. Cancer screenings and prevention services from Planned Parenthood have been cut in half over the past 7 years. They do not perform mammograms. They perform over 300,000 abortions annually.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), the vice chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee and a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, a bill I am proud to cosponsor.

Madam Speaker, as the Energy and Commerce Committee continues its investigation into the troubling Planned Parenthood videos, it is crucial we do everything in our power to protect human life and hold organizations such as Planned Parenthood accountable.

With this legislation, we have the opportunity to both save lives and respect the rights of the American people. Taxpayers should not be forced to financially support organizations whose behavior is at best unethical and possibly illegal.

When it comes to defunding Planned Parenthood, the issue should not be partisan. This is about protecting the rights of taxpayers, but also, more importantly, protecting the basic right of human life.

Madam Speaker, I will continue to give a voice to our most fragile Americans who cannot speak for themselves.

I thank Representative BLACK for her efforts on this important piece of legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood provides basic health services to millions of Americans: Pap smears, breast cancer screenings, family planning, and birth control. In fact, there were over 4 million visits to Planned Parenthood clinics last year, and over 90 percent of this was basic women's health care and not abortions.

So why are we talking about this today? Why are we talking about this legislation?

Planned Parenthood does these services and no Federal funds are spent on abortion services that Planned Parenthood does provide, but yet the majority will take the radical step of denying women the basic health care they need. This radical agenda is wrong. It is wrong for American women, and it is wrong for us when the Federal budget expires in just 13 days.

Madam Speaker, I, too, have reviewed the videotapes. Our committee reviewed the videotapes, and, as Ms. CASTOR said—and it bears repeating—no wrongdoing was shown. There are no criminal charges. There are no charges at all that are pending whatsoever against Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, yesterday in the Energy and Commerce Committee, my Republican colleagues in their radical effort went so far as to show a photo of a stillborn baby, implying that that baby was a fetus being used for fetal tissue development. What is worse, that photo was shown without the woman's consent. It had no relation to Planned Parenthood. It was used without the mother's consent.

What I want to know from the majority: Is this the evidence that you are using to decide that you are going to deny funding for Planned Parenthood and all the well-women visits women use?

Madam Speaker, my colleagues ought to be ashamed of showing this, and my colleagues ought to be ashamed of putting this bill on the floor today. We are seeing shamelessness right here on the floor today.

My colleagues on the other side are trying to do everything they can to insert themselves between American women and their right to make their own healthcare decisions. It is wrong, and I urge a “no” vote on this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I will never be ashamed of standing up and defending life—ever—and I find it so interesting that our efforts to protect life are termed “radical.” That is an interesting turn of events, if I say so myself.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

□ 1100

Mr. BUCSHON. Madam Speaker, with all due respect, a radical agenda is protecting an organization that dismembers body parts and sells them for profit.

For the record, I am probably the only Member of this body to have operated on babies as young as 23 weeks' gestation. In fact, the smallest baby I operated on weighed only 650 grams.

As a physician, I spent my career caring for patients regardless of their situations. So I take access to health care very seriously.

I find it troubling that those on the other side, most of whom have never spent a day caring for patients, continue to mislead the American people about the facts of Planned Parenthood.

Here are a few: By its own statistics, Planned Parenthood only treats 2 percent of the Nation's women for any reason.

Planned Parenthood doesn't offer women some of the most basic primary care. It doesn't provide services like mammograms, cardiovascular blood tests, or bone mass measurements.

Over the past 10 years, Planned Parenthood cut cancer screenings by half while it increased abortion services by 40 percent.

Across the country, we have 13,000 federally qualified or rural health centers that can provide basic health services compared to only 700 Planned Parenthood facilities that really don't provide these services at all.

Madam Speaker, taxpayers should not be forced to fund this organization when we have so many other alternatives.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, the previous speaker said something completely false. Planned Parenthood does not sell fetal tissue.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Illinois will suspend.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Madam Speaker, a complete falsehood was just stated. Planned Parenthood does not sell any body parts for profit. That is a fact.

So here we go again: Republicans threatening to shut down the government in order to deny women access to health care. When the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the first thing they did was nearly shut down the government over funding for Planned Parenthood, and 4 years later, Republicans are once again seriously considering shutting down the government over the exact same thing.

This time, they have manufactured a witch hunt based on heavily edited videos that were clearly intended to mislead the public and the Congress. They have wasted time and resources on futile investigations that have produced absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood. In contrast, there is growing evidence that The Center for Medical Progress broke several laws.

I recently sent a letter to the Department of Justice and to the California Attorney General, asking them to investigate the practices of this organization.

My letter raises concerns about fake identification that was used to gain access to Planned Parenthood facilities, fraudulent tax documents that were filed to create a fake corporate entity, and violations of California's Invasion of Privacy Act.

In response, the California Attorney General has initiated an investigation. There are also several legal actions pending against The Center for Medical Progress.

Enough is enough. I urge my colleagues to oppose this harmful bill for women's health.

Here we go again—Republicans threatening to shut down the government to deny women access to health care.

When the Republicans took control of the House in 2011, the first thing they did was nearly shut down the government over funding for Planned Parenthood.

Four years later, Republicans are once again seriously considering shutting down the government over the exact same thing.

This time, they've manufactured a witch hunt based on heavily edited videos that were clearly intended to mislead the public and Congress.

They've wasted time and resources on futile investigations that have produced absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing on behalf of Planned Parenthood.

In contrast, there is growing evidence that the Center for Medical Progress broke several laws.

I recently sent a letter to the Department of Justice and the California Attorney General asking them to investigate the potentially illegal practices of this organization.

My letter raises concerns about fake identification that was used to gain access to Planned Parenthood facilities, fraudulent tax documents that were filed to create a fake corporate entity, and violations of California's Invasion of Privacy Act.

In response, the California AG has initiated an investigation. There are also several legal actions pending against the Center for Medical Progress.

But we all know that Republicans are not really interested in the truth here. This entire charade is a thinly veiled attempt to erode a woman's ability to make decisions about her own body.

For proof, look no further than their budget proposal.

Their budget eliminated Title X, the only federal grant program dedicated to providing

women with family planning services, and cuts the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Program by over 80 percent—programs that would reduce the need for abortion.

Republicans have made it clear that women are fair game. They can't even pass a continuing resolution without interfering in the personal lives of American women.

Republicans can't overturn *Roe v. Wade* so they try every other way possible to erode this fundamental right.

They try to cut off funding to the clinics that provide abortions, they try to criminalize doctors who perform abortions, and they restrict access for millions of women every year through the Hyde Amendment.

Enough is enough. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this terrible bill and to stop interfering in the personal lives of American women.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. ELLMERS), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the chairman of the Republican Women's Policy Committee.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for holding this important discussion today.

I would like to thank Chairman UPTON, Chairman PITTS, and the full committee and staff of Energy and Commerce for their hard work.

Madam Speaker, I support H.R. 3134, and I proposed an amendment to be included within that bill, which redirects \$235 million to health centers across this country.

I am a nurse, and my husband is a general surgeon. One of our favorite places in the world is our back porch in Dunn, North Carolina, where we sip scuppernong wine and have a wonderful time, and we discuss good health care in this country. Let me tell you and the American people that Planned Parenthood is not good health care.

You can see that this chart clearly shows that the 13,000 federally qualified healthcare centers in this country provide comprehensive health care for women.

You can see this chart is just a mere example of 17 provided basic healthcare services for women to Planned Parenthood's 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 30 seconds.

Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina. I thank the gentlewoman.

Basically, what you have been told and what women in this country have been told is a false choice for American women from Planned Parenthood.

That false choice says that, if one Planned Parenthood facility is defunded, thousands of women and children who are in need will go without health care.

Let me tell you, if that false logic follows in Dunn, North Carolina, it basically says, if there are 18 grocery

stores and 1 closes its doors, thousands of families, including my own, will starve.

This is absolutely untrue. We need to support everything we can in this country for good women's health care. This chart provides the actual truth—the truth. Good health care takes care of the whole woman, not just parts.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has established that not all services currently provided by Planned Parenthood could be furnished by other health clinics and medical practitioners if Planned Parenthood were defunded.

A George Washington University professor confirmed this in a column this week. The reason is that so many of the services provided relate to gynecological services and personal female healthcare needs.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank my colleague from Florida for the recognition.

Madam Speaker, it is important that we do get our facts straight.

This year, over 2 million babies will be born to women on Medicaid. That is nearly half of all of the births in this country.

At the same time, more than half of the Medicaid providers in our country are not accepting new patients. That leaves hundreds of thousands of expectant mothers without access to essential prenatal care and treatment, and that is where Planned Parenthood comes in.

Beyond just prenatal care, they provide life-saving cancer screenings, STD tests, and compassionate counseling to millions of women, men, and families who often have nowhere else to turn for their basic health needs.

Eighty percent of the patients that Planned Parenthood serves have incomes at or below 150 percent of the poverty line.

Those patients are sitting inside waiting rooms at Planned Parenthood centers across the Nation at this very moment who are facing some of the most emotional decisions and challenging tests of their entire lives.

The practitioners and nurses who will treat them won't just tend to their immediate medical needs. They will make sure that the patient knows that he or she is not alone.

If we pass this bill, we are turning our backs on those patients. We are telling low-income families in every corner of this country that we count their health and happiness less.

I urge my colleagues to consider those patients and the impact of this legislation.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 5 seconds to respond.

For 98.5 percent of the pregnant women who received a pregnancy-related service at Planned Parenthood, that service was an abortion.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER), a member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. CRAMER. Madam Speaker, North Dakotans affirm life every day through strong, stable family structures and a culture that values life and that, frankly, values ending the circumstances that cause a woman to believe that her best option is an abortion.

We have over 70,000 square miles and thousands of women who need healthcare services, but we don't have a Planned Parenthood clinic because North Dakota women somehow don't meet its business model.

There are, however, compassionate providers offering more comprehensive services across my State. This map shows the localities of 71 federally qualified health centers that provide quality care to underserved and low-income women in rural and urban communities throughout my State.

The patients who go through the doors of these clinics are treated as valued community members, not as a fee for service and certainly not as a \$45 specimen.

This Congress and its relevant committees must complete a thorough investigation of the disturbing accusations evidenced—yes, evidenced—in the Planned Parenthood videos that we all have seen before another taxpayer dollar goes to this controversial organization. These funds can be better used to provide legitimate health services for women in places like North Dakota.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI).

Ms. MATSUI. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act, but we should call it the "Depriving Women of their Health Care Act."

This bill is just the latest political attack on millions of American women. This bill is a step backward for our Nation's healthcare system.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would deprive American women and their families of access to preventative services like cancer screenings and access to contraception and to prenatal counseling that helps women maintain healthy pregnancies.

Sadly, I am not surprised that my Republican colleagues continue this relentless attack on the autonomy of women. We have seen it countless times before: Congress telling this country that a politician's judgment is superior to that of an American woman's.

What does surprise me, however, is that now Republicans are willing to

shut down our government and put our economy at risk in order to deny women access to the healthcare providers of their choosing.

We can't allow Members of Congress to substitute their judgment for a woman's right to make decisions about her own body.

This bill does nothing more than take away healthcare options for low-income women because of a difference in beliefs over just 3 percent of the many vital services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Congress needs to get back to work on the real issues facing American women and their families.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the Pro-Life Caucus.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, undercover videos show and expose Planned Parenthood directors cheerfully talking about dismemberment and crushing babies to death all while altering abortion methods in a way that preserves organs and body parts for sale.

Watch the videos.

One senior director who talks about preserving a liver says they use ultrasound guidance because that is where they will know where to put the forceps. Of course, forceps are used to literally rip the child to pieces in what is called a dismemberment abortion.

One technician, Holly O'Donnell, talks about getting brain tissue. She said her supervisor "gave me the scissors and told me that I had to cut down the middle of the face. I can't even describe," she says, "what that feels like."

Some of our colleagues on the other side have said that there is no evidence. Watch the videos. There is ample evidence.

I would suggest and I would ask Congresswoman CASTOR to join us in a letter that asks the Attorney General of the United States to investigate this. Will you?

I yield to the gentlewoman.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, the repeated reference to these false videos is a true disservice to this Congress and to the people all across America. These false claims against Planned Parenthood have been widely discredited.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, the repeated references to these false videos do a real disservice to this Congress and to people all across America. The false claims against Planned Parenthood have been widely discredited.

The videos that so many have referenced are heavily edited. They have

edited content out, and they have edited false images in.

Politicians who are latching onto this smear campaign do so to further their personal agendas to the detriment of women's health care across America.

What has happened here since these videos were released in July is a coordinated smear campaign against trusted Planned Parenthood clinics. Let me give you some evidence directly from my home State of Florida.

□ 1115

In July, with absolutely no evidence of wrongdoing, Florida Republican Governor Rick Scott ordered investigations of Planned Parenthood clinics. It had all the trappings of a witch hunt.

In August, after the Agency for Health Care Administration had determined and written a draft press release that said: "However, there is no evidence of the mishandling of fetal remains at any of the 16 clinics we investigated across the State."

That didn't fit Governor Scott's political narrative, so his office scrubbed the press release of that language.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of the press release that was drafted by the Agency for Health Care Administration for Florida before Governor Scott's office scrubbed the language on the finding.

[For Immediate Release—Aug. 5, 2015]

ORIGINAL PROPOSED RELEASE FROM AHCA TO
THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

PLANNED PARENTHOOD INSPECTIONS FIND
DEFICIENCIES AT CLINICS

Agency findings include issues with the record keeping of fetal remains at one clinic and unlicensed procedures being performed at three clinics

TALLAHASSEE, FL.—Our investigations last week into Planned Parenthood clinics found three facilities performing procedures beyond their licensing authority, as well as one facility not keeping proper logs relating to fetal remains. However, there is no evidence of the mishandling of fetal remains at any of the 16 clinics we investigated across the state.

[For Immediate Release—Aug. 5, 2015]

FINAL VERSIONS THAT WAS RELEASED TO THE
MEDIA

PLANNED PARENTHOOD INSPECTIONS FIND
DEFICIENCIES AT CLINICS

Agency findings include issues with the record keeping of fetal remains at one clinic and unlicensed procedures being performed at three clinics

TALLAHASSEE, FL.—Our investigations last week into Planned Parenthood clinics found three facilities performing procedures beyond their licensing authority, as well as one facility not keeping proper logs relating to fetal remains.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. In fact, the press secretary for the agency said: "I would have thought a line on no handling of fetal remains would be included, as that is what questions will be on."

The agency's secretary wrote back, and she said she agreed.

Reporters subsequently obtained the scrubbed press release. Apparently, these had to go to the Governor's office to be purified and sanctified.

What happened earlier this week is that the communications director for the Florida Agency for Health Care Administration resigned. This is another example of the coordinated smear campaign based upon the false videos that have captured attention. They are outrageous, but they are false, and they have been proven to be false.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond.

We are hearing words such as "denied," "deprived," "detriment" to women's healthcare. We are increasing women's health care. Tennessee has four Planned Parenthood clinics and 26 federally qualified health clinics.

Also, I would remind my colleagues the investigation is ongoing. It is ongoing. It started yesterday at Energy and Commerce. We will continue through this to get to the bottom of it.

I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HENSARLING), the chairman of the Financial Services Committee.

Mr. HENSARLING. Madam Speaker, life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, as a people, we have no more sacred values; and the right to life is foremost among these.

Recently, shocking, appalling, horrific videos have come to light that show senior employees at Planned Parenthood casually discussing the harvesting and selling of organs of aborted children in ways to alter their procedures in order to "obtain intact fetal cadavers," which they refer to as "line items."

In perhaps the most chilling video, we see one of these so-called intact fetal cadavers with its heart still beating. Madam Speaker, its heart was still beating.

Madam Speaker, whether one considers themselves pro-life or pro-choice, can we not agree that the harvesting and trafficking of baby organs violates the sanctity with which every child created in the image of God is entitled to? How can a fair, civilized, and compassionate society come to any other conclusion?

Madam Speaker, today I rise to plead with my colleagues to speak up for the voiceless and the defenseless by voting to deny Planned Parenthood further taxpayer subsidies for the harvesting of baby body parts.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in staunch opposition to this dangerous bill. Planned Parenthood provides exactly the types of interventions that prevent unintended preg-

nancies and the need for an abortion in the first place, like birth control options and medically accurate sexual health education.

If this bill becomes law, these important services Planned Parenthood brings to our communities will disappear, and the health of our communities will pay the price.

We keep hearing that the work of Planned Parenthood would be done by other healthcare providers, mostly community health centers, and while that might sound like an easy shift, it doesn't work that way.

Madam Speaker, I have a letter here from the California Primary Care Association. In it, they write: "Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our State's comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining providers. We do not have the capacity for such an increase in care."

This is the direct quote from the health centers that the majority expects to pick up the slack if Planned Parenthood is defunded. It would be untenable.

Supporters of this bill are willfully putting their heads in the sand. They think it is no big deal to shut down hundreds of clinics offering essential services that are not available anywhere else. They think it is worth shutting down the government to achieve this goal. This political theater has to stop.

We need to trust women and their healthcare providers to make their own medical decisions. It is not the government's business.

I strongly urge a "no" vote on this dangerous bill.

I insert the letter from the California Primary Care Association into the RECORD.

CALIFORNIA PRIMARY
CARE ASSOCIATION,

Sacramento, CA, September 17, 2015.

Hon. LOIS CAPPS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN CAPPS: The California Primary Care Association has recently become aware of new legislation, H.R. 3134 combined with the Ellmers amendment, by Congresswoman Diane Black that would redirect federal funding from Planned Parenthood to federally qualified health centers. The purported goal of such legislation is to prevent a decrease in federal funding for women's health services, while putting a moratorium on Planned Parenthood as a healthcare provider for a year while Congress conducts a full investigation of the organization's activities.

As the state-wide representatives of community clinics and health centers in California, who serve 5.6 million patients annually, we believe this action would negatively impact the health of our community.

Planned Parenthood currently operates 115 health centers in California and serves nearly 800,000 patients through 1.5 million encounters annually. Eliminating Planned Parenthood from our state's comprehensive network of care would put untenable stress on remaining health centers. We do not have

the capacity for such an increase in care, even for a year, and should Congress seek to extend the moratorium building such capacity would require significant capital investment on par with the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act expansion.

Even then, the legislation would still eliminate patient's ability to choose the provider with which they feel most comfortable. Planned Parenthood is seen by many as women's health centric, which provides their patients with a level of comfort that cannot be easily replicated. The women's health focus allows them to be a provider of choice to hundreds of thousands of women who seek out a variety of services that include well woman exams, breast exams, birth control and sexually transmitted disease testing.

In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood conducted 733,641 tests for Chlamydia—the leading cause of preventable infertility—that resulted in 37,014 positive results and follow-up treatment.

Planned Parenthood is a vital component of the health care system in California and for that reason, we are opposed to legislation that will diminish their capacity to provide care in our state. We respectfully request that you oppose this legislation.

Sincerely,

CARMELA CASTELLANO GARCIA, ESQ.,

President and CEO,

California Primary Care Association.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY), who chairs the Subcommittee on Human Resources at Ways and Means.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Madam Speaker, as a newly minted physician fresh out of medical school, I took an oath to protect life. As a cardiovascular surgeon, I worked day and night performing thousands of cardiovascular operations on premature infants, all the way up to the elderly. Now, in Congress, I intend to uphold that oath that I took to save life.

The practices we have seen described recently released in the undercover videos of top Planned Parenthood executives detailing the methods they employ to harvest tissues and organs during abortions performed at these clinics is nothing short of atrocious.

After the release of the first video in July, I joined my pro-life colleagues to call immediately for thorough investigations into this activity, and now, these investigations are underway. The American people deserve and they need to know the truth. While these investigations are ongoing, it is important that we take action to prevent taxpayer dollars from going to this type of activity.

I have long supported legislation to end funding for Planned Parenthood and am proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill. It is a very important bill.

I urge my colleagues to defend the culture of life in this country, and let's vote in favor of this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

Ms. SPEIER. Madam Speaker, Planned Parenthood provides 865,000

pap smears and breast exams a year. That is more than the entire population of States like Wyoming, South Dakota, North Dakota.

I want to introduce you, Members on the other side of the aisle, to Colleen from Albany, New York, who is 27 years old. I want you to look into her eyes, and I want you to tell me that you would rather see her dead because Colleen went to Planned Parenthood because she was in between jobs and sought health care.

She received a breast cancer exam at Planned Parenthood. She had stage II breast cancer, and she is alive today because it was identified at a Planned Parenthood clinic. They operated, and she is healthy.

She is not the only one. There are 86,000 men and women who seek services at Planned Parenthood every year for breast cancer or for pap smears for cervical cancer who are identified as having a positive test result. As a result, they get care—86,000. What you are saying is that it is okay for 86,000 people to die because that is how they were accessing their health care.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond to some of the comments and to remind my colleagues this investigation that we are conducting is ongoing.

Cancer screenings and prevention services have been cut in half at Planned Parenthood over the past 7 years. They do not perform mammograms; they outsource it. They perform over 300,000 abortions annually; that is their own number.

Madam Speaker, 98.5 percent of the pregnant women who go there go for an abortion.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), the chairman of the Health Subcommittee.

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, this morning we are debating, actually, two bills. One is the delay of funds to Planned Parenthood until the investigation is over and redistributing that money to the rural and federally qualified community health clinics of which there are over 13,000—only 656 Planned Parenthood clinics—and they actually do women's health, like mammograms, as we have heard, and other issues, not just refer. I would urge support for that.

The other bill we are debating, which is sometimes infants are born alive after an abortion. We had two witnesses last week before the Judiciary Committee who were survivors. One of them said she was in contact with 203 other abortion survivors.

All we are doing is putting enforcement language, some penalties in there because born alive is the law, but it is not enforced, and this would permit that to be enforced.

Finally, with Pope Francis coming next week, he said: "The defense of the

unborn life is closely linked to the defense of each and every other human right. It involves the conviction that a human being is always sacred and inviolable in any situation, every stage of development."

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, while the investigation may be ongoing, there have been no cases of born alive. The one case from some time ago, a doctor is in prison for that. This simply is not accurate. Now, what we know from ongoing investigations here currently is there has been no substantiated allegation against Planned Parenthood.

What we have seen is this Center for Medical Progress that posted these YouTube video. They have made a number of misrepresentations that may have broken several Federal and State laws, including violating Federal tax laws, violating criminal laws, violating the Invasion of Privacy Act out of California, violating California's penal code by making false charitable solicitations.

Now, we have heard that the attorneys for the director, Mr. Daleiden, for CMP, his attorneys have advised a Federal district court that he intends to invoke his Fifth Amendment in the investigation of him for his violation of Federal and State laws.

At this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ).

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015. This bill is possibly the most dangerous bill for women's health to come to the House floor of this Congress.

State and Federal investigations of Planned Parenthood have produced no evidence of violations of laws or medical standards, and independent auditors confirm the videos referenced were heavily altered.

What really happens in Planned Parenthood clinics every year is this: 2.7 million Americans receive critical health services, 78 percent of which live below the poverty level; doctors deliver approximately 400,000 pap smear exams; and women receive nearly half a million breast exams, including screenings to 88,000 women whose cancer was detected early.

This legislation threatens those services and the health of patients, including 7,000 women in my district annually who rely on Planned Parenthood for health care.

As a woman, mother, and breast cancer survivor, I refuse to take that threat lying down. Republicans' own investigations turned up nothing; yet some of their Members are willing to risk women's lives just to score political points. Enough is enough.

I urge all Members who truly value women's health to vote against this outrageous witch hunt.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

Recent videos released by brave whistleblowers have definitively shown that it is well past time to defund Planned Parenthood. For far too long and to the tune of one-half billion dollars a year, taxpayers have been forced to subsidize Planned Parenthood's abortion on demand.

Thanks to these unsettling revelations, we now know that taxpayers have also been subsidizing the trafficking of aborted baby body parts. This is not health care, Madam Speaker.

There are over 13,000 publicly supported health centers in our country that do provide excellent women's health care. In my home State of Colorado, there are 240 such healthcare alternatives versus 21 Planned Parenthood locations.

This important legislation will not remove funds from women's health care, but shift it to responsible providers. Taxpayers won't have to fund Planned Parenthood's deplorable barbarism.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

□ 1130

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN).

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, this legislation is the latest attempt to take essential healthcare services away from women.

Our Republican colleagues know that none of the Planned Parenthood Federal funds are used for abortion, per the Hyde amendment. They know there is no evidence that Planned Parenthood has violated any Federal laws. They know that 90 percent of Planned Parenthood services go to essential cancer screenings, family planning counseling, pregnancy tests, contraceptive care, and other things.

This bill will deny women those services. When this bill fails in the Senate, our Republican colleagues are apparently prepared to shut down the government in order to shut down those women's health services.

Madam Speaker, our Republican colleagues are entitled to their views, but they should not harm our economy; they should not harm America's women; they should not shut down the government to try to impose their views on the country.

Madam Speaker, I rise to raise my opposition to H.R. 3134, Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015. This bill would prohibit all federal funding for Planned Parenthood health centers for one year.

Instead of using their majority to pass a clean budget and govern responsibly, the Republicans are willing to hold our country hostage to further their harmful agenda against women.

The Defund Planned Parenthood Act is just another shameful attempt to take essential healthcare services away from women. Republicans are so focused on defunding Planned Parenthood that they are willing to shut down the government again, and cause billions of dollars of damage to our economy.

Planned Parenthood has been investigated multiple times and each investigation has shown that Planned Parenthood has not violated any federal laws. Moreover none of Planned Parenthood's federal funds are used to perform abortions, in accordance with the Hyde Amendment. Republicans are ignoring facts and relying on doctored footage to continue their crusade against women's healthcare.

This bill will have a devastating impact on women. Approximately one in five American women, in her lifetime, has relied on a Planned Parenthood center for care. It serves a total of 2.7 million patients per year—women and men.

More than ninety percent of their much-needed services go toward providing essential health services that includes contraceptive care, family planning counseling, pregnancy tests, prenatal care, and essential cancer screenings.

There are not enough community health centers to care for all of those who would lose access to healthcare if this bill is passed. A direct threat would be posed to seventy-eight percent of Planned Parenthood patients who earn incomes of 150 percent of the federal poverty level or less.

It is time to focus on this country's real concerns and stop trying to deprive women of essential health services. I strongly oppose this bill and any other efforts to defund Planned Parenthood.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to respond.

Madam Speaker, they sure want that government shutdown. I do want to remind them that we have over 13,000 community health centers in the country. Planned Parenthood has cut their cancer screening and prevention services in half in the past 7 years, and they do not perform mammograms, but they do over 300,000 abortions.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROE).

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

As an OB/GYN physician who has delivered close to 5,000 babies, I was sickened and disturbed by the release of several videos showing Planned Parenthood executives casually discussing the dismemberment of babies to sell body parts.

Madam Speaker, this bill isn't about whether you are pro-life or pro-choice, though I am proud to say that I will always be a defender of the right to life.

This is about the gruesome practices of an organization that receives over \$500 million a year from the Federal Government. As legislators, we carry the responsibility and the privilege to protect those who do not have a voice and to ensure that tax dollars are supporting organizations that truly provide health care for women.

I have seen the videos, and I can tell you, that is not health care. I have spent my entire life caring for patients, and it is important to note that there are alternatives for women to receive care besides Planned Parenthood. I strongly support withholding tax dollars from Planned Parenthood until congressional investigators have had a chance to review the matter. I am proud to encourage my colleagues to support this important bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, may I please inquire how much time is left on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 8½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 11¼ minutes remaining.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, the videos keep being referenced here on the floor. I want Members to understand, I want the American public to understand that the first four short videos released on YouTube have 40 separate splices and edits that remove crucial context. They remove exculpatory statements like, "Nobody should be selling tissue; that is not the goal here," and, "This is not a service they should be making money from. It is something they should be able to offer to their patients in a way that doesn't impact them," or, "We are not looking to make money from this. Our goal is to keep access available." In one of the videos there are at least 16 substantial unexplained edits, including the removal of nine instances where Planned Parenthood staff said there is no profit related to tissue donation.

Doesn't that seem misleading and fundamentally dishonest to remove statements like that, and then base a smear campaign and bring it to the floor of the United States Congress for policymaking? I think so.

That is why these videos have been denounced across the country by independent editorial writers. They have called them distorted and unfair, dishonest, grossly misleading, and politically irresponsible and swift boating.

Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), my friend.

Mr. PAYNE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act.

There is nothing thoughtful about this legislation. This is a shameful and shocking sham. This has always been about Republicans wanting to restrict

the right of women to make their own healthcare decisions.

Let me say, you know, these doctored videos on YouTube, my children watch YouTube, and you can see whatever you want on YouTube. You can see a man punt a basketball through a basket from 500 feet. You can see whatever you want. So I am not surprised that these doctored videos are on YouTube.

Mammograms are done in imaging centers, so no health center does an actual mammogram. So let's stop trying to mislead the American people with this sham.

If you like YouTube so much, and that is where you are going to get your information, I have another video you can watch right now on YouTube. It is called, "Dumb and Dumber."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG).

Mr. WALBERG. Madam Speaker, it has been said that none are so blind as those who will not see, and so I rise today on behalf of the unborn babies who can't stand up for themselves.

Many of my colleagues have already described the horrifying videos that shock the conscience and have sparked several congressional investigations.

No matter what party you belong to, we should all agree that taxpayer dollars should not be used for harvesting baby parts for profit. The debate today is about more than these barbaric practices. It is about the very character of our Nation. Will we turn a blind eye to this callous disregard for human life? Is this the country we want to be?

Two weeks ago today, my newest granddaughter, Naomi Gail, was born after an emergency C-section from a doctor who understood the need for life for both the mother and the child. Holding her in my arms was a vivid reminder that all life is sacred, and every child deserves dignity, respect, and a chance for a full life.

America was founded on the values of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Madam Speaker, it all begins with life.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I want to thank Representative CASTOR for her tremendous leadership.

I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, which is nothing more than yet another ideological attack on women's health care. It would defund Planned Parenthood for a year, leaving millions of women across the country without access to critical healthcare services.

Planned Parenthood centers often serve as a primary care health facility for women seeking birth control, cancer and STI screenings, and other critical preventive care. In 2013 alone, Planned Parenthood provided healthcare services to more than 800,000 Cali-

fornians and provided more than 93,000 Pap tests and 97,000 breast exams.

Denying access to the healthcare services such as Planned Parenthood provides will harm those who most need these services, including low-income women and women of color. This bill is shameful. It is disrespectful. It is wrong. Politicians shouldn't be interfering, anyway, in a woman's personal healthcare decisions.

It is past time Republicans stop their war on women and stop these ideological attacks and stop using women's health care to divert attention from a looming government shutdown because Republicans refuse to pass a budget.

Vote "no" on this deceptive and dishonest bill.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to respond to something.

Our colleagues across the aisle have a colleague from New Jersey who previously spoke. I want to reference a press release that was sent out August 15 from his office on community health centers:

Community health centers attend to hard-to-reach populations and are a vital resource that have a significant impact in improving health in New Jersey.

Talking about reaching hard-to-serve populations, this is what we are doing. Let's put the money where it meets the most needs.

I now yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. DUFFY), who is the author of H.R. 3495, the Women's Public Health and Safety Act, and commend him for his commitment in those efforts.

Mr. DUFFY. "It is a boy," or, "it is a girl"; any parent knows that phrase. It is one of the most memorable moments that they will ever have in their lives.

Recently, we heard that same phrase, but it was said by an abortion provider at Planned Parenthood, and it was as that provider—we will use that term loosely—was siphoning through the body parts of a little baby, taking hearts and lungs for sale, but noticed it is a boy.

What a perversion. What a perversion of who we are as a people. I think it calls into question this debate. This is not a debate about women's health. We are providing the same amount of money for women's health to great clinics that provide great care. It is about Planned Parenthood.

Why is it about Planned Parenthood? If you watch this debate, you have to ask, how could anybody defend the practices at Planned Parenthood, harvesting body parts? How could anyone defend that? It is an easy answer. Look in political season. Millions of dollars—millions of dollars—are spent by Planned Parenthood to elect Democrats to the House of Representatives and to the Senate. This isn't about babies. This is about money.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Madam Speaker, this feels like *deja vu*. Once again, the House is ignoring the challenges facing our Nation in order to attack women's health. Already this year, the House has voted to restrict reproductive health care in private insurance, enact a sweeping 20-week abortion ban, and allow employers to discriminate against their workers for using birth control.

Now, with just 5 legislative days before a shutdown, we are wasting our time on a bill the President has said he will veto. It is past time for Congress to stop focusing on ideology and start focusing on the facts. The fact is defunding Planned Parenthood would have a devastating effect on women's access to health care. That care includes cancer screenings, immunizations, and birth control.

As my colleagues are well aware, current law already prevents Federal funding for abortion services. It is shameful that the House is allowing the reckless actions of a few extremists to jeopardize the critical safety net provided by Planned Parenthood. We can't let that happen.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. Madam Speaker, we have seen in the videos released this summer the horrific practices of harvesting the body parts of aborted children for profit. We have also known that Planned Parenthood provides abortion procedures, and the pro-life movement has for years worked very hard to ensure that no taxpayer dollars will be used to fund the procedure of abortion.

Planned Parenthood is not about women's health care. We know this because not one clinic performs mammograms. The despicable actions that were uncovered in these videos show the true nature of Planned Parenthood. It shows their complete disregard for life. It shows how careless they are with the responsibility to treat our most vulnerable and innocent with respect.

We cannot give taxpayer dollars to an organization that profits from the sale of organs from aborted children. Planned Parenthood officials have been caught haggling over the price of body parts from aborted children, and they have been recorded on camera fearing the consequences if their actions were revealed to the world. We have two House committee investigations. We have an obligation to suspend Federal funding to Planned Parenthood while the investigations are being conducted.

Now is the time for all Americans to reflect on the fragile nature of life and how we treat the unborn. I want to

thank Congresswoman BLACK for leading the efforts to defund Planned Parenthood. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 4½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 8 minutes remaining.

□ 1145

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY).

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I stand before you today not as a Republican and not as a Member of this House, but as a fellow human being, and I wonder: How did we get to this point? How do we somehow compromise in our mind what it is that we are talking about today?

I want you to disconnect from any organization or agency and concentrate on the act of what is taking place.

This is not a blob of tissue. This is one of America's sons or daughters waiting to be born. They are taken from the safety of their mother's womb and they are taken out very carefully so they can harvest certain body parts: hearts, lungs, heads.

You can sit here and try to make it something about an agency and turn a blind eye to the act that is taking place in a country that will go to any length to protect life, in a people that believes in the sanctity of life from its very conception to its natural death.

And somehow harvesting the parts from these little baby boys and girls has become a political issue?

This is an issue human being to human being. This is an issue of conscience and conviction. Please, do not make it a political battle.

This is about our sons and daughters. This is about a horrific act that is repulsive and repugnant and has no place in America. America's taxpayers refuse to pay for that type of act. Wake up.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. I thank the many colleagues who stood here and stand with me now to rise in support of ensuring that hard-earned taxpayer dollars do not go to private entities that are trafficking in fetal baby parts.

We have to put a stop to this heinous practice. We have to ensure that this problem is investigated. We have to ensure that the Federal Government is not condoning these actions.

I believe that we need to ensure that Planned Parenthood understands that the money that they have access to

from the Federal Treasury is not mandatory money that is given to that agency.

We need to ensure that women's health is a priority, but let's put the tax dollars into the agencies and the community health centers that are providing access to women's health care every day throughout this great Nation. We can do that.

Let's stand together. Let's ban this heinous practice. Let's make sure we move forward.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL).

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to the Defund Planned Parenthood Act. I want to say this as respectfully as possible, but this bill is dumb, it is foolish, and it is mean-spirited, with only one purpose, and that is to punish one of our country's premier health organizations because it provides women access to an array of services that we need to lead healthy lives. The bill is based upon lies and exaggerations.

Now, if you want to have a truthful debate, then let's talk about the 400,000 Pap smears, the 500,000 breast exams, and the 4.5 million STD and HIV tests that Planned Parenthood does each year. Now, that is saving lives. That is the truth.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 1 minute to gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PITTENGER).

Mr. PITTENGER. Madam Speaker, many years ago, I was in London with my family at the British Museum and watched a little movie about the development and growth of a baby inside a mother's womb. The video was all about life, tracking the baby's development week by week.

Recently, we have all watched videos where Planned Parenthood executives candidly talked about death. How can anyone defend the sale of a little baby's body parts? Why should Federal taxpayers support organizations that rob little ones of their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness?

Planned Parenthood has betrayed the rights and life of America's most defenseless. Today I am asking that you join me in supporting the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, which effectively halts Federal funding of Planned Parenthood for 1 year or until they can certify that their affiliates and clinics are not and will not perform abortions.

I thank Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her leadership on this issue. The character of our Nation is at stake. We must restore the value and sanctity of every life and fight back against those unfathomable acts. Life is precious. Let's cherish each and every one.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

Mr. ROTHFUS. Madam Speaker, what we have learned about Planned Parenthood through these videos is appalling, barbaric, and indefensible. Here are some of the quotes:

We've been very good at getting heart, lung, liver . . . so I'm not gonna crush that part.

Using a "less crunchy" technique to get more whole specimens.

We're going to procure brain . . . so what you do is you go through the face . . .

And when discussing the sale of body parts, a Planned Parenthood official asks:

Well, why don't you start by telling me what you're used to paying?

Madam Speaker, our Nation is so much better than this. The cold indifference shown in these videos is the inevitable result for an organization that does hundreds of thousands of abortions every year.

Federally funded clinics that serve women's health and do not perform abortions outnumber Planned Parenthood clinics by between two to one. Let's send the funds to those clinics.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. CASTRO of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR).

Mr. FARR. I don't think anybody on your side has read the bill. It doesn't do anything that you have talked about.

It doesn't stop abortions. It doesn't stop any of those other issues that are already illegal. It does one thing: It shuts down Planned Parenthood clinics.

I represent the largest affiliate of Planned Parenthood in the United States. And guess what. Twenty-two percent of the patients are men. So you are going to deny access not only to women, but to men.

You say: "Oh, we will shift the money somewhere else." There is nowhere else. These are the only clinics around in many of the communities.

So what you are doing is taking this angry white man's caucus on the Republican side that have been for years trying to use this as a political issue, using a bill that says you are going to do all these things. It only does one thing: it penalizes Planned Parenthood.

Penalizing Planned Parenthood penalizes us all. It is about access to health care, particularly, access to health care for women.

Stop beating up on women. Stop trying to make this a political issue. The reason we haven't been able to legislate against abortion is because you can't find a law that can enforce it.

This is really a moral issue and a medical issue that ought to be discussed with women and their doctors. Congress Members ought to stay out of this.

We haven't been successful in solving these problems. This only hurts people,

particularly in rural areas, because the majority of Planned Parenthood clinics are in rural areas.

Stop being so mean. Solve problems, not create them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I would encourage all Members to read the bill. It is very short. It is about three pages. What it will do is freeze this funding for a year so we can do the investigation, and it sends it to some of the 13,000 community health centers that are in the country.

We have even got a press release from one of their colleagues extolling the values of these community health centers.

I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The appalling videos that have been released revealing Planned Parenthood's horrific activities should spur deep concern in every American.

In a recent hearing with Secretary Burwell, I asked her whether the Department of Health and Human Services would probe into these allegations, but she refused to commit to an investigation.

We have a moral responsibility to act to investigate this organization's actions and hold them accountable.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, the recent allegations and videos that have come forth have literally shocked the world by showcasing the morally bankrupt practices of Planned Parenthood.

I am honored to stand with my colleagues to try to prevent tax dollars from going to this organization that has now stooped to the practice of trafficking innocent baby parts, they say, for the purpose of advancing medical research, but we all know that there is no excuse that can possibly be given to provide for the moral bankruptcy of Planned Parenthood.

It is time to defund this while the investigation occurs. The blood and body parts of children should be looked at as a sacred entity rather than an industry.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. I thank my friend for yielding and for her excellent remarks on the floor this morning.

Madam Speaker, defunding Planned Parenthood would have a real, profound, negative impact on the 10,000 people in Maine who get health care from Planned Parenthood every year, many of whom have no other access to care.

Planned Parenthood provides basic health care like cancer screenings, vaccinations, wellness exams, and STD testing, basic care that will mean the difference between health and sickness, prosperity and poverty, or even life and death for women in my State.

Let's be clear. Who is really behind the attempts to defund Planned Parenthood? Radical antiabortion groups who want to shut down Planned Parenthood and deny women access to safe and legal abortions. These are groups who want to deny women the right to make a private, personal medical decision.

In the process, they want to take away the access to birth control, family planning services, and even basic health care. They have orchestrated a false, misleading smear campaign to try and accomplish their goal, a campaign we have heard a lot today about here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and stand up for women's rights to make their own decisions about health care and protect their access to basic medical services.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD).

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Madam Speaker, during the recent Presidential debates Carly Fiorina called and dared President Obama and Hillary Clinton to watch these appalling videos.

I realize we only have a few minutes left, but I want to dare Members on the other side to watch these videos, too. There are computers in the cloakroom where they can watch them.

If they want to send one taxpayer dime to Planned Parenthood after watching it, shame on them. There are much better places to send it, like these community health centers created under President Obama's bill. There are lots of places women can go for health care, not just Planned Parenthood.

Go watch the videos.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. I am pleased to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. It is bizarre to watch the manufactured controversy surrounding ambush-type, heavily edited filming used to discredit Planned Parenthood.

These attacks do not reflect my experience and knowledge of the amazing, dedicated, civic-minded men and women—pillars of our community—who have built, supported, and led Planned Parenthood in my community.

There is no question that, because of their efforts, tens of thousands of abor-

tions never occurred. Because of their efforts, 70,000 women in Oregon last year received services.

They are people who know their communities, Planned Parenthood leadership understands that this heated rhetoric, outrageous claims, and attack against service to low-income women is not just false, it is wrong.

It is bizarre to watch the manufactured controversy surrounding ambush-type, heavily edited journalism used to discredit Planned Parenthood.

It's not just the blatantly manipulative and misleading tactics that are being used, which should be enough for most people to reject the allegations on their face. These attacks do not reflect my experience and knowledge of the amazing, dedicated, civic-minded men and women who have built, supported, and led Planned Parenthood in my community.

For decades, I have admired these pillars of community, leaders in education, religion, business, and other civic affairs that provided the vision, the volunteer effort, and personal contributions to women's health and reproductive freedom. There is no question that because of their efforts, tens of thousands of abortions never occurred in our community and those that did occur, did not result in harm to women.

Because of their efforts, Oregon's 11 Planned Parenthood centers provided care to over 70,000 women in 2013, including over 25,000 breast and cervical cancer screenings. Nationally, Planned Parenthood services over 2.5 million women annually. Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net clients than any other type of safety-net providers. Nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—these clinics offer affordable health care options for women who may have no alternate source of care.

The fact that we are engaged in a concerted assault against the provision of essential services to women, especially women of color and low-income status is appalling. If people would take the time, as I have, to visit these facilities, meet the employees, and most importantly, know these community leaders that have made it possible to protect women's health, to prevent countless abortions, and to promote wellbeing and education, they would see the lies behind this heated rhetoric and misguided attacks.

□ 1200

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WENSTRUP).

Mr. WENSTRUP. Madam Speaker, I serve on the board of health in Cincinnati, Ohio, and I am very familiar with FQHCs. I might say that FQHCs provide services, expansive services, not only to women, but men and children as well.

My wife and I are currently in the process of adoption, and it sickens me to see these parts of young children sitting there, knowing that we could take them, love them, and nurture them into a wonderful life. I don't know how people look at themselves in the mirror and think that this is okay.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The Republican Congress has fundamentally failed to fulfill its basic responsibility to work out an appropriations plan that will keep this government open. This bill, to inflame the passion that is based on false videos, distorted clips that was part of a coordinated smear campaign all across the country, is being used as the foundation to close the government.

I hope it doesn't happen, but it appears that the dysfunction in the Republican Congress is going to lead us down that path, at the expense of women's health care, their basic fundamental services all across this country.

Last spring, we asked the Republicans in Congress to sit down and hammer out an appropriations plan. They refused. They adjourned at the end of July. Nothing happened in August. Nothing has happened here in September, except for these inflammatory bills based upon false YouTube videos.

This Republican Congress' continuing dysfunction and inability to govern are having real effects on hard-working Americans. This "Deny Women Health Care Act" is a cynical attack on the ability of women to receive the health services they need.

I urge a "no" vote, and I urge my Republican colleagues to keep the government open for hard-working Americans.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. Madam Speaker, where have we gone? Where is the moral compass of the United States? Do we want to continue the issue of taking body parts of babies and selling them on the open market and protecting that enterprise? Or do we want to back up and say, if that is occurring, we are not funding it?

All this legislation does is say: Wait a minute, if that is occurring in America, we are not going to tolerate it. Until we find out, no more money, and it should go to other agencies that don't harvest the body parts of babies.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to close and draw to an end this debate. I do want to remind all my colleagues that we are not discussing government shutdown. What we are talking about is a bill that would withhold funds from Planned Parenthood for a period of a year, while we have an investigation.

Now, I know they have called this a smear campaign. We are investigating the operations of Planned Parenthood.

Why are we doing this? Planned Parenthood is big abortion in this country—300,000 abortions a year, as op-

posed to 1,800 adoption services; 98.5 percent of all women who go there for a prenatal service, it is an abortion. Think about that, 98.5 percent.

There is reason to review how they use taxpayer funding, and we are justified in withholding taxpayer funds until we finish that.

Now, our colleagues have chosen to say that we are radical, dumb, shameful, disrespectful, foolish, extremists, deniers, deprivers, mean-spirited, and beating up on women. Think about that. All because we stand for life, for liberty. We stand for life rights, a first right, and these are the names that you attach to people who defend those rights.

Saturday, I went to a baby shower. An excited grandmother said, Meet my granddaughter. It was an ultrasound, a 3-D ultrasound. Her name is Jessica. That is a baby with a life, and Planned Parenthood is aborting 300,000 of those lives each year.

It is time for taxpayer money to be withheld. I support the bill.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, today I speak in support of H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015, to terminate taxpayer support of this deplorable organization.

I'd like to thank my good friend, Congresswoman DIANE BLACK for her leadership on this issue and her unwavering support for the lives of the unborn.

This summer, we have learned of the shocking nature of Planned Parenthood's practice of selling babies' hearts, lungs, livers, brains and other organs, often for a profit, to the highest bidder.

We were disturbed by what we learned about these practices, but perhaps even more so by the cold indifference in which countless employees dehumanized unborn children, effectively turning them into line item revenue sources, rather than human life in its most precious form.

After discovering the grotesque nature of these practices, the U.S. House of Representatives responded to these abhorrent activities by launching investigative hearings, the first of which began in the House Judiciary Committee last week.

Yet the very same week we began investigating the extent of the wrongdoing, the Executive Branch, through the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, awarded Planned Parenthood of Missouri, Iowa and Montana with over \$1 million in taxpayer support.

The only response to this unthinkable action is for the U.S. House of Representatives, the legislative body with constitutional authority over federal funds, to pass legislation expressly prohibiting the federal government from supporting Planned Parenthood.

Madam Speaker, it is not enough for the U.S. House of Representatives to deny funds from a single continuing resolution or omnibus spending package.

Instead we must do so permanently and Congresswoman BLACK's legislation gives Congress an opportunity to continue our in-

vestigations into Planned Parenthood and work toward the day when we are no longer funding this abhorrent organization.

In the short term, there is much work to be done.

The U.S. House of Representatives is responsible for acting on behalf of the American people and investigating the extent to which Planned Parenthood's has profited from this activity.

Furthermore we must make sure that Planned Parenthood has not been engaging in illegal partial birth abortions.

We must determine whether or not Planned Parenthood has been breaking the law by altering abortion procedures to preserve certain organs for sale.

We must protect women and unborn children from these dangerous procedures that are designed to increase revenue for this group and profit from the destruction innocent life.

And perhaps most importantly, we must provide funding for other organizations that provide women's health care support and services—without also offering abortions.

And we must not continue taxpayer funding for groups like Planned Parenthood that believe they are above the laws of the United States.

We have a duty, as elected Representatives to stand up for the most vulnerable among us, to lend a voice to the voiceless, and fight back against injustice.

And so I lend my full support to H.R. 3134, so that we may defund Planned Parenthood and provide vulnerable women with better options for their health care needs.

Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act.

This bill is partisan politics at its worst. The attacks on Planned Parenthood are nothing more than political witch-hunts led by anti-abortion extremists. Their efforts to mislead the public and tarnish the reputation of Planned Parenthood are downright shameful.

Here are the facts: millions of American families, particularly in underserved areas, rely on Planned Parenthood for family planning services and basic women's healthcare. Seventy-eight percent of Planned Parenthood patients live with incomes at 150 percent of the federal poverty level or less, and almost half a million of their patients are Latinos. Were it not for Planned Parenthood, these families, including over 25 thousand in my district, would have nowhere to turn for basic health care needs.

Defunding Planned Parenthood has implications for the 2.7 million Americans across the country who count on Planned Parenthood for STD and STI testing, cancer screenings, contraceptive care, and other health services. These basic and critical healthcare services which account for 97% of those provided at Planned Parenthood, are what is really being defunded here.

It's been 42 years since the United States Supreme Court ruled that a woman has the constitutional right to choose what is best for her health and her body. Since then, anti-abortion extremists have been working tirelessly to chip away at this constitutional protection. This time, Madam Speaker, the ramifications of their efforts extend far beyond

abortion. They threaten the health and well-being of millions of hard-working American families in my district and across the country.

The majority always argues for small government. I guess this time they want a government small enough to fit inside the exam room with a woman and her doctor.

Madam Speaker, I'd like to submit a letter signed by 13 Latino advocacy groups in opposition to defunding Planned Parenthood.

AUGUST 3, 2015.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As organizations committed to the civil and human rights, health equity, and well-being of Latino/as, our families, and our communities, we the thirteen undersigned organizations urge you to oppose all efforts to defund Planned Parenthood Federation of America (PPFA) or other healthcare providers that Latino/as rely on for high quality care.

The recent manipulated and misleading attacks on PPFA are yet another political attempt to target providers of reproductive health services. The real agenda behind these attacks is to block access to basic health services, particularly for low-income communities, women of color, and young people. These tactics also create an atmosphere of fear and shame intended to intimidate women who seek abortion and those who provide the much needed care.

Such attacks on PPFA, a critical provider of vital health services to low-income women and women of color, threatens to unravel the reproductive health safety net that our Latino/a community relies on. We have already seen such efforts as in Texas when the state legislature authorized the "affiliate rule" that barred all Planned Parenthood health centers from receiving state funds. In 2012, the first full year following the devastating cuts to family planning funding and implementation of the "affiliate rule," Texas met only 13 percent of the need for publicly funded contraception—less than half of national totals for the same year.

Furthermore, defunding PPFA would have a devastating impact on the Latino/a community which experiences higher rates of reproductive cancers, unintended pregnancy, and sexually transmitted infections than most other groups of people in the U.S. In fact, according to the latest statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Latinas have the highest cervical cancer incidence rates. Latinos/as, including LGBTQ Latinos/as, immigrant women, and women of color experience system barriers such as cost, lack of available clinics, insufficient culturally and linguistically competent health systems, and discriminatory immigration policies that make it difficult for individuals and communities to access routine healthcare. For decades, Latinos/as have been the most uninsured racial and ethnic group.

That is why our communities rely on Planned Parenthood for quality healthcare. In 2013, PPFA's clinics served 575,000 Latinos/as, which was 22 percent of their overall patients. We will not tolerate any attempts to cut Latinos/as off from this care.

We strongly urge you to oppose all proposals to defund PPFA and stand with the undersigned organizations to protect the right to health care for Latinos/as and other persons of color. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Ann Marie Benitez, Senior Director of Government Re-

lations, at National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health.

Signed,

Casa de Esperanza, Farmworker Justice, Hispanic Federation, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement, LatinoJustice PRLDEF, League of United Latin American Citizens, Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund, National Alliance of Latin American and Caribbean Communities, National Hispanic Media Coalition, National Latina Institute for Reproductive Health, Presente, U.S.-Mexico Foundation, VotoLatino.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise in opposition to this brazen assault on women's health, which would harm lower income women around this nation.

The legislation we are debating today would mean that women with limited health options will find it harder to secure lifesaving services—like breast exams and pap tests. In New York alone, cutting Planned Parenthood funding would mean that nearly 50,000 fewer breast exams would occur. 37,000 women would no longer receive pap tests. Millions of women nationwide would no longer have access to STI screenings and treatments, to say nothing of additional unplanned pregnancies.

These are just some of the critical treatments and procedures Planned Parenthood provides—some of which save women's lives. If you want to proclaim yourself "pro-life" then you should care about women's lives—not focus on depriving them of health care services and contraception.

Today, we have just a few legislative days left before another Republican-fueled government shutdown. We know this misguided bill we are debating is going nowhere. It will not pass the Senate. If it did, the President would veto it.

Yet, House Republicans remain obsessed with attacking Planned Parenthood and reducing women's healthcare options—to the point where they are ready to engender another government shutdown.

We need to reject this legislation so we get back to the serious business of governing. Support women's health care, vote no on the bill.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, I stand in strong opposition to H.R. 3134, Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015.

This debate and vote are another attempt to deny women basic health care, including reproductive health services. 2.7 million patients—both men and women—all across America depend on Planned Parenthood for critical medical services every year. In my district, if you go to a Planned Parenthood clinic at the end of the day, women, many of modest means, will be lined up through the waiting room and, often, down the street, waiting to be seen.

While supporters of this bill claim women will have other comparable options, the experts tell us that is simply not the case. The non-partisan Congressional Budget Office found that if this bill is passed, as many as 630,000 Planned Parenthood patients could lose access to birth control, STD screening, and other reproductive health services. And researchers at the Guttmacher Institute estimate that in 103 of America's 491 counties,

Planned Parenthood is the only safety-net family planning clinic.

I am outraged by this attempt to use a heavily edited and thoroughly discredited video to vilify an organization that plays a vital role in communities across the nation. Planned Parenthood should be celebrated, not demonized, and I hope my colleagues reject this dangerous and disingenuous piece of legislation.

Ms. NORTON. Madam Speaker, today, I come to the House floor to stand up for women's health.

Republicans are using a heavily edited, agenda-driven series of videos that falsely portray Planned Parenthood's participation in tissue donation programs that support lifesaving scientific research. These outrageous and false claims about Planned Parenthood have been discredited. Edited and distorted video should not undermine the incredible work that Planned Parenthood does across this country in providing critical health care to millions of women.

This bill to defund Planned Parenthood would not defund abortion. Only three percent of all health services provided by Planned Parenthood are abortion services, and these services already cannot be paid for with federal funding. What this bill would defund is basic health services for millions of women. Planned Parenthood provides family planning counseling and contraception to 2.1 million patients, 400,000 lifesaving screenings for cervical cancer, nearly 500,000 breast exams, and nearly 4.5 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted infections, including HIV.

Despite news this week that the number of uninsured Americans decreased by 8.8 million last year thanks to the Affordable Care Act, 33 million Americans still have no health insurance. Perhaps hardest hit by this defunding effort will be the women who live in one of the 20 states that have declined the Medicaid expansion provided by the Affordable Care Act and who rely on Planned Parenthood for lifesaving health care.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would also be devastating for low-income communities, women of color, and young people. It would unravel our nation's reproductive health safety net. Planned Parenthood health centers comprise 10% of all publicly funded family planning centers, and serve 36% of all clients who obtain care from the nation's network of family planning providers. The view of some Republicans that federal funding could simply be redistributed to other health care centers and providers ignores where Planned Parenthood health centers are located. They are not typically on Main Street, but rather in areas and neighborhoods where they are most needed. For example, a new Planned Parenthood center currently under construction here in D.C. is located in a underserved area in Ward 5 whose population greatly needs access to the health services that Planned Parenthood provides.

Unfortunately, we in the District of Columbia know all too well this type of assault on women's reproductive health and Planned Parenthood. Whenever Republicans have controlled the House, they have imposed a devastating rider on the District that prevents us from spending our locally raised taxes on abortion

services for low-income women, singling us out as the only jurisdiction in the country that cannot spend its local tax dollars for such purposes. We were successful in getting that rider removed from the Senate's fiscal year 2016 D.C. Appropriations bill, and we will continue to fight to have the rider removed from any final spending bill.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this hyper-partisan bill, which would devastate women's access to health services, most drastically in low-income and minority communities.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, I rise to express several serious concerns with the flawed process that led to a flawed product, H.R. 3134, the "Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015."

Ten shocking videos released over the last few months document what many already knew was happening at Planned Parenthood facilities around our nation—the selling and trafficking of fetal organs for a profit. For the vast majority of Americans who view human life as sacred, these videos have caused righteous anger and disgust that the taxpayer-subsidized "non-profit organization" is not only extinguishing human life but also making money off of human parts—at the taxpayers' expense.

This is the moment for the pro-life movement to hold this evil organization accountable by completely and unequivocally defunding Planned Parenthood.

Rather than fighting to protect life and actually defunding Planned Parenthood, we are voting today on a weak bill, without teeth, that does not defund Planned Parenthood.

H.R. 3134 only places a one-year moratorium on federal funding of Planned Parenthood. Furthermore, it includes exceptions to continue to allow taxpayer dollars to go to Planned Parenthood and its abortion factories.

With all we know about what goes on at Planned Parenthood's abortion factories, why are we voting on a bill to "defund" Planned Parenthood for one year?

What's worse, H.R. 3134 does not defund Planned Parenthood. The exceptions included in this bill allow taxpayer dollars to be used to fund abortions performed at Planned Parenthood. In effect, this bill is a proactive vote by the GOP-controlled House of Representatives to affirmatively fund abortions at Planned Parenthood facilities. The very bill leadership has promoted as the solution to this grisly problem—the taxpayer funded mutilation of fully formed children—actually rubber stamps the existing situation.

Furthermore, the certification process in this bill is ripe for fraud and abuse. All Planned Parenthood needs to do is certify it is already following federal law and the Hyde Amendment to continue to receive funding. Who ensures this certification? Once Planned Parenthood receives federal funding and is found to violate this Act, what is the process for the executive branch to seek repayment of this money? H.R. 3134 does not go far enough to address concerns for fraud and abuse.

Because of my serious concerns with the substance of H.R. 3134, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee on Wednesday, September 16, 2015. My amendment states:

"No funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any

purpose to—(1) Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; (2) any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.; or (3) any successor of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. or any such affiliate or clinic."

My amendment is simple: no federal funds to Planned Parenthood. Period. No one-year moratorium. No exceptions. That should be the goal of this debate and any legislation to defund Planned Parenthood.

Unfortunately, the Rules Committee did not approve my amendment for debate on the floor or adopt it as part of the underlying bill. If my amendment was considered on the floor, I am confident that my colleagues would have overwhelming support and adopted my amendment into the underlying bill.

The funding fight starts now—this is our marker—H.R. 3134 is not a sufficient vote to defund Planned Parenthood. I expect much stronger language than this in the CR coming up in the next few weeks. Innocent, unborn babies deserve more than just a show vote.

Mr. ELLISON. Madam Speaker, today, I would like to talk about the Republican effort to defund Planned Parenthood and restrict access to health care services.

Planned Parenthood is an invaluable resource for working Americans across the country. In my home state of Minnesota, Planned Parenthood operates 18 clinics, an online health center, and serves over 54,000 people every year.

If funding for Planned Parenthood is eliminated—as my Republican colleagues are demanding—the consequences would be devastating. The elimination of Planned Parenthood's services would mean that millions of women and men would lose access to primary care services, contraceptive services, breast and cervical cancer screenings, and treatment for sexually transmitted diseases. These families—especially those in rural and high poverty areas—would have nowhere else to go.

My colleagues who support defunding Planned Parenthood say that working families could go elsewhere to receive care. This claim is false. Community Health Centers and other clinics that serve low-income Americans would not be able to provide care for all of the patients that would flood their offices should Planned Parenthood lose their federal funding.

Not only would defunding Planned Parenthood create barriers to accessing care, but it would limit the ability of women to achieve economic security. A recent Guttmacher Institute study showed that access to contraception helped women complete their education, keep or get a job, and take better care of their families. For example, the children of mothers who had access to contraception have higher family incomes and college completion rates. Moreover, research also shows that access to birth control contributed in a 30 percent rise in the number of women in skilled careers between 1970 and 1990. The positive effects of widespread access to reproductive and primary care services for women, families and Americans is immeasurable.

Unfortunately, the recent attacks on Planned Parenthood are nothing new. This is just another attack on working families and low-income women. In 1976, Congress passed the Hyde Amendment which restricts the use of

federal funds for abortion. This policy directly harms the wellbeing and safety of low-income women, and limits their personal autonomy. It is a policy I strongly oppose. Three decades later, Republican talking points about Planned Parenthood ignore the very real impact defunding the organization will have on every day Americans—both on a large economic scale, and on the personal health and autonomy of Americans. It is a reminder that my Republican colleagues in Congress do not trust women to make decisions that are best for them. That must change. We must trust women to do what is best for their bodies and their families. Republican tactics also ignore the consequences of shutting down the government simply to make an ideological point.

Putting the wellbeing of millions working Americans on the line is unacceptable. Supporting policies that restrict women's—specifically low-income women's—personal autonomy is unacceptable. That is why I support the Planned Parenthood and the working families it serves.

For these reasons, I will cast a present vote.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 421, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. ESTY. I am, in its current form.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Esty moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3134, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 6. NO IMPACT ON FUNDING FOR ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDING WOMEN'S HEALTH SERVICES.

Notwithstanding section 3, nothing in this Act shall impact the amount of funding available for any organization that provides women's health services, such as preventive care and cancer screenings, in appropriations legislation for fiscal year 2016, including any continuing resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill which will not stop the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, this bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

I rise today as a mother, as a woman, and as a Representative to offer this

straightforward amendment to protect women's access to vital health care.

Contrary to what many Americans have been led to believe, the bill before us today is not about abortion. This bill would, however, restrict women's access to health care all across the country by entirely eliminating all Federal funding for Planned Parenthood.

Let's be very clear. No Federal tax dollars go towards abortions, and none have since 1976. That is not what this bill is about.

We all know a woman who has been diagnosed with cancer—cervical cancer, breast cancer, ovarian cancer. It may be your mother, your neighbor, or your wife who sought preventive care or cancer screening from a doctor of her choice.

Yes, we all know a woman who has received quality medical care at Planned Parenthood. In fact, one in five American women have sought medical care from Planned Parenthood. It may be your daughter. It may be your boss. It may be your colleague.

My amendment will ensure that any qualified organization that provides women's health services can receive funding. It is simple, and it is fair.

We need more access to quality health care, not less. We need to stop trying to restrict access to lifesaving cancer screenings, birth control, and well-woman exams. We need to stop fighting 40-year-old battles on women's rights.

Defunding Planned Parenthood would have a devastating impact on women, especially low-income women, women in rural communities, and women of color.

It is not only women who receive health care at Planned Parenthood. Men receive health care at Planned Parenthood, too.

Here are some facts about Planned Parenthood's critical role in providing health services to Americans every year.

Planned Parenthood provides family planning counseling and contraceptive care to 2.1 million Americans, more than 1.1 million pregnancy tests, nearly 400,000 Pap smear tests, and nearly 500,000 lifesaving breast exams.

Let's remember that, in many areas, Planned Parenthood is the only source of family planning services. That is why, in 1976, as a college freshman, I volunteered for Planned Parenthood because I had seen the impact on young women in my rural high school who had no access to family planning services. Too many got pregnant, dropped out of school, and never pursued their dreams.

Today, with only 5 legislative days left, we should be focusing on avoiding a reckless and unnecessary government shutdown.

Do you remember the last government shutdown, the one that cost us

\$24 billion? No wonder some don't think America is great right now. Dysfunction in this Congress is undermining the American people's faith in democracy.

We, in Congress, have the power to act. We have the opportunity, and we have the duty to set aside ideological battles and, instead, take up the urgent business of the American people.

We should reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and pass a long-term, well-funded highway trust fund bill, investing in America's infrastructure, to ensure that America will continue to be great throughout the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to ensure that American women have access to vital health care, no matter where they live and no matter how much they earn.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Madam Speaker, we all know that Planned Parenthood receives hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars. For them to get that money, while they are under investigation for profiting off the sale of body parts, baby body parts, is just absolutely abhorrent.

What this bill does is to put a 1-year moratorium while we conduct the investigation. Let's be real clear about that, a 1-year moratorium while we do our due diligence. That is what you call smart business, doing your due diligence, being a steward of the taxpayers' money.

Now, I have found it so interesting that they continue to say this will cut access to women's health care. No, it will not.

Do you know Planned Parenthood sees less than 2 percent of all American women in a given year? There is an amendment on this legislation by Mrs. ELLMERS, it redirects \$235 million to the FQHCs, the federally qualified health centers.

It will increase access because we have more of those centers in more underserved areas, and they are required to provide services which include diagnostic lab and radiological services.

Planned Parenthood has cut those screenings and cancer screenings and those services in half over the last few years, while they have increased their abortions to 300,000 a year.

□ 1215

We are right in restricting these funds to Planned Parenthood while we

conduct this investigation. We are right to be a steward of the taxpayer money.

Madam Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit and a "yes" vote on the passage of H.R. 3134.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and passage of H.R. 3504.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 183, nays 245, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

YEAS—183

Adams	Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Engel	(NM)
Ashford	Eshoo	Lynch
Bass	Esty	Maloney,
Beatty	Farr	Carolyn
Becerra	Fattah	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Foster	Matsui
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McDermott
Blumenauer	Gabbard	McGovern
Bonamici	Gallego	McNerney
Boyle, Brendan	Garamendi	Meeks
F.	Graham	Meng
Brady (PA)	Grayson	Moore
Brown (FL)	Green, Al	Moulton
Brownley (CA)	Green, Gene	Murphy (FL)
Bustos	Grijalva	Nadler
Butterfield	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Capps	Hahn	Neal
Capuano	Hahn	Nolan
Carney	Hastings	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Higgins	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Himes	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Payne
Chu, Judy	Honda	Pelosi
Ciulline	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Pingree
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cleaver	Jeffries	Polis
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Connolly	Kaptur	Rangel
Conyers	Keating	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Costa	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Courtney	Kildee	Ruiz
Crowley	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Cuellar	Kind	Rush
Cummings	Kirkpatrick	Ryan (OH)
Davis (CA)	Kuster	Sánchez, Linda
Davis, Danny	Langevin	T.
DeFazio	Larsen (WA)	Sanchez, Loretta
DeGette	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Delaney	Lawrence	Schakowsky
DeLauro	Lee	Schiff
DelBene	Levin	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lewis	Scott (VA)
Deutch	Lieu, Ted	Scott, David
Dingell	Loeb	Serrano
Doggett	Lofgren	Sewell (AL)
Doyle, Michael	Lowenthal	Sherman
F.	Lowey	Sinema
Duckworth	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Edwards	(NM)	Slaughter

Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Cárdenas
Fincher

NOT VOTING—6

Fortenberry
Smith (WA)
Thompson (CA)
Wagner

□ 1239

Messrs. COFFMAN, MULVANEY, and ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 241, noes 187, answered “present” 1, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—241

NAYS—245

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman

Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Babin
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Benishke
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Boustany
Brady (TX)
Brat
Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Chaffetz
Clawson (FL)
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davis, Rodney
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Dold
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellmers (NC)
Emmer (MN)
Farenthold
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Garrett
Gibbs
Gibson
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman

Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Rice (SC)
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam

Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton

Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—187

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold
Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah

Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanna
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebbeck
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton

Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarelli
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

King (IA)

NOT VOTING—5

Fincher Smith (WA) Wagner
Fortenberry Thompson (CA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1247

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION
SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on passage of the bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a healthcare practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 248, nays 177, answered "present" 1, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—248

Abraham Crawford Harper
Aderholt Crenshaw Harris
Allen Cuellar Hartzler
Amash Culberson Heck (NV)
Amodei Curbelo (FL) Hensarling
Babin Davis, Rodney Herrera Beutler
Barletta Denham Hice, Jody B.
Barr Dent Hill
Barton DeSantis Holding
Benishek DesJarlais Hudson
Billrakis Diaz-Balart Huelskamp
Bishop (MI) Dold Huizenga (MI)
Bishop (UT) Donovan Hultgren
Black Duffy Hunter
Blackburn Duncan (SC) Hurd (TX)
Blum Duncan (TN) Hurt (VA)
Bost Ellmers (NC) Issa
Boustany Emmer (MN) Jenkins (KS)
Brady (TX) Farenthold Jenkins (WV)
Brat Fitzpatrick Johnson (OH)
Bridenstine Fleischmann Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL) Fleming Jolly
Brooks (IN) Flores Jones
Buchanan Forbes Jordan
Buck Foxx Joyce
Bucshon Franks (AZ) Katko
Burgess Frelinghuysen Kelly (MS)
Byrne Garrett Kelly (PA)
Calvert Gibbs King (IA)
Carter (GA) Gibson King (NY)
Carter (TX) Gohmert Kinzinger (IL)
Cartwright Goodlatte Kline
Chabot Gosar Knight
Chaffetz Gowdy Labrador
Clawson (FL) Granger LaHood
Coffman Graves (GA) LaMalfa
Cole Graves (LA) Lamborn
Collins (GA) Graves (MO) Lance
Collins (NY) Griffith Langevin
Comstock Grothman Latta
Conaway Guinta Lipinski
Cook Guthrie LoBiondo
Costello (PA) Hanna Long
Cramer Hardy Loudermilk

Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lummis
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Massie
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Mulaney
Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Pitts
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Pompeo
Posey
Price, Tom
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Ribble
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney (FL)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Santorum
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NAYS—177

Adams
Aguilar
Ashford
Bass
Beatty
Becerra
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardenas
Carney
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fattah
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hastings
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Loebach
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham (NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sanchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Speier

Swalwell (CA)
Takai
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Garamendi

NOT VOTING—8

Delaney Kind Thompson (CA)
Fincher Rangel Wagner
Fortenberry Smith (WA)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. LUMMIS) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1254

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WAGNER. Madam Speaker, due to extenuating circumstances, I was unable to attend votes for the week of September 14 through September 18, 2015.

On passage of H.R. 1214—National Forest Small Tracts Amendments Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 495), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 1949—National Liberty Memorial Clarification Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 496), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 758—Lawsuit Abuse Reduction Act (rollcall vote No. 501), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 3134—Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 (rollcall vote No. 505), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

On passage of H.R. 3504—Born Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act (rollcall vote No. 506), had I been present I would have voted "yes."

CONGRATULATING LEW MOHR

(Mr. FITZPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in recognition of an exemplary member of my district in Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

For decades, Lew Mohr has been a tireless advocate for Scouting in Bucks County and an outstanding leader for countless young men.

Both in the Playwicki District and the Washington Crossing Council, there is no doubt that throughout his long career in Scouting Lew has done his best to do his duty to God and country, to obey the Scout law, and to help other people at all times.

This evening, Mr. Mohr is again going to be recognized by the local Scouting community for his decades of great work.

As a fellow Scouter and a friend, it is my honor to congratulate Lew on another well-deserved recognition and highlight a life of Scouting well lived.

□ 1300

LOOMING GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be in session next week. Normally, as you know, we have a colloquy on the schedule. There is no colloquy today because, essentially, there is no schedule. We don't know what is going to be proposed to fund government, which will shut down in approximately 14 days if this body does not act. Actually, it is less than 14 days. It is 6 legislative days, Mr. Speaker.

The Export-Import Bank has been allowed to essentially go out of business for new loans, and we are losing jobs, Mr. Speaker, but there is no schedule. The highway bill on which States, cities, counties, localities, and private sector relies for some degree of certainty, there is no schedule, Mr. Speaker.

I regret that we do not have a colloquy today. I regret that the Export-Import Bank was not moved yesterday, today, or is not on the schedule for next week.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that the majority party sets forth a schedule to make sure America succeeds.

CHANGE SENATE RULES

(Mr. PALAZZO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, the American people are sick and tired of talk. They want action.

For 3 years now, Senate Democrats have blocked votes on bills important to all Americans. They have blindly supported the President's failed policies and have shielded him from having to defend his policies to the American people.

House Republicans have heard the American cry for help. We fought to repeat ObamaCare. We fought to stop the reckless Iranian nuclear agreement. Once again, we are fighting to defend the defenseless. We have passed budgets that will reduce our national debt, stop job-killing regulations, provide for our national defense, and get Americans working again.

Republicans control Congress. We have better solutions to the problems that face our Nation. It is time for the President to go on record for his opposition to commonsense solutions that put America first. This can only happen if the Senate employs the nuclear option. It is time to change the Senate rules and force this President and the Senate to work for the American people instead of against them.

CALLING FOR BIPARTISAN BUDGET AGREEMENT

(Mr. TAKAI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAKAI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss an issue of great importance, the need to pass a budget bill and prevent a government shutdown.

I think many of us here on Capitol Hill heard all the buzz when former Daily Show host Jon Stewart came into town, but what I hope is not lost in all the excitement was his reason for coming.

He came to deliver a message to Congress to pass the reauthorization of the James Zadroga 9/11 First Responders Act, of which I am a proud cosponsor. It expires at the end of this month.

Instead of working to subsidize the health care of our courageous first responders, Congress is fixated on creating another manufactured crisis. Instead of providing a firefighter burned so badly while saving a victim of the attack of the Twin Towers or a police officer suffering from lung cancer because of exposure to toxic chemicals free health care and really thanking them for their heroic sacrifices, Congress again took no action.

I truly hope my colleagues recognize the gravity of the situation and come together to get back to conducting the business of this Nation.

NATIONAL POW-MIA DAY

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize today as National POW-MIA Recognition Day, in honor of missing servicemen and -women across our Nation.

Sadly, more than 80,000 American soldiers ranging from World War II, the Korean war, and Vietnam are still unaccounted for. While we are thankful that several nations have worked to assist the United States in research and recovery efforts, there are still hurdles to clear when it comes to negotiations and operations. That is why I drafted H. Con. Res. 56, entitled "Keeping Our Promise to MIAs and POWs."

This bipartisan, noncontroversial resolution seeks to increase cooperation with nations that we enter into trade agreements in the research and recovery of our unaccounted soldiers.

With so many servicemen and -women still unaccounted for, we need to do everything we can to bring them home with the honor and dignity that they deserve.

I encourage all my colleagues to sign on to H. Con. Res. 56.

ANTISHUTDOWN

(Mr. PETERS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, unless we act soon, our government's functions will cease in 10 days. At the end of October, transportation and highway constructions will halt. Instead, Congress can do the right thing to create jobs for millions of Americans across this country.

This summer, the regular process for funding the government broke down because the majority couldn't figure out its stance on the Confederate flag. Today, partisan extremists are threatening another shutdown over women's health care that would be a self-inflicted hit to our economy.

We know that shutting down the government would be devastating for our economy. Standard & Poor's estimated that the 2013 shutdown cost our economy \$24 billion in economic activity; so instead of flirting with the government shutdown disaster, we should be investing in our future.

Twice this summer, Congress did the bare minimum by passing multiple, short-term extensions to the highway trust fund, mostly through accounting gimmicks. Across the board, from workers organizations to business groups, there is opposition to a government shutdown and support for long-term investments in infrastructure.

We should get to work, making it easier for Americans to grow their businesses and to create high-quality jobs instead of punishing our infrastructure, our military, and our economy with foolish partisanship.

WELCOME POPE FRANCIS

(Mr. ROTHFUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, in just a matter of days, we will welcome Pope Francis to the Nation's Capital.

Pope Francis is the 266th Bishop of Rome, following a line of succession that goes all the way back to St. Peter 2,000 years ago. The sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew teaches that Jesus told Peter that he would be the rock on whom Jesus would build his church.

Now, for the first time in history, Peter's successor will address Congress.

Here is an interesting perspective: America remains a young Nation compared to the 2,000-year-old Catholic church. While we have had 44 different Presidents—President Obama is the 45th President because count Grover Cleveland as the 22nd and 24th President—just 16 of the church's 266 popes have governed the church since 1776.

The Pope's visit offers all Americans, Catholics and non-Catholics alike, a chance to reflect on the great issues of

the day, including the sanctity of life, threats to the family, religious freedom, economic justice, care for the less fortunate, war and peace, and stewardship of the Earth.

Pope Francis' visit is an invitation to dialogue, and I look forward to his address.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

(Mr. TONKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, this week, one of the largest employers in my district, General Electric, announced it would be cutting hundreds of jobs nationwide due to Congress'—due to the leadership in this House—inability to renew the Export-Import Bank.

This politics over people and Republican dysfunction has plagued this body since the GOP won the majority. It has led to a government shutdown, obsession with blocking the President at every turn, and now a loss of hundreds of jobs in my district, Schenectady, New York.

The blame game is played all too often in Washington and at the desks of cable news pundits.

This, however, is a fact: hundreds of jobs in my district are gone because Republican House leadership decided it was more important to appease the extreme conservative flank of their own party than to renew an agency that creates jobs while cutting the deficit.

As the Albany Times-Union accurately phrased it: "This is the price tag of a Congress ruled by drown-government-in-the-bathtub ideologues who have no regard for facts: 500 American jobs bound for France, Hungary, and China."

I invite anyone in this body to visit Schenectady, New York. There, they will find families that work hard and play by the rules and don't expect a handout. In this case, a dysfunctional Congress shut down a program that lost families in my district their jobs. That is morally reprehensible and completely unacceptable.

Let's do our job and not have other people lose their job because of inaction in this House.

FEDERAL AGENCIES NEED MORE OVERSIGHT

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, Congress has a duty to ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and responsibly. However, too often, we have seen Federal agencies that have acted in a way that waste taxpayer money by holding excessive conferences with extravagant gifts, luxuries, and perks.

We all remember the lavish Las Vegas GSA conference that cost \$823,000 for 300 employees, including tens of thousands of dollars spent on gifts. The IRS spent a whopping \$50 million—taxpayer dollars—on conferences alone during a 3-year period.

These agencies need more accountability. That is why my colleague, RON KIND, and I have introduced the bipartisan TRACE Act. This legislation simply requires the head of a Federal agency who is hosting a conference to submit a summary of that event to Congress for review.

This initiative will hold agencies accountable. It will improve oversight and transparency. It will save hard-earned taxpayer money, and it will create a more efficient and effective government.

STANDING UP FOR AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, this Nation has a great history, and I would ask the question: What would Franklin Delano Roosevelt do, President Eisenhower, or Ronald Reagan, or John F. Kennedy, when a question from someone in the room attacked and presented a negative attitude about Muslims or Catholics or those in the Jewish faith or Protestant?

Well, it happened in a townhall meeting of a Presidential candidate. This person thought that they were maligning and deriding the President of the United States when they called him Muslim and that he was not a citizen; yet no voice rang out in this townhall meeting to oppose that heinous and horrific attitude toward individuals of the Muslim faith, who actually have fought on behalf of the flag of the United States of America. We malign no people for a general issue that all of us know we are all against, the world family is against.

Now, I ask this Congress to likewise fund this government because the last time, when the Republicans shut the government down in 2013, we lost \$24 billion.

Because you are denying women health care, you now want to defund the government and, at the same time, keep jobs away from the American people by not reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank.

Not only were 300 jobs lost, but 400 jobs may be lost by a businessman in Kenya who was waiting for the Export-Import Bank. He is an American, and he had 400 jobs.

I say, Mr. Speaker, stop the foolishness. Act like the history of this Nation, and stand up for what is right.

GIVE AMERICA THE SAME DEAL IRAN GETS

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under the President's nuclear deal, the United States agreed to give the world's largest state sponsor of terrorism a billion-dollar oil boom. The United States will allow Iran to export its crude oil, but ironically, it still bans exports of our crude oil.

The administration has the power to lift the American ban on crude oil exports, but the White House seems to be more worried about playing the Chamberlain and appeasing Iran than helping the United States economy.

The United States is the largest crude oil producer in the world. There is a world demand for this oil, but the White House will not allow exports, so the oil stays stagnant in the ground.

This ban is one factor that has led to 70,000 jobs being lost in the energy sector in America. Exporting U.S. crude oil will lower gas prices, create jobs, and increase our influence worldwide.

If the President won't act, Congress must. It is time to stop putting the interests of the mullahs and the haters of the United States above Americans citizens. Export American oil.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1315

IN RECOGNITION OF THE CRESCENTA VALLEY HIGH SCHOOL JUNIOR ROTC PROGRAM

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the Crescenta Valley High School Air Force Junior ROTC.

Under the distinguished leadership of Lieutenant Colonel David Worley, the Crescenta Valley Air Force JROTC is a well-respected and integral part of the foothills communities.

The cadets who participate in this program truly learn the value of community service and personal responsibility. It is a tremendous opportunity for young men and women to embrace the core values of "Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence in All We Do."

The cadets from the program are among the most impressive young people I have had the privilege to meet. We are so fortunate to have a program in our community that provides a structured, vibrant environment to develop future leaders.

I wish to offer my heartfelt congratulations and thanks to Lieutenant Colonel Worley and all the participants at Crescenta Valley High School. I am confident there is no program anywhere in the Nation that is a better

representative of the Air Force JROTC. I speak for all my constituents when I say, Job well done.

IF YOU WANT TO DESTROY ISIS, YOU MUST DESTROY BASHAR AL-ASSAD

(Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak today, but I just wanted to remind the American people, as I hear that the United States is about to enter talks with Russia over their presence in the Middle East, Russia is there for one reason. They are there to prop up a man named Bashar al-Assad, who has killed a quarter million of his own people.

Many of those people that Bashar al-Assad has killed include women and children. These children may look different or speak a different language, in some cases, than in the United States, but these are children with the same dreams as many American children. They may want to grow up to be police officers or teachers or doctors or pharmacists or work on the family farm and raise a family. These are young lives that have been snuffed out by the barrel bombs of this evil dictator.

As we wrestle with the failures in the Middle East and what to do with it, let me remind the American people that the choice is not between ISIS or Assad, but the choice is if you want to destroy ISIS, you must destroy Bashar al-Assad.

CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POLIQUIN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, we have talked about a lot this week. There has been a lot going on in Congress. We haven't gotten to spend much time recognizing that yesterday was Constitution Day, September 17, celebrating that summer in 1787 where they worked all summer long and all the way up until September 17 to craft this document that I would argue has preserved our freedoms for over 200 years. I want to talk about what I would argue is a national threat, a bipartisan threat to those principles embodied in that Constitution.

By way of background, Mr. Speaker, I want to put up a quote from James Madison. You can't see it from where you are, but James Madison says this:

The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elec-

tive, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about tyranny in different governments around the globe. What James Madison says is we are not talking about one evil dictator.

Mr. KINZINGER was down here just a moment ago talking about how one evil dictator can change the entire makeup of regional peace and stability. James Madison portrays it even larger. He says it does not matter whether it is one person or a few people or even many people. It does not matter whether it is hereditary or self-appointed or elective. When you have all of the power located in any one place, tyranny is the result.

We learn at an early age in our schools, Mr. Speaker, about separation of powers. We learn about checks and balances. We learn about the legislative branch on Capitol Hill, the Supreme Court right behind us, the executive branch headquartered at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, and the natural tension that is created within those branches.

John Adams said, Mr. Speaker:

A question arises whether all the powers of government, legislative, executive, and judicial, shall be left in this body.

They were struggling at that time trying to create our form of government. He says:

I think a people cannot long be free, nor ever happy, whose government is in one Assembly.

Constitution Day yesterday, Mr. Speaker, represents the culmination of all of the challenges, all of the thoughts, all of the prayers to spawn a new nation. But what they grappled with for the entirety of that summer was how to create a system that would prevent a return to tyranny.

The accumulation of all powers in the same hands, whether one, few, or many, whether hereditary, whether self-appointed, whether elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

James Madison.

I talk about that, Mr. Speaker, here, the day after Constitution Day, because this is something that I have seen come up over and over again in my lifetime in a bipartisan and a bicameral way.

So often we find ourselves talking about President Obama, Mr. Speaker, and I will certainly do that later on in this hour, but I want to begin by talking about President Bush. The headline I have here coming from The Washington Post, Mr. Speaker, says: "Bush's Tactic of Refusing Laws is Probed." The Washington Post says this:

The President is indicating that he will not either enforce part or the entirety of congressional bills, according to the ABA president, a Massachusetts attorney. "We will be close to a constitutional crisis," the ABA president says, "when the President of

the United States' use of signing statements is left unchecked."

This is where you are signing a bill into law. We have all seen the "I am just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill." We all know how laws are made. Congress deliberates, crafts, passes, sends to the President for his signature. Well, a signing statement is when you sign a bill into law and say: Oh, but by the way, this particular part of the law I don't recognize as being valid. Well, the veto pen gives you an opportunity to reject a law if you don't like it. A signing statement says: I like this part, and I am going to enforce it, but I don't like this part, and I am not.

Another headline, "Bush Challenges Hundreds of Laws":

President Bush has quietly claimed the authority to disobey more than 750 laws enacted since he took office, asserting that he has the power to set aside any statute passed by Congress when it conflicts with his interpretation of the Constitution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you and I were not in Congress during the Bush administration. You and I did not have an oversight role of the Bush administration, but I would tell you that Republicans and Democrats are each complicit in their own way in allowing the people's power, not the House's power, but the people's power to slowly drift down Pennsylvania Avenue, away from the people's representatives on Capitol Hill and into the hands of a Chief Executive.

This was going on during the Bush administration. This was a part of the national conversation during the Bush administration, but most Republicans remained silent. This is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. This is an American issue. This is a constitutional issue. If we are to prevent tyranny, we have to stand and be counted.

Mr. Speaker, Barack Obama was in Congress during the Bush administration. While you and I were not, Barack Obama was, and he says this in March of 2008:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with the President—then President Bush—

trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all. And that is what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is almost laughable, as we sit here in September of 2015. The words of then-Senator, now-President Barack Obama:

I take the Constitution very seriously. The biggest problems that we are facing right now have to do with the President trying to bring more and more power into the executive branch and not go through Congress at all, and that's what I intend to reverse when I'm President of the United States.

May of that same year, Mr. Speaker, then Senator Obama, now President Obama says this:

We have got a government designed by the Founders so that there would be checks and

balances. You don't want a President who is too powerful or a Congress who is too powerful or a court that is too powerful. Everybody's got their own role. Congress' job is to pass legislation. The President can veto it or he can sign it. I believe in the Constitution, and I will obey the Constitution of the United States. We are not going to use signing statements as a way of doing an end run around Congress.

When President Obama was Senator Obama, he saw separation of powers clearly; he saw the checks and balances clearly. On the campaign trail, while he was seeking to be the next President of the United States, he recognized the transgressions of the Bush administration, and he said:

Not on my watch, I will not follow in that path.

That was an election year, 2008. It seems laughable as we sit here in September of 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I take you to a press conference by President Obama in August of 2013. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, was in all the headlines. The President says this:

In a normal political environment, it would have been easier for me to simply call up the Speaker, then Speaker BOEHNER, and say, you know what, this is a tweak that doesn't go to the essence of the law—it has to do with, for example, are we able to simplify the attestation of employers to whether they're already providing health insurance or not.

Mr. Speaker, if you don't recall this press conference, the President, having just begun to implement the Affordable Care Act—remember, it was jammed through Congress, completely partisan vote, wasn't quite ready for prime time, but they lost the Senate election; they had to move through the unfinished product. As that bill is being implemented, obviously there are problems because it was not a conference bill. It was not a bill that had worked its way through the committee process. The President says: Well, ordinarily, when you are trying to fix these kind of problems, I would have just called up the Speaker. I would have said, Mr. Speaker, the law didn't work out quite the way we wanted it to. We need a few tweaks to make the law work.

The President continues. He says: It looks like there may be some better ways to do this, better ways than the way the law was drafted. Let's make a technical change to the law, the President says, what he would have asked for, had he called Speaker BOEHNER. The President says: That would be the normal thing that I would prefer to do, but we are not in a normal atmosphere around here when it comes to ObamaCare. We did have the executive authority to do so—by doing so, he means waiving parts of the Affordable Care Act—and we did so.

As candidate Obama, he saw clearly that the Bush administration was overstepping its bounds as the executive,

failing to either veto a law or pass a law, failing to recognize the separation of powers, Mr. Speaker. The President recognized that when he was a United States Senator. He recognized that while he was on the campaign trail, but when he was sworn into the office of President of the United States of America, upholder and defender of the United States Constitution, he says:

What I would have liked to have done was follow the law. What I would have liked to have done was to contact the Speaker and try to change the law, but we are not in normal circumstances around here. So I just did it myself. I had the authority, and I did it myself.

Mr. Speaker, that was one press conference in August of 2013, but the list goes on. I am not having this conversation today to pick on the President of the United States, not this President of the United States in particular, but something happens when you have all of the power and the responsibility that is vested in the White House—it happened to President Bush; it has happened to President Obama—where you say: I have all of this responsibility, and I am just going to do it. As long as the ends are correct, the means don't matter.

□ 1330

That is not okay. It is not okay for any of us, Republican or Democrat. You may like the way that goes today. As a Republican, we may have liked it when President Bush was doing it. As a Democrat, you might like it when President Obama is doing it.

But it is not the right way to run this country, and it is dangerous—dangerous—to the folks who actually hold the power, and that is each individual citizen of the United States.

I will use the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, as one minor example. The individual mandate delay said every American must go out and buy health insurance. Well, the plans weren't available.

Again, the law wasn't ready for prime time. We all knew it wasn't going to work. The President knew it wasn't going to work.

Congress introduced not one bill, not two bills, not three bills, but four different bills to fix the individual mandate. These were not Republican bills. These were bipartisan bills.

But the President, in the press conference that we talked about from August 2013, decided by himself to act unilaterally to change the law. It wasn't that Congress wouldn't do it. Congress wanted to do it.

The President said:

No. I don't want to work with Congress to do it. I am going to do it on my own.

He didn't just do it in October of 2013. He waived it again in March 2014 and again in February 2015, all on the one very specific section of the individual mandate.

We could have worked together. The Constitution requires that we work together. The Constitution requires that the law either be followed or be changed.

Changes of the law have to come through Congress, have to be signed by the President. In the case of Barack Obama, neither happened.

The employer mandate delay, Mr. Speaker, again, it is not that the House didn't want to deal with this issue. As you recall, the employers were not ready for this.

Again, this was not a fully baked idea. The White House knew this wasn't going to work. The Congress knew this wasn't going to work.

And so the House, of which I was a Member at that time, didn't just come up with a bill. We passed a bill. There wasn't just one bill.

There were three bills—House bills and Senate bills—to solve this problem that the White House knew existed, that Congress knew existed, and that the American people knew existed.

But the President didn't work with Congress. He went off and acted alone in July of 2013, waiving it once, and in February of 2014, waiving it again. Where is the outcry? Not the outcry over the policy, but the outcry over the process.

There are things that happen in this country, Mr. Speaker, that you and I may agree with the ends. But if the means are not the correct means, we have to stand up and say no.

Any American who works in manufacturing knows that, if you have a flawed process, you are going to produce a flawed product.

Process matters. It matters most when we are talking about protecting individual liberty. But Americans have become so frustrated, Mr. Speaker.

Americans have put that label on Washington, D.C., as either being inept or ineffective, intransigent, not able to work together, not able to move things forward. They have come to a place where they say the ends justify the means. It is a dangerous place to be.

Mr. Speaker, going back to the Affordable Care Act, "The renewal of noncompliant plans" is the headline I have here. I am sure you remember that from May, Mr. Speaker.

These were the plans that the President said are so bad, they are so damaging to American families, we have got to outlaw them. If you have one of these plans, we are going to outlaw these plans, because they are unworthy of Americans.

Well, when it actually came time for that part of the law to go into effect, it turns out there was a reason these plans existed: because folks couldn't afford more of an insurance policy than that. They needed these plans.

So what the President did is he said:

We know this isn't going to work. We know this part of the law is flawed. We have to fix it.

Congress said:

You are absolutely right.

House bill, Senate bill, bipartisan bills to solve the problem. The President acted alone, first in November of 2013, then in March of 2014, waiving the law, saying:

I advocated for this law. I signed this law. I made this language the law of the land. But now I don't like it. Rather than seeking a solution from Congress—which Congress had—I am going to act alone.

And, finally, on the Affordable Care Act, Mr. Speaker, the penalty waivers where you were going to be fined. If you didn't do what the law said you were supposed to do, you were going to be fined by the law. That wasn't going to work.

The system was not in place for Americans to follow the law. The paperwork trail, as you know, is amazingly burdensome. Folks could not comply with the law.

The White House knew it. The Congress knew it. The American people know it. That is why we had not one bill, not two bills, not three bills, but four bills, not just in the House, but in the House and Senate, not just Republicans, but bipartisan bills to solve that problem.

But the President didn't work with the Congress. The President didn't call the Speaker. The President went and acted alone, first in January 2015, again in February 2015.

Mr. Speaker, I am not down here to argue about the results of what the President did. I supported this legislation to achieve all of the goals that the President achieved by acting alone. But the President cannot write the law. The Congress must write the law.

We, as the American people—not we, as the House of Representatives—we, as the American people, cannot support a President amassing all of that authority to do whatever that President likes alone.

Our Framers knew it. John Adams knew it. James Madison knew it. They worked throughout the summer of 1787 to prevent it from ever taking root here in America. If we fail to keep watch, it is going to be on our watch that those liberties slip away.

I will go back to President George Bush. Because it makes me sad, Mr. Speaker, that when we try to have a conversation where we are critical of the White House, it sounds like we are just picking on a President that is not of our party. Nonsense.

I am not saying that doesn't go on. Of course that goes on. I am just saying that is not where we are today. So I want to take it back to President Bush one more time.

President Bush worked on immigration reform. Goodness knows we need immigration reform. I support immigration reform. We have a system that is broken.

Folks who need to get here can't get here. Folks who shouldn't be here are

able to get here. Anyway, it is a problem and challenge that America has been facing not just this year, not last year, but for decades.

President Bush said this:

Legal immigration is one of the top concerns of the American people. And Congress' failure to act on it is a disappointment.

The American people understand the status quo is unacceptable when it comes to our immigration laws. A lot of us worked hard to see if we couldn't find common ground, but it didn't work.

President Bush, wanting to achieve immigration reform, chastised Congress for not acting on immigration reform, championing the cause, asking for Congress to do more, but understanding what his limitations are.

President Obama, March 2011:

With respect to the notion that I can just suspend deportations through an executive order, that is just not the case, because there are laws on the books that Congress has.

In March of 2011, when asked about deportations and what is going on with immigration law and why won't Congress move forward, the President says:

The notion that I can just suspend deportations just isn't the case because there are laws that govern deportations.

President Obama, October 2010:

I am President. I am not king. I can't do these things just by myself. We have a system of government that requires the Congress to work with the executive branch to make it happen.

Mr. Speaker, these are the words of President Obama shortly after he became President. These are the sentiments of President Obama echoing the sentiments of then-Senator Obama when he said there is a way that this government is supposed to run and it takes all three branches to make it happen. Nobody can do it alone.

President Obama, May 2010:

Comprehensive reform. That is how we are going to solve this problem. Anybody who tells you it is going to be easy or that I can just waive a magic wand and make it happen hasn't been paying attention to how this town works.

He knows that it has to be a collaborative effort in order to change the law.

July 2010, President Obama:

There are those in the immigrants' rights community who have argued passionately that we should simply provide those who are here illegally with legal status or at least ignore the laws on the books and put an end to deportations until we have better laws.

That is what folks were asking of President Obama:

Can't you just ignore the laws? If you can't ignore the laws, won't you just put deportations on hold?

The President responded with this:

I believe that such an indiscriminate approach would be both unwise and unfair. It would suggest to those thinking about coming here illegally that there will be no repercussions for such a decision, and this could lead to a surge in more illegal immigration.

Did you see that was a little different conversation than what the President was talking about a little earlier?

Statement after statement, speech after speech, conversation after conversation, the President said:

No, I can't do this because it is against the law. No, I can't do this because the Constitution doesn't give me these powers. No, I can't do this because that is not what a President in the United States of America is allowed to do.

But then the conversation begins to change. What I just read to you, Mr. Speaker, was a quote about policy:

Well, I just don't think it is a good idea to do it.

It is not it is illegal, not it is unconstitutional to do it.

I just don't think it is a good idea to do it.

Mr. Speaker, fast-forward to November of last year. The President talked about his unilateral actions to suspend deportations, exactly as he said years earlier he was not allowed to do under the law.

He says this:

The actions I'm taking are not only lawful, they're the kinds of actions taken by every single Republican President, every single Democratic President of the past half-century.

And to those Members of Congress who question my authority to make our immigration system work better or question the wisdom of me acting where Congress has failed, I have one answer: Pass a bill.

I want to work with both parties to pass a more permanent legislative solution. And the day I sign that bill into law, the actions I take today will no longer be necessary.

That is pretty powerful, Mr. Speaker.

I wanted Congress to do what I wanted Congress to do, but they didn't. It didn't. So I'm going to do it myself. I have said that I couldn't. I said it was illegal to do. But I have rethought it. I now think it is perfectly legal to do, and I'm going to do it. But goods news, Congress, good news, American people. As soon as Congress does do what I want it to do, I'm going to stop doing what I'm not allowed to do.

Where was the outcry? Not the outcry over the policy, Mr. Speaker. The outcry over the process. We heard the outcry from Democrats when President Bush was overreaching. We heard the outcry from Republicans as President Obama has been overreaching.

But where is the outcry from America that says:

You know what? There might just be some wisdom in what John Adams and James Madison had to say. You know what? There might just be some merit to this whole separation of powers, checks and balances idea. You know what? Perhaps the ends don't justify the means. Let's stick with constitutional authority.

Mr. Speaker, this is not just a congressional or an executive branch issue. I quote Jonathan Turley, law professor, one of the eminent constitutional scholars of our time.

He says this:

Our government requires consent and compromise to function. It goes without saying

that, when we are politically divided as a Nation, less tends to get done.

I don't believe that shocks you, Mr. Speaker. It certainly doesn't shock me.

However, such division is no license to go it alone, as President Obama has suggested. You have only two choices in our system when facing political adversaries. You can either seek to convince them or you can replace them.

That is pretty powerful. As we talked about Constitution Day yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty powerful.

When we disagree in this country, we have two options. We can either change one another's minds or we can replace the people that we put in authority to make those decisions.

Jonathan Turley continues:

This is obviously frustrating for our Presidents and their supporters who want to see real change and to transcend gridlock. However, there is nothing noble in circumventing the Constitution. The claim of any one person that they can get the job done unilaterally is the very siren's call that our Framers warned us to resist.

□ 1345

The very notion that anyone can get the job done alone, Mr. Speaker, is the siren's call that our framers warned us to respect. Jonathan Turley continues:

It is certainly true that the Framers expected much from us, but no more than they demanded from themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this was November of 2014, when the President did his last round of unilateral immigration changes. Headline of the Washington Post, "President Obama's Unilateral Action on Immigration Has No Precedent." February of this year, headline, "Federal Judge Blocks Obama's Executive Actions on Immigration."

These aren't issues for the courts, Mr. Speaker. If Congress passes a law and the President signs a law and that law is unconstitutional, that is the issue for the courts. The issue of whether or not we want Presidents to be able to amass all the power so that they can get the job done alone is not an issue for the courts. It is an issue for every single one of us as citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I went through the Affordable Care Act. I went through immigration. It is not like the list is short.

Climate change, do you remember the climate change bill when Democrats had complete control of the U.S. House and the United States Senate and the White House the first 2 years of President Obama's first term? They worked and worked and worked and worked and worked to pass a climate change bill. They couldn't do it. It was rejected in a bipartisan way on Capitol Hill.

Headline from the Washington Post, last month, August, 2015, "What You Need to Know About Obama's Biggest Global Warming Move Yet, His Clean Power Plan." This is an editorial from Laurence Tribe, another constitutional

law professor recognized by absolutely everyone on both sides of the aisle for his knowledge. I would tell you he is not a particularly conservative law professor. I would tell you that he stands with my liberal friends more often than he stands with my conservative friends.

But he is not talking about liberalism. He is not talking about conservatism. He is not talking about public policy. He is talking about constitutional law, and he says this:

As a law professor, I taught the Nation's first environmental law class 45 years ago; and as a lawyer, I have supported countless environmental causes. And as a father and grandfather, I want to leave the Earth in better shape than when I arrived.

All of his policy goals support the environment, support those causes—want to leave the Earth in better shape than I found it. He says:

Nonetheless, I recently filed comments with the Environmental Protection Agency urging the Agency to withdraw its Clean Power Plan, a regulatory proposal to reduce carbon emissions from the Nation's electric power plants. In my view, coping with climate change is a vital end.

Hear that. In his view, solving the problem that the President aims to solve is a vital end.

Laurence Tribe continues:

But it does not justify using unconstitutional means.

Mr. Speaker, I don't admire the men and women in this Chamber who rise to their feet to cheer the causes that they support. I admire the men and women in this Chamber who do the right thing, even when it is hard to do so.

I admire the men and women who stand up to their party leadership when it is hard to do so. I admire the men and women who put their obligation to their constituents above their obligation to party, who put their obligation to the Constitution above their passions for the direction of public policy.

Taught the first environmental law class 45 years ago. Coping with climate change is a vital end, but it does not justify using unconstitutional means.

I go on, Laurence Tribe:

Even more fundamentally, the EPA, like every administrative agency, is constitutionally forbidden to exercise powers Congress never delegated in the first place.

The brute fact is that the Obama administration failed to get climate legislation through Congress, yet the EPA is acting as though it has the legislative authority to reengineer the Nation's electric generating system and power grid. It does not.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to have this case litigated, and nine men and women in black robes across the street are going to decide this issue. And we know how they are going to decide this issue.

My fear is not that we are not going to get the right decision. We are. This isn't our first rodeo here, Mr. Speaker.

Remember the recess appointments from January 2012, where the President stood, and he was giving a speech in a high school in Ohio. He was giving a speech to high school students, and he went and he told the tale, Mr. Speaker, of how there was gridlock in Washington, D.C. He told the tale of how he wanted to get the people's business done and how Congress was standing in the way.

Every time he spoke up and talked about how there was gridlock in Congress, there were boos in the crowd. Every time he spoke up and said, "But don't worry, I'm going to go it alone," there was applause throughout the crowd.

Our students who are studying constitutional principles today, our students who are being trained to be that next generation of leader, that citizen who sits on the board of directors of the United States of America, 330 million of us, stood and applauded when the President said Congress won't do it, so I will do it without them.

He was applauded by Democrats, Mr. Speaker. He was criticized by Republicans. He went right ahead and did what he said he would do. He brought out a legal memorandum that still sits on the Justice Department Web site outlining why it was absolutely permissible to do what he was doing, even though the Constitution clearly said it was not.

That case made its way through the Supreme Court, Mr. Speaker. It was the *NLRB v. Noel Canning* case, and it was decided 9-0.

If you were a Supreme Court Justice appointed by President Reagan, you told President Obama that he was violating the law. If you were a Supreme Court Justice appointed by President Clinton, you told President Obama he was violating the law. It does not matter whether you were a Clinton, Reagan, Bush, or even Obama appointee, nominee to the Supreme Court. Every single one of them agreed that the President overstepped his bounds.

My question, Mr. Speaker, is: You remember that spring of 2012, but how many American citizens do, those cheering high school students in Ohio, that campaign stop at a high school auditorium to say, I'm going to go it alone. Do they remember when nine Supreme Court Justices said: No, you won't; no, you won't.

Where does it stop, Mr. Speaker?

Congress says: No, you won't. Congress says: This is our responsibility. The President says: You are not getting it done my way; I'm going to go it alone. So it goes to the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court says, unanimously: No, Mr. President, you are not going to go it alone.

It is only one short step between the executive branch ignoring the coequal branch of the government that is the

legislature and the executive branch ignoring the coequal branch of government that is the Federal courts.

That burden lies on us, Mr. Speaker. It is not a Republican burden or a Democratic burden. It is an American burden.

I signed up to be on the Oversight Committee, Mr. Speaker. You know the Oversight Committee here on Capitol Hill. It has jurisdiction over absolutely everything, and its job is to make sure the executive branch is doing what the executive branch is supposed to do.

I signed up to be on the Oversight Committee because I thought Mitt Romney was going to win the last election, and I wanted to be the guy who said to the next Republican President: No, Mr. President, you can't do that. We are Article I of the Constitution; you are Article II of the Constitution. There is a process here, and process matters.

Well, Mitt Romney didn't win that election, so we are doing oversight over the Obama administration; and every single legitimate issue the Oversight Committee took up, headlines in the papers about just political hacks going after their political opposition. It is not true, and it is too important to dismiss in that way.

James Madison, Mr. Speaker:

The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judiciary, in the same hands, whether of one or few or many, and whether hereditary, self-appointed or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny.

This President has just over a year left in the White House, Mr. Speaker. I am not here to talk about President Obama. I am here to talk about our responsibility as 435 Members of the House. I am here to talk about America's responsibility as 330 million individual members of America's board of directors.

Does process matter or do the ends justify the means? Hold Republicans accountable for not standing up to President Bush. Hold Democrats accountable for not standing up to President Obama. Hold your friends and your neighbors and your coworkers accountable if you hear them say the ends justify the means.

We can only imagine how dangerous these times were. We can only imagine the summer of 1787 as the entire future of the Republic hung in the balance. We can only imagine 1776 when we were declaring our freedom from the world's largest superpower. We can only imagine what it meant to sign our name on a document pledging our lives, our fortunes, and our families' lives to the cause.

And as they grappled with those decisions in 1776, in 1787, they knew one thing with certainty: having all of the power accumulate anywhere, with anyone, was a threat to individual liberties and freedoms.

The President disagrees with me on a lot of public policy, and I welcome him to come down here to Congress and advocate for it; and if you get the votes in this body and you get the votes across the way and you beat me on public policy, fair and square. That is the way it is supposed to be. But when any one of us decides that our priorities, our policy preferences, are so important that the Constitution takes a backseat, we are not long for this form of government, this greatest experiment the world has ever known in self-governance.

It is easy to talk about health care, Mr. Speaker. It is easy to talk about environmental policy. It is easy to talk about water policy. The list goes on and on and on. What is hard is changing that policy, and it is deliberately so. It is deliberately so.

As the Courts have taken these challenges on, Mr. Speaker, 9-0, reining in the President from his overreach. And in that 9-0 case, Noel Canning, just 2 years ago, the Supreme Court said this:

The recess appointments clause—that was what they were arguing about at the time—is not designed to overcome serious institutional friction. It simply provides a subsidiary method for appointing officials when the Senate is away during a recess.

Here, as in other contexts, global warming, health care, water policy, on and on and on, here, as in other contexts, friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge you to go home to your constituents, as townhall meeting after townhall meeting after townhall meeting talks about the gridlock in Washington, D.C. Friction between the branches is an inevitable consequence of our constitutional structure. We must celebrate that friction, Mr. Speaker.

We have two ways to change policy in this country: You can either change your neighbor's mind, or you can replace your delegate to office. Changing minds and changing people are the only two methods we have in this country. It is the consequence of our constitutional structure.

I do not fear gridlock. I am not concerned that we cannot find a pathway forward. I do fear one man, one group, one party having all of the control.

□ 1415

I do fear folks short-circuiting a process that our Founders put in place to keep us safe for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will join me, as Constitution Day has just passed, in celebrating the wisdom in that summer of 1787 and committing ourselves—Republicans and Democrats alike, House Members and Senate Members alike—to ensuring that policy does not trump process, to ensure that we get to where all of America wants us to be, but that

we get there the right way, not just because it matters, but because that is what the Constitution and the law requires.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 30 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have a special guest with me tonight, my son Joshua, who was allowed the privileges of the floor. He has given me a speech tonight, and I appreciate it very much.

Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is an exceptional Nation whose unique core premise is that declared conviction that we are all created equal and that each of us is endowed by our Creator with the unalienable right to live.

Abraham Lincoln called upon all of us in this Chamber and beyond to remember those words of the Founding Fathers and "their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on or degraded and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity that "when in the distant future some man, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness that 'their posterity'—that is us, Mr. Speaker—"that their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began."

Mr. Speaker, the sincerest purpose of the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act that we voted on today is to renew that noble battle, to respect and protect those little fellow human beings among us who are at this moment being trodden on and degraded and imbruted by their fellows.

Not long ago, in the land of the free and the home of the brave, authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Kermit Gosnell and found a torture chamber for little born-alive babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

The grand jury report at the time said, "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years, there were hundreds of 'snippings.'"

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing and that she described one as 2 feet

long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this “screeching” noise and that it “sounded like a little alien.”

Now, in recent days, Mr. Speaker, numerous video recordings have been released that demonstrate to the world that Kermit Gosnell is just the tip of the iceberg of the abortion industry’s unspeakable cruelty to these little babies.

The veil has now been pulled back, Mr. Speaker, and all of us now see behind the walls of the abortion industry and the horrifying plight of its little human victims who, we must not forget, are also the least of these, our little brothers and sisters.

Our response, as a people and a nation, to these horrors shown in these videos is vital to everything those lying out in Arlington National Cemetery died to save.

Before any Senator, Mr. Speaker, decides to join a Democrat filibuster in the Senate against legislation that would protect little born-alive human babies, I hope they ask of themselves one question in the core of their own souls: Is filibustering against a bill to protect born-alive human babies from a torturous death at the hands of monsters like Kermit Gosnell who I truly am?

Now, I know that legislation like this has been attacked by President Obama and even others because of the many obvious similarities these born-alive children have with late-term, pain-capable, unborn children.

Mr. Speaker, this was an unborn child, but she was born alive and she survived. As hard as it is to consider that that could happen, she did.

President Obama explained his reasons for voting four times—Mr. Speaker, let me say that again. President Obama explained his reasons for voting four times against the Born-Alive Infants Protection Act, which would have protected children born alive.

He was afraid it might give born-alive babies personhood under the Equal Protection Clause of the 14th Amendment.

He said:

It would essentially bar abortions because the Equal Protection Clause does not allow somebody to kill a child. And if this is a child, then this would be an antiabortion statute.

It is impossible to deny that President Obama had a very sad and ironic, if also completely merciless, point.

Indeed, it does require enormous deliberate self-deception to say that those who deliberately kill a child who is born alive after 5 months of pregnancy are guilty of murder and deserve prison, but those who deliberately kill the same exact pain-capable child at the same exact age and development, but are not yet born—those individuals are merely furthering freedom of choice and should actually get paid for doing it.

But it still bears repeating, Mr. Speaker. The Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act that we voted on today and passed out of this Chamber protects little children who have been born alive.

No matter how blind opponents try to make themselves or convince others to be, no one can truly obscure the humanity and personhood of these little born-alive children of God, nor can they take refuge within the schizophrenic paradox *Roe v. Wade* to which this country has been subjected for now more than 40 years.

The abortion industry has labored for all these decades to convince the world that born children and unborn children should be completely separated in our minds, that while born children are persons worthy of protection, unborn children, on the other hand, are not persons and are not worthy of protection.

But, Mr. Speaker, those who oppose this bill today or those who might oppose it in the Senate that protects born-alive children now have the impossible task of trying to rejoin born children and unborn children back together again and then trying to convince us all that to condemn them both as inhuman and not worthy of protection after all is the thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, to anyone who has not invincibly hardened their heart and soul to this absurd inconsistency, there is an opportunity for a profoundly enlightening moment because, you see, Mr. Speaker, this country has faced such paradox and self-imposed blindness and heartlessness before.

There was a time that our own House rules banned any discussion or debate in this Chamber about the effort to end human slavery in America. But, Mr. Speaker, that debate did come.

And with it came a time when the humanity of the victims and the inhumanity of what was being done to them became so glaring that even the hardest of hearts began to see the truth, and it moved an entire generation of people to find the compassion and the courage within their own souls to change their position. And now to this generation, Mr. Speaker, that time has come again.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 18, 2015, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2015; AND ADJOURNMENT FROM TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 22, 2015, TO THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 4 p.m. on Tuesday, September 22, 2015; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, September 24, 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. FORTENBERRY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of attending a family funeral.

Mr. HASTINGS (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today for the second and third vote.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Thursday, September 17, 2015:

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THORNBERRY, on Wednesday, September 16, 2015, announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, September 22, 2015, at 4 p.m.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Ralph Lee Abraham, Alma S. Adams, Robert B. Aderholt, Pete Aguilar, Rick W. Allen, Justin Amash, Mark E. Amodei, Brad Ashford, Brian Babin, Lou Barletta, Andy Barr, Joe Barton, Karen Bass, Joyce Beatty, Xavier Becerra, Dan Benishek, Ami Bera, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Gus M. Bilirakis, Mike Bishop, Rob Bishop, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Diane Black, Marsha Blackburn, Rod Blum, Earl Blumenauer, John A. Boehner, Suzanne Bonamici, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Mike Bost, Charles W. Boustany, Jr., Brendan F. Boyle, Kevin Brady, Robert A. Brady, Dave Brat, Jim Bridenstine, Mo Brooks, Susan W. Brooks, Corrine Brown, Julia Brownley, Vern Buchanan, Ken Buck, Larry Bucshon,

Michael C. Burgess, Cheri Bustos, G. K. Butterfield, Bradley Byrne, Ken Calvert, Lois Capps, Michael E. Capuano, Tony Cardenas, John C. Carney, Jr., André Carson, Earl L. "Buddy" Carter, John R. Carter, Matt Cartwright, Kathy Castor, Joaquin Castro, Steve Chabot, Jason Chaffetz, Judy Chu, David N. Cicilline, Katherine M. Clark, Yvette D. Clarke, Curt Clawson, Wm. Lacy Clay, Emanuel Cleaver, James E. Clyburn, Mike Coffman, Steve Cohen, Tom Cole, Chris Collins, Doug Collins, Barbara Comstock, K. Michael Conaway, Gerald E. Connolly, John Conyers, Jr., Paul Cook, Jim Cooper, Jim Costa, Ryan A. Costello, Joe Courtney, Kevin Cramer, Eric A. "Rick" Crawford, Ander Crenshaw, Joseph Crowley, Henry Cuellar, John Abney Culberson, Elijah E. Cummings, Carlos Curbelo, Danny K. Davis, Rodney Davis, Susan A. Davis, Peter A. DeFazio, Diana DeGette, John K. Delaney, Rosa L. DeLauro, Suzan K. DelBene, Jeff Denham, Charles W. Dent, Ron DeSantis, Mark DeSaulnier, Scott DesJarlais, Theodore E. Deutch, Mario Diaz-Balart, Debbie Dingell, Lloyd Doggett, Robert J. Dold, Daniel M. Donovan, Jr., Michael F. Doyle, Tammy Duckworth, Sean P. Duffy, Jeff Duncan, John J. Duncan, Jr., Donna F. Edwards, Keith Ellison, Renee L. Ellmers, Tom Emmer, Eliot L. Engel, Anna G. Eshoo, Elizabeth H. Esty, Blake Farenthold, Sam Farr, Chaka Fattah, Stephen Lee Fincher, Michael G. Fitzpatrick, Charles J. "Chuck" Fleischmann, John Fleming, Bill Flores, J. Randy Forbes, Jeff Fortenberry, Bill Foster, Virginia Foxx, Lois Frankel, Trent Franks, Rodney P. Frelinghuysen, Marcia L. Fudge, Tulsi Gabbard, Ruben Gallego, John Garamendi, Scott Garrett, Bob Gibbs, Christopher P. Gibson, Louie Gohmert, Bob Goodlatte, Paul A. Gosar, Trey Gowdy, Gwen Graham, Kay Granger, Garret Graves, Sam Graves, Tom Graves, Alan Grayson, Al Green, Gene Green, H. Morgan Griffith, Raúl M. Grijalva, Glenn Grothman, Frank C. Guinta, Brett Guthrie, Luis V. Gutiérrez, Janice Hahn, Richard L. Hanna, Crescent Hardy, Gregg Harper, Andy Harris, Vicky Hartzler, Alcee L. Hastings, Denny Heck, Joseph J. Heck, Jeb Hensarling, Jaime Herrera Beutler, Jody B. Hice, Brian Higgins, J. French Hill, James A. Himes, Rubén Hinojosa, George Holding, Michael M. Honda, Steny H. Hoyer, Richard Hudson, Tim Huelskamp, Jared Huffman, Bill Huizenga, Randy Hultgren, Duncan Hunter, Will Hurd, Robert Hurt, Steve Israel, Darrell E. Issa, Sheila Jackson Lee, Hakeem S. Jeffries, Evan H. Jenkins, Lynn Jenkins, Bill Johnson, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr., Sam Johnson, David W. Jolly, Walter B. Jones, Jim Jordan, David P. Joyce, Marcy Kaptur, John Katko, William R. Keating, Mike Kelly, Robin L. Kelly, Trent Kelly, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Daniel T. Kildee, Derek Kilmer, Ron Kind, Peter T. King, Steve King, Adam Kinzinger, Ann Kirkpatrick, John Kline, Stephen Knight, Ann M. Kuster, Raúl R. Labrador, Darin LaHood, Doug LaMalfa, Doug Lamborn, Leonard Lance, James R. Langevin, Rick Larsen, John B. Larson, Robert E. Latta, Brenda L. Lawrence, Barbara Lee, Sander M. Levin, John Lewis, Ted Lieu, Daniel Lipinski, Frank A. LoBiondo, David Loebsack, Zoe Lofgren, Billy Long, Barry Loudermilk, Mia B. Love, Alan S. Lowenthal, Nita M. Lowey, Frank D. Lucas, Blaine Luetkemeyer, Ben Ray Lujan, Michelle Lujan Grisham, Cynthia M. Lummis, Stephen F. Lynch, Thomas MacArthur, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Patrick Maloney, Kenny Marchant, Tom Marino, Thomas Massie, Doris O. Mat-

sui, Kevin McCarthy, Michael T. McCaul, Tom McClintock, Betty McCollum, James P. McGovern, Patrick T. McHenry, David B. McKinley, Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Jerry McNerney, Martha McSally, Mark Meadows, Patrick Meehan, Gregory W. Meeks, Grace Meng, Luke Messer, John L. Mica, Candice S. Miller, Jeff Miller, John R. Mooolenaar, Alexander X. Mooney, Gwen Moore, Seth Moulton, Markwayne Mullin, Mick Mulvaney, Patrick Murphy, Tim Murphy, Jerrold Nadler, Grace F. Napolitano, Richard E. Neal, Randy Neugebauer, Dan Newhouse, Kristi L. Noem, Richard M. Nolan, Donald Norcross, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Richard B. Nugent, Devin Nunes, Alan Nunnelee*, Pete Olson, Beto O'Rourke, Steven M. Palazzo, Frank Pallone, Jr., Gary J. Palmer, Bill Pascrell, Jr., Erik Paulsen, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Stevan Pearce, Nancy Pelosi, Ed Perlmutter, Scott Perry, Scott H. Peters, Collin C. Peterson, Pedro R. Pierluisi, Chellie Pingree, Robert Pittenger, Joseph R. Pitts, Stacey E. Plaskett, Mark Pocan, Ted Poe, Bruce Poliquin, Jared Polis, Mike Pompeo, Bill Posey, David E. Price, Tom Price, Mike Quigley, Amata Coleman Radewagen, Charles B. Rangel, John Ratcliffe, Tom Reed, David G. Reichert, James B. Renacci, Reid J. Ribble, Kathleen M. Rice, Tom Rice, Cedric L. Richmond, E. Scott Rigell, Martha Roby, David P. Roe, Harold Rogers, Mike Rogers, Dana Rohrabacher, Todd Rokita, Thomas J. Rooney, Peter J. Roskam, Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, Dennis A. Ross, Keith J. Rothfus, David Rouzer, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Edward R. Royce, Raul Ruiz, C. A. Dutch Ruppersberger, Bobby L. Rush, Steve Russell, Paul Ryan, Tim Ryan, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Matt Salmon, Linda T. Sánchez, Loretta Sanchez, Mark Sanford, John P. Sarbanes, Steve Scalise, Janice D. Schakowsky, Adam B. Schiff, Aaron Schock*, Kurt Schrader, David Schweikert, Austin Scott, David Scott, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, F. James Sensenbrenner, Jr., José E. Serrano, Pete Sessions, Terri A. Sewell, Brad Sherman, John Shimkus, Bill Shuster, Michael K. Simpson, Kyrsten Sinema, Albio Sires, Louise McIntosh Slaughter, Adam Smith, Adrian Smith, Christopher H. Smith, Jason Smith, Lamar Smith, Jackie Speier, Elise M. Stefanik, Chris Stewart, Steve Stivers, Marlin A. Stutzman, Eric Swalwell, Mark Takai, Mark Takano, Bennie G. Thompson, Glenn Thompson, Mike Thompson, Mac Thornberry, Patrick J. Tiberi, Scott R. Tipton, Dina Titus, Paul Tonko, Norma J. Torres, David A. Trotter, Nikki Tsongas, Michael R. Turner, Fred Upton, David G. Valadao, Chris Van Hollen, Juan Vargas, Marc A. Veasey, Filemon Vela, Nydia M. Velázquez, Peter J. Visclosky, Ann Wagner, Tim Walberg, Greg Walden, Mark Walker, Jackie Walorski, Mimi Walters, Timothy J. Walz, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, Maxine Waters, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Randy K. Weber, Sr., Daniel Webster, Peter Welch, Brad R. Wenstrup, Bruce Westerman, Lynn A. Westmoreland, Ed Whitfield, Roger Williams, Frederica S. Wilson, Joe Wilson, Robert J. Wittman, Steve Womack, Rob Woodall, John A. Yarmuth, Kevin Yoder, Ted S. Yoho, David Young, Don Young, Todd C. Young, Lee M. Zeldin, Ryan K. Zinke

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2843. A letter from the Director, Budget and Performance Management, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's proposed rule — Changes to Fees and Payment Methods (RIN: 0518-AA05) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2844. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing ten United States Marine Corps officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, as indicated, in accordance with 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2845. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Clay County, MO, et al.) [Docket ID: FEMA-2015-0001] received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2846. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Removal of Certain References to Credit Ratings and Amendment to the Issuer Diversification Requirement in the Money Market Fund Rule [Release No.: IC-31828; File No.: S7-07-11] (RIN: 3235-AL02) received September 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2847. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Commercial and Industrial Solid Waste Incineration (CISWI) Units [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0514; FRL-9933-97-Region 7] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2848. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Missouri; Sewage Sludge Incinerators [EPA-R07-OAR-2015-0543; FRL-9933-95-Region 7] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2849. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Texas; Revision to Control Volatile Organic Compound Emissions from Storage Tanks and Transport Vessels [EPA-R06-OAR-2011-0079; FRL-9932-51-Region 6] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2850. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Fluensulfone; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2015-0375; FRL-9933-02] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2851. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Halosulfuron-methyl; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2014-0574; FRL-9933-00] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2852. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a notification that the national emergency declared with respect to persons who commit, threaten to commit, or support terrorism, declared in Executive Order 13224 of September 23, 2001, is to continue in effect beyond September 23, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2853. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a semi-annual report detailing telecommunications-related payments made to Cuba pursuant to Department of the Treasury licenses during the period from January 1 through June 30, 2015, as required by Sec. 1705(e)(6) of the Cuban Democracy Act of 1992, as amended by Sec. 102(g) of the Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity (LIBERTAD) Act of 1996, 22 U.S.C. 6004(e)(6), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2854. A letter from the Director, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule — Government Contractors, Prohibitions Against Pay Secrecy Policies and Actions (RIN: 1250-AA06) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2855. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #14 and #15 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE054) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2856. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XE139) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2857. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fisheries Off West Coast States; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; 2015-2016 Biennial Specifications and Management Measures; Inseason Adjustments [Docket No.: 140904754-5188-02] (RIN: 0648-BF27) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2858. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial, Recreational, and Treaty In-

dian Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #16 Through #21 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE111) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2859. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Snapper-Grouper Fishery of the South Atlantic; 2015 Recreational Accountability Measure and Closure for South Atlantic Hogfish [Docket No.: 120403249-2492-02] (RIN: 0648-XE088) received September 14, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2860. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's modification of fishing seasons — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Modifications of the West Coast Commercial Salmon Fisheries; Inseason Actions #7 through #13 [Docket No.: 150316270-5270-01] (RIN: 0648-XE020) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2861. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; 2015 Commercial Accountability Measure and Closure for Gulf of Mexico Greater Amberjack [Docket No.: 1206013412-2517-02] (RIN: 0648-XE028) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2862. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Possession Limit Adjustments for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 150105004-5355-01] (RIN: 0648-XD984) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2863. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 141021887-5172-02] (RIN: 0648-XD974) received September 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2864. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone, Seward, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0800] (RIN: 1625-AA87) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2865. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulations; Marine Events held in the Sector Long Island Sound Captain of the Port Zone — Correction [Docket No.: USCG-2015-0705]

(RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 8, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2866. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Dumping: Modification of Final Site Designation [EPA-R06-OW-2015-0121; FRL-9934-25-Region 6] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2867. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Regulation Policy and Management Staff, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Copayments for Medications in 2015 (RIN: 2900-AP15) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2868. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Bureau of the Fiscal Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Offset of Tax Refund Payments to Collect Certain Debts Owed to States (RIN: 1530-AA02) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2869. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Determination of Minimum Required Pension Contributions [TD 9732] (RIN: 1545-BH71) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2870. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Update to procedures for entering into a FET closing agreement based on provisions of an income tax treaty (Rev. Proc. 2015-46) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2871. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Procedures for Requesting a Waiver of the Electronic Filing Requirements for Form 8955-SSA and Form 5500-EZ (Rev. Proc. 2015-47) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2872. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final and temporary regulations — Clarification of the Coordination of the Transfer Pricing Rules with Other Code Provisions [TD 9738] (RIN: 1545-BM72) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2873. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — No-Rule on Certain Section 355 Transactions (Rev. Proc. 2015-43) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2874. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revenue Procedure Applying the Controlled Group Rules to Certain Fund of Funds (Rev. Proc. 2015-45) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2875. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Companion Notice to Rev. Proc. 2015-43 Announcing Issues Under Study and Requesting Comments [Notice 2015-59] received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2876. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Controlled Group Regulation Examples [TD 9737] (RIN: 1545-BK96) received September 15, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2877. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disclosure of Information for Certain Intellectual Property Rights Enforced at the Border [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0011] (RIN: 1515-AD87) received September 16, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2878. A letter from the Chairman and Board Members, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's budget request for fiscal year 2017, in accordance with Sec. 7(f) of the Railroad Retirement Act; jointly to the Committees on Appropriations, Transportation and Infrastructure, and Ways and Means.

2879. A letter from the Chair, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's fiscal year Office of Management and Budget 2017 budget request, pursuant to 52 U.S.C. 30107(d); jointly to the Committees on House Administration, Appropriations, and Oversight and Government Reform.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. S. 136. An act to amend chapter 21 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that fathers of certain permanently disabled or deceased veterans shall be included with mothers of such veterans as preference eligibles for treatment in the civil service (Rept. 114-263). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3089. A bill to close out expired grants, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 692. A bill to ensure the payment of interest and principal of the debt of the United States (Rept. 114-265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3556. A bill to prepare the National Park Service for its Centennial in 2016 and for a second century of protecting our national parks' natural, historic, and cultural resources for present and future generations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Agriculture, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself and Mr. HURT of Virginia):

H.R. 3557. A bill to amend the Financial Stability Act of 2010 to require the Financial Stability Oversight Council to hold open meetings and comply with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, to provide additional improvements to the Council, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BENISHEK, and Mr. COOK):

H.R. 3558. A bill to provide for the issuance of a forever stamp to honor the sacrifices of the brave men and women of the Armed Forces who are still prisoner, missing, or unaccounted for, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3559. A bill to establish minimum standards of disclosure by franchises whose franchisees use loans guaranteed by the Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3560. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Washington County, Utah, to authorize the exchange of Federal land and non-Federal land in the State of Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3561. A bill to amend the section 484(r) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to exclude certain marijuana-related offenses from the drug-related offenses that result in students being barred from receiving Federal educational loans, grants, and work assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3562. A bill to prohibit the pay of Members of Congress during periods in which a Government shutdown is in effect, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PIN-GREE, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3563. A bill to authorize the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk prod-

ucts that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Ms. PIN-GREE, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. RIGELL, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRAT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. LABRADOR, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. GOHMERT):

H.R. 3564. A bill to prohibit Federal interference with the interstate traffic of unpasteurized milk and milk products that are packaged for direct human consumption; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. CAPPS (for herself, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 3565. A bill to expand the boundary of the California Coastal National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. BARLETTA, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. OLSON, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. KING of Iowa):

H.R. 3566. A bill to prohibit an alien who is not in a lawful immigration status in the United States from being eligible for post-secondary education benefits that are not available to all citizens and nationals of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRAT (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3567. A bill to repeal the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act of 1975, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3568. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the authority of the Internal Revenue Service to require truncated social security numbers on Form W-2 wage and tax statements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3569. A bill to require the Attorney General to establish a "Good Neighbor" code of conduct for federally licensed firearms dealers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA (for himself and Mr. ISRAEL):

H.R. 3570. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for education in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut (for himself, Mr. GIBSON, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 3571. A bill to extend and modify certain provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 relating to fuel cells and hydrogen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 3572. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to reform, streamline,

and make improvements to the Department of Homeland Security and support the Department's efforts to implement better policy, planning, management, and performance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 3573. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the enactment into law of a joint resolution approving the number of refugees who may be admitted in any fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCNERNEY:

H.R. 3574. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage hiring unemployed individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. RENACCI):

H.R. 3575. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deny tax exemption to organizations which violate the Federal prohibitions regarding human fetal tissue; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 3576. A bill to increase transparency, accountability, and community engagement within U.S. Customs and Border Protection, provide independent oversight of border security activities, improve training for U.S. Customs and Border Protection agents and officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself and Mr. MURPHY of Florida):

H.R. 3577. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to restrict the printing and distribution of paper copies of Congressional documents; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE (for himself and Mr. RICHMOND):

H.R. 3578. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to strengthen and make improvements to the Directorate of Science and Technology of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. SARBANES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3579. A bill to amend section 5542 of title 5, United States Code, to provide that any hours worked by Federal firefighters under a qualified trade-of-time arrangement shall be excluded for purposes of determinations relating to overtime pay; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3580. A bill to establish in the Department of Veterans Affairs a continuing medical education program for non-Department medical professionals who treat veterans and family members of veterans to increase knowledge and recognition of medical condi-

tions common to veterans and family members of veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3581. A bill to require full funding of part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WELCH (for himself and Mr. MCKINLEY):

H.R. 3582. A bill to support the development, implementation, and evaluation of innovative strategies and methods to increase out-of-school access to digital learning resources for eligible students in order to increase student and educator engagement; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WILSON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. FORBES):

H. Con. Res. 78. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President in consultation with the Department of the Treasury should apply economic sanctions against Chinese businesses and state-owned enterprises that can be linked to cyberattacks against United States entities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLEMING (for himself, Mr. WENSTRUP, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POSEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. CULBERSON):

H. Res. 430. A resolution calling upon the President to declare a National Day of Prayer to end targeted violence against law enforcement officers and schedule appropriate public events in support of such a day; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIFFITH (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. FLORES, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. ABRAHAM, and Mr. BURGESS):

H. Res. 431. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in disapproval of the Senate's modern filibuster rule; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MURPHY of Florida (for himself and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 432. A resolution expressing support for designating February 2016 as "National Spine Ability Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

131. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 19, urging the Congress of the United States to enact legislation allowing immigrants to serve in the military if they are eligible under the President's Executive Order for Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or Executive Order for Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and the Judiciary.

132. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to Assembly Joint Resolution No. 18, urging the Congress of the United States to support H.R. 167, the federal Wildlife Disaster Funding Act; ; jointly to the Committees on the Budget, Agriculture, and Natural Resources.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3556.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes;

U.S. Const. art. IV, sec. 3, cl. 2, sen. a

The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States;

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.R. 3557.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (The Congress shall have Power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States and within the Indian Tribes") and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (The Congress shall have Power "to make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof").

By Mr. BILIRAKIS:

H.R. 3558.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States and Article I, Section 8, Clause 7 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 3559.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and 3.

By Mr. STEWART:

H.R. 3560.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 allows that "The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State."

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 3561.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. NOLAN:

H.R. 3562.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress can determine salaries and compensation of Members of Congress under Article 1, Section 6 of the US Constitution.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3563.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and

therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3564.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Commerce Clause of the United States Constitution gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the States, and therefore grants Congress the power to prevent federal agencies from interfering with citizens' ability to purchase, sell, or distribute unpasteurized milk across state lines.

By Mrs. CAPPS:

H.R. 3565.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 3566.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4 (the Naturalization Clause) and Section 5 of Amendment XIV (the Enforcement Clause). In *Oregon v. Mitchell*, the Supreme Court declared that Congress may ban state actions that violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Furthermore, in the *Chamber of Commerce v. Whiting* and *Cox v. Shalala*, the Supreme Court found that state laws are preempted if they conflict with federal law.

By Mr. BRAT:

H.R. 3567.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Much financial regulation is purportedly authorized as necessary and proper (Article I, Section 8, Clause 18) for carrying into execution Congress' power to "provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States" (Article I, Section 8, Clause 1) in the form of expenditures associated with federal credit programs. Regardless, Congress has the power to repeal existing statutes whether or not they were passed pursuant to the Constitution's enumerated powers.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 3568.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8.

By Mr. GALLEG0:

H.R. 3569.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 3570.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LARSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3571.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8, Article I

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 3572.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. McCAUL:

H.R. 3573.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 4: "Congress shall have Power To . . . establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization . . ."

By Mr. McNERNEY:

H.R. 3574.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3575.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the U.S. Constitution and amendment 16 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 3577.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. RATCLIFFE:

H.R. 3578.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. SARBANES:

H.R. 3579.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 3580.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. VAN HOLLEN:

H.R. 3581.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 3582.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 27: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 140: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 281: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 343: Ms. DELBENE and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 576: Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. WALZ, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 592: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 619: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 638: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 662: Mr. CLEAVER and Mrs. BLACK.

H.R. 713: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 745: Ms. DeLAURO.

H.R. 757: Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 799: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 822: Mr. LONG.

H.R. 836: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 842: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 879: Mr. FORBES, Mr. TROTT, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 885: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 920: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 932: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 962: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 963: Mr. CLAY and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 969: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. DUFFY, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 973: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1057: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1215: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1220: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1222: Mr. HONDA and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 1258: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 1286: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1312: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 1342: Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 1384: Mr. CICILLINE.

H.R. 1464: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1475: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1516: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1546: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1553: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HECK of Washington, and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1559: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1598: Mr. DENT.

H.R. 1604: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1610: Mr. HURD of Texas.

H.R. 1624: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 1684: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 1708: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1714: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1728: Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 1769: Mr. AMODEI and Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 1786: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. DOLD, Ms. MOORE, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1805: Mrs. LOVE.

H.R. 1814: Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GRAYSON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. NORCROSS, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1856: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1934: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 1943: Mr. KIND and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2017: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GRIFFITH, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 2023: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2030: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 2050: Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 2061: Mr. LOWENTHAL and Mr. ISSA.

H.R. 2096: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. REED, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 2124: Mr. McCAUL, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. EDWARDS, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2141: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. EMMER of Minnesota, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 2169: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2264: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2282: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2404: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2406: Mr. NUGENT.

H.R. 2477: Mr. MESSER.

H.R. 2494: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 2515: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 2553: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. GRAYSON, and Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 2568: Mr. BABIN and Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 2692: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 2697: Mr. LYNCH.

H.R. 2698: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 2737: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2799: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 2811: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 2847: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2855: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2862: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 2863: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2867: Mr. BEYER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2894: Mr. JOLLY, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2903: Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 2918: Mr. JOLLY.

H.R. 2937: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2957: Mr. TED LIEU of California.

H.R. 2989: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 3018: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H.R. 3025: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3107: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 3115: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3137: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 3177: Mr. NORCROSS.

H.R. 3183: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALAZZO, and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 3189: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. PITTINGER.

H.R. 3215: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 3247: Mr. LoBIONDO and Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 3284: Mr. POCAN, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 3299: Mr. FLORES.

H.R. 3312: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 3326: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 3337: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3338: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3340: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3351: Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3364: Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 3365: Mr. LOWENTHAL.

H.R. 3381: Mr. KNIGHT.

H.R. 3393: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 3423: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. STIVERS, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3442: Mr. BOUSTANY.

H.R. 3455: Mr. QUIGLEY.

H.R. 3457: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 3459: Mr. PALMER, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. LONG, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FORBES, and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 3463: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3471: Mr. AMODEL.

H.R. 3472: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 3477: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3495: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3522: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. DEUTCH, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3546: Mr. HUNTER.

H.R. 3555: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.J. Res. 22: Mr. LOEBSACK.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H. Con. Res. 19: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. LEE, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. NADLER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. BECERRA.

H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. LONG, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. MESSER, and Mr. HONDA.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. McCAUL.

H. Res. 28: Mrs. DINGELL and Mr. CICILLINE.

H. Res. 54: Mr. DOGGETT and Ms. TSONGAS.

H. Res. 277: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H. Res. 293: Mr. COOK and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 294: Ms. DUCKWORTH and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H. Res. 343: Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. TIPTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. McCAUL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. PITTINGER, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 346: Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H. Res. 393: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. CUMMINGS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H. Res. 394: Mr. RUSH and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H. Res. 402: Mr. SHERMAN.

H. Res. 417: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H. Res. 419: Ms. LEE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. ISRAEL, and Mr. HANNA.

H. Res. 425: Mr. CARNEY, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 427: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. WENSTRUP, and Mr. TURNER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HONORING VIETNAM ERA VETERANS OF MAINE'S SECOND DISTRICT

HON. BRUCE POLIQUIN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Speaker, I'm humbled by the opportunity to honor and welcome home our Vietnam Era Heroes to Northern Maine and take part in Vietnam Veterans Appreciation Day.

I thank The County Vietnam Veterans, and their families, for the sacrifices they made to protect our freedoms and special way of life. The memory of their heroics will inspire Maine generations to come.

One of my true joys has been connecting with thousands of our Maine Veterans. I have had the honor to meet our local heroes from the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans and Veterans of Foreign Wars, and in many more settings. Their patriotism, commitment to duty, humility and camaraderie inspire my own public service.

In June, at the Cross Insurance Center in Bangor, I had the privilege to help properly recognize and welcome home 1,000 of our Vietnam Veterans. It was an emotional gathering for our heroes who did all that was asked of them and served our Country with honor, but did not receive their due gratitude and respect from millions of Americans when they returned home. Our courageous servicemen in The County, Bangor, and throughout the state of Maine deserve our absolute and unwavering gratitude.

I stand with your fellow Mainers in thanks for all that you have given to our Country. We will never forget your bravery.

RECOGNIZING THE ROLIN FAMILY AS THE 2015 ESCAMBIA COUNTY FLORIDA, OUTSTANDING FARM FAMILY OF THE YEAR

HON. JEFF MILLER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I rise to recognize the Rolin Family for being selected as the 2015 Escambia County, Florida, Outstanding Farm Family of the Year.

SunnySlope Berry Farm, located in Pensacola, Florida, first began as a heifer farm, producing local dairy. However, after five years, Barry and Glenda Rolin decided it was time for a change, and the couple planted their first blueberry field in the winter of 2008. Once the blueberries had become a success, the Rolin family then planted several hundred blackberry

canes, selling both berry varieties to local markets in Florida and neighboring Alabama. Finally, after a few years of allowing the crops to flourish, the family opened up SunnySlope Berry Farm to the public. Now, families from the surrounding areas can build their own memories by coming to SunnySlope Berry Farm and picking their own berries.

The Rolin's first planted berries to teach their children—Kendra, Amy, Starla, and Shawn—about responsibility; and today SunnySlope Berry Farms is truly a family affair. The children wake up every morning and finish their chores before heading into school. For Barry and Glenda, married for 23 years, a typical day includes picking berries until late morning, packaging and delivering berries midday, picking again until dark, and packaging the remainder at the end of the day. Although many people may be unaware of the amount of work that goes into SunnySlope, the community certainly appreciates everything the Rolin family does to keep the farm running, from producing delicious berries to creating priceless memories.

Mr. Speaker, Northwest Florida and our Nation share a proud agricultural tradition built by the hard work of farmers and their families. The Escambia County Outstanding Farm Family of the Year Award is a reflection of the Rolin's tireless work and their dedication to family and farming. On behalf of the United States Congress, I would like to offer my congratulations to the Rolin family for being outstanding in their field. My wife Vicki and I extend our best wishes for their continued success.

IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 65TH ANNIVERSARY OF ROSTAS CAFE

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to help commemorate the 65th anniversary of the establishment of Rostas Cafe. The restaurant, located in Hazleton, Pennsylvania, is a city landmark and has continually provided my constituents with a fantastic dining and community experience.

Rostas Cafe was founded by John "Kookie" and Grace Rostas in 1950. The cafe originally opened as a bar, serving only fresh, hot pizza to the public. A true family business, John and Grace's daughter, Alfreda, became involved with her parent's enterprise when she was a teenager. Upon John's retirement, Alfreda and her husband, Tony Calucci, took over the restaurant. Tony's father, Nick, expanded the menu options to include hoagies, sandwiches, sizeable antipastos, and salads.

Tragedy struck in March of 1994 when a fire devastated this Hazleton landmark, destroying

the entire interior of the restaurant. Its patrons, faced with losing one of their favorite community gathering spots, called upon the restaurant to rebuild as soon as possible. In a miraculous feat, the cafe reopened in June of 1994, bigger and better than ever. Such a quick renovation is testament to the commitment and hard work of Alfreda and Tony Calucci, as well as the importance of the restaurant's role within the Hazleton community. Today, Rostas Cafe remains a Hazleton staple, and Melissa Calucci has joined her parents in adding to the restaurant's success and character.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to recognize Rostas Cafe as it celebrates its 65th anniversary. I am incredibly grateful for this community landmark that continues to bring generations of the Hazleton community closer together, and I look forward to the cafe's success over the years to come.

HONORING GARRETT NICHOLAS DOWNEY

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Garrett Nicholas Downey. Garrett is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 397, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Garrett has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Garrett has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Garrett has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Garrett Nicholas Downey for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. ALBERT "BUTCH" ARENAL

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Albert "Butch" Arenal, retiring Chief of Police for the Punta Gorda Police Department in Punta Gorda, Florida.

For the past three decades, Butch has been a pillar in our Florida community. Born and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

raised in Charlotte County, Butch has dedicated his adult life to the Punta Gorda Police Department. He has been with the Department for almost 30 years, and has served as Chief of Police for eight of those years.

Under his leadership, the Department was awarded the Punta Gorda Chamber of Commerce Small Business award as well as a number of other well-deserved accolades. Additionally, he will be sworn in as the President of the Florida Police Chief's Association, which is but a small testament of his leadership ability. As a member of Congress, it has been my pleasure to work with Butch professionally and get to know him personally.

Mr. Speaker, I speak for the Charlotte County Community as we say farewell to Butch and wish him the best of luck as he joins Coconut Creek Police Department, they are truly lucky to have him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MARY
GABRIELE, THE OLDEST
ITALIAN-AMERICAN IN THE HAZLETON AREA

HON. LOU BARLETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Mary Gabriele as she is celebrated as the oldest Italian-American in the Hazleton Area, an honor bestowed upon her by the Hazleton Chapter of UNICO. UNICO is the largest Italian-American service and volunteer organization in the United States, and has a significant, positive impact within my congressional district.

On March 19, 1909, Mary was born to Nicholas and Tomasina Lauro in Medix Run, Pennsylvania. Her family moved to Hazleton Heights in 1916 where she was able to establish strong, communal roots. As one of nine children, Mary began working at the Duplan Silk Mill at the youthful age of 14. The fact that she committed long and arduous hours at the facility did not stop her from obtaining an education, however. She went on to impressively complete her studies at St. Gabriel's High School during the evenings—a feat symbolic of her tireless work ethic.

Mary married Nazario Gabriele in 1935, and the newly married couple moved to Peace Street in Hazleton. It was here where Mary and Nazario raised their four children: Carmel, Nicholas, Mary, and Thomasina. After dedicating years to her family, Mary returned to the workforce at numerous retail stores in the area, including Bon Ton, Leader, Dotte's, and Fashion Bug. Mary and Nazario were married for a wonderful 49 years before Nazario passed away in 1984.

Currently, Mary resides at Providence Place in Drums, where she remains active and enjoys visits from friends and her extended family, including five grandchildren and six great-grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to recognize Mary Gabriele as the oldest Italian-American in the Hazleton Area. My community is extremely fortunate to have now called her a neighbor for close to 100 years. I hope she

will be able to celebrate this monumental occasion in the company of her family and friends.

HONORING SEAN CHRISTOPHER
MCMULLEN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Sean Christopher McMullen. Sean is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 397, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Sean has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Sean has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Sean has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Sean Christopher McMullen for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ROBERT S.
LAUBACH

HON. JOHN KATKO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the life of Dr. Robert Laubach, a pioneer in adult literacy and lifelong advocate of literacy and education. Dr. Robert Laubach, affectionately known as Dr. Bob, was born in the Philippines and lived there through his high school years. Dr. Bob moved to the United States and completed his undergraduate studies in Ohio. He went on to pursue graduate studies at Syracuse University where he earned a master's degree in journalism and a Ph.D. in education.

Dr. Bob developed his love of literacy and journalism at an early age, working the printing press for his dad's early literacy work. Dr. Bob traveled to over 40 countries in 5 years when he was in his twenties with his father and Dr. Bob carried his passion for literacy, both nationally and internationally for the rest of his life.

In 1952, Dr. Bob founded the Syracuse University Literacy Journalism program and taught hundreds of educators from around the world how to prepare literacy materials. Dr. Bob developed literacy primers in local languages and organized literacy programs in more than 60 countries. In 1959, Dr. Bob began publishing News for You, a weekly news source for adult new readers, which is still in publication today. Dr. Bob also founded New Readers Press, which develops and pub-

lishes instructional materials for adult learners and adult education teachers. Today, New Readers Press continues to provide over 400 educational titles that help adults learn how to read, write, and do basic math.

Dr. Bob was more than an educator, he was an innovator who helped changed countless lives by giving the gift of literacy. Dr. Bob's legacy of literacy will live on in the Central New York community, and all over the world through the thousands of literacy organizations, tutors, trainers, volunteers, and students who continue to work toward his dream of a world where everyone can read and write.

HIGHLIGHTING THE UNIVERSITY
OF MOBILE'S PROJECT SERVE

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the students, faculty, staff, and administration at the University of Mobile for their commitment to community service through "Project Serve."

The University of Mobile, which was founded in 1961 by Alabama Baptists as a Christian university, established Project Service during the university's 50th anniversary in 2011. For Project Serve, the university cancels classes for the day, and the classroom moves into the community in order to provide students and faculty with an opportunity to serve others. This year's event will be held on September 25th.

This is a record year for Project Serve with more than 1,200 members of the University of Mobile community signed up. On the 25th, these students will spread out to over 60 locations in Mobile and Baldwin counties to take part in service activities. For example, students from the School of Nursing will administer blood pressure checks, do laundry, and paint fingernails for residents of Little Sisters of the Poor. The RamCorps brass and percussion unit will perform for youth at the Strickland Youth Center. The men's basketball team will partner with Habitat for Humanity to build homes. These are just a few examples of the service projects that will make a big difference for people in Southwest Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the University of Mobile for making community service such an important part of their college experience. Through Project Serve, students will learn that there is more to personal development than just what you can find in a textbook. While Project Serve will only last one day, I am confident the experience will lead to a lifetime of service for everyone in the University of Mobile community.

HONORING ALAN DOAN AND
SARAH GALBRAITH

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Alan Doan and

Sarah Galbraith, small business owners from Hamilton, Missouri, on being named the Small Business Persons of the Year by the Small Business Administration, in recognition of their company, the Missouri Star Quilt Co.

After their father lost his retirement savings in the 2008 market crash, Alan and Sarah thought of their mother's skills with sewing and quilting. They decided to take out a loan to purchase a quilting machine to make the quilts and earn extra money to support their family. They began their business in a small building close to their parents' home and that is where Missouri Star Quilt Co. was born. They decided that in order to grow their business, they needed to reach a broader market and began putting quilting tutorial videos on the internet. Their business grew exponentially and soon they were receiving more orders than they could handle. Today, the Missouri Star Quilt Co. has more than 180 employees in Hamilton, Missouri, they have prompted other small businesses to open up their shops nearby, and have attracted as many as 10,000 tourists a month to Hamilton, which has a population less than 2,000. Their small business has not only profited and thrived, but has allowed many members of their community to thrive as well.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in recognizing Alan Doan and Sarah Galbraith for their achievement in receiving the SBA Small Business Persons of the Year award, as well as their hard work and commitment to their community.

HONORING GLENN HACKNEY FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of one of the most dedicated, selfless and kind-hearted individuals I have ever had the pleasure of knowing, Mr. Glenn Hackney. He is a friend and a true unsung hero for whom I have the deepest admiration.

Glenn moved to Alaska before statehood, arriving in 1948. He served in the State House from 1972 to 1976 and the State Senate from 1976 to 1980. From the time of his arrival, Glenn began a life of service to Alaska. Mere words today cannot express the profound impact Glenn has had on the lives of many; he has truly done so much good, for so many people. Glenn has always lived by the simple words of Abraham Lincoln and I quote: "To ease another's headache is to forget one's own."

In that same vein, Glenn's service to his community runs deep. I recall a time when Glenn was cleaning up the streets of Fairbanks, AK and was struck by a vehicle. He suffered many broken bones and endured great pain, but never held any ill-will towards the driver. In fact, he was more concerned for the driver's well-being than his own. Soon thereafter, he was back on the street once again doing his part to clean up the commu-

nity. Glenn is a strong, silent leader; a gentleman and a dear friend. I hope that this body will join me in recognizing his contributions to society and the great state of Alaska.

CELEBRATING NATIONAL TRUCK DRIVER APPRECIATION WEEK

HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this week, September 13–19, is designated National Truck Driver Appreciation Week and is set aside to honor the 3.4 million professional truck drivers in the United States. Trucking employs more than 7 million people, making it not just essential to our economy, but one of our country's largest sources of employment as well.

Citizens in every community around the nation rely on trucks—for the food we eat, the clothes we wear, and the products we use. As Ranking Member of the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I know firsthand how important truckers are to the strength and well-being of our great nation.

But trucks don't move without highly skilled drivers. I have long fought to ensure the safety of American roads and to preserve American trucking jobs. I have also advanced measures to ensure that all truck drivers have the opportunity make a decent living.

In order for our truckers to do their jobs, they need Congress to do its job and pass a long-overdue, robust highways reauthorization. Truck drivers are on the front lines and face the effects of Congressional inaction every day.

More than 147,000 bridges in the United States are structurally deficient or functionally obsolete (one of every four bridges). Nearly two thirds of the nation's roads are in less than "good" condition. Congestion is a ballooning problem, affecting 42 percent of America's major roads and costing the economy \$121 billion a year.

While our infrastructure has deteriorated, Congress has been asleep at the wheel, passing short-term patches that prolong uncertainty and force states to delay critical projects to fix decrepit, weight-restricted bridges that can't handle freight trucks or pockmarked highways that blow out tires.

As our needs have increased, surface transportation programs have been limping along with flat funding since 2009. The federal gas tax pays for highways and public transit, but it has not been raised in 22 years, and its purchasing power has fallen 40 percent. We need to do more than the status quo.

This must change. The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee is currently working on a bill to improve the conditions of our nation's roads, bridges, and intermodal facilities by reauthorizing surface transportation programs. A long-term bill is the only responsible action for Congress to take.

Robust levels of Federal investment make a truck driver's workplace—our highways—safer and more efficient. The Federal government needs to continue its leading role in promoting an interconnected interstate system vital to the

timely movement of goods and people. This system must be paid for with guaranteed, sustainable funding that will bring our economy into the 21st Century—and not myopic solutions to replace a strong Federal role, such as tolling or privatization.

National Truck Driver Appreciation Week is an opportunity to reflect on the vital role that truck drivers play in supporting and sustaining our economy and our society. The best way Congress can honor truck drivers is to pass a fully funded, long-term authorization bill.

RECOGNIZING THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF NAVAL AIR STATION JACKSONVILLE

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 75th anniversary of Naval Air Station Jacksonville, one of the United States Navy's pivotal bases. For Jacksonville citizens, this anniversary brings back a flood of memories. Many began their journeys here as young sailors ready to go to sea. They enlisted and scattered far and wide. Now, years later, many of these same sailors will commemorate this important base. For these sailors their sea anchor is right here in this military friendly town.

In 1938, before there was an NAS Jax—as we lovingly call the base—there were citizens who lobbied the Hepburn Board as it searched for a new naval base in the Southeast. The citizens voted to support bonds to purchase the property and construction began in 1939.

The base was commissioned on Oct. 15, 1940, with Captain Charles P. Mason serving as its first commanding officer. Walt Disney drew a logo for the new base depicting Donald Duck in flight gear and sporting gold wings emerging from an egg as NAS Jacksonville was given birth.

As America entered World War II, construction and the pace of training increased at NAS Jax. Soon, there were three runways operating as well as seaplane ramps. An overhaul and repair facility was begun to rework the station's planes. Today, that facility is called the Fleet Readiness Center Southeast, and they still inhabit some of the original buildings from the 1940's.

By 1949, NAS Jacksonville was the plane capital of the East Coast and handled 60 percent of the fleet's air striking force in the Atlantic area from pole to pole. As the Navy led the dawning of the jet age, the first jet carrier air groups and squadrons came to Jacksonville. So it was only natural that the Navy's first Flight Demonstration Team—later known as the Blue Angels—got its start at NAS Jacksonville. Fleet Air Wing 11, now the Patrol and Reconnaissance Wing 11, relocated to the station followed in the 1970s by Helicopter Antisubmarine Wing, U.S. Atlantic, and its squadrons.

Over the ensuing decades, NAS Jacksonville supported the Navy's efforts during wartime and peace. Its pilots and planes flew in combat and training. Planes and other airframes were retired and new ones put into the

inventory. As with other bases, buildings were added, old buildings were renovated, and personnel came and went.

Today, the runways are being totally rebuilt. The new airframe is heavier and larger than its predecessor and after 75 years of service, those original runways are being recycled. In a way, today's pilots will still be taking off and landing on the history of those who went before them.

NAS Jacksonville is a recent two-time winner of the Commander's in Chief, Naval Installations Command Excellence Award and is home to the newest manned and unmanned systems that Naval Aviation has in its inventory.

The Navy has led in advancing innovation because the Navy must ensure our maritime supremacy and national security. NAS Jacksonville has for 75 years been the face of that strength in Northeast Florida. Our citizens hear the sounds of freedom in support of our Nation's defense. NAS Jax has been a constant in my life and in the lives of all in Jacksonville. The greatness of this premier base is woven into the memories of all who have shared in the pride of having NAS Jacksonville within our city limits.

I salute the 75th Anniversary of Naval Air Station Jacksonville, which continues to be a major employer and economic stimulator, but more importantly, its personnel continues to contribute through their hard work and dedication to the important missions of our Nation's defense.

HONORING CALEB PRETTYMAN

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Caleb Prettyman. Caleb is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 75, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Caleb has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Caleb has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Caleb has earned the rank of Tom-Tom Beater in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Caleb has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Caleb sanded and repainted all 24 of the fire hydrants in Barnard, Missouri, and installed locator antennas on them so that they may easily be located in the event of an emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Caleb Prettyman for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING JACK COGHILL FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a great Alaskan and someone I am honored and privileged to call my friend, Mr. Jack Coghill. Without Jack, I would not be here today as the Congressman for all Alaska; I might very well be retired or even buried near the banks of the Yukon River.

Jack's commitment to public service goes back long before Alaska statehood. He served as the Mayor of Nenana for 22 years, served in the Territorial House from 1952 to 1956 and was a State Senator for the first three Legislatures. He rounded out his time in elected office as Alaska's sixth Lieutenant Governor from 1990 to 1994.

Beyond his elected political career, Jack—dubbed "Mr. Republican"—has had a profound impact upon all of Alaska as one of the 55 framers of the state constitution.

On a very personal note, in 1972 Jack was one of the few people who believed in me enough to encourage me to run for Congress. Jack not only encouraged my run but worked tirelessly in his support of my candidacy. None of us knew at that time there would be a horrific accident in which Congressman Nick Begich and House Majority Leader Hal Boggs would be lost in a flight from Anchorage to Juneau. Due to this loss, it was up to the Republican State Central Committee to appoint a Republican candidate for the Special election rather than go through a formal primary process. Despite many other qualified candidates, Jack stood by me and convinced his colleagues on the Central Committee to vote in my favor. I am forever thankful for his role in shaping the path that has led me to serve as the Congressman for all Alaska these past 42 years.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHERI BUSTOS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of September 17, 2015, a vote was held. Had I been present for this roll call vote, I would have cast the following vote:

Roll Call 497—I vote "NAY."

HONORING DONALD F. HARRISON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Donald F. Har-

ison, a teacher at Parkview Elementary in Cameron, Missouri, who was recently named America's Top Teacher by Live with Kelly and Michael.

Donn is more than just a teacher in Cameron. He also serves as a crossing guard, a volunteer firefighter, and an EMT for Cameron. He also serves as the unofficial voice of Cameron, announcing track meets, basketball games and any other church and school events he can make. Known for his affinity towards bowties and Chuck Taylors, Donn's nomination created an instant sensation in Cameron. Every business in town changed their signs to encourage folks to vote for Donn, "Vote for Donn" yard signs sprung up across town, and social media posts drove the vote for Donn. Winning this award not only earned him a well-deserved vacation and new car, it also provided the Cameron R-I School District with computers to facilitate the classroom experience.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me, his wife, Lynette, and their family and friends in commending Donald F. Harrison for his accomplishments in and out of the classroom and for his efforts put forth in achieving this high distinction.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DR. JON WOODS

HON. PATRICK J. TIBERI

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of Dr. Jon Woods, the long-time director of The Ohio State University Marching Band. He passed away on Saturday, September 12th fittingly on a day when so many of his former students were gathered together for the alumni game to perform with the current band during pre-game and half-time shows. I was privileged to be one of his students when I was a member of The Best Damn Band In The Land (TBDBITL).

Dr. Woods grew up in Pennsylvania, studied music education, and received a bachelor's degree from Indiana University of Pennsylvania, a master's degree from Penn State University, and a doctorate from "that school up North"—the University of Michigan. After serving 10 years as an associate director he became the director in 1983.

For 28 years he led TBDBITL. He was an innovator, creating computer-designed halftime shows that are now one of the band's trademarks. He led by example, quiet but firm, encouraging comradery and promoting a tradition of excellence. Notably, he always strove to improve the band's performances and inspired that drive in his students. Unusual among his peers, Dr. Woods was also a professor and an advisor. In fact, he felt his greatest legacy was his students.

During his career his name became synonymous with the band as he directed shows at 35 bowl games and three presidential inaugurations. It was my honor to work with him to secure the band's ability to march in the 1989 inaugural parade for President George Bush,

the 2001 inaugural parade for President George W. Bush and the 2009 inaugural parade for President Barack Obama. He said his favorite game was the 2002 National Championship overtime win against The University of Miami. Dr. Woods' greatest honor was dotting the "I" during his final season.

A trombone player himself, Dr. Woods looked forward to retiring so he could be more involved in his own musical group, Trombones Plus. He was also looking forward to travelling with his wife, Donna and spending time with his children and granddaughter, Reese. While his family will deeply feel his loss, Dr. Woods touched countless people's lives. He will be missed by his students, the university, and the TDBITL community.

HONORING MARY BINKLEY FOR
CONTRIBUTIONS IN PUBLIC
SERVICE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an Alaskan Pioneer—a woman who helped shape our great State and a dear friend of mine—Mary Binkley. From her humble beginnings with Jim on the Chena and Tanana Rivers to her dedication to public service, Mary has been a solid foundation to her family, Fairbanks and the state of Alaska.

Mary arrived to Alaska in 1944. As the matriarch of the Binkley family, Mary was crucial to the growth of their family business—from the Godspeed, a 25-passenger vessel, to what would become the Binkley enterprise. She has been the backbone of the Discover Riverboat Touring Company since its founding in 1950; a business which still operates today. When her husband, Jim, entered the Alaska State Legislature, Mary stepped up to successfully manage the family business. The company played a vital role in helping grow and modernize the entire region. When I traveled in Fairbanks, I traveled on the Riverboats Discovery.

Mary has been a leading Alaskan woman her entire life. She has always had a big heart and deep respect for the rich history and culture of the Alaska Native people. She consistently went out of her way to hire Alaska Natives, learning everything she could about their culture and graciously sharing hers in return. Those relationships echo her tireless efforts to build community.

Her dedication to improving the economy and her resilience to the unforgiving Alaskan frontier make her the definition of determination. I will always consider Mary a dear friend and pivotal stalwart in moving Alaska into the future. I could not be more honored to recognize her lifelong efforts as an Alaskan and one who sets the standard for others to follow.

HONORING TRENTON YATES
CALTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Trenton Yates Calton. Trenton is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 397, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Trenton has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Trenton has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Trenton has contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Trenton Yates Calton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING KATHLEEN “MIKE”
DALTON FOR CONTRIBUTIONS IN
PUBLIC SERVICE

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an Alaskan pioneer, a lifelong dedicated civil servant and volunteer, Mrs. Kathleen “Mike” Dalton. Life was not easy in any way for the pioneers of Alaska; only the strong in heart and mind would thrive in such an unforgiving environment. Mike's life epitomizes the spirit of resilience and strength which advanced an early Alaskan frontier.

As a young girl, Mike moved to Alaska in 1949. She began her lifelong involvement in politics and public service in 1962, and quickly became the backbone of the Fairbanks Republican Women. She has proudly served in numerous political positions throughout her life, and played an integral role in the office of Senator Ted Stevens.

Civic service was only one effort of the Dalton family. Mike's husband, Jim was instrumental to advancing U.S. energy and defense as a pioneer engineer of the early oil exploration efforts in the Arctic and the Distant Early Warning radar line (DEW line). Both of which made a great impact to the nation.

On a personal note, the Daltons have always treated me as one of their own. I will never forget the many times they opened their house off Dalton Trail to my late wife Lu, my daughters and me. I will always cherish the memories, friendship and unwavering support we've shared over the years. Alaska would be a different place without Mike, and it is only fitting that she be recognized for all her efforts.

HONORING JACOB I. HUTTON

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. GRAVES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Jacob I. Hutton. Jacob is a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 87, and earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Jacob has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the many years Jacob has been involved with scouting, he has not only earned numerous merit badges, but also the respect of his family, peers, and community. Most notably, Jacob has earned the rank of Runner in the Tribe of Mic-O-Say. Jacob has also contributed to his community through his Eagle Scout project. Jacob planted landscaping around the sign for the First Christian Church of Cameron, Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Jacob I. Hutton for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

HONORING THE USS “SIMPSON”

HON. ANDER CRENSHAW

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the fine Sailors who have served on the USS *Simpson* (FFG 56). On September 30, 2015, the *Simpson*, which is the last active Oliver Hazard Perry-class frigate, will be decommissioned and leave the active United States Navy fleet.

The *Simpson* is named for Rear Admiral Rodger W. Simpson (1898–1964), who was a distinguished officer during World War II. RADM Simpson was awarded the Navy Cross, Silver Star and Legion of Merit for rescuing and evacuating more than 7,500 Allied prisoners of war and civilians interned in Japanese concentration camps. The USS *Simpson* was commissioned on November 9, 1985.

From its first overseas deployment, the USS *Simpson* and her crew have distinguished themselves in combat. On April 18, 1988, along with two other navy ships, the *Simpson* responded to the Iranian mine attack on the USS *Samuel B. Roberts* by destroying an Iranian oil platform and sinking the Iranian Navy mission patrol combatant, Joshan.

Over her 30 years of service, the *Simpson* made 14 deployments. Her final deployment was for seven months to the U.S. 5th and 6th Fleet areas of operation in which she conducted theater security cooperation exercises. As in the past, the crew was called on to support various task forces and performed perfectly never missing an operational commitment. Every sailor made a difference every day. In addition, some of the newest technologies in the Navy were aboard, four Fire

Scouts (MQ-8B) vertical takeoff and landing tactical unmanned aerial vehicles.

The crew on the last deployment was comprised of reservists as well as active duty individual augmented personnel with zero previous experience with UAV's. Despite the challenges, the officers aboard reported the crew achieved the highest ever recorded maintenance readiness and sortie completion rate of any Fire Scout deployment in the program's history.

The *Simpson* will be decommissioned but the friendships and camaraderie this ship established on its decks will last for ages. It is a pleasure and honor to represent the great men and women who serve in the 4th Congressional District of Florida and to see them successfully complete the mission of the USS *Simpson*. Their hard work and dedication contributes to the important missions of our Nation's defense and reiterates our community's importance as an anchor of national security.

CONGRATULATING MRS. GLORIA
GALLOWAY ON HER RETIREMENT

HON. THOMAS J. ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize Mrs. Gloria Galloway, a dedicated professional with the Department of Veterans Affairs, Congressional Liaison Service, on the occasion of her retirement. Gloria has been an exemplary public servant who has demonstrated the highest standards of professionalism on a daily basis. She has served with the Department of Veterans Affairs for more than 36 years and her career in public service has been a testament to the importance of unselfish devotion. As Gloria embarks on a new chapter in life, it is my hope that she may recall with a deep sense of pride and accomplishment the outstanding contributions she has made to the Department of Veterans Affairs, the United States House of Representatives and the people of the United States of America. I would like to send her my best wishes for continued success in her future endeavors, and may her life be filled with health and happiness.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. GLENN THOMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 497, I was absent during roll call number 497 (the Previous Question on H. Res. 420) the afternoon of September 17, 2015 because I was meeting with constituents from Pennsylvania's Fifth Congressional District. Had I been present, I would have voted YES.

A TRIBUTE TO CARL AND
DENISE JARDON

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Carl and Denise Jardon of Randolph, Iowa, for receiving the 2015 Conservationist of the Year Award presented by the Fremont County Soil and Water Conservation District.

Carl and Denise were selected for this award based on their outstanding work in incorporating terraces, no-till farming, nitrogen stabilizer, and cover crops into their 368-acre farm operation. These practices are instrumental in helping preserve clean water and soil for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud and congratulate Carl and Denise for earning this award. They are shining examples of how hard work and dedication to protecting the environment will benefit their property and others. I urge my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Carl and Denise for this achievement. I wish them nothing but the best moving forward.

THE FAIR ACCESS TO EDUCATION
ACT OF 2015

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Fair Access to Education Act of 2015. This legislation would bring fairness to the Free Application for Federal Student Aid (FAFSA) form, which determines federal student aid, and currently asks eligibility questions about a student's drug conviction history.

Under this legislation, an applicant with misdemeanor marijuana possession offenses will not have to check the box when applying for federal financial assistance. It also immediately provides eligibility for grants, loans, and work assistance to those whose applications were suspended due to a marijuana misdemeanor offense.

Too often those with misdemeanor drug offenses, such as simple marijuana possession, continue to be discriminated against or stigmatized long after they've paid their fines or served their time. Such is the case when it comes to higher education. One of our greatest opportunities as Americans to better ourselves and start anew is pushed out of reach for many because of an outdated bias built into our federal student aid application.

Under current law, the FAFSA requires applicants to disclose any drug-related offense they've had while receiving federal student aid. This outdated question is on the application because of the Anti-Drug Abuse Act of 1988, which authorizes federal and state judges to deny certain federal benefits, including student aid, to persons convicted of drug trafficking or possession.

If that box is checked when a student submits an application, the application is immediately placed on hold and the student is informed that the application cannot be processed and additional steps are required to determine eligibility. This intimidating process often has the effect of discouraging students from continuing.

Public opinion and state law is shifting dramatically on questions related to marijuana. Prohibition is outdated and does not reflect how Americans think, nor how they actually behave. Nearly half of the population has smoked marijuana at some point in their lives, and now in four states and the District of Columbia, people can do so legally.

It is senseless that we would limit a student's future for any drug offense for which they have served their sentence, and even more senseless that we would do so for an offense for a drug that a majority believes should be legal.

The FAFSA question—number 23 for the 2015–16 school year—is outdated, unfair, and traps those seeking to recover from mistakes and create opportunities for themselves. Current policy is inevitably more harmful to those with the greatest need. If a student has a misdemeanor marijuana offense but is fully able to afford an education on their own, their future is not limited. But if a student has taken strides to recover from past mistakes and is seeking help in getting an education, current policy will only hold them back.

The Fair Access to Education Act would help reduce recidivism and strengthen our communities.

RECOGNIZING THE MARINE & ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH INSTITUTE ON ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and applaud an organization in my state on its 25th anniversary year of studying the effects of toxic chemicals on environmental and human health.

The Marine & Environmental Research Institute (MERI)—based in Blue Hill, Maine—began in 1990 with a group of scientists concerned about the impact of pollutants on marine mammal populations that were experiencing massive die-offs and disease outbreaks. Led by Dr. Susan Shaw, the organization has done incredible work since then investigating the effects toxic exposure has on health outcomes in the marine environment.

Moreover, the group has shown that toxic exposure has significant consequences for human health as well. I especially appreciate MERI's groundbreaking studies of the effects of chemical exposure on firefighters, a group that encounters high incidences of cancer. The organization has conducted the most extensive bio-monitoring assessment of firefighters to date and continues to gather information that can be used to protect the health of the first responders who keep our communities safe.

As beings on this planet, we cannot separate ourselves from the environment. What we do to it, we do to ourselves. I truly appreciate MERI's work to remind us all that wildlife and humans alike benefit from protecting the environment and limiting the spread of dangerous chemicals. May it continue to do this important work for many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO MATTHEW SHAFNER

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Mr. Matthew Shafner, who recently passed away after a courageous battle with cancer. Matt was a beloved native son of the Groton-New London community, and a legendary attorney who never wavered as a champion of the underdog.

Born in New London in 1935, Matt attended the Bulkeley School and graduated from New London High School in 1953. Growing up, Matt worked for his family's renowned furniture business headed by his father, who also served as a state representative in the Connecticut General Assembly. Matt earned his undergraduate degree from the University of Connecticut and was awarded a law degree from UConn Law School in 1959. Shortly thereafter, Matt opened and built a workers' compensation practice with John O'Brien in New London, representing the region's shipyard workers. These deep roots in the southeastern Connecticut community indelibly connected Matt with the citizens—his neighbors—whom he would represent in the courtroom.

In the early seventies, Matt took the case of a shipyard worker who died of lung cancer and then took on asbestos companies. The lawsuits started with one asbestos case and one lung cancer case and quickly grew to 12 cases and then 50 cases including asbestos, lung cancer, mesothelioma, laryngeal cancer, esophageal cancer and GI cancer. By the end of the decade, the first 50 asbestos cases settled for \$6.5 million—winning surviving families justice and compensation for their losses.

Matt continued to handle many other cases, including 90 aerospace workers who had developed brain tumors after working in the same factory. Another powerful case for Matt arose out of a fabricated glove and aprons manufacturer in northeastern Connecticut using chrysotile asbestos cloth and gas masks with crocidolite asbestos filters. The plant manager's son, who worked during school vacations and was a biking champion of Connecticut, developed pleural mesothelioma at age 41. He died soon after, leaving a young wife and two infant children. Matt won the case for this family in court.

In the New London Day, Senior Superior Court Judge Robert Martin described Matt as a "unanimous first ballot hall-of-fame lawyer. He had no peer in the personal injury field. We have a lot of good lawyers in New London County, but Matt really set the bar and I think everybody played off him. I don't know any lawyer who cared about justice more than Matt Shafner."

Matt served his community as faithfully he served individuals in need, as the attorney for the City of Groton for 20 years.

Matt was named among the Super Lawyers of Connecticut every year from 2007 to 2012, as well as in New England and Metropolitan New York. Matt served as President of the New London County Bar Association, on the Board of Governors of the Connecticut Trial Lawyers Association and as State Delegate to the Association of Trial Lawyers of America. His lectures included a 1981 address to the XI Triennial World Congress of Pathology in Jerusalem on the legal aspects of asbestos disease. Matt was awarded the first Paul Tremont Award for Advocacy recognizing the first asbestos litigation in the Northeast filed in 1975.

In addition to his prolific professional career, Matt was a stalwart, grassroots activist in local, state, and national politics. A member of the Groton Democratic Town Committee, Matt faithfully worked at party headquarters, attended conventions as a delegate, and shared his compassionate perspective on issues of the day in the press and with public officials and candidates.

I benefited greatly from Matt's strong support during my two campaigns for Congress as a challenger. In 2006, when my race was decided by 83 votes out of 242,000 cast, Matt volunteered to help with the recount process—a very tense and challenging task. His training and experience as a lawyer and his passion for democracy were a perfect blend, from which I feel honored to have benefited.

For someone so accomplished, Matt was known equally for his extraordinary humility. His gentleness belied a tenacity in the courtroom that was unparalleled for his clients and achieved major victories for them.

Matt is survived by his wife Denise, four children, three step-children, nine grandchildren, and ten great-grandchildren. I ask my colleagues to join me in expressing our deepest sorrow for their loss and to the southeastern Connecticut community who lost a humble legal legend, who never stopped fighting for the underdog.

TRIBUTE TO ELLEN GRACE BROWN

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ellen Grace Brown on the celebration of her 100th birthday. Ms. Brown celebrated her 100th birthday on August 30th, 2015 in Lenox, Iowa.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Ms. Brown's life. Since her birth, we have revolutionized air travel and walked on the moon. We have invented the television, cellular phones, and the internet. We have fought in wars overseas, seen the rise and fall of Soviet communism, and witnessed the birth of new democracies. Ms. Brown has lived through seventeen United States Presidents and twenty-four Governors of Iowa. In her lifetime, the population of the United States has more than tripled.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Ellen in the United States Congress and it is my pleasure to wish her a very happy 100th birthday. I invite my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Ms. Brown on reaching this incredible milestone, and wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

COMMEMORATING THE ONE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ROTARY CLUB OF LEXINGTON

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the centennial year of the Rotary Club of Lexington, Kentucky. This honorable humanitarian organization has been bringing men and women together to serve the Bluegrass community since 1915. It is one of the oldest and best established community-oriented organizations in the state and was Lexington's first civic club. The newly established Rotary Club first met in the historic Phoenix Hotel, which has been host to numerous celebrities and public figures including six United States Presidents. The club has grown over the years to become the twenty first largest in the world.

The motto of the Rotary Club is "Service over Self" and the Lexington club certainly exemplifies that. They are a shining example of individuals with servants' hearts coming together to better their community. Rotary organizes and implements several significant service projects that benefit our community, our commonwealth, and the world. Hundreds of community projects have been completed by the Rotary Club of Lexington, including providing clothing for children in the Fayette County School System, organizing the Southern Lights Santa Project, funding the Surgery on Sunday program, mentoring and assisting in school classrooms, funding the Born Learning night classes for parents, awarding sizeable college scholarships, and sponsoring international youth exchange programs. Rotary raises money and donates thousands of dollars each year to worthy programs such as the End Polio Now campaign and the Cardinal Hill Foundation.

Rotary membership consists of business owners, professionals, managers, and community leaders who take great interest in the happenings and welfare of the community. Lexington's Rotary Club members have been instrumental in community action for the betterment of Lexington and the quality of life of its citizens for one hundred years and this is cause for celebration. It is my honor to stand before the United States House of Representatives to acknowledge the historic celebration for the Rotary Club of Lexington. I wish them the best for a successful future in their next one hundred years.

SGT. RAYMOND J. KOOMAN

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Sergeant Raymond J. Kooman, who served bravely in World War II and survived as a prisoner of war in a German prison camp. Sgt. Kooman is being honored today at the 2015 POW/MIA Recognition Month Ceremony in Hackensack, NJ for his service.

In 1942, Sgt. Raymond J. Kooman, son of Mr. and Mrs. S. Kooman, enlisted in the service at the age of 19, serving in the United States Army, 28th Infantry Keystone Division. The red keystone, official emblem of the State of Pennsylvania, is the official shoulder sleeve insignia of the 28th Division which was originally a Pennsylvania National Guard organization. The Germans called it the 'Bloody Bucket' because of the blood-red keystone insignia and vicious fighting tactics during the Normandy Campaign. It was the 28th Infantry that paraded through the streets of Paris after the city's liberation. The division traces its history back to Benjamin Franklin's "Battalions for Associators" organized in 1747.

In October 1943, Sgt. Kooman was deployed to the European battlefield. He had been in action since D-Day and served with reconnaissance patrols, and in attacks on enemy strongholds. He continued to serve as a rifleman with the infantry in the European Theatre. On September 14, 1944 Sgt. Kooman was wounded when a German sniper shot him in the leg. He recovered quickly from his injuries and three weeks later he was sent back into action. After five months of fighting in France, Belgium, Luxembourg and Germany, the 28th Infantry was deployed along a 25-mile stretch of the Our River, from north-eastern Luxembourg to Wallenstein, Germany.

On December 18, 1944, just three months after being injured, Sgt. Kooman was captured and taken prisoner by enemy German troops in Luxembourg. He was captured during the Battle of the Bulge and was eventually held as a POW in Stalag IV B in Germany. Sgt. Kooman weighed 155 pounds when he enlisted and weighed only 80 pounds when he was liberated by British soldiers. He also fell ill to dysentery, as had all prisoners. However, somehow, Sgt. Kooman found the will to survive. He still carries the prisoner identification tag he was forced to wear. Sgt. Kooman describes his experience as such: "We had 3,007 prisoners in our camp. Everybody slept on the floor in this prison. There were no beds and no toilets. There was nothing to eat—35 men to one loaf of bread. I never took my socks off, yet walked 800 miles in 35 days, the death march. I buried a lot of people, a lot of soldiers. Every day, I buried them."

After a year in captivity, he was eventually liberated by the British Army in 1945. His story of survival in the midst of so much agony is both inspirational and a snapshot of the true brutality of war.

In recognition for his service in the U.S. Army, Sgt. Kooman received several military decorations: the Purple Heart, Bronze Star Medal—1st Oak Leaf Cluster, World War II

Victory Medal, ETO Campaign Medal, and the Bronze Arrowhead—Omaha Beach Assault.

It is an honor for me to recognize Sgt. Raymond J. Kooman, who hails from the Borough of Little Ferry, which I am proud to represent within the 9th Congressional District of New Jersey.

The job of a United States Congressman involves much that is rewarding, yet nothing compares to recognizing and commemorating the life and achievements of individuals such as Sgt. Raymond J. Kooman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you join our colleagues, Sgt. Kooman's family and friends, all those whose lives he has touched, and me, in recognizing the life and service of Sergeant Raymond J. Kooman.

TRIBUTE TO HAROLD AND
SANDRA BINTZ

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Harold and Sandra Bintz of Minden, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary.

Harold and Sandra's lifelong commitment to each other and their family truly embodies Iowa values. I commend this great couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF HONOR
FLIGHT OREGON

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to welcome the 35 World War II veterans visiting Washington, DC this week from our home state of Oregon. Their trip was made possible by Honor Flight of Oregon and their presence in the Capitol today is a humbling one.

We are joined by Navy, Army, Marine, Merchant Marine, Coast Guard and Army Air Force veterans who have faced terrors and dangers with bravery that continues to inspire. In this group are veterans who fought in Iwo Jima; those who fended off and survived the harrowing attack on the USS *Franklin*; documentarians who photographed the war; cryptographers who kept our secrets safe; and mechanics of all branches that kept us marching forward. These are just a few examples of the contributions these heroes made, but each deserves individual recognition:

Kenneth Anderson; John Fellas; RD, Sr Fortner; James Riopelle; Stanley Wheeler; Donald Bean; Marvin Johnson; Leo Schammel; Earl Uptegrove; Clyde Harrop; Roland Halberg; Lawrence Torrey; Donald

Fowler; Patrick O'Brien; Eldon Dyer; Raymond Stahly; Robert Bortvedt; Lawrence Kissinger; Everett Lee; Gerald Midbust; Harold Goff; Raynold Deluca Sr; Murray Watts; Lyle Wescott; George Prusynski; Donald Cresap; William Birkeland; Harold Englet; Kenneth Kerns; Juanita Price; Donald Ford; James Sperling; Robert Zimmerman; Rupert Fixott; and Joe Bruer.

The world as we know it would not be the same were it not for their courage, their bravery, and I hope that this trip bestows upon them a tiny fraction of the respect and gratitude that can never be fully repaid. To our Greatest Generation, I wish them my very best on their visit and thank them for their service.

These events are so important, connecting our veterans with the memorials erected to honor their service and with younger generations to ensure they know this important history. And a trip such as this would not be possible without the help of the volunteers who donate their time, resources and passion to Honor Flight Oregon. They ensure that each visit is met with the heroes welcome these veterans deserve.

OBSERVING SEPTEMBER AS CHILDREN'S
CARDIOMYOPATHY
AWARENESS MONTH

HON. CHELLIE PINGREE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, when my constituent Matthew Nehaus was 9, he suddenly lost weight, became too tired to participate in sports, and was frequently overcome by coughing bouts. Concerned, his parents took him to the doctor, who initially thought the cause was an infection or pneumonia. But an X-ray led to a much scarier diagnosis—cardiomyopathy.

Cardiomyopathy is a degenerative disease of the heart muscle that weakens its ability to efficiently and effectively pump blood around the body. Though more common for adults, it is a leading cause of sudden cardiac arrest and heart transplants in children.

This September is the second annual Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month, an opportunity to educate people about the condition, its signs and risk factors, as well as advocate for policies that help address it.

One of those policies, which I'm proud to support, is H.R. 829, the SAFE PLAY Act. Introduced by Representatives LOIS CAPPS and BILL PASCRELL, the bill would take a number of needed steps to protect the safety of student athletes, including developing emergency response plans at schools, communicating the risks of overexertion in hot weather, and teaching students to conduct CPR and use defibrillators. Another important measure of this bill is identifying students with cardiomyopathy to help them get treatment and reduce their risks.

Luckily, Matthew Nehaus and his family found out about his condition in time to stabilize his health and, after years on the donation list, he received a heart transplant. I'm so grateful that Matthew has the opportunity to

pursue a bright future and dearly hope that other children facing cardiomyopathy get the same chance. Please join me in spreading awareness about this condition and supporting policies that can lead to early detection and better health outcomes for these kids.

TRIBUTE TO DOROTHY BUCH

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Dorothy Buch on the celebration of her 100th birthday. Dorothy celebrated her 100th birthday on August 12, 2015.

Our world has changed a great deal during the course of Dorothy's life. Dorothy grew up on a farm in Mills County, Iowa. She would walk a mile to and from school every day. She was a 1932 graduate of Glenwood High School. Dorothy and her late husband, Carl, worked their farm for 61 years and are the proud parents of three daughters, five grandchildren, 10 great-grandchildren, and 5 great-great-grandchildren. For years, Dorothy was the pianist and organist at the Trinity Lutheran Church where she still attends Sunday services.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to represent Iowans like Dorothy. I urge my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating Dorothy on reaching this incredible milestone and wishing her even more health and happiness in the years to come.

THE JOHN WAYNE IN SCRUBS—DR. JAMES HENRY “RED” DUKE

HON. TED POE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on 25 August 2015, the Great State of Texas lost one of its greatest sons. A world class trauma surgeon, educator and family man, Dr. James “Red” Duke is a legend of the Houston and Texas A&M communities.

I was deeply saddened to hear of the loss of this good man and my friend.

Dr. Duke—or as I liked to call him “the John Wayne in scrubs”—was Texan to the core. His trademark bristly mustache, gold rimmed glasses, lanky Texas swagger and heavy twang were second only to his colorful personality.

I met Dr. Duke in the '80s when he appeared as an expert witness in criminal cases in my courtroom. (I was a felony court judge.)

A few years later we teamed up as doctor and judge to teach high school students lessons about drunk driving.

Working with him to make those kids think twice about their decisions is something I will never forget.

But while Dr. Duke may have been a straight shooter from humble roots, he was

also one of the most celebrated folks in his field. He founded the Life Flight air ambulance service, wrote over forty publications, eighteen textbook chapters and gave almost 600 lectures. He became a household name through his educational TV series Bodywatch and the Texas Health Reports.

A man dedicated to serving others, Dr. Duke completed a two-year tour of duty as a tank officer in the 2nd Armored Division, before returning home from Germany to enter a theological seminary in 1955.

Shortly thereafter he switched from one life-saving vocation to another, qualifying as a physician and taking up a residency at the Parkland Memorial Hospital, where in 1963 he was the first surgeon to receive President Kennedy after he was shot on that fateful day in Dallas.

For the next 50 years, Dr. Duke dedicated himself to treating trauma victims and educating young doctors, while in his spare time, generously giving his time to the Boy Scouts and wildlife conservation efforts.

In 1989 he was considered for the position of Surgeon General of the United States, one year after being named Surgeon of the Year by the James F Mitchell Foundation.

While the United States did not receive the pleasure of Dr. Duke's service in this role, we in Texas were happy to have him stay. We were fortunate to call Red our own.

He was bigger than life.

He was “John Wayne in scrubs.”

And that's just the way it is.

RECOGNIZING DETECTIVE STEVE HAYES OF THE COPPELL POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. KENNY MARCHANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Detective Steve Hayes on receiving the Star of Texas Resolution for his service and dedication to the community.

Detective Hayes has been a hardworking and respected member of the Coppell Police Department in Coppell, Texas, for several decades in different capacities. One routine traffic stop on March 31, 1995, changed his life forever. During the stop, a different vehicle struck his patrol car and left him with severe injuries to both his legs. Yet this didn't stop him from returning to work and continuing to make a positive impact on the community in any capacity he could.

After Steve lost his right leg to amputation, endured multiple surgeries, and many months rehabbing and caring to his injuries, he came back to the police department as a training officer and dispatcher and has since been promoted. Today Steve works as a crime scene investigator and property crimes detective. His story is an inspiration and a strong message to all.

Steve also volunteers and has become a board member of the Peace Officers Angels foundation. He regularly calls, travels, and meets with injured officers across the state as part of their program. He has been an integral

part of the foundation and provides emotional support to other members of law enforcement injured on the job. It's admirable and inspirational that he uses his unfortunate accident as a positive influence to aid fellow members of law enforcement with their struggles from being injured in the line of duty.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to recognize the hard work and support Steve contributes as well as being awarded the Star of Texas Resolution. I ask all of my distinguished colleagues to join me in recognizing Detective Steve Hayes of the Coppell Police Department.

TRIBUTE TO THE FARMERS TELEPHONE COMPANY

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Farmers Telephone Company of Essex, Iowa. This year marks the 60th year of operation for the telecommunications company, which opened its doors in 1955.

The Farmers Telephone Company was formed by a group of area farmers. The company has grown a great deal over the past 60 years, but they have kept their roots and remained at 615 Iowa Avenue in Essex since it first opened. While their location hasn't changed, the way they operate their business has. The biggest change is the growth of internet service and the effects it has had on businesses and residents alike. General Manager Tim Hill attributes the longevity of the Farmers Telephone Company to its core base of local customers and its constant willingness to evolve to keep up with the times.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate the Farmers Telephone Company and its staff for providing cutting-edge telecommunication services to the Essex community and southwest Iowa for the past 60 years. I urge my colleagues in the United States Congress to join me in congratulating Farmers Telephone Company for their numerous achievements in the communications industry. I wish them and all of their employees nothing but the best moving forward.

HONORING THE LIFE OF JOHN LESCOE

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and remember the life of John Lescoe, Jr. of Willimantic, Connecticut who passed away on September 14, 2015. John was a lifelong resident of Willimantic, where he lived with his wife Pauline “Bunny” Lescoe. He served as a State Representative for the 49th District in the Connecticut General Assembly for 12 years and First Selectman for the Town of Windham for two and a half years.

John graduated from Windham High School in 1956. Following his two year service in the Marine Corps, John worked at Pratt & Whitney for eight years as a machinist. John then entered another phase of his life by enrolling in Eastern Connecticut State University in 1966, and graduated with a degree in Physical Education.

John put his new degree to work by teaching physical education, social studies, and language arts for 30 years at Horace Porter Elementary School in Columbia, CT. In 1986, John won election to serve as State Representative of the 49th District in the Connecticut General Assembly. After representing the 49th District in Hartford from 1987 to 1999, John shifted to serve two and a half years as First Selectman for the Town of Windham. John also served the town as Alderman, Selectman, and was the last mayor of Willimantic and the first mayor of Windham. Among John's signature accomplishments, were helping to secure funding for the town to install lights and a playground at Recreation Park, the Textile Museum, and the iconic "Frog Bridge" downtown.

Beyond his 32 years of service as a public servant, John's reputation for civic engagement was legendary. He was passionate about recreation, and not only played on a softball team himself for over 50 years, but also ran the Elk's "Hoop Shoot" and the Knights of Columbus Free Throw contest for over 40 years, was a member of the Town Recreation Commission, and was involved with Little Pal basketball, Little League baseball, WYO and the intermediate junior high basketball travel team.

No sporting event did John care about more than his children's athletic events—he even created a shortcut on his computer to track his daughter's statistics for the Springfield College basketball and rugby teams. John's hard work to promote civic engagement and youth recreation was recognized when he was honored as the P.O.B.E. Elks Club Elk of the Year in 2003–2004, as president of the Polish Club, and an honorary member of the Franco-American Citizens Club.

The Windham community will miss John deeply. I ask my colleagues to join me in offering our condolences to his wife, Pauline, and his family as they mourn the passing of a good man.

**HONORING CLAIRE'S CORNER
COPIA ON THE OCCASION OF ITS
40TH ANNIVERSARY**

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, nestled on the corner of Chapel and College Streets in Downtown New Haven is Claire's Corner Copia, a gourmet vegetarian restaurant that is among one of the most popular and beloved restaurants in the City. Founded by Claire and the late Frank Criscuolo, this community treasure is celebrating its 40th Anniversary and I am proud to rise today to join the community in extending my heartfelt congratulations on this remarkable milestone.

A registered nurse by training, Claire decided she really wanted to find a way to work with her husband, Frank. Disappointed with some of the fare she was getting from local restaurants at the time, she and Frank opened Claire's Corner Copia in 1975. Claire was determined to bring the essence of her home-cooked meals to her restaurant and to create what she calls her "own utopia."

Claire's is, in a word, eclectic. Its two walls of windows allow customers to enjoy the bustling crowds on Chapel and Church Streets, the tables and chairs do not match, and the menu is a series of blackboards with your choices written in colorful chalk. You wait in line to place your order, give your name to have it brought to you, you get your own cutlery, and bus your own table. Claire liked the idea of her customers "participating" in their dining experience. Over the course of its 40-year history, Claire's Corner Copia has built a loyal following not only locally but for travelers as well. A Seattle resident who travels to New Haven on business recently told the local paper, "It's the only restaurant I go to every time I come to New Haven. Everything is fresh and there is a wide assortment of characters." That is Claire's Corner Copia.

What makes Claire's Corner Copia so special—aside from the all-vegetarian menu, the use of fresh ingredients, and its famous baked goods—is the atmosphere that Claire has created. Nearly everything on the menu is made in-house, you can always find Claire buzzing around the restaurant, and her employees, many who have been with her for more than a decade love their work. Instead of relying on tips, her staff is paid a fair wage, provided health benefits, and paid time off. Claire and her staff dedicate themselves to providing their customers with a unique experience. That is the secret of the success of Claire's Corner Copia.

I want to extend a special note of congratulations to Claire Criscuolo. The restaurant business is not easy and her determination, vision, creativity, and entrepreneurial skill have made Claire's Corner Copia an iconic local landmark. Claire is also a dedicated member of our community, supporting a variety of organizations including New Haven Reads, St. Francis and St. Rose of Lima Schools, and Smilow Cancer Hospital. I cannot remember a time when I did not know her and I consider myself fortunate to call her my friend. I am honored to rise today to extend my very best wishes to her and her staff on this very special occasion. Happy 40th Anniversary.

**TRIBUTE TO RONNIE AND SHARON
FOSTER**

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Ronnie and Sharon Foster of Clarinda, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. Ronnie and Sharon were married on August 8, 1955 at the New Market Methodist Church of New Market, Iowa.

Ronnie and Sharon's lifelong commitment to each other and their children, Beth, the late Dan, Don, the late Dusty, and Leesa, their grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, truly embodies Iowa values. I commend this devoted couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion. I wish them and their family all the best moving forward.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. PETER WELCH

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that I inadvertently voted "Yes" on Roll Call 503. I intended to vote "No."

**OUR UNCONSCIONABLE NATIONAL
DEBT**

HON. MIKE COFFMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 2009, the day President Obama took office, the national debt was \$10,626,877,048,913.08.

Today, it is \$18,151,038,086,972.10. We've added \$7,524,161,038,059.02 to our debt in 6 years. This is over \$7.5 trillion in debt our nation, our economy, and our children could have avoided with a balanced budget amendment.

**TRIBUTE TO RICHARD AND
CAROLYN MILLER**

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Richard and Carolyn Miller of Neola, Iowa, on the very special occasion of their 50th wedding anniversary. They were married on August 28, 1965 at the Grace Evangelical United Brethren Church in Story City.

Richard and Carolyn's lifelong commitment to each other and their children, Tami and Jeff, as well as their grandchildren, truly embodies Iowa's values. I commend this great couple on their 50th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE GRAND
OPENING OF THE NEW SCHOOL
OF NURSING AT THE UNIVER-
SITY OF MICHIGAN

HON. DEBBIE DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the grand opening of the new academic building at the University of Michigan School of Nursing.

The University of Michigan School of Nursing is a premier institution that is committed to teaching and training the next generation of nurses. Consistently recognized as one of the best nursing schools in the country, they have trained many individuals who have gone on to excel in the field of nursing and give back to their communities. In fact, just this year they were recognized for having six subspecialties ranked in the Top 10 of the U.S. News and World Report's annual rankings. This includes the Nursing Administration program, which is ranked second, and the Family Nurse Practitioner and the Gerontology Primary Care program, which were both ranked third. This strong praise affirms the University's commitment to training the "leaders and the best."

Our nation needs more well-trained nurses who are committed to giving back to their community. It is great to have a national leader in the field in Ann Arbor, Michigan. This new academic building will further enhance their ability to train the next generation of nurses who will be on the front lines of providing much needed care to those who need it most. It is especially exciting that the modern tools within this facility will teach students to work in contemporary and collaborative environments, which will help them prepare to excel at their jobs. Through this 75,000 square-foot new structure, new nurses will continue to expand upon the University of Michigan's reputation of excellence and high achievement.

My friend, Dr. Kathleen Potempa, the Dean of the School of Nursing, deserves our praise for her leadership in spearheading the opening of this new facility and for her dedication to teaching. It is my hope that this grand opening will be the start of a new and continued era of excellence at the University of Michigan School of Nursing. I ask all of my colleagues to join me in honoring the opening of the new School of Nursing Academic Building at the University of Michigan. I wish each and every new student the best of luck and much success in their future endeavors.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
RICHARD DUDA

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor and remember the life of Richard Duda of Griswold, Connecticut who passed

away late last week. Dick was a fixture in Griswold, where he lived all his life with his wife Barbara and their two children. He was the quintessential "citizen" who believed giving back to the community was his duty. He served five terms in the Connecticut State Legislature representing the 58th district and as the Town Attorney for Griswold for many years.

Dick was a lifelong Democrat, and served as the Chairman of the Griswold Democratic Town Committee for over 30 years. Outside of government, he was a board member at the local library, a member of St. Mary's Church, and a member of the board of directors for Jewett City Savings Bank. His involvement in local government and advocacy was extensive, and his capacity to help was boundless. Dick saw his local law practice as a way to give back to the Griswold community. He embodied the ideal of the profession, serving as a resource and advocate for his neighbors—often taking cases that others would have passed over or accepting rates far lower than average for the time. His goal was to serve as a resource and as a true community lawyer. The law was his calling, and his passion.

In politics and law, fields that can turn acrimonious, Dick was a true gentleman. He stayed above any bitterness, and his friends recall how he remained polite and deferential. His amiable manner, dedication to his community, and upbeat attitude will be sorely missed in Griswold. I ask my colleagues to please join me in offering our condolences to his wife Barbara, his son Christopher, and grandchildren Cameron, Caitlyn and Gavin.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE WEIL

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Charlie Weil of Afton, Iowa, for his retirement from Wellman Dynamics in Creston after 50 years of service.

On August 25th, 2015, Mr. Weil marked 50 years working as a molder for Wellman's, which manufactures aluminum and magnesium sand castings for aerospace applications. He also spent a year serving our country in Vietnam and when he completed his service, he demonstrated great commitment to Wellman's, immediately returning to work there.

Mr. Speaker, Charlie's hard work and dedication to his craft embodies the Iowa spirit and I am honored to represent him in the United States Congress. I know that all of my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating him on his achievement, and I wish him nothing but continued success and happiness in his retirement.

PERPETUAL POW/MIA STAMP ACT
OF 2015

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our nation's POWs and MIA service members.

Today is National Prisoner of War, Missing in Action Day. As Vice-Chairman of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs I am constantly in awe of the sacrifices and efforts that have been made on behalf of our great country by the men and women who have worn the uniform of our Armed Services.

Tragically, according to the Department of Defense, more than 83,000 service members remain missing since World War II. These individuals represent a unique segment of the men and women who serve or have served in the Armed Forces—men and women who are missing or captured, unable to come home.

I am proud to introduce H.R. 3558, legislation to create a forever stamp depicting the National League of Families POW/MIA flag.

This bill will help demonstrate our nation's gratitude to this special segment of heroes, both past and present. I am forever grateful for their service.

H.R. 3504 AND H.R. 3134

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, today I voted against H.R. 3504, which would limit women's health care choices and interfere in the doctor-patient relationship, and against H.R. 3134, which would defund Planned Parenthood.

It is bizarre to watch the manufactured controversy surrounding ambush-type, heavily-edited journalism used to discredit Planned Parenthood.

It's not just the blatantly manipulative and misleading tactics that are being used, which should be enough for most people to reject the allegations on their face. These attacks do not reflect my experience and knowledge of the amazing, dedicated, civic-minded men and women who have built, supported, and led Planned Parenthood in my community.

For decades, I have admired these pillars of community, leaders in education, religion, business, and other civic affairs that provided the vision, the volunteer effort, and personal contributions to women's health and reproductive freedom. There is no question that because of their efforts, tens of thousands of abortions never occurred in our community and those that did occur, did not result in harm to women.

Because of their efforts, Oregon's 11 Planned Parenthood centers provided care to over 70,000 women in 2013, including over 25,000 breast and cervical cancer screenings. Nationally, Planned Parenthood cares for more than 2.5 million women annually.

Planned Parenthood centers serve a greater share of safety-net clients than any other type of safety-net providers. Nearly 80 percent of women using Planned Parenthood have incomes at or below 150 percent of poverty—these clinics offer affordable health care options for women who may have no alternate source of care.

The fact that we are engaged in a concerted assault against the provision of essential services to women, especially women of color and low-income status is appalling. If people would take the time, as I have, to visit these facilities, meet the employees, and most importantly, know these community leaders that have made it possible to protect women's health, to prevent countless abortions, and to promote wellbeing and education, would see the lies behind this heated rhetoric and misguided attacks.

TRIBUTE TO THE CLARINDA COMMUNITY THEATRE

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate the Clarinda Community Theatre of Clarinda, Iowa for celebrating their 60th anniversary. The Community Theatre was founded in 1955 by a group of theatre enthusiasts.

The mission of the Clarinda Community Theatre is to encourage and promote an interest in participating, observing, and supporting amateur theatre in the community of Clarinda. Clarinda resident Jolly Ann Davidson has played an important role in the success of the community theater. She felt it was important for Clarinda to have some form of live stage performances in town and has been the driving force in bringing numerous productions to Clarinda for the community to enjoy. Jolly Ann has performed in many of the plays and has seen the theatre grow into a top-notch performing arts facility.

Mr. Speaker, I commend and congratulate the Clarinda Community Theatre for reaching this 60-year milestone. I am proud to represent all those who have been involved in creating this outstanding theater. I urge my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in congratulating them on a job well done and wishing them nothing but continued success.

HONORING THE ACCOMPLISH- MENTS OF MR. CHARLES DORCH

HON. EMANUEL CLEAVER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mr. Charles Dorch, a remarkable leader whose passion for music and teaching has touched so many young people in Kansas City. Mr. Dorch attended Arkansas AM&N University in Pine Bluff on a music scholarship,

and then turned down a job in Detroit to teach in Kansas City at Southeast High School after his wife was hired at Paseo High School. As we celebrate the distinguished and acclaimed history of Southeast High School in Missouri's Fifth District, it is necessary that Mr. Dorch be celebrated as well. His dedication to his students as the band director reached far beyond expectations.

Starting at Southeast Junior High in 1970 and continuing to Southeast High School in 1973, Mr. Dorch was a gift to the music department of the Kansas City School District for over fifteen years. He was determined to revitalize the band program at the high school, by encouraging students to enjoy playing music in and outside of the classroom. While he was band director, the high school participated in numerous publicized appearances, including varsity football games, pre-games, and half-time shows; annual American Royal parades; the once Kansas City Kings basketball games; and even a bicentennial half-time performance at the Kansas City Chiefs football game. The regard of the band program, under his leadership, is clear when looking at this list of striking performances.

In addition, Mr. Dorch led students through the jazz lab, stage band, and symphonic concert band. All of these opportunities were ways in which students could be involved in activities outside of the classroom. Prospects for students to perform at such occasions as the Goombay Festival on a Bahamas cruise, the nationally televised Republican National Convention at the Charlie Parker Center, or move on to compete in district or all-state bands, were all ways in which students were enthused to further appreciate music and continue their education.

Mr. Dorch urged students to pursue music beyond high school. He knew the importance of a college education, and many students continued on to schools such as Bishop College, Florida A&M, Langston University, and Prairie View A&M University, which I proudly call my alma mater. His effort to help his students' musical interests did not stop with his students either. Mr. Dorch also created the Band Parents Association in order to get the students' parents involved, as well as help with fundraising, which provided such amenities as new uniforms.

His instruction through music also brought him to direct the St. James United Methodist Church choir for nine years. His musical aptitude shined in his ability to not only prime and motivate the choir during worship, but also expand their reach by adding instruments and genres of music to their ensemble.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and our fellow colleagues in conveying our gratitude to a teacher, a man of worship, and a man of music. Mr. Charles Dorch has spread his passion for music and has inspired thousands of his students, young and old alike. He has provided them with opportunities to show off their full musical talent and adoration, where they may have not been able to before or under different guidance. We join the alumni and leadership of Southeast High School in honoring the accomplishments of Mr. Charles Dorch for his tireless enrichment of our community and country.

RECOGNIZING MICHAEL R. FREY ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RE- TIREMENT AS SULLY DISTRICT SUPERVISOR

HON. GERALD E. CONNOLLY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize and commend my former colleague Michael R. Frey on the occasion of his retirement after a distinguished 38-year career in public service, culminating in his six terms representing the residents of the Sully District on the Fairfax County, Va., Board of Supervisors.

Michael has represented the Sully District in western Fairfax since it was created following the 1990 census. Prior to seeking elected office, he served 14 years as a staff member to former Springfield District Supervisor and Chairman Jack Herrity and former Springfield District Supervisor Elaine McConnell. The Sully District was carved largely out of the Springfield District, so Michael was intimately familiar with the community. I had the great pleasure of serving with him during my 14 years on the Board, first representing the Providence District and then as Chairman.

Fairfax County is the largest local jurisdiction in the Commonwealth of Virginia and the National Capital Region, and Michael had a front-row seat for much of that growth, particularly in the western part of the county, where the once sleepy rural community has become the largest magisterial district in the County. As a testament to his skill in working with those growing communities and managing the growth in Sully, Michael has chaired the Board's Development Process Committee since 1992.

In a career spanning four decades, Michael's accomplishments are many, but let me cite just a few to convey the magnitude of the imprint he will leave on the community and our county. Michael and I both share a passion for history, and the Sully District is a historically-rich community. It is home to several landmarks, including the Centreville Historic District and Park, which Michael helped to initiate and expand. The park contains remnants of one of the first fortifications constructed by the Confederate Army during the Civil War and was actually occupied by both sides during the conflict. He was instrumental in preserving historic Mount Gilead and the Sears House as well.

Michael was active in the effort to launch Centreville Days, an annual community festival that attracts families from throughout the region. He championed the expansion of public facilities into western Fairfax, from new schools and libraries to parks and recreation centers to meet the explosive growth and demand from new residents. Of course, he was intimately involved in the project to construct the Sully District Police Station, in which his office is now located. I know I and the community will never forget the leadership and compassion Michael displayed following the May 8, 2006, tragic shooting outside the station in which two officers were killed.

For those who don't know him, Michael has been a lifelong sports fan. He has coached

youth baseball and basketball for multiple community sports leagues, and we worked together during my tenure on the board to convert playing fields to synthetic turf in Fairfax to expand such opportunities for our youth. Michael was active in the bid to lure a Major League Baseball team to Northern Virginia. He served on, and at one time chaired, the Virginia Baseball Stadium Authority. As we all know, the team ultimately relocated into Washington, D.C., but the efforts of Michael and the Authority were instrumental in baseball's return to the National Capital Region.

Of course, I cannot mention Michael without bringing up his steady canine companions. Since I've known him, Michael has owned a series of German shepherd rescue dogs—first Mosby, then Marley, and now Boomer—that have been a fixture by his side at community events and in his office. They made frequent appearances at Board meetings and retreats. Our love of animals is another shared bond, and I was pleased to work with Michael on various efforts to support the Fairfax County Animal Shelter and the construction of its new headquarters.

During his tenure on the Board of Supervisors, Michael has represented Fairfax on a number of regional organizations, including the Metropolitan Washington Council of Government's Transportation Planning Board and the Environmental Quality Advisory Committee. He has served on the Inova Health Care Services Board. In addition, Michael has represented Fairfax as part of regional or statewide delegations traveling overseas.

In fact, I had the pleasure of traveling with Michael to Israel as part of a trip hosted by the Jewish Community Relations Council, in

which we visited the Dead Sea. Wanting to have the full experience, we thought we'd partake in a mud bath, which we were assured held healing powers. Well, there's a very unfortunate picture of the two of us that will never see the light of day under a "mutual self-destruction pact" we've made and continue to honor, and I will remind Michael that our agreement endures past his life in elected office.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Frey's commitment to our community and the mission of local government is unparalleled. He leaves behind a legacy that will enrich our community for generations to come. His career in public service is truly commendable and deserving of our heartfelt gratitude. When I was Chairman of the Board of Supervisors, Michael often heard me joke at retirement announcements that we should not allow retirement for such talented and dedicated public servants. I know the residents of the Sully District certainly wish that was the case here. I join the community in wishing Michael the best of luck in his retirement, and Task my colleagues in the House to join me in expressing our appreciation for his commitment and service to not just the Sully District but all of Fairfax County.

TRIBUTE TO CHARLIE AND
RUTH DIX

HON. DAVID YOUNG

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mr. YOUNG of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and congratulate Charlie

and Ruth Dix of Council Bluffs, on the very special occasion of their 60th wedding anniversary. Charlie and Ruth were married in 1955.

Charlie and Ruth's lifelong commitment to each other and their children, Cheryl, Eric, Mark, Andy and Paula, their grandchildren, and great-grandchildren truly embodies Iowa values. I salute this devoted couple on their 60th year together and I wish them many more. I know my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives will join me in congratulating them on this momentous occasion. I wish them and their family all the best moving forward.

REGARDING THE ABSENCE OF
REPRESENTATIVE WAGNER

HON. ANN WAGNER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 18, 2015

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, September 14, my family and I said goodbye to a remarkable woman, my mother, Ruth Ann Trousdale. A devoted wife to our father, Earl, for 51 years until his death in 2012, she was a strong woman with an even stronger faith. As we mourn her passing, we also find comfort in knowing she is in the arms of our Lord and reunited with her beloved Earl, whom she missed so much. She was an inspiration to us all, and we will hold her memory in our hearts until we are reunited in heaven.

SENATE—Monday, September 21, 2015

The Senate met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Sovereign God, teach us to live in and for Your peace. As our Senators permit Your peace to govern their hearts, may they make decisions that honor You. Remind them that true spirituality is more than believing the right things or performing good deeds. Help them to see that true religion consists of having a relationship with You characterized by righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit.

Lord, help us this day to receive from You the gift of Your love, permitting You to fill our lives with joy. Inspired by Your Spirit, help us to refrain from evil and to have a deep longing to do Your will on Earth even as it is done in Heaven.

We pray in Your mighty Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The Democratic leader is recognized.

ANTI-MUSLIM RHETORIC AND GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. REID. Mr. President, at this great cemetery we call Arlington, there is a white headstone, which, like so many others, marks the final resting place of a courageous servicemember who gave his life in combat. The grave belongs to a man by the name of Kareem Khan. He was from New Jersey. He was only 20 years old. He was a Muslim.

Kareem's rank was that of a specialist in the Stryker Brigade of the U.S. Army's 2nd Infantry Division. By all accounts, this young man was a terrific soldier. He had a Purple Heart and was awarded the Bronze Star and a medal for good conduct. Remember, he was barely 20 years of age. His career in the Army would have been much

more significant, but he gave the ultimate, his life.

Here is what happened. This tragedy struck on August 6, 2007, as Kareem and three other soldiers were checking abandoned Iraqi houses for explosives. In one house they went into, there was a hidden bomb that exploded that killed all four of them. Like thousands of other soldiers in Iraq and Afghanistan, Kareem sacrificed everything for his country. He gave, as President Abraham Lincoln said, "the last full measure of devotion" for the United States.

But yesterday I watched on "Meet the Press" as a Republican candidate for President of the United States denigrated Kareem Khan and all Muslim Americans. Ben Carson questioned Muslim Americans' devotion to the United States. He questioned their integrity, and then Ben Carson unilaterally disqualified every Muslim in America from becoming the President of the United States.

Shame on Dr. Carson. Shame on any person that spews such hateful rhetoric. In America today, there are more than 3 million Muslims. They are part of the fabric of America. They teach in our schools, and they fight for our military. They serve in Congress. Congressmen KEITH ELLISON of Minnesota and ANDRÉ CARSON of Indiana, both Muslim, represent their districts in States with distinction.

I was proud to have both of these young men come and campaign for me throughout Nevada. Sadly, though, Dr. Carson's remarks are just another example of Republican candidates refusing to speak for 3 million Muslim Americans. We saw it last week with Donald Trump, as he refused to denounce bigotry at his own campaign rally. If these Republican candidates are incapable of going to bat for America's Muslim community, then they should not be running for President of the United States. I call upon every Republican to denounce Dr. Carson's disgusting remarks. That shameful intolerance and bigotry have no place in America today. Sadly, it seems to have a lasting place in the Republican Party.

Republicans should open their eyes and take note of the contributions of our country's Muslim community. Until they do that, none of them will be worthy of leading this Nation.

In a little more than a week, our government runs out of money. We have precious little time. The Senate will be in session for 3, possibly 4 days this week and another 3 days next week. The House of Representatives is not in

session today, tomorrow or Wednesday. Yet it seems that the Republicans are simply ignoring or are in complete denial of any fiscal crisis that is coming at year's end.

Instead of coming to grips with the reality of the situation and working with Democrats to avoid a government shutdown, the Republicans seem more interested in political theater. Keeping with this show-vote craze, the Republican leader and the Speaker—the Republican leader over here and the Speaker on the other side of the Capitol—are doing things that are really hard to comprehend.

For example, over here there is going to be a forced vote tomorrow morning on cloture on a motion to proceed to a 20-week abortion ban. The 20-week bill is just a way for Senator MCCONNELL to pander to extremists in his party who are once again holding government hostage so they can attack the health of women. This legislation is going nowhere. The Republican leader knows this. Every Senator here knows this. The bill is just another box to check for the Republican leader and his Senators. It is pretense to prove their extreme conservative credentials. It is all about political gamesmanship.

It comes at the expense of America's women's health. Think about all the ways the Republicans have attacked women in this Congress. Republicans have manipulated a bill to help victims of human trafficking and turned it instead into a political football by attaching ideological abortion riders.

Again, Republicans tried and are continuing to try to cut off funds for a critical safety net provider for women—Planned Parenthood. It is not the first time they have done it. Now they are wasting time as the government runs out of money in just a few days, wasting it on the 20-week abortion ban. Frankly, the American people are tired of Republican's obsession with attacking the health of women. They are tired of the never-ending wasteful votes orchestrated by the Republican leader instead of meaningful legislation.

But more than anything, Americans are watching congressional Republicans' failure to govern. We are fast approaching the year since Republicans assumed control of both Houses of Congress. What do they have to show for it? Nothing. The few things that have passed were things that would have passed easily last Congress, except they were filibustered by the Republicans.

If this 20-week abortion ban bill is any indication, nothing is all we can

expect from the Republican leader and his party for the remaining 15 months of this Congress.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise today to address the topic of criminal justice reform. There has been a lot of discussion in Congress recently on this subject. Nearly all of the conversation has focused on sentencing. Various proposals have been introduced to cut prison sentences, augment judges' ability to sentence below statutory minimums or allow prisoners to earn early release for good behavior.

A number of my colleagues on the Senate Judiciary Committee have been meeting behind closed doors for months to try to reach a compromise—a compromise that incorporates elements of these various proposals. I rise today to address the broader parameters of criminal justice reform and to remind my colleagues that sentencing reform is only one piece of the broader effort that has been underway for some time now in both houses of Congress.

There are a number of other aspects of criminal justice reform that merit our attention, foremost of which is the need to ensure meaningful criminal intent requirements in our statutes and regulations. Over the past several years, a unique coalition of Members and stakeholder groups from across the ideological spectrum have been working together to address the problem of overcriminalization.

There is broad, bipartisan agreement in many quarters that Congress has criminalized too much conduct and mandated overly harsh penalties for too many crimes. Congress's persistent recourse to criminal law as the answer to today's society ills has cost taxpayers millions of dollars and branded as criminal conduct that may be unwitting or not even blameworthy. It

has also resulted in thousands of Americans losing their livelihoods or liberty for reasons that, upon closer examination, seem not entirely justified.

The overcriminalization problem manifests itself in a variety of ways. First is through the sheer number of Federal crimes. There are now nearly 5,000 criminal statutes scattered in the U.S. Code. But statutes are only part of the story. In addition, there are an estimated 300,000 criminal regulatory offenses buried in the 80,000-page Code of Federal Regulations—300,000. If the administration promulgated one criminal regulation per day—that is, if it created one new crime each day—it would take 822 years to create that many criminal regulations.

The entire Code of Hammurabi was only 282 laws. Our current Federal criminal code—statutes and regulations together—is over 1,000 times that size. I am not saying Hammurabi should be our model in many things, but surely 300,000-plus Federal crimes is overkill. If Hammurabi could govern ancient Mesopotamia with fewer than 300 laws, surely we can make do with less than 300,000.

It is not just the sheer number of crimes. Overcriminalization also manifests itself through the creation of arcane, obscure, and, frankly, ridiculous crimes. For example, under Federal law it is a crime punishable by up to 6 months in prison to use the 4-H Club logo without authorization.

It is also a Federal crime, again punishable for up to 6 months in prison, to walk a dog in a Federal park area on a leash that is longer than 6 feet. Why on Earth do either of these actions need to be Federal crimes? I do not dispute that really long dog leashes can be annoying. I can understand why the 4-H Club would not want pretenders roaming around claiming to serve the heads, hearts, hands, and health of youth. But these are not the proper subjects for criminal penalties. Whatever crises exist with overlong dog leashes or imposter 4-H clubs can be dealt with through civil means.

The problem with such obscure and esoteric crimes—aside from the sheer embarrassment they should cause to Congress and the promulgating agency—is that they criminalize conduct that no reasonable person would know was illegal. Walking a dog on a 7-foot leash is not inherently wrongful, nor is putting a 4-H Club logo on a sign. Even if common sense might suggest checking with the 4-H Club before using its logo, no sane person would think it is a crime to do so.

The upshot is there are who-knows-how-many crimes on the books that the average person has no idea about and that criminalize conduct no reasonable person would think is wrong. According to a recent book, the average American unwittingly commits three felonies per day. That should

deeply trouble all of us—and not because it suggests anything wrong with the average American.

We are a nation of laws. We are supposed to be guided by the rule of law. Our criminal law—indeed, the very idea that it is proper to brand some conduct, and some people, as criminal—is predicated on the notion that individuals know the law and are able to choose whether to follow it. If, as I have suggested—and as many scholars agree—we live in a country where much otherwise benign conduct has been labeled criminal and where decent, honorable citizens can become criminals through no fault or intent of their own, then we have a problem on our hands. Our criminal laws should be aimed at protecting our communities and keeping bad influences off our streets, not tripping up honest citizens.

The third way the problem of overcriminalization manifests itself is through the vague, duplicative, and even conflicting terms of many of our criminal laws. Put simply, many of our criminal laws are bad laws. They are poorly written, they sweep too broadly, and they give too much power to overzealous prosecutors.

Consider the case of John Yates, who was convicted of violating the so-called anti-shredding provision of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act. This extraordinarily broad law, which Congress passed in the wake of the Enron scandal, prohibits the destruction of any “tangible object” with intent to impede, obstruct or influence a Federal investigation.

Yates was not an Enron executive or any sort of corporate executive, he was a fisherman. His crime? Discarding a small number of undersized fish from his boat after a State inspector found him carrying fish slightly below the minimum legal size. Yates appealed his conviction all the way to the Supreme Court on the ground that the statute did not apply to his conduct. By a 5-to-4 vote the Court agreed.

In a remarkable move, the dissenting Justices, who had voted to sustain Yates's conviction, heaped scorn on the anti-shredding statute. They called it a “bad law—too broad and undifferentiated, with too-high maximum penalties.” Its vague terms and overly harsh penalties were “unfortunately not an outlier, [but rather] an emblem of a deeper pathology in the Federal criminal code.”

These words should be a wake-up call. For too long Congress has criminalized too much conduct and enacted overbroad statutes that sweep far beyond the evils they are designed to avoid. Surely, of all the categories of law we pass in Congress, we should take most care with criminal laws. Criminal laws empower the State to deprive citizens of liberty and precious, financial resources. They carry serious collateral consequences, including the loss of the right to vote, the right to

own a firearm, the ability to hold certain jobs, and they permit the State to brand citizens with that most repugnant of all titles—criminal. There is simply no excuse for sloppily drafted, slapdash criminal laws. Too much is at stake.

Related to the problem of poor draftmanship is the fourth way the overcriminalization problem manifests itself, through the absence of meaningful mens rea requirements. The need for strong mens rea protections, I believe, is of particular concern and will be the rest of the focus of my remarks.

“Mens rea” is Latin for guilty mind. The term expresses a time-honored, fundamental feature of our criminal law that in order for an act to be a crime, the actor must have committed the act with malicious intent. The requirement of a guilty mind protects individuals who unwittingly commit wrongful acts or who act without knowledge that what they are doing is wrong.

The person who mistakenly retrieves the wrong coat from the coatroom does not become a thief merely because he took something that wasn’t his. Only if he takes a coat knowing that it belongs to someone else has he committed a criminal act, for only then has he acted with criminal intent. Similarly, a person enters land that he believes is public property but that in fact belongs to another person does not thereby commit criminal trespassing. Only if the person knows she is not legally entitled to enter the property is she guilty of a criminal offense.

In an era when our statute books and regulations overflow with criminal offenses, mens rea protections are even more important. Many modern criminal offenses, such as the dog-walking offense I mentioned earlier, involve conduct that is not inherently wrongful. Only a person who knows the details of such offenses—and knows they exist—would know that conduct in violation of the offenses is criminal.

This is different from traditional crimes such as assault or theft, which even a child knows is wrong. With 300,000-plus Federal crimes on the books, you can be sure the vast majority are not traditional crimes that everyone knows are wrong but rather obscure provisions known only to a select few in the bowels of the Federal bureaucracy. It doesn’t take 300,000 individual crimes to cover the categories of conduct everyone knows is wrong.

Without adequate mens rea protections—that is, without the requirement that a person knows his conduct was wrong or unlawful—everyday citizens can be held criminally liable for conduct that no reasonable person would know was wrong. This is not only unfair, it is immoral. No government that purports to safeguard the liberty and rights of its people should have the power to lock up individuals for con-

duct they did not know was wrong. Only when a person has acted with a guilty mind is it just, is it ethical to brand that person a criminal and deprive him of liberty.

Unfortunately, many of our current criminal laws and regulations contain inadequate mens rea requirements or even no mens rea requirement at all. Far too often, such laws leave people vulnerable to prosecution for conduct they thought was lawful. Consider two examples.

The first is Wade Martin, an Alaskan fisherman who sold 10 sea otters to a buyer he thought was a Native Alaskan but who turned out not to be. Authorities charged Wade with violating the Marine Mammal Protection Act, which criminalizes the sale of sea otters to non-Native Alaskans. The fact that he thought the buyer was a Native Alaskan was irrelevant. Prosecutors had to prove only that the buyer was not, in fact, a Native Alaskan. The absence of the criminal intent requirement meant Wade could be convicted regardless of whether he knew what he was doing was wrong. Wade pleaded guilty to a felony charge and was ordered to pay a \$1,000 fine.

Second is Lawrence Lewis, a janitor at a retirement home who was charged with criminally violating the Clean Water Act when he diverted backed-up sewage at the retirement home to a storm drain. Lawrence thought the storm drain was connected to the city’s sewage system, but it turned out it emptied into a creek that ultimately connected to the Potomac River, a protected waterway. The Clean Water Act required proof only that Lawrence diverted the sewage into the storm drain. It required no proof that he knew the drain connected to a creek that emptied into the Potomac or that he knew he was violating the law. Lawrence pleaded guilty and was sentenced to probation.

These and other examples demonstrate the danger of missing or incomplete mens rea requirements. Even before we get to the point of sentencing, the fact that people can be swept up in the criminal justice system and convicted for doing things they thought were lawful is deeply troubling. Any sentence they receive for their purported crimes is unfair because they should not even have been charged criminally in the first place—or at the very least the government should have to prove criminal intent in order to convict.

This is why it is important for my colleagues to keep in mind the full scope of our overcriminalization problem. Sentencing is only one part of the criminal justice process—an important part to be sure but only one part in a very long process.

That process begins in Washington, where we in Congress decide what conduct to criminalize and what the gov-

ernment must prove in order to convict. Among the most important choices we make when crafting a criminal law is deciding what level of criminal intent the government must prove. Must the person know he or she was acting unlawfully? Is it enough that the person intended the wrongful act or is it enough merely that he or she knew their actions would produce a certain result? The answers to these questions determine whether the person even committed a crime in the first place, separate and apart from what the felony should be if he is convicted.

As one expert has written, “While sentencing reform addresses how long people should serve once convicted, mens rea reform addresses those who never should have been convicted in the first place: people who engaged in conduct without any knowledge of or intent to violate the law and [conduct] that they could not reasonably have anticipated would violate a criminal law.” Surely we can all agree that a person should not be branded a criminal and locked up for doing something they did not know was wrong.

Unsurprisingly then, from the inception of the anti-overcriminalization movement, ensuring that criminal laws have adequate mens rea protections has been a bipartisan priority. During the hearings of the House Overcriminalization Task Force, Chairman SENSENBRENNER declared that “[t]he lack of an adequate intent requirement in the Federal code is one of the most pressing problems facing this Task Force. . . .” Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT similarly warned that without adequate mens rea protections “honest citizens are at risk of being victimized and criminalized by poorly crafted legislation and overzealous prosecutors.” Representative CONYERS said that “when good people find themselves confronted with accusations of violating regulations that are vague, address seemingly innocent behavior, and lack adequate mens rea, fundamental principles of fairness and due process are undermined.”

But in the Senate there has been a notable absence of discussion about mens rea and the need for robust mens rea protections. There has been a lot of talk about sentencing but little about mens rea. It is time to change that.

For the past several months, I have been working on legislation to address the deficiencies in mens rea requirements in existing statutes. My bill would set a default mens rea requirement for all statutes that lack such a requirement. It would ensure that courts and creative prosecutors do not take the absence of an express criminal intent standard to mean the government could convict without any proof of a guilty mind. My bill would also clarify that when a statute identifies a mens rea standard but does not specify which elements of the crime that

standard applies to, the standard identified applies to all elements of the crime unless a contrary purpose plainly appears in the text of the statute.

My bill would not mandate a particular mens rea standard for all crimes, nor would it override existing standards set forth in statutes. All it would do is set a default for when Congress has failed to specify the criminal intent required for conviction. Congress would remain free, however, whenever it wanted to specify a different mens rea standard for a statute, replacing the default with its own chosen standard. The default would operate merely in the absence of congressional action. It would bring clarity, ensure that Congress does not—through oversight—create crimes without any mens rea requirement, and protect individuals from being convicted for conduct they did not know was wrong.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this important legislation and urge all of them to give it their support. Any deal on sentencing and any package of criminal justice reform must include provisions to shore up mens rea protections. In fact, I question whether a sentencing reform package that does not include mens rea reform would be worth it, and I am not alone. Many members of the overcriminalization coalition—members who helped lay the key intellectual and political groundwork for the negotiations now underway—believe strongly that any criminal justice reform bill that passes this body must include mens rea reform. I agree. There can be no more important work that we do here in Congress than ensuring that honest, hardworking Americans are not unjustly imprisoned.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I come to the floor to express my strong opposition to the bill we are going to be voting on tomorrow morning, and that is a bill to limit women's choice by banning abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy. I would like to make several points today: Why the bill is unconstitutional, the truth about late-term abortions, the bill's rape certification requirements and the absence of a health exception, and, finally, how this debate is much more than this one bill.

Let me be clear, Mr. President. This bill is just one part of a sustained assault on a woman's access to health care and her right to make decisions for herself and her family.

First, this bill is unconstitutional. Similar State laws banning abortion at 20 weeks have been struck down by the courts. The Supreme Court in the controlling opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 1992, stated:

The woman's right to terminate her pregnancy before viability is the most central principle of *Roe v. Wade*. It is a rule of law and a component of liberty we cannot renounce.

Viability refers to the point at which a fetus could survive outside the womb. The Supreme Court's 2007 decision in *Gonzales v. Carhart* summarizes that portion of the *Casey* decision stating, "Before viability, a State may not prohibit a woman from making the ultimate decision to terminate her pregnancy."

In 2012, Arizona enacted a law prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks. The Ninth Circuit found that statute unconstitutional. Now that is a direct case in point from one circuit. The Ninth Circuit said the law conflicted with a long line of Supreme Court cases that found bans on women's right to abortion prior to viability as unconstitutional.

In that case, Arizona admitted that a fetus at 20 weeks was not viable. A conservative judge on the Ninth Circuit, Andrew Kleinfeld, said he was "compelled" to strike down the Arizona law based on existing precedent. The Supreme Court subsequently denied Arizona's petition to hear the case.

Other State laws banning abortions at 20 weeks or earlier have also been struck down on these grounds. For example, Idaho's 20-week ban was struck down by the courts. The opinion in that case stated that the Idaho law was "directly contrary to the court's holding in *Casey* that a woman has the right to 'choose to have an abortion before viability and obtain it without undue interference from the State.'"

The court's rulings have been informed by medical experts, and medical experts have said repeatedly that a fetus is not viable at 20 weeks. Let me give you a good example. Dr. Hal Lawrence, the chief executive officer of the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, recently addressed this issue, and I would like to read a portion of his remarks:

The 20-week mark is just not notable from a fetal development standpoint. More than 40 years ago, the Supreme Court stipulated that abortion is legal until a fetus is viable. Well, in no way, shape, or form is a 20-week fetus viable.

Now, this is a medical OB/GYN, who is head of the association speaking. Continuing to quote him:

There is no evidence anywhere of a 20-week fetus surviving, even with intensive medical care. Unfortunately, some advocates of abortion bans are pointing to a new study they claim heralds 22 weeks as being the new point of viability. They suggest that we might someday reach viability at 20 weeks. It is essential that we address that now, be-

fore this becomes another myth about abortion that is accepted as reality.

The doctor goes on to say:

First, this new study was not conducted to add fuel to the fire of abortion rights opponents. It was intended to help give OB-GYNs and neonatologists improved understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with early premature delivery. Second, even in this study, survival at 22 weeks was only 5 percent overall. This is why the medical community refers to the "threshold of viability," because there is no point at which viability is clearly established. Even among babies that receive intensive medical care, survival only reached 23 percent, and most of those babies had moderate to severe neurological impairment. Importantly, this study only looked at babies without fetal anomalies, which surely would have lowered the survival rates even more.

Bottom line: A ban on abortion before viability, which is exactly what this bill represents, is unconstitutional, and the courts have spoken on the issue.

Next, I would like to set the record straight on the widespread misconceptions about late-term abortions. First, they are not usual. They are extraordinarily rare. Just 1 percent of abortions occur after 20 weeks. Secondly, many of the pregnancies terminated after 20 weeks occur because something has gone terribly wrong—the fetus has a fatal disease or the woman's health is in danger. Let me give an example. Christy Zink, a mother of two here in Washington, testified before Congress against this bill. In 2009, after trying for years to become pregnant, she and her husband were elated to be expecting a boy. Unfortunately, when Christy reached the 21st week of her pregnancy, the MRI revealed that her baby's brain had not developed correctly. One side of it was missing.

Everything up to that point looked normal. The brain scan wasn't capable of detecting the problem any earlier. Christy and her husband consulted the best doctors hoping there was some treatment, but nothing could be done. They were devastated.

If Christy's baby had made it to the end of the pregnancy, according to her doctors, he would have been in terrible pain and likely died soon after birth. Christy said, "The decision I made to have an abortion at almost 22 weeks was made out of love and to spare my son's pain and suffering."

Christy's incredibly difficult story isn't just an isolated example. There are many fatal diseases that can't be detected until later in a pregnancy, including one that causes the fetus's organs to develop outside of the body. Another, called severe brittle bone disease, causes the fetus's bones to break inside the womb.

Our own colleague, Congresswoman JACKIE SPEIER from California, someone I know very well, shared her story on the House floor in 2011. She terminated a much-wanted pregnancy at 17 weeks due to a medical complication.

She said, "To suggest that somehow this is a procedure that is either welcomed or done cavalierly or done without any thought is preposterous."

Congresswoman SPEIER is right. Making this personal medical decision is one of the most gut-wrenching decisions a woman could make, and there is no good option. But these decisions need to be made by women, in consultation with their doctors and their families, not by politicians. Every situation is different, and we shouldn't pretend to stand in a woman's shoes and make these choices for them. We shouldn't make a difficult decision even harder.

Next, I wish to discuss the fact that this bill has no exception for the health of the mother. Only when a mother's health deteriorates to the point that she could die does it allow an exception. This is unconstitutional as well. The Supreme Court's controlling opinion in *Planned Parenthood v. Casey* said that even after viability, the government may restrict abortion "except where it is necessary, in appropriate medical judgment, for the preservation of the life or health of the mother."

The Supreme Court's 2000 decision in *Stenberg v. Carhart* reiterated this point. The decision quotes *Casey* and other cases about the need for a health exception. It is true the Supreme Court in *Gonzalez v. Carhart* in 2007 upheld a Federal ban on a particular abortion procedure, a law many of us opposed, but the *Gonzalez* decision still quotes *Casey* and other cases about the need for a health exception, and it does not suggest that the government can completely ban abortion after a particular week of pregnancy without a health exception.

The bottom line: This bill would endanger women by banning abortion even when necessary to protect the mother's health—and that is also unconstitutional. This is shocking because in no other circumstance would we restrict medical care until the patient is at risk of death. In cases where the mother is bleeding severely or has gone into septic shock, it could be too late to save her or prevent serious injury.

Another shocking provision of this bill requires rape victims to provide certification from law enforcement that they have been raped, as well as proof that they have attended counseling or received medical treatment.

Just a few months ago I spoke on the Senate floor in support of anti-human trafficking legislation. The bill was stalled because some of us wanted to ensure that trafficking victims had access to the medical services they needed, including abortion. There seemed to be agreement on both sides that a trafficking victim who has been raped repeatedly, imprisoned, and abused should be able to get the health care she needs. Yet under the bill we are

voting on, a 13-year-old sex trafficking victim—a rape victim—would not be eligible for an exception unless she gets a note from law enforcement or a child welfare agency.

I just did a sex trafficking meeting in Los Angeles with three district attorneys from big cities in California, as well as the sheriff of L.A. County and the chief of police. What they told me is the average girl, sex-trafficked, is between the ages of 12 to 14. So this isn't some outrageously small example. Let's say the victim is 12 to 14. She has been traumatized, she has been emotionally and physically abused. Supposing she was one of those in Oakland, where she was handcuffed at night and stripped naked and then worked the streets during the day. She may not be ready or even able to go to the police. She wouldn't qualify for a rape exception under this bill. That is just terrible. My Republican colleagues would force her to endure the pregnancy—the result of rape—because she didn't have the right paperwork.

Finally, I wish to talk about why it is important to view this bill in the broader context of efforts to dismantle women's access to health care and ban abortion outright. Anti-choice groups have been trying to make it as hard as possible, bit by bit, piece by piece, for women to access safe, legal abortion care.

Take this latest attack on *Planned Parenthood*. The individuals who made the highly edited videos spent years trying to befriend *Planned Parenthood* officials and obtain the footage—you can read about it on the front page of *Politico* today—and they are under investigation for possible criminal activity. They used false identification to represent a fake medical company. The videos were presented to the public as unedited, but forensics experts at the firm *Fusion GPS* tell us that is not the case. Content is missing and numerous edits have been made to even the so-called full footage videos. Many Members of Congress have requested the full videos. These requests have gone, as one might expect, unanswered.

The point is, a woman's ability to make her own health care decisions is under sustained, unrelenting attacks, most of them by men. Historically, it has always been interesting to me to see that some of the most vocal, the most sustained voices, are male voices, and all women have asked is to be able to control their own reproductive system.

As a result, more than one in three American women lives in a county without a single health care provider that offers abortion services. Today these services are unavailable for millions of low-income women in the country, just the way it was when I was young, when we had to pass the plate at Stanford so women could go to Tijuana for an abortion, and many of

us felt she would kill herself if that didn't happen.

As a result of new restrictions, women are once again turning to unsafe methods, much as they did before *Roe v. Wade*. Women were forced into unsafe conditions, often in back alleys. Some were permanently injured or died. I am old enough to remember those days. In the early 1960s, when I set sentences in California, as a member of the California Women's Board of Terms and Parole, I set a sentence—which the State had determined the sentence law at the time for abortion was 6 months to 10 years. I remember interviewing the woman when she came back. I remember her name. I said to her: Anita, why did you do this again? You should know better. She said to me: Because people are so compelling, and I felt so sorry for these women. That is what this leads to. That is what this leads to.

In 2013, *Bloomberg News* reported on the increasing number of women in Texas buying pills on the black market to induce abortion. One woman interviewed, a mother of four, was on her way to buy these pills at a flea market. She said:

You'd be amazed at how many people, young people, are taking those pills. I probably know 12 to 20 people who have done this. My cousin just went to the flea market a few months ago.

That is the result of actions like this. When those of us who lived through pre-*Roe* recount the risks of returning to the way things were, we truly are not exaggerating. Restricting access to safe, legal abortion doesn't reduce abortions; it makes women desperate, it increases health risks, and can lead to death.

At the same time women are facing these attacks on access to health care and the ability to make health care decisions, there is also an effort underway to cut programs that help new mothers and their children. Nearly 15 million children in the United States live in poverty—15 million. That is less than \$24,000 a year for a family of four, and nearly half of these families don't have enough food to eat. There are more homeless children in this country—2.5 million, 500,000 of them in California alone—than ever before. One in five of these children actually lives in my State. It is astonishing to me that with all the talk about supporting children, Republicans continue to cut the very programs that support them. These are programs such as the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, Head Start, child care subsidies, Medicaid, and housing assistance.

House and Senate Republican budgets have proposed cutting \$5 trillion from nondefense spending, which includes programs to help low-income families. These attacks on vulnerable families must stop.

In conclusion, the bill we are considering today is unconstitutional, and

the highest Court of the land has found that so. It would trample on a woman's right to make her own medical decisions. It would even force women to continue pregnancies in the most tragic of circumstances. But this bill is only the start.

If the groups pushing this bill have their way, only the most privileged women in our country will have access to safe, legal abortion. That is how it was before *Roe v. Wade*. I remember it well. And the women of this Nation will not stand to return to this time. Not on this Senator's watch.

I strongly urge a "no" vote.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COTTON. Madam President, over the last year I have learned a lot about the magic of human life—from conception to growth in the mother's womb, to childbirth, to newborn development. This wasn't a part of my legislative work or my public duties. My newfound knowledge didn't come from a course of study reading scientific journals or consulting with medical experts; instead, like many parents, I learned through experience the blessings of my first child.

My wife Anna gave birth to our very own little angel Gabriel almost 5 months ago. Since then, Gabriel has joined me on this very floor, at this very desk. Many of you have met our little man and happily agree that he appears to take after his mother.

Gabriel has been a part of our family from the beginning, long before he was born. I remember when Anna and I first discovered she was pregnant. We were so excited, yet like so many new parents, also apprehensive for his health and safety. Then 1 year ago this week, we had our first appointment with the OB-GYN in Russellville. We couldn't believe it when we heard his little heartbeat on the ultrasound at barely 9 weeks. Anna recalls that she almost started crying, though I don't recall an "almost" for either one of us. Just 4 weeks later, as the first trimester concluded, we got one of those perfect ultrasound shots. We saw Gabriel in profile lying on his back, hands near his face, feet and legs kicked up in the air.

We now know how much of his personality and habits he had already developed by that point because that position is how we usually find him when he wakes from his nap. Soon after, he began to flip around, kick and hiccup, which he also likes to do to this day. All of these things happened before the

halfway point in Anna's pregnancy, before Gabriel reached 20 weeks. While he is precious and one of a kind for us, it is quite normal for a typical baby, as expecting parents can tell you and as modern medical science can now document.

While Anna carried Gabriel to term and he was born happy and healthy, many babies aren't as lucky, but thanks to the miracle of medical science, babies age just 20 weeks after fertilization can increasingly survive if born at that extremely premature age. A remarkable study published earlier this year in the *New England Journal of Medicine* concluded that babies age 20 to 22 weeks can survive with skilled and proper, though not extraordinary, medical intervention and treatment. Likewise, advances in perinatology have made fetal surgery more common and successful, sometimes as early as 16 weeks.

These breakthroughs can help correct or ameliorate certain fetal conditions. Not only can 20-week-old babies survive outside of the womb, but they can also undergo successful surgery inside the womb. It is common practice in these surgeries to administer anesthesia, not just to the mother but specifically to the baby in utero to prevent both from feeling pain. In other words, medical science increasingly confirms the common experience of parents and the religious and ethical belief of the ages that an unborn baby is just as much a person as you, as I, as each of us, only more innocent, more helpless and therefore even more deserving of protection, especially by the halfway point of the pregnancy. They feel pain and they seek life. It is particularly heartbreaking that such babies are killed in our country.

By some estimates, 10,000 babies 20 weeks or older are aborted each year. By this point most Americans have seen the gruesome videos of Planned Parenthood officials callously discussing the dismemberment of babies to harvest and sell their organs. They cavalierly talk about using "less crunchy procedures" to preserve the organs, subjecting the baby to excruciating pain and death for profit.

This is a sad reality in America today. Just 2 miles from where I stand, just 5 blocks from the White House is an abortionist who advertises on his Web site for abortions without restriction up to 26 weeks—right up to the third trimester. It is far past the medically accepted point of viability. Who knows how many other abortionists do the same, just more discreetly.

It is past time to end this barbaric practice and protect these innocent babies. Therefore, I strongly support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act and urge my fellow Senators to do the same. This legislation would stop the abortion of babies 20 weeks or older, with certain reasonable and widely supported exceptions.

I understand that abortion provokes strong feelings on both sides of the question. I acknowledge that reasonable people of good will disagree about the wisdom and morality of early first-term abortions, but I am mystified as to why we cannot come together and agree to protect babies who feel pain and who can survive outside of the womb. It is not just I and large majorities of the American people who feel this way; the civilized world overwhelmingly rejects this kind of late-term abortion. Only seven countries allow elective abortion after 20 weeks, including Communist dictatorships like China and North Korea, which also inflict enforced abortion and sterilization on their people. By contrast, countries to our left, like France and Germany, heavily restrict or ban abortion after the first trimester and so does Belgium, home of the European Union. Even Russia bans elective abortion after the first trimester.

Our abortion policy is one case where we should be ashamed of our international isolation and follow Europe's lead in protecting innocent life. In our country, founded as it is on the equal rights of mankind and the unalienable right of life, it is deeply disappointing that the laws don't protect those most innocent lives among us, particularly when medical science now has the ability to do so. These scientific advances, like life itself, are miracles. These days it may seem like a miracle when a law passes around here. If that is the case, as a father, as an American, as a lawmaker, I think a miracle is called for now if it ever was.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

THE FILIBUSTER

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, during the last several days several Republicans have suggested that the Senate should abandon a tradition that has existed in this body since Thomas Jefferson wrote the rules of the Senate in 1789. It is the tradition of extended debate—a tradition that when an issue comes up, under the rules of this body, we continue to talk, we continue to debate until every Senator has had his or her say, at least enough of a say that 60 Senators then say it is time to stop talking and start voting.

Republicans who want to abolish the filibuster in the Senate are, I would suggest, Republicans with very short memories. The Senate's 226-year tradition of extended debate was created for the purpose of protecting the minority from the tyranny of the majority. For the last 70 years, most of the time Republicans have been the minority needing that protection.

Since World War II, Democrats have controlled the Presidency and both Houses of Congress for 22 years; Republicans have had such complete control for 6 years. Let me say that again. Since World War II, Democrats have

controlled the Presidency and both Houses of Congress for 22 years; Republicans have had such complete control for only 6 years.

During those 22 years when the Democrats had complete control, without a Senate filibuster to protect the minority, Democrats could have enacted any law they wanted. To see what can happen when Democrats have complete control and Republican Senators can't filibuster, one has to look back only to 2009 and 2010. Then, because there were 60 Democratic Senators making a Republican filibuster futile, the country got ObamaCare. This is because the so-called filibuster rule says that the Senate cannot vote on legislation until 60 of the 100 Senators decide it is time to end the debate. When more than 40 Senators want to continue debating and object to moving to a vote, that is called a filibuster.

Let's look at the future, to the possibility of a President Hillary Clinton, a Democratic majority in both Houses, and no Senate filibuster rule. My prediction is that at the top of the Democratic agenda would be a Federal law abolishing right-to-work laws in the 25 States that have them. This is precisely what President Lyndon B. Johnson tried to do in 1965 and 1966. President Johnson was not successful. What stopped the President? A threatened filibuster by the Senate Republican leader Everett McKinley Dirksen.

You can make your own list of what else would be on the agenda if Democrats had complete control and there were no Senate filibuster. I would predict higher taxes, more gun control, fewer abortion restrictions, making every city a sanctuary city, card check instead of the secret ballot for union elections, and numerous other liberal laws.

The most important reason to keep the filibuster rule is that the country needs one legislative body that takes its time to think through an issue and try to develop a consensus. The House of Representatives is, quite properly, the Nation's sounding board. If the country is boiling, the House of Representatives is boiling. On the other hand—as George Washington told Thomas Jefferson—the Senate is the saucer into which hot tea is poured to cool. The Senate's tradition of extended debate requires continuing debate until 60 Senators decide it is time to stop discussing and time to start voting. That allows every Senator to have a say. It encourages bipartisan consensus, which is the best way to govern a large, complex country such as the United States of America.

When both parties agree on a solution to a controversial issue—such as the civil rights laws of the 1960s—the country accepts the laws more easily. When the laws are jammed through by a partisan vote—as happened with

ObamaCare—the losers start the next day trying to repeal the law and the country is plunged into confusion.

There is one more serious problem with the current proposals to use the so-called nuclear option to change the Senate rules. Senate rules require 67 votes to change the rules. If Republicans use the nuclear option, we would be operating in the same lawless fashion that the Democrats did in 2013, when they used a mere majority vote to eliminate the filibuster for most Presidential nominations.

The Democrats' action in 2013 made little difference in how the Senate actually operates by custom. By custom, nominations have almost always been decided by a majority vote, but the 2013 use of the nuclear option set a damaging precedent. As one dissenting Democratic Senator said, a Senate that can change its rules any time it wants by majority vote is a Senate without any rules.

How then could the country's chief rulemaking body earn respect for the rules it makes for 320 million Americans if we don't follow our own rules? Unlike nominations, the opportunity for extended debate on legislation has existed since Thomas Jefferson wrote the Senate rules in 1789.

Of course, the current proposals to abolish the filibuster wouldn't change a thing in the Congress. President Obama could simply veto whatever he wanted to. According to the U.S. Constitution, it takes 67 votes in the Senate to overturn a Presidential veto.

Now, it is true that Democrats and Republicans have used the filibuster too often. There absolutely should be an up-or-down vote in this body on the President's Iran agreement and on the 12 appropriations bills that our committee has completed work on and are ready to come to the floor. All of them are being blocked by Democratic filibusters.

To solve this problem, some suggest eliminating the filibuster only in "some cases," but who will decide which cases are "some cases"? If the minority decides, nothing will be changed. If the majority decides, the minority is crushed. The only way to reduce the number of filibusters is by consent and by restraint on the part of both political parties.

In 1995, Republicans were elected majorities in both Houses of Congress. A Democratic Senator proposed abolishing the filibuster. Even though this temporarily would have seemed to benefit Republicans, every single Republican voted no. House Republicans are often frustrated because legislation that runs through the House like a freight train slows down or even grinds to a halt in the Senate. But that was the system of checks and balances that our Founders created, and sometimes the shoe is on the other foot.

This year, the Senate has passed important legislation on a 6-year highway

bill which is still stalled in the House. Republicans and conservatives who are thinking about abolishing the filibuster should think some more about how ObamaCare became law. They should think about what it would be like to live in the 25 States that now have right-to-work laws if Democrats gained the Presidency and majorities in Congress and abolished those right-to-work laws because there was no Senate filibuster. Think about what might happen if Democrats again have complete control and Congress dances to the tune of the White House and the Republican minority might have no filibuster to protect itself and this country from the tyranny of that Democrat majority.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from this morning's Wall Street Journal printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal,
Sept. 21, 2015]

EDITORIAL: REPUBLICAN FILIBUSTER

BLOWING UP THE SENATE'S 60-VOTE RULE WOULD
GAIN NO POLICY VICTORY

In the movie classic "Animal House," the fraternity brother Otter reacts to the Delta House's closure with the line, "I think that this situation absolutely requires a really futile and stupid gesture be done on somebody's part." To which Bluto replies, "We're just the guys to do it." The film ends by noting that Bluto becomes a Senator, so perhaps this explains the growing frenzy to abolish the filibuster.

Conservatives are frustrated that Republicans lack the 60 votes necessary to end Senate debate and send bills to President Obama that disapprove the Iran nuclear deal and defund Planned Parenthood. Thus they want Majority Leader Mitch McConnell to break Senate rules midterm and exercise the "nuclear option" to pass legislation with a simple majority instead of the current three-fifths requirement to end debate and allow a vote.

Conservatives also want some understandable revenge for then Majority Leader Harry Reid's 2013 decision to kill the filibuster for most executive nominees and appellate judges to pack the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals. The liberals who used to wail that the filibuster undermines democracy have suddenly gone silent now that Democrats are using the tool to obstruct conservative priorities.

In a letter last week, 57 House Republicans declared that some bills are "so consequential that they demand revisions to the Senate's procedures." In a press conference, Kevin McCarthy, the House Majority Leader, also endorsed the idea "to let the people have a voice."

Presidential candidate John Kasich said Sunday that he favored "extreme measures," including blowing up the filibuster. "Forget about the 60-vote rule," fellow candidate Scott Walker said at last week's debate. "Pass it with 51 votes, put it on the desk of the President and go forward and actually make a point. This is why people are upset with Washington."

Maybe so, but surely Messrs. Walker and Kasich know that Mr. Obama will veto anything that emerges from Congress on

Planned Parenthood or Iran. Senate Republicans still wouldn't have the 67 votes to override a veto. So they'd achieve no policy victory.

In exchange, they'd end an important check on majoritarian control—an action they may one day come to regret. Over the years the filibuster has helped block numerous progressive priorities such as union card-check, limits on political speech, and cap and trade. The filibuster also allows a minority to help shape legislation, not merely to block it, and on balance the procedure has served the country well by moderating extreme proposals.

If Republicans do want to convert the Senate into a high-end version of the House, where even a near-majority is powerless, then they should at least do so when they can accomplish something significant with a Republican President. The precise wrong time is 14 months ahead of an election that may result in a new Democratic President and Senate majority under leader-in-waiting Chuck Schumer.

Now that Mr. Reid has cashiered the filibuster for nominees, we agree that Republicans should follow that precedent the next time there's a GOP President. A GOP Senate majority should refuse to let Democrats filibuster a conservative Supreme Court nominee. But giving up the filibuster over policy now would be a futile gesture that liberals would exploit to expand government in the future.

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

Ms. HIRONO. Madam President, I rise today to speak about yet another Republican attempt to limit women's health care choices.

Congress should be focused on funding the government and keeping our country open for business. Instead, we are wasting our limited legislative days on H.R. 36, a bill that will not pass, and therefore is just for show. This bill is yet another example of a relentless anti-woman agenda. Rather than doing our jobs to keep important government services funded, we are debating a 20-week abortion ban.

The decision to end a pregnancy is a difficult one that involves many factors. Each case is unique, and any decision made is a very private one. Ending a pregnancy after 20 weeks is extremely rare. It is often a medical necessity.

This weekend in the Washington Post a woman bravely wrote about her need to end her pregnancy after the 20-week mark. When Rebecca and her husband went in for a routine checkup, they received the tragic news that her pregnancy was no longer viable. After consulting many physicians and specialists, Rebecca was left with an untenable decision, but she was able to access all of her health care options and get care that was right for her.

This bill would severely limit the ability of women to access vital and necessary health care options. H.R. 36 contains few exceptions, and these exceptions are so burdensome that they may as well not be there.

I have met with providers who stand on the frontlines of this choice debate.

Despite threats lobbied at them every day, they work hard to ensure that the United States is a country where women are fully empowered to make decisions about their own health care. These physicians have seen the heartache and agony women experience making this difficult decision. Women should not be subjected to medically unnecessary, financially taxing, and just plain cruel treatment at the behest of some Republican lawmakers.

If my colleagues truly wanted to improve women's health care, they would fund title X programs, bolster the Maternal and Child Health Block Grant, and support the Affordable Care Act.

We have no business attempting to legislate a private, constitutionally protected right using unsubstantiated science and hyperbole. In fact, numerous courts have found similar laws by States to be unconstitutional. We need to move on from these votes for show and get back to the real work of the Senate. I am calling this bill what it is: An unnecessary, unwarranted, and likely unconstitutional intrusion into women's private health care decisions.

Meanwhile, time is running out to reach an agreement to keep our government open, and we cannot afford another shutdown. We need to pass a clean continuing resolution to keep the government going. I ask my colleagues to join me in focusing on legislation to improve the lives of every single American. We need legislation that increases access to education, promotes job growth, strengthens our national security, and keeps America vibrant.

I ask my colleagues to join me in voting no on cloture on H.R. 36.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PERDUE. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I rise today to talk about why I am here, and really why all of us are here. We are here to represent the people of our great States. We are here to do the people's business and to be good stewards of taxpayer dollars.

We just finished an ongoing debate about how Congress can direct and guide foreign policy in the United States. In doing so, we have seen the dangerous consequences of partisan politics right here on the Senate floor and how that can affect this process. Just last week, 42 of my Democratic

colleagues supported President Obama's dangerous nuclear deal with Iran while still having serious concerns about its global ramifications.

Now we must refocus our attention on solving our fiscal crisis and tackling our skyrocketing national debt. State governments across the country set both funding levels and clear priorities for their States each year based on the needs of their people and their local communities. Washington has been distracted from this for far too long. Balancing the budget and efficiently allocating resources is what Washington has not done well for the last several years. Too many people here are preoccupied by politics of the day when getting our fiscal house in order should always be the top priority. In other words, Washington has stopped listening to the American people. Well, I—and a few of us, including the Presiding Officer—am indeed listening. The American people told us what they wanted in November of last year when the Presiding Officer and I were elected. Georgians tell me repeatedly—even now—what they want. They want less government. They want less spending. They want us to push back against President Obama's out-of-control spending and Executive overreaches that are failing the working men and women of America. The bottom line is they want us to deal with this debt crisis.

Earlier this year, the Senate Budget Committee took a great first step by passing a balanced budget for the first time since 2001. This budget outlined our conservative principles and spending limits. This budget spends \$7 trillion less than the President's budget over the next 10 years. What it doesn't do is reduce the debt today or deal with the over \$100 trillion of future unfunded liabilities coming at us like a freight train. It does balance in 10 years, which is quite an achievement given what we had to work with, but more can and must be done right now. So I am going to continue my focus on cutting wasteful spending and reducing Federal expenditures with the goal of developing a long-term plan to pay down this out-of-control massive \$18 trillion of Federal debt.

In the last 6 years, we spent \$21½ trillion funding our Federal Government. That is so large that it is hard to spend. What I can't understand is of that \$21½ trillion, \$8 trillion was borrowed. We simply cannot continue going down this road. While one side wants tax increases, the other side wants spending cuts. In my experience, neither alone will solve the equation in its entirety. Growing our economy is the only real solution. Again, the budget is just the first step. We must put our conservative principles into action and work through the regular appropriations process to determine how we responsibly allocate Federal funds.

The Senate Appropriations Committee has put forward 12 appropriations bills that adhere to the Republican budget and that reflect the priorities of the American people. Overall, these bills are under the Budget Control Act caps that were put in place by Congress in 2011 to control spending. More importantly, they better prioritize taxpayer dollars to meet the goals of the American people. For example, these appropriation bills decrease spending on ObamaCare and increase spending for border security. They end the EPA's waters of the United States rule and stop the Obama administration's onerous greenhouse gas regulations. They also prohibit the NLRB from changing the rules of the game, such as the ambush election rule and changing the joint-employer relationship, in order to prevent negative impacts to American workers and business.

They subject the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, or CFPB, to congressional oversight and eliminate hundreds of duplicative programs that have outlived their original mission. The list goes on and on.

The fiscal year ends on September 30. That is only a few days from now. We must move forward and debate these 12 appropriations bills that reflect Georgia values and fulfill the promises we all made to represent the American people.

While we have already seen our Democratic colleagues block such debate on these important bills, I hope we can immediately restart this critical process and return to regular order. Certainly, a full and robust debate on all of these bills is necessary to ensure that our Federal Government continues to function without overspending.

Now, I can tell my colleagues there are some things I would like to change in these bills, but they ought to be debated. It ought to be debated in the open and not blocked by more partisan gridlock that we see here every day. I hope the majority leader will continue to bring these bills to the floor and I hope the objections of my Democratic colleagues will finally end, and let's get to an open and honest debate.

Georgians sent me to the Senate to fight for them, and that is what I intend to do. This is just a start. I will not and I cannot stand by while Senate Democrats continue to block the Senate from doing the people's work as they did every day when they were in charge.

Madam President, I also wish to speak for just a moment on a bill that is going to come up this week focusing on the unborn. I wish to say a few words today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act of which I am a proud cosponsor in the Senate. Simply put, this legislation protects unborn babies from unimaginable pain.

Every child is a blessing, and I am incredibly fortunate that God has blessed my wife and me with two great boys and three grandsons. I will never forget the day we found out we were going to have our first child. It was life changing. When the doctor gave us the exciting news, we were overjoyed, but, at the same time, we were a bit overwhelmed. We were young, like most parents. We were going to become parents. We were going to have a baby. There is a difference.

Like every expectant mother, my wife was glowing. She may not have felt great and maybe didn't think she was glowing, but I assure my colleagues, she was. I will never forget seeing our baby on the ultrasound for the first time, or feeling him kick. And, the day my first son was born, holding him for the very first time was one of the most incredible moments of my life.

When the doctor told us we were going to have our second child, I was concerned we couldn't possibly love this second child as much as we did the first, but, wow, how I was wrong.

Later in life, my wife and I have been blessed with three grandsons who are all great. There is no greater love than that of a parent, although it can be rivaled by that of a grandparent. Believe me, my three grandchildren know how to tug at my heartstrings.

My children and grandchildren are why I am here in the Senate, fighting for them and others like them to have a better future, for my fellow Georgians, for them, and for all Americans.

We live in the most compassionate country in the world. We send food, clothing, and medicine all over the world to help save underprivileged children and families who are struggling to find the basic things they need to survive. It is extremely troubling, therefore, that our country's compassion for life is absent here at home. Only seven countries in the world allow parents to abort a baby after 5 months—only seven. That is not a list America should aspire to be a part of.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, over 10,000 unborn babies 20 weeks or older are killed in America every year. Imagine that for a moment. Each year, more than 10,000 lives, who feel and react to pain, have their lives brutally taken from them.

In my view, this is a national disgrace. It is absolutely unconscionable. I cannot believe protecting life, especially that of the unborn, is an actual subject of debate. One would think this would be an issue of unity, but debate on this important legislation could not have come at a more urgent time.

Recent gruesome videos describe the harvesting and selling of fetal organs and remind our Nation just how barbaric the abortion industry has become. As a parent, and now a grandparent, I find it difficult to imagine

that something so horrific can happen in a country as compassionate as America.

Our Nation must promote a culture that values all life. We must protect the innocent and the most vulnerable among us, especially the unborn.

We can protect unborn babies from unimaginable pain. We can protect life.

That is why I support this legislation. That is why I cosponsored it. I urge my colleagues to take it very seriously.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion?

Mr. PERDUE. Yes.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

CLIMATE CHANGE

I rise today in my series of "Time to Wake Up" speeches to bring attention to two of God's humblest but most useful creatures.

Here in the high political majesty of the Senate, it is easy to forget Matthew: "No man can serve two masters. . . . Ye cannot serve God and mammon."

Who do we serve here? I submit it is mammon, all day long, no doubt about it. Mammon surrounds and submerges us. We swim in its currents. This Senate of ours, this is "Mammon Hall."

How easy it is from our perch of worldly power here in Mammon Hall to overlook the humble, and what could be humbler than God's humblest beasts? So, today, I want us to remember two: The bumblebee and the pteropod.

When was the last time any of us thought of the humble bumblebee? Not recently, I expect, and not often. We have important things to do. Who can be thinking about bumblebees? Yet, by the millions, by God's plan, these small creatures spend their days out busily pollinating the plants that yield the crops that turn into the food we humans depend on to survive.

The humble bumblebee does much more good in God's natural realm than we humans do. On the spectrum between givers and takers of this good Earth's blessings, we humans are way over on the taker end of the spectrum, and the bumblebee—it is humble—but it is way over on the giver end. And the humble pteropod, how many of us even know what it is? Not many in this Senate, I would bet. The pteropod is a winged snail that populates the ocean in immense numbers. It is sometimes called the sea butterfly because, over millennia, God's evolution of these creatures has turned their snail foot into an oceanic wing. A cousin species is called the sea angel.

Like the bumblebee, the pteropod performs an unheralded service in

God's natural realm. The pteropod is an essential link in the oceanic food chain, supporting the whole great network of trophic levels and species above it.

In what Pope Francis calls "the mysterious network of relations between things"—in that mysterious network of relations between things, the pteropod gives its life to transmit food energy from the microscopic plants it eats, that would be no use to us, up to the fish that consume the pteropod—fish, which we, in turn, consume—all in that great "mysterious network."

Back here in Mammon Hall, many interests can only appreciate nature in monetary terms and can only value things to the extent that they can be monetized. They are the mercenary sort Pope John Paul II said "see no other meaning in their natural environment than what serves for immediate use and consumption." Or, as Pope Benedict said, think "everything is simply our property and we use it for ourselves alone." They are the interests who, as Pope Francis said, have the attitude "of masters, consumers, ruthless exploiters, unable to set limits on their immediate needs." According to them, if you can't grab it and sell it, it has no value—not here in Mammon Hall.

So, to them, let me say that the money-making salmon fishery depends in large part on the humble pteropod. For them, let me say that our enormous agribusiness enterprise depends on pollination by the humble bumblebee.

In Mammon Hall here, we have actually gotten used to this kind of behavior. It no longer even seems deviant to us. It has become normalized, but in our hearts we have to still know it is not normal. It is wrong.

Pope Francis reminds us in his recent encyclical: "When nature is viewed solely as a source of profit and gain," that is "[c]ompletely at odds with . . . the ideals . . . proposed by Jesus."

Completely at odds with the ideals proposed by Jesus.

The Pope was blunt. He said: "Today, . . . sin is manifest in . . . attacks on nature. . . . a sin against ourselves and a sin against God."

That is what the interests we traffic with do all day long—no doubt about it.

The Pope has said that "our common home is falling into serious disrepair. . . . [T]hings are now reaching a breaking point. . . . [H]umanity has disappointed God's expectations." The Earth herself, he said, "groans in travail," and we are leaving to our children a world that, to use his words, "is beginning to look more and more like an immense pile of filth." If we don't see that, it is because we see so poorly outside our privileged bubble of consumption.

But if we don't see that, the bumblebee and the pteropod do. Here is what is happening to them.

A study in the peer-reviewed journal *Science*, published in early July, shows that as temperatures warm, bumblebee populations are retreating northward from the hottest part of their ranges as they warm further and further. But here is the rub: The northern range for the bumblebees for some reason is not expanding, which means the changing climate is crushing bumblebee populations in a climate vice.

"Bumblebee species across Europe and North America are declining at continental scales," warns study author Dr. Jeremy Kerr of the University of Ottawa. "Our data suggest that climate change plays a leading role, or perhaps the leading role, in this trend."

Carbon pollution from burning fossil fuels floods the atmosphere and causes climate change. But about 25 percent of it actually enters the oceans, and there, it acidifies the waters, souring them for creatures such as the pteropod.

Research led by NOAA scientists published last year found that acidified water off our west coast is hitting the pteropod especially hard. They found "severe shell damage" on more than half of the pteropods they collected from Central California to the Canadian border. That was more than double the expected rate. The pteropods are being eaten away by acidic water.

Oceanographer William Peterson, co-author of the study, said, "We did not expect to see pteropods being affected to this extent in our coastal region for several decades." The pace and extent of ocean acidification that we are observing now, that we are measuring now, that we are driving now with our carbon pollution, are nearly unprecedented in the geological record. The closest historical analogs, scientists say, are the great extinctions, when marine creatures were wiped out en masse and ocean ecosystems took millions of years to recover.

John Kenneth Galbraith knew something about importance, and he said this about importance: "The threat to men of great dignity, privilege, and pretense is . . . from accepting their own myth." That happens when that "great dignity, privilege, and pretense" become so great that we no longer feel the need to listen—certainly not to something as insignificant as a bumblebee, as humble as a pteropod. But remember why Jesus was so angry with the Pharisees. What was their sin? Their dignity, their privilege, and their pretense blinded them to how out of touch they were with the truth.

So here we are in mammon hall, where powerful special interests court us, gigantic corporations lobby us, and billionaires pay us attention, and indeed they fund some of us. Presidents must deal with us. Truly, we are today's Pharisees. But Jesus taught that truth is among the things that are humble.

We had better start listening to the bumblebee and the pteropod, to the coral polyp and the oyster spat, to the New Hampshire moose and the Idaho pine, to the Utah snowfall and the California drought, to the measured carbon concentration of our only atmosphere and the measured pH level of our only oceans. These are gifts, and these gifts are all God's creations, and their signals are all God's voice. We ignore them in our arrogance, we ignore them in our folly, and we ignore them at our peril.

It has already begun, as we careen into the next great extinction. As Pope Francis wrote, "Because of us, thousands of species will no longer give glory to God by their very existence, nor convey their message to us. We have no such right," he said.

Indeed, we have no such right. The day the bumblebee and pteropod no longer give glory to God by their very existence will be a bleak and perilous day for humankind. In the meantime, we had better smarten up to the message they convey to us. If their message, if the message of God's creatures—if that message of warning is not God's voice, then whose voice is it?

I challenge you. If the voice of God's creatures to us in the way they lead their lives and the way they are dying is not God's voice, then whose voice is it and what message does it convey?

As Pope Francis comes to this Congress this week, I hope we will listen to the voice of God as expressed through his humblest creatures and just for a second turn off the noise from mammon that surrounds us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the Chair.

This Senator wants to take a few moments to talk about the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which I think is a good piece of legislation. I support it, and I hope my colleagues will allow it to move forward. I think when God speaks, maybe He would speak about that issue too.

However, I really want to talk a little bit more about where we are on the funding of Planned Parenthood, the two aspects of it. One is a large—hundreds of millions of dollars—appropriations that goes there through the Medicaid program, and another is \$28 million that was directly appropriated last year from the government to this Planned Parenthood agency. I call it an agency, but that is not really correct. It is a nongovernmental entity, a nongovernmental activist group that does some good things and some things I don't think are good.

I think we ought to recognize that Congress has certain powers. It is very clear, I would submit, that a majority of the Members of the Senate and a majority of the Members of the House of Representatives do not want to fund

this agency—certainly not as it has been funded in the past. What we have, as I understand it now, is at least \$28 million of federal money that goes to it unless Congress decides not to fund it.

Colleagues, the power of the purse resides in the United States Congress. Not one dollar can be spent by the President, any of his Department heads, or the U.S. military, unless Congress has appropriated the money. That is an ultimate power of Congress.

At the end of this fiscal year—September 30—if Congress has not appropriated money for the future, then it can't be spent. That is why we have a so-called shutdown. If you don't fund the whole government, it is blocked in some way and then the government can't expend the money that has not been appropriated by the elected representatives of the people of the United States.

Let me just say it this way. I don't believe the American people's money that has been extracted from them by the Internal Revenue Service and other government extractors—I don't believe that money should be spent on any program that is unhealthy or not wise. That is what we are all elected to do; is that not right? Fund programs that are good, worthwhile, and that create value for the American people, and not fund the programs that we don't think are wise and create value, and advocate and promote principles we think are healthy for the American culture, the American people. We don't have to fund any program Congress decides not to fund. The power of the purse resides in the Congress of the United States. A majority of the Congress does not favor advancing funding for Planned Parenthood and certainly not the \$28 million that goes through the HHS grant-writing process, so I suggest we don't fund it. That is what I think. Let's not fund it. Why are we funding it?

Well, we have to fund it, SESSIONS. You don't understand.

What don't I understand?

If it is not funded, you are shutting down the government.

So if we do not provide the money for a nongovernmental agency that we think is not spending the taxpayers' money wisely, we are shutting down the entire government of the United States? I suggest that is a ludicrous position, one that goes beyond any rationality, and I am prepared to say so.

How did this happen? How could they say that?

We are funding the government. We are passing a bill that funds all the government agencies. It just doesn't fund this nongovernmental agency—the money they would like to have to advance their agenda, which isn't my agenda, so I am not for funding it. I got elected.

How did this happen?

Well, the President says he will veto the bill, and since Congress hasn't

passed any of the appropriations bills in series like we should be doing, it is going to be cobbled together in one monumental matter, one monumental omnibus bill or continuing resolution. The President is going to veto the entire Federal funding because he doesn't want us to cut \$28 million. He wants it to be spent the way he thinks it should be spent.

I think we should tell the President: Mr. President, you have your power. You can sign your agreement—not valid beyond your tenure—with Iran even though we disagree with it. A substantial majority of both Houses opposes it, but apparently, you have the lawful authority to do so. But you don't have the lawful authority to spend money on an entity—not even a government entity—that Congress chooses not to spend money on. This is our business.

We are in a bad trend here of Congress just capitulating in favor of the Executive. By any historical standard, I have never seen a more supine Congress.

So should we fund this program? I say no. Don't put it in there. And I think we should send a note to the President:

Dear Mr. President, we funded the Defense Department, we funded Medicare, we funded Medicaid, we funded other programs, hundreds of them, at \$1 trillion. That would be in this bill, basically, around \$1 trillion. That is a thousand billion dollars. But we have chosen to cut \$28 million of one of the programs we don't think is good. Congress doesn't like it, and Congress chose not to fund it. And somebody told us that you declared that if we do that, you are going to veto the entire funding for the government of the United States, including the Defense Department and all the other programs that aid us, including the Environmental Protection Agency. You are going to veto funding for those agencies and blame the Congress and go on to say Congress caused this. Wow.

He is going to say that we who funded the government and he who blocked the funding for the government have a disagreement over this amount of money, and as a result he is going to veto the funding for the government and accuse the Republicans, who passed the bill to fund the government, of shutting down the government.

Now, some people are afraid of the President.

Oh, he always wins. The President always wins, and Congress always loses. SESSIONS, don't you understand?

But the facts of the case matter. The situation matters. If we follow the budget and we appropriate at a level for the Defense Department that the President wants and Congress wants and we do all these things, but we just choose not to fund this program, I don't believe the President has the

moral authority, the political clout to tell the American people that the Congress shut down the government when he vetoes the bill that will fund the government.

So I just want to say that it is time for this Congress to do its duty, and we should fund programs that need funding and not fund programs that don't need funding, and we should try wherever possible to reach a compromise the way we have done in the Armed Services Committee. All the members of the committee argued about this, that, and the other, and we created a military bill which we think is a healthy bill and which had overwhelming bipartisan support. Almost all of the appropriations bills that have come out of the committees have had bipartisan support, I think many of them unanimous, Republicans and Democrats—every one of them—supporting them. We get along around here a lot better than people say. But there are certain things Congress should not cede. It should not cede to the Executive the power of the purse. That is all I am saying.

At this point in time, we will be dealing directly with the HHS grant programs that are giving money to an entity that I don't think should be funded. I am not voting to fund it. I think that is a reasonable position. And I think it would be extraordinary if the President were to take the view that he will not fund the Department of Defense and other programs of the government because of a disagreement over this issue.

Indeed, colleagues, I believe the House has proposed legislation that would have generous funding for women's health. The money that would have gone to Planned Parenthood would instead go through a general plan of community health centers and other quasi-government entities that serve women throughout the country.

So I thank the Presiding Officer for allowing me to say that. It is a matter we are going to have to wrestle with as a Congress. In the long run, I truly believe Congress needs to fulfill its constitutional role, and that congressional role calls on it to evaluate every dollar spent by this government, to examine those programs that we think are valid and fund them, and if they need more funding, to give them more funding considering the debt situation the country is in and to not fund programs we do not think should be funded.

What other role do we have in the Congress greater than that, the power of the purse. The President is not authorized to demand Congress spend money on every program he desires, a program that sells body parts and other things of that nature that I do not think is decent and good. So I am not for funding it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. FRANKEN. Madam President, I rise in strong opposition to continued attacks on women's access to health care. Today, the Senate majority leader is attempting to advance a bill to ban abortion after 20 weeks. This is a blatantly unconstitutional proposal that injects politics into a private and deeply personal decision, one that should remain between a woman and her medical provider and her family.

This bill is the latest—but not the last, I know—in a series of unrelenting attacks on safe and legal abortion in this country. It not only represents a cynical affront to well-settled law, it poses a serious threat to women's health. Let me tell you why. Nearly 43 years ago, the U.S. Supreme Court held that the Constitution protects, as a fundamental right, a woman's ability to decide whether and when to start a family. This bill is plainly at odds with that holding and plainly at odds with the Constitution, which is why Federal and State courts have found laws like this one unconstitutional time and time again, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are now pushing forward with this bill and doing it at the expense of women who need medical care in the most desperate of circumstances.

Bills like this one demonstrate a callous disregard for the risks women face during pregnancy—women like Danielle Deaver, from Nebraska, who went to the doctor in a desperate attempt to save her pregnancy when her water broke at 22 weeks. Tests revealed that Danielle's amniotic fluid had ruptured, and her doctors explained that the baby could not be expected to survive, but that was not all. The rupture also put Danielle at risk, at risk of an infection that could jeopardize her fertility and her ability to have children in the future. Together, Danielle and her husband made the heartbreaking decision to terminate her pregnancy, but because Danielle lived in a State with an abortion ban that made no exception for a woman's health and had not been challenged in court, her doctor was unable to help. Danielle endured 8 days of severe pain and infection before delivering a daughter who survived for just 15 minutes.

Christy Zink of Washington, DC, was 21 weeks pregnant when an examination revealed that her pregnancy suffered from a severe fetal anomaly—meaning, effectively, that the entire hemisphere of the brain was missing. Christy and her husband consulted her physician and other doctors in an attempt to save her much wanted pregnancy, but after hearing of a near inevitability that if delivered, their child would not survive, she and her husband ultimately made the very difficult personal decision to end her pregnancy.

The bill we are discussing today has no exception for cases where a woman's pregnancy experiences a fetal anomaly.

If a ban like this were to become law, families like Christy's would have no options. As a father of two grown children, with one grandchild and another on the way, I know what it feels like to celebrate the news that your wife or your daughter or daughter-in-law is pregnant, to accompany them to doctor's visits and checkups, to look forward to welcoming a child or grandchild into your family, and to look on with hope and worry as the pregnancy progresses, but my family has been very fortunate. I can only imagine the pain and heartbreak a family experiences when they are faced with the kind of tragic news Danielle and Christy received when they learned something was wrong, but the idea that Congress should insert itself into those moments and act to limit the difficult choices available to women and their families confronting unimaginable pain and sorrow is unconscionable.

This bill ignores women like Danielle and Christy. It ignores the unique circumstances surrounding every woman's pregnancy. Instead, it substitutes the judgment of Congress for that of medical professionals, even going so far as to threaten doctors with a 5-year prison sentence for providing women with the care they need.

Make no mistake, this is an extreme proposal. Unfortunately, it represents just the latest salvo in an unending campaign to make safe and legal abortion virtually impossible to access. Since the 114th Congress was gavelled into session, we have seen no fewer than 65 legislative attacks on the right to choose. Just last month, the Senate voted on a measure that would have defunded Planned Parenthood, a health care provider that serves millions of Americans, including more than 54,000 people in my State of Minnesota. That legislation failed, but as the end of the fiscal year approaches, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—both in the House and in the Senate—have pledged not to support a spending bill that continues funding for Planned Parenthood. They prefer to see the government shut down rather than allow a single penny to support the family planning services, the cancer screenings, and tests for sexually transmitted diseases that Planned Parenthood provides.

My good friend from Alabama Senator SESSIONS—and he is a good friend—suggested that we instead send that money to community health centers. They do not have the staffing, they do not have the capacity to provide these needed services for the millions of people Planned Parenthood serves. That is why the public does not agree. According to a poll released last week, more than 7 in 10 Americans oppose shutting down the government to defund Planned Parenthood.

One of the reasons the public does not buy into these tactics is they un-

derstand that access to reproductive health services, including contraception and abortion, has a powerful effect on the decisions women and their families make every day, decisions about whether to start a job or how much a family can afford to save for college.

For the vast majority of Americans, this is not political; this is personal. It is not a place for Congress to interfere. I urge my colleagues to oppose legislation that would restrict the ability of women and families to make their own reproductive choices.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, tomorrow this Chamber will vote on something called the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, legislation I have cosponsored, that would recognize that a woman has a legal right to have an abortion up to the point of 5 months' gestation; that is, after 5 months' gestation, an unborn child is beginning to grow hair on their head, their fingernails are growing.

By this time in development, mothers are beginning to feel the baby kicking and moving for the very first time. In other words, this is the point at which the child literally becomes viable, becomes a human being, capable of life outside of the mother. Obviously, a typical period of pregnancy is 40 weeks. So obviously we hope that in most cases a child will remain in the womb until it is fully developed. But the fact is, talk to any neonatologist, talk to any physician, they will tell you that at a point around 20 weeks, certainly 5 months of gestation, you have no longer a child dependent upon their mother for life but somebody who can actually live independently.

Indeed, as many of us have done, go into some of these nurseries, where they have literally babies who weigh 1 pound or less, and see what medical science is able to do to actually save the lives of these premature babies—in a way that will allow them to grow up and be healthy and productive. It is nothing less than a medical miracle.

But at 20 weeks of gestation, which is 5 months, an unborn child is without a doubt a life—a life worth defending and worth protecting. This is something that is commonly accepted around the world. I don't know how many people realize that actually this legislation would bring the United States in line with the developed countries around the world. As a matter of fact, the United States is just one of seven countries worldwide that permit access to an elective abortion after 5 months of

gestation, and we are in some pretty tough company. Right now we are in company with China, Vietnam, and North Korea. The United States, China, Vietnam, and North Korea basically permit an abortion up until the time a child is born naturally.

This bill is also important because it would significantly curtail the horrifying practices depicted in the videos we have seen of Planned Parenthood's operations over the summer. I am surprised to see in the press that only about 49 percent of the American people have actually seen these videos because they are so horrific, but I think they are also shocking. And perhaps it is that people would just rather turn their gaze and look away rather than see the barbaric practices depicted in these videos. But indeed these videos show Planned Parenthood executives callously discussing the value of an unborn child's organs, and it is truly morally reprehensible. I think, unfortunately, it reveals a dark side of humanity—one that prizes the organs of an unborn child over the potential life that child could have. And I have asked myself: How did we get here? How did we become so desensitized to this practice? And if there is anything these videos have done, hopefully it is to awaken the conscience of the American people as well as the Members of Congress to realize exactly what is going on and to conduct the investigations that are now underway by four committees of this Congress and to do what we can, such as passing this Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. It would make out of bounds the sort of late-term abortions that apparently this sort of enterprise depicted in the video depends upon.

This legislation is a unique and powerful opportunity for us to act and defend the lives of unborn children across this country. It is the best chance we have to advance a culture of life in this country. I am not suggesting that it is going to be easy or that we will have this vote and we will be finished. We will not be. I remember the long road to passage of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act over a decade ago, and I think the distinguished majority leader, who has set this matter for a vote, recognizes that this is the beginning of raising the visibility of this horrific practice and asking the American people whether they are comfortable with the sort of conduct they see depicted on these videos or whether we ought to think again about whether we want to be part of a coalition of China, Vietnam, and North Korea when it comes to sanctioning these late-term abortions after a baby has literally become viable in the womb.

If this bill becomes the law of the land, it will be the first time Congress has significantly and meaningfully advanced the pro-life agenda in over a decade. It took a long time for us to

get the passage of the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act over a decade ago. And I don't think we should underestimate the difficulty of passing this legislation and other pro-life legislation, but we need to start. These videos have given us the opportunity because they have awakened America's conscience.

This legislation, if passed, would save the lives of thousands of unborn children and make impossible the sort of organ-harvesting practice that we have seen on fully developed, unborn babies that we have seen depicted in these videos.

Tomorrow the Senate will have a unique opportunity to stand up for the most vulnerable, and if we are not here to stand for those who cannot speak for themselves, the most vulnerable in our society, not the least of whom are the unborn, what are we here for? I hope my Senate colleagues will vote to advance this legislation and in doing so vote to invoke a life of culture in this country.

Moving this bill forward should be seen as a moral imperative by every Member of the Chamber. We can unite behind an understanding of obvious right and wrong and save thousands of lives by making the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act a reality.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PAPAL VISIT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Madam President, I know many Americans are looking ahead to the visit of Pope Francis this week with a great deal of interest. Thousands will gather on the Capitol grounds for the chance to hear him speak. I think I can speak for every colleague when I say the Senate welcomes him with open arms. We look forward to his visit.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Madam President, it obviously is going to be a busy week in the Senate. That is true of the legislative issues before us as well. One is government funding.

Earlier this year, a new majority took office with a different outlook on government funding from that of the previous majority. We thought it made sense to actually pass a budget and then to fund it. So we passed a budget for the first time in 6 years. Then we passed all 12 appropriations bills through a committee for the first time in 6 years. Democratic colleagues voted for and praised the appropriations bills in committee. Had we passed the 12 appropriations bills on the floor, it would have funded the government without the dramas of the past. But Democrats didn't change their minds and decided to pursue a regrettable "filibuster summer" strategy of blocking all government funding for months. Some blocked bills they had just praised, all

with the aim of pushing Washington into another one of these manufactured crises they just cannot seem to shake. It is truly unfortunate, but they have succeeded in making this a reality we now face.

We have to push forward, and we will. I will have much to say on the issue as the week progresses. Discussions on the best way forward are ongoing. Discussions about the character of our country continue as well.

Madam President, tomorrow we will take up a bill the House of Representatives has already passed. It is legislation that would allow America to join the ranks of most civilized nations when it comes to protecting the lives of the most innocent and vulnerable.

We—along with countries like North Korea—are one of just seven nations to allow late-term abortions after 20 weeks, in other words, 5 months, when science and medical research tell us unborn children can feel pain. As the father of three daughters, I find that both tragic and heartbreaking. Many Americans feel the same way. Polls show that both men and women support protections for innocent life at 5 months.

I am asking colleagues to open their hearts and work with us to help defend the defenseless. Help us pass the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. I will have more to say about this important bill before we take a vote on it tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, I rise today in strong support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This bill recognizes an indisputable fact and it stands for an indispensable principle. The fact is that each of us was a living human being before birth. The principle is that each human being has inherent dignity and worth.

The Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* degraded the Constitution, and the regime of virtually unrestricted abortion that it spawned continues to degrade our culture. It degraded the Constitution by reducing it to little more than a prop and using it as a cover for imposing the opinions of individual Justices. This decision is perhaps the best example of what Justice Benjamin Curtis warned about in his dissenting opinion in *Dred Scott v. Sandford*. He wrote that when the opinions of individuals control the Constitution's meaning, "we have a government which is merely . . . an exponent of the individual political opinions of the members of [the Supreme] Court." That is exactly what *Roe v. Wade* is.

In addition to degrading the Constitution, the abortion regime spawned by *Roe* and maintained by its progeny continues to degrade our culture. This effect is inevitable because that regime is built on the dark proposition that

humanity itself has no inherent worth that demands respect and that individual members of the human family can be killed for any reason at any time before birth.

It was not always like this. Just 25 years before *Roe v. Wade*, the United States voted for the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The very first statement in the preamble recognizes "the inherent dignity and . . . the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family." Article 3 states that everyone has the right to a life.

Just 2 years after the U.S. Supreme Court created an unlimited right to abortion in *Roe v. Wade*, the Federal Constitutional Court of Germany came to a very different conclusion. Reviewing a law that allowed abortions in the first 12 weeks of pregnancy, the German court said that human life is the supreme value in the constitutional value and "the vital basis for humanity and the prerequisite of all other basic rights." What a contrast.

The United States has degraded human dignity by striking down a law protecting preborn children. Germany promoted human dignity by striking down a law endangering preborn children. Our Supreme Court said that a preborn child is not a person under the U.S. Constitution and would not even address whether that child is a living, human being. The German court said that every human individual possessing life is covered by the German Constitution, including preborn human beings.

One of the most successful coverups in legal and social history has misled Americans into believing either that abortion is not legal for any reason at any time in this country or that this radical abortion regime is the norm around the world. Neither is true. Today the United States is one of only seven nations in the entire world to allow elective abortion after 20 weeks of pregnancy. Other members of that club include China and North Korea.

The bill before us would prohibit the unjustified killing in the womb of human beings who can feel pain. The bill recognizes three justifications: when abortion is necessary to save the life of the mother and when the pregnancy resulted from rape or from incest against a minor. This bill would do nothing more than move the United States a step away from the most extreme abortion position in the world.

The Supreme Court may be preventing us from upholding in law the inherent dignity of all human beings before birth. That does not mean, however, that we should not defend that dignity for as many members of the human family as we can. That is why I support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act before us today.

This bill is consistent in two different ways with how the Supreme Court has set rules for abortion regula-

tions in the past. In *Roe v. Wade*, the Court drew a line at certain points in pregnancy reflecting something that the Court found to be medically meaningful. The end of the first trimester, the Court said, was related to the relative safety of the abortion procedure. The end of the second trimester, the Court said, marked the time when a preborn child could potentially live outside the womb, at least with artificial aid. The Court said that these lines, which identify when certain abortion regulations are permissible, should be drawn "in the light of present medical knowledge."

That is exactly what this bill does. As its findings state, there is substantial medical evidence that a preborn child is capable of experiencing pain by 20 weeks after fertilization, if not earlier. I might add that this is not a recent discovery. Americans United for Life, for example, published a monograph more than 30 years ago reviewing the medical evidence. Dr. Vincent Collins, professor of anesthesiology at the University of Illinois, wrote that the entire sensory nervous system is functioning well before the 20-week point.

More recently, Dr. Maureen Condic, Associate Professor of Neurobiology and Anatomy at the University of Utah School of Medicine, has testified before Congress and written that the scientific evidence regarding fetal pain is undisputed. That evidence shows that the brain's circuitry responsible for the detection, and its response to pain is established well before the 20-week mark.

This bill is consistent with precedent in another way. The Supreme Court has approved actually prohibiting abortion after a point when the preborn child takes on an important quality that justifies protection. In *Roe v. Wade* that reality was the viability or the ability to survive outside the womb with artificial aid.

In this bill, that quality is the ability to feel pain, which has been universally recognized as compelling. Both medicine and the law, for example, impose a duty to relieve or to avoid pain. Just look at the Web site of the National Institutes of Health. It includes an article by Dr. Eric J. Cassell, Professor of Public Health at the Cornell University Medical College. He writes that the obligation of physicians to relieve human suffering stretches back into antiquity, and he calls relief of suffering "one of the primary ends of medicine."

The clinical guidelines for acute pain published by the Federal Government stated that "the ethical obligation to manage pain and relieve the patient's suffering is at the core of the health care professional's commitment." The American Academy of Pain Medicine has publicized an Ethics Charter which outlines how physicians must implement "the ethical imperative to provide relief from pain."

If medical professionals have a fundamental obligation to relieve human suffering, they should be prohibited from imposing human suffering before birth. In its most recent abortion decision, the Supreme Court acknowledged that certain ethical and moral concerns can justify a specific abortion prohibition. The prevention of intentional pain and suffering, the very core and one of the primary ends of medicine, certainly qualifies and justifies the policy in this bill.

Turning to the law, the Eighth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. Federal courts across the country are considering whether the drugs used in lethal injection cause extreme or unnecessary pain and, therefore, violate the Eighth Amendment. Some have said that it does.

If the infliction of pain can make executing the guilty unconstitutional, I believe that the infliction of pain should make aborting the innocent illegal.

Or look at the civil side of the law. Juries award multimillion dollar verdicts against medical professionals and facilities for failing to relieve pain in their patients. One article in the *Western Journal of Medicine* reviewing such cases concluded that "there is a standard of care for pain management, a significant departure from which constitutes not merely medical malpractice but gross negligence." If failing to prevent pain in the sick can make a physician liable, physicians should be prohibited from inflicting pain on healthy children before birth.

Madam President, I began by saying that *Roe v. Wade* and the abortion regime it spawned has degraded both the law and our culture. I am echoing the thoughtful words of President Ronald Reagan, who in 1983 published an essay entitled "Abortion and the Conscience of a Nation." He wrote that abortion-on-demand is not a right granted by the Constitution but was an act of raw judicial power. And he wrote, "We cannot diminish the value of one category of human life—the unborn—without diminishing the value of all human life."

The American people have embraced this view. By more than 2 to 1 Americans support what this bill would do—prohibiting abortions after 20 weeks—and the percentage of women supporting a 20-week ban is even higher than the national average.

I think opponents of this legislation owe the American people an explanation. Why does a physician's ethical duty to prevent pain begin only when someone is born? Why shouldn't that duty begin when someone can feel pain? Why do we care so much about preventing even the most despicable criminals from feeling pain but turn a blind eye to the pain inflicted on innocent preborn children?

The Supreme Court has said from the beginning that the right to abortion

must be balanced with other compelling interests. Why does medical knowledge matter when it facilitates abortions but not when it can prevent the pain caused by abortion?

This bill recognizes the indisputable fact that each of us, including each individual Member of the Senate, was a living human being before we were born. This bill reflects the indispensable principle that each individual member of the human family has inherent dignity and worth. Prohibiting the killing of innocent human beings who can feel pain is only a small step in the right direction, but it is a step we must take. I don't think there is a legitimate excuse for not taking that step.

It is horrifying to me that some in the Senate don't understand this or, if they do, continue to march down the path of indiscriminate abortion on demand. I think they are going to have to pay a price for that someday. It is a shame it has come to this type of a standard where you cannot protect preborn children who can feel the pain of abortion and feel the pain of some of the medical techniques some of these abortionists use.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEE. Madam President, it is customary when rising in support of legislation to speak in gracious terms about the opportunity to vote for the legislation in question. This is a good day for the Senate. The American people can be proud. This bill represents legislating at its very best. That is what we say. I have said it in the past myself many times.

While I will soon join the majority—though maybe not the necessary supermajority—of our colleagues voting to take up the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, it is a tragedy that we should have to. That late-term abortions, abortions after children are viable and their nervous systems can feel pain, are legal in this country, is itself an affront to American democracy and a stain on America's great history.

It is not the fault of the American people, who, like the rest of the civilized world, are appalled by the violent extremism of aborting viable unborn infants. Rather, in 1973, it was originally the fault of a constitutionally unhinged and scientifically illiterate Supreme Court majority.

Four decades on, the fault is now fully shared by a Democratic Party so corrupted by special interest politics that it has forsaken the one principle—

standing up for the little guy—that once earned them all Americans' gratitude and respect. Our friends on the other side of the aisle still claim that surrendered high ground, but that claim gets harder to take seriously every time they not only abandon but deny the very humanity of the littlest guy or girl of all. Let's not forget that the Democratic Party today is not just the party of taxpayer-subsidized, late-term abortion on demand; it is also the party of taxpayer subsidized, late-term, sex-selective abortion on demand. Seven or eight or nine months along, with eyes and a nose, a full head of hair, with a beating heart and a perfect smile and late-night hiccups, they think it should be legal for a doctor to take her life, just because she is a girl or just because she may have Down Syndrome or a cleft palate or any reason really. To the Democratic Party today, there is no reason so superficial or bigoted that it shouldn't negate the right to life of an unborn child or a born child, for that matter.

As was confirmed by the recently released video testimony of abortion industry insiders, some abortion clinics—clinics funded by the Federal Government—kill infants that are born alive. There is a word for that, and it isn't "health care." Yet even though Philadelphia abortionist and serial infant killer Kermit Gosnell was convicted of first-degree murder for doing just that, physician-assisted infanticide is something like a stated principle of the Senate Democratic caucus. Remember, it was on this very floor a few feet from here that in 1999, one of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said that legal protection of a child should begin only "when you bring your baby home."

When we get down to it, what difference does a few centimeters make, anyway? Why should it be legal to kill a perfectly healthy 8-month-old, 6-pound little girl right here and illegal to kill her over here? After all, abortion is not the first peculiar institution that has arbitrarily dehumanized certain Americans based on geography, especially with such a high progressive principle at stake.

As a Supreme Court Justice, of all people, put it in a 2009 interview with the New York Times, describing the social, political, and moral attitudes that led to the Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade*, "Frankly, I had thought that at the time *Roe* was decided, there was concern about population growth and particularly growth in populations that we don't want to have too many of."

As chilling as that sounds—and one certainly must wonder which populations liberals wanted to cull—to me, the most important part of that statement is not the hint toward genetic cleansing at the end; rather, it is the word "frankly" at the beginning. That

was a window into the soul of abortion extremism, and we see it again and again and again.

On the rare occasions when we hear abortion advocates speaking frankly, it terrifies us, and duly so. The conspirators exposed in the Center for Medical Progress videos are only the most recent example. Watch the videos, listen to what they say, and pay attention to how they say it. In their detached, dehumanizing euphemisms and stomach-turning humor, they speak not like fairy tale monsters, but the real thing—the rational, rationalizing men and women with prestigious degrees and cultivated tastes who hide their barbarism in bureaucracy.

But we can rest assured, there will be no such talk here today. There will be no such talk here tomorrow. There will be no frank, candid public discussion of late-term abortions because that might eventually lead us to the truth—and only one side in this debate is interested in that.

When it comes to the reality of abortion, pro-choice politicians choose not to debate; they choose to deceive. They will come down to this floor for the next 2 days not to defend what we all know is indefensible, rather they will try to cloak their extremism in a fog of denial and distraction. Politicians who defend the right to kill born-alive little girls will, with straight faces, rail about a war on women. Politicians who defend lax, unsanitary clinic standards will, with straight faces, lecture us all about their commitment to women's health. Politicians who resurrect embarrassing, medieval superstitions about when life begins will, with straight faces, thunder against the scourge of Republican science-deniers—as if none of us has touched a pregnant mom's tummy and felt a little kick, as if those grisly Planned Parenthood videos didn't exist, as if none of us took high school biology.

But they know the truth. In unguarded moments, as we have heard, they speak the truth and one day the truth will set us all free and the Democratic Party will stop taking its problems out on the kids. We are not there yet, but as the desperate tactics on the other side of the question reveal, we are getting closer and closer all the time.

Truth doesn't wait on partisanship. The truth is, a ban on late-term abortions after 5 months should be the law of our land. The truth is that unborn children can feel pain after only 2 months of development. In the words of University of Utah Professor Maureen Condic, with whom I met last week, "Based on universally accepted scientific findings, the human fetus detects and reacts to painful stimuli as early as eight weeks following sperm-egg fusion."

Now, for our unfrozen cavemen Senators on the other side of the aisle

whose primitive minds are confused and frightened by modern science, sperm-egg fusion is when biology tells us that human life begins, on day one, a fact that is neither a mystery nor above the pay grade of a curious seventh grader. At 8 weeks, we know a fetus can feel pain. That is not just scientific consensus; it is "universally accepted," "entirely uncontested" in Dr. Condic's words.

Why then does the bill before us allow abortions even up to 20 weeks? Because that is where the science is directly observable. That is how modest a compromise this bill is. As Dr. Condic puts it, "Fetuses at 20 weeks have an increase in stress hormones in response to painful experiences that can be eliminated by appropriate anesthesia." In other words, at 20 weeks, an unborn child can feel pain. We can see them feel it. We can observe them as they feel it.

That is also the age, according to the New England Journal of Medicine, at which an unborn child is viable outside the woman. Prenatal surgeons can now treat unborn children as young as 16 weeks, and with every innovation and advance in perinatology, modern medicine stretches its miraculous light further and further into what used to be "the valley of the shadow of death."

These are the facts: At 20 weeks, a little boy or a little girl has a chance to seize the great adventure of life, and they feel pain when that chance is violently taken away from them, just like any child would, just like our own would, just like we would. We owe it to them to give them that chance. The science actually goes much further. This bill is only the least we can do right now.

Our generation doesn't yet know what chapter we are writing in America's long struggle to defend the equal dignity of all human life, but we all do know—even our friends on the side of the aisle, I think—that this story has a happy ending. Like generations past that overcame ignorance and bigotry to welcome marginalized Americans into our hearts and our society, we, too, shall overcome, because even though the unborn don't have a voice, they do have an unflinching ally: the truth, not just the philosophical truth expressed in our Declaration of Independence but the biological, medical, and scientific truth that unborn children are children. There is no us and them, just us, and deep down we all know it. We know that children are a gift and deserve our protection. We know mothers are heroes and deserve our support. The bill before us would provide them a little bit more of both.

Despite its majority support, this bill might not pass this time, and America's moms and children waiting for the laws of the United States to catch up to the justice and compassion reflected in the laws of nature and of na-

ture's God will have to wait a little longer—but not too long. For if our national story has taught us anything, it is that extremism in defense of violence will not long stand. This bill will one day soon be the law of the land. So, too, will those passed last week in the House of Representatives and still others yet to come.

The arc of American history may be long, but the American people have a way of bending it toward life, and after decades of violence and lies and corruption, help is on the way. Maybe it is a good day for the Senate after all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

GOVERNMENT FUNDING

Mr. DONNELLY. Madam President, here we are again. There is just over a week before funding runs out to keep our government open, and some in Congress are threatening to shut down the Federal Government again to advance their own political agendas.

I have said before and I will say it again, most Hoosiers think Congress can play a role in improving the economy, but at the very least we shouldn't make things worse. That is exactly what Congress has done with the Export-Import Bank. The Ex-Im Bank helps level the playing field for American businesses, it helps protect and create jobs here at home, returns money to the Treasury, and over 100 companies in Indiana use the Ex-Im Bank.

In July, some in Congress blocked the bipartisan effort to reauthorize the bank just so a few Members could play politics. As a result, the Export-Import Bank is unable to provide any new financing to American businesses. In fact, we just found out, we have already seen some companies moving American jobs overseas because of this. Despite the lessons learned just 2 years ago, we are once again debating whether Congress can meet its most basic needs and duties: keeping the government open.

Frankly, it is embarrassing that some in Congress are willing to bring us to the brink of a government shutdown and would rather play games with our recovering economy than solve the problems and challenges in front of us.

The truth is, there is reason to be optimistic in our country. Unemployment is dropping, and nowhere in the world are there more opportunities to invest and to innovate in a brighter future and stronger economy than right here in the United States, but to realize our full potential, we have real work to do. We need to create more good-paying jobs with which we can support a family and strengthen our communities, we need to invest in a 21st century infrastructure, and we need to prepare and train a workforce ready to lead the world in both innovation and production.

Over the last several weeks we have heard a lot of rhetoric about making America great again. America is already great. It starts with the basics, and that is what we need to get back to—by showing up to work every day and doing our jobs, just like every Hoosier does.

I am an optimist. I know we can do great things for our country. Let's do the job we were sent here to do in Congress—work together and keep the government open. It is the least we should do. I am ready to do it. I hope my colleagues will join me.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I note that my colleague from South Carolina has arrived on the floor, and I would happily yield to him if he wishes to go. Otherwise, I will be very brief.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Madam President, I want to second the very powerful remarks made by my colleague from Indiana. In Connecticut, what I hear again and again is the need for this body to address jobs and the economy. They are talking about putting people back to work and moving our economy forward. That is what I have sought to do from day one in the U.S. Senate and what I will continue to fight to do. That is what we should be doing through reauthorizing the Export-Import Bank, creating more jobs in an infrastructure program worthy of the name, and repairing and reinvigorating our roads, bridges, ports, airports, and our railroads which need to be made more safe and reliable. That is what we should be doing in programs for veterans—particularly in veterans health care—putting our veterans to work, programs that provide for skill training and job opportunities for them.

There are so many momentous issues facing our Nation today, and that is the challenge we should be facing in the U.S. Senate. Yet tomorrow we will be voting on a bill that is divisive, dangerous, and doomed to failure. Even today, we are spending valuable time debating it.

The bill before us is both unconscionable and unconstitutional. It is a waste of time because tomorrow it will be defeated, in effect. We are engaged in a political charade here. The timing may not be accidental, but there is no good time for a blatantly and plainly unconstitutional proposal. Sadly, it is only

the latest in a long line of unconstitutional proposals since the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Roe v. Wade* which enshrined a woman's constitutionally protected right to make her own reproductive decisions. There have been incessant and constant attempts by politicians to substitute their own judgment for hers, for her doctor's, her family's, and for her religious advisers. These decisions should be a woman's to make.

The onslaught on women's health care, unfortunately, has been a fact of life in this Nation. The bill before us now will ban abortion care after 20 weeks of pregnancy except for so-called exceptions. The inadequacy of those exceptions alone doom this bill to unconstitutional status. The legislation represents an unconstitutional interference as a matter of policy and law with the woman's right to choose the care that is best for her and the failure to recognize the many complex factors that may be involved in that decision, medical complications that often lead to a woman's decision to seek a late-term abortion. The bill would place in her way a host of unnecessary, unwise, and burdensome requirements.

In effect, this bill would force women—including all who have been through the traumatic experience of rape or incest—to meet a combination of a myriad of reporting and record-keeping requirements. In many cases, the bill would require survivors of heinous crimes to make multiple appointments with multiple providers before having the right to reproductive care and force her to relive her traumatic experiences before having the benefit of those services. It would place numerous nonmedical requirements on doctors, such as forcing them to determine whether survivors of rape or incest have reported their experience to appropriate law enforcement entities, essentially forcing doctors to choose between criminal penalties and doing what is best for patients' health, which is why the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists oppose this measure. None of these requirements placed on women or their doctors are rooted in science, health, or safety. None of these requirements are consistent with the constitutionally protected right to access reproductive care and abortion.

Simply put, women's health care decisions should be left to women, their families, themselves, their doctors, and themselves. That is the essence of the constitutionally protected right of privacy that underlies all of these rights. It is the right to be left alone from men and women in this Chamber who would intrude and invade that right.

This measure also implicitly encourages an ongoing and indeed intensifying assault on women's health care among the States. Many other unconstitutional and unconscionable attacks

on women's health care are increasing at the State level and making it harder for women to access reproductive health care in general. There is an increasing drumbeat of regulations and restrictions that attack women's health care and make it harder to access as State governments pass more regulations. Those regulations number now 230 in the past 5 years. They are nothing more than embarrassing attempts to deny women's health care in the guise of invasive and unnecessary medical tests, arbitrary building regulations, and financially unsustainable procedures. That is why Senator BALDWIN and I have proposed the Women's Health Protection Act, joined by 31 of our colleagues, to make sure that those State laws are stopped before they cause the costs, fear, and uncertainty, as they are bound to do and as they have done in many States around the country. These State laws are beyond wrong. They are dangerous to women's health care.

My hope is that we will be proactive in protecting a woman's right to care, not encourage the worst of State practices that are embodied in these restrictive State laws.

Finally, I am dismayed that the House of Representatives actually has taken a step toward gutting a measure designed to help veterans. The Border Jobs for Veterans Act of 2015—a bipartisan measure that I cosponsored with my colleague Senator FLAKE designed to do just what the title says: to utilize the skills and expertise of our veterans to help fill vacancies at our borders, to use veterans to stop illegal immigration—that bill has been gutted and unfortunately has been made a vehicle to deny health care to women. The provisions of this transformed legislation are a disservice to our veterans. I thought veterans legislation would be out of bounds for this fight. Sadly, apparently not.

I urge my colleagues to find more productive ways to use our time, to address the needs, to expand job opportunities, to move our economy forward, and to drive economic growth. A bipartisan goal we should all share is to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank and to make sure we serve the best instincts of this Nation and preserve our Constitution from these unwarranted attacks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COATS). The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized for 15 minutes, and ask the Chair to let me know when my time is close to being up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I am the author of legislation we will be vot-

ing on tomorrow, so I am very proud of the product. I have worked with my colleagues to try to come up with a solution to what I think is a problem that needs to be addressed.

To my good friend from Connecticut, I appreciate where he is coming from. He is a fine man. We just disagree on this. He has legislation called the Women's Health Protection Act. He has legislation that will roll back State limitations on abortion that have been proved by the Supreme Court. He disagrees with what the States are doing in light of what the Supreme Court would allow a State to do. He has a piece of legislation that would at the Federal level change all these State laws. I respect his point of view. The point I am trying to make is that he wouldn't have introduced the legislation if he didn't think this was an important topic.

To my colleagues on the other side, you have legislation that I would gladly allow you to bring to the floor. I want to have a debate on what we are trying to accomplish here. You have legislation that—I am sure the reason you did it is you would like to change State laws you don't agree with. It is a little bit disingenuous to say we shouldn't be talking about these topics because you drafted legislation on this topic.

What am I trying to accomplish? We are one of seven nations in the entire world that allow abortion on demand at 20 weeks, the fifth month of pregnancy. I would like to get us out of that club. Why? Because at 5 months I really don't believe it makes us a better nation to have abortion on demand. There are exceptions in this bill—for the life of the mother and in the cases of rape, you have to tell the physician this pregnancy was as a result of a rape—but there is no reporting requirement to the police or anything else. That is a balance we have tried to achieve. But what I would suggest is that most Americans agree with me, that most Americans believe that at the fifth month, we should not have abortion-on-demand, we should not be in a club of seven nations on the entire planet that allow abortion at this stage in the birthing process.

The theory of the case is pretty simple. Medical science has evolved to the point now that if you operate on a baby at 20 weeks—which you can—to save that baby's life or to help them medically, medical science says you have to provide anesthesia because the baby can feel excruciating pain. We now know scientifically that at the fifth month of the birthing process, at 20 weeks, doctors will not operate on the baby without anesthesia. Here is the question: Should we be allowing abortion-on-demand at that point in time? Should we be crushing the skulls? Should we be destroying the baby's life? Should we be one of seven countries that allow this heinous practice

in the fifth month? We do have exceptions—for life of the mother, rape, and incest.

I would suggest that we should be talking about this. I suggest that we should have done this a long time ago, that we should have gotten out of this club of seven nations that allow a baby to be aborted in the fifth month.

Medical encyclopedias advise and encourage young parents at this stage in the pregnancy to interact with the unborn baby and sing and speak because the baby can associate sound. We are talking about 5 months, folks. We are talking about changing the law so that this country will not allow abortion-on-demand at this late stage in the birthing process. This is something I am proud to be talking about. I am honored to lead the fight, and all I ask is that we have a vote.

The vote is whether or not to have a debate. Our Democratic friends are going to deny us a debate as to whether or not this is a good idea. We can't even proceed to the bill. I am willing to allow them to bring up their legislation as an amendment to mine, the Women's Health Protection Act, where they want to repeal State laws that put limits on abortions consistent with the Supreme Court's decisions. I am not afraid of my idea, and they shouldn't be afraid of theirs.

This is a debate worthy of a free people. This is a debate worthy of democracy. If this is not worth talking about, what is? When do you become you? When do you have a soul, if you have one at all? What kind of Nation do we want to be in 2015?

Roe v. Wade says that for the first trimester, abortions are off limits, but when medical viability is reached, the State has a compelling interest in providing protection to the unborn child. That was 1973. Has anything changed since 1973? I would argue a lot has changed, and all for the better in terms of medical science. We can do things now for patients, including for the unborn, that one could not even imagine in 1973. But the theory of the case here is not medical viability at 20 weeks, but a new concept that I hope most Americans will embrace. Now that we know the baby has developed to the point where it would feel excruciating pain if it were operated on to save its life, is it appropriate for legislative bodies, such as ours, to come to that baby's aid and take abortion-on-demand off the table?

Here is what I believe: I believe this is constitutionally sound. I believe this is a debate worthy of a free people. I believe the time has come for America to get out of the club of seven that allows this procedure at 20 weeks, the fifth month of the birthing process. I think this is something we should talk about, and I think it is worthy of our time.

To my friends on the other side, you have views about this topic too. You

have introduced legislation regarding abortion that would roll back State protections of the unborn. I am not afraid of that debate. I disagree with you. Bring your legislation forward.

What are you afraid of? Why won't you let me debate my bill? Why can't we have a discussion as a free people about where we want to be in 2015 regarding the unborn child?

To my friends on the other side, the unborn child is not the enemy. The unborn child is something that every American should care about. And here is what I think: In the fifth month of pregnancy an overwhelming number of Americans—not all, but most—are going to side with me and my colleagues who have helped me through this journey and say: No, America will not allow this. We are not going to be one of seven nations that allows abortion-on-demand in the fifth month. We are going to withdraw from that club, and if we do, it will be a good thing. We will be a better people if we stop this practice in the fifth month, knowing that we have exceptions for the life of the mother in cases of rape and incest. This doesn't make us anything other than a caring, better people.

This is why I ran for office, to have debates like this—not just this, but like this. I want to talk about creating jobs and growing the economy and stopping radical Islam. There is so much we need to do, but here is the question: Do we need to do this? I think so. I think with all my heart and soul that America needs to get out of this club, that America needs to come to the aid of a baby who is 20 weeks into the birthing process, and we should stand united and stop this practice. I think this makes us a better people.

I think at the end of the day, this debate is worthy of our time and, quite frankly, is long overdue. I am very disappointed that we can't even have the debate. But this I promise: As long as I am here—and many others on our side, and hopefully some on that side over there—this debate will continue until we get the right answer.

We came together in a very large vote—bipartisan in nature—to ban abortion in the last trimester, except in rare circumstances. That was the right thing to do. Abortions in the seventh, eighth, and ninth month do not make us a better people. There was bipartisanship to stop that procedure.

Here is what I believe: I believe over time the American people are going to side with me and my colleagues, we are going to rise to the occasion, and we are going to say something pretty basic. At 5 months we are not going to allow abortion-on-demand because that baby can feel excruciating pain, and we are not going to put that baby through the process of having their life terminated in such a gruesome fashion.

These Planned Parenthood videos and this discussion about harvesting

organs from children late in the birthing process have awakened America. I promise this is a debate worthy of this body, worthy of this country, and one that we are going to have over and over again until we can get a vote. I am not going to stop. You have stopped me if we don't get those 60 votes to debate this. If we can't get the bill to the floor for a debate, I think that is a bad thing.

I think life is more than just about money. I think the quality of our country is more than our financial situation. I think the quality of our Nation, in many ways, is founded not on our finances, but our character. And here is what I believe: America needs to get out of this club of seven that allows little babies to be aborted at a time when doctors cannot operate on them without providing anesthesia because it hurts so much.

Think about what I just said. Medical science will not put the baby through an operation to save its life without anesthesia because it hurts so much. All I am asking is: Just don't crush that baby's skull unless there is a very good reason. Is that too much to ask? I don't think so. Is that worthy of our time? I definitely believe so. Are we going to keep pushing? You better believe it.

I thank Senator PORTMAN, Senator ERNST, and others who have helped me so much.

I thank Senator MCCONNELL for reserving some time to have this discussion. I hope it turns into a debate. The Senate needs to be on record, and this is an opportunity for all of us to be on record as to where we think the country should be in 2015.

Here is what I think: I think in 2015 America needs to withdraw from the club of seven nations that will allow a baby at 20 weeks to be aborted for any reason at all.

I look forward to this discussion. I hope we can have a debate. I am not afraid of my ideas, and they shouldn't be afraid of their ideas. But I promise everybody who cares about this that we will not stop, and to me, it has always been about the baby. I think most Americans will side with me and my colleagues and say over time with a very strong and loud voice: We do not want abortion-on-demand in the fifth month of pregnancy unless there is a darn good reason because that doesn't make us a better people. Quite frankly, it is the opposite.

I thank the Presiding Officer for his support. To my colleagues over here, and hopefully a few over there, I look forward to this journey until one day when we can withdraw from the club of seven and protect unborn children in a way that I think most Americans would appreciate.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. ERNST. Mr. President, a short while ago, I had the opportunity to meet with a very special family from Newton, IA. Micha Pickering, an adorable, energetic 3-year-old boy was born prematurely at just 22 weeks gestational age—the equivalent of 20 weeks after fertilization, the method of measurement in the bill before us.

You will notice the picture I have in the Chamber. This is Micah, that energetic 3-year-old boy. He was just in the office when this picture was in there, and Micah ran up and said: That's me. And then he said: That's a baby. This is Micah when he was born. We are talking about 5 months. Think about that for a minute.

Micah's parents and the doctors and nurses at the University of Iowa hospitals and clinics were dedicated to his survival. Micah's mother Danielle has recounted the first time she got to meet her son in the hospital:

The second I was able to meet Micah changed my life. He was so small. I didn't know what to expect. Would he look 'normal'? Could I bond with this baby? Those questions were a mess in my head as I was wheeled into his room two hours after his birth. The sight I saw was a perfectly formed baby.

We didn't understand at the time that Micah was right on time, but now we do. . . . You can be knowledgeable on every part of prematurity, but that does not change the fact that Micah was just as much full of life at 22.4 weeks as he is now at almost 3 years old.

I can attest that this little boy pictured behind me is indeed full of life.

The bill before us today—the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—would protect up to 10,000 lives like Micah's every year by preventing abortions after 20 weeks or about 5 months of development. As Micah proves, at 5 months babies can live.

The United States is currently only one of seven countries in the world that allows abortions after 5 months. We are currently in the same company as China and North Korea. We must do better.

Substantial medical evidence indicates that at about 5 months of development, unborn babies can feel pain. This means that thousands of unborn lives end painfully through abortion in our country every year. Is this really whom we want to be as a nation? We are a country that stands for life. Just earlier I heard a colleague across the aisle talking about how God intends that we should protect bumblebees and pteropods but what about human life. In order to rise to meet that commitment, we must protect the most vulnerable in our society, particularly those who cannot protect themselves.

The majority of men and women across this great Nation agree. According to a Quinnipiac poll from last November, 60 percent of those surveyed support a law prohibiting abortion after 5 months of pregnancy.

Although passionate advocates on both sides of this issue of life often disagree, there should be no disagreement when it comes to protecting the life of an unborn child who has reached the point of development at which he or she can feel pain. As we can see from the photo behind me, an unborn baby in its fifth month of development is not just a clump of cells; he or she can suck his or her thumb, yawn, stretch, and make faces. They have 10 fingers and 10 toes. They can also feel pain, and as Micah proves, they can survive outside of the womb. As a mother and a grandmother, I urge my colleagues not to deny these babies the right to life.

Micah's mom has said it best: "I bet that if Micah could have gone up to everyone who opposes this bill and gave them a big hug, he could change all their minds."

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. SHAHEEN. Mr. President, in just 10 days, funding for the government will expire. So we have just 10 days for the Senate and the House to come together and figure out a way to keep the government doors open.

We have been here before. In 2013—and I remember all too well, as I am sure all of the Members of this Chamber do—the impact of that shutdown. It was devastating. It resulted in economic confidence falling to its lowest level in several years. It took \$24 billion out of our economy and cost us 120,000 private sector jobs. Yet at a time when we should be coming to the table to do our jobs to avoid a government shutdown, we are back again talking about limiting women's access to their own health care choices.

Once again, those who want to limit women's access to health care and take away our constitutionally protected rights are threatening to wreak havoc across the entire U.S. economy, just as they did in 2013.

This attack on women is not just at the Federal level; sadly, we are seeing it in New Hampshire as well. The New Hampshire Executive Council recently voted not to renew the State's contract with Planned Parenthood. That vote was totally out of touch with the needs of women across New Hampshire, and it puts women's health care at risk.

For many in New Hampshire, Planned Parenthood is the most affordable and accessible way to get the care they need, including basic preventive care such as family planning services—everything from breast and cervical cancer screenings and immunizations to HIV testing.

Last year alone, Planned Parenthood served more than 12,000 women in New Hampshire. Planned Parenthood is a trusted health care provider and an important part of our health care system. In some areas of New Hampshire, Planned Parenthood is the only local provider for women to receive affordable care.

On behalf of the millions of women who are served by Planned Parenthood, I will continue to oppose any effort to defund women's health care services, but of course, as we know, this week the attack on women's access to health care does not end with Planned Parenthood. Tomorrow we will vote on a bill that would ban women's access to abortion after 20 weeks.

The choice to terminate a pregnancy is a difficult and very personal decision. If that choice needs to be made later in a pregnancy, it is often the result of very complex circumstances—the kinds of situations where a woman and her doctor need every medical option available. This bill would place an added burden on women who are placed in that difficult situation. Women who are survivors of rape and incest would have that added burden. Furthermore, it threatens doctors, putting them at risk for harsh Federal criminal penalties.

Each woman, in consultation with her own family, her own health care providers, and her own conscience, should be able to follow her own beliefs when it comes to her own health care. We must protect women's reproductive constitutional rights, and I intend to continue to stand up for women as others here play politics with their health care.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle know they don't have the votes to pass this legislation. They know they don't have the votes to pass other legislation related to women's health that would limit women's access to comprehensive health services. Yet on the eve of a government shutdown, they are using precious floor time to bring these bills to a vote. This is shortsighted and, furthermore, I think it is irresponsible.

I remember the 2013 shutdown well. The impact on New Hampshire, on this country, was significant. Small- and medium-sized businesses across the State suffered from economic disruptions and financial losses. Their government contracts were frozen or they were disrupted. Their SBA loans were stalled. That shutdown, much like the one that is being threatened now, came at the peak of the fall tourism season.

National parks and forests were closed, including the White Mountain National Forest in New Hampshire. The impacts on our tourism and outdoor recreational facilities were severe, not just in New Hampshire but across the country. FHA and VA loans were put on hold. Thousands of Federal employees who live in New Hampshire were furloughed. To shut down the Federal Government for any reason is reckless and irresponsible, but to do this, to contemplate doing this in order to deny women access to health care services, is reprehensible.

I hope this week or any other week we will not tolerate it, and we will move to the business of funding the government and addressing the challenges we face and leave the personal decisions about personal health care choices to the women and families and health care providers who should be making those decisions, not having the government make that decision.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FISCHER. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, a bill that protects children from late-term abortions. As cosponsor of this commonsense proposal, I am grateful the Senate will be taking a vote on this very important piece of legislation. Our constituents should know where we stand on this issue.

The American people support reasonable limits on dangerous late-term abortions. A November 2014 Quinnipiac poll shows that 60 percent of Americans support legislation limiting abortions after 20 weeks. In line with this prevailing view, several States have already passed laws limiting late-term abortions.

I note that Nebraska was actually the first State to pass language like the Federal Pain-Capable Unborn Protection Act. I was a member of our legislature at the time, and I was proud to be a cosponsor of that piece of legislation that was offered by my good friend, former Nebraska speaker Mike Flood. Speaker Flood's proposal passed in our unicameral legislature by a bipartisan vote of 44 to 5. We had pro-choice Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, who supported it. We had pro-life Senators, both Republicans and Democrats, who supported it. Nearly 90 percent of our legislature came together and supported that bill. Why? Well, because it is a piece of reasonable legislation. Americans recognize that

and also recognize that opposition to this legislation is extremism.

This isn't a new idea. Eleven States already have protections against late-term abortions that are similar to this bill. Science clearly indicates that at 20 weeks, these babies can feel pain.

On this issue, party affiliation should not matter. On this issue, whether we declare we are pro-life or whether we say we are pro-choice should not matter. These designations didn't matter in my State of Nebraska. We looked at the facts. We came together from both sides of the aisle and passed a sensible, compassionate bill. Let's do the same here in the Senate.

We all agree that we must support women who find themselves with unplanned pregnancies. Too many women experience despair, pain, and judgment during an unplanned pregnancy. Rather than offering condemnation, we should show kindness and understanding. We should offer assistance for these women, these expectant mothers who need to know we will continue to support them in the challenging years ahead.

I recognize that abortion remains an emotionally charged issue here in this country, but I also recognize that people of good will can disagree on the matter. I respect those opinions that are different from my own. But this legislation is not controversial, and it shouldn't divide us.

Before us today is a fundamental question of whether it is worth protecting human life capable of feeling pain. For anyone who believes otherwise, I would challenge them to explain when a life is worth protecting if not when she feels pain? Nebraska affirmed this principle 5 years ago. The rest of the Nation should do so as well.

Thank you, Mr. President, and I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. WARREN. Mr. President, I will be honest. I am deep-down furious at the Republican scheme to defund Planned Parenthood. I didn't think the Republican leadership could sink any lower than trying to defund women's cancer screenings and access to birth control, but then I saw the bill we are voting on tomorrow and I felt sick to my stomach. Here we are just days away from another reckless Republican government shutdown, and the Republicans think the best use of our time is to vote on a bill to give the government the power to intrude on the most wrenching, intimate, private medical decisions a woman will ever make.

The Republicans want a debate over a 20-week abortion ban, so let's talk about exactly what that means. Nearly 99 percent of all abortions take place within the first 21 weeks of a woman's pregnancy. Let me repeat. Nearly 99 percent are in the first 21 weeks. So based on statistics alone, this bill won't make a big difference in the number of abortions, but for the women who get hit, the consequences can be truly horrific.

Let's start with the research. Who are these women? Who are the 1 percent who get an abortion after 20 weeks? Who? Women or girls who are the victims of rape, incest, or domestic violence and were too frightened to ask for help any sooner. Who? Women whose doctors have told them that if they don't end their pregnancy—pregnancies they really wanted—their kidneys could fail or their hearts could give out or they couldn't get the chemotherapy they may need to save their lives. Who? Women who go for an ultrasound and get the worst possible news—that their fetus has a giant hole in its stomach or organs outside its body or a deformed head and the fetus either has no chance of survival or has a severe abnormality that would mean a short life filled with pain. Research also shows that women who have had later abortions are more likely to be young—very young girls, really—and didn't understand they were pregnant. They are more likely to live in places where getting an abortion means driving 3 hours or more to find a doctor who will perform one. They are more likely to be poor and need to save up money to pay for the procedure. That is who gets hit by this.

I have taken a close look at the Republican bill to see just how hard they get hit. I want to put it right out here in the open for everyone to see.

There are no—I repeat—no exceptions in this bill for the condition of the fetus. Even if a woman knows at 20 weeks that her child will die immediately after birth, she would still be required to carry that pregnancy for months.

An 18-year-old survivor of rape or incest must wait until she can provide written proof that she received counseling from a doctor, and then that counseling is loaded with hurdles: The counseling must come only from a doctor who refuses to perform abortions and who doesn't work in an office with another doctor who does. Think about it. Prolong the pain and anxiety, and for anyone who lives in a rural area or anyone who is making it barely paycheck to paycheck and cannot miss multiple days of work, make it twice as hard to get any help.

If the victim of rape or incest is a minor, it gets even worse. A girl—a girl who is 10, 12, 14 years old—this girl must face the same challenges and must provide written proof that she reported the crime to the police, even if

turning in a family member or announcing to the world that she has been raped could destroy her life in a million different ways. I cannot imagine that the Senate would pass a law to require a frightened 12-year-old girl to submit written proof that she had called the police to report a rape by her mother's boyfriend before she could terminate that pregnancy. That kind of cruelty is barbaric, and it has no place in our laws.

But this is not just about the tiny number of people who must seek abortions after 20 weeks; this horrifying bill that we will vote on tomorrow is just one more piece of a deliberate, methodical, orchestrated rightwing plan to attack women's health and reproductive rights. A funding cut here, a new restriction there, month after month, year after year, and *Rowe v. Wade* will be chipped away to nothing. That is what this is all about. That is what this has always been all about.

We have lived in an America where women died in back-alley abortions. We have lived in an America where high school girls tried poisons and coat hangers to try to end pregnancies. We have lived in an America where young women who faced unwanted pregnancies took their own lives. We have lived in that America, and we are not going back—not now, not ever.

We stand here on the brink of another reckless Republican government shutdown. We all remember what happened the last time the Republicans shut the government down: \$24 billion was flushed down the drain for a political stunt—\$24 billion that could have gone to help mothers and their babies with prenatal care, better infant nutrition, Head Start classes, medical research on birth abnormalities. Instead, the money was flushed away by Republicans who want to play political games more than they want to help children and families all across this country.

I urge my colleagues to vote no on this terrible bill. Stand up to this rightwing assault on women and families. Instead of trying to do the job of physicians and telling women what is best for their own medical care, Republicans in the Senate should start doing the job of legislators and get to work on this Nation's budget.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, the image I am putting up right now beside me is the cover of *Time* magazine from June 2014, the first issue in June, June 2, 2014. According to the corresponding feature story, the baby on this cover, Emalyn Aubrey Randolph, was born prematurely at 29 weeks into the pregnancy. She weighed 2 pounds and 10 ounces. The legislation we are actually talking about today, unlike the legisla-

tion I just heard described—which we may very well talk about later—the legislation which we are talking about today and which we will vote on tomorrow takes us back only a few weeks before this cover-story baby was born at 29 weeks.

We know of lots of cases after 20 weeks—where we have seen babies survive an early birth.

In 2010, Freida Mangold was born at 21 weeks and 5 days into her mother's pregnancy. Both had complications. The baby was born, and after intensive care she was able to go home. In Florida in 2006, Amillia Taylor was delivered by an emergency C-section when she was 21 weeks and 6 days into that pregnancy. She received medical care and survived.

In Iowa in 2012, Micah Pickering was born prematurely at 22 weeks and 1 day. Micah and her family are actually here visiting with the Senate tomorrow. Micah just turned 3 this past July. She will be meeting with Members of the Senate to talk about and to be the example that her parents will be talking about of what happened to a baby who was born 22 weeks and 1 day into the pregnancy.

In my State of Missouri, we know of a remarkable story where the Cowan family in Kansas City welcomed their twin sons into the world 39 days apart. Little Carl was so small that his mother Elene could put her wedding ring over his wrist when he was born at 24 weeks and 1 day. He weighed barely a pound—twins are often small anyway; he was a twin—at that point in the pregnancy. Thirty-nine days later, his twin brother David came into the world. Carl is busy catching up with David in his size as things go on.

In St. Louis, Andrew Konopka was born at 23 weeks. Andrew weighed a pound and a half. He was born at Mercy Hospital there. Today he is 8 years old and is doing well. His family lives in Webster Groves.

Also in St. Louis last year, Zeke Miller was born at 27 weeks on December 10, 2014. He weighed 2 pounds and 15 ounces. Zeke was in the hospital 111 days. He is now 9 months old. Just last week his parents were excited to hear that Zeke no longer needs to be on oxygen. He has passed another milestone.

Across the State line in Overland Park, KS, at the Overland Park Medical Center, babies born as early as 23 weeks of pregnancy are receiving care in the neonatal intensive care unit. Their neonatal unit has been featured for its emphasis on what it calls “kangaroo care” because in “kangaroo care” the baby's parents come and have that skin-to-skin, parent-to-baby contact so that the baby knows for sure there is somebody out there ready to take care of it.

I recognize there is no national consensus on the issue we are talking about or even the issue of the early

months of pregnancy. However, the overwhelming majority of Americans know that at this stage—20 weeks—they are not talking about a clump of cells; they are talking about a baby. The baby has 10 fingers and 10 toes. It has unique fingerprints that nobody has ever had and nobody will ever have again. It has a beating heart. Thanks to advanced ultrasound technology, this is about the time when people find out whether they are the parents of a little boy or the parents of a little girl.

The fact that the baby at 20 weeks is a baby is obvious to the larger culture. In fact, this cover story in *Time* magazine—no advocate, as a rule, for outlandishly conservative social structure—*Time* magazine tells stories of young babies fighting for their lives and doctors who are fighting to save them.

Let me quote from the article. It says, “. . . fragile babies being looked after by a round the clock SWAT team of nutritionists, pharmacologists, gastroenterologists, ophthalmologists, pulmonary specialists, surgeons. . . .”

It concludes: In some ways, the work of the NICU will always seem like an exercise in disproportion—an army of people and a mountain of infrastructure caring for a pound of life. But it is a disproportion that speaks very well of us.

That is not me saying that is a disproportion that speaks very well of us; it is *Time* magazine. The value that our society places on little 1- and 2-pound premature babies in the neonatal intensive care unit is remarkable. It speaks well for us, according to *Time*.

So many of us have experienced now or have friends—in fact, my guess would be that as Members of the Senate go do hospital visits, nothing is more riveting than that moment you sometimes get to spend in the neonatal unit with a baby who is so little that you don't know how it survived, but it has, and you know with the technology we have today, that baby is very likely to go home.

When everyone in your family is healthy, you have a lot of problems. When someone in your family is sick, you have one problem, and the one thing that is the focus in the case of these families and these babies is what they are about to do right then, which is everything they can do to save a life that has all it takes to survive, but it just needs some help.

So while the culture is embracing the value of these lives—these little lives who can survive—on the one hand, our laws really don't reflect that science has made that almost an indisputable argument. We know that babies born 20 weeks after conception can survive. Down the road in Maryland, a doctor says he will end a human life at 28 weeks—that is about 7 months—into a pregnancy. Several States and the District of Columbia allow life to be ended

with an abortion in the ninth month of pregnancy. Can anyone on either side of this debate defend that? If they can't, really you should favor this fairly easy-to-achieve view of this issue.

There are only seven countries in the world, including ours, that allow this to happen, these lives to be ended after 20 weeks. These babies can feel pain, as I just talked about. They have or are very quickly going to have the ability to survive with some help.

By the way, the seven countries include China, North Korea, Vietnam, and the United States of America—not a list I think we want to be on.

Shortly my colleagues and I will be able to cast a vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

I would like to close by saying a baby is a baby, and science tells us they can feel pain. This bill is a commonsense idea. It is broadly supported. I hope the Senate will take a step to protect these lives.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Ms. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I rise today to speak in opposition to my Republican colleagues who are once again bringing forward a political attack on the freedom of American women to make their own personal health care decisions. Instead of focusing on improving access to health care for women, Republicans are pursuing a divisive policy that jeopardizes women's health and puts politicians and the government between a woman and her doctor. Instead of spending our time on bipartisan budget negotiations, Republicans are wasting what is precious time on another failed attempt to strip funding for critical women's health programs, denying women the health services they need.

They have scheduled yet another show vote. They know it is destined to fail, and many believe it is just to pander to extreme allies by taking away women's constitutionally protected health care choices. I have to say I object to this dangerous political game. Women's access to quality health care isn't a political game. It is not one for me and many of my other colleagues who join me on the floor today, nor is it a game for women and their families across the country and in my home State of Wisconsin.

Too many States have enacted what are record numbers of laws—over 230 of them in the past 4 years—that restrict a women's access to reproductive health services and the freedom and right to make her own health care decisions.

The bill before us today would impose a 20-week abortion ban nationwide and would have real and grave consequences for American families.

Last year I heard from a woman from Middleton, WI, who at 20 weeks was devastated to find out that her baby

had a severe fetal anomaly and that there would be no chance of surviving delivery. She had to undergo an emergency termination, and a clinic in Milwaukee was the only place in Wisconsin that would do the procedure. But because at the time our Republican Governor was set to sign into law a new measure imposing unreasonable requirements on providers, this particular clinic was preparing to close its doors and would not schedule her procedure. She and her husband were forced to find childcare for their two sons and travel to another State to get the medical care she needed.

Since hearing this mother's story, Wisconsin's Republican lawmakers have attempted to enact even more restrictions, including a bill recently passed in the Wisconsin State Senate to ban abortions after 20 weeks with no exceptions for rape or incest. In addition, this bill's medical emergency exception is similar to what is included in Senator GRAHAM's Federal proposal. It says nothing about the health of the mother.

The threat in Wisconsin and States across the country is clear. When Congressmen and politicians play doctor, American families suffer. This is why my good friend and colleague from Connecticut Senator BLUMENTHAL and I have introduced a serious proposal, the Women's Health Protection Act. This proposal would put a stop to these sorts of legislative attacks on women's rights and freedoms. Our bill creates Federal protections against restrictions such as the proposal before us that unduly limit access to reproductive health care and do nothing to further women's health or safety and certainly intrude upon personal decision-making. It is time that we place our trust back in women to carefully consider their options and make their own health decisions, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this important legislation.

We know that this week's Republican spectacle is not meant to produce a serious debate about protecting women's reproductive health; it is about the narrow Republican agenda to take our country backward and roll back the important health benefits for American families. We have seen this with the numerous failed attempts by Republicans to repeal the protections in the Affordable Care Act, protections that have empowered millions of women with more choices and stronger health care coverage. Today women can finally rest assured that they will not be charged more for coverage just because they are women, and someone's mother can get a lifesaving mammogram without the fear of high medical bills.

Over 75 times, congressional Republicans have tried to roll back this measure, which provides health security and economic security for millions of American families. It seems that Re-

publicans would gladly go back to the days where being a woman was a pre-existing condition and when insurance companies could drop your coverage just because you got sick or older or had a baby.

We are not going to go back to those days, just as we are not going to create a future where politicians in Washington take away from freedom and the right of women to make their own personal health decisions. I am committing to putting a stop to the relentless and ideological attacks on American families and will continue to fight to ensure that both men and women have the freedom to access the health care they need.

The American people do not want Congress playing doctor, and they are sick and tired of Republicans manufacturing crisis after crisis. Just 2 years after they shut down the government because of a partisan battle with the President over the Affordable Care Act, they are again threatening to shut down the government over another partisan attack on funding for women's health care. These political games could come at a serious cost to America's economic strength and the well-being of working families.

It is time for Republicans to stop playing dangerous games with women's health. It is time for Republicans to stop manufacturing crisis after crisis. It is time for Republicans to join Democrats and work in a bipartisan manner to keep the government open and negotiate a budget agreement that ends sequestration and invests in economic growth, invests in our middle class, invests in our national security, and invests in women's health.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, this week Pope Francis will be making a historic visit to Washington, DC, to address those of us in Congress and millions of Americans across the United States.

While I am not a Catholic, one of the tenets of the Catholic Church that I have long respected is adherence and devotion to the sanctity of life. We have an issue before us regarding the very essence of what life is and how life is treated in this country. So my colleagues who don't agree with the legislation before us and who don't even want us to have a debate on this are trying to, through a procedural motion, stop us from moving forward to discuss an issue that ought to be debated before the American people and certainly before this body.

It is no secret now that the science has proven that pain can be experienced by an unborn child in the womb. And the taking of that life—many of us believe that life begins at conception, but even if you don't adhere to that, it is now a fact, a pure fact, that it is a viable life at the age of 20 weeks and that life can experience pain. Surgery

can be provided for that life. Anesthesia is given to that unborn child in the womb to prevent it from experiencing the pain that may result from surgery that is trying to correct perhaps an abnormality or some condition in the womb and give that child an opportunity to be a healthier baby and to live out the privilege of living.

I have spoken a number of times on this floor about the sanctity of life and how we as elected representatives and the American people—people of conscience and conviction—need to protect the sanctity of life. In doing so, it means that we have to discuss the issue of abortion. This is not a pleasant or comfortable issue to debate on the Senate floor, but we are not elected to come here to just discuss and debate pleasant issues; we are here to face difficult and often emotional issues, to face it honestly, to face it openly, and to cast our votes either for or against.

There are few, if any, issues that I believe are potentially more divisive and emotional than the issue of abortion because it goes to the heart of the meaning of life itself. It is about protecting those who cannot protect themselves. The story of America is a history of inclusion and an impulse to protect and uplift those who have been on the margins of society, and no human being is more on the margin of society than an unborn child who is seen not as a human life but is seen as something that can be dissected, can be torn apart, can be harvested, and the organs can be sold for research.

That is not the issue we will be debating in this vote coming up, but it has been debated and it has been raised—I have been on the floor listening to a number of these speeches that raised it a number of times—that somehow Republicans are denying women health care coverage because we are not wanting to fund an organization, Planned Parenthood, that uses some of the most brutal and inhumane efforts to harvest from unborn children organs to sale for the use of research. We had that debate and we had that vote. Unfortunately, we came up short on that vote. That, in and of itself, is an issue that we must continue to debate and continue to deal with, but the issue before us now is the ability to debate, discuss, vote, and hopefully pass legislation that is based on science—not on theory, not on ideology but based on science.

We now know that a child growing in the womb of its mother at the age of 20 weeks can experience pain, and we also now know that under the procedures that are used by Planned Parenthood, those children are harvested—they are dissected, harvested, some of their organs are carefully preserved and sold. It is almost beyond comprehension that a nation that has reached out to be inclusive to the most vulnerable, that at this point in life for a child

views it as nothing more than something to be harvested. The descriptions of how Planned Parenthood describes the cold, calculating, numerical profit that might occur from the sale of certain organs and the techniques used to go into the womb to make sure that certain organs are preserved while others are crushed, just goes beyond comprehension.

Yet to stand on the floor and simply say Republicans are taking away women's health—no, we aren't. We are simply saying we don't want the taxpayers to fund an organization that practices these methods, that takes the lives of children, and that ignores the pain that is incurred in doing so. We want to transfer that money to women's health organizations—about five times as many in my State as there are Planned Parenthood organizations—that will provide for every aspect of women's health care except for abortion. The question before us on that vote was: Should the taxpayer fund something of this nature? And, unfortunately, we came up short because our colleagues simply would not support us in the effort to do so.

This goes to the soul of the Nation. This goes to who we are. This goes to a country which has been compassionate and reached out to those on the margin but now turns its back on those who are the most vulnerable. It is not just a matter of politics. It is not, as has been said on the floor, that Republicans want to roll back important health care coverage for mothers, deny women's health and access to health care. It is not a manufactured crisis, a dangerous game we are playing. How can you describe as a dangerous game the provision before us on the Senate floor that addresses the issue of the excruciating pain a child feels, which we now know is scientifically documented and proved in the taking of that life, for the harvesting of that life's organs? How can you describe that as a dangerous game?

If we treat this with such total irrelevance, in terms of what is happening here, it says something about our country. I deeply regret our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are even denying us the opportunity to go forward. We are on a procedural motion here where they can kill the debate. They can prevent us from doing what the American people have sent us here to do—to deal with tough issues, state our positions, and let our yes be yes and our no be no. Once again, we are in a situation now where even that procedure to get to that point is being denied. I regret we are here.

I have noticed the discussions on the floor have been quite somber. The statements made are made softly. That doesn't mask the kind of emotion and the kind of passion that many of us feel. What it shows is grief. What it shows is the grief over a practice con-

ducted in this advanced Nation of ours. It is a grief over the fact we are taking hundreds of thousands and have taken millions of lives of unborn children. It shows a special emotion and a special grief over the fact that we know those children are experiencing the pain of dismemberment—of arms and legs being ripped apart, of organs being harvested for sale.

So without the shouting, without the accusations, it is a sincere belief and grief over what is happening in this country. As has been stated by my colleagues, only seven other countries in the world allow this kind of practice. It is shameful that one of those countries is the United States of America.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, first of all, I am going to make a reference to a 20-week sonogram. I will introduce, however, Donelle Harden. I am a little bit biased, but I think she is the best communication director in the U.S. Senate, and you can see she is 31 weeks pregnant. At the conclusion of my remarks, I want to demonstrate clearly what a 20-week sonogram looks like and what a baby does look like.

By 20 weeks, a woman has reached the halfway point of the pregnancy and has the opportunity to learn the gender of her child. By 20 weeks, there is conclusive scientific evidence that a baby can feel pain, they can hear sounds, and they can react to sounds. They twist, they kick, they yawn, and they stretch, and some even open their eyes and suck their thumbs. But most importantly, they feel pain.

The United States is just one of seven countries with populations of more than a million that allows abortions past 20 weeks. Other countries who join ours in this practice are countries like China and North Korea and Vietnam.

The abortion procedure after 20 weeks is known as late-term abortions. We have been talking about this on the floor, and I think people are pretty familiar with it—much more so now than they were just a short while ago. It is very unpleasant and very shocking. During the procedure the baby is rotated and the forceps are used to pull the baby's legs, arms, and shoulders through the birth canal. Once this is done—because the head is too large—an incision is made at the base of the baby's skull to allow a suction catheter to be inserted to remove the cerebral material—that is the brains—collapsing the skull and allowing the baby to be completely removed.

Now, I lay this out for you because people need to know what inhumane practices are taking place in America. When you start to devalue the life of a child just because it hasn't been born yet, you start devaluing life in general, situations like what happened in Philadelphia are allowed to occur.

As I am sure the occupier of the Chair remembers very well, in May of 2013, Kermit Gosnell was convicted of three first-degree murder charges for killing babies who had been born alive at his abortion clinic in Philadelphia. Testimony from the trial indicated he and his staff snipped the necks of more than 100 infants who survived abortion attempts. Viable babies were delivered and then murdered. Furthermore, Gosnell endangered the health and lives of the women who came to his clinic by reusing disposable medical equipment, performing procedures in unsanitary conditions with unsanitary instruments, overdosing them, and causing serious injuries to their bodies. On at least two occasions women died after visiting his clinic. Talk about a war on women, this guy is on the front lines.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania turned its back on these women when it never once inspected the clinic in 17 years, despite receiving complaints against Gosnell and being notified that a woman died in the clinic. Pennsylvania Department of State wouldn't investigate the complaints they received. These kinds of things can happen when human life is considered disposable.

This year, we have seen 10 videos released by the Center for Medical Progress, showing Planned Parenthood executives and employees across the country detailing the sale of baby parts and how they manipulated and delayed the abortions. What we are saying is they delayed an abortion from taking place so the baby could mature and the parts they were using as their specimens would be of greater value to the customers they were selling the baby parts to. The heartless way they talked about these things and the complete disregard for the life of the baby that is being dissected are shocking and sickening.

It is no wonder over the past decade Americans have been waking up to the scientific facts and the moral implications regarding abortions. There was a Gallup poll in 2010 that called pro-life the "new normal" for Americans. But 3 years later, in 2013, the Gallup poll showed that 64 percent of Americans—that is 2 to 1, a majority of Americans by 2 to 1, which is a very strong majority—supported banning abortions after the first trimester. That is just one of many polls showing this trend to favor life. In the first trimester you are only talking about 12 weeks at that point.

What is really interesting about these polls is that in each of them women always support these bans at a higher rate than men. As I have learned from my wife and two daughters, only women can really understand what is at stake.

I had the opportunity to experience firsthand and be there at the time of the birth of my four children and my 12 grandchildren. Life is truly a miracle.

It is not just the life of a child but also that of the mother. Thanks to the progress of science it is more evident than ever that abortion ends life. Medical data is now also showing significant risks to women's health and well-being.

Now, what I am going to show—what Donelle is going to show—is the baby she is carrying right now. That sonogram was taken at 20 weeks. At 20 weeks you can see all the details of the baby, and I would like to have Donelle point out the ear of the baby the sonogram shows. It is very, very clear—the kidney, the heart, the spine, the teeth, the lips, and the brain. Now, that was 20 weeks.

What we have here in the United States is an opportunity for those in favor of abortion to go far longer than just the 20 weeks. They can go all the way up to, in America, the time of birth. All they have to do is show the health of the mother is at risk and this can be done. The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would ban these abortions and protect these babies.

We have 46 Senators signed to the bill. The House has passed its own version, and I think we have the opportunity to take a major step forward. That is what this is all about. I have hope. I have run into so many people who have not had the opportunity to get some of the graphic details of what Planned Parenthood has been doing in murdering these babies and selling their parts, but I hope this is an opportunity.

We are going to have a vote so that we will have an opportunity to do this, and I am very hopeful some of these Senators who have not acknowledged this is going on, that they will do so. This is what it is all about. This is what the baby is, and this is what we have the opportunity to reform in our system.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, this week the Senate is considering the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would protect unborn children who have reached the age of 20 weeks—that is 5 months of pregnancy—from being killed by abortion.

Five months into a pregnancy, babies are sucking their thumbs, they are yawning and stretching, they are actively moving around, they respond to noises, and they feel and respond to pain.

The scientific evidence on this point is incontrovertible. Five months into a

pregnancy, unborn babies feel pain. Their stress hormones spike, and they shrink from painful stimuli. In fact, some scientific evidence suggests that babies of this age feel pain more keenly than adults since some of the neural mechanisms that inhibit pain don't fully develop until after birth.

Babies are regularly born weeks or months early in this country and with medical care survive and often thrive.

A Time magazine article from May 2014 that highlighted the tremendous advances that have been made in the treatment of premature babies noted that 76 percent of babies born at 25 weeks of pregnancy—or about 6 months—will go on to leave the hospital.

A May 2015 article of the New York Times entitled "Premature Babies May Survive at 22 Weeks if Treated, Study Finds" highlighted a recent study published in the New England Journal of Medicine reporting on successes in treating extremely early premature births. One baby mentioned in the New York Times article, Alexis Hutchinson, was delivered at 22 weeks and 1 day. She weighed 1.1 pounds at delivery. Today, the Times reports, "aside from being more vulnerable to respiratory viruses, Alexis is a healthy 5-year-old girl." Let me repeat that. Alexis Hutchinson, who was born at 22 weeks and 1 day—or approximately halfway through her mother's pregnancy—is today a healthy 5-year-old girl. Yet, under the laws of this country, a baby of the very same age can be killed by abortion.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that more than 15,000 late-term abortions are performed each year in the United States. Many of those babies could have survived if instead of being aborted they had been born in a hospital and given medical care.

Late-term abortion procedures are so brutal, it is difficult to even talk about them. Americans would rightly shrink in horror from performing one of these procedures on an animal. How, then, are we allowing these procedures to be performed on our children?

Right now only seven countries in the world allow elective abortion after 5 months of pregnancy. It is hard to believe the United States is one of them. Among those countries are China and North Korea. Unfortunately, our country is on that list. I suggest that might not be the company we want to keep when it comes to protecting human life.

A society is measured by how it treats its weakest and most vulnerable members, and we have been failing some of ours. But we have a chance with this legislation to start fixing that today.

Ultimately, it is very simple: That unborn baby—the one with the fingers

and toes, who sucks her thumb and responds to her mother's voice—that unborn baby is one of us, and as such she deserves to be protected. I hope the United States Senate will vote in support of protecting our unborn and vote in favor of this legislation when we have that opportunity tomorrow.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, the Pope's visit this week to our Nation's Capital reminds us all of how very important it is to show compassion and concern for the most innocent and vulnerable among us. Unborn children who fall into this category are entitled to the same dignity all human beings share. This is true even when their presence might be uncomfortable or create difficulties, the Pope reminds us.

We are now considering moving to a bill known as the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation would make no change to our abortion policy in the first 20 weeks of pregnancy. At 20 weeks of fetal age, when the unborn child can detect and respond to painful stimuli, the bill would impose some restrictions on elective late-term abortions. Such a change to existing law would put us in line with the vast majority of other countries around the globe.

I want to emphasize that the United States is in the small minority of countries around the world that allow abortion on demand after the fifth month of pregnancy. As some of my colleagues have mentioned earlier, we are just one of seven countries that take this unusual position. China, North Korea, and Vietnam are among the other seven. Are these countries really the ones we in the United States want to align ourselves with on this particular human rights issue?

Many of us in this Chamber actively supported the Americans with Disability Act. Could anyone here support an abortion after 5 months because the unborn baby had a cleft lip? What about a late-term abortion of a baby with hemophilia? Under current law, it is quite possible to destroy unborn babies with these or other more serious abnormalities in utero. I believe these babies' lives have the same value as those of other unborn babies without disabilities.

There are some who say they cannot support this legislation. I say to them, if you do not support restrictions on abortion after the fifth month of pregnancy, when some babies born prematurely at this stage now are surviving long-term, then what exactly is your limit on abortion?

Scientists say the unborn child can feel pain perhaps even as early as 8 weeks and most certainly by 20 weeks' fetal age. The American people overwhelmingly support restrictions on late-term abortions.

Doctors tell us that about a quarter of the babies born prematurely, around 5 months, will survive long term if given proper medical assistance.

Dr. Colleen Malloy, an assistant professor of pediatrics at Northwestern's School of Medicine, testified before a congressional panel just 3 years ago that infants born at 20 weeks' fetal age now are "kicking, moving, reacting, and developing right before our eyes in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit." She explained that treatment of neonatal pain is standard in such cases and added that there is no reason to believe an infant born prematurely would feel pain any differently from the same infant if still in the womb.

We also have the statements from Dr. Anthony Levatino, a practicing gynecologist with decades of experience. Dr. Levatino estimates that he performed over 1,000 abortions in private practice, until his adopted daughter died in a car crash. The death of his child was a life-changing event that ultimately led him to stop performing abortions. Dr. Levatino testified before the House Judiciary Committee—again, 3 years ago—that performing an abortion on a 24-week-old child is painful for that unborn baby. In the words of Dr. Levatino, "If you refuse to believe that this procedure inflicts severe pain on an unborn child, please think again."

Scientific studies confirm what Dr. Levatino has noted—that the unborn can experience pain after the fifth month. In fact, at least one medical school professor says it is indisputable that unborn babies can react to painful stimuli as early as 8 weeks after conception.

Dr. Maureen Condic, a neurobiology professor who earned her Ph.D. at Berkeley, explains that the unborn child at this stage of development reacts to painful stimuli just as other human beings do at later stages. In both the case of the unborn child and human beings at later stages of development, the response is the same: to actively withdraw from the painful stimulus.

As stated in a paper written by Dr. Condic:

The scientific evidence that the human fetus can detect and react to painful stimuli as early as 8 weeks . . . is indisputable. The neural circuitry responsible for the most primitive response to pain, the spinal reflex, is in place by eight weeks. . . . Connections between the spinal cord and the thalamus, the region of the brain that is largely responsible for pain perception in both the fetus and the adult, begin to form around 12 weeks, and are completed by 18 weeks.

Babies delivered prematurely also show pain-related behaviors, according to Dr. Condic. Also, the earlier infants are delivered, the stronger their response to pain is, she reports. It is perhaps for this reason that many doctors use anesthesia when operating on late-term babies in utero. Research suggests that these babies do better and

recover faster when anesthesia is used during utero surgery.

Many expectant mothers today are encouraged to talk to their babies in utero or play soft music for the babies' benefit. Unborn babies can hear as early as the fifth month and find their mom's voice soothing, new research suggests. Babies even learn while in the womb, absorbing language earlier than previously suspected, according to another report. Regardless of whether you characterize yourself as pro-choice or pro-life, common sense tells us that if such techniques work to soothe the unborn baby, then the reverse likely is true as well. Late in pregnancy, unborn babies aren't impervious to dismemberment with steel tools in utero.

Some say abortion saves and helps women. Remember that 5 years ago a woman walked into a Pennsylvania abortion clinic expecting that she would have her pregnancy terminated and would walk out of that clinic without major side effects. She was 41 years old and 19 weeks pregnant. She had three children and was a grandmother. She and her daughter entered the clinic, but she never made it out alive. Her name was Karnamaya Mongar. She was one of the many victims of Kermit Gosnell. He operated a clinic in West Philadelphia for four decades. He made a living by performing abortions that no other doctor should ever do. The grand jury report that framed the case around Kermit Gosnell stated: "Gosnell's approach was simple: keep volume high, expenses low—and break the law. That was his competitive edge."

According to the grand jury report:

The bigger the baby, the bigger the charge. Ultrasounds were forged so that the Government would never know how old aborted babies truly were. Babies were born alive, killed after breathing on their own, by sticking scissors into the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. These were live, breathing, squirming babies.

This doctor didn't care about the well-being of these aborted babies. He didn't care about the health of the women.

Extremely experienced doctors like Dr. Levatino, whom I mentioned earlier, also tell us that abortion is "seldom if ever a useful intervention" when life-threatening conditions require immediate care late in pregnancy. In most of these late second and third trimester cases, any attempt to perform an abortion "would entail undue and dangerous delay in providing appropriate, truly life-saving care." The number of babies whose lives Dr. Levatino had to terminate in such cases was zero, he testified.

The bill we are talking about that we are going to vote on tomorrow is a commonsense measure aimed at protecting women and children across the country. I urge my colleagues to embrace the sanctity of human life and vote to move to this bill so it can at least be considered.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, I first want to commend the Senator from Iowa. Senator GRASSLEY has done a great job of a detailed report on why this bill is so extremely important, and I thank him for his comments.

My remarks will be somewhat abbreviated. Today I rise to speak about this very important legislation, absolutely crucial legislation the Senate is considering tomorrow. Like so many Americans, I agree that we have a responsibility to protect those who cannot defend themselves. That is why I am a cosponsor of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act—this critical legislation which simply prohibits abortions after an unborn child reaches 20 weeks of development.

Scientific evidence—Senator GRASSLEY reported about that—has shown that after 20 weeks, a child's brain has developed to a point where they can experience pain. With modern medical advances, even children born at this early stage have a chance to survive. It is appalling that the United States is one of only seven countries where elected abortions after 20 weeks are legal. How can our country take pride in protecting human rights when we continue to allow this practice to happen within our own borders?

A poll conducted by the Quinnipiac University found that a majority of Americans now support the banning of this abhorrent practice. Representing the values shared by a majority of Americans should be a bipartisan effort. We need to work together to protect innocent life.

So many Americans are troubled by the recent videos of Planned Parenthood employees selling fetal tissue for a profit. Those videos have helped the American people understand exactly what life at conception means. This legislation is a line of defense for protecting unborn children from Planned Parenthood's unconscionable practices.

I commend the States that have stopped this practice in the absence of a Federal law. Thirteen States maintain prohibitions of abortion at 20 weeks. This includes my home State of Kansas. It is now time for the Senate to act and ensure that this practice is banned all across the Nation. I encourage my colleagues to unite on this issue and support this critical legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Mr. President, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act will do exactly that: protect unborn children who can feel pain. Studies have shown that babies can feel pain by 20 weeks or 5 months into pregnancy, and it is unconscionable to subject a child, at any stage in their life, to such pain.

Anesthesiologists protect these children from the pain of surgery in the womb. Today these premature babies have a one in four chance of living a full and complete life.

Do a quick Google search and type in "20-week baby" or "20-week baby pictures." Take out your smartphone and Google it. The results of that search will pull up something like you see here to my right—a baby whose facial features are clearly visible. In fact, only seven countries in the world allow babies 20 weeks or older to be aborted—seven countries. The United States is one of them, along with North Korea and China, to name a few.

Overwhelmingly, Americans support this commonsense legislation. According to a November 2014 poll, 60 percent of Americans support a ban on abortion at 20 weeks, including nearly 60 percent of American women. This is a bill that a majority of the American people are behind, protecting babies after 20 weeks when they can feel pain.

We must continue to fight for the most vulnerable in our society—the elderly, the disabled, and the unborn—for they don't have a voice up here on Capitol Hill. Their right to life is protected by our Constitution and is part of the framework of the Declaration of Independence, and because of that, we speak up.

During the Gosnell trial, we all learned about the gruesome methods of ending the life of just-born children by using a method similar to dismemberment, which occurs in several clinics throughout our country. Science tells us that this method causes pain to the baby, some of whom were a little over 20 weeks old.

Why do we allow these late-term abortions? If Gosnell aborted these children moments before they were removed from the womb, would the loss of life have been any less tragic or less appalling?

We cannot stand idly by and allow such painful terminations of human life to continue. We must continue to be a voice for those who don't have a voice. The Senate needs to join the House of Representatives and get this legislation passed and on the President's desk.

I yield back my time.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DAINES). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I appreciate the opportunity to speak tonight. I am rising in strong support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This is an opportunity for all of us to give voice to the unborn.

The fight to preserve the sanctity of life is something I have consistently and proudly supported. I am proud of my record with regard to supporting the sanctity of life. I am proud of my 100-percent pro-life voting record by supporting legislation in the House and now here in the Senate.

Earlier this year I reintroduced the Child Custody Protection Act. It prevents the transportation of minors across State lines for the purposes of eluding parental notification laws. This is a big deal in my State. The legislation simply says that parents have the right to be involved in their kids' most important decisions. It is supported, by the way, by an overwhelming majority of Americans. Parental notification laws are key to reducing the number of abortions in this country and should be supported. We should not allow parental notification laws to be circumvented.

I understand that there are raw emotions that are evoked by these issues, and I know there are fundamental disagreements on the issue of abortion. However, I hope there are steps we can take to promote a culture of life, and I think passing the Child Custody Protection Act is certainly one of those. I hope the Senate will take up that legislation soon so that we can indeed come together as a group and promote the sanctity of life. I think another way to do this is to support the pain-capable legislation I will talk about in a moment.

Along with millions of other Americans, I have watched these deeply disturbing Planned Parenthood videos that were recently released. The videos graphically show how some at Planned Parenthood view the unborn as something to be exploited and not as precious life that deserves to be protected. Because of the shocking nature of these videos, congressional committees of jurisdiction are properly now investigating. Beyond that, I call on the Obama administration to begin a criminal investigation into this matter to determine if employees of a federally funded organization have violated the law. These acts must not be tolerated.

Last month I cosponsored and voted for legislation that would end Federal funding for Planned Parenthood while ensuring that taxpayer dollars would continue to be offered to community health organizations to continue to provide health services to women across my State of Ohio and across America. By the way, there are seven times more community health organizations in the State of Ohio than there are Planned Parenthood clinics. So this is an opportunity for us to shift that funding to where women can get the health care support they need. These health care issues for women are a national priority and should continue to be. We need to strengthen women's

health initiatives without having to fund Planned Parenthood from the paychecks of American workers.

The pain-capable legislation that is currently being debated here on the floor is really about science, and it is about advances in medical technology. Scientific evidence now tells us that at the age of 20 weeks post fertilization, an unborn child can feel pain. It is time to recognize this fact and take the necessary steps to protect unborn children and welcome them to life. I believe this legislation is a very important part of that overall goal.

I have visited the neonatal units at the great children's hospitals in my home State of Ohio. I have seen the amazing work that is done there by our doctors, nurses, and other medical professionals. It is incredible. I encourage all of my colleagues to make visits in their own States. I have seen firsthand this amazing work. I have seen as they help babies who were born extremely premature come to life. It is inspirational to see what they are doing. These newborns represent the miracle of life, and it is our duty to make sure they are protected. We have seen advances in neonatal care to allow these babies to survive and to live to their full potential. Just a few years ago this was not necessarily the case, so these medical advances have been really exciting, and it is one more reason to pass this legislation.

As we continue to enhance our medical technologies, more and more people are able to see that we are not talking about unviable fetuses, but unborn children who could one day grow up and become part of our American family. As a result, increasingly, the American people believe that ending a child's life should be as rare as possible and that we should work together to reduce the number of abortions performed in this country. That is progress.

The debate on this legislation is not just about morals or values or religious views. It is about protecting innocent life from a painful act that they do not deserve. We have a responsibility to protect unborn children and give them the chance to succeed. This legislation and this vote before us here tomorrow in the Senate is an opportunity to make that happen.

The United States of America is only one of only seven countries in the world to provide and allow for elective abortions after 20 weeks. Think about that. On that short list, by the way, are North Korea and China. What does that say about our national character if we know these unborn children are feeling excruciating pain, yet we choose not to act? When our Founders declared our independence, they wrote of certain unalienable truths endowed by our Creator, they said, and among them, of course, are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Life is the

very first one. So let's stand together today and take a unified step toward protecting life.

This is a commonsense bill. It has the support of the American people. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help provide a voice for those who cannot provide that voice for themselves, to take this important step toward holding up the sanctity of life, and to pass this important legislation.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, we as a Nation treat bugs in a very unique way. There is a little bug called the American burying beetle. They are in many areas of the country. They are all over Oklahoma. In southeastern Oklahoma, in a lot of areas where there is commercial construction, we have to wait through the early part of the spring because, in the springtime, the American burying beetle lays little eggs and those eggs multiply in the ground and little bugs start crawling up. The folks at the Fish and Wildlife Service tell us not to step on those bugs because they could possibly be threatened, and construction needs to stop during the springtime so the Earth is not disturbed during that time period. We don't want to disturb the Earth because those eggs might be damaged, and we will have fewer of the American burying beetle.

I bring that up not because I am so enamored with that bug, but because our Nation has a history of protecting life—life wherever it may be—whether it is a burying beetle in southeastern Oklahoma or whether it is a child.

For some strange reason, in this room, the conversation tends to go more towards the American burying beetle and their eggs and protecting that bug than it is about protecting children. So I bring up today something that I don't think should be that controversial. What are we going to do with children who can feel and experience pain? Will we as a Nation guard children? That would be a pretty straightforward thing, I would say.

In 1973 the Supreme Court of the United States struggled with how to be able to define life. This whole conversation the Supreme Court had behind closed doors as they struggled with a decision that we now know as *Roe v. Wade*. In January of 1973, after struggling behind closed doors, the Supreme Court came out with a decision that was brand new to American law, coming from actually common law, and that was viability. What used to be in common law when they would discuss quickening, when the child could kick and move, they would now consider this child a child worthy of protection. They asked the question: When is it possible for a fetus to be alive? In

January of 1973, they said they would have to leave it up to medical technology as to when that child would be viable.

Fast forward up to today. Let's talk about when a child is considered viable. Let's talk about what happens now. We know at 20 weeks that child can respond to different stimuli. That child feels pain. That child can respond to normal things that are happening around it. I can distinctly remember, with both of my daughters, my wife and I went in at 20 weeks to be able to look at the sonogram because at 20 weeks, that was the first time the doctor could say whether we were going to have a boy or a girl, and we could see the health of my two daughters. That was a big day for us, to be able to go in and see the sonogram and to know it is a girl and to be able to watch them move around in the womb, to dream about what her name would be and what they would look like. Now one daughter is in college, and one is in high school. But the first time I ever laid eyes on them, they were 20 weeks old, when we got a peak into the womb with the sonogram.

This bill asks a simple question, this bill that deals with pain-capable. This pain-capable bill asks the question: Is the child alive at five months, when the baby can kick, suck its thumb, stretch, yawn, make faces; when medical science tells us they can experience pain, is that child alive?

Recently The New York Times did a report studying this one issue about children that are born extremely early—at this exact time we are discussing right now—how many of the children that are born even that early make it. The New York Times' latest study said more than 25 percent of them make it.

Let me tell my colleagues about one of them. Her name is Violet. She is the daughter of a friend of mine. She is a pretty amazing young lady. She was born at this exact date we are discussing, and she was born at 14 ounces. She would fit into your hand, less than a pound. That tiny little girl who had such a tough start is a 1-year-old now. She is not 14 ounces, she is 15 pounds and—thanks for asking—she is doing great. She is healthy and strong and she is beautiful. You ought to see her beautiful face with the bow on the top of her head—a sparkling little girl. She was born at 14 ounces.

I am asking our Nation to think about this again. The discussion in 1973 about viability needs to catch up to the science of today. At 14 ounces and at 5 months of gestation, that little girl is doing great. Yet in many places in our country—not all but in many places in our country—that child can still be executed in the womb and no one would bat an eye.

This is a conversation our Nation needs to have. I can't imagine it would

be controversial to make a simple statement. When a child can feel pain, when a child is viable—even the Supreme Court from 1973 would look at this time period and say that is viability—at that moment, should we as a nation step up and protect children? This shouldn't be about whether a child can feel pain. We know that child can feel pain. It is not even about viability. We know that child is viable. In fact, I know her name. It is about when our laws catch up to our morals and to our science.

Late-term abortions in many areas of our country are already illegal. Let's address this. As a people and as a nation, I am asking a simple thing. When we know the child can feel pain, when we know they are viable, let's treat them as a child. Let's honor that child as alive, and let's say we don't do abortions when we know that child is viable. It is a straightforward issue that I hope will not be controversial. This is not about women's health. This is about the health of little boys and little girls who need our Nation to stay with them.

This bill we can pass. A lot of important things we are dealing with—the budget, the Iran nuclear negotiations—but can we not stop for a moment and say our Nation will guard our most vulnerable? Can we not protect our children? I think we can do both.

I yield back.

Mr. ENZI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, which protects unborn babies who are capable of feeling pain from abortions. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the Senate version of this bill and applaud our Leader for bringing the bill to the floor.

According to the National Library of Medicine, a baby's major systems and structures develop at week 5 of fetal development. Blood cells, kidney cells, and nerve cells develop at this time; and the baby's brain, spinal cord, and heart begin to develop. During the sixth and seventh weeks, a baby's brain forms into five different areas and a baby's heart beats at a regular rhythm, with blood pumping through the main vessels. Lungs start to form during week 8, and all essential organs have begun to grow by week 9.

The National Library of Medicine reports that a baby's face is well-formed between weeks 11 and 14. Bones become harder between weeks 15 and 18, and the baby's liver and pancreas produce secretions. Between weeks 19 and 21, a baby can hear and swallow.

Some of my colleagues are aware that this issue is very personal for me. Our daughter Amy was born three months premature. She weighed 2 pounds and the doctor's advice was to wait and see. We took Amy to Wyoming's biggest hospital to get the best kind of care we could find. When my wife, Diana, and I would visit her, the

nurses often told us it wasn't looking good. We were even asked if we had had Amy baptized. When we said she was, a relieved nurse said, "Good. We've never lost a baptized preemie."

Amy is a fighter, and she lived. Today, she is a teacher in Wyoming, and Diana and I were so proud to see her get married last year. What I learned from watching Amy is how hard a 6-month old baby struggles to live. I want babies like Amy to be protected. I firmly believe that every life demands our respect as a special gift from God, and I urge my colleagues to support the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act as a step in the right direction.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

20TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AFTER-SCHOOL ALL-STARS

Mr. REID. Mr. President, today I recognize the 20th anniversary of the After-School All-Stars of Greater Las Vegas, NV.

In 1995, Elaine Wynn established the Greater Las Vegas Inner-City Games to provide thousands of young Nevadans with a fun, safe, and positive place to go during after-school hours. In 2003, the program was expanded to include more services and the program was transformed into the After-School All-Stars.

Over the past two decades, After-School All-Stars has provided more than 120,000 underprivileged Southern Nevadans with a free and comprehensive after-school program. Today, the After-School All-Stars program has reached 12 states, including the District of Columbia.

After-School All-Stars takes pride in providing its students with the opportunity to participate in exciting and engaging activities, while also building self-esteem. This important program teaches its participants the value of saying no to drugs and yes to hope and offers students academic support, enrichment activities, and health and fitness awareness. Through its mission, After-School All-Stars is working to graduate students from high school, prepare them for college and future careers, and encourage them to give back to their communities.

This organization has impacted the lives of Nevada students for 20 years, and I applaud the After-School All-Stars program of Greater Las Vegas for their dedication to improving the lives

of at-risk students throughout Southern Nevada. I congratulate the program's board of directors, staff, and volunteers on decades of success and wish them the best in the years to come.

OBSERVING NATIONAL POW/MIA RECOGNITION DAY

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, today I wish to join Americans across our great Nation in recognizing National POW/MIA Day—a day to honor prisoners of war, POW, and those missing in action, MIA.

Throughout the history of our Nation, Americans have answered the call of duty to defend our country and its interests. They bravely step forward knowing of the sacrifices they may endure. At home, we enjoy the security and freedoms they have fought to ensure. We must not forget the costs of our freedoms and the Americans who sacrificed for our country. We must be resolute in our duty to bring them home should they go missing or be taken prisoner when serving our Nation.

The safe return of those who have gone missing in action or are prisoners of war remains at the forefront of my thoughts and prayers. Likewise, the challenges of families of missing servicemembers as they await the return of loved ones cannot be forgotten. POW/MIA families and veterans have remained committed to the pursuit of facts. Finding resolution for military families, who have supported the brave men and women who protect our freedoms, must also remain a priority.

We cannot forget the remarkable service of those who put their lives on the line to secure the return of missing military personnel. Those courageous Americans and their families deserve gratitude for the work they do to bring Americans home.

Thank you for the service of our Nation's servicemembers, their families, and all those who work to ensure the return home of America's best and bravest.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO SECRETARY JOHN McHUGH

• Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. REED, who serves as the cochair of the Senate Army Caucus, together with the members of the caucus, I proudly wish to pay tribute to the Honorable John M. McHugh, former Member of the House of Representatives, colleague, friend, and inspirational leader as he leaves his current post as one of the longest serving Secretaries of the Army in U.S. history.

To say this patriot has faithfully served his country is an understatement. After over 42 years of public service, John leaves our Army, our Nation, and our world both safer and more secure. Moreover, his tireless advocacy and bold leadership for our soldiers, civilians, and their family members are legendary. From improvements in family and mental health programs to unprecedented strides in combating sexual assault and suicide, John M. McHugh has truly earned the oft-stated moniker of "The Soldier's Secretary."

Raised in Watertown, NY, John served as assistant city manager and went on to serve four terms in the New York State Senate. From there, this great leader was asked to run for Congress, ultimately representing his district in the House of Representatives for nearly 17 years, and rising to be the ranking member of the House Armed Services Committee.

As Congressman McHugh demonstrated repeatedly, it takes thoughtful, determined, and visionary leadership to ensure the security of our Nation. As a Representative of the 24th and later the 23rd District of New York, which includes one of our most important Army posts, Fort Drum, John ensured that cutting-edge facilities and programs supported our warfighters. To say that Fort Drum is the "House that McHugh Built" is very apropos. From MILCON projects to weapons systems, the soldiers, civilians, and families of that historic post were always cared for and supported, and John ensured that the 10th Mountain Division had all of the tools it needed to be at the tip of the spear of our Nation's defense. Moreover, his exceptional work as the cochair of the Army Caucus for over 15 years and as a critical member of the West Point board of visitors was instrumental in improving Congress's understanding of the Army's needs.

During his tenure as the second-longest serving Secretary of the Army, John M. McHugh has been at the very forefront of national military strategy, policy, and programs. His expert leadership, bold initiatives, and pragmatic management of the oldest and largest military service has ensured that our Army remains the finest fighting force the world has ever known. And it has been no easy task.

John presided over some of the toughest missions the Army has ever faced. From overseeing one of the largest retrogrades in military history; while holding the Army together as it was hit by sequestration; to reorganizing, revamping, and restructuring our force, while our soldiers conducted combat operations around the world, Secretary McHugh led with distinction and results.

Of particular note, John's determination, devotion, and love of our

servicemembers ensured that our most sacred and hallowed ground, Arlington National Cemetery, overcame years of neglect and transformed its management and oversight.

With profound admiration and deep respect, we pay tribute to Secretary McHugh for all he has done for our Nation. We thank him for his dedication and sacrifice. We wish him all the fullest measure of peace and happiness as he boldly takes on new challenges in the next phase of his life.●

TRIBUTE TO PINKY KRAVITZ

● Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, today I am honored to recognize Mr. Pinky Kravitz on the occasion of his retirement from the WOND-AM 1400 after many years of remarkable broadcasting throughout the Garden State.

Mr. Kravitz could be heard over the airways for more than 59 years as a radio broadcaster. He started his illustrious career first in 1956 as the host of a live call-in show on WLDB-AM, now known as 1490 WBSS. Since 1958, he has continuously hosted numerous radio programs with WOND-AM 1400, including Pinky's Corner, a live call-in program, and WMGM Presents Pinky, a weekly television program. Additionally, his written word could be heard across numerous publications and newspapers, most recently for the Press of Atlantic City. His radio show was one of the longest-running shows in the country, proof of his wide appeal and heartfelt reporting.

Known widely as "Mr. Atlantic City" due to his promotion of the area, Mr. Kravitz was the unshakable spokesman of Southern New Jersey. A fierce advocate for the region, his voice was unmistakable, as he consistently sought to highlight the very best of what makes New Jersey great. His in-depth programming spoke to many, as he resonated with the hearts and minds of our friends and neighbors. Mr. Kravitz represented the very best of engaging, informative, entertaining, and responsible broadcasting.

In addition to these and many more accomplishments, Mr. Kravitz was the first inductee into the New Jersey Broadcasters Hall of Fame in 2012, a testament to his impact on the industry. He was also the first recipient of the New Jersey Broadcasters Association, NJBA, Lifetime Achievement Award.

I was honored to appear on Mr. Kravitz's radio show on several occasions. He was always the utmost professional while embracing the nature of substantive, meaningful journalism. For many years, his radio and television shows consistently sought to provide the region with a unique and fair perspective while maintaining a sense of familiarity and comfort, an accomplishment in and of itself.

I recognize, commend, and applaud Mr. Pinky Kravitz in light of his ex-

traordinary service to WOND-AM 1400 and his unwavering dedication to the airways of New Jersey.●

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 2015, the Secretary of the Senate, on September 18, 2015, during the adjournment of the Senate, received a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) has signed the following enrolled bills:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:02 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Novotny, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 758. An act to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3134. An act to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

H.R. 3504. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

The message also announced that the House has passed the following bills, with amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 764. An act to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1603. An act to actively recruit members of the Armed Forces who are separating from

military service to serve as Customs and Border Protection Officers.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH) announced that on today, September 21, 2015, he had signed the following enrolled bills, previously signed by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY) of the House:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

H.R. 23. An act to reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 758. An act to amend Rule 11 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to improve attorney accountability, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEASURES READ THE FIRST TIME

The following bills were read the first time:

H.R. 3134. An act to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

H.R. 3504. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 21, 2015, she had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 230. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property to the Yukon Kuskokwim Health Corporation located in Bethel, Alaska.

S. 501. An act to make technical corrections to the Navajo water rights settlement in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 623. An act to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to authorize the Department of Homeland Security to establish a social media working group, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-145).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MORAN:

S. 2061. A bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. HIRONO:

S. 2062. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend authority for operation of the Department of Veterans Affairs Regional Office in Manila, the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY):

S. Res. 260. A resolution honoring the life and legacy of Calvin G. Moret; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 163

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Ms. BALDWIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 163, a bill to establish a grant program to help State and local law enforcement agencies reduce the risk of injury and death relating to the wandering characteristics of some children with autism and other disabilities.

S. 175

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 175, a bill to provide for certain land to be taken into trust for the benefit of Morongo Band of Mission Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 235

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 235, a bill to provide for wildfire suppression operations, and for other purposes.

S. 502

At the request of Mr. LEE, the names of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 502, a bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders.

S. 524

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 524, a bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use.

S. 571

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) was added as a co-

sponsor of S. 571, a bill to amend the Pilot's Bill of Rights to facilitate appeals and to apply to other certificates issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, to require the revision of the third class medical certification regulations issued by the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes.

S. 578

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 578, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure more timely access to home health services for Medicare beneficiaries under the Medicare program.

S. 579

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) were added as cosponsors of S. 579, a bill to amend the Inspector General Act of 1978 to strengthen the independence of the Inspectors General, and for other purposes.

S. 598

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 598, a bill to improve the understanding of, and promote access to treatment for, chronic kidney disease, and for other purposes.

S. 681

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the names of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 681, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify presumptions relating to the exposure of certain veterans who served in the vicinity of the Republic of Vietnam, and for other purposes.

S. 740

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 740, a bill to improve the coordination and use of geospatial data.

S. 746

At the request of Mr. WHITEHOUSE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 746, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Commission to Accelerate the End of Breast Cancer.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1020

At the request of Mr. VITTER, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1020, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to ensure the continued access of Medicare beneficiaries to diagnostic imaging services, and for other purposes.

S. 1085

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1085, a bill to expand eligibility for the program of comprehensive assistance for family caregivers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to expand benefits available to participants under such program, to enhance special compensation for members of the uniformed services who require assistance in everyday life, and for other purposes.

S. 1169

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1169, a bill to reauthorize and improve the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act of 1974, and for other purposes.

S. 1239

At the request of Mr. DONNELLY, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1239, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act with respect to the ethanol waiver for the Reid vapor pressure limitations under that Act.

S. 1314

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. MERKLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1314, a bill to establish an interim rule for the operation of small unmanned aircraft for commercial purposes and their safe integration into the national airspace system.

S. 1383

At the request of Mr. PERDUE, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1383, a bill to amend the Consumer Financial Protection Act of 2010 to subject the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection to the regular appropriations process, and for other purposes.

S. 1512

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1512, a bill to eliminate discrimination and promote women's health and economic security by ensuring reasonable workplace accommodations for workers whose ability to perform the functions of a job are limited by pregnancy, childbirth, or a related medical condition.

S. 1659

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cospon-

sor of S. 1659, a bill to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to revise the criteria for determining which States and political subdivisions are subject to section 4 of the Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1661

At the request of Mr. ISAKSON, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1661, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act to preserve consumer and employer access to licensed independent insurance producers.

S. 1794

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1794, a bill to prohibit drilling in the Arctic Ocean.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. VITTER) and the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1918

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. KIRK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1918, a bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to extend the import- and export-related provision of that Act to species proposed for listing as threatened or endangered under that Act.

S. 1964

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1964, a bill to amend parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act to invest in funding prevention and family services to help keep children safe and supported at home with their families, and for other purposes.

S. 2016

At the request of Mr. KAINE, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2016, a bill to amend chapter 44 of title 18, United States Code, to promote the responsible transfer of firearms.

S.J. RES. 22

At the request of Mrs. ERNST, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. CASSIDY) was added as a cosponsor of S.J. Res. 22, a joint resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by the Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency relating to the definition of "waters of the United States" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 260—HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF CALVIN G. MORET

Mr. VITTER (for himself and Mr. CASSIDY) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. RES. 260

Whereas Calvin G. Moret was born on August 15, 1925, in New Orleans, Louisiana;

Whereas, in 1943, Calvin G. Moret joined the Tuskegee Airmen and completed his advanced training in P-51 Mustangs;

Whereas the Tuskegee Airmen were the first African-American military airmen;

Whereas, on November 20, 1944, Calvin G. Moret graduated as a Flight Officer as part of class 44-I-SE in the Tuskegee Airmen program;

Whereas, according to the Veterans History Project of the Library of Congress, Calvin G. Moret served as a flight instructor;

Whereas Calvin G. Moret was a recipient of the Congressional Gold Medal, presented in the rotunda of the United States Capitol, for his service to the United States;

Whereas Calvin G. Moret was the last surviving Tuskegee Airman pilot in Louisiana;

Whereas Calvin G. Moret contributed oral histories to the collection of the National WWII Museum;

Whereas, on June 29, 2013, the Urban League of Greater New Orleans presented Calvin G. Moret with the Whitney M. Young Legacy Award;

Whereas, in 2014, Calvin G. Moret became the fifth honorary member of the Black Pilots of America; and

Whereas Calvin G. Moret was a distinguished speaker for the National WWII Museum at major exhibits, including the "Fighting for the Right to Fight: African American Experiences in World War II" exhibit: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life of Calvin G. Moret, who was dedicated to serving the community and recording the experiences of the members of the Tuskegee Airmen;

(2) recognizes the lasting contributions made by Calvin G. Moret to World War II educational programming and the National WWII Museum; and

(3) requests that the Secretary of the Senate prepare an official copy of this resolution for presentation to the family of Calvin G. Moret.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2667. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 2668. Mr. LANKFORD (for Mr. VITTER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1109, to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2667. Mr. CASEY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by

him to the bill H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR THE PREGNANCY ASSISTANCE FUND.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) In 2011, 730,322 legal induced abortions were reported to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

(2) Forty-nine percent of all pregnancies in America are unintended. Excluding miscarriages, 42 percent of unintended pregnancies end in abortion.

(3) Of those unintended pregnancies ending in abortion, 50 percent of the women have incomes below 200 percent of the poverty level.

(4) The pregnancy assistance fund is an initiative to support women facing unplanned pregnancies, new parents and their children by providing for health care needs, supportive services and helpful prenatal information and postnatal services.

(b) ADDITIONAL FUNDING.—Section 10214 of Public Law 111-148 (42 U.S.C. 18204) is amended by adding at the end the following: “In addition to amounts authorized to be appropriated in the previous sentence, there are authorized to be appropriated, and there are appropriated from funds not otherwise obligated, to carry out section 10210, an additional \$25,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2019, and an additional \$50,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2020 through 2024.”.

SA 2668. Mr. LANKFORD (for Mr. VITTER) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1109, to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; as follows:

On page 2, strike lines 11 through 20 and insert the following:

“(1) the term ‘covered settlement agreement’ means a settlement agreement (including a consent decree)—

“(A) that is entered into by an Executive agency; and

“(B)(i) that—

“(I) relates to an alleged violation of Federal civil or criminal law; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$1,000,000 by 1 or more non-Federal persons; or

“(ii) that—

“(I) relates to the rule making process of the Executive agency or an alleged failure by the Executive agency to engage in a rule making process; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$200,000 in attorney fees, costs, or expenses by the Executive agency or entity within the Federal Government to a non-Federal person;

On page 2, line 23, strike “and”.

On page 2, line 26, strike the period and insert “; and”.

On page 2, after line 26, insert the following:

“(4) the term ‘rule making’ has the meaning given that term under section 551(5).

On page 4, line 3, strike “and”.

On page 4, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

“(VII) a description of where amounts collected under the covered settlement agreement will be deposited, including, if applica-

ble, the deposit of such amounts in an account available for use for 1 or more programs of the Federal Government; and

On page 7, line 25, insert “or that entered into a settlement agreement that involves regulatory action or regulatory changes” after “covered settlement agreement”.

On page 8, line 11, strike “and”.

On page 8, line 15, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

On page 8, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

“(D) the total amount of attorney fees, costs, and expenses paid to non-Federal persons under settlement agreements (including consent decrees) of the Executive agency during that fiscal year; and

“(E) the number of settlement agreements (including consent decrees) between the Executive agency and non-Federal persons that involve regulatory action or regulatory changes, including the promulgation of new rules, during that fiscal year.

On page 8, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 9, line 20.

On page 9, line 21, strike “(c)” and insert “(b)”.

TRUTH IN SETTLEMENTS ACT OF 2015

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 140, S. 1109.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1109) to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. LANKFORD. I ask unanimous consent that the Vitter amendment be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2668) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To apply the disclosure requirements to settlements between agencies and private entities and require information regarding the use of funds collected under settlement agreements)

On page 2, strike lines 11 through 20 and insert the following:

“(1) the term ‘covered settlement agreement’ means a settlement agreement (including a consent decree)—

“(A) that is entered into by an Executive agency; and

“(B)(i) that—

“(I) relates to an alleged violation of Federal civil or criminal law; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$1,000,000 by 1 or more non-Federal persons; or

“(ii) that—

“(I) relates to the rule making process of the Executive agency or an alleged failure by the Executive agency to engage in a rule making process; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$200,000 in attorney fees, costs, or

expenses by the Executive agency or entity within the Federal Government to a non-Federal person;

On page 2, line 23, strike “and”.

On page 2, line 26, strike the period and insert “; and”.

On page 2, after line 26, insert the following:

“(4) the term ‘rule making’ has the meaning given that term under section 551(5).

On page 4, line 3, strike “and”.

On page 4, between lines 16 and 17, insert the following:

“(VII) a description of where amounts collected under the covered settlement agreement will be deposited, including, if applicable, the deposit of such amounts in an account available for use for 1 or more programs of the Federal Government; and

On page 7, line 25, insert “or that entered into a settlement agreement that involves regulatory action or regulatory changes” after “covered settlement agreement”.

On page 8, line 11, strike “and”.

On page 8, line 15, strike the period and insert a semicolon.

On page 8, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following:

“(D) the total amount of attorney fees, costs, and expenses paid to non-Federal persons under settlement agreements (including consent decrees) of the Executive agency during that fiscal year; and

“(E) the number of settlement agreements (including consent decrees) between the Executive agency and non-Federal persons that involve regulatory action or regulatory changes, including the promulgation of new rules, during that fiscal year.

On page 8, strike line 25 and all that follows through page 9, line 20.

On page 9, line 21, strike “(c)” and insert “(b)”.

The bill (S. 1109), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1109

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Truth in Settlements Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. INFORMATION REGARDING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BY FEDERAL AGENCIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS FOR SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 307. Information regarding settlement agreements

“(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section—

“(1) the term ‘covered settlement agreement’ means a settlement agreement (including a consent decree)—

“(A) that is entered into by an Executive agency; and

“(B)(i) that—

“(I) relates to an alleged violation of Federal civil or criminal law; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$1,000,000 by 1 or more non-Federal persons; or

“(ii) that—

“(I) relates to the rule making process of the Executive agency or an alleged failure by the Executive agency to engage in a rule making process; and

“(II) requires the payment of a total of not less than \$200,000 in attorney fees, costs, or

expenses by the Executive agency or entity within the Federal Government to a non-Federal person;

“(2) the term ‘entity within the Federal Government’ includes an officer or employee of the Federal Government acting in an official capacity;

“(3) the term ‘non-Federal person’ means a person that is not an entity within the Federal Government; and

“(4) the term ‘rule making’ has the meaning given that term under section 551(5).

“(b) INFORMATION TO BE POSTED ONLINE.—

“(1) REQUIREMENT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), the head of each Executive agency shall make publicly available in a searchable format in a prominent location on the Web site of the Executive agency—

“(i) a list of each covered settlement agreement entered into by the Executive agency, which shall include, for each covered settlement agreement—

“(I) the date on which the parties entered into the covered settlement agreement;

“(II) the names of the parties that settled claims under the covered settlement agreement;

“(III) a description of the claims each party settled under the covered settlement agreement;

“(IV) the amount each party settling a claim under the covered settlement agreement is obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

“(V) the total amount the settling parties are obligated to pay under the settlement agreement;

“(VI) for each settling party—

“(aa) the amount, if any, the settling party is obligated to pay that is expressly specified under the covered settlement agreement as a civil or criminal penalty or fine; and

“(bb) the amount, if any, that is expressly specified under the covered settlement agreement as not deductible for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; and

“(VII) a description of where amounts collected under the covered settlement agreement will be deposited, including, if applicable, the deposit of such amounts in an account available for use for 1 or more programs of the Federal Government; and

“(ii) a copy of each covered settlement agreement entered into by the Executive agency.

“(B) CONFIDENTIALITY PROVISIONS.—The requirement to disclose information or a copy of a covered settlement agreement under subparagraph (A) shall apply to the extent that the information or copy (or portion thereof) is not subject to a confidentiality provision that prohibits disclosure of the information or copy (or portion thereof).

“(2) PERIOD.—The head of each Executive agency shall ensure that—

“(A) information regarding a covered settlement agreement is publicly available on the list described in paragraph (1)(A)(i) for a period of not less than 5 years, beginning on the date of the covered settlement agreement; and

“(B) a copy of a covered settlement agreement made available under paragraph (1)(A)(ii) is publicly available—

“(i) for a period of not less than 1 year, beginning on the date of the covered settlement agreement; or

“(ii) for a covered settlement agreement under which a non-Federal person is required to pay not less than \$50,000,000, for a period of not less than 5 years, beginning on the date of the covered settlement agreement.

“(c) PUBLIC STATEMENT.—If the head of an Executive agency determines that a con-

fidentiality provision in a covered settlement agreement, or the sealing of a covered settlement agreement, is required to protect the public interest of the United States, the head of the Executive agency shall issue a public statement stating why such action is required to protect the public interest of the United States, which shall explain—

“(1) what interests confidentiality protects; and

“(2) why the interests protected by confidentiality outweigh the public's interest in knowing about the conduct of the Federal Government and the expenditure of Federal resources.

“(d) REQUIREMENTS FOR WRITTEN PUBLIC STATEMENTS.—Any written public statement issued by an Executive agency that refers to an amount to be paid by a non-Federal person under a covered settlement agreement shall—

“(1) specify which portion, if any, of the amount to be paid under the covered settlement agreement by a non-Federal person—

“(A) is expressly specified under the covered settlement agreement as a civil or criminal penalty or fine to be paid for a violation of Federal law; or

“(B) is expressly specified under the covered settlement agreement as not deductible for purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

“(2) if no portion of the amount to be paid under the covered settlement agreement by a non-Federal person is expressly specified under the covered settlement agreement as a civil or criminal penalty or fine, include a statement specifying that is the case; and

“(3) describe in detail—

“(A) any actions the non-Federal person shall take under the covered settlement agreement in lieu of payment to the Federal Government or a State or local government; and

“(B) any payments or compensation the non-Federal person shall make to other non-Federal persons under the covered settlement agreement.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY.—The requirement to disclose information under subsection (d) shall apply to the extent that the information to be disclosed (or portion thereof) is not subject to a confidentiality provision that prohibits disclosure of the information (or portion thereof).

“(f) REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than January 15 of each year, the head of an Executive agency that entered into a covered settlement agreement or that entered into a settlement agreement that involves regulatory action or regulatory changes during the previous fiscal year shall submit to each committee of Congress with jurisdiction over the activities of the Executive agency a report indicating—

“(A) how many covered settlement agreements the Executive agency entered into during that fiscal year;

“(B) how many covered settlement agreements the Executive agency entered into during that fiscal year that had any terms or conditions that are required to be kept confidential;

“(C) how many covered settlement agreements the Executive agency entered into during that fiscal year for which all terms and conditions are required to be kept confidential;

“(D) the total amount of attorney fees, costs, and expenses paid to non-Federal persons under settlement agreements (including consent decrees) of the Executive agency during that fiscal year; and

“(E) the number of settlement agreements (including consent decrees) between the Executive agency and non-Federal persons that involve regulatory action or regulatory changes, including the promulgation of new rules, during that fiscal year.

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF REPORTS.—The head of an Executive agency that is required to submit a report under paragraph (1) shall make the report publicly available in a searchable format in a prominent location on the Web site of the Executive agency.”.

(2) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“307. Information regarding settlement agreements.”.

(b) REVIEW OF CONFIDENTIALITY OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENTS.—Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit to Congress a report regarding how Executive agencies (as defined under section 105 of title 5, United States Code) determine whether the terms of a settlement agreement or the existence of a settlement agreement will be treated as confidential, which shall include recommendations, if any, for legislative or administrative action to increase the transparency of Government settlements while continuing to protect the legitimate interests that confidentiality provisions serve.

MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING ACT OF 2015

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 231, H.R. 2051.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 2051) to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 to extend the livestock mandatory price reporting requirements, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Agriculture Reauthorizations Act of 2015”.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.

TITLE I—MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING

Sec. 101. Extension of livestock mandatory reporting.

Sec. 102. Swine reporting.

Sec. 103. Lamb reporting.

Sec. 104. Study on livestock mandatory reporting.

TITLE II—NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Sec. 201. National Forest Foundation Act reauthorization.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

Sec. 301. Reauthorization of United States Grain Standards Act.

Sec. 302. Report on disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports.

Sec. 303. Report on policy barriers to grain producers.

TITLE I—MANDATORY PRICE REPORTING

SEC. 101. EXTENSION OF LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY.**—Section 260 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1636i) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Section 942 of the Livestock Mandatory Reporting Act of 1999 (7 U.S.C. 1635 note; Public Law 106–78) is amended by striking “September 30, 2015” and inserting “September 30, 2020”.

SEC. 102. SWINE REPORTING.

(a) **DEFINITIONS.**—Section 231 of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635i) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (9) through (22) as paragraphs (10) through (23), respectively;

(2) by inserting after paragraph (8) the following:

“(9) **NEGOTIATED FORMULA PURCHASE.**—The term ‘negotiated formula purchase’ means a term or pork market formula purchase under which—

“(A) the formula is determined by negotiation on a lot-by-lot basis; and

“(B) the swine are scheduled for delivery to the packer not later than 14 days after the date on which the formula is negotiated and swine are committed to the packer.”;

(3) in paragraph (12)(A) (as so redesignated), by inserting “negotiated formula purchase,” after “pork market formula purchase,”; and

(4) in paragraph (23) (as so redesignated)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (D) as subparagraph (E); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following:

“(D) a negotiated formula purchase; and”.

(b) **DAILY REPORTING.**—Section 232(c) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635j(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(D), by striking clause (ii) and inserting the following:

“(ii) **PRICE DISTRIBUTIONS.**—The information published by the Secretary under clause (i) shall include—

“(I) a distribution of net prices in the range between and including the lowest net price and the highest net price reported;

“(II) a delineation of the number of barrows and gilts at each reported price level or, at the option of the Secretary, the number of barrows and gilts within each of a series of reasonable price bands within the range of prices; and

“(III) the total number and weighted average price of barrows and gilts purchased through negotiated purchases and negotiated formula purchases.”; and

(2) in paragraph (3), by adding at the end the following:

“(C) **LATE IN THE DAY REPORT INFORMATION.**—The Secretary shall include in the morning report and the afternoon report for the following day any information required to be reported under subparagraph (A) that is obtained after the time of the reporting day specified in that subparagraph.”.

SEC. 103. LAMB REPORTING.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall revise section 59.300 of title 7, Code of Federal Regulations, so that—

(1) the definition of the term “importer”—

(A) includes only those importers that imported an average of 1,000 metric tons of lamb meat products per year during the immediately preceding 4 calendar years; and

(B) may include any person that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (A), if the Secretary determines that the person should be considered an importer based on their volume of lamb imports; and

(2) the definition of the term “packer”—

(A) applies to any entity with 50 percent or more ownership in a facility;

(B) includes a federally inspected lamb processing plant which slaughtered or processed the equivalent of an average of 35,000 head of lambs per year during the immediately preceding 5 calendar years; and

(C) may include any other lamb processing plant that does not meet the requirement referred to in subparagraph (B), if the Secretary determines that the processing plant should be considered a packer after considering the capacity of the processing plant.

SEC. 104. STUDY ON LIVESTOCK MANDATORY REPORTING.

(a) **STUDY REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Agricultural Marketing Service in conjunction with the Office of the Chief Economist and in consultation with cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants, shall conduct a study on the program of information regarding the marketing of cattle, swine, lambs, and products of such livestock under subtitle B of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1635 et seq.).

(2) **REQUIREMENTS.**—The study shall—

(A) analyze current marketing practices in the cattle, swine, and lamb markets;

(B) identify legislative or regulatory recommendations made by cattle, swine, and lamb producers, packers, and other market participants to ensure that information provided under the program—

(i) can be readily understood by producers, packers, and other market participants;

(ii) reflects current marketing practices; and

(iii) is relevant and useful to producers, packers, and other market participants;

(C) analyze the price and supply information reporting services of the Department of Agriculture related to cattle, swine, and lamb; and

(D) address any other issues that the Secretary considers appropriate.

(b) **REPORT.**—Not later than March 1, 2018, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report containing the findings of the study conducted under subsection (a).

TITLE II—NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 201. NATIONAL FOREST FOUNDATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION.

(a) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MATCHING FUNDS FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND PROJECT EXPENSES.**—Section 405(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–3(b)) is amended by striking “for a period of five years beginning October 1, 1992” and inserting “during fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(b) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—Section 410(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–8(b)) is amended by striking “during the five-year period” and all that follows through “\$1,000,000 annually” and inserting “there are authorized to be appropriated \$3,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2016 through 2018”.

(c) **TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.**—

(1) **AGENT.**—Section 404 of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–2) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a)(4), by inserting “notice or” after “authorized to accept”; and

(B) in subsection (b), by striking “under this paragraph” and inserting “by subsection (a)(4)”.

(2) **ANNUAL REPORT.**—Section 407(b) of the National Forest Foundation Act (16 U.S.C. 583j–5(b)) is amended by striking the comma after “The Foundation shall”.

TITLE III—UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT REAUTHORIZATION

SEC. 301. REAUTHORIZATION OF UNITED STATES GRAIN STANDARDS ACT.

(a) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AND WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS.**—

(1) **DISCRETIONARY WAIVER AUTHORITY.**—Section 5(a)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(1)) is amended in the first proviso by striking “may waive the foregoing requirement in emergency or other circumstances which would not impair the objectives of this Act” and inserting “shall waive the foregoing requirement in emergency or other circumstances that would not impair the objectives of this Act whenever the parties to a contract for such shipment mutually agree to the waiver and documentation of such agreement is provided to the Secretary prior to shipment”.

(2) **WEIGHING REQUIREMENTS AT EXPORT ELEVATORS.**—Section 5(a)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77(a)(2)) is amended in the proviso by striking “intra-company shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation, grain transferred into an export elevator by transportation modes other than barge,” and inserting “shipments of grain into an export elevator by any mode of transportation”.

(3) **DISRUPTION IN GRAIN INSPECTION OR WEIGHING.**—Section 5 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 77) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) **DISRUPTION IN GRAIN INSPECTION OR WEIGHING.**—In the case of a disruption in official grain inspections or weighings, including if the Secretary waives the requirement for official inspection due to an emergency under subsection (a)(1), the Secretary shall—

“(1) immediately take such actions as are necessary to address the disruption and resume inspections or weighings;

“(2) not later than 24 hours after the start of the disruption in inspection or weighing, submit to the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate a report that describes—

“(A) the disruption; and

“(B) any actions necessary to address the concerns of the Secretary relating to the disruption so that inspections or weighings may resume; and

“(3) once the initial report in paragraph (2) has been made, provide daily updates until official inspection or weighing services at the site of disruption have resumed.”.

(b) **OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY AND FUNDING.**—

(1) **DELEGATION OF OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.**—Section 7(e)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(e)(2)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(2) If the Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(2) **DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO STATE AGENCIES.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary”; and

(B) in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “and (A)” and inserting “and (i)”;

(ii) by striking “or (B)(i)” and inserting “or (ii)(I)”;

(iii) by striking “(ii)” and inserting “(II)”;

and

(iv) by striking “(iii)” and inserting “(III)”;

and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(B) **CERTIFICATION.**—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—Every 5 years, the Secretary shall certify that each State agency with a delegation of authority is meeting the criteria described in subsection (f)(1)(A).

“(ii) *PROCESS.*—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of the Agriculture Reauthorizations Act of 2015, the Secretary shall establish a process for certification under which the Secretary shall—

“(I) publish in the Federal Register notice of intent to certify a State agency and provide a 30-day period for public comment;

“(II) evaluate the public comments received and, in accordance with paragraph (3), conduct an investigation to determine whether the State agency is qualified;

“(III) make findings based on the public comments received and investigation conducted; and

“(IV) publish in the Federal Register a notice announcing whether the certification has been granted and describing the basis on which the Secretary made the decision.

“(C) *STATE AGENCY REQUIREMENTS.*—

“(i) *IN GENERAL.*—If a State agency that has been delegated authority under this paragraph intends to temporarily discontinue official inspection or weighing services for any reason, except in the case of a major disaster, the State agency shall notify the Secretary in writing of the intention of the State agency to do so at least 72 hours in advance of the discontinuation date.

“(ii) *SECRETARIAL CONSIDERATION.*—The Secretary shall consider receipt of a notice described in clause (i) as a factor in administering the delegation of authority under this paragraph.”.

(2) *CONSULTATION.*—Section 7(f)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(1)) is amended—

(A) in subparagraph (A)(xi), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) the Secretary—

“(i) periodically conducts a consultation with the customers of the applicant, in a manner that provides opportunity for protection of the identity of the customer if desired by the customer, to review the performance of the applicant with regard to the provision of official inspection services and other requirements of this Act; and

“(ii) works with the applicant to address any concerns identified during the consultation process.”.

(3) *GEOGRAPHIC BOUNDARIES FOR OFFICIAL AGENCIES.*—

(A) *OFFICIAL INSPECTION AUTHORITY.*—Section 7(f)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(f)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out inspections in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide inspection services in a timely manner;

“(B) a person requesting inspection services in that geographic area requests a probe inspection on a barge-lot basis; or

“(C) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(B) *WEIGHING AUTHORITY.*—Section 7A(i)(2) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a(i)(2)) is amended by striking “the Secretary may” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting the following: “the Secretary shall allow a designated official agency to cross boundary lines to carry out weighing in another geographic area if—

“(A) the current designated official agency for that geographic area is unable to provide weighing services in a timely manner; or

“(B) the current official agency for that geographic area agrees in writing with the adjacent official agency to waive the current geographic area restriction at the request of the applicant for service.”.

(4) *DURATION OF DESIGNATION AUTHORITY.*—Section 7(g)(1) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(g)(1)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every 5 years”.

(5) *FEES.*—Section 7(j) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79(j)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking “(j)(1) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(j) *FEES.*—

“(1) *INSPECTION FEES.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary”;

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) the second sentence, by striking “The fees” and inserting the following:

“(B) *AMOUNT OF FEES.*—The fees”; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “Such fees” and inserting the following:

“(C) *USE OF FEES.*—Fees described in this paragraph”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) *EXPORT TONNAGE FEES.*—For an official inspection at an export facility performed by the Secretary, the portion of the fees based on export tonnage shall be based on the rolling 5-year average of export tonnage volumes.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

“(4) *ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.*—In order to maintain an operating reserve of not less than 3 and not more than 6 months, the Secretary shall adjust the fees described in paragraphs (1) and (2) not less frequently than annually.”; and

(E) in paragraph (5) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)), in the first sentence, by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(c) *WEIGHING AUTHORITY.*—Section 7A of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (c)(2), in the last sentence, by striking “subsection (g) of section 7” and inserting “subsections (e) and (g) of section 7”; and

(2) in subsection (1)—

(A) by striking “(1)(1) The Secretary” and inserting the following:

“(1) *FEES.*—

“(1) *WEIGHING FEES.*—

“(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Secretary”; and

(B) in paragraph (1)—

(i) the second sentence, by striking “The fees” and inserting the following:

“(B) *AMOUNT OF FEES.*—The fees”; and

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “Such fees” and inserting the following:

“(C) *USE OF FEES.*—Fees described in this paragraph”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(D) *EXPORT TONNAGE FEES.*—For an official weighing at an export facility performed by the Secretary, the portion of the fees based on export tonnage shall be based on the rolling 5-year average of export tonnage volumes.”;

(C) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (4);

(D) by inserting after paragraph (2) the following:

“(3) *ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.*—In order to maintain an operating reserve of not less than 3 and not more than 6 months, the Secretary shall adjust the fees described in paragraphs (1) and (2) not less frequently than annually.”; and

(E) in paragraph (4) (as redesignated by subparagraph (C)), in the first sentence, by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(d) *LIMITATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPERVISORY COSTS.*—Section 7D of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 79d) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(e) *ISSUANCE OF AUTHORIZATION.*—Section 8(b) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 84(b)) is amended by striking “triennially” and inserting “every 5 years”.

(f) *APPROPRIATIONS.*—Section 19 of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87h) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

(g) *ADVISORY COMMITTEE.*—Section 21(e) of the United States Grain Standards Act (7 U.S.C. 87j(e)) is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2020”.

SEC. 302. REPORT ON DISRUPTION IN FEDERAL INSPECTION OF GRAIN EXPORTS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate, the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives, the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, and the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the specific factors that led to disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports at the Port of Vancouver in the summer of 2014;

(2) any factors that contributed to the disruption referred to in paragraph (1) that were unique to the Port of Vancouver, including a description of the port facility, security needs and available resources for that purpose, and any other significant factors as determined by the Secretary; and

(3) any changes in policy that the Secretary has implemented to ensure that a similar disruption in Federal inspection of grain exports at the Port of Vancouver or any other location does not occur in the future.

SEC. 303. REPORT ON POLICY BARRIERS TO GRAIN PRODUCERS.

Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the United States Trade Representative, shall submit to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate and the Committee on Agriculture of the House of Representatives a report that describes—

(1) the policy barriers to United States grain producers in countries the grain of which receives official grading in the United States but which do not offer official grading for United States grain or provide only the lowest designation for United States grain, including an analysis of possible inconsistencies with trade obligations; and

(2) any actions the Executive Branch is taking to remedy the policy barriers so as to put United States grain producers on equal footing with grain producers in countries imposing the barriers.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee-reported amendment be agreed to, that the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

The bill (H.R. 2051), as amended, was passed.

CONGRATULATING CAPTAIN
KRISTEN GRIEST AND FIRST
LIEUTENANT SHAYE HAVER ON
THEIR GRADUATION FROM
RANGER SCHOOL

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Armed Services Committee be discharged from further consideration of and the Senate now proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 257.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 257) congratulating Captain Kristen Griest and First Lieutenant Shaye Haver on their graduation from Ranger School.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to honor and congratulate CPT Kristen Griest and 1LT Shaye Haver for their historic accomplishment of being the first two women soldiers to complete U.S. Army Ranger School and earn their highly coveted Ranger tabs.

Earning the right to wear a Ranger tab is not for the faint-hearted. The rigors of the course test even the strongest service members. Many try; few succeed.

Through their grit and determination, Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver have demonstrated that character, courage, and tenacity, not gender, are the hallmarks of great servicemembers and leaders.

Just as teamwork and dedication are the benchmarks for military effectiveness, they are also the mandates of the U.S. Army Rangers who are tasked with our Nation's most challenging and difficult missions. Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, along with their fellow Ranger School classmates, braved the challenges and serve as role models for girls and boys—women and men—in the United States and around the world. This integrated class answered our Nation's call to service. They stood shoulder-to-shoulder, enduring the course's extreme mental and physical stress, together. Each carried his or her own weight, and at times the weight of others, proving that integration represents not just a lofty goal, but an achievable reality. Their collective and distinguished accomplishments embody the values of our Armed Forces and our Nation.

The journey toward integration, however, has been hard fought. Before them, the first African Americans and women who answered the call to serv-

ice laid the foundation for making integration possible. These pioneers inherently understood the importance of their contributions to the realization of integration. They also recognized the undeniable truth that an integrated and balanced force is a successful force both on and off the battlefield.

The effectiveness of a military unit is almost always determined by the cohesion of its individual members, their dedication to the team, and their commitment to the mission. No individual servicemember can succeed by his or her efforts alone. Success is forged from equality and integration.

As we celebrate Captain Griest's and Lieutenant Haver's historic and inspiring achievements, we express our pride and gratitude for their personal courage and sacrifice. I am confident that the military and our country are more battle ready as a result. I am also confident that Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver will continue to serve with distinction as they "lead the way" as our Nation's newest U.S. Army Rangers. As a result of their milestone achievements, they have inspired a nation.

With this in mind, I am pleased to offer this resolution with Senators MIKULSKI, AYOTTE, BALDWIN, BOXER, CANTWELL, CAPITO, ERNST, FEINSTEIN, FISCHER, GILLIBRAND, HEITKAMP, HIRONO, KLOBUCHAR, MCCASKILL, MURKOWSKI, MURRAY, SHAHEEN, STABENOW, WARREN, PERDUE, MURPHY, KIRK, TESTER, FLAKE, REED, DONNELLY, GRASSLEY, BLUMENTHAL, ISAKSON, WARNER, LEAHY, FRANKEN, RUBIO, HEINRICH, COONS, THUNE, MERKLEY, and GARDNER, honoring and recognizing the patriotism and historic contributions to the United States by Captain Griest and Lieutenant Haver, and extend my best wishes and heartiest congratulations.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 257) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of September 17, 2015, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY
OF CALVIN G. MORET

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 260, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 260) honoring the life and legacy of Calvin G. Moret.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 260) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

MEASURES READ THE FIRST
TIME—H.R. 3134 AND H.R. 3504

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk, and I ask for their first reading en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the first time.

The bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

A bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I now ask for a second reading, and I object to my own request, all en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The bills will be read for the second time on the next legislative day.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY,
SEPTEMBER 22, 2015

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, September 22; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, with the time until 11 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.
TOMORROW

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:53 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, September 22, 2015, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

RICARDO A. AGUILERA, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE LISA S. DISBROW.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

SHOSHANA MIRIAM LEW, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, VICE SYLVIA I. GARCIA, RESIGNED.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

THOMAS A. SHANNON, JR., OF VIRGINIA, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF CAREER AMBASSADOR, TO BE AN UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE (POLITICAL AFFAIRS), VICE WENDY RUTH SHERMAN.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

JANINE ANNE DAVIDSON, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE NAVY, VICE ROBERT O. WORK, RESIGNED.

LISA S. DISBROW, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE, VICE ERIC K. FANNING, RESIGNED.

ERIC K. FANNING, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY, VICE JOHN M. MCHUGH.

JENNIFER M. O'CONNOR, OF MARYLAND, TO BE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE, VICE STEPHEN WOOLMAN PRESTON, RESIGNED.

FOREIGN SERVICE

THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS OF THE CLASSES STATED.

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS ONE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

JASON DOUGLAS KALBFLEISCH, OF ALASKA
RAHIMA KANDAHARI, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS TWO, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

MARLAINE R. CASEY, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
REBECCA SCHWALBACH DALEY, OF VIRGINIA
REBECCA EDWARDS, OF VIRGINIA
PATRICK FENNING, OF VIRGINIA
FADI A. HADDAD, OF FLORIDA
ALBERT JOHN JANEK III, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID H. LIBOFF, OF FLORIDA
GWENDOLYN LLEWELLYN, OF VIRGINIA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS THREE, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

LIDIA AVAKIAN, OF VIRGINIA
CARRIE LYNN BASNIGHT, OF FLORIDA
KARLA C. BROWN, OF CALIFORNIA
TABATHA L. FAIRCLOUGH, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
KWANG H. KIM, OF FLORIDA

FOR APPOINTMENT AS FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

NISHA ABRAHAM, OF TEXAS
CLARISSA S. ADAMSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
MICHAEL KEITH AGNER, JR., OF FLORIDA
MEGAN AHEARN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MAROOF P. AHMED, OF FLORIDA
NADIA SHAIRZAY AHMED, OF VIRGINIA
AAMIR ALAVI, OF CALIFORNIA
DANA O. AL-EBRAHIM, OF PENNSYLVANIA
DRU ALEJANDRO, OF FLORIDA
BETH M. ANDONOV, OF NEVADA
BRIAN DAVID ASCHER, OF FLORIDA
NATHANIEL F. AUSTIN, OF WASHINGTON
OSCAR D. AVILA, OF FLORIDA
KALA CARRUTHERS AZAR, OF VIRGINIA
JONATHAN BAAS, OF ARIZONA
ANDREW C. BAKER, OF CALIFORNIA
ANNA L. BALOGH, OF MASSACHUSETTS
SARAH S. BANERJEE, OF WASHINGTON
FRANCESCO CARLO BARBACCI, OF VIRGINIA
ZACHARY ISAAC BARTER, OF COLORADO
ANDREW BARWIG, OF COLORADO
NICOLE C. BAYER, OF CALIFORNIA
CALEB DANIEL BECKER, OF TEXAS
BRANISLAVA BELL, OF NORTH CAROLINA
ANNIKA R. BETANCOURT, OF CONNECTICUT
BRIDGET K. BINDER, OF MARYLAND
SHAILAJA BISTA, OF GEORGIA
D. JAMES BJORKMAN, OF UTAH
BRIDGET BLAGOVESKI-TRAZOFF, OF NEW YORK
RICHMOND PAUL BLAKE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
JOSHUA AARON BLANC SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA
SEAN DANIEL BODA, OF FLORIDA
MATTHEW ANTHONY BOULLIOUN, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL DAVIDSON BOVEN, OF MICHIGAN
ROYCE MELBERT BRANCH II, OF TEXAS
BRIAN JAMES BREUHAUS, OF NEW YORK

LASEAN WADE BROWN, OF GEORGIA
CAROLINE R. BUDDENHAGEN, OF FLORIDA
TIMOTHY JAMES BUGANSKY, OF OHIO
KEVIN J. BURGWINKLE, OF VIRGINIA
LAURA ALLISON BURNS, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW GEORGE BURY III, OF VIRGINIA
JOHN W. BUSH II, OF FLORIDA
CYNTHIA ROCHELLE CAPLAN, OF CALIFORNIA
THERESA ANN CARPENTER SONDJQ, OF MARYLAND
YANCY W. CARUTHERS, OF MISSOURI
JEFFREY PHILIP CERNYAR, OF TEXAS
DEAN I. CHANG, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ERICA CECILIA CHIUSANO, OF CALIFORNIA
GRACE WOORI CHOI, OF CALIFORNIA
YUSHIN CHOI, OF CALIFORNIA
MICHAEL CHOI, OF NEW YORK
ROGER VINCENT CHUANG, OF CALIFORNIA
D. MARKO CIMBALJEVICH, OF INDIANA
SHOSHANA A. CLARK, OF COLORADO
VANESSA D. COLON, OF TEXAS
NATHAN J. COOPER, OF CALIFORNIA
JESSI MARIE COPELAND, OF VIRGINIA
ELISE S. CRANE, OF COLORADO
IAN CRAWFORD, OF VIRGINIA
REID MILLER CREEDON, OF MICHIGAN
CATHERINE CROFT, OF WASHINGTON
RYAN ELIZABETH CROWLEY, OF MARYLAND
CHAD SPENCER CRYDER, OF INDIANA
CHANSONETTA C. CUMMINGS, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID JUDE CUMMINGS, OF COLORADO
ANDREW A. DAEHNE, OF TEXAS
EDWARD FRANCIS DANOWITZ III, OF GEORGIA
CYNTHIA C. DAVILA, OF CALIFORNIA
STEWART E. DAVIS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JENNIFER L. DENHARD, OF FLORIDA
ANDREW R. DEVLIN, OF VIRGINIA
CINDY MARIE DIOUF, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DAISY A. DIX, OF VIRGINIA
DUSTIN DOCKIEWICZ, OF CALIFORNIA
ANDREW HARRINGTON DOEBLER, OF MARYLAND
CHRISTY S. DOHERTY, OF VIRGINIA
KIRK EDWARD DONAHOE, OF PENNSYLVANIA
CLARE E. DOWDLE, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
RICHARD L. DUBOIS III, OF KANSAS
MICHAEL DUBRAY, OF CALIFORNIA
KARL DUCKWORTH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
ANDREW WEBER DUFF, OF VIRGINIA
SUSAN L. DUNATHAN, OF WASHINGTON
NAKASHIA CHERISE DUNNER, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANNA DUPONT, OF NEW YORK
SANDRA L. DUPUY, OF FLORIDA
JOSEPH R. DURAN, OF OKLAHOMA
JOEL DYLHOFF, OF ILLINOIS
HANNAH EAGLETON, OF MINNESOTA
DERRICK EDUARD ECKARDT, OF INDIANA
TIMOTHY R. EDGE, OF CALIFORNIA
KRISTEN MICHELLE EDIANN SMART, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AMY ELIZABETH EICHENBERG, OF MICHIGAN
WREN S. ELHAI, OF VIRGINIA
GAVIN TOLLEFSEN ELLIOTT, OF CALIFORNIA
CHRISTOPHER CHARLES ELLIS, OF OREGON
MARY K. FANOUS, OF FLORIDA
CHRISTOPHER R. FARLOW, OF FLORIDA
JESSICA T. FARMER, OF MAINE
MARTHA C. FARNSWORTH, OF CONNECTICUT
BILAL FARUQI, OF NEW YORK
CHARLES A. FEE, OF WASHINGTON
MICHAEL JARED FELDMAN, OF MARYLAND
JAMES P. FELDMAYER, OF VIRGINIA
DANIEL D. FENECH, OF TEXAS
BETH RUSHFORD FERNALD, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
LIAM E. FITZGERALD, OF VIRGINIA
SHARYN C. FITZGERALD, OF VIRGINIA
ROBERT WILLIAM FOLLEY, OF WISCONSIN
AMIRA A. FOUAD, OF CALIFORNIA
ADAM EDWIN FOX, OF IOWA
SACHA FRAITURE, OF MARYLAND
DAVID C. FREEMAN, OF VIRGINIA
DAVID FREITAS, OF CALIFORNIA
KATHERINE B. G. TARR, OF TEXAS
GREGORY ROBERT GAEDE, OF CALIFORNIA
JASON HOWARD GALLIAN, OF UTAH
EDUARDO GARCIA, OF TEXAS
NICHOLAS B. GEISINGER, OF VIRGINIA
LAUREN M. GIBSON, OF MARYLAND
BRIAN A. GILLESPIE, OF TENNESSEE
DARROW SLADE GODESKI MERTON, OF NEW YORK
TRACI L. GOINS, OF FLORIDA
KESHAV GOPINATH, OF CALIFORNIA
KAM J. GORDON, OF UTAH
NICHOLAS GRAY, OF WISCONSIN
LUKE S. GREICIUS, OF NEW YORK
KAY TRENHOLME HAIRSTON, OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDER FERRELL HALL, OF WASHINGTON
JOHN RICHARD HALL, OF TEXAS
BARBARA HALL, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JASON DAMON HALLECK, OF CALIFORNIA
JAMES NOEL HAMILTON, OF WASHINGTON
HAMMAD BASSAM HAMMAD, OF CALIFORNIA
JEFFREY HANLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MICHAEL HARKER, OF NORTH CAROLINA
BRENDAN J. HARLEY, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MARY K. HARRINGTON, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
JENNIFER ANNE-MARIE HARWOOD, OF MARYLAND
AMAL MOUSSAOUI HAYNES, OF NEW YORK
KARLENE M. HENNINGER FRELICH, OF FLORIDA
YASMEEN HIBRAWI, OF CALIFORNIA
CARLTON JEROME HICKS, OF VIRGINIA
ALLEN C. HODGES, OF WASHINGTON
CHRISTIANA MICHELLE HOLLIS, OF FLORIDA
REID STEVENSON HOWELL, OF OREGON

MAIETA HOWZE, OF NEW YORK
RICHARD DANIEL HUGHES, OF NEW YORK
JONATHAN HWANG, OF CALIFORNIA
ADAENZE J. IGWE, OF TEXAS
KUMI T. IKEDA, OF CALIFORNIA
AMIRAH TAREK ISMAIL, OF VIRGINIA
AARON THEODORE JACKSON, OF CALIFORNIA
DANIEL ALEXANDER JACOBS-NHAN, OF GEORGIA
KARI L. JAKSA, OF MICHIGAN
JESSICA LYNN JARCEV, OF WASHINGTON
JOSANDA EVELYN JINETTE, OF TEXAS
JOO WEON JOHN PARK, OF VIRGINIA
ELVIN JOHN, OF TEXAS
DOUGLAS MAYES JOHNSON, OF ARIZONA
NADINE FARID JOHNSON, OF WASHINGTON
ALLISON BARR JONES, OF MAINE
BRITT JAMISON JONES, OF NORTH CAROLINA
DAVID JOSAR, OF PENNSYLVANIA
BARRY H. JUNKER, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
JAMES JOSEPH KANIA, OF NEW JERSEY
RISHI KAPOOR, OF VIRGINIA
ASHOK KAUL, OF NEVADA
KAMILAH MARESSA KEITH, OF GEORGIA
DERELL KENNEDO, OF TEXAS
JULIA HARTT KENTNOR CORBY, OF ARIZONA
GEOFFREY L. KEOGH, OF TEXAS
PHILIP R. KERN, OF WYOMING
AAMER ALAM KHAN, OF NEW JERSEY
UZMA FATIMAH KHAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
MIRA J. KIM, OF ILLINOIS
JUSTIN KIMMONS-GILBERT, OF TEXAS
CHELSEA M. KINSMAN, OF NEW YORK
JENNIFER S. KLARMAN, OF FLORIDA
JOHN C. KNETTLES, OF WASHINGTON
VALERIE KNOBELSDORF, OF VIRGINIA
KEVIN J. KOCHER, OF FLORIDA
AHMED KOKON, OF NEW YORK
KENNETH KOSAKOWSKI, OF FLORIDA
JAN JERRY KRASNY, OF FLORIDA
ARIANA KROSHINSKY, OF NEW YORK
CHANANYA KUNVATANAGARN, OF PENNSYLVANIA
MATTHEW H. KUSTEL, OF CALIFORNIA
KAREN ANN KUZIS MEYER, OF WASHINGTON
VALERIE A. LABOY, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL W. LACYK, OF CALIFORNIA
BORCHIEEN LAI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
JEFFREY R. LAKSHAS, OF WASHINGTON
JIN-FONG YASUO LAM, OF FLORIDA
MATTHEW COURTNEY LAMM, OF WASHINGTON
RENEE LYNN LARIVIERE, OF VERMONT
BENJAMIN ISAAC LAZARUS, OF NORTH CAROLINA
BENEY JUHYON LEE, OF WASHINGTON
DANIEL K. LEE, OF CALIFORNIA
SCOTT T. LEO, OF CONNECTICUT
KRISTINA LESZCZAK, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
STEVE DAVIS LEU, OF CALIFORNIA
KUAN-WEN LIAO, OF NEW YORK
SHANNON LIBURD, OF NEW YORK
JOSEPH KUO LIN, OF CALIFORNIA
DAVID LINFIELD, OF FLORIDA
ALLISON WERNER LISTERMAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
JEREMY PAUL LITTLE, OF WASHINGTON
PETER ALBERT LOSSAU, OF FLORIDA
MY LU, OF CALIFORNIA
JACLYN LUO, OF TEXAS
JOSHUA HOWARD LUSTIG, OF MARYLAND
JENNIFER L. MAATTA, OF WASHINGTON
EWAN JOHN MACDOUGALL, OF NEW YORK
DANIEL P. MADAR, OF SOUTH CAROLINA
MATTHEW A. MALONE, OF MARYLAND
CRISTOPH ALEXIS MARK, OF CALIFORNIA
DAN MARK, OF WASHINGTON
DOREEN VAILLANCOURT MARONEY, OF MARYLAND
THOMAS PATRICK MAROTTA, OF FLORIDA
TRACY MARTIN, OF NEW YORK
MARY RODEGHIER MARTIN, OF FLORIDA
CATHERINE LIND MATHES, OF KANSAS
BRIAN AARON MATTYS, OF NEW YORK
PAUL A. MCDERMOTT, OF TEXAS
KRISTINE R. MCELWEE, OF OREGON
TODD MICHAEL MCGEE, OF FLORIDA
KARL W. MCNAMARA, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
DAVID MCWILLIAMS, OF TEXAS
LAUREN ALEXANDRIA MEEHLING, OF ARIZONA
REAZ MEHDI, OF VIRGINIA
KRISTIN ASHLEY MENCER, OF TENNESSEE
RACHEL ATWOOD MENDIOLA, OF NORTH DAKOTA
SAUL MERCADO, OF NEW YORK
SHANNON M. MERLO, OF VIRGINIA
LITAH NICOLE MILLER, OF MISSOURI
RYAN S. MILLER, OF OHIO
SETH ADAM MILLER, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHAD GREGORY MINER, OF LOUISIANA
KYLE JOHN MISSBACH, OF TEXAS
MICHAEL JOHN MITCHELL, OF MINNESOTA
HOMEYRA NAVEEN MOKHTARZADA, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
CHARLES L. MONTGOMERY, OF CALIFORNIA
EVAN MORRISSEY, OF WASHINGTON
SCOTT E. MURPHY, OF VIRGINIA
NINA MURRAY, OF NEBRASKA
ALI J. NADIR, OF NEW YORK
KERRIE ANN NANNI, OF TEXAS
JOSEPH JOHN NARUS, OF OREGON
CRISTINA MARIE NARVAEZ, OF FLORIDA
MEGAN JOHNSON NAYLOR, OF TEXAS
WILLIAM E. O'BRYAN, OF NEBRASKA
RACHEL MARIE O'HARA, OF MARYLAND
RACHEL OREOLUWA OKUNUBI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
AMBER M. OLIVA, OF ALASKA
MARK GEORGE OSWALD, OF OREGON

DIANNA PALEQUIN, OF MICHIGAN
 DAVID TODD PANETTI, OF MINNESOTA
 JASON LEE PARK, OF NEW JERSEY
 TYLER J. PARTRIDGE, OF ARIZONA
 LEONARD K. PAYNE IV, OF FLORIDA
 CASSANDRA J. PAYTON, OF FLORIDA
 MEGAN MCCORRY PEILER, OF VIRGINIA
 MIGUEL S. PENIX, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 AMY PETERSEN, OF TEXAS
 NATALIE L. PETERSON, OF OHIO
 SHANNON ELISABETH PETRY, OF TEXAS
 ROBERT MATTHEW PICKETT, OF OREGON
 BRANDON NOBLE PIERCE, OF FLORIDA
 MATTHEW COLE PIERSON, OF VIRGINIA
 LISA N. PODOLNY, OF FLORIDA
 KEVIN C. PRICE, OF VIRGINIA
 LAURA QUINN, OF NEW YORK
 HEDAYAT KHALIL RAFIQZAD, OF VIRGINIA
 CHRISTOPHER RAINS, OF CALIFORNIA
 BAHAM M. RAJAEI, OF DELAWARE
 AMANJIT RAMESH, OF VIRGINIA
 SHANKAR RAO, OF CALIFORNIA
 KEDENARD MADEILLE RAYMOND, OF MARYLAND
 JUSTIN REID, OF CALIFORNIA
 JAMES PATRICK REIDY, OF TEXAS
 REBECCA RESNIK, OF MARYLAND
 SALINA RICO, OF CALIFORNIA
 ARMANDO DIEGO RIVERA, OF ARIZONA
 JOHN TIMOTHY ROBBINS, OF TEXAS
 KAHINA MILDRENA ROBINSON, OF CALIFORNIA
 SEAN WILLIAM ROBINSON, OF FLORIDA
 THAD W. ROSS, OF IDAHO
 SAMUEL J. ROTENBERG, OF NEW YORK
 JOHN RUNKLE, OF WASHINGTON
 EMILY ANNE RUPPEL, OF MINNESOTA
 RAUL A. RUSSELL, OF TENNESSEE
 JOHN JACOB RUTHERFORD IV, OF CALIFORNIA
 WILLIAM C. SANDS, OF TEXAS
 SCOTT R. SANFORD, OF WYOMING
 JOHN DAVID SARRAF, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 BRIAN J. SAWICH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 GEORGE A. SCHAAL, OF ARIZONA
 JOANNA M. SCHENKE, OF TEXAS
 CHRISTOPHER SCHIRM, OF ARIZONA
 MIRIAM S. SCHIVE, OF MARYLAND
 STEPHANIE LAURA SCHMID, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 CURTIS L. SCHMUCKER, OF FLORIDA
 GARY SCHUMANN, OF FLORIDA
 MATTHEW WILLIAM SCRANTON, OF DELAWARE
 MONICA M. SENDOR, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 SHEILA TAYLOR SHAMBER, OF FLORIDA
 JAMES JONAS SHEA, OF MARYLAND
 ALEXANDRA G. SHEMA, OF VIRGINIA
 MARY ANN SHEPHERD, OF COLORADO
 TIMOTHY SHRIVER, OF IOWA
 SHANE A. SIEGEL, OF NEW YORK
 JEFFREY HANCOCK SILLIN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 JOAN LOUISE SIMON BARTHOLOMAUS, OF WASHINGTON
 LEE JAMES SKLUZAK, OF VIRGINIA
 BENJAMIN J. SMITH, OF ARIZONA
 CHRISTOPHER FREDERIC SMITH, OF TEXAS
 MARISSA L. SMITH, OF ARIZONA
 RACHEL ELIZABETH SMITH, OF CALIFORNIA
 SEAN ROBERT SMITH, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 LACHLYN M. SOPER, OF TEXAS
 JULIANA AURELIA SPAVEN, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 SILVIA FREYRE SPRING, OF MARYLAND
 PAUL A. ST. PIERRE II, OF TENNESSEE
 GREGORY S. STAFF, OF VIRGINIA
 EVAN ROBERT STANLEY, OF FLORIDA
 ANDREW STAPLES, OF WASHINGTON
 JUSTIN JAMES STECKLEY, OF FLORIDA

ADAM T. STEVENS, OF CONNECTICUT
 JACOB DARYL STEVENS, OF WASHINGTON
 KARYN M. STOVALL, OF ILLINOIS
 LUCIJA BAJZER STRALEY, OF MINNESOTA
 ELISABETH CORBIN STRATTON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 TRACY M. STRAUCH, OF VIRGINIA
 MARY M. STREETZEL, OF FLORIDA
 AKASH R. SURI, OF CALIFORNIA
 BENJAMIN ANDRI SWANSON, OF SOUTH DAKOTA
 SARAH HOWE SWATZBURG, OF NEVADA
 SANDY A. SWITZER, OF CALIFORNIA
 CODY W. SWYER, OF CALIFORNIA
 TINA K. TAKAGI, OF CALIFORNIA
 KAREN TANG, OF VIRGINIA
 SHAWN TENBRINK, OF OHIO
 JOHN THOMPSON, OF TEXAS
 SEAN ANDREW THOMPSON, OF WASHINGTON
 BRIAN ANDREW TIMM-BROCK, OF MARYLAND
 TAYLOR C. TINNEY, OF FLORIDA
 LESLIE M. TOKIWA, OF CALIFORNIA
 GREGORY VINSON TOLLE, OF VIRGINIA
 J. BARRETT TRAVIS, OF TEXAS
 AARON CHAUNCEY TRUAX, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
 KARL EVAN TRUNK, OF WASHINGTON
 CAITLIN JANE TUMULTY, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 OLGA TUNGA, OF TEXAS
 WILLIAM DAVID TUNGETT FROST, OF KENTUCKY
 NICHOLAS TYNER, OF MASSACHUSETTS
 DAVID MARK URBIA, OF MINNESOTA
 ANNE M. VASQUEZ, OF FLORIDA
 KARINA A. VERAS, OF NEW YORK
 CHARLES F. VETTER, OF TEXAS
 NHU VU, OF CALIFORNIA
 VANJA VUKOTA, OF FLORIDA
 PERSIA WALKER, OF CALIFORNIA
 CYNTHIA H. WANG, OF CALIFORNIA
 RONALD P. WARD, OF FLORIDA
 JEFFREY M. WARNER, OF NEVADA
 EILEEN WEDEL, OF FLORIDA
 REBECCA WEIDNER, OF VIRGINIA
 NELSON H. WEN, OF TEXAS
 KEITH E. WEST, OF FLORIDA
 ELIZABETH ANNE WEWERKA, OF FLORIDA
 EMILY BUTLER WHITE, OF CALIFORNIA
 ASHLEY M. WHITE, OF OHIO
 ZAINABU ZAWADI WILLIAMS, OF MARYLAND
 ERIC MICHAEL WILSON, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 ANDREW G. WINKELMAN, OF NORTH CAROLINA
 KEVIN JAMES WITTENBERGER, OF FLORIDA
 COURTNEY J. WOODS, OF ARKANSAS
 ANDREW J. WYLIE, OF FLORIDA
 STALLION EASE YANG, OF CALIFORNIA
 HYUN YOON, OF FLORIDA
 DENISE ROSALIND ZAVRAS, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 LU ZHOU, OF CALIFORNIA
 MICHELLE ZIA, OF VIRGINIA
 MATTHEW H. ZIEMS, OF ILLINOIS
 YETTA JOY ZIOLKOWSKI, OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
 RAFAELA ZUIDEMA-BLOMFELD, OF PENNSYLVANIA
 THE FOLLOWING-NAMED PERSON OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR APPOINTMENT AS A FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF THE CLASS STATED:
 FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICER OF CLASS FOUR, CONSULAR OFFICER AND SECRETARY IN THE DIPLOMATIC SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, EFFECTIVE JULY 6, 2010:
 DERRIN RAY SMITH, OF FLORIDA
 THE FOLLOWING-NAMED CAREER MEMBER OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE FOR PROMOTION WITHIN THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE TO THE CLASS INDICATED:

CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR:

STUART MACKENZIE HATCHER, OF VIRGINIA

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

LT. GEN. DAVID D. HALVERSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. KENNETH R. DAHL

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY VETERINARY CORPS TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 3064 AND 3084:

To be brigadier general

COL. ERIK H. TORRING III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 601:

To be lieutenant general

MAJ. GEN. THOMAS S. VANDAL

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. VALERIA GONZALEZ-KERR

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 12203 AND 12211:

To be brigadier general

COL. JOHN J. MORRIS

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPT. ANDREW S. MCKINLEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14, U.S.C., SECTION 271(E):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

CAPTAIN MATTHEW T. BELL
 CAPTAIN MELISSA BERT
 CAPTAIN DAVID M. DERMANELIAN
 CAPTAIN ROBERT P. HAYES
 CAPTAIN ANDREW J. TIONGSON
 CAPTAIN ANTHONY J. VOGT

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, September 22, 2015 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

SEPTEMBER 23

11 a.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Regulatory Affairs and Federal Management
To hold hearings to examine the use of agency regulatory guidance.

SD-342

SEPTEMBER 24

2:30 p.m.
Select Committee on Intelligence
To hold hearings to examine certain intelligence matters.

SH-216

SEPTEMBER 30

2:30 p.m.
Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs
Subcommittee on Federal Spending Oversight and Emergency Management
To hold hearings to examine end of the year spending.

SD-342

OCTOBER 1

9:30 a.m.
Committee on Armed Services
To hold hearings to examine the procurement, acquisition, testing, and oversight of the Navy's *Gerald R. Ford*-class aircraft carrier program.

SD-G50

2 p.m.
Committee on the Judiciary
Subcommittee on Immigration and the National Interest
To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Administration's FY 2016 refugee resettlement program, including fiscal and security implications.

SD-226

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, September 22, 2015

The House met at 4 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. COMSTOCK).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 22, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BARBARA COMSTOCK to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

Lieutenant Commander Stephen Cloer, Chaplain, United States Navy, Office of the Chief of Navy Chaplains, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Yours, O Lord, is the greatness, the power, the glory, the victory, and the majesty. Everything in the heavens and on Earth is Yours, O Lord, and this is Your kingdom. We adore You as the one who is over all things. Wealth and honor come from You alone. Power and might are in Your hand. At Your discretion, people are made great and given strength.

Heavenly Father, Savior, and friend, I am humbled to pray within these historic halls. By Your divine appointment, Members of this House have been selected to represent the precious mosaic of people across our Nation. Lord, bless our leaders. Make Your face to shine upon them and give them strength. May every decision made here pass carefully under the scrutiny of Your holy standards.

Bless our deployed soldiers, airmen, sailors, coastguardsmen, marines, and their families. Heal and restore our veterans.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

CALLING FOR THE RELEASE OF UKRAINIAN FIGHTER PILOT NADIYA SAVCHENKO

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 50) calling for the release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who was captured by Russian forces in Eastern Ukraine and has been held illegally in a Russian prison since July 2014, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 50

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is the first-ever female fighter pilot in Ukraine's Armed Forces and is an Iraqi war veteran;

Whereas in the ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine, Nadiya Savchenko volunteered her services to the Ukrainian Aidar battalion;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko was elected in absentia from the Batkivshchyna Party to Ukraine's Parliament in October 2014, and appointed to the Parliament Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) as a representative from Ukraine;

Whereas as a member of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, Lieutenant Nadiya Savchenko was conducting operations in eastern Ukraine against pro-Russian forces in the summer of 2014 when she was captured and taken into captivity;

Whereas during her mission in Eastern Ukraine, she was captured by the Donbas People's Militia, detained on Ukrainian territory, deprived of rights to due process, and illegally transferred to the Russian Federation to stand trial on unsubstantiated charges of terrorism;

Whereas since July 2014, Nadiya Savchenko has endured involuntary psychiatric evaluations and solitary confinement;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is currently entering her sixth week of a hunger strike as a symbol of her protest;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is denied access to urgently needed medical attention and access to legal counsel;

Whereas the Minsk Protocol of September 2014, signed by Ukraine and the Russian Federation, calls for the "immediate release of all hostages and illegally held persons";

Whereas appeals have been made to the United Nations Human Rights Council and the International Red Cross to secure Nadiya Savchenko's release;

Whereas the international community including representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and of the United States have urged her immediate release;

Whereas, on January 26, 2015, the opening day of the Parliamentary Assembly, the global community embark on a public campaign to bring attention to the plight of Nadiya Savchenko and demand her immediate release; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and its people express concern about the deteriorating health of detained pilot Nadiya Savchenko and her continued illegal imprisonment: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Russian Federation for its illegal imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko;

(2) calls on the Russian Federation to immediately release Nadiya Savchenko;

(3) calls on the United States, its European allies, and the international community to aggressively support efforts to release Nadiya Savchenko and other illegally detained persons; and

(4) expresses solidarity with the Ukrainian people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, H. Res. 50, introduced by Representative LEVIN, calls for the release of former Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who has been languishing in Russian prisons since she was abducted by pro-Russian forces in eastern Ukraine in 2014, and illegally transferred across the border in handcuffs and with a bag over her head.

Since she was incarcerated on specious and unsubstantiated charges, Nadiya has endured interrogations, involuntary psychiatric evaluations and solitary confinement. She spent four months on a hunger strike as a symbol of protest, ending it last April. Her trial opened today.

Nadiya is yet another victim of the Putin regime's brutality. We must recognize that this isn't just about her, but also represents a very visible manifestation of Russia's aggression towards a Ukraine that wishes to remain free, independent, and democratic. Nadiya is a symbol for the struggle of Ukraine.

Madam Speaker, Nadiya Savchenko was elected in absentia to the Ukrainian Parliament in October and was named a member of Ukraine's delegation to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe. As such, she enjoys diplomatic immunity.

With its illegal annexation of Crimea and the war in eastern Ukraine, Russia has made a mockery of its international commitments, including all ten core OSCE principles enshrined in the 1975 Helsinki Final Act. Nadiya's illegal detention, along with that of other Ukrainian citizens held hostage by Moscow, represents

yet another in a long list of violations of international agreements and the norms of civilized behavior.

According to the Minsk agreements between Russia along with its separatist proxies, and Ukraine, hostages are supposed to be released. Moscow needs to immediately release Nadiya and the many other hostages, including Oleg Sentsov and Oleksander Kolchenko, who were recently sentenced in a Russian court on completely baseless charges.

Madam Speaker, my amendment calls for the imposition of personal sanctions against individuals responsible for the kidnapping, arrest, and imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko and other Ukrainian citizens illegally incarcerated in Russia.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Resolution 50, calling on the release of the detained Ukrainian pilot Nadiya Savchenko.

The Ukrainian pilot Nadiya Savchenko was captured by Russia-controlled forces in July 2014 in eastern Ukraine; illegally transferred to Russia, and later charged with trumped up charges of murder. Since then, she has been kept in Russian custody. There can be little doubt that she is being held as a political prisoner, punished for her defiance, and used as a bargaining tool in Russia's protracted offense against Ukraine.

Since her capture, Ms. Savchenko has come to represent the spirit of an independent Ukraine. A Ukraine that is free from interference and eager to embrace the will of its own people, striving towards the rule of law and democracy. We all know that the last two years have been difficult. Since the start of the conflict in eastern Ukraine, eight thousand people have been killed, over a million people have been displaced, and Crimea has become occupied. All the while, meaningful progress seems elusive as reports of continued fighting make news week after week.

Amidst all the reports of death and violence, Ms. Savchenko's courage and spirit have inspired millions of people around the world. Here at home, the Ukrainian-American community in my home district has followed her case especially closely. Together, we worried for her health when she underwent a lengthy hunger strike earlier in the year. And we also worried for her well-being, as her case suffered repeated and unfair delays. We now call for her release.

For those of us who have followed human rights issues, it is easy to see through the repeated delays, the so-called psychiatric evaluations, and the changes in venues to discourage outside observers. These tactics are used all too often as tools of intimidation and confusion by authoritarian regimes.

Ms. Savchenko's trial began earlier today, where journalists were barred from the courtroom. I have no reason to believe that her trial will be fair, given the precedents set thus far.

I call for her release, and urge my colleagues to rise in support of Ms. Savchenko, and in support of the Ukrainian people. Let us send a unified message in support of human rights around the world.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the text of the resolution at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) condemns the Government of the Russian Federation for its illegal imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko;

(2) calls on the Government of the Russian Federation to immediately release Nadiya Savchenko;

(3) calls on the United States, its European allies, and the international community to aggressively support efforts to release Nadiya Savchenko and other illegally detained persons;

(4) reiterates that it is the policy of the United States not to recognize the de jure or de facto sovereignty of the Russian Federation over any part of Ukraine, its airspace, or its territorial waters;

(5) calls upon the United States to impose targeted sanctions against persons responsible for the kidnapping, arrest, and imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko and other illegally detained persons; and

(6) expresses solidarity with the Ukrainian people.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the trial of Nadiya Savchenko is scheduled to begin in Russia on September 22, 2015;

Whereas Nadiya Savchenko is the first-ever female fighter pilot in Ukraine's Armed Forces and is an Iraqi war veteran;

Whereas in the ongoing conflict in Eastern Ukraine, Savchenko volunteered her services to the Ukrainian Aidar battalion;

Whereas Savchenko was elected in absentia from the Batkivshchyna Party to Ukraine's Parliament in October 2014, and appointed to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) as a representative from Ukraine;

Whereas as a member of the Armed Forces of Ukraine, Savchenko was conducting operations in eastern Ukraine against pro-Russian forces in the summer of 2014 when she was captured and taken into captivity;

Whereas Savchenko was captured and illegally transferred to the Russian Federation to stand trial on unsubstantiated charges of murder, attempted murder, and illegally entering Russian territory among other allegations;

Whereas while being kept in Russian custody since July 2014, Savchenko's hearing and trial dates have been repeatedly delayed;

Whereas in protest of her illegal detention, Savchenko conducted a hunger strike lasting over 80 days;

Whereas her courage and determination have inspired people across the globe;

Whereas the Minsk Protocol of September 2014, signed by Ukraine and the Russian Federation, calls for the "immediate release of all hostages and illegally held persons";

Whereas appeals have been made to the United Nations Human Rights Council and the International Red Cross to secure Savchenko's release;

Whereas the international community including representatives of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (PACE) and of the United States have urged her immediate release;

Whereas on January 26, 2015, the opening day of the Parliamentary Assembly, a broad range of individuals and organizations in the United States and Europe dedicated to promoting human rights embarked on a public campaign to bring attention to Savchenko's plight and demanded her immediate release;

Whereas on February 12, 2015, the United States Senate passed S. Res. 52 by unanimous consent, a Resolution calling for Savchenko's release;

Whereas on April 22, 2015, the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine voted unanimously to pass a resolution "On the imposing of sanctions on persons responsible for the illegal imprisonment in the Russian Federation of Nadiya Savchenko", which included the names of 35 individuals believed to be responsible for Nadiya Savchenko's illegal imprisonment; and

Whereas the Government of the United States and its people express concern about the continued illegal imprisonment of Nadiya Savchenko: Now, therefore, be it

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (during the reading). Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution calling for the release of Ukrainian fighter pilot Nadiya Savchenko, who was captured by pro-Russian forces in Eastern Ukraine and has been held illegally in a Russian prison since July 2014."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days to submit statements and extraneous materials for the RECORD on H. Res. 50.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 22, 2015 at 11:30 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 2051.

That the Senate passed S. 1109.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1109. An act to require adequate information regarding the tax treatment of payments under settlement agreements entered into by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 17, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 720. To improve intergovernmental planning for and communication during security incidents at domestic airports, and for other purposes.

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, further reported that on September 21, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 23. To reauthorize the National Windstorm Impact Reduction Program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Thursday, September 24, 2015, at 8:30 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the third quarter of 2015, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JEFFREY DRESSLER, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 26 AND SEPT. 1, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jeffrey Dressler	8/27	8/28	Qatar		568.00		14,827.00*				15,395.00
	8/28	8/30	United Arab Emirates		728.00						728.00
	8/30	9/1	Israel		1,050.00						1,050.00
Committee total					2,346.00		14,827.00				17,173.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

*transportation all inclusive.

JEFFREY DRESSLER, Sept. 9, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, CASON HIGHTOWER, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 16 AND AUG. 22, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Cason Hightower	8/16	8/19	United Kingdom	183.24	282.00					183.24	282.00
	8/16	8/19	United Kingdom	792.00	1,221.77					13,834.00	21,293.63
	8/19	8/20	Poland	326.25	87.00					326.25	87.00
	8/19	8/20	Poland	569.70	153.00					569.70	153.00
	8/20	8/22	Ukraine	5,686.00	262.00					5,686.00	262.00
	8/20	8/22	Ukraine	10,583.19	482.26					10,583.19	482.26
Committee total					2,488.63						22,559.89

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

CASON HIGHTOWER, Sept. 14, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JENNIFER M. STEWART, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 2 AND SEPT. 6, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jennifer M. Stewart	9/3	9/5	Afghanistan		12.00		11,867.20				11,879.20
Committee total					12.00		11,867.20				11,879.20

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER, Sept. 16, 2015.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ITALY AND UKRAINE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 31 AND AUG. 6, 2015

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,209.64		(3)				2,209.64
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Hon. Anna Eshoo	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Hon. Chellie Pingree	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Hon. David Cicilline	8/1	8/4	Italy		1,402.15		3,803.80				5,205.95
Hon. Cedric Richmond	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Hon. Marc Veasey	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Wyndee Parker	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Kate Knudson Wolters	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		377.00				2,522.05
Bina Surgeon	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Evangeline George	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		(3)				2,145.05
Patricia Ross	7/31	8/4	Italy		2,145.05		379.50				2,524.55
Hon. Nancy Pelosi	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.88		(3)				754.88
Hon. Rosa DeLauro	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.88		(3)				754.88
Hon. Anna Eshoo	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.88		(3)				754.88
Hon. Chellie Pingree	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Hon. David Cicilline	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Hon. Cedric Richmond	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Hon. Marc Veasey	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Wyndee Parker	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Kate Knudson Wolters	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Bina Surgeon	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Evangeline George	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Patricia Ross	8/4	8/6	Ukraine		754.89		(3)				754.89
Committee total					34,799.25		4,560.30				39,359.55

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.³ Military air transportation.

HON. NANCY PELOSI, Aug. 31, 2015.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2880. A letter from the Secretary, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Membership in a Registered Futures Association (RIN: 3038-AE09) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2881. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — U.S. Industrial Base Surveys Pursuant to the Defense Production Act of 1950 [Docket No.: 140501396-5463-02] (RIN: 0694-AG17) received July 22, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2882. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule — On-Site Completion of Construction of Manufactured Homes [Docket No.: FR-5295-F-02] (RIN: 2502-AI83) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Financial Services.

2883. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority — Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Workforce Innovation Technical Assistance Center [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0069; CFDA Number: 84.264G.] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2884. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of

Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and definitions — Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center-Targeted Communities [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0070] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2885. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority — Technical Assistance Center for Vocational Rehabilitation Agency Program Evaluation and Quality Assurance [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0048; CFDA Number: 84.263B.] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2886. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority and definitions — Demonstration and Training Program: Career Pathways for Individuals With Disabilities [Docket ID: ED-2015-OSERS-0061] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2887. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priority — Rehabilitation Training: Vocational Rehabilitation Technical Assistance Center-Youth With Disabilities [CFDA Number: 84.264H.] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2888. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for the Division of Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged; Assistance to States for the Education of Children with Disabilities

[Docket ID: ED-2012-OESE-0018] (RIN: 1810-AB16) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2889. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, OC/OPPLA/OP/RPMS, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — Administrative Destruction of Certain Drugs Refused Admission to the United States [Docket No.: FDA-2014-N-0504] (RIN: 0910-AH12) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2890. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Significant New Use Rule for Hexabromocyclododecane and 1,2,5,6,9,10-Hexabromocyclododecane [EPA-HQ-OPPT-2011-0489; FRL-9927-44] (RIN: 2070-AJ88) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2891. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Revisions to the California State Implementation Plan, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0369; FRL-9933-22-Region 9] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2892. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Designation for Planning Purposes; California; PM10; Technical Amendment [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0608; FRL-9934-57-Region 9] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2893. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington: Update to the Spokane Regional Clean Air Agency Solid Fuel Burning Device Standards [EPA-R10-OAR-2015-0483; FRL-9934-61-Region 10] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2894. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; South Carolina: Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2012-0852; FRL-9934-40-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2895. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Georgia: Removal of Clean Fuel Fleet Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0114; FRL-9934-52-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2896. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Florida Infrastructure Requirements for the 2008 Lead NAAQS [EPA-R04-OAR-2013-0040; FRL-9934-41-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2897. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for the State of Alabama: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0313; FRL-9934-50-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2898. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans for the State of Alabama: Cross-State Air Pollution Rule [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0313; FRL-9934-49-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2899. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; GA: Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0113; FRL-9934-53-Region 4] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2900. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions and Spectrum Access Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Updating Part 1 Competitive Bidding Rules; Expanding the Economic and Innovation Opportunities of Spectrum Through Incentive Auctions; Peti-

tion of DIRECTV Group, Inc. and EchoStar LLC for Expedited Rulemaking to Amend Sec. 1.2105(a)(2)(xi) and 1.2106(a) of the Commission's Rules and/or for Interim Conditional Waiver; Implementation of the Commercial Spectrum Enhancement Act and Modernization of the Commission's Competitive Bidding Rules and Procedures [WT Docket No.: 14-170] [GN Docket No.: 12-268] [RM-11395] [WT Docket No.: 05-211] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2901. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's revised interim rules — Resource Agency Hearings and Alternatives Development Procedures in Hydropower Licenses [Docket No.: DOI-2015-0001] (RIN: 0596-AC42, 1090-AA91, and 0648-AU01) received August 28, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2902. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Formatting and Non-substantive Corrections to Authority Citations [NRC-2015-0122] (RIN: 3150-AJ61) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2903. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final NUREG — Chilled Water System (9.2.7) (NUREG-0800) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2904. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Assessment and Collection of Regulatory Fees for Fiscal Year 2015 [MD Docket No.: 15-121] received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2905. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's "Seventh Annual Report on Delays in Approvals of Applications Related to Citizen Petitions and Petitions for Stay of Agency Action for Fiscal Year 2014", as required by Sec. 914 of the Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110-85; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2906. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting agreements prepared by the Department of State concerning international agreements, other than treaties entered into by the United States, to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, 1 U.S.C. 112b; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates — Passport and Citizenship Services Fee Changes [Public Notice: 9257] (RIN: 1400-AD71) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added

by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2908. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995, as required by Sec. 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), Sec. 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and Sec. 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), and pursuant to Executive Order 13313 of July 31, 2003; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2909. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2910. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2911. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2912. A letter from the Assistant Director, Senior Executive Management Office, Department of the Army, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Vacancies Reform Act of 1998, Pub. L. 105-277, 5 U.S.C. 3345-3349d; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2913. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Provisions; Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Omnibus Amendment to Simplify Vessel Baselines [Docket No.: 110907562-5681-03] (RIN: 0648-BB40) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2914. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's interim rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Purse Seine Fishing Restrictions During Closure Periods [Docket No.: 150629563-5703-01] (RIN: 0648-BF23) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2915. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — International Fisheries; Western and Central Pacific Fisheries for Highly Migratory Species; Fishing Effort Limits in Purse Seine Fisheries for 2015 [Docket No.: 150406346-5700-02] (RIN: 0648-BF03) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121,

Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2916. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Large Coastal and Small Coastal Atlantic Shark Management Measures [Docket No.: 100825390-5664-03] (RIN: 0648-BA17) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2917. A letter from the Director, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Departmental Component Designations (RIN: 3209-AA14) received September 18, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2918. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Water Quality Standards Regulatory Revisions; Correction [EPA-HQ-OW-2010-0606; FRL-9934-33-OW] (RIN: 2040-AF16) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2919. A letter from the Chief Impact Analyst, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the General Counsel (02REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Loan Guaranty — Specially Adapted Housing Assistive Technology Grant Program (RIN: 2900-AO70) received September 21, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2920. A letter from the Chief, Trade and Commercial Regulations Branch, U.S. Customs and Border Protection, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disclosure of Information for Certain Intellectual Property Rights Enforced at the Border [Docket No.: USCBP-2012-0011] (RIN: 1515-AD87) received September 17, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3583. A bill to reform and improve the Federal Emergency Management Agency, the Office of Emergency Communications, and the Office of Health Affairs of the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3584. A bill to authorize, streamline, and identify efficiencies within the Trans-

portation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. WESTERMAN, and Mr. ABRAHAM):

H.R. 3585. A bill to authorize surface transportation research and development programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3586. A bill to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to improve border and maritime security coordination in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. KEATING):

H.R. 3587. A bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 to provide for the development of plans for dry cask storage of spent nuclear fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3588. A bill to require the establishment of a Consumer Price Index for Elderly Consumers to compute cost-of-living increases for Social Security benefits under title II of the Social Security Act and to provide, in the case of elderly beneficiaries under such title, for an annual cost-of-living increase which is not less than 3 percent; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3589. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to ensure continuing funding for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Ms. ROSELEHTINEN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. OLSON, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. DOLD, and Mr. SMITH of Missouri):

H.R. 3590. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the increase in the income threshold used in determining the deduction for medical care; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REED (for himself and Mr. LANDEVIN):

H.R. 3591. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3592. A bill to establish a pilot program to reduce the number of vehicles owned by certain Federal departments and increase

the use of ride-sharing services; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3593. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue or revise regulations to ensure that a person who holds a private pilot certificate may communicate with the public to facilitate certain shared cost flights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. POLIS (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H. Res. 433. A resolution expressing support for designation of the week of September 21, 2015, as National Adult Education and Family Literacy Week; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

133. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 1508, expressing support for the use of sound science to study and regulate such modern agricultural technologies as crop protection chemistries, genetically engineered or enhanced traits, and nutrients; to the Committee on Agriculture.

134. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 1605, expressing the commitment of the House of Representatives of the 84th Texas State Legislature to the elimination of illegal fishing, to the long-term conservation of Texas marine resources, and to the protection of the Texas Gulf Coast fishing and coastal communities; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

135. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, relative to House Joint Resolution 19-5, requesting that the Covenant Section 902 process be utilized by the President of the United States of America and the Governor of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands as the sole forum of discussion, consultation, and negotiation to address the United States' desire to acquire any interest in real property not already given under the Covenant; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

136. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 1835, expressing support for the implementation of the Next Generation Air Transportation System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

137. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Texas, relative to House Resolution No. 1215, urging the Congress to instruct the Transportation Security Administration to accept concealed handgun licenses as valid forms of identification; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3576.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3583.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 3584.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 3585.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with Indian tribes.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 3586.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1; and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3587.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under the following provisions of the United States Constitution:

Article I, Section 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1;

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3; and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3588.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 3589.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. MCSALLY:

H.R. 3590.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1

This Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 3591.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3592.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3593.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 244: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 282: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 330: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 333: Mr. TONKO and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 379: Mr. TONKO, Mr. BARLETTA, Ms. CLARKE of New York, and Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 556: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 686: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.

H.R. 703: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.

H.R. 845: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H.R. 920: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 1019: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REED, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 1117: Ms. MCSALLY.

H.R. 1188: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1258: Mr. HIMES, Mr. GALLEGU, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. HINOJOSA, and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 1270: Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 1338: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 1346: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1347: Mr. HOYER and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 1422: Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 1479: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 1548: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1595: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1610: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 1644: Mr. LATTA and Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 1848: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 1854: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY and Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 2096: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. HANNA.

H.R. 2104: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 2148: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2197: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2216: Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2257: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 2315: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2494: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 2567: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 2657: Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan.

H.R. 2680: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2713: Mr. BEYER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2728: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 2754: Mr. ABRAHAM.

H.R. 2808: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 2847: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2858: Mr. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. ISRAEL.

H.R. 2912: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 2948: Ms. GRAHAM.

H.R. 2956: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 2957: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 2963: Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2982: Mr. POCAN, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.

H.R. 3123: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3151: Mr. PALMER and Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 3180: Mr. DOLD.

H.R. 3229: Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 3268: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. GRAHAM, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. TAKAI.

H.R. 3314: Mr. POSEY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 3323: Mr. MCHENRY and Mr. HECK of Nevada.

H.R. 3326: Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 3341: Mrs. TORRES.

H.R. 3381: Mr. WELCH, Mr. ROSKAM, and Mr. ROSS.

H.R. 3437: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.

H.R. 3442: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 3456: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 3471: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 3497: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 3512: Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. VELA, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3514: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 3520: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. STEWART, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 3532: Mr. WALZ.

H.R. 3543: Ms. BASS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3557: Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 3573: Mr. NUNES and Mr. CRAMER.

H. J. Res. 14: Mr. ZELDIN.

H. J. Res. 51: Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H. Con. Res. 50: Mr. HUNTER.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. ISRAEL.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. ELLISON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 177: Mr. ROSS.

H. Res. 207: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York and Mr. GRIFFITH.

H. Res. 214: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, and Mr. BEYER.

H. Res. 277: Mr. SMITH of Texas and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H. Res. 346: Mr. HARDY.

H. Res. 354: Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. ESTY, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. HIGGINS, and Mr. STIVERS.

H. Res. 427: Ms. BASS.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

27. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council of Jamestown, NY, relative

to a resolution encouraging President Barack Obama, Senator Charles Schumer, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, Representative Thomas Reed, Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell, Senate Minority Leader Harry Reid, House of Representatives Speaker John Boehner, and House of Representatives Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi, to vigorously oppose the proposed reductions in funding for the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Program and the elimi-

nation of the “grandfathering” of metropolitan cities not meeting population levels for which they initially qualified as a HUD Entitlement Community; to the Committee on Financial Services.

28. Also, a petition of the Mayor and City Council of Westminster, CA, relative to Resolution No. 4550, urging the 114th United States Congress to adopt H.R. 2140 — The Vietnam Human Rights Act of 2015 and support attaching human rights conditions to

trade and security agreements with Vietnam and prohibit DRAFT non-humanitarian aid unless the President certifies to Congress that the government of Vietnam has made substantial progress respecting political, civil, media, Internet, religious freedoms, minority rights, access to U.S. refugee programs, actions to end trafficking in persons, and the release of religious and political prisoners; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 22, 2015

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal Lord God, our hope for years to come, as we approach Yom Kippur, the holiest day in the Jewish year, inspire us to strive to live Godly lives.

Lord, remind our lawmakers that You call each of us to flee from impurity and to live with integrity. Teach our Senators to accentuate the positive, to think thoughts that are pure, commendable, just, and honorable. May they permit You to cleanse them from every defilement, empowering them to live for You as they seek to do Your will.

Lord, create in us all clean hearts and renew a right spirit within us.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). The majority leader is recognized.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, ask a family to show you the first picture of their child these days, and you are likely to get a black-and-white image with delicate fingers and tiny toes. Maybe it is their precious Christine. Maybe it is their little guy Brett. But one thing's for sure—that baby is their child.

Scientific advances like the sonogram are helping pull back the curtain on the mystery of life, they are helping foster a new spirit of compassionate protection for the most defenseless, and they are providing new opportunities to bridge old political divides.

We in this Chamber are never going to agree completely on the abortion question, but we should at least be able to agree that if an unborn child has reached the point where he or she can

feel pain, that child's life deserves protection. Science is telling us that a child can reach this stage around 20 weeks—in other words, 5 months. This is when unborn children can react—even recoil—to stimuli an adult would recognize as painful. This is when doctors even administer fetal anesthesia during surgery.

As the New England Journal of Medicine study recently demonstrated, babies delivered at this age can survive outside the womb. So even if we differ on the larger abortion issue, can't we at least agree that children at this late stage of development deserve our protection? The American people seem to think so. Polls show that American women and American men oppose abortions after 5 months. The fact is that we are now one of just seven nations—among them countries such as North Korea and China—that allow elective abortions at such a late stage. Can't we do better than this as a country? The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act would allow America to finally join the ranks of the most civilized nations on this issue.

Just this past weekend in Louisville, hundreds of Kentuckians gathered to spread a message of dignity and hope. They marched for those who may not meet them. They marched for those who may not hear them. But I hope Americans across the country, including participants in the 37th annual Walk for Life, will be encouraged to know that their voices of humanity and of respect are finally being heard again in a Senate under new leadership.

The executive director of Kentucky Right to Life said the issue before us is "critical." She said, "We have worked tirelessly to give these defenseless babies some protection." Several States have already taken action to protect these children. So has the House of Representatives. Now it is up to each of us to show where we stand. We are seeing how science is changing this debate.

So what I am asking every colleague is this: Look in your hearts and help us stand up for the most innocent life, help us protect that beating heart in that sonogram.

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR—H.R. 3134 AND H.R. 3504

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I understand there are two bills at the desk due for a second reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bills by title for the second time.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3134) to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

A bill (H.R. 3504) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in order to place the bills on the calendar under the provisions of rule XIV, I object to further proceedings en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bills will be placed on the calendar.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum call under rule XXII be waived with respect to the cloture vote on the motion to proceed to H.R. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

WOMEN'S HEALTH

Mr. REID. Mr. President, it is said you cannot make the same mistake twice because the second time it is a choice, it is not a mistake. I repeat: It is said you cannot make the same mistake twice because the second time you make it, it is a choice. On every issue, Republicans are choosing to employ the same failed strategy they have tried time and time again. They are making choices. Over and over again, they drag Congress and the American people through votes that are nothing more than publicity stunts, solely designed to boost their conservative records.

Today we stand in the midst of yet another show vote designed to honor the political wish lists of extremists. Once again, Republicans have decided to place a woman's health at the center of their ideological campaign. We have seen this tactic before. It does not work.

Americans are tired of the Republican attacks on the health of women. Earlier this year, Republicans manipulated a bill. The bill was to help victims of human trafficking. They turned it into a political football by attaching ideological abortion riders. They have tried to repeatedly cut off funds for Planned Parenthood, a critical safety net provider for women.

Now today, in the face of a government shutdown, they decide to waste the Senate's time on a 20-week abortion ban. Every Senator in this body knows this bill is going nowhere. This attack is a waste of time. The bill on its merits is no good. It will accomplish nothing. By holding today's vote, the Republican leader is pandering to the rightwing extremists in his party who are willing to take our government hostage, trying to score nothing more than political points.

The time for partisan politics is over. The Senate, our government, cannot afford to be subjected to meaningless attacks on the health of women. We will be in session for only 2 more days this week. The House will not convene today or tomorrow. On October 1 the government will run out of money. With or without the stamp of approval Republicans are so desperately seeking, on October 1 the government will be out of money.

Republicans should end their partisan attack on women and join Democrats in carrying out one of our primary responsibilities as elected officials, as Members of Congress, and that is to keep the government doors open. Actions speak louder than words. These partisan attacks on the health of women, led by Republicans and the leader specifically today, will not only push Congress to the brink of another government shutdown—we are there. It would show once again that Republicans would rather attack women's health than keep their obligation to the American people.

On Thursday we are going to be in a very difficult time squeeze. We are going to have another vote, abortion related, on Planned Parenthood, and then we are going to have to try to figure out a way to fund the government. This responsibility is on the Republicans. They control the House and the Senate. It is not our responsibility. We will help in any way we can. We have not held up anything procedurally. We do not intend to do that. We want to move forward and get the government funded. But we are at a crossroads here. I am not sure we can make it with the time set because of all of these unnecessary votes that have been scheduled by the Republican leader these last couple of weeks. I hope we can make it and not have to see the government shut down again. But, you know, we have seen that before. The American people have been to that rodeo before. Who has suffered? The American people.

I would hope the Republican leader has a plan to help us get out of this morass they have created. We will do everything we can within reason to make sure the American people are treated fairly in the upcoming spending bills, but we have to get there by October 1.

Will the Chair announce the business of the day.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the leaders or their designees.

The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to address the issue before the Senate. It relates to the divisive and controversial issue of abortion. It comes at an unusual moment in the history of the Congress.

This week, for the first time, the Pope will be addressing a joint session of Congress. It was 50 years ago when the first Pope visited the United States. The arrival of Pope Francis this week is a cause of great celebration to people from my State of Illinois and across this Nation because of their respect for his leadership of the Catholic Church. It calls to question, of course, the relationship between religion and our government.

This summer I finished a book called "Mayflower," which told the story of the Pilgrims coming to the United States, settling in in our country, looking for a new opportunity but looking more than anything for freedom of religious belief. They were followed by scores and thousands of others who came for the same reason.

My mother was an immigrant to this country, brought here at the age of 2. Her mother brought her and her sister and brother to our shores for a variety of reasons. But there is one thing that sticks out in that journey. Up in my office I have something that my grandmother carried across the ocean from Lithuania to the United States. It was a Roman Catholic prayer book written in Lithuanian. It was contraband in 1911 in Lithuania for her to possess it because the Russians were in control and the Russians were imposing the orthodox religion and making it difficult to practice the Catholic religion. I never knew my grandmother, but she was one brave lady to bring three kids across the ocean and stick in her bag that prayer book which meant so much to her, that prayer book which she could use in the United States of America without the government telling her she could not.

We have tried to strike the right balance between religion and our democracy from the beginning. I believe our Founding Fathers got it right. They said three things in the Constitution about religion: first, that each of us would have the freedom to worship as we choose or to choose not to worship; second, that the government would not choose a religion and that we would not have an official government religion; and third, that there would be no religious test for public office in America.

I thought those were settled principles, but this Presidential campaign suggests otherwise. We had the outrageous suggestion by a Republican Presidential candidate this last week-end that a Muslim should never serve as President of the United States. I would think that a man of his background and learning would at least take the time to understand our Constitution and the express provision which says that he is wrong, that there will never be a religious litmus test to serve in public office in the United States.

And now, this week on the floor of the Senate, we will have two votes on the issue of abortion. There was a time when this issue came before us frequently—not so much lately. It is a divisive and controversial issue; that is for sure. But this week the Republican Senate leadership has allowed two of their Presidential candidates to raise this issue on the floor of the Senate. It is no coincidence this issue comes before us the same week the Pope, the leader of the Catholic Church, will be addressing a joint session of Congress. It is more than a coincidence.

This particular bill relates to when a person can terminate a pregnancy. For 47 years, if I am not mistaken—maybe I have that calculation slightly wrong—we have had Supreme Court guidance on when the government can play a role in the decision about the termination of a pregnancy. Now there is an effort on the floor of the Senate to change that basic guidance from the *Roe v. Wade* decision. Each time we step into this question, into something which seems as clear as "at 20 weeks we will draw a line and after that there cannot be a legal termination of pregnancy," we find we are walking into an area of uncertainty.

I remember meeting many years ago, when we were debating this issue, a woman from Illinois. She was from the town of Naperville. In 1996 she told me a harrowing story of how legislation such as the bill before us would have impacted her. She learned late in her pregnancy that the child she was carrying could not survive outside the womb. Her doctors diagnosed her baby with at least nine major anomalies, including a fluid-filled cranium with no brain tissue. Sadly, she also had underlying medical conditions—personal

conditions—that complicated her pregnancy even more. Doctors were concerned that if she went through with the pregnancy at that point, she ran the risk of never having another baby. With tears in her eyes, she told me how she and her husband agonized over the news and eventually decided it was best for them and their other children to terminate that pregnancy.

If the bill before us today—the 20-week abortion bill—had been the law of the land back then, sadly it would have jeopardized and endangered her health.

Well, 18 years later she came back to see me. I learned she was able to do what was best for her family in terminating that pregnancy. That was her decision with her doctor and her husband. But she was given a second chance. Soon after, she became pregnant again. This time she was thankful to give birth to a healthy baby boy. When she came to see me, she told me about her son Nick. She said he had become a star football player and had a bright future ahead of him.

If this bill had been the law of the land, this woman in Illinois—and others like her—would not even have had the choice to terminate a pregnancy for her own health protection and for the opportunity to have another baby. That is the challenge we face when we try to spell out in law all of the medical possibilities, limiting opportunities and decisions to be made by individuals under the most heartbreaking circumstances.

This bill has other issues. The fact that the rape and incest exceptions, which have largely been built into the law to this point, would be changed dramatically by this law raises questions as well. There is a requirement, as I understand it, in this law that victims of incest would have had to report to a law enforcement agency that crime of incest before they would even be able to terminate a pregnancy under these circumstances. That is not even realistic—to think some young child in a household, who has been exploited by another member of the family, would think to go to a law enforcement agency and report that other member of her family before they could qualify to terminate a pregnancy in this circumstance.

That shows the extremes this bill goes to. I hope we will defeat this measure. I sincerely hope the other Republican Presidential candidate, who is going to try to shut down the government over the funding of Planned Parenthood later in the week, does not prevail either. We need to move on to find other issues—not divisive issues but issues we can build a bipartisan consensus on to make this a stronger country.

We need to address the issue of funding our government and to accept the responsibilities to move forward in a bipartisan fashion. This bill does not do that.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, before we vote on whether to proceed to H.R. 36, I want to respond to a couple of arguments made by a Democratic Senator yesterday.

First, that Democratic Senator quoted Hal Lawrence of the American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists for the proposition that a 20-week fetus is not viable. The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the group Dr. Lawrence represents, has long opposed this legislation.

According to the Senator I am confronting on this issue, Dr. Lawrence said the following on May 13, 2015:

In no way, shape or form is a 20-week fetus viable. There is no evidence anywhere of a 20-week fetus surviving, even with intensive medical care.

But as explained by the Washington Post Fact Checker of May 26 of this year, Dr. Lawrence's statement is simply incorrect when applied to H.R. 36. The bill uses a method of calculating fetal age that is based on the day that fertilization actually occurred. The legislation would protect the unborn beginning at 20 weeks after fertilization, which is the same as 22 weeks of pregnancy, also known as 22-week gestational age. Gestational age is a measure of calculating the unborn baby's age that relies on the date of the mother's last normal menstrual period.

It is well established that babies can survive at 22-week gestational age. As noted in the Washington Post, for example: "That babies can survive at 22 weeks gestational age has been known for 15 years."

Perhaps Dr. Lawrence was confused about what H.R. 36 would accomplish. The Washington Post Fact Checker article sets the record straight.

Second, the Senator I am referring to said earlier that abortions past 20-week fetal age are extraordinarily rare. Some jurisdictions with the most lax abortion policies don't even collect data on the stage of pregnancy when an abortion is performed, while other jurisdictions may have reporting requirements but are not really enforcing those reporting requirements. Because data on late-term abortions is not widely available, it is hard to know what hard evidence really exists to support the claim. We do know that several hundred doctors, and well over 200 facilities across the United States, offer abortions after 20 weeks of fetal age.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Post article I earlier referred to.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 2015]

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT ON MEASURING FETAL AGE AND THE '20-WEEK ABORTION'

(By Michelle Ye Hee Lee)

"In no way, shape or form is a 20-week fetus viable. There's no evidence of a 20-week fetus surviving, even with intensive medical care."—American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists Executive Vice President Hal Lawrence, quoted in a news article, May 13, 2015

Several readers requested The Fact Checker to examine claims related to the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, recently passed by the House. This bill is commonly referred to as the "20-week abortion ban."

The abortion debate is fraught with rhetoric that cannot be easily fact-checked. But a reader pointed us to the quote above and asked whether a new study on the viability of 22-week fetuses can be applied to 20-week fetuses, when using a different method to count gestational age. To add to the confusion, states vary in their definitions for gestational age. The quote above is one example of several instances in recent media coverage that related to definitions of gestational age.

This is a technical, but important, part of the bill. The little-known difference between two methods of counting gestational age is contributing to inconsistent media coverage, and could mislead the public, parents and providers about the bill's provisions.

So what exactly is going on?

THE FACTS

The Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act bans late-term abortions after the midpoint of a woman's pregnancy, and before the fetus typically is considered viable to live outside of the womb. The age of viability has been pegged at 24 to 28 weeks. Proponents argue an abortion ban at younger than 24 weeks, saying fetuses can feel pain before then—a claim based in complex science and disputed by the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. (Supporters point to various studies related to fetal development, compiled here.)

A new study published in the New England Journal of Medicine on May 7 examined how hospitals differ in whether and how they treat extremely premature babies, starting at 22 weeks. Proponents of the bill say this study, funded by the National Institutes of Health, shows that the babies who would be saved through the 20-week abortion ban could now be considered viable. Some media reports also echoed the same conclusions.

Sound confusing? The distinction is this: The bill defines the age of the fetus as "post-fertilization age," calculated from the moment of conception. This is different from the widely-accepted definition used by medical professionals and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, counting the fetus age from the first day of the pregnant woman's last menstrual period ("LMP").

Fertilization typically happens about two weeks after the first day of LMP. The idea is that it is difficult to know exactly when you became pregnant, but you know when you started your last period. That is why the bill's supporters say the 20-week age measured from fertilization essentially is the LMP-measured age of 22 weeks.

The bill's definition is a more technical and accurate measure, said Michael Woeste, House Judiciary Committee spokesman. He noted an excerpt in *The Developing Human: Clinically Oriented Embryology*, arguing that the LMP method is error prone partly because "it depends on the mother's memory

of an event that occurred several weeks before she realized she was pregnant" and that "the day fertilization occurs is the most accurate reference point for estimating age."

Lawrence's quote at the top of this fact check comes from a statement during a recent media call. (The American Congress of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, or ACOG, opposed the bill.) He was referring to the 20-week LMP age, not the 20-week post-fertilization age.

The rest of his statement during the call explains his point further and how it ties in with the legislation (and also wrote an op-ed about it in Time):

"Now, I'd like to talk a bit about why supporters of a 20-week abortion ban are, quite simply, wrong. There is no medical milestone associated with 20 weeks. Gestation is a gradual process, and it can vary depending on the circumstances, such as the woman's health.

"But still, even accounting for this, the 20-week mark is just not notable from a fetal development standpoint. More than 40 years ago, the Supreme Court stipulated that abortion is legal until a fetus is viable. Well, in no way, shape or form is a 20-week fetus viable. There is no evidence anywhere of a 20-week fetus surviving, even with intensive medical care.

"Unfortunately, some advocates of abortion bans are pointing to a new study, just published last week, that they claim heralds 22 weeks as being the new point of viability. They suggest that we might someday reach viability at 20 weeks. It is essential that we address that now, before this becomes another myth about abortion that is accepted as reality."

We spoke with the main authors of the study, Matthew Rysavy and Dr. Edward Bell of University of Iowa. They collected data for nearly 5,000 infants born between 22 and 27 weeks of gestation (using LMP method) and did not have abnormalities at birth. These babies are extremely pre-term, as full term is considered at 39 to 40 weeks, according to ACOG guidelines.

Researchers found that 22 percent of the babies born at 22 weeks received active treatment, and hospitals varied in their whether and how they gave treatment to babies born between 22 and 27 weeks. There were 78 babies born at 22 weeks who received aggressive treatment. Among them, 18 of them survived (23 percent) to toddler age. Seven (9 percent) of them did not have severe or moderate impairment by the time they were toddlers.

That babies can survive at 22 weeks is not a new finding; it has been known for 15 years, Rysavy said. The point of the study was to highlight differences in practices and outcomes between hospitals, he said. Many factors, including gestational age, influence how well a baby does: "Our paper wasn't exactly intended for identifying which infants would do well."

The Fact Checker asked if, using the "post-fertilization" age definition in the bill, their findings can carry over to babies at 20 weeks old from the point of conception. Bell and Rysavy said that would be "terribly confusing" to the public, pregnant women and even to politicians. Bell said the LMP method is used around the world, and that the time of conception accurately cannot be ascertained.

"You cannot redefine gestational age based on conception. . . . The new terms are politician terms. They have no relevance at all to medicine or biology. They're just going to confuse everybody," Bell said. "They have

the right to do that for the purpose of making laws, but to me, it just looks like an attempt to obfuscate and create confusion. We already have a well-established definition of the length of pregnancy that has worked just fine, for generations, has been used forever."

Rysavy also sent us this diagram, of the American Academy of Pediatrics' terminology for age during the perinatal period:

ACOG recommends using LMP and updating the due date with other measures, such as ultrasounds, since women may have irregular cycles and there is variability in how long a fertilized egg becomes implanted in the uterus (thus beginning pregnancy). Lawrence, in a statement, said: "The fact that federal legislation is basing restrictions on reproductive care based on a non-medical calculation of pregnancy is evidence of what happens when lawmakers try to legislate women's health."

THE BOTTOM LINE

New research confirmed that 22-week fetuses, measured from the first day of the pregnant woman's last menstrual cycle, can survive. Babies born before that age did not survive. So, Lawrence is correct that 20-week fetuses, measured from the first day of the pregnant woman's last menstrual cycle, are not viable. He is incorrect when using the definition in the Pain Capable Unborn Child Protection Act.

The Fact Checker takes no stance on which definition should be used. However, we want to set the record straight for the public and the media. This is a technical point over how gestational age is calculated. But it is important, as it has contributed to some misleading headlines, lack of context in news coverage and general confusion in the public debate. It also has contributed to the rhetoric on both sides; the difference between the two definitions has not been clear in much of the news reporting.

In many ways, the debate is similar to how budget figures can vary dramatically depending on the baseline that is used. Reporters need to specify exactly what method of measuring the pregnancy is being used, as the difference is not trivial.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I am opposed to late-term abortions and would support legislation to ban them except in unusual circumstances. A carefully drawn, short list of exceptions to apply in those rare cases should have been included in this bill. Regrettably, the bill before us provides no exception for when the physical health of the mother is at risk of serious harm, the most glaring deficiency in this legislation.

Let me give just three examples of devastating conditions that could threaten the physical health of a pregnant woman. An extremely serious condition triggered by pregnancy in some women is preeclampsia, which tends to develop after the 20th week of pregnancy. This condition can lead to serious, long-term health consequences for a woman, including liver and kidney problems, vision disturbances, seizures and strokes.

Another example would be a woman diagnosed with cancer who requires chemotherapy and radiation but can-

not be treated while pregnant. A massive infection, such as severe sepsis, is yet another case of a grave illness that could cause grievous harm for a pregnant woman and to her physical health.

Almost every country in Europe that limits late-term abortions allows for exceptions for the physical health of the mother. Like these European countries, States such as Alabama, Arkansas, Indiana, Louisiana, Mississippi, and others that ban late-term abortions provide an exception for the health as well as the life of the woman. But the bill before us does not.

I have advocated that we add language that would provide an exception when the woman is at serious risk of grievous injury to her physical health. This is an appropriately high standard to meet, but one that would allow a woman to terminate her pregnancy when the alternative is serious harm to her physical health.

Under this bill, a doctor who performs such an abortion after 20 weeks to prevent grievous physical injury to the pregnant woman would be subject to criminal penalties of up to 5 years in prison.

Do we really want to make a criminal out of a physician who is trying to prevent a woman with preeclampsia from suffering damage to her kidneys or liver or having a stroke or seizures? Do we want the threat of prison for a doctor who knows that his pregnant patient needs chemotherapy or radiation treatments? If a woman has the terrible misfortune to have a serious infection of amniotic fluid that threatens her physical health and her ability to have children in the future, do we want her doctor to be unable to perform an abortion because he faces the prospect of years in prison if he terminates her pregnancy?

The way the rape and incest exceptions to this bill are drafted is also problematic. I do not question the good motives of the sponsors of this bill, as I share their goal of prohibiting late-term abortions. My point, however, is that all of these language problems could be solved, and then we might well be able to enact a law that would accomplish the goal of ending late-term abortions except in those unusual cases where an exception is warranted. Therefore, I shall cast my vote in opposition to this well-meaning but flawed bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am a proud pro-life Senator, and I stand on the floor of the Senate today with a gnawing feeling in the pit of my stomach. It is a feeling that comes with the knowledge that over the past 40 years more than 50 million Americans have not had the chance to have their feet touch the soil of our country. That is why I am thankful for the opportunity

we have this week here in the Senate—an opportunity to celebrate life and to protect life, God's most amazing gift of all.

I am proud to have joined my colleague and senior Senator from my State, LINDSEY GRAHAM, in introducing this version of the pain-capable legislation in the Senate.

The studies are very, very clear that this legislation can save more than 18,000 lives each and every year. That is right, 18,000 lives each and every year. We aren't talking about anything other than the results of sound science. And because of that sound science, we know that at approximately 5 months babies can feel pain. We know that if a baby were to need prenatal surgery at that age, they would be given anesthesia. Why? Because that little life—that little life—feels pain.

Yesterday, Senator BLUNT gave name after name after name of babies born around 5 months who have gone on to live healthy and full lives. This is not about pro-choice or pro-life. It is simply about protecting ten fingers, ten toes, and one beating heart, and bringing the amazing gift of life.

In our world, out of nearly 200 nations, only seven allow abortions on demand after 20 weeks—only seven out of 200 nations. Who is among the seven nations? China, North Korea, Vietnam, and the United States. Really?

So while I may stand here today with a gnawing in my stomach, I also stand with hope—hope that we can take a massive step forward in protecting life—18,000 lives a year—by passing this important legislation.

America is truly a great nation. So let's improve our reputation and not lower our expectations because, as John Winthrop said nearly 400 years ago, "We shall be as a city upon a hill, the eyes of all people are upon us."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all time spent in a quorum call before the 11 a.m. vote be equally charged to each side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, we are about a week away from the deadline to keep the Federal Government open. Our National Highway System, which at one time was a matter of great pride, will soon run out of money. The nominations of 16 consensus judicial nominees that came out of committee with bipartisan support are languishing on the Senate floor. We're not

allowed to have a vote on the Senate floor about them even though, in many cases, they are courts with judicial emergencies. There is still strong support in the Senate for passing meaningful immigration reform as we did 2 years ago by a 2-to-1 margin, Republicans and Democrats. Now, those are just a few of the pressing issues that the Senate should have been working on this month. Instead, the Senate Republican leadership has wasted 2 weeks on political show votes. And with a government shutdown looming, Senate Republicans plan to use this week to continue their relentless attack on women's health care.

Republicans brought us to this brink just 2 years ago, and, once again, they are trying to use Americans' access to health care as leverage in a fight over funding the Federal Government. This time, though, Republicans also seem intent on holding hostage the constitutional rights of women as part of this political exercise. Frankly, what I hear when I go home is the American people, including women across this country, have had enough.

It is incredible to me that, in 2015, we are debating Federal funding for one of the Nation's largest and most trusted providers of basic health care. For nearly 100 years, Planned Parenthood has provided women's health care and has enjoyed the leadership and support of great Americans like the civil rights leader, Rosa Parks, who was a member of the organization's board of advocates.

Over 90 percent of the services Planned Parenthood provides are preventative, including annual health exams, cervical and breast cancer screenings, and HIV screenings for millions of American women, men, and young people. It is these preventive services and only these preventive services that are paid for with Federal funds.

Republicans are focused on abortion services that are not paid for with Federal dollars and are otherwise only a very small part of what Planned Parenthood does. Republicans say it is because of recently released videos that purport to show wrongdoing on the part of Planned Parenthood. But these surreptitiously recorded videos were heavily edited in a misleading way and generated by an organization formed with an agenda to end safe and legal abortion in our country.

In reality, this partisan debate is nothing more than an opportunity for Senate Republicans to wage their personal opposition to a woman's decision to access safe and legal abortions in this country. They are entitled to their own beliefs. But missing from these arguments are the stories of women across this country whose health and lives are at stake when politicians play doctor and tell women they cannot make their own health care decisions.

That is exactly the situation we face with the bill the Senate will vote on today, which puts women's health at risk by imposing a nationwide ban on abortions at 20 weeks or more and criminalizing the doctors who care for them.

The bill before us is as unconstitutional as it is extreme. Federal courts have repeatedly struck down similar State 20-week bans as unconstitutional. Just last year, the U.S. Supreme Court refused to review a Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision permanently blocking Arizona's 20-week ban law. And this bill makes no exception where the health of the woman is at risk. The exceptions it does include are severely limited. It is only if a woman's health has deteriorated to the point at which she might die is she allowed to have an abortion under the bill's exception for a woman's life.

The bill's so-called rape exception is, in reality, an overwhelming bureaucracy requiring survivors to jump through hoop after hoop, such as filing police reports or going to mandatory counseling. We should not be forcing these survivors to relive their trauma again and again before they can access abortion services. How many incest victims do you think are going to be able to do that, going through all these bureaucratic hoops? Doctors providing safe abortion care who fail to comply with all of the bill's requirements would face up to 5 years of jail time.

Now, it has all these dangerous provisions, but you know what is even more shocking? This bill has had no committee process in the Senate. There have been no Senate hearings on this bill, not one single Republican chairman of any committee in the Senate has held a hearing. There has been no debate in the Judiciary Committee. We've not had a chance to hear from women and doctors about the care this bill would criminalize. I know last Congress, the current majority leader, who is a friend of mine, repeatedly urged the Senate to follow "regular order" on all legislation. On this bill, there was no regular order. It was brought straight to the floor. This is not a political point; it is about what process in this body represents. It gives Senators the opportunity to grapple with the real impact of legislation like this. That is what was lost here.

In Vermont, I witnessed the devastating effect of restricting women's access to safe and legal abortion. I say this, Mr. President, because I am the only Member of the U.S. Senate who has ever prosecuted somebody in an abortion case. When I was a young prosecutor in Vermont, I was called to a hospital to see a young woman who nearly died from hemorrhaging caused by a botched abortion. She was unable to obtain a safe abortion in my state because it was illegal. I prosecuted the man who had arranged for her unsafe

and illegal abortion that nearly killed her.

Don't talk about hypotheticals. I saw the tragic impact that the lack of safe legal abortion care had on women and families in my state, and so I talked to doctors about challenging Vermont's law. In that case, *Beecham v. Leahy*, the conservative Vermont Supreme Court called out the hypocrisy of a statute whose stated purpose was to protect women's health, rightly asking, "Where is that concern for the health of the pregnant woman when she is denied the advice and assistance of her doctor?" One year before *Roe v. Wade*, the Vermont Supreme Court, all members of it were Republicans, ruled that protecting women's health required access to safe and legal abortion services, ensuring that women in our state would no longer be subjected to back alley abortions. We should not forget that this history was once reality for so many women in our Nation. That is why I supported our Vermont Supreme Court's decision that we should not deny women's health by denying access to safe and legal abortion services.

As we consider the bill before us today, we should also remember what *Beecham v. Leahy* and, a year later, when *Roe* made clear which should be crystal clear for all of us here today in 2015, abortion is an extremely difficult and personal choice. And if we truly want to reduce abortions—as I do, and I suspect most of us do, maybe all of us do—we should be making sure that family planning services are universally available. We should support organizations like Planned Parenthood that can provide family planning services, especially in rural areas and elsewhere where they might not be available, because that, in itself, will lower the number of abortions.

I oppose the bill pending before us. I hope that Senators on both sides of the aisle will do the same. And this Senate, which I love, ought to turn away from show votes and start leading responsibly so that we can avoid yet another government shutdown with billions upon billions of dollars that would be wasted.

Now, some want a shutdown because they think it might help their campaigns or their press availability. None of them are going to tell the press when they have that shutdown how many billions of dollars of taxpayers' money they waste by doing it. So let us remember again, the Vermont Supreme Court, at that time a very conservative Supreme Court, in the case of *Beecham v. Leahy*, when they called out the hypocrisy of a statute whose stated purpose was to protect women's health, said, "Where is that concern for the health of the pregnant woman when she's denied the advice and assistance of her doctor?"

Let's stop the show voting; let's stop playing for whatever group we want to

raise money from for a campaign or for the Presidency by forcing a shutdown. And let's think about the taxpayers of this country which are going to try to force a shutdown, then let's put a dollar figure on it and say how much the grandstanding cost. It will cost into the billions and billions of dollars and makes this great nation look foolish around the world.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 230, H.R. 36, to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, Joni Ernst, Mike Lee, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Tim Scott, Patrick J. Toomey, John Boozman, David Perdue, Johnny Isakson, James M. Inhofe, James E. Risch, Steve Daines, Roy Blunt, Roger F. Wicker, John Thune, James Lankford.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 36, an act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 268 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander
Ayotte
Barrasso
Blunt
Boozman
Burr
Capito

Casey
Cassidy
Coats
Cochran
Corker
Cornyn
Cotton

Crapo
Cruz
Daines
Donnelly
Enzi
Ernst
Fischer

Flake
Gardner
Graham
Grassley
Hatch
Heller
Hoeven
Inhofe
Isakson
Johnson
Lankford

Lee
Manchin
McCain
McConnell
Moran
Paul
Perdue
Portman
Risch
Roberts
Rounds

Rubio
Sasse
Scott
Sessions
Shelby
Sullivan
Thune
Tillis
Toomey
Vitter
Wicker

NAYS—42

Baldwin
Bennet
Blumenthal
Booker
Brown
Cantwell
Cardin
Carper
Collins
Coons
Durbin
Feinstein
Franken
Gillibrand

Heinrich
Heitkamp
Hirono
Kaine
King
Kirk
Klobuchar
Leahy
Markey
McCaskill
Menendez
Merkley
Mikulski
Murphy

Nelson
Peters
Reed
Reid
Sanders
Schatz
Schumer
Shaheen
Stabenow
Tester
Udall
Warren
Whitehouse
Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer
Murkowski

Murray
Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FLAKE). On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion is not agreed to.

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, today the Senate voted on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, H.R. 36. While I was unable to vote today, I would have opposed this bill, which would have amended the Criminal Code to prohibit any person from performing an abortion after 20 weeks. As the father of three daughters, I believe that a woman's health, not politicians in Washington, should drive important medical decisions. It is critical that we as a nation continue to have a meaningful and respectful dialogue about an issue we all care about deeply, and I do not believe that this bill would have advanced that dialogue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to the motion to reconsider the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I move to reconsider the vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the time until 12 noon be equally divided prior to the cloture vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, almost exactly a year ago, President Obama addressed the Nation and declared his resolve to degrade and destroy ISIL. I will speak more on that in just a moment, but there are two lines in that speech of particular relevance to the vote we are about to take.

This is what President Obama had to say:

As Commander-in-Chief, my highest priority is the security of the American people [and] our own safety, our own security, depends upon our willingness to do what it takes to defend this nation and uphold the values that we stand for.

He was certainly right. It does. And doing what it takes requires many things—everything from amphibious shipping, Joint Strike Fighters, and forward presence, to preserving our gains in Afghanistan and investing in the naval systems required to balance against Chinese expansion in Asia.

So when President Obama sent us a budget request asking for \$612 billion in defense spending, we worked across the aisle to craft a bipartisan appropriations bill at that level. Democrats hailed the defense spending as a win-win and a victory for their States. They voted to pass it out of the Appropriations Committee. This is how the Defense appropriations bill came out of the Appropriations Committee: 27 to 3.

But then, as the Washington Post put it, Democrats “decided to block all spending bills starting with the defense appropriations measure” as part of some “filibuster summer” strategy designed to pump more taxpayer cash into Washington bureaucracies such as the IRS. The same President who had lectured the Nation about doing “what it takes to defend this nation” seemed content to have our military held hostage to the whims of the far left. The White House cheered as they voted repeatedly to block the bill that funds pay raises and medical care for our troops. It was outrageous then, and it is outrageous now.

China is deploying ships to the Bering Sea and to the coast of Alaska. Russia’s military is positioning itself in Syria to attack anti-regime forces under the guise of a counterterrorism campaign. Refugees are pouring forth in the thousands, causing instability in Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, and Europe. And 1 year after the President’s speech, ISIL is consolidating its gains within Syria and Iraq as it demonstrates an agility and an operational flexibility that threaten our country and our national security interests.

The sad lesson of the last 7 years is that our global conventional drawdown and withdrawal from the Middle East emboldened Russia and China. Our ambitious train-and-equip and economy-of-force programs to train combat forces within Yemen, Afghanistan, and Iraq and our program to train an oppo-

sition to fight within Syria—all have failed to defeat the enemy. And Iran now appears free under the President’s deal to inspect its own suspected nuclear site and to funnel more cash to Hezbollah.

If President Obama is committed to protecting the American people, he will convince his party to end its blockade of funding our military. We are going to give our Democratic friends that chance again in a few moments.

The goal of Democrats’ “filibuster summer” was to force Congress back to the brink. They have succeeded in doing that. They think it is the only way to force America to accept their demands for more debt and more bureaucracy. But it is time Democrats started considering the needs of our country, not the wants of the far left or the IRS. Ending their blockade of funding for our military at a time of significant international threats would show they are ready to start putting Americans first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we have voted on this before. It seems that is what we have been doing the last few weeks—revoting. Vote once and vote again. The results are going to be the same. We have made it clear we are not going to proceed to appropriations bills under the Republicans’ partisan budget. We have 12 appropriations bills, not 1. We have 12.

We seek a budget agreement that fairly prevents mindless sequester cuts to defense and to the middle class. I am gratified that our votes on this measure have caused the Republican leader to acknowledge publicly that we need to negotiate an end to this fiscal crisis that has been created by the Republicans.

As for this upcoming vote, there is no reason for Senators to change their votes from how they voted earlier this year. This is yet another case of the Republicans just wasting time rather than addressing the real deal. Another revote.

We read in this morning’s papers that the Republican leader intends to bring a clean continuing resolution before the Senate later this week. Congratulations. We appreciate that very much. But bringing it to a conclusion now is certainly very important because we are running out of time. The end of the fiscal year is now. On September 30, we need more money or the government will shut down. It is not as though we are making up something. They have done it before. And who has been hurt? The American middle class more than anyone else.

I hope we will just move on to the business at hand. The business at hand is to make sure the government does not close. We have cooperated every way we can. We are not asking for re-

votes on tearing down the tree numerous times. We have agreed to that. We are not trying in any way to procedurally stop us from moving to important funding measures. So I hope we can move on past this as quickly as possible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, unfortunately, our Democratic friends have now blocked another vital piece of legislation from moving forward by a vote of 54 to 42. The cloture vote on the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act has failed on that cloture vote. But I want to point out to our colleagues that this is not the end of this discussion. This is the beginning of the discussion once again.

I would point out that over the years we have actually been making some progress in favor of an agenda that favors life. In 2007 eight Senate Republicans opposed defunding Planned Parenthood, by 2011 five Senate Republicans opposed defunding Planned Parenthood, and in August just one Senator opposed it by voting to filibuster the bill. Last time we had zero Democratic Senators vote on such a measure. In August we got two.

The pain-capable bill that was blocked by Senate Democrats last year, of course, is what we just voted on again. Today we had an opportunity to be on the record and advocate for what is a top priority for pro-life groups.

There is legislation that has passed in the House of Representatives—namely, the born-alive piece of legislation, which really shouldn’t divide Congress the way perhaps the defunding of Planned Parenthood bill has because at some point, whether you are pro-choice or pro-life, hopefully we can agree that a child who is basically grown to full-term in their mother should be protected from the abortion industries. I think we are going to have other opportunities to vote on that issue.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act is really a moral imperative for our Nation. It says a lot about who we are as a country. This Chamber just had the opportunity to send a clear message that America is a nation that seeks to advance a culture of life and opportunity for everyone, particularly those who are the most vulnerable. As a father of two daughters, I don’t understand the rationale of some of my colleagues on the other side. Do they believe there should be no limitation on access to abortion at all? No limit?

Well, we will have an opportunity for another vote that perhaps will give them a chance to go on record on the born-alive bill that passed the House of Representatives last week. Unfortunately, I think it appears that by blocking this vote, some of our colleagues were simply unable to cast

aside the pressures of special interest groups to take a stand for life. But it is important to note for pro-life Members such as myself that protecting the sanctity of life is an ongoing mission, and it doesn't end with this one vote.

Mr. President, briefly on another matter, we will shortly consider or reconsider another vote that should be a clear-cut issue. This vote would make sure that our military has what they need in order to protect our country and deal with the rising and diverse threats to national security occurring around the world. This will most pointedly help our troops maintain their status as the greatest military. The Defense appropriations bill includes simple initiatives that make sense and serve our troops well, such as giving them a well-deserved pay raise.

I think it is worth reminding those here today that this will be the second opportunity to move this legislation forward. Earlier, our colleagues across the aisle blocked this Defense appropriations bill that provides critical funding for our troops and refused to allow it to move forward. That legislation, as the majority leader pointed out, was voted overwhelmingly out of the Appropriations Committee in June with the support of many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who then turned and voted against it on the floor. I guess, in the famous words of John Kerry, they were for it before they were against it.

So the bill we will be considering and voting on shortly is not a piece of partisan legislation, but holding up this legislation is unfortunately indicative of a larger strategy of keeping the Senate tied in knots and making it impossible for it to function as intended. If the goal is to stymie real progress, I would have to congratulate our friends across the aisle. But unfortunately they have taken as a hostage in this partisan political fight the very military which they claim to support and which I believe they do support, but their vote certainly does not indicate that when they vote against funding our troops.

I would point out that in 2013 the Democratic leader himself advocated for something we call regular order around here when it comes to setting our Nation's fiscal policy.

Fortunately, this year, under the new majority, we were able to pass a budget for the first time since 2009. But then what should have happened after that is the Appropriations Committee should have done its work—in fact, it did do its work—and then those bills would come to the floor and they would be voted on by the Senate. But that is what our Democratic colleagues have blocked. I think they have gone a bridge too far in blocking the funding for our military, particularly with the headlines we see in the newspapers and the conflicts arising and spreading across the world.

So this is the first time in 6 years that the Appropriations Committee has approved and reported out all 12 appropriations bills. But then these bills became hostage to something our Democratic friends called “filibuster summer”—a political strategy telegraphed from the pages of the Washington Post just last June to block all appropriations bills.

I said it then and it bears repeating that stifling debate and blocking votes is a pretty lousy political strategy, and it is not what the American people sent us here to do. It is what lost my friends across the aisle control of this Chamber nearly a year ago. It is a losing strategy, it is bad policy, and it is cynical politics. It is simply shameful to take these partisan political fights to the point of denying our troops the resources they need in order to do their job.

So the Appropriations Committee has done its work on a bipartisan basis and painstakingly drafted, considered, and passed all 12 appropriations bills. Now this Chamber should do our job and move those appropriations bills forward, starting with the Defense appropriations bill.

Now that the majority leader has moved to reconsider that failed vote, earlier blocked by our Democratic colleagues, I hope our friends across the aisle have had a chance to reconsider and to think carefully about the ramifications of their decision and that they will join us in moving this bill forward. The world is far too dangerous and the threats are far too real to take this important piece of legislation hostage and prevent the resources going to the troops, who simply deserve it.

Quite simply, we have no time to lose when it comes to fulfilling one of our most basic duties to the American people: defending against threats to national security. I would urge my fellow colleagues to join me in moving this important bill forward.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I respect my colleague from Texas, the majority whip. I disagree with his conclusion. I am vice chairman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. The chairman is Senator COCHRAN of Mississippi. The two of us and our staffs worked night and day to put together a good Defense appropriations bill. I think we did a good job.

The problem is, there is a difference between the Democrats and the Republicans about the total amount to be spent on the defense budget. The Republicans suggest that we should take \$38 billion and put it into the defense budget but not to add a similar amount to the nondefense budget. I could go onto the arcane language of OCO and all of the sequestration. I am going to try to avoid that and keep this at a

level where most people understand what we are talking about.

Our concern is not about funding the military on the Democratic side. We wholeheartedly support that, all of us. Not a single Democrat dissents from what I have just said, but the question is whether or not the money that is going to be invested in nondefense agencies is also going to be protected in this appropriations process. That is all we have asked for.

We are willing to put \$38 billion more into defense, let's put the same amount in nondefense. What is nondefense? Nondefense, frankly, includes a lot of appropriations programs that are critically important to middle-income families across America. Are we going to continue to fund educational programs so that the kids of working families have a shot at college? That is non-defense spending.

Are we going to make sure that we make the basic processes of government be protected when it comes to investing in nondefense? May I give you an example? Medical research. Is that worth putting money into? From the Republican side, that is nondefense, that is not really that important. I think it is critically important. Once every 67 seconds in America, one of our citizens is diagnosed with Alzheimer's—once every 67 seconds.

It is a tragedy. It is an expensive tragedy. It cost us over \$200 billion last year just to care for Alzheimer's patients in America under Medicare and Medicaid. That does not even come close to calculating the sacrifices made by family members on behalf of those who are suffering from Alzheimer's. So should we invest more money in Alzheimer's research? Should we put more money into an effort to delay the onset of Alzheimer's or, God willing, find a cure? Of course we should. That is non-defense spending. That is not a priority of the other side of the aisle.

What we have said to them is: We need to sit down and work this out. Be fair to defense to keep us strong and safe as a nation, but make those critical investments in programs that make a difference to middle-income families across America. What we are asking for today is nothing new. As the Senator from Texas reminded us, we took a vote on this issue. It was over 3 months ago—the same vote. We took the same vote we are about to take at noon today as to whether or not we should have this lopsided appropriation, money to the defense budget but not to the nondefense budget. We said no. Balance it. Be fair. Be as concerned about middle-income families in America as you are about the defense of our Nation. Let the budget reflect that.

But they said no. So we are back again. It was on June 18 when the leadership on the Democratic side of the aisle, aided by others who felt the same way, sent a letter to the Republicans

and said: Let's not waste any time shouting at one another and giving speeches on the floor. Let's sit down in closed, bipartisan negotiations and work out the budget, bring the President in. He is critical. We need his participation. But let's work it out.

We wrote that letter on June 18. Here we are more than 3 months later in the same predicament. We should have taken the time before now—days before the end of the fiscal year, at the end of September—to sit down and work this out by budget negotiation. But they refused. They don't want to sit down.

Instead, they want us to go through these show votes. Last week—last week we had five unnecessary separate votes on the Iran agreement. We had already established, by public announcement of every Senator and by an open public vote, where we stood. Senator McCONNELL insisted on spending another week and five more votes on exactly the same thing with exactly the same outcome. What a waste of Senate time.

Look at this week. This week is a challenge because of the visit of the Pope and the Jewish holy day, but instead of dealing with substantive issues, this week we have allowed two Republican Presidential candidates who are Senators to have their day on the floor. I think we should be rolling up our sleeves and tackling this issue. I don't want to see a government shutdown. We allowed the Senator from Texas to do that a few years ago, and we paid a heavy price for it. He has now threatened to do it again. He likes shutting down our government, thinks that is a great expression of his effectiveness as a leader. So be it. Maybe it is to some, but not to most.

Instead we should be involved in real budget negotiations. I want to tell you, this idea of a continuing resolution—what is a continuing resolution? It says: Spend the money this year the same way you spent it last year. What if your family had that charge? What if we said: Spend the same amount for groceries and utilities that you did last year, spend it this year. You would say: Wait a minute, that does not reflect the things that have changed in my family. My son is off to college. We are changing the place where we live and such.

That is not the kind of thing that you would respect. That is what a continuing resolution does. It continues to spend money the same way. It wastes taxpayers' money. Senator COCHRAN and I, on a bipartisan basis, came up with a better approach. It is an appropriations bill which we think keeps us safe and spends our defense dollars wisely. So let's not get comfortable with a continuing resolution. It is not good for the Department of Defense, not good for the men and women in uniform who risk their lives for us every single day.

It is important for us to do the responsible thing and move forward.

Let's not waste any more time with repeat votes and show-boat votes; let's instead focus our time on negotiating a sound budget.

On June 18, we sent an invitation to the Republicans to sit down and negotiate a budget. The invitation is still open, but we are running out of time. It is important that the President be in that negotiation. It has been 96 days since the last vote we had on this issue. We are going to face it again in just a few moments.

There has not been any progress made on budget negotiations. I ask the Republican leadership of the House and Senate: What are you waiting for? When are you going to sit down and govern? When are you going to sit down and work out problems instead of dreaming up new ways to shut down the Government of the United States of America?

There are signs we are headed back to the same old process that was used before. By the end of the week, they are talking about filibusters on the Republican side, and staying in all night, and maybe we will hear another Dr. Seuss book read to us in the middle of the night by the Texas Senator.

I am not sure what lies ahead, but what the American people are sick and tired of is what they see on the Senate floor today. They want us to do our work. They want us to compromise, to agree, to do what is best for this Nation.

Having one show vote after another does not accomplish that. I ask my colleagues: Work together. I ask the leaders on the Republican side: Instead of one more monotonous, predictable vote after another, should we not sit down and work out a budget negotiation that serves our Nation, not only the defense budget, but all of America, including middle-income families.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to support the motion to proceed to the Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 2016. The Committee on Appropriations approved the bill on June 11 by a vote of 27 to 3. The bill provides \$489.1 billion in base funding, and \$86.8 billion in overseas contingency operations, which is consistent with both the fiscal year 2016 budget resolution and the Defense Subcommittee's allocation.

The bill provides funding to protect the security interests of our country. The Senate should return to regular order starting with this national security legislation. It is a bipartisan bill that provides the President, as Commander in Chief, with the resources to protect our Nation. I urge the Senate to approve proceeding to this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes for the minority, 1 minute for the majority.

Mr. DURBIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, James Lankford, Roger F. Wicker, John Barrasso, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Tom Cotton, Kelly Ayotte, Lindsey Graham, John McCain, John Thune, Jerry Moran, Richard C. Shelby, Daniel Coats, Jeff Flake, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the motion to proceed to H.R. 2685, an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes, shall be brought to a close, upon reconsideration?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Alaska (Ms. MURKOWSKI).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 54, nays 42, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 269 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Alexander	Collins	Fischer
Ayotte	Corker	Flake
Barrasso	Cornyn	Gardner
Blunt	Cotton	Graham
Boozman	Crapo	Grassley
Burr	Cruz	Hatch
Capito	Daines	Heller
Cassidy	Donnelly	Hoeven
Coats	Enzi	Inhofe
Cochran	Ernst	Isakson

Johnson	Perdue	Sessions
Kirk	Portman	Shelby
Lankford	Risch	Sullivan
Lee	Roberts	Thune
McCain	Rounds	Tillis
McConnell	Rubio	Toomey
Moran	Sasse	Vitter
Paul	Scott	Wicker

NAYS—42

Baldwin	Heinrich	Nelson
Bennet	Heitkamp	Peters
Blumenthal	Hirono	Reed
Booker	Kaine	Reid
Brown	King	Sanders
Cantwell	Klobuchar	Schatz
Cardin	Leahy	Schumer
Carper	Manchin	Shaheen
Casey	Markey	Stabenow
Coons	McCaskill	Tester
Durbin	Menendez	Udall
Feinstein	Merkley	Warren
Franken	Mikulski	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—4

Boxer	Murray
Murkowski	Warner

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 54, the nays are 42.

Three-fifths of the Senators duly chosen and sworn not having voted in the affirmative, the motion, upon reconsideration, is rejected.

The majority leader.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion to proceed to H.R. 36.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is withdrawn.

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015—Resumed

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the pending business.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 61) amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

Pending:

McConnell amendment No. 2640, of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2656 (to amendment No. 2640), to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2657 (to amendment No. 2656), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2658 (to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2640), to change the enactment date.

McConnell amendment No. 2659 (to amendment No. 2658), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell motion to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions, with instructions, McConnell amendment No. 2660, to prohibit the President from waiving, suspending, reducing, providing relief from, or otherwise limiting the application of sanctions pursuant to an agreement related to the nuclear program of Iran.

McConnell amendment No. 2661 (to (the instructions) amendment No. 2660), of a perfecting nature.

McConnell amendment No. 2662 (to amendment No. 2661), of a perfecting nature.

VOTE ON MOTION TO COMMIT

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table the motion to commit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2658

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2658.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT NO. 2640

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to table amendment No. 2640.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2669

(Purpose: Making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2016, and for other purposes.)

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a substitute amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell], for Mr. COCHRAN, proposes an amendment numbered 2669.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The amendment is printed in today's RECORD under "Text of Amendments.")

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2670 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2669

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment at the desk that I ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2670 to amendment No. 2669.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment."

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2671 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2670

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2671 to amendment No. 2670.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "1 day" and insert "2 days".

AMENDMENT NO. 2672

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the text proposed to be stricken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2672 to the language proposed to be stricken by amendment No. 2669.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2673 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2672

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. McConnell] proposes an amendment numbered 2673 to amendment No. 2672.

Mr. McCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "3" and insert "4"

MOTION TO COMMIT WITH AMENDMENT NO. 2674

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a motion to commit with instructions at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] moves to commit the joint resolution to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report back forthwith with an amendment numbered 2674.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end add the following.

"This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment."

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2675

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the instructions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2675 to the instructions (amendment No. 2674) of the motion to commit H.J. Res. 61.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "5" and insert "6"

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

AMENDMENT NO. 2676 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2675

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a second-degree amendment at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MCCONNELL] proposes an amendment numbered 2676 to amendment No. 2675.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike "6" and insert "7"

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk for amendment No. 2669.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the

Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on Senate amendment No. 2669 to H.J. Res. 61.

Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn, Marco Rubio, Tom Cotton, Orrin G. Hatch, Joni Ernst, Jeff Flake, Lindsey Graham, David Vitter, Chuck Grassley, Thom Tillis, Steve Daines, Bill Cassidy, David Perdue, John Boozman, James Lankford, Thad Cochran.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to waive the mandatory quorum call for this cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I was struck by some things the Democratic leader said this morning about funding the Government. First he said it was not the Democrats' responsibility to work toward sensible solutions because "we've helped in any way we can, we've not held up anything procedurally."

That was just minutes before his party voted again to hold up a bill procedurally that would fund the military at a time with unprecedented international threats. Then he said this: "We've made it clear that we're not going to proceed to appropriations bills"—talk about a mixed message.

His party has crowed for months about its filibuster summer strategy of blocking every last funding bill in the hopes of taking Americans to the brink. They have now succeeded in taking us there. They think it is the only way to force America to accept their demands for more debt and more bureaucracy. But that is not what Americans want. Americans want Democrats to now work with us responsibly to help our country get out of the situation that they, in fact, have engineered.

The bill before us would do that. It would keep the government funded through the fall while adhering to the bipartisan spending levels already agreed to by both parties. For 1 year, it would defund Planned Parenthood and protect women's health by funding community health clinics with the \$235 million instead. This would allow us to press the pause button as we investigate the serious scandals surrounding Planned Parenthood.

I know Democrats have already blocked virtually every bill to fund the government this year, but I am asking them to allow the Senate to fund the government now. I know Democrats have relied on Planned Parenthood as a political ally, but they must be moved by the horrifying images we have seen. Can they not resolve to protect women's health instead of their powerful political friends?

I am not happy that we have been forced into pursuing a CR instead of the normal appropriations process. After all, for the first time in 6 years, a Senate under new leadership actually passed a budget. After all, for the first time in 6 years, a Senate under new

leadership passed all 12 necessary bills to fund the government out of committee. It is truly regrettable to see the actions of the party on the other side that led us to this point. The bill before us now represents the best option to keep the government funded, to protect women's health, to press the pause button on funding for a scandal-plagued organization as we investigate further into some truly shocking allegations.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today for the weekly conference meetings.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, will my friend allow me to speak prior to that?

Mr. MCCONNELL. After the remarks of the Democratic leader.

I am sorry, Mr. President. I didn't realize the Democratic leader wished to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I served in the House of Representatives. It was standard over there for Members at committee hearings and on the floor to always say: I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. That was standard practice in the House. We don't do that here. But certainly in the House it would have been totally inappropriate to say: I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks of my friend from California or wherever they might be from, but that is basically what my friend, the Republican leader, has done.

He has no right to make up what I said this morning. What I said this morning is in the RECORD. The fact is that he can't rewrite what I said. Here is what I said earlier today: We have made it clear that we will not proceed to appropriations bills under the Republicans' partisan budget. That is what I said verbatim this morning.

We seek a budget agreement that fairly prevents mindless sequester cuts to defense and the middle class alike. We want negotiations to start, and I said I am gratified our votes on this measure have caused the Republican leader to acknowledge that we need to negotiate, and that is true. I am happy to see that, and I have publicly commended the Republican leader for the statements he has made in recent days about how we need a clean CR. I also said this morning, as far as the upcoming vote, that there is no reason for Senators to change their votes from how they voted earlier, and that was on the Defense appropriations revote. This is yet another case of the Republican leader just wasting time before we address the real deal.

We read in this morning's papers that the Republican leader plans to bring a clean continuing resolution before the Senate later this week. That is not a

day too soon. That is what I said, and that is what I say again.

This vote on Planned Parenthood this Thursday is another rerun vote. I do not in any way take away from people who feel strongly about their position on abortion, Planned Parenthood, and the 20-week abortion. I understand how strongly people feel on both sides of that issue, but this is yet another rerun vote.

The Republicans—in the 9 months they have been running the Senate—have had more revotes than any other majority party in the history of our country. They are No. 1 in revotes. We have revoted and revoted and revoted. We voted on Planned Parenthood earlier this year in August, and we voted on abortion today. How many times will the Republican leader need to return to this same show vote?

We are going to prevent a government shutdown with a clean continuing resolution. That is what he said, and I agree with him.

When will we avoid a default by addressing the debt limit? When will we address cyber security and the highway trust fund? All of these things are important to do, and I am anxious to get them done. We have a lot of problems out there in our great country. We have so many things to do. We haven't addressed the energy problems that face this Nation.

We have fires that are ravaging the great Western part of the United States. The government entities that are fighting these fires don't have the money to fight them. The two worst fires in the history of the State of California are just being tamped down, but they are still not completed. Hundreds of homes have burned. We have a country that is burning up.

The Governor of Nevada is a good man. He is a Republican Governor, and I have great admiration for him. I suggested his name to the President of the United States to become a Federal judge, and he accepted my recommendation. He then resigned that position to run for Governor. He is now conducting a 3-day event in Nevada—bringing people in from all over the West and all over the country—to talk about what is happening to Nevada. We are having so many problems in Nevada. Lake Mead is drying up, and Lake Tahoe is having tremendous problems. We have a snowpack that basically doesn't exist. We don't have many rivers in Nevada, but those little rivers that we have, including the mighty Colorado, are in deep trouble. We have snowpack in upper Colorado that evaporates before it gets into the river.

I am willing to do whatever is necessary to move forward in funding this government, but to blame us for not funding the government is really carrying things to extremes.

I have completed my statement, Mr. President.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. COCHRAN. I withhold my suggestion.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:49 p.m., recessed until 2:15 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. PORTMAN).

HIRE MORE HEROES ACT OF 2015— Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the following Senators to speak about the importance of the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. I ask that Senator COONS be recognized for 5 minutes but first that Senator KING be recognized for 5 minutes and that I be recognized for 10 minutes, reserving the remaining time for others who may join us.

I wish to initially yield time to Senator KING.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Maine.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. KING. Mr. President, as the Senator from North Dakota just mentioned, we are here on the floor to talk about the importance of the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. There are a lot of issues here that are contentious and controversial, and there are arguments to be made on both sides, but this one, frankly, puzzles me. I do not understand why the Congress has not moved with alacrity to reauthorize an agency of the Federal Government that fills a gap in the private market which is not filled by private enterprise, which has been in business for over 80 years, and which helps and assists businesses large and small across America and returns money to the Treasury. This is not a cost to the Treasury. This is not some kind of budget bill that increases our deficit. This actually will increase revenue because this agency makes a net return for the taxpayers.

When General Electric last week announced the possible layoff of 500 people across the country and the moving of jobs overseas—because virtually every other industrialized country in the world has an export-import bank, an export promotion authority that is comparable to what we have, General Electric says: We are going to have to go where they provide that kind of support.

One staff member of the committee in the other body, which has voted to not reauthorize this, said: Well, for General Electric, this is a drop in the bucket.

Well, of those 400 or 500 jobs General Electric is talking about, 80 of them are at a General Electric plant in Bangor, ME, and 80 good jobs in Bangor, ME, is not a drop in the bucket.

I would invite that staff member to come to Bangor, ME, and talk to the families of those people who are going to lose their jobs because of this ridiculous policy of not reauthorizing a governmental agency that is serving the public needs of this country, particularly in an age of expanding global trade. We are competing with the rest of the world, and we are shooting ourselves in the foot in the process. It simply makes no sense.

I have visited with small businesses in Maine—as few as 35 jobs which depend upon the actions of the Export-Import Bank in order to be able to finance their receivables from foreign countries and then they can compete in the international marketplace.

There is simply no reason to not move with some speed to reauthorize this agency. We are penalizing American businesses in global competition for no good reason that I can discern. If there are issues at the Bank with its management or whatever, let's fix those. Let's have hearings. Let's find what the problems are and fix them but not eliminate an agency that is doing good and returning money to the taxpayers, particularly at this moment in American and world history where international trade and world exports are so important.

I hope my colleagues in both Houses, on both sides of the aisle will join with us to make a simple reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank so it can continue to do the good work it has done on behalf of businesses in Maine and North Dakota and Texas and California and New York and all over this country.

This is just common sense. There are things around here that I understand we have controversies about and we can argue about, but I have not heard any argument that holds any water as to why this agency should not be continued and allowed to provide the benefits it has and does and will do for the businesses and, more importantly, the employees of those businesses all across the country.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware.

Mr. COONS. Mr. President, I wish to address the issue of the Export-Import Bank reauthorization, if I might, for a few moments. My colleague, the Senator from the State of Maine, has just spoken to it, and I expect my colleague from the State of North Dakota will

also follow along the same lines. I wish to join with my colleagues here today in standing up for American manufacturing and in standing up for American businesses that rely on the Export-Import Bank for the critical financing they need to export their products to the markets of the world. Many of us have said the same thing on this floor over the weeks or months since its authorization expired.

It is striking to me that because of the views of a few Members of the House and Senate, this valuable tool which has helped American companies sell their goods around the world for more than 80 years has been allowed to expire. As we just heard from the Senator from Maine, the Export-Import Bank actually operates at no cost to the taxpayer, and it is something that has helped American businesses sell almost \$30 billion in goods and supported more than 150,000 American jobs last year alone. So I really think the opposition to the reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank is badly misguided. It is my hope that we will find some bipartisan path toward the restoration of this critical tool.

In my first 4 years in the Senate, I was the chair of the Africa subcommittee on the Foreign Relations Committee, and I took advantage of that opportunity to learn a great deal more about this vast continent with 54 countries and the opportunities it provides for American companies to sell their exported products to their growing markets.

Most folks think of the Export-Import Bank as principally providing financing for a few very large companies—companies such as General Electric and Boeing—and it does provide essential financing for their export sales, but those big companies also have enormous supplier chains that employ folks all over the country. I could focus today on the important sales that Boeing and GE have made to Africa and its growing market, but I wish to focus on a very small company with an important story that I think helps illuminate why Ex-Im financing matters.

This little company is called Acrow Bridge. Although it is headquartered in New Jersey, it has a manufacturing plant right near Lewisburg, PA. That plant rolls out steel bridges. It is in Milton, PA. It has been making bridges from the same model Patton's troops used as they rolled across France and Germany during the Second World War, modular bridges that are easy to install in remote places without a whole lot of infrastructure support.

Why does that matter? Because they recently successfully competed for big contracts to sell hundreds of bridges to areas in Africa, including countries like Cameroon or Zambia that badly need infrastructure.

Who are their competitors? Comparable companies from China and

from Europe that are also seeking to sell into these growing markets.

Why do I care? I am from Delaware. I care about manufacturing all over this country, but this Acrow Bridge company ships their bridges from Pennsylvania to Delaware, where, in New Castle, the Voigt & Schweitzer hot dip galvanizing company takes each bridge and dips it in zinc and galvanizes it before it is put on a ship and sent off to places all over the world. Voigt & Schweitzer doesn't employ thousands of people, but it employs dozens of people. Acrow Bridge in Milton, PA, doesn't employ thousands of people, but it employs dozens of people. Manufacturing across our country critically depends on access to export markets.

I recently had a chance to meet up with the Acrow Bridge export sales specialist at a conference in Gabon in Africa. He was alarmed that in the absence of Ex-Im financing, his key competitors are much more likely to succeed in the next contract and the next contract and the next contract.

We folks are just unilaterally disarming here in the fight to access the growing markets of the world, and I can't for the life of me fathom why we have done this. As my colleague from Maine said, if there are issues with the Ex-Im Bank, put them on the floor, put them on the table, and let's address them.

In my experience, when the Bank makes a loan to American businesses, it is not replacing private capital that would otherwise have been making that loan. Most often, it supplements private capital or makes a private bank more inclined to put up its own. And more often than not, Ex-Im serves as the lender of last resort, especially when you are financing sales into risky, growing markets in countries like Cameroon, Zambia, or elsewhere in Africa.

I don't think the Export-Import Bank is doing something best left to the private sector; I think it picks up where the private sector leaves off and it provides key financing to level the global playing field and make it possible for our manufacturers, for our small businesses to compete around the world.

Frankly, most of our competitors have much more robust financing available for their export sales than the Export-Import Bank provides. I just can't fathom why we would allow American businesses to be put at such a key competitive disadvantage. It is my real hope that before it is too late, we will take up and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank.

There were disappointing and concerning announcements just in recent weeks by General Electric and by Boeing that they are already moving employment overseas or they are seriously considering it. GE just an-

nounced they are moving a turboprop engine development center to Europe because they can't remain competitive in the absence of Ex-Im financing. That is going to cause the loss of 500 jobs in a community here in America. And Boeing has made even more concerning announcements.

I think it is critical that we in Congress come together and show that we care about American jobs and that we care about fighting for American manufacturers because we recognize that 95 percent of the opportunity in the world is in the growing sectors that are represented by the export markets of the world.

It is my hope that we can find a way through this, that the unwillingness to reopen the Bank, which is sending the wrong message to the world markets, is something we can come together and address. At a time when our economy is gaining steam and Americans are going back to work, we need to continue to help American companies to compete around the world, not make it harder. So I think we should stop playing politics with American jobs, stop pursuing an ideological agenda, and reauthorize the Export-Import Bank immediately.

Thank you.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Ms. HEITKAMP. Mr. President, we have just heard what I think is almost a horror story from two great Senators, one representing 80 jobs, one representing maybe just dozens of jobs, but every one of those jobs matters in America. We come here every week and we say we are here fighting for the middle class. We are here fighting to build the American economy. We are here fighting to make sure our manufacturing and our businesses are competitive in a highly charged and highly competitive world. And we have an institution that is critical to making sure we have access to these export markets, doesn't cost the Treasury a dime, is used by large corporations and small corporations alike, and it is supported by Democrats and Republicans. But why do we shut down the Ex-Im Bank?

I serve on the banking committee, and we had a hearing. The bill we have been considering these many months is the Kirk-Heitkamp bill. I have taken responsibility for addressing some of the concerns about the Ex-Im Bank and looking at how we can reform some of the things that are legitimate concerns about how the Bank operates. But I will tell my colleagues from that hearing that what we saw is the National Association of Manufacturers, we saw the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. And we might imagine that those two witnesses were the Republican witnesses. They were not the Republican witnesses; they were the Democratic

witnesses. The Republican witnesses came from intellectual think tanks. They came from institutions of higher learning with conservative think tanks. They all had a theory about the Ex-Im Bank. I asked them a simple question when it came time for me to ask them a question. I asked every one of those persons who represented a think tank or represented an academic institution how many jobs they have created, what their output is, what their contribution to the gross domestic product was. They didn't have much of an answer. I said: Why should I believe what you are telling me in terms of this being the slippery slope toward the demise of democracy as we know it, which is really how the Ex-Im Bank has been categorized against the word of the National Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Manufacturers.

This has become an irrational ideological fight. And, unfortunately, we have irrational ideological fights almost daily in the Congress, to no good end for the American people. But this Senator will say this: This fight has devastating consequences. We now have shut down the Bank. No new credit is coming in for 2½ months—2½ months where a small manufacturer in Delaware may say: Well, how have we done this in the past? How have we taken on currency risk? How have we taken on debt risk? How have we guaranteed this in the past? Call your local bank. Do you know what the banker is going to tell you? Call the Ex-Im Bank because in spite of what they tell you, somehow magically in this market will emerge a private institution that will carry on the responsibility of the Ex-Im Bank.

That is not reality. The largest supporters of the Ex-Im Bank are those financial institutions that want to continue to provide credit and help grow those American businesses that are putting Americans back to work.

One of the things I did want to talk about today is that way too often we hear about the so-called bank of Boeing, the bank of GE, and how it is that this institution helps only those large manufacturers. What I would tell you, first, is if you look at the business model of GE or the business model of Boeing, what they do is assemble. They assemble products that are manufactured all across the country, and the components are manufactured in large shops and small shops all the way down the supply chain to small communities that are doing things in Jamestown, ND, that are growing jobs. In the communities that you just heard about in Bangor, ME, and communities in Delaware, they are building out those jobs. Those are the people we are hearing from. Those are the people who are shaking their heads, saying: Why is it that you guys talk all the time about helping American business, growing

the economy, growing exports? You talk all the time about jobs and the need to bring back the innovation, and you curtail and limit my ability to grow and, quite frankly, my ability to survive. How does that happen?

I want to talk about the equipment wholesalers that will see a negative impact. Look at this—35 to 40 percent, if Ex-Im isn't reauthorized.

Equipment wholesalers stated that without the Export-Import Bank, it will be at a disadvantage in increasingly globalized markets. No access—do you know why? Because there are 80 other countries that have export credit agencies.

The first thing China and India did when Asia slowed down, when they knew their economies were beginning to suffer some of the consequences of slow growth—guess what they did. The first thing they did is pump more money into their export credit agencies—in fact, billions more into those export credit agencies. Then, when this institution shut down the Ex-Im Bank, they shouted: Hip, hip, hooray. They knew that not only did they have money to capitalize and to guarantee these sales, but they were operating in a market where we have unilaterally, economically disarmed in the export market.

When we go back and take a look at how the U.S. Export-Import Bank has supported more than 850,000 jobs, when we look at Wahpeton, ND—Wahpeton, ND, is the largest town next to my hometown. Not a lot of people live there, but for the people who work there, those jobs matter. Look at that—almost \$1 million—and those jobs are being threatened today because of the inactivity of this institution.

Sixty percent of WCCO Belting's annual sales and revenues come from customers who are located outside the United States of America. This is a small town in Wahpeton, ND. Many of the pages here probably didn't even know such a place existed, but the people who work there are doing a great job, and they are contributing to the global economy. More importantly, they are building up their local economy, and they are building up the U.S. manufacturing and trade deficit. This is something I know the Presiding Officer, as a former member of the OMB and somebody who has watched the American economy, is very concerned about, making sure that the trade deficit is favorable to us, that we are actually exporting more than we are importing. That is how we grow our economy. That is called new wealth creation.

When we look at not just manufacturing, but we look at J.M. Grain, a business that I visited—built out of nothing by a mom and pop who put their heads together and said: This is something I think we can do. They built this great business. The Export-

Import Bank provides credit and credit insurance needed for J.M. Grain to export its products. If Ex-Im isn't reauthorized, J.M. Grain may be forced to sell its products to larger corporations that can finance the exports—consolidation—because we can't take care of small business.

Even though we hear the platitudes and all of the statements quite to the contrary on the floor of the Senate and the Congress, that we care about small business, we do nothing in terms of our actions to really prove that.

Amity Technology is a great story. This is a family—the developers of this company come from the family who developed the Bobcat skid-steer loaders, if you can imagine that. That company was sold and has moved on, yet those young entrepreneurs—those young inventors—have taken the next step. This is a company that is absolutely dependent on the Export-Import Bank. If you look at this, it has supported more than \$50 million in exports in the last decade. Without the help of the Export-Import Bank, Amity would lose at least 10 percent of its business.

Story after story in America—this is just North Dakota. We can tell you more stories about what is happening in North Dakota, but stories after stories in the State of North Dakota and across the country include small businessmen and small businesswomen who are shaking their heads, saying: What did we do? Why is it that something such as the Export-Import Bank, which is so critical to our being successful and doesn't cost the American taxpayers a dime. Why is it that this is so hard?

I have to try and explain how it is that we got 64 votes for the Export-Import Bank here on the floor of the Senate—a huge majority. We think we actually have the support of about 67 Members of the Senate—a veto-proof majority, if you look at it that way.

And we know that over in the House of Representatives there is well over 50 percent of the Members of that body that would vote for the Ex-Im Bank. Where is the hangup? Where is the problem?

Quite honestly, the problem is with leadership because if this isn't a priority or if the Ex-Im Bank may be a problem for a Speaker who has a small but vocal group of conservatives who hate the Ex-Im Bank and who have made this their celebrity cause, then we will just send it over here and we will try to sneak it in. That is kind of the idea, right? We need a vehicle.

I hear that so often for good ideas and for things we know we have majority votes for and well over majority votes for: We need a vehicle. I joke to my staff that I am going to introduce a bill, and it is going to be called "the vehicle." Then we will be able to do everything we have to do to keep the American economy moving forward—

the things that we can all agree on—because then, maybe, the American public will see something that is not rancor and disagreement. They will see us listening to American business, to American manufacturers, to American workers, and they will hear that we actually will respond, and we will move this bill forward.

Now there is a lot of talk that we may not get this done in September. No, it doesn't look very good. And if you had told me when we shut down the Bank in June, if you had told me that we were going to open it up in July, I would have said: That is not likely. We will get the Bank reopened in July.

July came and went, and the promise of the vehicle, which was supposed to be the Transportation bill, never materialized. And the promise of putting it somewhere where we could actually get it done never materialized. So we went home in August, and I said: Well, we will get it done in September. We will figure out a way to reauthorize the Ex-Im Bank in September because we can't shut it down for that long.

September has come and gone. We have got other priorities—no opportunity for floor time. Now we are looking at October, and the promise once again in October is that we are going to put it on the Transportation bill. Well, this Senator has heard that promise twice. So I think it is now time to ask for consideration of this bill.

People say: We all need to reserve the special floor time of the Senate for really important ideas. I say that these people, the 80 people, 90 people in Bangor, ME, think this is an important idea. All the people now who supply GE who are looking at GE's plan to move a lot of this manufacturing and assembly overseas, they think this is very important. They think American jobs, American manufacturing, our trade deficit, and our access to global markets, are very important for the Congress to consider.

So we have a bill that has broad bipartisan support: the Kirk-Heitkamp Export-Import Reauthorization bill. We can put that bill on the floor. We can move it in an expedited fashion because we have a procedure to do this. When there is a will, there is a way. We can move pretty quickly to votes here if we want to, and we can pass this bill. Then we can send it over to the House of Representatives. They can put it on the floor, and they can pass this bill. It can get sent to the President's desk and get signed, and we can reopen the Export-Import Bank. We can hang out a big sign: "Open for business once again."

But the longer we wait, the longer we continue to allow this to become the celebrity cause of a very, very small minority of hard-core conservatives in this country, the harder it is going to

be to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank. Make no mistake. At the end of the day, it is not about inside-the-beltway politics. It is not about whether we are going to have political winners or losers. What this is about is people's livelihoods. It is about helping American workers do what we know we do best: innovate, create, manufacture, and export.

I thank the Presiding Officer so much for the time. We will continue to be talking about the Ex-Im Bank. As you know, I almost can't even approach a group because they think I am going to regale them with 20 hours of the Ex-Im Bank and the challenges we have with reauthorization.

But I will tell you this: The Ex-Im Bank is not only about manufacturing; it is almost a metaphor for what is wrong in the Congress. What that is, is an institution that creates jobs, has broad bipartisan support, and has the ability to provide opportunity for American workers, and we shut it down because the Congress cannot figure out how to avoid a minority of people dictating the agenda.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO ASHLEY ALDRIDGE

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to share a story with Members of the Senate and those following us this evening. It is an amazing story of the selfless courage of a young Illinois mother who many are calling—with good reason—a guardian angel.

Ashley Aldridge of Auburn, IL, was home making lunch for two little babies last Tuesday. She heard someone outside crying for help. She looked out her kitchen window and saw an elderly man in a wheelchair on the railroad tracks near her mobile home. He was calling for help.

Without a moment's hesitation Ashley asked a neighbor to stay with her kids and she ran toward the man in distress. She saw the railroad guard arms coming down and heard the oncoming train. When she reached the man in the wheelchair, Earl Moorman, Ashley discovered that the wheel of his chair was lodged in the tracks. There was no moving it. So Ashley tried to pick up Mr. Moorman. Now, Mr. Moorman is 75 years old and he weighs about 200 pounds. Ashley could not move him. She tried again. With an Amtrak train barreling down the tracks at 81 miles an hour, Ashley Aldridge somehow, some way found the strength to lift Earl Moorman up and out of his trapped wheelchair. Not 5 seconds after she dragged him off the railroad track, the train hit the wheelchair and smashed it into bits.

When the last car on the Amtrak train passed, Ashley looked up and saw a police car on the other side of the

tracks. Someone had heard Mr. Moorman and called 911. The police were there quickly, but they could not get there fast enough to save Mr. Moorman. Ashley Aldridge, a 19-year-old wife and stay-at-home mom with two little kids got there in time. No wonder Earl Moorman is calling Ashley his guardian angel.

Ashley Aldridge and Earl Moorman live in Auburn, IL. It is a little town about 20 miles south of my hometown of Springfield. Auburn's mayor and town council and all the folks around town are hailing Ashley Aldridge as a hero. She is that and more. In a world in which we often hear the message that we should only be concerned about ourselves and our own families, Ashley is an inspiration. Without a moment's hesitation this brave, young mom risked her own life to save the life of a man she had never met. It is an amazing story of selfless courage. In this world filled with so many innocent people in danger, I hope we will all remember and be inspired by the courage of this remarkable young woman.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, this is a historic week in Washington, DC. Later today Pope Francis will arrive in Washington for a 2-day visit. During his time here, the Holy Father will meet with President Obama, celebrate mass, canonize a new saint, and address a joint meeting of Congress. This will be the first time a Pope has ever addressed Congress.

In light of Pope Francis's historic visit, I believe today is an appropriate time to reflect on the importance of religious liberty in American life. This will be the first of a series of addresses I will be delivering on this vital subject. Religious liberty is an issue of deep significance to me. I come from a family of faith. I represent a State that was founded by religious pioneers fleeing persecution.

In my many travels, I have seen people express religious devotion in a multitude of ways, affirming their belief in the Divine through song, word, and deed. I have also seen misguided government officials limit religious expression, often in the name of security or some other nebulous goal. I have seen people of courage stand up to these officials, refusing to accept claims that the commands of the State trump rights of religious belief, nor am I alone in viewing religious liberty as a vitally important subject. Indeed, throughout our history, protecting religious liberty has been a priority of lawmakers and laymen alike.

As far back as 1657, residents of the community known today as Flushing, NY, petitioned colonial leaders to end restrictions on religious practice that prevented some community members

from practicing their faith. Their petition, known as the Flushing Remonstrance, declared that community members should be allowed to decide for themselves how to worship.

In 1776, 120 years later, Virginia adopted a declaration of rights that proclaimed in no uncertain terms that “all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion according to the dictates of conscience.”

This was followed a decade later by the famous words of the First Amendment, which forbids Congress from making any law that prohibits the free exercise of religion. More recently, our leaders have continued to affirm the importance of religious liberty in both word and deed. In 1984, the United States joined 47 other nations in approving the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which of course proclaims that every person has a right to “manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship or observance.”

Four decades later, in 1800, Congress passed a law declaring that government may not “substantially burden a person’s exercise of religion,” unless doing so is necessary to further a compelling government interest. Presidents Bill Clinton, George W. Bush, and Barrack Obama have all issued proclamations affirming the continued importance of religious liberty in American life. President Obama’s most recent proclamation, issued on January 15 of this year, called religious freedom a “fundamental libert[y].”

He declared that every person should be “free to choose and live their faith.” There can be no question that religious liberty has been a central concern throughout our Nation’s history. Over the coming weeks, I will discuss a number of topics related to religious liberty. These topics will include, among other things, the legal and political history of religious liberty in our country, the ways in which religious liberty is under attack both at home and abroad, and what we in Congress should do to protect religious freedom against such encroachments. I will also address the history and importance of religion in the public square and the ways in which religion is beneficial to society.

Today, however, I begin with first principles: why religious freedom matters, why it is important, why it is worth protecting. It is common, when speaking of religious liberty, to begin by noting that religious exercise is the first individual right listed in the Constitution. This priority of place denotes that religious exercise has special significance.

Of all the potential rights out there, both God-given and manmade, the Founders chose to list religious freedom first. Part of this, no doubt, had to do with history. The United States exists because of religious freedom. The

Pilgrims set sail because they wanted to go to a place where they could practice their beliefs free from state interference. The Founders of Maryland similarly sought a new land where an oppressed religious minority, Catholics, could live out their faith openly and honestly.

Pennsylvania was a haven for Quakers and other religious groups. Although the motivations of colonists were multifaceted, the desire for religious freedom was a driving force behind many settlers’ decisions to come to America. They came to escape persecution, to practice their religion as they wished without the need for official state sanction or the threat of state-sponsored suppression.

But history is not the end of the story. There is something inherent in the nature of religious exercise that merits special protection. To explain, I first need to talk a bit about the character of government. I will then connect my discussion back to religious liberty. Government is, at bottom, a war of wills. It is how we answer the fundamental question of all human relations: Who decides?

Government is the instrument by which we place certain conduct off-limits or make other conduct compulsory and then back up those rules with threat of force. We may extol democracy as the best and highest form of government, while at the same time disparaging autocracy or other dictatorial regimes, but the difference between these governments is a difference of form, not function.

All governments limit individual freedom. The question is, who decides what those limits are and how far they extend? When government limits freedom, it makes a value judgment that the conduct proscribed is less important, less worthy, than whatever goal the government is seeking to accomplish. Take the fight against drugs. Long ago, Congress made a decision that avoiding the devastating consequences of drug addiction and drug violence is a more worthy goal than permitting people to choose for themselves whether to ingest certain mind-altering substances. We made a value judgment that reducing violence and preventing addiction is more important than giving people unfettered control over what they consume.

It is easy to see why. Violence and addiction are tangible, devastating harms that ruin lives and destroy aspirations. The ability to consume mind-altering substances, by contrast, is a narrow concern that does not go to any core concept of personhood. In other areas, the calculus may be more complicated. Whether we are debating the proper approach to energy production, health insurance, infrastructure investment, education standards or tax reform, we weigh competing values. The policy we ultimately select de-

pends on which values to which we give greater weight.

Now to religious liberty. I said earlier that religious liberty merits special protection. Indeed, it deserves preeminent protection against all other rights. The reason is that rights of conscience and of religious exercise go to the very heart of who we are as human beings and how we make sense of our world. There can be no higher value than enabling people to find purpose in their lives, to make sense of the sorrows and disappointments, as well as the joys that attend life here on the Earth.

Indeed, the choices we make about what we believe and about whom we stand among are the most important choices we make in life. When a person feels called by a higher power to perform some act or to refrain from some activity, that person is defining himself by reference to his beliefs. Those beliefs may seem irrational to some or silly to others, but to the person who holds those beliefs they make all the difference in the world.

When government interferes with religious exercise, it seeks to insert itself into the place of God. It tells a believer that his views about what really matters may be an interesting curiosity, a nice psychosocial experiment, perhaps, but that at the end of the day they are illegitimate. The state’s interests must prevail because the state is the source of justice and truth.

What is going on is a value judgment. Just as with all other government decrees, when a state commands a person to violate his religious beliefs, it makes a value judgment that the state’s objectives override all contrary concerns. It just so happens that in this case, those contrary concerns are an individual’s most personal, deeply held beliefs.

This is a problem for three reasons: First, we have or are supposed to have a limited government. Our government is supposed to serve us. It is supposed to help us flourish, not vice versa. But the government that overrides religious belief is not a limited government; it is a tyranny. It presumes power to decide for its citizens the most fundamental and defining choices of life: who we are, why we are here, what our purpose is, and how we find happiness.

No decision is more fundamental to human existence than the decision we make regarding our relationship to the Divine. No act of government can be more intrusive or more invasive of individual autonomy and free will than the act of compelling a person to violate his or her sincerely chosen religious beliefs. We should have more humility than to think we can define better than our fellow citizens the purpose of life and the ends thereof. Certainly a limited government such as ours ought not tell its people that it knows best on matters far beyond its ambit.

Second, valuing transient policy objectives over deeply held religious beliefs places citizens on the horns of an impossible dilemma: either obey God whose commands are eternal and unalterable or obey the state, which controls life, liberty, and property here on Earth. There are some who seek to equate religious liberties with other forms of liberty or to downgrade it to a form of "belief liberty."

Under this view, as explained by LDS Apostle Dallin H. Oaks, there is nothing particularly special about religious liberty. It is merely the ability to believe as one chooses about spiritual matters, just as one might choose a political party, a favorite philosopher or a favorite actor, but there is no equivalency. Religious liberty alone goes to one's conception of self of one's place in the universe. It alone goes to those most fundamental questions that help us find purpose in our lives. What is more, it implicates duties that transcend mere personal choice and become obligatory in the life of the believer.

Professor Robbie George, the chairman of the U.S. Commission on International Religious Freedom, explains powerfully the flaw in the claim that religious liberty is just another type of so-called belief liberty:

The right to follow one's conscience, and the obligation to respect conscience—especially in matters of faith—obtain not because people as autonomous agents should be able to do as they please; they obtain, and are stringent and sometimes overriding, because people have duties and the obligation to fulfill them. . . . The right of conscience is a right to do what one judge's oneself to be under an obligation to do, whether one welcomes the obligation or must overcome strong aversion in order to fulfill it.

When government denies religious freedom, it forces believers to choose between duty to God and duty to man—duty to man backed by a threat of force. No government that values its citizens' agency and certainly no limited government that exists at the suffrage of the people should put its citizens to such an impossible choice.

The third reason why valuing State objectives over religious beliefs is a problem is that it sets up the State as moral arbiter. I will speak only briefly to this point.

When the State declares certain beliefs out of bounds or unworthy of protection, it tells the world that the opinions of government officials trump rights of conscience. It tells believers that government knows best and that their benighted views—the believers' views, that is—have been weighed and found wanting. The current wisdom, which may be contrary to the wisdom of all human history, must triumph for no reason other than it is current and currently favored by government elites. All must fall before the State, which is supreme both in matters of might and morality.

This aggressive view of the State's moral authority has no place in a sys-

tem of limited government and is completely contrary to our constitution. Humility should be our watchword. We should remember that we may be wrong.

Now, this doesn't mean religious freedom should be unlimited, that there should be no boundaries on religious exercise. When a religious practice causes injury or threatens to upend important State goals, government does have a proper role to play in balancing interests. But the standard that must be met before the State intervenes should be very high.

Again, we are not talking here about mere personal preferences, about things people would rather do or not do, all else being equal; we are talking about acts that, as Professor George puts it, individuals feel they have an obligation to do, an obligation that comes not from family or friends or from society but from God himself.

Before we ask individuals to contravene commands they believe come from a higher power, we had better be sure that what we are asking is absolutely necessary. We had better be sure that what we are asking furthers a compelling government interest and is the only way to accomplish that interest. Only this standard, which requires government to exhaust all other options before invading the religious liberty over its citizens, adequately accounts for the centrality of faith in the lives of believers and the proper relationship between individual and State.

Mr. President, my argument today has been based on first principles, on the inviolate right of each and every person to look out for himself or herself, the purpose of life, and his or her place in the universe. It has also been based on the principle, enshrined in our Constitution, that ours is a limited government that exists to serve, not dominate, its people.

I have purposely stayed away from arguing that religion is a good thing, a net benefit to society, because I believe religious freedom deserves special protection separate and apart from whether religion makes men and women better citizens. Religious liberty should be a protected value because the State has no authority to tell individuals how they should approach the Divine or prescribe for them the meaning of their lives. It is a matter of autonomy, a question of who serves whom. But I would be remiss if I did not briefly outline the many ways religion and religious exercise have benefited our Nation.

Today, many people sadly view religion as a sort of fetter, a chain that holds us back as a society from achieving our true potential. They see religion as the antagonist of social justice, as a refuge for reactionaries who do not understand or who fear our modern world. This view is not only shortsighted, it is ignorant.

The two greatest social movements in our Nation's history—the abolition movement and the civil rights movement—were inspired by religious conviction and led by religious leaders. We speak today of Dr. Martin Luther King, but we forget that before he was a doctor, he was a reverend. In 1967, the year before his death, Reverend King proclaimed:

Before I was a civil rights leader, I was a preacher of the Gospel. This was my first calling and it still remains my greatest commitment. . . . [A]ll that I do in civil rights I do because I consider it a part of my ministry.

Religion instills in our youth principles of morality and right behavior. I do not claim that religion is necessary for a person to be a good citizen, but I do affirm that religion, rightly practiced, instills virtues—concern for others, a desire for good, objectives beyond the mere pursuit of something pleasures—that lead to engaged citizens and a healthy society. Happily, religious freedom is not just a good in and of itself but is a good for society as well.

I will have much more to say on this topic in a future set of remarks. For present purposes, I will conclude with this point: Religious liberty is a fundamental feature of our Republic. It is why we exist as a nation. It helps to explain why we have endured so long despite our many differences. It has been a bedrock of our laws for centuries and was largely uncontested until only a few years ago. It deserves continuing protection as a preeminent value because it safeguards our ability as citizens to find purpose in our lives and to divine for ourselves who we are. It matters more than any other freedom. That is why it was listed first in the Constitution.

Too many of our fellow citizens—perhaps even too many in this body—have lost sight of the purpose and importance of religious liberty and of our duty as legislators to protect the freedom of all citizens to believe and to act according to their beliefs.

I will return to this theme in the coming weeks as I deliver additional remarks on this most crucial topic. All I can say is that religious freedom means everything to me. I think it means everything to people of good will who really have studied how this Nation came about, how it progressed, how it has overcome some of the most monumental problems in the history of the world, and how we have been so successful after all these years.

We have a tendency in this current climate, in this current world to start to decry religious belief. I want to make sure that we don't end it, that we augment it, and that we get back to where we should be as a Nation so that we can continue to maintain this great Nation as the greatest Nation with the greatest freedom and the greatest Constitution in the world.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LANKFORD). The Senator from Arizona. Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following my remarks, the Senator from Alaska be recognized.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today I was proud and honored to vote for cloture on the motion to proceed to the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, offered by my dear friend and leader, Senator GRAHAM of South Carolina.

Nearly 17 years ago to this day, I came to the Senate floor to cast a vote to override then-President Clinton's veto of the Federal partial-birth abortion ban and to speak out for the voiceless unborn children who were victims of that deplorable practice. As supporters of that effort to end partial-birth abortions in the United States will recall, it was a long journey to see legislation finally signed into law in 2003 but a journey fully consistent with America's long commitment to the rights and dignity of all human life. Enacting that legislation called upon our Nation's moral conscience in the same way our country is compelled to action in the face of injustice at home and abroad, and I believe we as a nation are better off for it today.

The Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act the Senate considered today is no different. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation to protect the lives of unborn children by banning abortions beyond the time when a child in the womb can feel pain. My support for this bill is a continuation of my longstanding and unequivocal pro-life record since I was first elected to the Senate.

As was the case when the Senate considered the ban on partial-birth abortion, we have to recognize that the bill the Senate voted on today does not fit neatly into the traditional debate about whether you are pro-life or pro-choice. The bill is about banning the extreme practice of late-term abortions and protecting the lives of fully formed human beings who can feel real pain. These abortions occur at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy. They end the life of a human being who has been found worthy of fetal anesthesia to dull the pain the procedure causes but somehow unworthy of life. I submit that to oppose this bill, to vote to allow this practice to continue to be legal in this country, is extreme and unconscionable.

This effort puts us on the right side of the American people and the right side of history. This legislation has 45 cosponsors in the Senate, and it passed the House by a vote of 242 to 184 in May of this year. A recent poll found that 64 percent of Americans support restricting late-term abortions.

I am proudly pro-life because I believe this is a human rights issue inextricably tied to the values of our Nation. These are the same values that have resulted in a long-held American commitment to fighting for human rights and for the disadvantaged and the voiceless around the world. The same commitment to fighting for human life must be true in our Nation today for unborn children.

In April 2014, Time magazine ran a story called "A Preemie Revolution: Cutting-edge medicine and dedicated caregivers are helping the tiniest babies survive—and thrive." The article discussed remarkable medical advancements that have resulted in a steadily decreasing age of viability for infants born prematurely. It details the complexities of caring for premature babies, the challenge of seeing to things as basic as breathing for these babies, as well as the "round-the-clock SWAT team of nearly 300 [medical professionals]" that come together at neonatal intensive care units, NICU, to fight for these tiny lives.

In the author's words:

[I]n some ways, the work of a NICU will always seem like an exercise in disproportion—an army of people and a mountain of infrastructure caring for a pound of life. But it's a disproportion that speaks very well of us.

The painstaking fight for human life that goes on in NICUs around the country is irreconcilable with the current status quo in our Federal law that permits late-term abortions.

As we know, what is at stake in this debate is made all the more real and urgent by the heinous video footage showing Planned Parenthood's role in the harvesting of unborn babies' body parts. I was proud to vote in support of defunding Planned Parenthood while preserving Federal funding for women's health services in facilities such as community health centers.

I urge my colleagues to consider the significance of this vote today, the reality of the practice that this bill is aimed at prohibiting, and what permitting late-term abortions says about our Nation's commitment to fighting for life and standing up for human rights when our conscience calls us to. I deeply regret that this body failed today to vote for the voiceless and ban late-term abortions and protect life. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to reconsider their position on this important issue.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, listening to the last two speakers, I am reminded what a privilege and honor it is to be able to serve in the Senate alongside great Americans—the President pro tempore, the Senator from Utah, and the Senator from Arizona, JOHN MCCAIN, who have served this

country for decades—decades—with honor and distinction, and, as we saw in their remarks just a few minutes ago, with wisdom from experience and conviction.

We took two important votes today. One, as Senator MCCAIN was talking about, was the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, very important pro-life legislation. I agree with what the Senator from Arizona said about that very important bill and commend the Presiding Officer for his leadership throughout the country.

We also voted on the Defense appropriations bill today, another important bill. I am not sure it is going to get a lot of press, but I wish to talk about what is going on there because it is actually very important for the American people to really have a sense of what is happening. We saw in the media, we see all over Washington and on TV this talk concerning a government shutdown. I think a lot of people have concerns about it. Let me talk about that in the context of the bill we voted on today, which, unfortunately, was filibustered by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

A lot of us who are new here in the Senate—the Presiding Officer, my colleague from North Carolina—ran on the issue of a dysfunctional Senate, where the most basic function of government was not happening. Let me give one critical example. We weren't passing a budget, we weren't funding government, and we weren't doing regular order in terms of appropriations bills. So many of us ran to say: Enough, we are going to change things here. With all due respect to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, they neglected this function—no budget, no appropriations bills—for years. The most basic function of government was not happening in the Senate.

So many of us campaigned to change that—to work hard to change that—because we knew that is what the American people wanted. And we have done it. We are starting to do it. For example, we passed the budget resolution.

If we look at the 10 years out of our budget versus the 10 years out of the President's budget, we cut \$5 to \$7 trillion in terms of the President's wasteful spending. That is serious. We did that. We passed the budget resolution. We debated it here for a number of weeks, not days. The other side of the aisle hadn't done that for years.

When I went back home and said we did that, a lot of people in Alaska said: Well, big deal, my household passes a budget every year. My business passes a budget every year. The State of Alaska passes a budget every year.

But it is a big deal because we hadn't done it here. But now we are doing it because that is what we committed to do.

So that is one step: We passed a budget. Then the Members of this body,

working hard, particularly through the Appropriations Committee, passed 12 appropriations bills—9 of which passed out of the committee with very, very strong bipartisan votes—to fund the government. So far so good—that is what we are supposed to be doing here. We are back to work, back to regular order.

One of these bills was the Defense appropriation bill. What does that mean? It is kind of a wonky term. That is the bill that funds our military, that funds our national defense, that funds the sergeant in the Marine Corps and the Army—a really important bill. It passed out of the committee with a very strong bipartisan vote of 27 to 3. We almost can't get any more bipartisan than that, 27 to 3. Virtually everybody, Democrats and Republicans, voted for that because they know how important it is.

So what happened today? We took the next step in the regular order process as we promised the American people to fund our government by bringing forward that bill. At 27 to 3, it should be no problem passing it in the Senate. Look at how many Democrats voted for that bill. So we wanted to move forward on that bill. We all know how critical that bill is—probably one of the most critical appropriations bills we have because it is funding the defense of our Nation and the brave men and women who serve our Nation.

So what happened in the vote today? Well, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle decided: No, we are going to filibuster that. I know we voted 27 to 3 to move it out of committee, but now we are going to filibuster that.

In fact, according to the leader on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats are saying they are going to filibuster all 12 appropriations bills—all 12 of them.

Let me repeat. Here is what is happening. We passed the budget. We passed, for the most part, very bipartisan appropriations bills. Let me read a few of them: Agriculture, 28 to 2, out of committee; Commerce, Justice, Science and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, 27 to 3; Defense, 27 to 3; Energy and Water, 26 to 4; State and Foreign Operations, 27 to 3.

This is a list of very bipartisan work by the Senate in the Appropriations Committee. I commend all the Members of this body who worked so hard on that. But now we hear that the other side is going to filibuster every single one of these. They did it today. That is actually the second time they did it with regard to the Defense appropriations bill. They are going to do it again and again and again.

It is my view that we should bring all 12 of these bills to the Senate floor, like we did today. We are trying to move forward and fund this government. We are trying to get back to reg-

ular order, the way the Senate used to work. It hadn't worked like that for years, but now we are trying to do that. If the other side of the aisle wants to continually filibuster the funding of our government, let them stand up to the American people and do that.

For example, I think we should bring up the Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill that passed out of committee 21 to 9. It is very important for the country. Let's bring it up. Let's have a vote on it. If they want to filibuster that, I think they will have to explain why they are not supporting veterans.

This will make one thing clear, though. In all the talk we hear in the media every day about Republicans wanting to shut down the government, I think it is pretty clear when we look at what is happening here with the filibustering of all the appropriations bills that there is another side to this story. There is another side to this story. The defunding of the government—of our troops, as we saw today—is happening because of the filibuster.

It is my hope that our friends in the media, who love to talk about this story, are going to look a little bit more deeply—look at these votes today, look at the budget, look at what the Appropriations Committee has been doing—and tell the real story. There are people very focused on stopping the funding of the government. We saw it today. It is not the majority party in the Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION BILL

Mr. TILLIS. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from the great State of Alaska for his comments. I wish to be associated with those comments. I also thank him not only for his service in the Senate but for his service in the Marines.

I stand here today heartbroken over the failure to advance a bill that would protect the lives of unborn babies—babies who are old enough, who, with proper care, can survive when born at this age.

Many of my colleagues have spoken regarding all that we know about the science of fetal development—how unborn babies feel pain, when they feel pain, the related neurological data, and so on. Others will tell us that the United States is out of step with the overwhelming majority of other nations on this policy. Others will show poll numbers that demonstrate that an overwhelming majority of Americans, especially women, think this policy is a good policy—the policy that was voted down in this Chamber today.

But we don't need to know all that to know what is right and what is wrong. We know what is right. Any of us who have ever watched our wife's belly

grow, as I did with the miracle of my son and daughter; any of us who have ever experienced the excitement before learning the results of a prenatal test; any of us who have seen an ultrasound or attended a baby shower, we all know. We know because of the hundreds and thousands of friends, family, neighbors, and coworkers whose own baby stories we have watched over our lives. The stories of successful deliveries, the complications, the joys, the tragedies, and all of these stories—the beautiful stories and the bittersweet stories—have taught us the truth about the unborn. We all know. We don't need to be scientists to understand what the science can tell us.

So I wish to tell some stories that illustrate what this bill, which was voted down today in this Chamber, is about.

I want to start with Samuel. As early as 1999, we were doing fetal surgeries here in the United States. Samuel's parents, Julie and Alex, were given the terrible news that their unborn son had permanent nerve damage from an opening in his spine due to spina bifida. Doctors said that half of all babies with spina bifida were aborted, but Julie and Alex chose a different path for Samuel. This was at 21 weeks. Samuel was operated on in utero. Today he is all grown up. Samuel said that he believes God sent him to Earth to help stop abortion.

Then there is Elijah.

When April Leffingwell's ultrasound at 20 weeks revealed a life-threatening tumor growing in Elijah's left lung, she knew his life was in grave danger. Thankfully, this fateful diagnosis was not the end of the story. Instead, Elijah's life was saved by an innovative fetal surgery performed at just 25 weeks. During the surgery, 3 years ago, 5-month-old baby Elijah was given anesthesia to protect him from pain. He was then partially removed from his mother's womb, and the life-threatening tumor the size of an orange was removed. Elijah's primary surgeon at Children's Hospital of Philadelphia said that he would have died if the operation were not done before birth. Now, several years later, after a challenging beginning, Elijah is a healthy and very active toddler.

Here is another story, about Micah.

Micah's mom Danielle went into labor and delivered Micah when he was just 22 weeks old. This is little Micah shortly after delivery as shown in this picture. She was given the worst of news—that her son would not survive. But Micah received state-of-the-art care and spent the next 4 months in the neonatal intensive care unit, or NICU. Micah's parents kept vigil at his side and watched all the developmental milestones, which should have been reached in utero, be reached in the artificial environment in the NICU. And slowly, day by day, he made it. He thrived and is 3 years old.

Micah and his family are here today at the Senate. I met them earlier today. He actually gave me this band that says "Miracles for Micah." Surely my colleagues can see what Micah's parents see; that their son was just as precious at 22 weeks as he is today at 3 years old.

There are more stories. Some of us remember former Philadelphia Eagles player Vaughn Hebronn. Vaughn and his wife Kim were given the news that their twins, 5 months old in utero, were facing what is called twin-transfusion—a life-threatening condition. Doctors said there was a 70-percent chance that one or both of the twins would die, but Vaughn and his wife chose to fight for their boys. They received state-of-the-art care and both boys are now healthy teenagers.

All of these children—the Hebronn twins, Micah, Elijah, Samuel—there is only one difference between them and the babies aborted, dismembered, and sold by Planned Parenthood; the only difference is that these children were wanted and welcomed. If they are wanted and welcome, we fight like mad to save them. We throw everything at them that science and medicine can possibly do. We save their lives and we create miracles every day.

We need this bill to protect those poor babies who are unwanted and unwelcome. We don't strip born children of their right to life and protection just because their parents don't want them. We take care of them at taxpayer expense. We try to help their parents support them. We provide health care for them. If their parents will not or can't raise them, we seek adoptive families for them. But if they are a few months, even a few days or a few minutes younger, our law denies them the opportunity to grow, to learn, and to become the bright-eyed, world-changing children we all cherish and protect.

They say a picture is worth a thousand words. I think this one says it better than anything any of us will say on this Senate floor. This is a baby in utero around 20 weeks. There is simply no arguing that this is a baby. At this age, she is about 10 ounces, about 10 inches long—about the size of a big banana. A baby this age is practicing swallowing for the first time. She is moving. Her skin is thickening up so it is starting to lose that translucent look. A good fraction of the babies who are delivered prematurely at this age survive. A few weeks later, almost all of them survive.

The bill we voted on today would have protected babies from this age and older—when they can feel pain, when they look like humans in photographs and sonograms, and when they are kicking around in their mama's bellies. Although we didn't advance this bill today, we must not give up. I am not giving up on my colleagues because I believe justice can still win

out. This bill must eventually pass. History will clothe us in disgrace if we fail to do so. The law should protect these children. Nobody put it better than the late great children's author Dr. Seuss when he said: "A person's a person, no matter how small."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

CORPORATE CULTURE IN THE AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, Volkswagen has become part of the lexicon of the American economy, American culture. Volkswagen Beetles, at the time when I was growing up as a kid, were all a part of the America we know and love. Now we find out that Volkswagen for years has been purposely deceiving the American public—for that matter, their customers around the world—on their diesel cars by deceptively telling them what the mileage is on the cars. And oh, by the way, in the United States, because they were supposedly getting great mileage, there was a tax benefit to the purchasers of those vehicles.

What in the world is happening to the American automobile industry and those foreign manufacturers that are selling automobiles here to take advantage of the American automobile-consuming public? It is an outrage that VW would take advantage of its consumers by purposely deceiving them on their mileage on diesel vehicles.

First there was General Motors. Over 100 people died as a result of a defective ignition switch that General Motors did not tell us about, and in the process just recently—last week—announced a fine of \$900 million. Where are our U.S. regulatory agencies? What is the Obama administration doing about this in its regulatory agencies? Why are they not dropping the hammer on corporations and corporate executives that are purposely deceiving the American people about faulty automobile products that cause the loss of lives and property? It was General Motors. Then it was Takata airbags, which are in a lot of automobiles but especially in Hondas and Toyotas. We know that a number of people have lost their lives, a number of people have been maimed, and they are driving around with an airbag in the middle of the steering wheel—which now there have been millions and millions of recalls—and in the middle of that steering wheel is an explosive grenade because it hasn't been replaced.

Today, Volkswagen admitted, over the course of the last half dozen years, that they have deceived people on their diesel vehicles by deceptively telling them what the gas mileage was. Has the corporate culture in what is an automobile society shrunk so low that we can't be upfront when our products are defective or when we are trying to gain competitive advantage? I lay this

not only on the corporate culture, I lay it at the feet of the U.S. regulatory agencies that ought to be doing their job and ought to be doing it in a forceful way. Then there ought to be some prosecutions, and corporate executives who knew this and have done it ought to be going to jail.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. BOOKER. Mr. President, in the coming days we know that we are going to have an extraordinary visit. This is a historic occasion. We are going to gather both Houses of Congress to hear from Pope Francis. During his time in the United States, Pope Francis has chosen to do something that I think is extraordinary—to visit with the imprisoned.

In his address here, he may or may not discuss the American criminal justice system, but this visit alone, which speaks to something deep within the Catholic faith, deep within the Christian religion, reflected in Matthew 25: "I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me." This step by the Pope, to me, is an extraordinary accomplishment in bringing a further highlight to the challenges we have in the United States with our criminal justice system.

The Pope has predicated his time as Pope on an ideal of mercy. His motto, "miserando atque eligendo," which translates to "to be shown mercy and be chosen," to me is extraordinary. I actually believe the Pope and what he is doing resonates not just in a religious sense with the Christian faith but in the American sense with our shared collective values.

I have taken the time to speak on the Senate floor on numerous occasions about our criminal justice system from many perspectives, but on this occasion, I would like to talk about those moral values which do not divide us as a nation but unite us. Those are values deep within the core of our country, part of our heritage, part of our songs, our pledges, and our words.

We know the criminal justice system as it stands right now has many issues. If it was just analyzed on an economic angle, it would be enough to show how this criminal justice system is out of step with who we are as a people. We know that right now we in America are imprisoning more people than anybody else on the globe. We are the "incarceration nation" when it comes to comparing ourselves with other global nations. We are about 5 percent of the global population but 25 percent of the global prison population. One out of every four people on the planet Earth who are incarcerated are in the United States of America. The cost of that, from a fiscal perspective, is incredible.

We spend over a quarter of a trillion dollars every single year on our criminal justice system, a significant cost to American taxpayers. It is estimated that between 1980 and 2004, we would have had 20 percent less poverty in America if not for mass incarceration. Think about that for a second—the costs of poverty on our productivity. We know that only about 9 percent of children who are poor are going to go to college. There are significant costs associated with poverty, both fiscal and moral. The poverty rate would be 20 percent lower if we had incarceration rates at the same levels as our industrial peers.

At a time that our roads and our bridges are crumbling, as we as a nation have seen ourselves having gone from having the best infrastructure on the globe to now being a nation with an infrastructure that is not even ranked in the top 10 globally, at a time that we have seen investment go down as a percentage of our GDP, one thing we have seen go up is our investment in the prison infrastructure.

We know that between 1990 and 2005, a new prison opened in the United States every 10 days. We have seen our prison population on a Federal level go up over the last 30 years about 800 percent. Looking at this from the fiscal perspective, we know we are digging a hole for ourselves—self-inflicted economic wounds that are just unnecessary for a nation of free people. Take for example a report from the Center for Economic and Policy Research. They concluded that in the year 2008 alone, ex-offender unemployment losses to our economy were the equivalent of 1.5 to 1.7 million workers or \$57 billion to \$65 billion annually. In other words, when our folks come out of prison, as most do, they find it so hard to reintegrate into our economy. They find it hard to start jobs as there are bars to employment, finding it hard to start businesses as there are bars to business licenses. And that loss to our economy is the equivalent of about 1.6 million workers or \$57 billion to \$65 billion annually.

This reality, the fiscal reality alone—before we even talk about our values as a country, before we even talk about our morals—should be enough for us to find greater urgency about the need to reform our criminal justice system, especially because States in America are beginning to show that you can save taxpayer dollars by reducing incarceration levels and empowering people to succeed while simultaneously lowering the crime rate. This alone should be enough to show that we have a broken criminal justice system that violates the ideals of economic prudence and fiscal conservatism. We are digging an economic hole for ourselves.

While the Pope will talk to us with a moral force during his visit, it is also

important to understand that as a moral nation, the values we have put forth into the world are being violated by our criminal justice system as well.

This body has been a body that has spoken with clarity on numerous moral issues—from the Civil Rights Act to the Fair Housing Act—but now we are seeing that we are failing to do what is necessary when it comes to living up to those powerful words of equal justice under the law. It is inscribed on the Supreme Court just hundreds of yards from where I am standing right now.

We now know that there is no difference in drug usage and selling rates between African Americans, Whites, and Latinos. Yet our criminal justice system is incarcerating minorities in this country well disproportionate to their numbers in those drug crimes.

Even at a time when we have had our last three Presidents admit to using drugs—the last two admitted to violating the drug laws—we still have a nation in which we are treating certain people differently.

Take, for example, that we now know that African Americans and Whites have no difference for selling and using drugs, but Blacks are about 3.7 times more likely to be arrested for a marijuana related crime. Take, for example, that African Americans and Whites are arrested for the same crimes, and Blacks are given sentences that are about 20 percent longer than Whites for those similar crimes. African Americans are about 21 percent more likely to receive a mandatory minimum than Whites facing similar charges.

This disproportionate experience under the law has created harrowing results within our Nation. There are more African Americans in jail, prison or under State or Federal supervision today than there were African Americans enslaved in 1850.

Even though African Americans make up 14.7 percent of the population in my State of New Jersey, they make up 61 percent of the total correctional population. One in three African-American men born in 2001 will go to prison during their lifetime. These numbers are astonishing, and in many ways they are being fueled by a criminal justice system that, from arrests to sentencing, is treating African Americans harsher than their White peers. This value of equal justice under the law is not being fulfilled.

Latinos face the same challenges. Native Americans are also grossly over-represented in our criminal justice system, with incarceration rates that are 38 percent higher than the national average. There is no difference in proclivity for drug crimes among people of color, but we have a system that actually punishes those who are of color in different ways. We need to begin, as a Congress and a nation, to find ways to have drug laws that make sense. The explosion of incarcerations in this

country was fueled by the war on drugs, and we know that certain communities are facing the harsh impact of that enforcement in ways that other communities are not.

We need to reform our harsh mandatory minimum policies. For too long we have taken away judicial discretion and tied the hands of sentencing experts who can and should weigh other factors when it comes to making sentencing decisions. We need to now avoid what Congress intended—giving these harsh sentences to people who are not drug kingpins or large players but often low-level offenders.

This idea of equal opportunity as well is something that is of value and is deep within our system. Unfortunately, the trends we see in our criminal justice system aren't limited to adults and the treatment under the law, but they are also showing that our kids as well do not always face equal pathways to opportunity. Today we know that the number of children who are born to people who are incarcerated or have an incarcerated parent is growing astonishingly. Right now, 1 in 28 children is growing up with a parent in prison, and 1 in 9 African-American kids, as a result of this mass incarceration disproportionately hitting minority communities, is growing up with a parent behind bars. These kids often struggle more in school, have families who are often poorer, and have limited opportunities of success.

Over half of imprisoned parents were the primary earners for their children prior to their incarceration, and a child with an incarcerated father is more likely to be suspended from school than a peer without an incarcerated father—23 percent compared to 4 percent. These are serious gulfs in opportunity being created by a broken criminal justice system. The gulfs of opportunity between young people based on race start young and actually only grow with time.

For too many children, zero-tolerance discipline policies in schools across America serve as a gateway into the criminal justice system and a lifetime of devastating collateral consequences. And just as in the American criminal justice system, too many young people of color in America are falling into the trap of that school-to-prison pipeline.

According to the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Civil Rights in March 2014, Black students were suspended at a rate three times greater than White students. On average, 5 percent of White students are suspended compared to 16 percent of Black students. Students who have been suspended or expelled as a part of their school's disciplinary policy are 3 times as likely to become involved in the juvenile justice system within the next year. There is evidence showing that kids of different races face the harshness of those policies in different ways.

In other words, minority students are often treated harshly while others see leniency. We need to begin to enact commonsense policies that provide for equal opportunity—those commonsense policies that don't lead to suspension or involvement with police officers when in the past the infraction typically would have been dealt with the school internally. We need to find a system where a child's one mistake does not become a lifetime sentence, where children are empowered to succeed and not fear a retribution that destabilizes their lives.

We also know that it is important that we begin to think: Are we a nation of second chances? Are we a nation where words such as redemption and mercy have meaning? Are we a nation that can live up to these ideals where just because you fall down and stumble and make a mistake, you cannot be someone who can still stand up again and make your way?

We know that every single year approximately 600,000 Americans finish their prison sentences after paying their debt to society and reenter their communities. They often find themselves unable to work, to vote, to get back to school or to get a loan. The collateral consequences are extraordinary.

The American Bar Association has identified over 46,000 collateral consequences that impact people with criminal records. About 60 to 70 percent of them are employment-related. In other words, even though we are saying to people who have paid their debt that they now need to get back to work, we are actually putting up bars which prevent them from doing so. They are finding it hard to get a job, get a business license, get a loan, or get a Pell grant, and if they fall and stumble, they often find it hard to even get food stamps or get the social safety net that often keeps people from abject desperation. These realities place too many roadblocks in the way of people coming home.

During Pope Francis's visits to prisons, he is said to have asked himself: Why did God allow that I should not be here? But for the grace of God.

In advance of his visit, I believe we should be asking ourselves: What do these ideals of mercy and redemption mean to us—this idea that when we see people who are broken by society, we should understand that we should be investing in their success? It actually not only makes moral sense to do so, but it makes sense to do so because we will reap the economic benefit.

If you take, for example, Americans who are suffering from addiction, we now know that \$1 invested in people with addiction to get treatment produces a benefit in reducing interactions with the police and incarceration by \$4 to \$7. Yet the overwhelming majority of people with drug addictions do not

get treatment. Not only is that fiscally unsound, but that makes no sense in the ideals of our morals as a nation, that we should help people who are broken by disease.

This is the point we have come to as a nation, where we know that doing the morally right thing actually helps to save the dollars of our taxpayers so that we can keep that in our own pockets or invest them in areas that we so desperately need.

Take, for example, a simple thing that companies around this country, such as Bed Bath & Beyond and Starbucks, are doing but we don't do in the Federal Government—this commonsense idea that those who have paid their debt will be given a level playing field and a fair shot to get a job to prove that they are worthy of work. Some people call this Ban the Box, something that 18 States have done. But here in the Federal Government, we still make people—right at the point of application—check the box and say that they have been formally incarcerated, which means, for many Americans, that it gives them 50 to 60 percent less chance of even getting an interview or getting an opportunity to demonstrate their worth and make their case.

We know that simple things such as moving that time of disclosure of a previous criminal conviction to later in the process could elevate the chances of getting more people to work. And when they get to work, they begin to be there for their families, their kids, our economy, and they become productive, as opposed to what we have now, which over time is a recidivism rate—the rate at which people go back to prison—that is upwards of 75 percent, costing us again billions of dollars as taxpayers.

This system is broken. It makes no economic sense, but more importantly, it violates our ideals as a nation of equal justice under the law, the ideal of having a second chance in our country, and the ideal of equal opportunity for all.

We must now embrace the urgency of the moment. To have a wasteful system that is broken, that further harms and injures people with illnesses—whether it be mental health disorder or an addiction—that aggravates them with practices such as putting children in solitary confinement—all of these things violate our principals as a nation, and it is time for us to join together and embrace change.

I feel honored that right now in this country there is an emerging bipartisan and nonpartisan coalition around criminal justice reform. We see people from all across the political perspective approaching it from different perspectives—from Christian Evangelicals to fiscal conservatives to civil libertarians to civil rights activists—all beginning to say the system is morally

bankrupt. It is bankrupting States and our Nation. It is a violation of who we are as a country, and it just makes no sense.

It was James Baldwin who once said:

There is never time in the future in which we will work out our salvation. The challenge is in the moment; the time is always now.

With this visit from the Pope and his further spotlighting our criminal justice system, let us find that moral urgency in our Nation. Let us find the grit that we have shown in the past for overcoming injustice. Let us join together and begin with even more urgency to do the hard work of correcting the ills within our criminal justice system, of fixing what is broken, and making right in America that which we hold so dear—that we are a nation indeed with liberty and justice for all.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I know my friend, the distinguished Senator from Vermont, has been waiting, and so I will be very quick with the statement that I am going to give.

REMEMBERING JIM SANTINI

Mr. President, today Nevada lost a historic figure. This morning former U.S. Congressman Jim Santini of Nevada passed away. He was a remarkably good person—a tremendous person who understood Nevada so well.

He was a native Nevadan, born in Reno. He came from a real heritage that caused him to love his State of Nevada. His grandfather, Walter E. Clark, was the longest serving president at the University of Nevada. His uncle is a famous writer—a really celebrated author—Walter Van Tillburg Clark. It has been a long time, but what a great writer. His most famous work was "The Ox-Bow Incident." I read it again a few years ago. It was made into a movie, which I watched again. It was considered by most to be the most—actually, the first modern Western novel.

So Jim Santini breathed what Nevada was all about. He knew the State extremely well. He graduated from the University of Nevada—the same school where his grandfather was the president. He became close friends with former Senator Richard Bryan of Nevada, a two-term Governor and a striking figure in his own right. They were inseparable friends. They were in college together. They went to the same law school—Hastings Law School in San Francisco.

Jim graduated from law school in 1962. He immediately decided he would serve his country, and for 3 years he served in the U.S. Army. His service to his State and country spans many decades.

His good friend Richard Bryan convinced him that he should move from

Reno. The growth in the State was in the southern part of the State, the Las Vegas area. Jim—in some respects reluctantly—moved from his roots to southern Nevada, where he excelled. He worked as a deputy district attorney. After the first public defender in the State of Nevada decided to run for public office, he was replaced—that is Richard Bryan, the first public defender in Clark County—he was replaced with his good friend Jim Santini, who became a public defender.

It was a short time thereafter that he was elected justice of the peace of Las Vegas. During this period of time, the role of the justice of the peace changed. It became more of a judicial officer rather than someone who became fabulously wealthy by marrying hundreds and hundreds of people. That is the way it used to be. He did a very good job as justice of the peace. He was so impressive that the Governor of the State of Nevada, Mike O'Callaghan, appointed him to serve as a Nevada district court judge representing Clark County.

In 1972 Jim ran for Nevada's at-large congressional seat. From 1864, when Nevada became a State, until 1982, Nevada only had one Congressman, one Member of Congress, and it was an at-large seat. And when Jim ran for that in 1972, he ran against Republican incumbent David Towell, who just 2 years before was in a race with Congressman Walter S. Baring, who served in Congress for some 22 years representing Nevada's at-large congressional seat and who was defeated in the primary. But David Towell came from nowhere and beat the Democrat in that case. Santini came right back, and David Towell was a one-term Congressman.

Jim represented the State of Nevada in Congress very honorably for four terms. He was well respected, well regarded, and very popular in the State of Nevada. However, in 1982 Jim decided to run for the Senate, and he was not successful. In 1986 he ran for the Senate again. I was his opponent. It was a relatively close race, but when that race was over, it was over. I knew Jim before he and I became opponents. We worked together on many different projects. We never had a cross word. To this day we never had a cross word.

Jim became a counsel—a lawyer—and a lobbyist for America's tourism and travel industry. He worked to bring tourists to the United States and to the State of Nevada, and he did it very admirably and very well.

Jim Santini had a wonderful wife, Ann Santini. She has quite a career in her own right. She is the director of international affairs for the LDS Church here in Washington, DC. They have four children: Lisa, Lori, Mark, and J.D. They have 11 grandchildren.

Before leaving Jim Santini, we have to speak about his uniqueness. Here is

a man who had—there may be someone who has a better arrowhead collection than Jim Santini; I just don't know who it would be. He spent many decades—a lot of the time in Nevada but around the country—collecting arrowheads. He had a great collection of arrowheads. He also collected Indian baskets, and in Nevada we had probably the most famous basket weaver in the history of the country, a woman by the name of Dat So La Lee. She is really a very famous woman. Many of her baskets are worth over \$1 million. She made baskets this big—woven, of course, by hand—and baskets this large. Jim collected baskets. I don't know how many he wound up having of Dat So La Lee's, but I am sure he had some.

It is with a great deal of sadness that I report to my friends in Nevada and the friends Jim had here in Washington that Jim passed away this morning. I said that earlier. I will miss him. He and I exchanged letters right after the first of the year, right after I got hurt, injured my eye. He always was a kind, gracious man, and I will miss him very much, as will everyone in Nevada and his friends here in Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont.

PAPAL VISIT

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I am delighted that Pope Francis will be addressing a joint session of Congress on Thursday.

The Pope has played, in my view, an extraordinary role since he assumed his position in speaking out with courage and brilliance about some of the most important issues facing our world. From the moment he was elected, he immediately let it be known that he would be a different kind of Pope, a different kind of religious leader. In choosing his Papal name—Francis—he said:

Francis of Assisi. For me, he is the man of poverty, the man of peace, the man who loves and protects creation.

What I want to do in a short period of time is read some of the very profound and important statements Pope Francis has made over the last several years. They are incisive, they are courageous, and they speak to a world in trouble that needs the kind of leadership that he is providing.

Let me quote from a number of the statements he has made.

Quote:

While the income of a minority is increasing exponentially, that of the majority is crumbling. This imbalance results from ideologies which uphold the absolute autonomy of markets and financial speculation, and thus deny the right of control to States, which are themselves charged with providing for the common good.

Obviously, he is not talking about the United States; he is talking about the global economy. But certainly in our country, when he talks about the

income of the minority increasing exponentially and that of the majority crumbling, he is, of course, right. We have right now in our country the top one-tenth of 1 percent owning almost as much wealth as the bottom 90 percent. We have about 58 percent of all new income being created now going to the top 1 percent. In the last several years, we have seen the 14 wealthiest people in America increase their wealth by \$156 billion, and that increase in wealth is more wealth than is owned by the bottom 40 percent of the American people.

As the Pope points out, this is not by any means just an American issue; this is a global issue. We are moving toward a period where very shortly the top 1 percent of the people on the planet will own more wealth than the bottom 99 percent. To me, that is immoral, that is wrong, that is unsustainable, and I am glad the Pope has raised that issue.

He talks about another issue which is even more profound. It is one thing to talk about income and wealth inequality, and it is another thing to talk about poverty.

Here, he says:

We have created new idols. The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money and the dictatorship of an economy which is faceless and lacking any truly humane goal.

“The worship of the golden calf of old has found a new and heartless image in the cult of money.” What does that mean? Well, I take it to mean that we are living in a society which turns its back on people who work hard, decent people, people who are good parents, but yet we worship those people who for whatever reason—sometimes honestly and with creativity, sometimes dishonestly and illegally—have become millionaires and billionaires. Those are the people we worship. The more money they make, the more they get worshipped. I think the Pope is right in saying that is not something we should be doing.

In another statement, which is certainly relevant for a lot of the discussions we have here on the floor of the Senate, he said:

In this context, some people continue to defend trickle-down theories which assume that economic growth, encouraged by a free market, will inevitably succeed in bringing about greater justice and inclusiveness in the world. This opinion, which has never been confirmed by the facts, expresses a crude and naive trust in the goodness of those wielding economic power and in the sacralized workings of the prevailing economic system.

What is he talking about? He is talking about a lot of what has gone on here in this country for many decades. There is a theory, which the Pope is right in saying has never been confirmed by the facts—quite the contrary—that if we give huge tax breaks to billionaires and large corporations, somehow that money will trickle down

to the middle class and working class. Well, that theory has not proved to be true. Under trickle-down economics, the rich get richer and virtually everybody else gets poorer. I think the Pope is quite right in making that point.

Let me again quote the Pope. This is what he said:

Man is not in charge today, money is in charge. Money rules.

Money rules. Well, 5 years ago the U.S. Supreme Court by a 5-to-4 decision passed the disastrous Citizens United decision which basically said to the wealthiest people in this country: You already own much of the economy; now we are going to give you the opportunity to buy the United States Government. And that is exactly what they are now attempting to do. Money rules. You have one family—the Koch brothers—who will spend \$900 million in this election cycle to elect candidates who will protect the wealthy and powerful. That is more money than will be spent by either the Democratic or Republican Party. When one family is spending more money than either of the two major political parties, I think it is an example of what the Pope is talking about when he says “money rules.”

Money does rule, and that is why, in my view, we have to overturn Citizens United and move to the public funding of elections—so the wealthy and the powerful will not be able to buy elections.

He also said something very interesting about the media. This is what he said:

These things become the norm: that some homeless people die of cold on the streets is not news. In contrast, a ten point drop on the stock markets of some cities is a tragedy.

Well, what is news? Is he right? We talk about the stock market going up, the stock market going up. It is big news. The 45 million Americans living in poverty—I don't hear much discussion about that. There are thousands of people dying every single year because they don't have health insurance and can't get to a doctor when they need to. That ain't big news—not big news at all. I think it is an interesting point about what constitutes news, and I think the Pope makes a very good point in that regard.

Let me give another quote:

It is a well-known fact that current levels of production are sufficient, yet millions of people are still suffering and dying of starvation. This, dear friends, is truly scandalous.

I think what the Pope is talking about is that in a world where we have enormous productive capability—industrial, agricultural—we have a situation where children die of diseases that are preventable all over the world, where people go hungry all over the world. Yet, as he says, our current levels of production are sufficient. We are producing enough to feed the hungry, to clothe the naked, to provide what

people need, and yet we have an economy which works day after day to make billionaires richer and turns its back on desperate people all over the world.

Let me end with this quote:

Today everything comes under the laws of competition and the survival of the fittest, where the powerful feed upon the powerless. As a consequence, masses of people find themselves excluded and marginalized: without work, without possibilities, without any means of escape.

That is certainly true in the United States. It is certainly truer all over the world. We are living in a world of the survival of the fittest. If you are poor, if you are unemployed, if you are hungry, government turns its back on you. But if you are rich, if you are powerful, if you can make campaign contributions of hundreds of millions of dollars, we love you, we welcome you, and we need you more and more.

I think during this week where we welcome the Pope to Washington, DC, I would hope that some of my colleagues would examine the very profound lessons he is teaching people all over this world.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi.

(The remarks of Mr. WICKER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2067 are printed in today's RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARASSO). The Senator from New Hampshire.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I rise to speak about a very important issue. It is a fundamental constitutional issue for this body and part of our duty in the Senate and the Congress; that is, to ensure next week the funding for the government which expires at the end of the month. With only 1 week until the current government funding runs out, it is our responsibility to work together to make sure that the government keeps running, that we do not disrupt people's lives, that we do not end up spending more money because we shut the government down to reopen it, and that we provide certainty with all of the challenges we face at home and, of course, the threats we face abroad.

An issue has come up that is a very important issue, and that is an organization called Planned Parenthood and holding Planned Parenthood accountable in the wake of deeply disturbing videos that discuss the appalling practice of harvesting the organs and body parts of unborn babies.

Like Americans across all political spectrums, I was just sick—sick to see the contents of recent videos that have been disclosed that show a callous disregard by officials at Planned Parenthood for the dignity of human life.

These videos have shocked the conscience of people across our country because this organization does receive taxpayer funding. I understand why we have had an important debate in this body about redirecting this funding because of Planned Parenthood's actions and fully investigating what was revealed in these disturbing videos that show the practice of the harvesting of organs and body parts of unborn babies.

So I support the efforts of the Judiciary Committee to investigate these disturbing videos. I also do not believe it is appropriate that taxpayer funds should be used to fund a private organization that performs hundreds of thousands of abortions each year and that engages in the horrific practices that were shown in these videos.

That is why last month I joined a bipartisan majority of Senators in voting to redirect Federal funding from Planned Parenthood to community health centers that provide women's health services, including mammograms, cancer screenings, and contraceptives. In New Hampshire there are more than 30 community health centers, compared to 5 Planned Parenthood clinics.

But when we had this debate and vote on the Senate floor, we received only 53 votes in favor of redirecting this money from Planned Parenthood to community health centers which provide women's health services, falling well short of the 60-vote threshold required to advance this legislation in the Senate. Yet despite already having had a vote on this, which failed the 60-vote threshold in the Senate, there are some that are pushing to attach this issue to the funding of the government, even though when we had the vote here, we did not have the votes to get it passed in the Senate, and even though the President himself has explicitly said he would veto any bill that prohibits funding for Planned Parenthood or redirects that funding to community health centers.

In fact, the President is so dug in on funding for Planned Parenthood that he is prepared to let the government shut down over it. And those who are pushing the strategy, saying we should go forward with it anyway—they have not explained how we would obtain 67 votes in the Senate.

When we had the vote on it, we only got 53, not even enough to advance the legislation in the Senate, which requires 60. The President certainly knows that we do not have 67 votes in the Senate to override his veto. Nevertheless, those who are pushing the strategy to attach this to the government funding bill—this issue of redirecting the funding—also know that there are not 60 votes in the Senate, never mind 67 to override a Presidential veto. So the result is that if we passed the bill, even if we could get the 60 votes, the President is sure to veto

it, and the 67 votes are not there to override his veto.

In the end, we are heading for an imminent government shutdown if this is not resolved. Everyone who looks at this issue knows the reality of where the votes lie. In fact, those on my side of the aisle who have been pushing the strategy of pass the bill, send it to the President for his veto, I have asked them the question: Let's assume we get the 60 votes to do that; first of all, how do we get those 60 votes? I have not received an answer to that question. Then I have asked the next question: Even if we could get those 60 votes to pass it out of the Senate and to send this to the President's desk with a government funding bill that redirects the money to Planned Parenthood over his opposition and he vetoes it, where do the 67 votes come from? I have not received an answer to that.

So I am here on the floor today to say: I am tired of the political games. I am tired of the President's game on this, that he is so dug in on this issue that he would be willing to let the government shut down. I am tired of the people on my side of the aisle who are pushing this strategy even though they know they do not have the votes to have it pass the Senate, and they certainly don't have the votes to override a Presidential veto, so, therefore, they cannot answer the question: What is the end game for success here, even if you feel as passionately about these issues as we all do?

So here we are again with the political posturing on both sides. I don't want to play this game anymore. I think it is too important that we not relive the movie of where we were in 2013 when the government shut down because I asked the very same question then, when the issue was defunding ObamaCare. I asked the question: How does this end? How does it end successfully to defund ObamaCare? How does it end without shutting down the government? I never received an answer then, and I have not received an answer now from those who are pushing this strategy.

We saw the movie in 2013. I do not think we should relive that movie. Let's remember what happened. When you shut the government down and you reopen it, it actually costs us more money. So if you care about the fiscal state of the country, let's not waste money shutting down the government with no results. You think about the economy and the disruption in people's lives. I remember my constituents calling me on the phone, because I was answering my phones. I remember people who saved for years for a family vacation to our national parks and could not participate in that family vacation and lost the money they had sunk into it for years in their savings for their big family vacation because people were pushing to keep the government

shut down, even though they had no strategy for achieving a result on it.

I remember the uncertainty and the hardship for working families and our military. Even though we keep our national security piece open during a government shutdown, there is so much uncertainty about whom that covers and whom it doesn't. When we look at the threats we are facing around the world right now, we do not need uncertainty when it comes to those who keep us safe at home on the law enforcement end, on our intel, on our military, and all the civilian workforce that supports them and makes sure they can do their job every single day.

The bottom line is, in 2013 we did not get a result, the funding for ObamaCare continued, the government was shut down, it cost us more money and disruption. We never got an answer then for how that would end successfully. Here we find ourselves again, the same group of people pushing the same strategy on the Planned Parenthood issue, saying we should shut the government down again, even though they cannot answer the question: How do we get to 60 votes? How do we get to 67 votes so that you can actually achieve a result here? I think the answer is that they don't know the answer, because we all know where the votes are. It is not going to happen.

So I am here on the floor because I feel strongly. I agree with the National Right to Life on this. In a recent op-ed, the National Right to Life rightly points out that pursuing this shutdown strategy could actually undermine efforts to hold Planned Parenthood accountable, primarily by shifting public attention in the political blame game that would result inevitably from the shutdown. The National Right to Life also cited a study by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service, which found that the majority of Federal funds flowing to Planned Parenthood would not even be temporarily interrupted if the government shut down because the funds flow from mandatory spending programs like Medicaid rather than the congressional funding process, which is the discretionary spending piece impacted by what we will vote on regarding the continuing resolution.

Again, this was the same issue that actually came up in 2013 when it came to the tactics of trying to defund ObamaCare without a strategy for success. Right now we are playing a game of chicken. It is a dangerous game. We already know as we stand here where the votes are and what it takes to keep the government open. Yet, as I understand it, we are going to be taking another vote on Thursday so we can show the proponents of those who are again seeking to attach the Planned Parenthood redirecting-of-funding issue to the government funding bill that, guess what, we already know the answer to

this. We don't have the votes. We are not going to get to 60 in the Senate, never mind the 67 it would take to override a Presidential veto.

So we all know what it is going to take to keep the government open. I think we should have that vote now, instead of continuing to have the political show votes that show the people where we know the votes already are on this issue. That means a clean funding bill now, so that we are not wasting time, so that we are not bringing ourselves closer to the brink of a shutdown.

So in good conscience, while I fully support redirecting the money from Planned Parenthood to community health centers who serve women, I cannot in good conscience participate again in this process, one that would ensure we come closer to the brink of a shutdown, when I have not heard a strategy for success.

I think the American people are owed an answer to the question: What is your strategy of success if you are threatening to shut down the government? I would ask the same of President Obama: If this is such an important issue to you that you are willing also to participate in this exercise of threatening a shutdown, is it that important to you given that the money can be redirected to community health centers that provide services to women?

That said, it is time to quit the games on both sides of the aisle. I came here to solve problems. That means we need to address this issue now. We should have the vote on the clean funding bill now. We should make sure we keep the government running, given the challenges we are facing at home and abroad, so that we do not have shutdown 2 and relive the movie we saw in 2013, and that was not a good one for the country.

I hope we will take the vote right now instead of continuing to play political games on both sides of the aisle while the clock ticks down. This is a very important issue for our country, and I am prepared right now to vote for a bill that will keep the government funded.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. AYOTTE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

OIL EXPORT BAN

Mr. BARRASSO. Madam President, last week a bipartisan majority of Senators—Members of this body—voted to try to stop President Obama's dangerous and desperate deal with Iran—that is right, dangerous and desperate.

The President wants to give Iran relief from the economic sanctions the world imposed. I believe President Obama traded away these sanctions too readily and he got too little in return. These sanctions included limits on the sale of Iranian oil. According to one estimate, Iran could soon begin to export as many as 1 million additional barrels of oil each and every day. I know the money Iran makes from these sales will go to shoring up its economy, and it will go to building up Iran's military. Some of it will undoubtedly go to supporting global terrorists. That is what President Obama traded away. Iran will be allowed to sell its oil anywhere in the world, yet American oil producers are largely prohibited from selling American oil anywhere in the world. Apparently, that is exactly the way the White House wants to keep things.

There is legislation working its way through Congress right now to lift the ban on American crude oil exports. The Obama administration has said it doesn't support the bill. There is bipartisan support of the bill but not this White House—oh no. They think Congress shouldn't even get to decide. They think it should be up to Washington bureaucrats in the Obama administration to make the decisions. The administration thinks they are the only ones who should be allowed to decide whether the oil export ban gets lifted.

It was the Obama administration that let Iran off the hook by signing such a terrible deal. It is the Obama administration that now wants to lift the sanctions and give Iran access to more than \$100 billion. Should the Obama administration be the one to decide whether Iran gets to sell its oil without American competition? Is that what the President wants? Why is the Obama administration so interested in making sure Iran's economy gets back on its feet faster?

The President ought to be focused on helping America's economy, not Iran's economy. Right now American producers export about 500,000 barrels of oil a day. Where does it go? It goes to Canada. Iran is exporting about 1 million barrels a day. But once President Obama lifts the sanctions, that number is going to jump to almost 2 million barrels a day—2 million barrels a day. So President Obama favors a situation where Iran will be allowed to export four times as much oil as America does—four times as much. That is what the President is in favor of. And Senate Democrats who voted to help the President lift the sanctions want the same thing. That is what they say, 4 to 1—Iran over the United States.

Republicans want something very different. If the export ban is lifted, U.S. energy producers could export another 1.6 million barrels a day. Our daily oil exports would jump from half

a million barrels to about 2 million barrels. That is what we want, to lift the sanctions. At the same time, Republicans voted to keep the sanctions in place against Iran. So under Republican plans, America would be exporting twice as much oil as Iran.

The Democrats vote four for Iran, one for the United States, and Republicans voted two for the United States, one for Iran. That is the difference between what Washington Democrats want and what Senate Republicans want.

The Brookings Institution looked at this in September of 2014. They came out with a report. They looked at a variety of different scenarios for how much oil America might export. They found that for every scenario they looked at, "there are positive gains for U.S. households," with the United States being able to export more crude oil. The Government Accountability Office said the same thing last year. It said that "removing export restrictions is expected to increase the size of the economy"—that is the U.S. economy—"with implications for employment, investment, public revenue and trade."

Those are key for America.

These studies and others predict that adding American crude oil to global supplies could ultimately reduce gasoline prices right here at home. By how much, you ask? Well, one study estimated it would save American consumers a combined average of almost \$6 billion per year. This study found the savings would help increase the U.S. economy by about \$38 billion by 2020. New oil exports could support an additional 300,000 jobs by 2020.

These are huge benefits for the American economy, for American families—all because we free up American energy and we allow it to compete in the world's markets.

There would also be benefits for America's foreign policy. More oil would reduce prices worldwide. That means the other countries that export a lot of oil won't be able to make as much money off of their own oil sales. They would have to compete with us. This includes Iran. It includes countries such as Russia and Venezuela that use the wealth from their energy sales to pilot their own economies and not for the good.

New oil exports would undercut the ability of those countries to do things that are not in America's best interest. It would also help American allies around the world. Poland gets 96 percent of its oil from Russia. When they are negotiating to buy more oil, they would love—love—the opportunity and the option of American oil as an alternative. Belgium gets 60 percent of its oil from Russia and Saudi Arabia. Japan gets 75 percent of its oil from Russia and the Middle East. All of these countries and many more around the world could benefit from U.S. oil being sold on the world market.

Of course, another country that would really be helped is Israel. President Obama's reckless deal with Iran has put Israel in a much more dangerous situation. Even the White House seems to recognize this. The Obama administration says that it plans to offer Israel more military aid—aid to be used to bolster Israel's defenses against Iran. But the administration should not stop at military aid; it should also offer Israel the opportunity to import American oil. Israel has trouble buying oil from many of its neighboring countries because they do not recognize the State of Israel. That leaves places such as Russia and Iraqi Kurdistan as its largest suppliers of crude oil.

If the Israelis had the opportunity to buy from American oil producers instead, that would be a big help in making sure their oil supply is stable and secure. It would also help repair some of the significant damage the President's Iran deal did to the relations between our two countries.

This should be an easy call. Ending the ban on U.S. oil exports would be good for American families, good for our national security, and good for our allies. The Obama administration should change course now. The Obama administration should work with Congress to end this ban on American energy exports as quickly as possible.

This past Saturday marked 7 years since a Canadian company filed its application to build the Keystone KL Pipeline—7 years. It has been buried in the bureaucratic limbo of the State Department ever since. That pipeline would provide American jobs just as more oil exports would. Americans should not have to wait another 7 years for Washington to lift the oil export ban and unleash the power of American energy.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

CLIMATE CHANGE AND NONPROFIT ENERGY EFFICIENCY

Ms. KLOBUCHAR. Madam President, I rise today to talk about a critical issue that I think the Pope's arrival today in Washington really highlights, and I am hopeful we will be addressing it in this Chamber.

I wanted to join Senator WHITEHOUSE yesterday. He has been an unwavering voice on the need for Congress to take legislative action to address climate change. He hit a milestone in May of this year by giving his 100th speech on the floor calling on his colleagues to act on climate change. He has also brought together a group of Senators to form a climate action task force, and I am proud to be a member of the group.

I believe we need a strong energy agenda for America, one that recognizes the challenges of climate change and that empowers people to be part of the solution.

The Pope has called climate change “one of the principal challenges facing humanity in our day.” He has gained international attention for his commitment to protecting our world and serving those in need. Thursday, when we have the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to hear from the Pope as he addresses Congress, I anticipate he will call on all Americans to come together to tackle many challenges, but among them is climate change.

During my time in the Senate, we have made some progress on this issue. In 2008 we took action to raise gas mileage standards for cars for the first time in decades. We have also made energy efficiency improvements for consumer goods and have maintained tax credits for energy-efficient products and renewable sources. We passed farm bills in 2008 and again in 2014 with a large number of conservation, environment, and energy groups strongly supporting them. As a member of the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry, I have ensured that the energy title promoted investment in the next generation of biofuels crops, which are important renewable sources of energy. Earlier this year, we passed the Energy Efficiency Improvement Act of 2015, bipartisan legislation sponsored by Senators PORTMAN and SHAHEEN. It included the Water Heater Efficiency Act, which I worked on with Senator HOEVEN. This bipartisan measure enabled rural electric co-ops to optimize their energy management through continued use of energy-efficient water heaters. It also included measures to encourage energy efficiency practices in office spaces. These achievements are thanks to a combination of many factors. It continues to be the case that we need bipartisanship to move sound energy policy forward. And while we have taken some action, there is so much more to be done.

This summer, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee passed a bipartisan, comprehensive energy bill. I commend Chairwoman MURKOWSKI for her tireless efforts and Senator CANTWELL for her introduction today of the Energy bill—a bill I am a sponsor of—which sets a bar on comprehensive energy policy reform that would aggressively move our country forward in addressing climate change. Both of these pieces of legislation include the bill I have with Senator HOEVEN, the Nonprofit Energy Efficiency Act, which would allow the nonprofit community to save energy and money through a retrofit program.

During my time in the Senate, I have worked to find innovative solutions that move us forward. One example is this bill. Our bill empowers the nonprofit and faith communities to make energy efficiency improvements. It would help both our environment and our local communities by ensuring nonprofit organizations can benefit

from policies that promote greater energy savings and efficiencies.

Whether feeding the hungry, helping the sick, or mentoring youth, my State’s nearly 7,000 nonprofit organizations work hard every day to make a difference in people’s lives. Nonprofit organizations are at the heart of our country and serve millions of Americans every day. Houses of worship, hospitals, schools, youth centers, and other not-for-profit entities provide critical services and assistance to communities across the country, but like businesses they must count their pennies and operate on a budget. Right now, nonprofit organizations—which, by the way, are often in very old buildings, including churches, synagogues, mosques—cannot benefit from any of the energy efficiency programs available to regular businesses because these programs are provided in the form of tax credits, and because nonprofits are tax exempt they can’t get these credits. That often leaves nonprofits with a difficult choice. They can either invest in energy efficiency projects or they can dedicate their very scarce resources to providing valuable resources to the community, but we know investing in energy efficiency improvements today can lead to savings over time that go beyond the cost of the initial investment. So our nonprofits find themselves asking this question: Should we help fewer people for a year or two in order to replace our heating system and then use the long-term savings to serve our community well into the future? That is not a choice they should have to make.

Our bill provides \$10 million each year for the next 5 years to create a pilot program at the U.S. Department of Energy that would help local nonprofit organizations make their buildings more energy efficient. The grants would promote energy efficiency in savings by helping to upgrade and retrofit old buildings as well as installing renewable energy generators and heaters. We worked to ensure that the grants will achieve a significant amount of energy savings and are done in a cost-effective manner. The grants would require a 50-percent match so that there is complete buy-in from nonprofits. This will be especially valuable to the many nonprofit organizations that work from older, less energy-efficient buildings.

We are taking a fiscally responsible approach. Our amendment is fully offset. We have support from both sides of the aisle with not just Senator HOEVEN and myself but Senators STABENOW, RISCH, SCHATZ, BLUNT, MIKULSKI, WHITEHOUSE, and UDALL. I am proud to say we have the support of many religious organizations and nonprofits, including the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops that has been a leading supporter of our efforts. They say the bill would enable them to reduce their op-

erating costs, lessen impact on their environment, and bolster America’s energy independence.

The bill is now part of both the Energy Policy Modernization Act that recently passed in a bipartisan manner out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, and it is also part of the bill Senator CANTWELL introduced this morning. Although Senators may differ on the specific details of these two energy plans, I believe we can find broad agreement that energy efficiency must be a part of any energy plan. Energy efficiency is an issue we should be able to find common ground on. It is good for the economy, good for consumers, and good for the environment.

I urge my fellow Senators to work together to keep taking real steps forward on meaningful energy legislation that does something about climate change.

As we prepare to welcome Pope Francis to this Congress, it is time to pass legislation that will help nonprofits continue to serve our communities and conserve our natural resources for generations to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mrs. FISCHER. Madam President, I rise to reiterate the importance of providing necessary resources to our men and women in uniform.

We are rapidly approaching the end of the fiscal year, and there are many major issues awaiting thoughtful consideration and action by Congress. There is one item on our to-do list that should have already been checked off; that is, fully funding our national security. That is why I am very disappointed that once again efforts to advance the Department of Defense Appropriations Act were halted today by my friends on the other side of the aisle.

Congress’s first priority is, and should be, the defense of our Nation. We should not be hindered by political games in meeting that core duty that we have. The world is a dangerous place. It is not getting any safer. We cannot afford to be complacent about these threats. Our Nation faces challenges from nation states and asymmetric threats. These threats span the globe.

In Asia, Chinese behavior in the South China Sea threatens the longstanding freedom of navigation and our ability to operate on the high seas. Continuing China’s pattern of increasing antagonism, a senior Chinese admiral recently declared that the entire South China Sea belongs to China. China’s increasing military power, bullying of its neighbors, expansionist policies, and rejection of international norms threatens to upend the stability of that region. Simply put, China’s behavior has dramatic consequences for

the interests of the United States and our allies. The Asia-Pacific region will continue to grow in importance to the global economy. The ability of our military to operate freely in the Pacific is a key component to our national defense strategy and our economic security. We must vote to provide the necessary resources to address this challenge.

Additionally, the violence in Syria and Iraq continues to grow. This instability has created a vacuum in which terrorist groups like ISIL continue to operate. Its actions threaten the security of the United States and its allies in the region as well as basic human rights and religious freedom.

These challenges are far from the only threats that are facing our Nation. We still have thousands of servicemembers deployed in Afghanistan. What is more, regional conflicts in Yemen and Libya jeopardize U.S. interests. The same is true of the growing number of terrorist groups from the Sinai Peninsula to West Africa.

Congress must ensure that our Nation's military has the necessary resources to protect the United States and to meet our commitments to our allies. As the character of these threats changes between the conventional, the unconventional, and the unknown, failure to appropriate defense resources is a threat in itself to our defense strategy.

As a Member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I have heard our Nation's highest military officers repeatedly testify on a wide array of threats to our national security. For example, in his testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee on July 29, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter highlighted the threat that is posed by Iran. Beyond its nuclear program, Iran's support for proxies like Hezbollah and the Assad regime, its hostility toward our ally Israel, and its contribution to the ongoing violence in Yemen—they all present very serious threats to the interests of the United States.

Additionally, referring to the nuclear deal President Obama has signed with Iran, Secretary Carter said the deal places “no limitations on what the Department of Defense can and will do to pursue our defense strategy in the region”—“no limitations on what the Department of Defense can and will do.”

For the Department of Defense to operate robustly and swiftly and without limitation requires funding of its people, programs, equipment, supplies, and research and development. Yet with an array of dangers facing our Nation, the Commander in Chief of our military has stated he will veto defense spending unless it is accompanied by an increase in nondefense spending.

To be clear, this appropriations bill would provide the President with the funding he asked for in his budget re-

quest. A strong bipartisan majority in this body has already voted that we must provide our military men and women with the resources they need to protect this country. In June of this year, the Senate voted 71 to 25 and said we must authorize spending at a level similar to what is contained in the Defense appropriations bill, but when it comes to actually appropriating the necessary resources by stepping up and voting to supply our military servicemembers with the resources they need to accomplish the missions they are given, the minority party objects because they contend that nondefense spending is insufficient.

I fundamentally disagree with this view. All government spending is not created equal. Resources that support our soldiers should not be held up for any reason—least of all in an attempt to increase spending on various objectives that are championed by the EPA or the IRS.

For the first time in 6 years, the Senate Appropriations Committee has sent all 12 appropriations bills to the floor. That is a positive step. That is a good thing, but unfortunately, despite their support in committee, my friends on the other side of the aisle have blocked them on this floor.

So now we find ourselves once again at the brink. Once again, we are veering toward a crisis. We can and we must do better to responsibly govern. That starts with providing for our common defense.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MERKLEY. Madam President, today Pope Francis arrives in Washington. In 2 days, he will be speaking to a joint meeting of Congress, where he will undoubtedly remind us all to remember what he has termed “the most abandoned.”

It was Pope Francis who said: “I invite all of the institutions of the world, the Church, each of us, as one single human family, to give a voice to all of those who suffer silently from hunger, so that this voice becomes a roar which can shake the world.”

He continued and said: “This campaign [to end hunger] is an invitation to all of us . . . to stop thinking that our daily actions do not have an impact on the lives of those who suffer from hunger firsthand.”

It turns out that the Pope's message on addressing hunger is more timely than we could have imagined. In a moment, I will explain why. It has to do with the government shutdown. Certainly we know from 2 years ago that a government shutdown hurts every family in America, it hurts small businesses across America, it sets the economy back, it creates all sorts of obstructions and frustrations, and it is a self-inflicted wound on America. Yet my colleagues across the aisle are con-

tending that is exactly where they want to head, another showdown over social issues. We have been down this road before. It is a needless self-inflicted wound. We shouldn't be planning to go there.

But here is why the Pope's words on hunger are particularly timely:

Two years ago when we had a government shutdown, it did not impact the program known as SNAP or food stamps—the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program or food stamps, as we often refer to it. That is because we still had funds left from the stimulus program to be able to make sure hungry Americans did have the ability to receive the credits on their electronic food stamp card and to purchase groceries for their families. But we are in a different position this time around.

Last Friday the U.S. Department of Agriculture notified the Appropriations Committee that because the stimulus funds that existed 2 years ago are not there any longer, that come October 1, if we shut this government down, then we are also going to be shutting down food stamps—that is shutting down food stamps for 45 million Americans.

In my home State of Oregon, there are about one out of five Oregonians who depend on food stamps to hold hunger at bay. We are certainly talking about an incredible number of children among that number, so across the country, millions of children, millions more Americans—45 million Americans. Yet here we are saying that it is all right to shut down food stamps and leave millions of Americans with the prospect of going hungry.

It causes me to reflect on Robert Kennedy's effort to take on hunger. He was known back in 1967 to have visited children in Mississippi, and he said the following:

I have seen children in the Delta area of Mississippi with distended stomachs, whose faces are covered with sores from starvation, and we haven't developed a policy so we can get enough food so that they can live, so that their children, so that their lives are not destroyed. I don't think that's acceptable in the United States of America and I think we need a change.

That is what Robert Kennedy said to our Nation. His advocacy had an impact in two particular areas, and that is that we proceeded to put a lot more resources into fighting hunger and we rewrote the food stamp regulations to provide greater access for those at the lowest income levels. The Food Stamp Program—or as it is now called, SNAP—has become the largest, most effective program in the United States in the fight against hunger.

Again, the USDA contacted us Friday of last week and said it looks like they will have to shut down this program if there is a government shutdown. This did not happen 2 years ago, so this is new information. They said they are going to work through the

weekend to see if they can find any way with an existing law to prevent this from happening. As of this morning, they had been unable to find any legal pathway to extend the Food Stamp Program should we be in a government shutdown.

In our country, the poverty threshold for a family of four is about \$24,000. For a family of four, that translates to about \$6,000 a person. More than half of those who receive food stamps live in families who are below 50 percent of that threshold or roughly \$3,000 per year per individual in the family.

In my home State of Oregon, SNAP provides food benefits for about 800,000 residents or, as I mentioned, one in five Oregonians. This will have a widespread impact on hundreds of thousands of individuals in my home State and for my colleagues, hundreds of thousands of individuals in their States—45 million across the country. The USDA tells us that the timing for the recharging of the food stamp cards varies. Not everyone will be affected on October 1, but all of those 45 million would be affected in the month of October. The majority of the SNAP recipients in Oregon and nationwide are vulnerable populations. They are children. They are the disabled. They are the elderly. Can we not come together in a responsible fashion to prevent sending millions of Americans into a crisis over available food, millions of children across our country in a crisis because they do not have food because of our inability to act responsibly?

The words Robert Kennedy used were that this should not happen in America. Let me repeat that certainly I believe this should not happen in America. I cannot conceive of any moral argument that would justify leaving our children, our disabled, our elderly hungry because a few people in this body want to make a political point over a social issue. That is unacceptable.

I do a lot of townhalls back home in Oregon, one in every county every year. I hear from folks who are worried over a lot of issues. They are certainly worried about finding a good job. They are certainly worried about the cost of sending their children to college. They are certainly worried about cuts to Head Start programs and the quality of their public schools. They are worried about the possibility of a secure retirement. And now, because of the threats of partisan point-making here in the body of the Senate, they are going to have to worry about whether they can put dinner on the table and feed their children. That is wrong.

The American people are sick and tired of Congress manufacturing crises like this. Let's move beyond this brinkmanship and this hostage politics. Let's avert this shutdown. Let's carry out the responsibilities to the people of the United States of America.

Pope Francis said in that initial quote I noted that he invited all of the

institutions of the world to give voice to all those who suffer silently from hunger. Little did he imagine that on the day he arrived here in Washington, DC, this institution—the U.S. Senate—would be involved not only in not helping those who are hungry but plotting and planning a shutdown of the government that will put millions of Americans into a food crisis. Let's change that. Let's come together. Let's address a responsible plan for carrying the full funding of our government forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. PERDUE. Madam President, I want to thank the majority leader for bringing the Defense appropriations bill to the floor for a vote and remind everyone that the Senate Appropriations Committee has put forward 12 appropriations bills that adhere to the Republican budget and that reflect the priorities of the American people.

You have heard all year that we need to get back to regular order, and that means we need to bring up and debate each of these 12 bills individually. It is clear after two votes that the Democratic obstructionism through the Defense appropriations bill will prevent us from funding our service men and women. My colleagues across the aisle are voting against supplying the military with the tools to stop ISIS. They are voting against the much needed upgrades to our missile defense program. They are voting against increasing missile defense support to Israel. They are voting against restoring readiness to our military.

The demands on our military are great. The threats we face today as a nation are numerous, complex, and may be the most dangerous in my lifetime. Those who also volunteer to defend our great Nation against these threats rely on us to meet these obligations as Senators.

Congress is responsible for ensuring that American service men and women have the tools they need to do their jobs and remain safe. But today my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have done our Nation a great disservice. By failing to bring up the Defense appropriations bill, Democrats aren't letting us do our job. That is dangerous.

We need to return to regular order and vote on these appropriations bills so that the priorities of the American people can once and for all be restored.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

INSPECTOR GENERAL VACANCY AT THE VA

Ms. AYOTTE. Mr. President, the Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee—headed by Chairman JOHNSON and Ranking Member CARPER—had a very important hearing where we heard from whistleblowers from the VA, and then afterwards we heard from VA officials and representatives from the inspector general's office. The issue of how we treat those who have served the country is so critical to who we are as a nation. Yet, over the last year, we have learned of shocking failures at the Department of Veterans Affairs, and today's testimony, unfortunately, was no different in terms of how whistleblowers were retaliated against at the Department of Veterans Affairs. Instead of a culture that encourages people to come forward when things go wrong, people who come forward when things go wrong are treated badly and also face consequences as far as their employment, and that is wrong.

Over the last year, we have seen shocking failures, including veterans being denied care after being placed on secret wait lists, experiencing extended delays in benefits, and endless wait times for appeals, reviews, or action on claims.

Recently, we also learned that as of last year, the VA had 867,000 pending health care enrollment records. That is almost 1 million records without a final determination status—some from decades ago. Nearly one-third of the veterans who had applied to the VA for care have now been reported as having died. Additionally, the VA staff has deleted 10,000 transaction records, but the reasons are undocumented. These failures are outrageous, and that word is used a lot around here, but this truly does define what is happening in our VA—outrageous.

Our veterans, who have served and sacrificed so much for our country, deserve the very best care and support we can give them. The VA has fallen short time and time again in meeting that goal.

The bipartisan VA reform bill, enacted last summer, represents an important step in increasing accountability and mismanagement at the department, and also giving our veterans the choice of care in their communities rather than waiting in line. That is very important to my State, New Hampshire, where, unfortunately, we don't have a full-service veterans hospital. There is so much more work to be done on that front; however, we continue to hear about reports of bureaucratic delays and failures at the VA, such as overprescribing opiates, bonuses paid to employees involved in serious misconduct, enrollment record mayhem, and inflated claims of VA employees being held accountable and fired. Unfortunately, we still can't get a number, even after all the wait-list

scandals where veterans literally died while waiting for care.

I have a few recent headlines about the VA. In the *Chicago Tribune*, January 9, "Veterans: VA hospital nicknamed 'Candy Land' because painkillers given out freely."

Arizona Republic, February 13, "Whistle-blowers: VA still endangering suicidal vets."

Washington Post, March 9, "Veteran Affairs manager pokes fun at mental health issues with photo of elf begging for Xanax."

Associated Press, April 9, "Veterans hospital wait times haven't improved."

Stars and Stripes, April 13, "Whistle-blowers say retaliation unabated year into VA scandal."

The *Washington Post* on May 14, "Veterans Affairs improperly spent \$6 billion annually, senior official says."

In light of all of the issues that have been raised with our VA, can you imagine that we are in a place where there is no permanent inspector general who has been appointed by the President to serve in that important watchdog position for the Veterans' Administration after all of the issues I just cited in this Chamber? There are many more issues that I didn't even have on this list.

The inspector general position at the Veterans' Administration has been vacant since December of 2013. That is 631 days—631 days that the President has failed to appoint someone to ensure that there is critical oversight and transparency at the Veterans' Administration. In fact, we have just had acting individuals in that position. We have not had a permanent watchdog in that position. In light of everything we have been through, we have had 631 days without adequate accountability; 631 days without permanent oversight leadership; 631 days without a permanent watchdog to investigate scandals that have tarnished the promises we made to our veterans which they earned by defending our great Nation; 631 days without the President even submitting a nomination to fill this empty position. That is unacceptable.

We need the President to step up and appoint an inspector general to be the watchdog for the Veterans' Administration so they can have a continuity of leadership. There is no more important oversight issue right now.

I have written the President, along with Members on both sides of the aisle. We have repeatedly called on the President to make a nomination for this inspector general position, and we know that—through the process—names of individuals who are qualified to serve in this position have actually been submitted to the President's desk. Both sides of the aisle in this body agree on this issue. Our desire—on a bipartisan basis—is to make sure that those who have defended, served, and answered the call of duty for our Na-

tion receive the very best care for what they have done to defend our freedom. Yet, after all the scandals and all the issues and challenges that our veterans face, can you imagine leaving this particular position open for 631 days?

I am, again, in this Chamber going to call on the President, and I know that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, whom I have worked with on this issue, agree that it is time for the President of the United States to nominate a qualified individual—he has had many names submitted to him—to serve in this critical watchdog position as the permanent inspector general for the VA with the full authority to conduct the investigations that need to be conducted on issues that have been raised repeatedly about the Veterans' Administration.

What is clear from the testimony we heard today at the homeland security committee hearing is that we have so much more work to do to ensure accountability at the Veterans' Administration and to ensure that our veterans get the very best of what they deserve and have earned by defending our Nation.

What is clear is that the IG council has done its job and nominated individuals for the President to consider for this inspector general position.

I am now calling on the President: Mr. President, please nominate a qualified individual to be a permanent VA inspector general in order to protect our veterans.

Mr. President, 631 days is already way too long, and our veterans should not have to wait a day longer to have this position filled. This important agency needs a watchdog that is there to serve them.

I thank the Presiding Officer.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today deeply concerned about the growing economic crisis in Puerto Rico, which threatens to destabilize the island, and that we must step in and help our fellow American citizens—but sometimes we forget that the 3.5 million people who live in Puerto Rico are American citizens—before a financial crisis becomes a calamity.

I again urge, as I recently did in a letter to Secretary Lew, along with seven Members of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, that the Department of the Treasury move beyond simply providing technical assistance and take a full-throated leadership role to re-

solve this crisis immediately as we have done in previous financial crises. If we do not act, the result could be a financial disorder that will, at the end of the day, be much more expensive, much more chaotic, and will, in both the long and short term, cost Puerto Rico and the United States.

The fact is that a potential solution rests in the hands of the administration, with Treasury and with HHS. As we said in the letter to Secretary Lew, the world is watching Puerto Rico, and we must ensure that the United States does everything in its power to take strong, bold, and substantive action that stabilizes the situation and protects the 3.5 million American citizens on the island and their families. Technical assistance and advice from Treasury is all well and good, but, in my view, it is just not enough.

Treasury needs to take an active role, and Congress needs to approve the pending debt restructuring legislation I introduced with Senators BLUMENTHAL, SCHUMER, and other Senate colleagues that would allow the government of Puerto Rico to authorize its public utilities to rework their debts under chapter 9. That is in the best interests of both Puerto Rico and the mainland.

The fact of the matter is Puerto Rico would actually be running a surplus—a surplus—if it did not have to make debt payments. Allowing government-owned corporations to restructure their debts using a sound legal process would give the island breathing room to make necessary reforms and would not cost U.S. taxpayers a dime. This could go a long way to promote the fairest and most efficient outcome.

The idea has been endorsed by the editorial boards of the *Wall Street Journal*, the *Washington Post*, *Bloomberg View*, the *New York Times*, the *Los Angeles Times*, the *Boston Globe*, and others. The bill is also supported by the nonpartisan National Bankruptcy Conference and numerous bankruptcy lawyers and judges.

Additionally, it is clear that the island's health care system is adding additional pressure to the overall financial situation, accounting for 20 percent of the island's economy and responsible for a third of its overall debt burden. Sixty percent of Puerto Ricans living on the island are enrolled in Medicare or Medicaid. And because of the disparity in how these two health programs are funded relative to the 50 States, the financial crisis is only exacerbated.

To help alleviate some of this pressure on the health care system, I have introduced the Improving the Treatment of U.S. Territories Under Federal Health Programs Act of 2015 with Senators SCHUMER, NELSON, GILLIBRAND, and BLUMENTHAL. This legislation provides several policies that will ensure Puerto Rico providers, both hospitals

and physicians, are treated more equally to the States under the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Just as importantly, this legislation ensures that beneficiaries on the island are treated equally too. As citizens of the United States, it is imperative that Puerto Ricans be afforded the same access to care, coverage, and health benefits as everyone else.

While I believe this legislation will go a long way toward addressing the island's systemic health care issues, there are several steps that HHS can take immediately and without the need for congressional action. They can change payment calculations under Medicare Advantage and Medicare's inpatient hospital rules to more accurately reflect the costs and demographics on the island. By making necessary adjustments to certain key payment formulas, HHS could make the practice of medicine a financially viable option in Puerto Rico and stem the tide of physicians leaving the island for the U.S. mainland and ensure that our fellow Americans living on the island are able to receive the care they need and deserve. I urge not only Treasury Secretary Lew but HHS Secretary Burwell to do all they can to provide financial and health care-related relief to Puerto Rico to help curb the island's financial crisis.

Now, Governor Garcia Padilla's Working Group for the Fiscal and Economic Recovery of Puerto Rico has also recently released a 5-year plan earlier this month. While I don't agree with everything included in the plan, it shows a determined and legitimate effort to confront the economic crisis facing the island. Unfortunately, the current debt structure and legal restraints threaten the effectiveness of these proposed reforms. Without providing some flexibility and room to maneuver, all the difficult choices in the world won't be able to resolve the crisis.

I wish to make it, however, absolutely clear: I am not—I am not—calling for a Federal bailout of Puerto Rico. But there is still much we can and should do to restore solvency to the island that is home to 3.5 million Americans. Our bond with these Americans who live on the island has always been strong. Our relationship with Puerto Rico is long and deep and extensive. With more than 5 million Puerto Ricans residing in the United States—more than in Puerto Rico itself—we are inextricably tied.

Now, I should not need to remind this body that from the infancy of our Nation, the people of Puerto Rico have been there for us. Now we need to be there for them. Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States in 1898 after the Spanish-American war. Less than two decades later, in 1917, Congress passed the Jones Act, granting American citizenship to residents of the island.

But even long before they were granted U.S. citizenship, Puerto Ricans have had a long and proud history of fighting on the side of America. As far back as 1777, Puerto Rican ports were used by U.S. ships, enabling them to run British blockades and keep commerce flowing, which was so crucial to the war effort. It was Puerto Rican soldiers who took up arms in the U.S. Civil War, defending Washington, DC, from attack and fought in the Battle of Fredericksburg. In World War I, almost 20,000 Puerto Ricans were drafted into the U.S. Armed Forces. Let's not forget about the 65th Infantry Regiment, known as the Borinqueneers, the segregated military unit composed almost entirely of soldiers from Puerto Rico that played a prominent and crucial role in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, one of the most highly decorated regiments known in military history.

I am proud to say I have worked with Senator BLUMENTHAL and others to make sure that the heroic Borinqueneers, the only Active-Duty segregated Latino military unit in the history of the United States and the last segregated unit to be deactivated, received well-deserved and long-overdue national recognition when we passed a bill last year awarding these courageous patriots with the Congressional Gold Medal—the highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions to the United States.

It is very easy to point our fingers at our brothers and sisters on the island and fault Puerto Rico for carrying more than \$70 billion in debt. But I challenge my Senate colleagues to work with me on finding solutions, to step up to our responsibility at the Federal level by seeking opportunities for Congress and the administration to correct some of the inequities that have contributed to this crisis. I am talking about the unequal Medicare and Medicaid funding that I referenced earlier, the exclusion of Puerto Rico from the Supplemental Security Income program that aids the most vulnerable Americans, the exclusion of Puerto Rico from the child tax credit and earned income tax credit, which encourages low-income individuals to seek employment, and, as previously mentioned, the exclusion of Puerto Rico from chapter 9 of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code.

Now, more than ever, we need to be asking in Washington what steps can be taken to manage this crisis. Unequal treatment at the Federal level is, whether we want to own up to it or not, a contributing factor to the current economic crisis. The lack of Federal support has encouraged heavy borrowing by the Puerto Rican government of many, many administrations going back. We must do our part, both in Congress and the administration, to

address this crisis, and we must act now, with urgency.

I think the point is clear. As I said, we have a special, historic, unshakable bond with Puerto Rico, and now is the time to strengthen that bond. The time has come to prevent the worsening fiscal crisis in Puerto Rico. The time has come to help Puerto Rico, and we can do so simply by giving them the wherewithal to help themselves through the Bankruptcy Code, as we would any other similar entity, to have the wherewithal to have an orderly restructuring and to get their economic future back in shape.

With that, Mr. President, I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Ms. HIRONO. Mr. President, we are on the eve of yet another government shutdown, yet another manufactured crisis. Two years ago it was over defunding the Affordable Care Act. Today Republicans introduced a continuing resolution that holds our country hostage over funding for Planned Parenthood.

The 2013 shutdown of a couple years ago cost billions of dollars in economic losses. We heard many stories of hardships caused by the shutdown, including small business owners who were suffering because our national parks closed, public safety workers protecting our country without pay, and Federal contractors left holding the bag for personnel and program costs. We cannot do this to our working families for the second time in 3 years. We cannot do this to our country.

Instead of funding the government, my colleagues across the aisle are using threats of a shutdown to attack Planned Parenthood without any hard evidence of wrongdoing by Planned Parenthood. Threatening to shut down the government over an organization that annually provides 400,000 cervical cancer screenings, 500,000 breast exams, and 4.5 million tests and treatments for sexually transmitted diseases is completely uncalled for.

Arguments that there are other providers that can fill the important and critical role of Planned Parenthood are not persuasive. According to the Guttmacher Institute, Planned Parenthood serves more contraceptive clients each year than any other similar provider, including federally qualified health centers. In more than 300 counties across the country, safety net providers such as Planned Parenthood are the providers of choice for nearly half of women. Furthermore, Planned Parenthood is the sole safety net provider in nearly 100 of these counties.

Planned Parenthood services cannot be easily replaced. In an attempt to defund Planned Parenthood, one State submitted a list of providers they said could replace Planned Parenthood's critical women's health care services. This list that the State provided included dentists, ophthalmologists, radiologists, and nursing homes. Think about that. Providers are not widgets.

After a Federal judge called their bluff, the State cut their list from over 2,000 providers to just 29 providers who actually are able to provide primary care services to women. Those 29 providers could not possibly absorb the thousands of patients Planned Parenthood served in that State. Planned Parenthood has long been in the crosshairs of the anti-choice movement.

This recent attack on Planned Parenthood is based on heavily edited videos by radical fringe groups. I refer my colleagues to a letter from Planned Parenthood's Cecile Richards to House and Senate leadership dated August 27, 2015.

Instead of improving the lives of women by passing legislation raising the minimum wage, closing the gender pay gap or ensuring paid leave for all workers, my colleagues across the aisle continue to narrowly focus on ways to further marginalize women. Instead of introducing continuing resolutions that contain these kinds of poison pills, such as defunding Planned Parenthood, we must pass clean legislation that keeps our government funded, that provides needed and critical services to the people of this country. I ask my colleagues to join with me.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF KATHRYN K. MATTHEW TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, Calendar No. 298, Kathryn Matthew; that the Senate vote without intervening action or debate on the nomination; that following the disposition of the nomination, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate; that no further motions be in order to the nomination; that any

statements related to the nomination be printed in the RECORD; that the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then resume legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the nomination.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Kathryn K. Matthew, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years.

The Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Kathryn K. Matthew, of South Carolina, to be Director of the Institute of Museum and Library Services for a term of four years?

The nomination was confirmed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will now resume legislative session.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REMEMBERING TROOPER JOSEPH CAMERON PONDER

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to a Kentucky State Police trooper who was tragically lost in the line of duty. Trooper Joseph Cameron Ponder, of Rineyville, was shot and killed while pursuing a suspect on September 13. He was 31 years old.

Cameron Ponder was proud to be a Kentucky State trooper. "He was eager and he absolutely loved his job," is how a State police spokesman described him. He was also new to the job, having just graduated in January of this year from the Kentucky State Police Training Academy. He was stationed at the State police post in Mayfield.

Before becoming a Kentucky State trooper, Cameron served in the U.S. Navy. He enlisted in September 2007, when he was 23 years old, and became a Navy diver. Over the next 6 years he was stationed in places as varied as Great Lakes, IL; Coronado, CA; Panama City, FL; and San Diego, CA.

During his Navy service he received several awards, medals and decorations, including the Combat Action Ribbon, the Good Conduct Medal, the Navy Expeditionary Medal, the National Defense Service Medal, the Glob-

al War on Terrorism Service Medal, the Expert Rifle Marksmanship Ribbon and the Expert Pistol Marksmanship Ribbon.

Cameron was discharged from the Navy in July 2013. He was a member of the Church of Christ in Elizabethtown, KY. He was also a dedicated hunter and fisherman who enjoyed the outdoors.

Sadly, Trooper Ponder is the second trooper from the Mayfield post to be killed in the line of duty this year. In June, Trooper Eric K. Chrisman was killed in a vehicle crash. He also had served with the Kentucky State Police for under a year.

Members of Trooper Ponder's family who are suffering from this loss include his father, Joseph Ponder; his mother, Brenda Tiffany, and her husband Allan; his fiancée, Chrystal Coleman; his sister, Kelly Ponder; his brothers, Damon Tiffany and Travis Tiffany; his grandmother, Erika Shook; his niece, Mahlea Starks; and many other family members and friends.

I am proud to share Trooper Ponder's story with my colleagues here in the United States Senate. We're thinking of his family today as well as his fellow officers of the Kentucky State Police. We are praying for the loved ones he has left behind who are feeling this devastating loss.

We are honored by Trooper Ponder's service and his extraordinary sacrifice on behalf of his fellow Kentuckians. I hold the deepest admiration and respect for Trooper Ponder and for every brave police officer across the Bluegrass State. Law enforcement is both an honorable profession and a dangerous one, and Kentucky is grateful they have made a sacred pledge to protect and defend our communities and our lives.

TRIBUTE TO GENERAL MARTIN E. DEMPSEY

Mr. REED. Mr. President, today I recognize and pay tribute to GEN Martin E. Dempsey, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for his lifetime of service to our country. His retirement marks more than 41 years of selfless devotion to our military and our Nation. A leader of exceptional character and consequence, his humility, courage, and expertise will be sorely missed.

A New Jersey native and 1974 graduate of the United States Military Academy, General Dempsey was well prepared to lead our Armed Forces these last 4 years as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. A career armor officer, he has commanded at every level, from platoon leader to combatant commander, and his assignments have carried him and his family across the United States and around the world.

As a company grade officer, he served with the 2nd Cavalry in Europe and the

10th Cavalry at Fort Carson. Following troop command, he earned his masters of arts in English from Duke University and was assigned to the English Department at West Point. He subsequently earned additional advanced degrees from the U.S. Army Command and General Staff College and the National War College.

In 1991, General Dempsey deployed with the 3rd Armored Division in support of Operation Desert Storm. He later commanded a battalion in Germany and then served as the Army's "senior scout" as the 67th colonel of the Third Armored Cavalry Regiment—the Brave Rifles—before reporting to the joint staff as an assistant deputy director in the J-5 and later as a special assistant to the 14th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In 2003, General Dempsey commanded the 1st Armored Division in Baghdad and returned to Iraq in 2005 as the commanding general of the Multi-National Security Transition Command—Iraq. From 2007 to 2008, he was the deputy commander and then acting commander of U.S. Central Command, and from 2008 to 2011, he commanded U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command.

Appointed to serve as the Army's 37th Chief of Staff, General Dempsey led his beloved Army a short 149 days before being tapped to serve as the 18th Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In that capacity and as the Nation's highest-ranking military officer, he has served as the principal military adviser to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the National Security Council, and this Congress these past 4 years.

General Dempsey's exceptional ability to coordinate and build consensus among the office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Staff, the services, and the combatant commands has served us well and ensured those charged with civilian oversight of the military have received the best military advice possible to achieve our national objectives. Additionally, he has built trust and strengthened relations with both national and foreign leaders.

During a period of complex and rapid global change, coupled with the military's exceptionally high operational tempo and unprecedented fiscal challenges, General Dempsey's decisive leadership enabled the success of military operations around the world. He masterfully guided the Joint Force to extraordinary execution of global responsibilities, from counterterrorism and crisis response, to supporting our allies, building partner capacity, and humanitarian assistance. His efforts strengthened key alliances, bolstered new partnerships, and more closely integrated the military with the other instruments of our national power against the many threats we face.

Because of those many threats, General Dempsey's tenure as Chairman has

been marked by significant transitions in military operations and personnel. His exemplary stewardship helped reset our forces after the conclusion of major combat operations and has prepared them for an increasingly dynamic and unpredictable security environment.

His leadership was critical during the transition of authority to the Afghan National Security Forces following Operation Enduring Freedom. Additionally, in the fight against ISIL, his expert advice helped formulate the military component of a sustainable counter-ISIL strategy. He also guided the military's work as part of the U.S. interagency response to the Ebola virus epidemic in West Africa.

He guided the Joint Force to capitalize on the lessons learned over these past 14 years fighting as a Joint team, undertaking reforms that have driven "jointness" further into our military's capability development and operational planning. In addition, recognizing the shifting nature of the security environment and our ability to respond to it, General Dempsey led a paradigm shift in how we posture and employ this Joint team around the world.

At the same time, the past few years have witnessed exponential growth of the cyber threat against our Nation, and, in response, General Dempsey has deftly pushed the expansion of our cyber capabilities. He has pressed hard for cyber legislation, championed the rapid development of our cyber forces, and implemented the Joint Information Environment to optimize and better defend our military's information technology infrastructure. These initiatives will be critical to the future security of our Nation.

As principal steward of the military profession, he renewed an internal commitment to strengthen the profession of arms and reinvigorated education, training, and leader development. He managed historic decisions, including reforms to general and flag officer ethics, Department-wide improvements in sexual assault prevention and response, expansion of service opportunities for women, and the extension of benefits to same-sex spouses of uniformed servicemembers and Department of Defense civilian employees. His stewardship set conditions to preserve the strength of the all-volunteer force and to ensure servicemembers departing the military are successfully reintegrated back into their communities.

As he retires, General Dempsey should take great pride in his role in ensuring our military remains the best supported, best trained, best equipped, and best led force on the planet. His contributions to our national security are a testament to his remarkable leadership and selfless dedication. During trying times, under sometimes harsh scrutiny and with high national

security stakes at hand, his steadfast commitment to the readiness and welfare of Joint Force servicemembers and their families, as well as his exceptional support for commanders and their warfighting requirements, made significant and lasting contributions to our Nation.

With over four decades of exemplary service to our Nation, General Dempsey and his family deserve our most heartfelt gratitude and admiration. He and Deanie have my very best wishes for a long, happy, and well-deserved retirement. Our Nation, our Joint Force, and our Army are all better for his leadership and distinguished service.

OBSERVING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE VIETNAM WAR

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, on the 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war, we reflect with reverence upon a generation that served with honor, distinction, and selflessness. We pay tribute to the 9 million men and women who wore our Nation's uniform during the Vietnam era, answered our Nation's call to service, and advanced the sacred ideals of liberty and self-determination.

All gave some, and some gave all. Currently, the names of the more than 58,000 patriots who gave their all are forever etched in black granite on the Vietnam Memorial in our Nation's Capital. The names of the nearly 1,800 Americans who remain unaccounted for are forever etched in our hearts.

Nearly 350 patriots from Maine are listed among the killed or missing. Among those names is U.S. Army SGT Donald Skidgel, a Medal of Honor recipient, born in my hometown of Caribou, ME, who served in Vietnam and who gave his life saving the lives of others. On September 14 of this year, Navy pilot LT Neil Taylor was finally laid to rest in his hometown of Rangeley, ME, 50 years to the day after his aircraft was shot down on his 68th mission and he was reported missing. They were patriots in the best American tradition. We will never forget them.

May the families of those who fell and of those unaccounted for find peace in knowing that the American people share their loss and grief. We will always be grateful for the valor and sacrifice of their loved ones. And we will never forget them.

From the founding of our Nation to today, the freedom we hold sacred has been earned by our fellow citizens. Our Nation's history has been written by the men and women who serve, despite the sacrifices, with courage and devotion. The men and women of the Vietnam era carried on that tradition. They carry on another tradition that echoes throughout our history: After their military service was done, they returned home, quietly and modestly,

and continued to serve their communities.

The American people believe that supporting our troops doesn't stop once they leave the military. Just as no member of our Armed Forces would leave a comrade behind on the battlefield, we must not leave our veterans and their families behind on the battlefields of injury and disease. We must be strong advocates for veterans' health care and be concerned about the Vietnam veterans who were exposed to agent orange. We must remain committed to ensuring that those veterans and their families receive the care and support they have earned.

The men and women who served our Nation a half century ago upheld the highest ideals of America and of the American Armed Forces. Our Vietnam veterans were then, and remain today, heroes who deserve our respect and our gratitude.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, this month marks the 50th anniversary of the introduction of U.S. ground troops in the Vietnam war, and I would like to recognize our Vietnam era veterans who dedicated their strength and service to defend freedom and democracy across the globe. In honor of this anniversary, the Secretary of Defense coordinated various events to thank and honor all veterans of the Vietnam war. A well-deserved welcome home ceremony will be held in Presque Isle, ME, on September 26, 2015, to recognize and commemorate the lives of those who fought so bravely.

For nearly 20 years, the Vietnam war occupied the American collective conscience. American involvement initially focused on assisting French forces to counter the Vietminh communist revolution. However, in 1964 the Gulf of Tonkin incident dramatically shifted American perspective, and on August 7, President Johnson drafted and Congress unanimously approved a resolution authorizing direct military intervention in Vietnam.

Throughout the war, the United States deployed over 2.7 million servicemembers to Vietnam, and over 8 million Americans served in uniform during the Vietnam era. More than 58,200 Americans lost their lives and more than 150,000 were seriously wounded during the conflict. I would like to honor those brave Americans who sacrificed so much for their country. Their contributions to our Nation will never be forgotten.

Maine played a crucial role in the war effort. With one of the highest percentages of veterans per capita in the nation, the Vietnam war's legacy still resonates in Maine today. Close to 48,000 people from Maine served in Vietnam, and nearly 350 Maine servicemembers were killed or went missing in action during the war. Our veterans' unwavering patriotism, courage, and resilience fully demonstrate the for-

itude of American character and our Nation's commitment to democracy worldwide.

On this 50th anniversary of the Vietnam war, I would like to join the Secretary of Defense in recognizing the brave Americans who served overseas, as well as those on the homefront whose unrelenting support was invaluable to those overseas. Our veterans have made countless personal sacrifices in protection of our freedoms, and I am proud to honor and thank them for their service to our great Nation.

BEING A TOLERANT AND ACCEPTING COUNTRY

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, in recent weeks two of the leading contenders to be President of the United States called into question the devotion of American Muslims to this great country, and one even outrageously suggested that being Muslim precludes you from being President. I denounce this. It is in violation of Article VI of the Constitution and in violation of our County's basic principles.

Everyone that serves in public office from President to the Senate must uphold the Constitution. Article VI of the Constitution explicitly states:

All debts contracted and engagements entered into, before the adoption of this Constitution, shall be as valid against the United States under this Constitution, as under the Confederation.

This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.

The Senators and Representatives before mentioned, and the members of the several state legislatures, and all executive and judicial officers, both of the United States and of the several states, shall be bound by oath or affirmation, to support this Constitution; but no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States.

There are 3 million American Muslims in our country. They teach in our schools, they work in our hospitals, and they attend our universities. Their children play on the same playgrounds and go to the same schools. They are able to do this because one of our founding principles on which our country was established was freedom of religion. It is on that basis that the United States should strive to be a tolerant and accepting country where differences are understood and diversity is celebrated. This is not the America some leading candidates for President imagine. They are perpetuating an undercurrent of bigotry by suggesting that American Muslims can't be President because of their religious beliefs. Not only is this contrary to our Amer-

ican values, it defies the U.S. Constitution.

TRIBUTE TO MARY BEHRENS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, the Wyoming Nurses Association is honoring Casper nurse practitioner Mary Behrens with the 2015 Lifetime Achievement award. I am delighted to congratulate Mary on this tremendous honor.

Following in the footsteps of her mother, Mary pursued her passion for service by completing her RN at the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1964. She practiced as a nurse in Madison while her husband Jerry finished his medical degree and residency. She remained in Madison as Jerry served our Nation as a physician treating wounded soldiers in Vietnam. In 1973, the couple moved to Casper, WY. Folks in Wyoming are fortunate that Mary chose to dedicate her career helping others in our State. She is truly an innovator, leader, and mentor for many nurses in Wyoming across the Nation and around the world.

The list of Mary's accomplishments and awards is long. She was active on the American Nurses Association board and is a board member of the University of Wyoming's Friends of the Fay W. Whitney School of Nursing. She is one of only three Wyoming nurses to be nationally recognized as a fellow of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners, FAANP. Her leadership in this area is incredible.

In 2005 she was a member of the American delegation to the World Health Assembly in Geneva, Switzerland, where she testified on the national nursing shortage. In addition, through her involvement with the Friendship Bridge program, Mary is credited with helping to establish an education pathway for nurses in Vietnam. Her efforts to develop a modern baccalaureate curriculum have had a tremendous impact on the global scope of nursing, particularly in Vietnam and neighboring countries.

Mary's civic service is not at all limited to her profession. In fact, she has an established history as a public servant for both Casper and Wyoming. Mary served on the Casper city council and as mayor of Casper. She was also a Natrona county commissioner and a representative in the Wyoming State Legislature. This experience, and her intense desire to make change, has made a profound impact on our State. Mary's extensive activity in shaping public policy truly stands alone, as few people possess such a wide breadth of policy knowledge, leadership skills, and passion for the nursing profession.

It is fitting that the Wyoming Nurses Association is honoring Mary Behrens with their most prestigious award. Countless patients and nursing students have benefitted from her leadership and care. The nursing profession is

stronger because of Mary's enthusiastic advocacy.

Please join me in thanking Mary Behrens for her lifetime investment in nursing. Bobbi and I are truly fortunate to call her our friend.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO TERRY BOSTON

• Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I would like to take this moment for the Congress to note and honor the work of Terry Boston, president and CEO of PJM Interconnection, LLC.

It is most fitting that Terry Boston be recognized in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for he has served countless Americans and played a key role in ensuring adequate infrastructure to drive America's economic development and our citizens' well-being throughout his professional life.

Since 2008, Terry Boston has served as president and chief executive officer of PJM located in Valley Forge, PA. In this role, Terry oversees the largest power grid in North America and the largest electricity market in the world. Terry also is president of the Association of Edison Illuminating Companies, Inc., and immediate past president of the GO 15, the association of the world's largest power grid operators. Terry was recently elected to the National Academy of Engineering, one of the highest professional honors accorded an engineer. He is a member of the Board for the Electric Power Research Institute.

Terry Boston is past chair of the North American Transmission Forum, dedicated to excellence in performance and sharing industry best practices. He also was one of the eight industry experts selected to direct the North American Reliability Corporation investigation of the August 2003 Northeast/Midwest blackout.

Prior to joining PJM, Terry Boston was the executive vice president of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Nation's largest public power provider. In his 35 years at TVA, Terry directed divisions in transmission and power operations, pricing, contracts and electric system reliability.

PJM employs over 600 people in Pennsylvania and performs a critical function by "keeping the lights on" 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. PJM helps to ensure the health and well-being of our citizens not just in my State but for over 51 million persons in all or portions of the States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, Illinois, and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, Terry Boston has been an excellent engineer and an inspirational leader in the electric industry.

As he retires from PJM, I ask that you join me and the entire Senate in wishing Terry success in his future endeavors.●

REMEMBERING BILLY ROSS BROWN

• Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, the agriculture community and the State of Mississippi suffered a great loss with the passing of Billy Ross Brown, Jr., on Saturday, September 12, 2015. He was a good friend, a neighbor, a highly respected member of his community, and a gentleman who dedicated much of his life to helping Mississippi farmers and improving the overall quality of life in rural America.

A native of Oxford, MS, Billy Ross faithfully served the Farm Credit System and U.S. agricultural interests for over 36 years. In 1990 Billy Ross was appointed by President George H. W. Bush to serve on the Farm Credit Administration Board, and in 1993 he was designated Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of the Board by President Clinton, where he served with distinction until October of 1994. Following his tenure in Washington, Billy Ross returned to Mississippi and was nominated to the First South Farm Credit Board of Directors, a position in which he served until his retirement in March 2005.

In addition to his contributions to the U.S. Farm Credit System, Billy Ross was active in various agriculture and conservation organizations. He served more than 20 years as area vice president for the Mississippi Association of Conservation Districts and more than 30 years as a commissioner of the Lafayette County Soil and Water Conservation District. Billy Ross also served on the Mississippi Soil and Water Conservation Commission as well as the U.S. Forest Service National Advisory Committee. He received many awards for his work in agriculture, conservation, forestry and wildlife habitat.

Billy Ross was a true gentleman who illustrated dedication to his community and country. I am grateful for his friendship and all he accomplished for American agriculture. My thoughts and prayers are with his wife Lynn and the entire Brown family during this sad time.●

TRIBUTE TO MARGO WALSH

• Mr. KING. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Margo Walsh, founder of MaineWorks, for her outstanding leadership and dedication to the State of Maine.

Under Margo's leadership, MaineWorks is strengthening communities and developing infrastructure across our State by providing temporary employment in the industrial construction sector to vulnerable la-

borers seeking to re-enter the workforce. Margo's vision has grown MaineWorks into an inclusive and empowering community for recent immigrants, low-income laborers, past non-violent offenders, military veterans, and other Mainers recovering from substance abuse.

Margo holds a BA in Psychology from Wheaton College and spent over 10 years in New York City as a recruiter for Goldman Sachs's Investment Banking Division and as an international human resources consultant at Hewitt. She subsequently returned to her home State of Maine, determined to channel her passion for economic and social development towards the common good.

Margo's accomplishments at MaineWorks, however, extend beyond her initial decision to found the company in 2010. Under her continued leadership, MaineWorks has received recognition across the State and nationwide. In 2014 and 2015, SCORE recognized MaineWorks as the most successful innovative business in the State of Maine, and in 2014, MaineBiz Magazine named Margo as one of five women to watch. Additionally, MaineWorks is featured on the Federal Minimum Wage Campaign's video and was recently certified as a B-corporation, a testament to the company's commitment to transparency, social development, and environmental sustainability.

I would like to recognize and thank Margo for her ongoing commitment to the State of Maine. Our State owes Margo a great deal for her vision, leadership, compassion, and commitment to Maine's social and economic development. I look forward to Margo's continued service to MaineWorks and to the entire State of Maine.●

MEASURES PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bills were read the second time, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3134. An act to provide for a moratorium on Federal funding to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc.

H.R. 3504. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 34. An act to authorize and strengthen the tsunami detection, forecast, warning, research, and mitigation program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 114-146).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF
COMMITTEE

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McCain for the Committee on Armed Services.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Barbara R. Holcomb, to be Major General.

Air Force nomination of Maj. Gen. Jack Weinstein, to be Lieutenant General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Michael E. Flanagan, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. David W. Silva II, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Philip R. Sheridan, to be Brigadier General.

Air Force nomination of Col. Timothy J. LaBarge, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Col. Kristan L. K. Hericks, to be Brigadier General.

Army nomination of Brig. Gen. Jody J. Daniels, to be Major General.

Navy nomination of Vice Adm. Frank C. Pandolfo, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. Raquel C. Bono, to be Vice Admiral.

Navy nomination of Rear Adm. David C. Johnson, to be Vice Admiral.

Marine Corps nomination of Lt. Gen. Kenneth F. McKenzie, Jr., to be Lieutenant General.

Marine Corps nomination of Maj. Gen. William D. Beydler, to be Lieutenant General.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, for the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the following nomination lists which were printed in the RECORDS on the dates indicated, and ask unanimous consent, to save the expense of reprinting on the Executive Calendar that these nominations lie at the Secretary's desk for the information of Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Air Force nomination of Kyle J. Weld, to be Colonel.

Air Force nominations beginning with Kathleen E. Akers and ending with Saiprasad M. Zemse, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Paul R. Brezinski and ending with Thomas E. Williford, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Dwayne A. Baca and ending with Liana Lucas Vogel, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with Reni B. Angelova and ending with Grant W. Wisner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2015.

Air Force nominations beginning with David R. Alaniz and ending with Devon L. Wentz, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 9, 2015.

Air Force nomination of John M. Gooch, to be Colonel.

Air Force nomination of Herman W. Dykes, Jr., to be Lieutenant Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with Jonathan S. Ackiss and ending with D012659, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Michael H. Adorjan and ending with G010310, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Matthew T. Adamczyk and ending with D012593, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Army nomination of Gregory I. Kelts, to be Major.

Army nominations beginning with Stephen H. Cooper and ending with David G. Wortman, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Army nomination of Lesley A. Watts, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Kirby R. Gross, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Francesca M. Desriviere, to be Major.

Army nomination of Jerry L. Tolbert, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Christopher R. Forsythe, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Francis G. Maresco, Jr., to be Colonel.

Army nominations beginning with David S. Abrahams and ending with D012627, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Stephanie R. Ahern and ending with G010384, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Army nominations beginning with Christopher W. Abbott and ending with D011026, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Army nomination of Neil I. Nelson, to be Colonel.

Army nomination of Benjamin J. Bigelow, to be Colonel.

Navy nominations beginning with Enrique R. Asuncion and ending with Timothy J. Saxon, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christian J. Auger and ending with Chester J. Wyckoff, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Cara M. Addison and ending with Joel A. White, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Oluwafadekemi N. Adewetan and ending with Justin I. Watson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Frederic Albesa and ending with Franz J. Yu, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Maricar S. Aberin and ending with Cardia M. Wilson, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with James P. Adwell and ending with Maresa C.J. Zenner, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard R. Abitria and ending with David J.

Zelinskas, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 8, 2015.

Navy nomination of Michelle D. Carter, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Regine Reimers, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Joel V. Finny, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nomination of Ernest C. Lee, to be Captain.

Navy nomination of Natalia C. Henriquez, to be Lieutenant Commander.

Navy nominations beginning with Whitney A. Abraham and ending with Bethany R. Zmitrovich, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Rebecca K. Adams and ending with Michael L. Zuehlke, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Christopher M. Bade and ending with Cassandra M. Sisti, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jamie P. Drage and ending with Richard M. Yates, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Jason M. Bauman and ending with Mark A. Williams, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Joshua A. Aisen and ending with Scott M. Thornbury, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Richard S. Chernitzer and ending with Beth A. Teach, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Nicholas A. Denison and ending with Theodore J. Stow, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Travis C. Adams and ending with Antonio Zubia, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Michael K. Allen and ending with Jerry W. Wyrick II, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Brielle L. Adamovich and ending with Richard S. Ziba, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nominations beginning with Gilbert R. Baughn and ending with Sergio B. Wooden, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on September 16, 2015.

Navy nomination of Gregory A. Grubbs, to be Lieutenant Commander.

(Nominations without an asterisk were reported with the recommendation that they be confirmed.)

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND
JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. HEINRICH, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 2063. A bill to provide compensation to injured persons relating to the Gold King Mine spill, to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to address mining-related issues, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. BROWN, Mr. CASEY, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 2064. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to expand the definition of eligible program; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. BALDWIN (for herself, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, and Mr. BROWN):

S. 2065. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to increase the income protection allowances; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. SASSE (for himself, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. COATS, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. DAINES, Mrs. ERNST, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. LANKFORD, Mr. MORAN, Mr. PAUL, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. ROUNDS, Mr. RUBIO, Mr. TILLIS, Mr. MCCAIN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. ENZI, and Mr. CRAPO):

S. 2066. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit a health care practitioner from failing to exercise the proper degree of care in the case of a child who survives an abortion or attempted abortion; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WICKER (for himself, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Mr. SCHATZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COLLINS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2067. A bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2069. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. AYOTTE:

S. 2070. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON):

S. Res. 261. A resolution designating the week of October 11 through October 17, 2015, as "National Case Management Week" to recognize the role of case management in improving health care outcomes for patients; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. Res. 262. A resolution to support the empowerment of women and urge countries to #FreeThe20; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. COLLINS):

S. Res. 263. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes; considered and agreed to.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. MCCASKILL):

S. Res. 264. A resolution designating September 23, 2015, as "National Falls Prevention Awareness Day" to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of falls among older adults; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN):

S. Res. 265. A resolution honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH):

S. Res. 266. A resolution designating September 2015 at "National Kinship Care Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 108

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 108, a bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve access for students to Federal grants and loans to help pay for postsecondary, graduate, and professional educational opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 238

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 238, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the Director of the Bureau of Prisons to issue oleoresin capsaicin spray to officers and employees of the Bureau of Prisons.

S. 314

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 314, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to

provide for coverage under the Medicare program of pharmacist services.

S. 423

At the request of Ms. HEITKAMP, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 423, a bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to provide an exception to the annual written privacy notice requirement.

S. 553

At the request of Mr. MENENDEZ, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, a bill to marshal resources to undertake a concerted, transformative effort that seeks to bring an end to modern slavery, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. CORKER, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 553, *supra*.

S. 569

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 569, a bill to reauthorize the farm to school program, and for other purposes.

S. 637

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 637, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and modify the railroad track maintenance credit.

S. 697

At the request of Mr. UDALL, the names of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) were added as cosponsors of S. 697, a bill to amend the Toxic Substances Control Act to reauthorize and modernize that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 968

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 968, a bill to require the Commissioner of Social Security to revise the medical and evaluation criteria for determining disability in a person diagnosed with Huntington's Disease and to waive the 24-month waiting period for Medicare eligibility for individuals disabled by Huntington's Disease.

S. 1082

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. AYOTTE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1082, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the removal or demotion of employees of the Department of Veterans Affairs based on performance or misconduct, and for other purposes.

S. 1140

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from Tennessee

(Mr. CORKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1140, a bill to require the Secretary of the Army and the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to propose a regulation revising the definition of the term "waters of the United States", and for other purposes.

S. 1170

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Ms. HEITKAMP) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1170, a bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

S. 1252

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1252, a bill to authorize a comprehensive strategic approach for United States foreign assistance to developing countries to reduce global poverty and hunger, achieve food and nutrition security, promote inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth, improve nutritional outcomes, especially for women and children, build resilience among vulnerable populations, and for other purposes.

S. 1261

At the request of Mr. MANCHIN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1261, a bill to ensure that methods of collecting taxes and fees by private citizens on behalf of State and local governments are fair and effective and do not discriminate against interstate commerce for wireless telecommunications.

S. 1287

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1287, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the program for viral hepatitis surveillance, education, and testing in order to prevent deaths from chronic liver disease and liver cancer, and for other purposes.

S. 1493

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1493, a bill to provide for an increase, effective December 1, 2015, in the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

At the request of Mr. VITTER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1493, *supra*.

S. 1555

At the request of Ms. HIRONO, the names of the Senator from New York

(Mrs. GILLIBRAND) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1555, a bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal, collectively, to the Filipino veterans of World War II, in recognition of the dedicated service of the veterans during World War II.

S. 1559

At the request of Ms. AYOTTE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) and the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1559, a bill to protect victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and dating violence from emotional and psychological trauma caused by acts of violence or threats of violence against their pets.

S. 1562

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. TESTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1562, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform taxation of alcoholic beverages.

S. 1667

At the request of Ms. CANTWELL, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. FRANKEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1667, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the special rules for accident and health plans of certain governmental entities, and for other purposes.

S. 1682

At the request of Mr. KIRK, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1682, a bill to extend the Iran Sanctions Act of 1996 and to require the Secretary of the Treasury to report on the use by Iran of funds made available through sanctions relief.

S. 1766

At the request of Mr. SCHATZ, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Kaine) were added as cosponsors of S. 1766, a bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to review the discharge characterization of former members of the Armed Forces who were discharged by reason of the sexual orientation of the member, and for other purposes.

S. 1798

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1798, a bill to reauthorize the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, and for other purposes.

S. 1830

At the request of Mr. BARRASSO, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1830, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage of marriage and family therapist services and men-

tal health counselor services under part B of the Medicare program, and for other purposes.

S. 1831

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1831, a bill to revise section 48 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes.

S. 1893

At the request of Mr. ALEXANDER, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1893, a bill to reauthorize and improve programs related to mental health and substance use disorders.

S. 1911

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. RUBIO) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1911, a bill to implement policies to end preventable maternal, newborn, and child deaths globally.

S. 1982

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1982, a bill to authorize a Wall of Remembrance as part of the Korean War Veterans Memorial and to allow certain private contributions to fund the Wall of Remembrance.

S. 2028

At the request of Mr. PAUL, the name of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. HEINRICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2028, a bill to amend the Federal Credit Union Act, to advance the ability of credit unions to promote small business growth and economic development opportunities, and for other purposes.

S. 2034

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2034, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide additional aggravating factors for the imposition of the death penalty based on the status of the victim.

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. ROBERTS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to designate a National Memorial to Fallen Educators at the National Teachers Hall of Fame in Emporia, Kansas.

AMENDMENT NO. 2667

At the request of Mr. CASEY, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 2667 intended to be proposed to H.R. 36, a bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED
BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. WICKER (for himself,
Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, Mr.
SCHATZ, Ms. AYOTTE, Ms. COL-
LINS, and Mr. BARRASSO):

S. 2067. A bill to establish EUREKA Prize Competitions to accelerate discovery and development of disease-modifying, preventive, or curative treatments for Alzheimer's disease and related dementia, to encourage efforts to enhance detection and diagnosis of such diseases, or to enhance the quality and efficiency of care of individuals with such diseases; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. WICKER. Mr. President, I am wearing purple today in honor of World Alzheimer's Month. As a matter of fact, yesterday, September 21, was World Alzheimer's Day. So I have chosen today to introduce a bill that I hope will lead to a major breakthrough in fighting this terrible disease and treating and potentially curing Alzheimer's disease.

The legislation which I introduced this morning is called the EUREKA Act, which stands for Ensuring Useful Research Expenditures is Key for Alzheimer's—EUREKA.

I am taking this moment to briefly discuss the problem of Alzheimer's and to ask my colleagues to get behind this tripartisan legislation and see if we can create some momentum to cure Alzheimer's disease in a decade.

First of all, a little bit about awareness. As we all know, Alzheimer's is a 100-percent fatal disease. It affects some 36 million people around the globe. More than 5 million Americans currently have Alzheimer's disease. My mother died of Alzheimer's disease. I can tell you it is an incredibly personal trial for families who deal with loved ones suffering and ultimately succumbing to this disease. So there is the human cost which so many of us have experienced and are experiencing.

There is also the cost in dollars and cents. Americans will spend \$226 billion from our Treasury on Alzheimer's this year alone. The disease puts an extraordinary burden on Medicare and Medicaid. As a matter of fact, one in five Medicare dollars will be spent this year on someone with Alzheimer's. Think of what we could do to alleviate the suffering our previous speaker was talking about if we didn't have to spend this \$226 billion per year, if we didn't have to spend one in five of our Medicare dollars on someone with Alzheimer's. Consider the 2013 filing from the Rand Corporation. Direct costs of Alzheimer's exceed similar costs associated with cancer and heart disease combined.

According to Rush University, Alzheimer's is responsible for more than 500,000 deaths each year.

Without a cure or a way to halt this disease, these numbers will continue to grow. By 2050 Alzheimer's is expected to cost \$1.1 trillion per year. By then, Medicare and Medicaid could see a 500-percent increase in Alzheimer's spending. So we have a problem in terms of dollars and cents, and we certainly have a problem in terms of the hardship it causes on families today.

Experts say we need \$2 billion a year in public research if we are going to get to this goal of conquering Alzheimer's by 2025. We do the best we can at the National Institutes of Health, but we spend only \$586 million a year on Alzheimer's research. We need \$2 billion a year. We spend roughly a quarter of that amount each year, with very little prospect of getting it up to four times what we are spending now.

What is the solution? I believe the solution is to go to a concept that has made America great for decades and even centuries, and that is the American spirit of innovation and entrepreneurship and competition. We create, we build, and we make a difference in people's lives through competition and innovation. So today I have introduced the EUREKA bill, which would establish a national prize for achieving benchmarks in fighting this disease. I want to make it clear that the EUREKA Act would proceed on a parallel track with what is being done at NIH and the Federal Government in terms of research. It wouldn't take a penny away from the research dollars currently spent on Alzheimer's and the funds used to attack Alzheimer's in so many ways. It would be another route for a breakthrough by establishing a competition to run parallel to the research being done.

We will need to research some milestones before we arrive at an Alzheimer's cure. This bill would create a system within the government, with cooperation from NIH, to encourage public and private collaboration to help us establish prizes for milestones reached to conquer Alzheimer's. Of course, we need to remember that prizes are paid only for success. If we don't meet the milestones, we won't have to expend the money.

My excellent staff and I have been working for months with some of the leading experts in the United States on this concept, not the least of which is the XPRIZE Foundation, which has done such a good job in establishing breakthroughs in other areas. So we have the support and cooperation of the XPRIZE Foundation. In addition, we have worked with the National Institutes of Health and the Food and Drug Administration to get as much information as possible, and we think we have come up with a way to have government-funded prizes to conquer this disease.

This is nothing new. The XPRIZE Foundation came along relatively re-

cently, but it was inspired by previous examples of success. In 1927 Charles Lindbergh won \$25,000 for his Spirit of St. Louis aircraft in a competition to achieve the first nonstop flight between New York City and Paris. He received a prize for this accomplishment. Today aviation is a \$300 billion industry. So prizes are not a new strategy. The government already invests in countless areas, including health. As a matter of fact, the America COMPETES Act gives Federal agencies the authority to conduct prize-based challenges. NIH has already completed dozens of them. This builds on that success.

I envision that a panel would be established under this legislation to set benchmarks that would get us well along the road to conquering Alzheimer's. Successful, prize-worthy events would be measures such as identifying an Alzheimer's biomarker, developing early-detection techniques, or repurposing existing drugs for treatment. Milestones such as these would be established by a panel of experts. Think of what could be achieved if people with expertise combine their skills inside and outside the government to end Alzheimer's. Think of the progress that could be made toward ending human suffering.

My bill is S. 2067, the EUREKA Act, and it has received support from researchers, including the MIND Center at the University of Mississippi in my home State, where we are doing innovative, groundbreaking achievements every day on Alzheimer's. Other organizations supporting the EUREKA Act include the Alzheimer's Association, Us Against Alzheimer's, the XPRIZE Foundation, the Alzheimer's Foundation of America, BrightFocus Foundation, Leaders Engaged on Alzheimer's Disease, otherwise known as LEAD, and Eli Lilly. All of these organizations and companies are supporting EUREKA.

We already have not bipartisan cosponsorship but tripartisan cosponsorship of this legislation because we have Republicans, Democrats, and Independents already cosponsoring this EUREKA Act.

So I come to the floor today and ask my colleagues to talk to their health staff members. Look at this concept. Talk to us about the efforts we are engaged in, about the research we have done, about the learned people who know what they are talking about and who have worked with us to bring this bill where it is. I hope we can create some momentum for this act soon. I hope we can attach it to legislation before the end of the year. I hope we can put this on the President's desk sometime early in the year 2016.

EUREKA can be a game changer in fighting one of the most terrible and horrible and expensive diseases we have. So I would urge my colleagues to

look at this, to get back to me. I am going to aggressively be talking to each of my colleagues and asking them to cosponsor this legislation. I think we are onto something. I think we are getting very, very near to achieving this goal of conquering Alzheimer's within a decade.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mr. CARPER):

S. 2068. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to include automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as section 179 property and classify certain automated fire sprinkler system retrofits as 15-year property for purposes of depreciation; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the Fire Sprinkler Incentive Act. I am very pleased to be joined by my colleague from Delaware, Senator CARPER, in introducing this bipartisan bill.

Our bill would encourage commercial building owners to invest in life-saving fire safety upgrades. While building codes require sprinklers in new commercial buildings, a great number of structures across the U.S. were built and put in service before sprinklers were required. This is of significance in Maine, which has some of the oldest housing stock in the country and which has experienced deadly apartment building fires.

Maine has a large number of older, historic buildings—buildings that generally may not be required to have fire sprinklers. According to the Maine State Housing Authority, Maine has the sixth oldest housing stock in the country. In fact, many of the historic areas of Portland were built following a devastating fire in 1866. This fire destroyed most of Portland's commercial buildings, many of its churches, and countless homes.

Fire sprinklers are very effective at preventing deaths caused by fires. Small business building owners find it difficult, however, to fund adding retrofit sprinklers. Our bill would provide two tax incentives to encourage building owners to make this investment.

Currently, commercial building owners must depreciate fire sprinkler retrofits over a lengthy 39-year period. The period for residential buildings is 27 and a half years. This bill reclassifies fire sprinkler retrofits as 15-year depreciable property, thus allowing building owners to write off their costs more quickly. The bill also provides an option for certain small businesses to deduct the cost of the fire system upgrades immediately under Section 179 of the tax code. Together, these proposals will provide a strong incentive for building owners to install fire sprinkler systems.

According to the National Fire Protection Association, in 2013, a fire department responded to a structure fire

every 65 seconds, and fire claimed 9 lives every day. Just last October, five young adults were killed when fire swept through a two apartment building near the University of Southern Maine. In addition to these five, 20 other people died in fires in Maine in 2014. Just last month, a fire killed two people in Old Town, ME. Sprinklers decrease the fire death rate by about 80 percent and the average loss per home fire by about 70 percent.

This bill was originally drafted in response to the deadly nightclub fire in West Warwick, RI, in 2003. One hundred people died in that fire. The building did not have a fire sprinkler system. Let us work together to prevent another tragedy like this from happening. I invite my colleagues to join Senator CARPER and me in support of this bipartisan, common sense legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter of support be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL FIRE SERVICES
INSTITUTE,
September 18, 2015.

Hon. SUSAN COLLINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the Congressional Fire Services Institute (CFSI), I would like to express our thanks and appreciation for sponsoring the Fire Sprinkler Incentive Act. In 2002, CFSI's National Advisory Committee (NAC), a coalition of 35 national fire and emergency service organizations, unanimously approved a resolution expressing the need for federal tax incentives to encourage the installation of automatic fire sprinkler systems in residential and commercial buildings. The introduction of the Fire Sprinkler Incentive Act is an important step in achieving this goal.

The cost of fire in America is enormous. According to the National Fire Protection Association (NFPA), in 2014, there were 1,298,000 fires reported in the United States, leading to 3,275 civilian fire deaths, 15,775 civilian injuries, and \$11.6 billion in property damage. When you include the indirect cost of fire, such as lost economic activity, the cost is closer to \$108 billion annually.

Studies by NFPA have concluded that buildings outfitted with sprinklers reduce the death rate per fire by at least 57% and decrease the property damage by up to 68%. By classifying the retrofit of an automatic fire sprinkler system as an eligible property under Section 179 of the tax code, the Fire Sprinkler Incentive Act will save lives by allowing small and medium-sized businesses to deduct the cost of sprinkler systems up to \$125,000.00. The legislation would also create a tax incentive for the retrofit of high-rise buildings. In the United States alone, there are nearly 10,000 high-rise fires annually. These structures, when not sprinklered, pose serious safety risks to both civilians and firefighters.

It is an incontrovertible fact that fire sprinklers save lives, including the lives of our firefighters. No firefighter has ever died while fighting a fire in a fully sprinklered structure. But unfortunately approximately 100 firefighters die in the line of duty every year. We, as a nation, owe it to our fire-

fighters and their families to make the profession as safe as possible. The Fire Sprinkler Incentive Act will help us achieve that goal.

We strongly encourage all members of Congress to support this important piece of legislation. Thank you for your leadership on this issue, and best wishes on your continued success and safety.

Sincerely,

BILL WEBB,
Executive Director.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 2069. A bill to amend the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 to modify provisions relating to certain land exchanges in the Mt. Hood Wilderness in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Mt. Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act. This bill is a necessary step to ensuring that the Cooper Spur land exchange on Mt. Hood proceeds as Congress originally intended when it passed as a part of the Omnibus Public Lands Bill in 2009. I am pleased to introduce this bill with my colleague from Oregon, Senator JEFF MERKLEY.

The Mt. Hood Cooper Spur land exchange was included in the Mt. Hood Wilderness designation that passed 6 years ago as part of the Omnibus Public Lands Act of 2009. The bill, which has now been law for over 6 years, directed several land exchanges including the Cooper Spur land exchange.

The Cooper Spur land exchange required the Forest Service to transfer approximately 120 acres of Federal land to Mt. Hood Meadows in exchange for approximately 770 acres of private land, with the goal of keeping development of Mt. Hood concentrated around the current development at Government Camp and ensuring the protection of the North side of the mountain. The swap was to be completed in 16 months. It is now 77 months later and the exchange has not moved forward. The delays have angered the public, endangered the environment, and have now spurred a lawsuit against the Forest Service.

The Mt. Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act would make technical corrections to the Original Cooper Spur land exchange provisions in the Omnibus Public Lands Act to jumpstart the land exchange and keep the process moving forward so the exchange can finally be completed, as originally intended.

I introduced the original Mt. Hood Wilderness proposal in 2004 and again in 2006 and 2007 with my then-colleague Senator Gordon Smith of Oregon. As the Wilderness proposal and associated land exchanges took shape, more than 1,700 constituents provided input on the proposal. It was supported by members of the Oregon congressional delegation at the time, then-Governor

Kulongoski, the Bush administration, and over 100 community groups. The Mt. Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act is supported by Mt. Hood Meadows, Friends of Hood River Valley, Clackamas County, and Hood River County.

The Cooper Spur land exchange was an important part of the Mt. Hood Wilderness designation to ensure the protection of the undeveloped North side of the mountain. In turn, the Mt. Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act is needed in order to ensure that the land exchange, a community-driven solution to the development challenges on Mt. Hood, is finally completed.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2069

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Mount Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act”.

SEC. 2. COOPER SPUR LAND EXCHANGE CLARIFICATION AMENDMENTS.

Section 1206(a) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1018) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (C), by striking “120 acres” and inserting “107 acres”; and

(B) in subparagraph (E)(ii), by inserting “improvements,” after “buildings,”; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by amending the text of subparagraph (C) to read as follows: “As a condition of the land exchange under this subsection, title to the non-Federal land to be acquired by the Secretary under this subsection shall be acceptable to the Secretary.”;

(B) in subparagraph (D)—

(i) in clause (i), by striking “As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary and Mt. Hood Meadows shall select” and inserting “Not later than 60 days after the date of the enactment of the Mount Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act, the Secretary and Mt. Hood Meadows shall jointly select”;

(ii) in clause (ii), in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “An appraisal under clause (i) shall” and inserting “Except as provided under clause (iii), an appraisal under clause (i) shall assign a separate value to each tax lot to allow for the equalization of values and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) FINAL APPRAISED VALUE.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subclause (II), after the final appraised value of the Federal land and the non-Federal land are determined and approved by the Secretary, the Secretary shall not be required to reappraise or update the final appraised value for a period of up to 3 years, beginning on the date of the approval by the Secretary of the final appraised value.

“(II) EXCEPTION.—Subclause (I) shall not apply if the condition of either the Federal land or the non-Federal land referred to in subclause (I) is significantly and substantially altered by fire, windstorm, or other events.

“(iv) PUBLIC REVIEW.—Before completing the land exchange under this Act, the Secretary shall make available for public review the complete appraisals of the land to be exchanged.”;

(C) in subparagraph (F), by striking “16 months after the date of enactment of this Act” and inserting “1 year after the date of the enactment of the Mount Hood Cooper Spur Land Exchange Clarification Act”; and

(D) by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following:

“(G) REQUIRED CONVEYANCE CONDITIONS.—Prior to the exchange of the Federal and non-Federal land—

“(i) in full satisfaction of Executive Order 11990, Mt. Hood Meadows shall obtain the concurrence of the Oregon Department of State Lands with the identification of wetland boundaries on the Federal land as designated on a wetland delineation report prepared by an independent professional engineer registered in the State of Oregon so as to provide protection of the identified wetland according to applicable law; and

“(ii) the Secretary shall reserve a 24-foot-wide nonexclusive trail easement at the existing trail locations on the Federal land that retains for the United States existing rights to construct, reconstruct, maintain, and permit nonmotorized use by the public of existing trails subject to the right of the owner of the Federal land—

“(I) to cross the trails with roads, utilities, and infrastructure facilities; and

“(II) to improve or relocate the trails to accommodate development of the Federal land.

“(H) EQUALIZATION OF VALUES.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), in addition to or in lieu of monetary compensation, a lesser area of Federal land or non-Federal land may be conveyed if necessary to equalize appraised values of the exchange properties, without limitation, consistent with the requirements of this Act and subject to the approval of the Secretary and Mt. Hood Meadows.

“(ii) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN COMPENSATION OR CONVEYANCES AS DONATION.—If, after payment of compensation or adjustment of land area subject to exchange under this Act, the amount by which the appraised value of the land and other property conveyed by Mt. Hood Meadows under subparagraph (A) exceeds the appraised value of the land conveyed by the Secretary under subparagraph (A) shall be considered a donation by Mt. Hood Meadows to the United States.”.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 261—DESIGNATING THE WEEK OF OCTOBER 11 THROUGH OCTOBER 17, 2015, AS “NATIONAL CASE MANAGEMENT WEEK” TO RECOGNIZE THE ROLE OF CASE MANAGEMENT IN IMPROVING HEALTH CARE OUTCOMES FOR PATIENTS

Mr. BOOZMAN (for himself and Mr. COTTON) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 261

Whereas case management is a collaborative process of assessment, education, planning, facilitation, care coordination, evaluation, and advocacy;

Whereas the goal of case management is to meet the health needs of the patient and the

family of the patient, while respecting and assuring the right of the patient to self-determination through communication and other available resources in order to promote high-quality, cost-effective outcomes;

Whereas case managers are advocates who help patients understand their current health status, guide patients on ways to improve their health, and provide cohesion with other professionals on the health care delivery team;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America work diligently to raise awareness about the broad range of services that case managers offer and to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers on the improved patient outcomes that case management services can provide;

Whereas through National Case Management Week, the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America aim to continue to educate providers, payers, regulators, and consumers about how vital case managers are to the successful delivery of health care;

Whereas the American Case Management Association and the Case Management Society of America will celebrate National Case Management Week during the week of October 11 through October 17, 2015, in order to recognize case managers as an essential link to patients receiving quality health care; and

Whereas it is appropriate to recognize the many achievements of case managers in improving health care outcomes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week of October 11 through October 17, 2015, as “National Case Management Week”;;

(2) recognizes the role of case management in providing successful and cost-effective health care; and

(3) encourages the people of the United States to observe National Case Management Week and learn about the field of case management.

SENATE RESOLUTION 262—TO SUPPORT THE EMPOWERMENT OF WOMEN AND URGE COUNTRIES TO #FREETHE20

Ms. AYOTTE (for herself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. COLLINS, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mrs. FISCHER, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. MURKOWSKI, Ms. HEITKAMP, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. MIKULSKI, Ms. WARREN, Mrs. CAPITO, Mrs. ERNST, Mrs. BOXER, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. CANTWELL, and Mrs. MURRAY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. RES. 262

Whereas, in 1995, representatives from 189 governments and tens of thousands of organizations met in Beijing at the Fourth World Conference on Women for the purpose of empowering women;

Whereas, at the Fourth World Conference on Women, the governments represented produced the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, a roadmap seeking to advance gender equality and women's rights;

Whereas, on September 27, 2015, the United Nations will host the “Global Leaders’ Meeting on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment: A Commitment to Action” at

the United Nations headquarters in New York City;

Whereas, at this high level conference, governments will be invited to make commitments to achieve gender equality and the empowerment of women;

Whereas the ongoing imprisonment by many countries of innocent women is contrary to Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as well as the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action;

Whereas some countries attending the conference at the United Nations imprison women for exercising universal human rights; and

Whereas, on September 1, 2015, the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations began a government-wide campaign to highlight the cases of women prisoners held unjustly around the world, including—

(1) Wang Yu of China, who—

(A) after being assaulted attempting to board a train in 2008, was sentenced to 2½-years in prison for assault;

(B) has taken on the cases of clients who other lawyers fear representing;

(C) has been harassed, threatened, and smeared in the state-run media; and

(D) was detained again on July 9, 2015;

(2) Khadija Ismayilova of Azerbaijan, who was—

(A) arrested in December 2014 in a crackdown on civil society activists and journalists; and

(B) sentenced on September 1, 2015, to 7½-years in prison after alleging government fraud;

(3) Bahareh Hedayat of Iran, a student activist and campaigner for women's rights, who—

(A) was arrested December 31, 2009 and charged with several "offenses" including interviews with foreign media and insulting the President and leader;

(B) was sentenced in May 2010 to—

(i) 6 months in prison for "insulting the president";

(ii) 2 years in prison for "insulting the leader"; and

(iii) 5 years in prison for "gathering and colluding to commit crimes against national security";

(C) received an additional 6 months in prison for having written a letter in December 2010 encouraging students to continue struggling peacefully for freedom; and

(D) was given an additional 2 year prison sentence on August 28, 2015;

(4) Blen Mesfin, Meron Alemayehu, and Nigist Wondifraw of Ethiopia, who were imprisoned after being charged with inciting violence during anti-Islamic State in Libya demonstrations in Addis Ababa in April 2015;

(5) Gao Yu of China, a 71 year old veteran journalist, who was initially arrested in April 2014 as authorities detained dozens of rights activists and dissidents ahead of the 25th anniversary of the June 4 Tiananmen Square Massacre and was sentenced to 7 years in jail on April 17, 2015, on charges of "leaking state secrets overseas";

(6) Aster Yohannes of Eritrea, the wife of an imprisoned political activist, who—

(A) was arrested in 2003 upon returning from the United States;

(B) was never publicly accused of a crime or tried in a court of law; and

(C) is of unknown whereabouts;

(7) Matlyuba Kamilova of Uzbekistan, who—

(A) was jailed in September 2010 for alleged drug possession;

(B) was arrested under highly suspicious circumstances in the midst of efforts to expose police corruption; and

(C) remains in prison;

(8) Leyla Yunus of Azerbaijan, who—

(A) was arrested with her husband in August 2014 during a broad crackdown on civil society activists;

(B) was sentenced to an 8½-year prison term on August 13, 2015;

(C) was named by France as a Chevalier of the National Order of the Legion of Honour in 2013 in recognition of her human rights work; and

(D) received the Polish Prize of Sérgio Vieira de Mello in 2014;

(9) Phyoee Aung of Burma, who was arrested in March 2015, with over 100 participants, for leading protests advocating for reform to the education system of Burma;

(10) Ta Phong Tan of Vietnam, who was arrested in 2011 for "anti-state propaganda" for writing online articles alleging government corruption and was sentenced in 2012 to 10 years in prison with 2 years of house arrest to follow;

(11) Liu Xia of China, who—

(A) has been under house arrest since the 2010 announcement that her husband received the Nobel Peace Prize;

(B) is confined to her Beijing apartment without internet or phone access;

(C) is allowed only weekly trips to buy groceries and visit her parents;

(D) is allowed to visit Liu Xiaobo once a month; and

(E) reportedly suffers from heart problems and severe depression;

(12) Sanaa Seif of Egypt, who was sentenced in October 2014, with 23 other people, to 3 years in prison for conducting a peaceful demonstration without permission, a sentence which was reduced to 2 years in December 2014;

(13) Judge María Lourdes Afuini Mora of Venezuela, who—

(A) was imprisoned in December 2009 on charges of corruption and abuse of authority for releasing an imprisoned banker, was placed on house arrest until June 2013, and, according to President Chavez, "must pay for what she has done"; and

(B) is on conditional release awaiting trial and is forbidden to leave the country or speak publicly;

(14) Naw Ohn Hla of Burma, who—

(A) is the co-founder of the Democracy and Peace Women Network and a prominent land rights and political prisoners advocate;

(B) was sentenced to a 4 years and 4 month term in prison on May 15, 2015, for protesting, in front of the Chinese Embassy in Rangoon, the deadly police crackdown at the Chinese company Wanbao's Letpadaung copper mine; and

(C) was, on June 29, 2015, given an additional 6 month prison term with hard labor for conducting a peaceful prayer service in 2007 protesting against Daw Aung San Suu Kyi's house arrest;

(15) Nadiya Savchenko of Russia, who—

(A) is a member of the parliament of Ukraine, the Verkhovna Rada, and a helicopter pilot in the Ukrainian military;

(B) was seized in Ukraine by Russian-backed separatists in 2014; and

(C) was illegally transferred to Russian custody, where she remains;

(16) serving as a composite for prisoners of concern worldwide, an estimated 80,000 to 120,000 political prisoners, including men, women, and children, who are detained in the brutal political prison camps of North Korea where starvation, forced labor, executions, rape, sexual violence, forced abortions, and torture are commonplace and whose offenses, according to defectors, include—

(A) burning old currency or criticizing the currency revaluation of the Government;

(B) sitting on newspapers bearing the picture of Kim Il Sung or Kim Jong Il;

(C) mentioning the limited formal education of Kim Il Sung; and

(D) defacing photographs of the Kims;

(17) Bui Thi Minh Hang of Vietnam—

(A) is an active anti-China demonstrator and vocal supporter of human rights and democracy, with a particular focus on helping victims and their families;

(B) was arrested on February 12, 2014 and is serving a 3 year sentence for "disrupting public order"; and

(C) was detained without trial for 6 months at a "reeducation center" prior to her arrest in February of 2014; and

(18) Rasha Chorbaji of Syria—

(A) who was arrested trying to obtain a passport in 2014 with 3 of her children because her husband opposed the regime during the revolution; and

(B) whose children were taken by the Government of Syria and placed in an orphanage, and whose husband drowned in the Mediterranean Sea while fleeing Syria: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) recognizes the 20th anniversary of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action, as well as the high level conference in September 2015 at the United Nations to empower women;

(2) recognizes that many women will not be able to participate in the dialogue about the conference in September 2015 because they are imprisoned unjustly;

(3) reiterates support for efforts to empower women and secure universal human rights for women;

(4) reminds governments attending the conference that unjustly imprisoning women is inconsistent with the Beijing Declaration and does not empower women;

(5) welcomes the release of Ta Phong Tan of Vietnam on September 19, 2015, whose release was called for as part of the campaign;

(6) calls for the immediate release of the women mentioned in the preamble of this resolution, most of whom remain wrongfully imprisoned or under house arrest; and

(7) encourages conference attendees to fulfill previous commitments related to the empowerment of women and to commit to meaningful and concrete steps to advance women's rights, for the betterment of all people.

SENATE RESOLUTION 263—SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY WEEK, INCLUDING RAISING PUBLIC AWARENESS OF THE VARIOUS TAX-PREFERRED RETIREMENT VEHICLES, INCREASING PERSONAL FINANCIAL LITERACY, AND ENGAGING THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES ON THE KEYS TO SUCCESS IN ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING RETIREMENT SECURITY THROUGHOUT THEIR LIFETIMES

Mr. ENZI (for himself, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. WYDEN, and Ms. COLLINS) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 263

Whereas people in the United States are living longer, and the cost of retirement is increasing significantly;

Whereas Social Security remains the bedrock of retirement income for the great majority of the people of the United States but was never intended by Congress to be the sole source of retirement income for families;

Whereas recent data from the Employee Benefit Research Institute indicates that, in the United States—

(1) only approximately ⅓ of workers or the spouses of the workers are saving for retirement; and

(2) the amount that workers have saved for retirement is much less than the amount the workers need to adequately fund their retirement years;

Whereas the financial literacy of workers in the United States is important for the workers to understand the need to save for retirement;

Whereas saving for retirement is a key component of overall financial health and security during retirement years, and the importance of financial literacy in planning for retirement must be advocated;

Whereas many workers may not—

(1) be aware of the various options in saving for retirement; or

(2) have focused on the importance of, and need for, saving for retirement and successfully achieving retirement security;

Whereas, although many employees have access through their employers to defined benefit and defined contribution plans to assist the employees in preparing for retirement, many of the employees may not be taking advantage of those plans at all or to the full extent allowed by Federal law;

Whereas saving for retirement is necessary even during economic downturns or market declines, which makes continued contributions all the more important;

Whereas all workers, including public and private sector employees, employees of tax-exempt organizations, and self-employed individuals, can benefit from developing personal budgets and financial plans that include retirement savings strategies that take advantage of tax-preferred retirement savings vehicles;

Whereas effectively and sustainably withdrawing retirement resources throughout the retirement years of an individual is as important and crucial as saving and accumulating funds for retirement; and

Whereas the week of October 18 through October 24, 2015 has been designated as “National Retirement Security Week”: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) supports the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the importance of saving adequately for retirement;

(2) acknowledges the need to raise public awareness of a variety of tax-preferred retirement vehicles that are used by many people in the United States but could be used by more; and

(3) calls on States, localities, schools, universities, nonprofit organizations, businesses, other entities, and the people of the United States to observe National Retirement Security Week with appropriate programs and activities, with the goal of increasing the retirement savings and personal financial literacy of all people in the United States, thereby enhancing the retirement security of the people of the United States.

SENATE RESOLUTION 264—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 23, 2015, AS “NATIONAL FALLS PREVENTION AWARENESS DAY” TO RAISE AWARENESS AND ENCOURAGE THE PREVENTION OF FALLS AMONG OLDER ADULTS

Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Mrs. McCASKILL) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 264

Whereas older adults, 65 years of age and older, are the fastest-growing segment of the population in the United States;

Whereas the number of older adults in the United States will increase from 35,000,000 in 2000 to 82,300,000 in 2040;

Whereas 1 out of 3 adults over age 65 in the United States falls each year;

Whereas falls are the leading cause of both fatal and nonfatal injuries among older adults;

Whereas, in 2013, approximately 2,500,000 older adults were treated in hospital emergency departments for fall-related injuries, and more than 734,000 were subsequently hospitalized;

Whereas, in 2013, more than 25,500 older adults died from injuries related to unintentional falls, and the death rates from falls among older adults in the United States have risen sharply in the last decade;

Whereas, in 2013, the total direct medical cost of fall-related injuries for older adults, adjusted for inflation, was \$34,000,000,000;

Whereas if the rate of increase in falls is not slowed, the annual cost of fall injuries will reach \$67,700,000,000 by 2020; and

Whereas evidence-based programs show promise in reducing falls by utilizing cost-effective strategies, such as exercise programs to improve balance and strength, medication management, vision improvement, reduction of home hazards, and fall prevention education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 23, 2015, as “National Falls Prevention Awareness Day”;

(2) recognizes that there are proven, cost-effective falls prevention programs and policies;

(3) commends the 72 member organizations of the Falls Free Coalition and the falls prevention coalitions in 43 States and the District of Columbia for their efforts to work together to increase education and awareness about preventing falls among older adults;

(4) encourages businesses, individuals, Federal, State, and local governments, the public health community, and health care providers to work together to raise awareness of falls in an effort to reduce the incidence of falls among older adults in the United States;

(5) urges the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to continue developing and evaluating interventions to prevent falls among older adults that will translate into effective community-based falls prevention programs;

(6) urges the Administration for Community Living, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and partners to continue to promote evidence-based programs and services in communities across the United States to reduce the number of older adults at risk for falls;

(7) encourages State health departments and State Units on Aging, which provide significant leadership in reducing injuries and

related health care costs by collaborating with organizations and individuals, to reduce falls among older adults; and

(8) encourages experts in the field of falls prevention to share their best practices so that their success can be replicated by others.

SENATE RESOLUTION 265—HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Mr. BROWN (for himself and Mr. PORTMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 265

Whereas Louis Stokes was born on February 23, 1925, in Cleveland, Ohio, to Charles and Louise Cinthy Stokes;

Whereas, in 1943, Louis Stokes graduated from Central High School in Cleveland, Ohio;

Whereas, from 1943 to 1946, Louis Stokes served as a personnel specialist in the United States Army;

Whereas, following these years of military service, Louis Stokes returned to Cleveland and attended the Cleveland College of Western Reserve University from 1946 to 1948 and earned a Juris Doctor from the Cleveland Marshall School of Law in 1953;

Whereas Louis Stokes practiced law in Cleveland, Ohio for 14 years and was one of the founders of the Stokes, Stokes, Character and Terry law firm;

Whereas, during his time at his law firm, Louis Stokes became involved in a number of civil rights related cases, often working pro bono on behalf of poor clients and activists;

Whereas Louis Stokes argued 3 cases before the Supreme Court of the United States, including the landmark case of *Terry v. Ohio*, 392 U.S. 1 (1968), which defined the legality of police search and seizure procedures;

Whereas, on November 6, 1968, Louis Stokes was elected to the House of Representatives, representing the 21st (later the 11th) District of Ohio;

Whereas, upon his election, Louis Stokes became the first African-American to represent Ohio in the House of Representatives;

Whereas Congressman Stokes was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus, an organization comprised of the Black Members of the Congress and created to be the voice for people of color and vulnerable communities;

Whereas Congressman Stokes served as the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus for 2 terms;

Whereas, in 1971, Congressman Stokes was the first African-American to serve on the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and, by his retirement in 1998, had earned the distinguished rank of “Cardinal” as chairman of the Subcommittee on VA-HUD-Independent Agencies;

Whereas Congressman Stokes chaired a number of historic committees, including—

(1) the House Select Committee on the Assassinations of President John F. Kennedy and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. in the 95th Congress;

(2) the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in the 100th Congress; and

(3) the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct in the 97th and 98th Congresses;

Whereas Congressman Stokes also served on the Committee on the Budget of the

House of Representatives and gained national prominence as a member of the House Select Committee to Investigate Covert Arms Transactions with Iran in 1987;

Whereas, in 1998, Congressman Stokes successfully led the House of Representatives in passing H.R. 1635, the National Underground Railroad Network to Freedom Act, which was his final major piece of legislation;

Whereas, after serving 15 consecutive terms in the House of Representatives, Congressman Stokes ranked 11th out of 435 Members of Congress in seniority and was the dean of the Ohio delegation;

Whereas few Members have left such an indelible mark in the House of Representatives;

Whereas with kindness, integrity, and diligence, Congressman Stokes worked hard with both sides of the aisle to serve the constituents of his Congressional District, the city of Cleveland, the State of Ohio, and citizens of the United States;

Whereas Congressman Stokes worked tirelessly for minorities, the poor, and disadvantaged persons;

Whereas Congressman Stokes played a pivotal role in the quest for civil rights, equality, and justice;

Whereas the Christian faith of Congressman Stokes was the foundation of his service to others;

Whereas Congressman Stokes often expressed gratitude for the sacrifices of his mother—a young widow, former sharecropper, and daughter of slaves—who inspired her sons to get an education so that her sons would not have to work with their hands as she had done as a domestic worker;

Whereas Congressman Stokes received numerous awards and honors during his lifetime that recognize his leadership and his commitment to public service;

Whereas there are several landmarks in the city of Cleveland that bear the name of Congressman Stokes, including the Louis Stokes Wing of the Cleveland Public Library, the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Center at Case Western Reserve University, and the Louis Stokes Cleveland Veterans Affairs Medical Center;

Whereas nationally, buildings named in honor of Congressman Stokes include the Louis Stokes Laboratories at the National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, Maryland and the Louis Stokes Health Sciences Library at Howard University in Washington, DC;

Whereas, given his commitment to education, the Louis Stokes Alliance for Minority Participation (LSAMP) in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) at the National Science Foundation also bears the name of Congressman Stokes;

Whereas LSAMP assists universities and colleges in increasing the number of students completing high quality degree programs in the STEM disciplines in order to diversify the STEM workforce;

Whereas Louis Stokes received 26 honorary doctorate degrees from colleges and universities; and

Whereas, on July 8, 2003, Congressman Stokes was honored by the Congress with the Congressional Distinguished Service Award: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) honors the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes; and

(2) extends its heartfelt sympathies and condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones of Congressman Louis Stokes.

SENATE RESOLUTION 266—DESIGNATING SEPTEMBER 2015 AS “NATIONAL KINSHIP CARE MONTH”

Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. HATCH) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 266

Whereas in September 2015, “National Kinship Care Month” is observed;

Whereas nationally 2,700,000 children are living in kinship care with grandparents or other relatives;

Whereas grandparents and relatives residing in urban, rural, and suburban households in every county of the United States have stepped forward out of love and loyalty to care for children during times in which biological parents are unable to do so;

Whereas kinship caregivers provide safety, promote well-being, and establish stable households for vulnerable children;

Whereas kinship care enables a child—

(1) to maintain family relationships and cultural heritage; and

(2) to remain in the community of the child;

Whereas kinship care is a national resource that provides loving homes for children at risk;

Whereas kinship caregivers face daunting challenges to keep countless children from entering foster care;

Whereas the Senate is proud to recognize the many kinship care families in which a child is raised by grandparents or other relatives;

Whereas the Senate wishes to honor the many kinship caregivers who throughout the history of the United States have provided loving homes for parentless children;

Whereas National Kinship Care Month provides an opportunity to urge people in every State to join in recognizing and celebrating kinship caregiving families and the tradition of families in the United States to help raise children; and

Whereas much remains to be done to ensure that all children have a safe, loving, nurturing, and permanent family, regardless of age or special needs: Now, therefore, be it *Resolved*, That the Senate—

(1) designates September 2015 as “National Kinship Care Month”;

(2) encourages Congress to implement policies to improve the lives of vulnerable children and families;

(3) honors the commitment and dedication of kinship caregivers and the advocates and allies who work tirelessly to provide assistance and services to kinship caregiving families; and

(4) reaffirms the need to continue working to improve the outcomes of all vulnerable children through parts B and E of title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 601 et seq.), and other programs designed—

(A) to support vulnerable families;

(B) to invest in prevention and reunification services; and

(C) to ensure that extended family members who take on the role of kinship caregivers receive the necessary support.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 2669. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employ-

ees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

SA 2670. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2669 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2671. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2670 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2669 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2672. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2673. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2672 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2674. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2675. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2674 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2676. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2675 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2674 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, *supra*.

SA 2677. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFE)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1632, to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 2669. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

The following sums are hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, for the several departments, agencies, corporations, and other organizational units of Government for fiscal year 2016, and for other purposes, namely:

SEC. 101. (a) Such amounts as may be necessary, at a rate for operations as provided in the applicable appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2015 and under the authority and conditions provided in such Acts, for continuing projects or activities (including the costs of direct loans and loan guarantees) that are not otherwise specifically provided for in this Act, that were conducted in fiscal year 2015, and for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were made available in the following appropriations Acts:

(1) The Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division A of Public Law 113-235), except section 743 and title VIII.

(2) The Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division B of Public Law 113-235).

(3) The Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2015 (division C of Public Law 113-235), except title X.

(4) The Energy and Water Development and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division D of Public Law 113-235).

(5) The Financial Services and General Government Appropriations Act, 2015 (division E of Public Law 113-235).

(6) The Department of Homeland Security Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 114-4).

(7) The Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division F of Public Law 113-235).

(8) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division G of Public Law 113-235), except title VI.

(9) The Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2015 (division H of Public Law 113-235).

(10) The Military Construction and Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division I of Public Law 113-235).

(11) The Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2015 (division J of Public Law 113-235), except title IX.

(12) The Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2015 (division K of Public Law 113-235).

(13) Section 11 of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235).

(b) The rate for operations provided by subsection (a) is hereby reduced by 0.2108 percent.

SEC. 102. (a) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used for: (1) the new production of items not funded for production in fiscal year 2015 or prior years; (2) the increase in production rates above those sustained with fiscal year 2015 funds; or (3) the initiation, resumption, or continuation of any project, activity, operation, or organization (defined as any project, subproject, activity, budget activity, program element, and subprogram within a program element, and for any investment items defined as a P-1 line item in a budget activity within an appropriation account and an R-1 line item that includes a program element and subprogram element within an appropriation account) for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2015.

(b) No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 for the Department of Defense shall be used to initiate multi-year procurements utilizing advance procurement funding for economic order quantity procurement unless specifically appropriated later.

SEC. 103. Appropriations made by section 101 shall be available to the extent and in the manner that would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 104. Except as otherwise provided in section 102, no appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to section 101 shall be used to initiate or resume any project or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 105. Appropriations made and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for

any project or activity during the period for which funds or authority for such project or activity are available under this Act.

SEC. 106. Unless otherwise provided for in this Act or in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016, appropriations and funds made available and authority granted pursuant to this Act shall be available until whichever of the following first occurs: (1) the enactment into law of an appropriation for any project or activity provided for in this Act; (2) the enactment into law of the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2016 without any provision for such project or activity; or (3) December 11, 2015.

SEC. 107. Expenditures made pursuant to this Act shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a bill in which such applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization is contained is enacted into law.

SEC. 108. Appropriations made and funds made available by or authority granted pursuant to this Act may be used without regard to the time limitations for submission and approval of apportionments set forth in section 1513 of title 31, United States Code, but nothing in this Act may be construed to waive any other provision of law governing the apportionment of funds.

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, for those programs that would otherwise have high initial rates of operation or complete distribution of appropriations at the beginning of fiscal year 2016 because of distributions of funding to States, foreign countries, grantees, or others, such high initial rates of operation or complete distribution shall not be made, and no grants shall be awarded for such programs funded by this Act that would impinge on final funding prerogatives.

SEC. 110. This Act shall be implemented so that only the most limited funding action of that permitted in the Act shall be taken in order to provide for continuation of projects and activities.

SEC. 111. (a) For entitlements and other mandatory payments whose budget authority was provided in appropriations Acts for fiscal year 2015, and for activities under the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008, activities shall be continued at the rate to maintain program levels under current law, under the authority and conditions provided in the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, to be continued through the date specified in section 106(3).

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, obligations for mandatory payments due on or about the first day of any month that begins after October 2015 but not later than 30 days after the date specified in section 106(3) may continue to be made, and funds shall be available for such payments.

SEC. 112. Amounts made available under section 101 for civilian personnel compensation and benefits in each department and agency may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid furloughs within such department or agency, consistent with the applicable appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015, except that such authority provided under this section shall not be used until after the department or agency has taken all necessary actions to reduce or defer non-personnel-related administrative expenses.

SEC. 113. Funds appropriated by this Act may be obligated and expended notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 (22 U.S.C. 2412), section 15 of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (22 U.S.C. 2680), section 313 of the Foreign Relations

Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995 (22 U.S.C. 6212), and section 504(a)(1) of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3094(a)(1)).

SEC. 114. (a) Each amount incorporated by reference in this Act that was previously designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act is designated by the Congress for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) of such Act or as being for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of such Act, respectively.

(b) The reduction in section 101(b) of this Act shall not apply to—

(1) amounts designated under subsection (a) of this section; or

(2) amounts made available by section 101(a) by reference to the second paragraph under the heading “Social Security Administration—Limitation on Administrative Expenses” in division G of Public Law 113-235; or

(3) amounts made available by section 101(a) by reference to the paragraph under the heading “Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services—Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Account” in division G of Public Law 113-235.

(c) Section 6 of Public Law 113-235 shall apply to amounts designated in subsection (a) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.

SEC. 115. During the period covered by this Act, discretionary amounts appropriated for fiscal year 2016 that were provided in advance by appropriations Acts shall be available in the amounts provided in such Acts, reduced by the percentage in section 101(b).

SEC. 116. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Agriculture—Domestic Food Programs—Food and Nutrition Service—Commodity Assistance Program” at a rate for operations of \$288,317,000, of which \$221,298,000 shall be for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program.

SEC. 117. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Rural Housing Service—Rental Assistance Program” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to pay ongoing debt service for the multi-family direct loan programs under sections 514 and 515 of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1484 and 1485): *Provided*, That the Secretary may waive the prohibition in the second proviso under such heading in division A of Public Law 113-235 with respect to rental assistance contracts entered into or renewed during fiscal year 2015.

SEC. 118. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Department of Commerce—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration—Procurement, Acquisition and Construction” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned launch schedules for the Joint Polar Satellite System.

SEC. 119. (a) The first proviso under the heading “United States Marshals Service—Federal Prisoner Detention” in title II of division B of Public Law 113-235 shall not apply during the period covered by this Act.

(b) The limitation in section 217(c) of division B of Public Law 113-235 on the amount of excess unobligated balances available under section 524(c)(8)(E) of title 28, United States Code, shall not apply under this Act

to the use of such funds for “United States Marshals Service—Federal Prisoner Detention”.

SEC. 120. (a) The authority regarding close-out of Space Shuttle contracts and associated programs provided by language under the heading “National Aeronautics and Space Administration—Administrative Provisions” in the Omnibus Appropriations Act, 2009 (Public Law 111-8) shall continue in effect through fiscal year 2021.

(b) This section shall be applied as if it were in effect on September 30, 2015.

SEC. 121. (a) Notwithstanding section 1552 of title 31, United States Code, funds made available, including funds that have expired but have not been cancelled, and identified by Treasury Appropriation Fund Symbol 13-09/10-0554 shall remain available for expenditure through fiscal year 2020 for the purpose of liquidating valid obligations of active grants.

(b) For the purpose of subsection (a), grants for which the period of performance has expired but are not finally closed out shall be considered active grants.

(c) This section shall be applied as if it were in effect on September 30, 2015.

SEC. 122. The following provisions shall be applied by substituting “2016” for “2015” through the earlier of the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act or the date of the enactment of an Act authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2016 for military activities of the Department of Defense:

(1) Section 1215(f)(1) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2012 (Public Law 112-81; 10 U.S.C. 113 note), as most recently amended by section 1237 of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 (Public Law 113-291).

(2) Section 127b(c)(3)(C) of title 10, United States Code.

SEC. 123. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for “Department of Energy—Energy Programs—Uranium Enrichment Decontamination and Decommissioning Fund” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to avoid disruption of continuing projects or activities funded in this appropriation.

(b) The Secretary of Energy shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate not later than 3 days after each use of the authority provided in subsection (a).

SEC. 124. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, except section 106, the District of Columbia may expend local funds under the heading “District of Columbia Funds” for such programs and activities under the District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2015 (title IV of division E of Public Law 113-235) at the rate set forth under “District of Columbia Funds—Summary of Expenses” as included in the Fiscal Year 2016 Budget Request Act of 2015 (D.C. Act 21-99), as modified as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 125. Notwithstanding section 101, no funds are provided by this Act for “Recovery Accountability and Transparency Board—Salaries and Expenses”.

SEC. 126. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Small Business Administration—Business Loans Program Account” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to accommodate increased demand for commitments for general business loans authorized under section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)).

SEC. 127. Sections 1101(a) and 1104(a)(2)(A) of the Internet Tax Freedom Act (title XI of

division C of Public Law 105-277; 47 U.S.C. 151 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “October 1, 2015”.

SEC. 128. Section 101 shall be applied by assuming that section 7 of Public Law 113-235 was enacted as part of title VII of division E of Public Law 113-235.

SEC. 129. The authority provided by section 831 of the Homeland Security Act of 2002 (6 U.S.C. 391) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 130. Section 401(b) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (8 U.S.C. 1324a note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 131. Section 610(b) of the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (8 U.S.C. 1153 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 132. Subclauses 101(a)(27)(C)(ii)(I) and (III) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(27)(C)(ii)(I) and (III)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 133. Section 220(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Technical Corrections Act of 1994 (8 U.S.C. 1182 note) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 134. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) is amended by striking all that follows after “shall terminate” and inserting “September 30, 2017”.

SEC. 135. In addition to the amount otherwise provided by section 101 for “Department of Agriculture—Forest Service—Wildland Fire Management”, there is appropriated \$700,000,000 for an additional amount for fiscal year 2016, to remain available until expended, for urgent wildland fire suppression activities: *Provided*, That such funds shall only become available if funds previously provided for wildland fire suppression will be exhausted imminently and the Secretary of Agriculture notifies the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate in writing of the need for these additional funds: *Provided further*, That such funds are also available for transfer to other appropriations accounts to repay amounts previously transferred for wildfire suppression: *Provided further*, That such amount is designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that such amount shall be available only if the President subsequently so designates such amount and transmits such designation to the Congress.

SEC. 136. The authorities provided by sections 117 and 123 of division G of Public Law 113-76 shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

SEC. 137. (a) The authority provided by subsection (m)(3) of section 8162 of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79) shall continue in effect through the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act.

(b) For the period covered by this Act, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading “Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction” in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

SEC. 138. Section 3096(2) of the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 is amended by inserting “for fiscal year 2015” after “\$37,000,000”.

SEC. 139. Funds made available in prior appropriations Acts for construction and renovation of facilities for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention may also be used for construction on leased land.

SEC. 140. Subsection (b) of section 163 of Public Law 111-242, as amended, is further amended by striking “2015-2016” and inserting “2016-2017”.

SEC. 141. Section 101 shall be applied by assuming that section 139 of Public Law 113-164 was enacted as part of division G of Public Law 113-235, and section 139 of Public Law 113-164 shall be applied by adding at the end the following: “and of the unobligated balance of amounts deposited or available in the Child Enrollment Contingency Fund from appropriations to the Fund under section 2104(n)(2)(A)(i) of the Social Security Act and the income derived from investment of those funds pursuant to 2104(n)(2)(C) of that Act, \$1,664,000,000 is rescinded”.

SEC. 142. Section 114(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1011c(f)) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 143. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, there is appropriated for payment to Tori B. Nunnelee, widow of Alan Nunnelee, late a Representative from the State of Mississippi, \$174,000.

SEC. 144. Of the discretionary unobligated balances of the Department of Veterans Affairs from fiscal year 2015 or prior fiscal years, or discretionary amounts appropriated in advance for fiscal year 2016, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs may transfer up to \$625,000,000 to “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—Construction, Major Projects”, to be merged with the amounts available in such account: *Provided*, That no amounts may be transferred from amounts that were designated by the Congress as an emergency requirement pursuant to the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, or the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010: *Provided further*, That no amounts may be transferred until the Secretary submits to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a request for, and receives from the Committees written approval of, such transfers: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall specify in such request the donor account and amount of each proposed transfer, the fiscal year of each appropriation to be transferred, the amount of unobligated balances remaining in the account after the transfer, and the project or program impact of the transfer.

SEC. 145. Notwithstanding section 101, amounts are provided for “Department of Veterans Affairs—Departmental Administration—General Operating Expenses, Veterans Benefits Administration” at a rate for operations of \$2,697,734,000.

SEC. 146. Notwithstanding section 101, section 226(a) of division I of Public Law 113-235 shall be applied to amounts made available by this Act by substituting “division I of Public Law 113-235” for “division J of Public Law 113-76” and by substituting “2015” for “2014”.

SEC. 147. Section 209 of the International Religious Freedom Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6436) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “September 30, 2015”.

SEC. 148. Amounts made available by section 101 for “Broadcasting Board of Governors—International Broadcasting Operations”, “Bilateral Economic Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President—Economic Support Fund”, “International Security Assistance—Department of State—International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement”, “International Security Assistance—Department of State—Nonproliferation, Anti-terrorism, Demining and Related Programs”, and “International Security Assistance—Funds Appropriated to the President Foreign Military Financing Program” shall be obligated at a rate for operations as necessary to sustain assistance for Ukraine to counter external, regional aggression and influence, including for the costs of authorized loan guarantees.

SEC. 149. Section 1334 of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (22 U.S.C. 6553) shall be applied by substituting the date specified in section 106(3) of this Act for “October 1, 2015”.

SEC. 150. (a) Funds made available by section 101 for “Department of Housing and Urban Development—Management and Administration—Administrative Support Offices” may be apportioned up to the rate for operations necessary to maintain the planned schedule for the New Core Shared Services Project.

(b) Not later than 3 days before the first use of the apportionment authority in subsection (a), each 30 days thereafter, and 3 days after the authority expires under this Act, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall submit to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report specifying each use of the authority through the date of the report.

SEC. 151. (a) Section 48103(a) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied: (1) by substituting the amount specified in such section with \$1,610,000,000; and (2) by substituting the fiscal year specified in such section with the period beginning October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016.

(b) Section 47104(c), 47107(r)(3), and 47115(j) of title 49, United States Code, shall each be applied by substituting “2016” for “2015”.

(c) Section 47141(f) of title 49, United States Code, shall be applied by substituting “March 31, 2016” for “September 30, 2015”.

(d) For purposes of calculating funding apportionments and meeting other requirements under sections 47114, 47115, 47116, and 47117 of title 49, United States Code, for the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall—

(1) first calculate funding apportionments on an annualized basis as if the total amount available under section 48103 of such title for fiscal year 2016 were \$3,220,000,000; and

(2) then reduce by 50 percent—

(A) all funding apportionments calculated under paragraph (1); and

(B) amounts available pursuant to sections 47117(b) and 47117(f)(2) of such title.

(e) Section 409(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (49 U.S.C. 41731 note) shall be applied by substituting “March 31, 2016” for “September 30, 2015”.

(f) Nothing in this section shall affect the availability of any balances of contract authority provided under section 48103 of title 49, United States Code, for fiscal year 2015 or any prior fiscal year.

(g) Section 186(d) of the Vision 100—Century of Aviation Reauthorization Act (117 Stat. 2518) is amended by inserting “and for

the period beginning on October 1, 2015, and ending on March 31, 2016,” after “fiscal years 2012 through 2015”.

(h) This section shall be in effect through March 31, 2016.

SEC. 152. (a) Notwithstanding section 106, sections 4081(d)(2)(B), 4261(j), 4261(k)(1)(A)(ii), and 4271(d)(1)(A)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall each be applied by substituting “March 31, 2016” for “September 30, 2015”.

(b) Notwithstanding section 106, section 4083(b) and subsections (d)(1) and (e)(2) of section 9502 of such Code shall each be applied by substituting “April 1, 2016” for “October 1, 2015”.

(c) Subparagraph (A) of section 9502(d)(1) of such Code is amended by inserting “or any Act making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2016” before the semicolon at the end.

SEC. 153. (a) Congress finds the following:

(1) State and county health departments, community health centers, hospitals, physicians offices, and other entities currently provide, and will continue to provide, health services to women. Such health services include relevant diagnostic laboratory and radiology services, well-child care, prenatal and postpartum care, immunization, family planning services (including contraception), cervical and breast cancer screenings and referrals, and sexually transmitted disease testing.

(2) Many such entities provide services to all persons, regardless of the person’s ability to pay, and provide services in medically underserved areas and to medically underserved populations.

(3) All funds that are no longer available to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc. and its affiliates and clinics pursuant to this section will continue to be made available to other eligible entities to provide women’s health care services.

(4) Funds authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, by subsection (e) of this section are offset by the funding limitation under subsection (b) of this section.

(b) For the one-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, subject to subsection (c) of this section, no funds authorized or appropriated by Federal law may be made available for any purpose to Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., unless such entities certify that Planned Parenthood Federation of America affiliates and clinics will not perform, and will not provide any funds to any other entity that performs, an abortion during such period.

(c) Subsection (b) of this section shall not apply to an abortion—

(1) if the pregnancy is the result of an act of rape or incest; or

(2) in the case where a woman suffers from a physical disorder, physical injury, or physical illness that would, as certified by a physician, place the woman in danger of death unless an abortion is performed, including a life-endangering physical condition caused by or arising from the pregnancy itself.

(d) The Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Agriculture shall seek repayment of any Federal assistance received by Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., or any affiliate or clinic of Planned Parenthood Federation of America, Inc., if it violates the terms of the certification required by subsection (b) of this section during the period specified in subsection (b) of this section.

(e) There is authorized to be appropriated, and appropriated, \$235,000,000 for the commu-

nity health center program under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b), in addition to any other funds made available to such program, for the period for which the funding limitation under subsection (b) of this section applies.

(f) None of the funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to subsection (e) of this section may be expended for an abortion other than as described in subsection (c) of this section.

(g) Nothing in this section shall be construed to reduce overall Federal funding available in support of women’s health.

This Act may be cited as the “Continuing Appropriations Resolution, 2016”.

SA 2670. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2669 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 1 day after the date of enactment.”

SA 2671. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2670 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the amendment SA 2669 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL (for Mr. COCHRAN) to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “1 day” and insert “2 days”

SA 2672. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 3 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2673. Mr. McCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2672 proposed by Mr. McCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “3” and insert “4”

SA 2674. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

At the end add the following.

“This Act shall take effect 5 days after the date of enactment.”

SA 2675. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2674 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “5” and insert “6”

SA 2676. Mr. MCCONNELL proposed an amendment to amendment SA 2675 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the amendment SA 2674 proposed by Mr. MCCONNELL to the joint resolution H.J. Res. 61, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt employees with health coverage under TRICARE or the Veterans Administration from being taken into account for purposes of determining the employers to which the employer mandate applies under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; as follows:

Strike “6” and insert “7”

SA 2677. Mr. MCCONNELL (for Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. INHOFF)) proposed an amendment to the bill S. 1632, to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram; as follows:

On page 8, strike lines 5 through 16 and insert the following:

(b) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit, to the appropriate committees of Congress, an assessment regarding—

(1) the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the Government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed to enable the Government of Nigeria and the governments of its partner countries in the region—

(A) to counter the threat of Boko Haram; and

(B) to address the legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram; and

(2) significant United States intelligence gaps concerning Boko Haram or on the willingness and capacity of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a).

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 22, 2015, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Nominations.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 22, 2015, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing entitled “Improving VA Accountability: Examining First-Hand Accounts of Department of Veterans Affairs Whistleblowers.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Committee on Intelligence be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 22, 2015, at 2:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, COMPETITION POLICY AND CONSUMER RIGHTS.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Antitrust, Competition Policy and Consumer Rights, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on September 22, 2015, at 10 a.m., in room SD-1A226 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building, to conduct a hearing entitled “Examining Consolidation in the Health Insurance Industry and its Impact on Consumers.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that David McFarland, a fellow detailed to my office from the Department of State, be granted privileges of the floor for the remainder of the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIRING A REGIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREAT POSED BY BOKO HARAM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 175, S. 1632.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1632) to require a regional strategy to address the threat posed by Boko Haram.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. REGIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREAT POSED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) STRATEGY REQUIRED.—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a five-year strategy to help enable the Government of Nigeria, members of the Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram (MNJTF) authorized by the African Union, and relevant partners to counter the regional threat of Boko Haram and assist the Government of Nigeria and its neighbors to accept and address legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—At a minimum, the strategy must address the following elements:

(A) Enhance, pursuant to existing authorities and restrictions, the institutional capacity, including military capabilities, of the Government of Nigeria and partner nations in the region, as appropriate, to counter the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(B) Provide humanitarian support to civilian populations impacted by Boko Haram's activity.

(C) Specific activities through which the United States Government intends to improve and enhance the capacity of Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram partner nations to investigate and prosecute human rights abuses by security forces and promote respect for the rule of law within the military.

(D) A means for assisting Nigeria, and as appropriate, Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram nations, to counter violent extremism, including efforts to address underlying societal factors shown to contribute to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals.

(E) A plan to strengthen and promote the rule of law, including by improving the capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria, enhancing public safety, and responding to crime (including gender-based violence), while respecting human rights and strengthening accountability measures, including measures to prevent corruption.

(F) Strengthen the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to enhance security for schools such that children are safer and girls seeking an education are better protected, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality.

(G) Identify and develop mechanisms for coordinating the implementation of the strategy across the inter-agency and with the Government of Nigeria, regional partners, and other relevant foreign partners.

(H) Identify the resources required to achieve the strategy's objectives.

(b) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Director of National Intelligence, in consultation with the Secretary of State, shall submit to the appropriate committees of Congress an assessment regarding the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy required by subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed in order to enable the Government of Nigeria and the governments of its partner countries in the region to counter the threat of Boko Haram and to address legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that lack of economic opportunity and access to education, justice, and other social services contributes to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals.

(d) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Lankford amendment at the desk be agreed to, that the committee-reported amendment, as amended, be agreed to, the bill, as amended, be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 2677) was agreed to, as follows:

(Purpose: To require that the Director of National Intelligence assess the capability of the United States Government to help implement the 5-year strategy to counter the regional threat of Boko Haram)

On page 8, strike lines 5 through 16 and insert the following:

(b) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit, to the appropriate committees of Congress, an assessment regarding—

(1) the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the Government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed to enable the Government of Nigeria and the governments of its partner countries in the region—

(A) to counter the threat of Boko Haram; and

(B) to address the legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram; and

(2) significant United States intelligence gaps concerning Boko Haram or on the willingness and capacity of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a).

The committee-reported amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill (S. 1632), as amended, was ordered to be engrossed for a third read-

ing, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1632

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REGIONAL STRATEGY TO ADDRESS THE THREAT POSED BY BOKO HARAM.

(a) **STRATEGY REQUIRED.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense shall jointly develop and submit to the appropriate committees of Congress a five-year strategy to help enable the Government of Nigeria, members of the Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram (MNJTF) authorized by the African Union, and relevant partners to counter the regional threat of Boko Haram and assist the Government of Nigeria and its neighbors to accept and address legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram.

(2) **ELEMENTS.**—At a minimum, the strategy must address the following elements:

(A) Enhance, pursuant to existing authorities and restrictions, the institutional capacity, including military capabilities, of the Government of Nigeria and partner nations in the region, as appropriate, to counter the threat posed by Boko Haram.

(B) Provide humanitarian support to civilian populations impacted by Boko Haram's activity.

(C) Specific activities through which the United States Government intends to improve and enhance the capacity of Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram partner nations to investigate and prosecute human rights abuses by security forces and promote respect for the rule of law within the military.

(D) A means for assisting Nigeria, and as appropriate, Multinational Joint Task Force to Combat Boko Haram nations, to counter violent extremism, including efforts to address underlying societal factors shown to contribute to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals.

(E) A plan to strengthen and promote the rule of law, including by improving the capacity of the civilian police and judicial system in Nigeria, enhancing public safety, and responding to crime (including gender-based violence), while respecting human rights and strengthening accountability measures, including measures to prevent corruption.

(F) Strengthen the long-term capacity of the Government of Nigeria to enhance security for schools such that children are safer and girls seeking an education are better protected, and to combat gender-based violence and gender inequality.

(G) Identify and develop mechanisms for coordinating the implementation of the strategy across the inter-agency and with the Government of Nigeria, regional partners, and other relevant foreign partners.

(H) Identify the resources required to achieve the strategy's objectives.

(b) **ASSESSMENT.**—The Director of National Intelligence shall submit, to the appropriate committees of Congress, an assessment regarding—

(1) the willingness and capability of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a), including the capability gaps, if any, of the Government and military forces of Nigeria that would need to be addressed to enable the Government of Nigeria

and the governments of its partner countries in the region—

(A) to counter the threat of Boko Haram; and

(B) to address the legitimate grievances of vulnerable populations in areas affected by Boko Haram; and

(2) significant United States intelligence gaps concerning Boko Haram or on the willingness and capacity of the Government of Nigeria and regional partners to implement the strategy developed under subsection (a).

(c) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that lack of economic opportunity and access to education, justice, and other social services contributes to the ability of Boko Haram to radicalize and recruit individuals.

(d) **APPROPRIATE COMMITTEES OF CONGRESS DEFINED.**—In this section, the term "appropriate committees of Congress" means—

(1) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate; and

(2) the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Appropriations, and the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives.

ALBUQUERQUE INDIAN SCHOOL LAND TRANSFER ACT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 194, S. 986.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 986) to require the Secretary of the Interior to take into trust 4 parcels of Federal land for the benefit of certain Indian Pueblos in the State of New Mexico.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 986) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 986

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Albuquerque Indian School Land Transfer Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **19 PUEBLOS.**—The term "19 Pueblos" means the New Mexico Indian Pueblos of—

(A) Acoma;

(B) Cochiti;

(C) Isleta;

(D) Jemez;

(E) Laguna;

(F) Nambe;

(G) Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan);

(H) Picuris;

(I) Pojoaque;

(J) San Felipe;

(K) San Ildefonso;
 (L) Sandia;
 (M) Santa Ana;
 (N) Santa Clara;
 (O) Santo Domingo;
 (P) Taos;
 (Q) Tesuque;
 (R) Zia; and
 (S) Zuni.

(2) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “The Town of Albuquerque Grant, Bernalillo County, within Township 10 North, Range 3 East, of the New Mexico Principal Meridian, New Mexico—Metes and Bounds Survey” and dated August 12, 2011.

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. LAND TAKEN INTO TRUST FOR BENEFIT OF 19 PUEBLOS.

(a) ACTION BY SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall take into trust all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the Federal land described in subsection (b) for the benefit of the 19 Pueblos immediately after the Secretary determines that the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) have been satisfied regarding the trust acquisition of the Federal land.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—The Secretary shall—

(A) take such action as the Secretary determines to be necessary to document the transfer under paragraph (1); and

(B) appropriately assign each applicable private and municipal utility and service right or agreement.

(b) DESCRIPTION OF LAND.—The Federal land referred to in subsection (a)(1) is the 4 tracts of Federal land, the combined acreage of which is approximately 11.11 acres, that were historically part of the Albuquerque Indian School, more particularly described as follows:

(1) ABANDONED INDIAN SCHOOL ROAD.—The approximately 0.83 acres located in sec. 7 and sec. 8 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(2) SOUTHERN PART TRACT D.—The approximately 6.18 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(3) TRACT 1.—The approximately 0.41 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(4) WESTERN PART TRACT B.—The approximately 3.69 acres located in sec. 7 of T. 10 N., R. 3 E., of the New Mexico Principal Meridian in Albuquerque, New Mexico, as identified on the map.

(c) SURVEY.—The Secretary shall conduct a survey of the Federal land to be transferred consistent with subsection (b) and may make minor corrections to the survey and legal description of the Federal land described in subsection (b) as the Secretary determines to be necessary to correct clerical, typographical, and surveying errors.

(d) USE OF LAND.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall be used for the educational, health, cultural, business, and economic development of the 19 Pueblos.

(e) LIMITATIONS AND CONDITIONS.—The Federal land taken into trust under subsection (a) shall remain subject to any private or municipal encumbrance, right-of-way, restriction, easement of record, or utility service agreement in effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS USE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The 19 Pueblos shall allow the Bureau of Indian Affairs to continue to use the land taken into trust under subsection (a) for the facilities and purposes as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The use by the Bureau of Indian Affairs under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) be free of any rental charge; and

(B) continue until such time as the Secretary determines there is no further need for the existing Bureau of Indian Affairs facilities.

SEC. 4. EFFECT OF OTHER LAWS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subsection (b), Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a) shall be subject to Federal laws relating to Indian land.

(b) GAMING.—No class I gaming, class II gaming, or class III gaming (as defined in section 4 of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (25 U.S.C. 2703)) shall be carried out on the Federal land taken into trust under section 3(a).

BREAST CANCER RESEARCH STAMP REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 233, S. 1170.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1170) to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend the authority of the United States Postal Service to issue a semipostal to raise funds for breast cancer research, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 1170) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1170

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Breast Cancer Research Stamp Reauthorization Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF POSTAGE STAMP FOR BREAST CANCER RESEARCH.

Section 414(h) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking “2015” and inserting “2019”.

SEC. 3. ENSURING THAT FUNDS GENERATED BY SPECIAL POSTAGE STAMP SALES ARE USED FOR BREAST CANCER RESEARCH.

Section 414(c)(1) of title 39, United States Code, is amended in the matter following subparagraph (B) by adding at the end the following: “An agency that receives amounts from the Postal Service under this paragraph shall use the amounts for breast cancer research.”.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEALS OF NATIONAL RETIREMENT SECURITY WEEK

NATIONAL FALLS PREVENTION AWARENESS DAY

HONORING THE LIFE, ACCOMPLISHMENTS, AND LEGACY OF CONGRESSMAN LOUIS STOKES

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the en bloc consideration of the following Senate resolutions, which were submitted earlier today: S. Res. 263, S. Res. 264, and S. Res. 265.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolutions by title en bloc.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 263) supporting the goals and ideals of National Retirement Security Week, including raising public awareness of the various tax-preferred retirement vehicles, increasing personal financial literacy, and engaging the people of the United States on the keys to success in achieving and maintaining retirement security throughout their lifetimes.

A resolution (S. Res. 264) designating September 23, 2015, as “National Falls Prevention Awareness Day” to raise awareness and encourage the prevention of falls among older adults.

A resolution (S. Res. 265) honoring the life, accomplishments, and legacy of Congressman Louis Stokes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolutions.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be agreed to, the preambles be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The preambles were agreed to.

(The resolutions, with their preambles, are printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

AUTHORIZING APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO ESCORT HIS HOLINESS POPE FRANCIS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with a like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort His Holiness Pope Francis into the House Chamber for the joint meeting at 10 a.m. on Thursday, September 24, 2015.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the

Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 1 p.m., Thursday, September 24; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of H.J. Res. 61, with the time until 2 p.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees; further, that notwithstanding rule XXII, the cloture motion filed during today's session with re-

spect to amendment No. 2669 ripen at 2 p.m., Thursday, September 24; finally, that the filing deadline for all first- and second-degree amendments to amendment No. 2669 be at 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 24, 2015, AT 1 P.M.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous con-

sent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:29 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 24, 2015, at 1 p.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate September 22, 2015:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE
HUMANITIES

KATHRYN K. MATTHEW, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE
DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY
SERVICES FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

RECOGNIZING PATRICIA FRY FOR BECOMING A FINALIST FOR NATIONAL PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Patricia Fry, a dedicated principal who has been selected as, not only the Massachusetts Principal of the year, but is also a finalist for the 2015 National Principal of the Year.

The National Principal of the Year program identifies exemplary principals, like Patricia, from both the middle school and high school levels across the United States who have gone above and beyond to provide the best quality educational opportunities for their students while also contributing significantly to their profession, and I can think of no one more deserving than Patricia.

For the past 10 years, Patricia has served as principal at Plymouth South High School in Plymouth, Massachusetts. Prior to this position, she has served as principal at Seekonk High School in Seekonk, Massachusetts. Before rising to the position of principal, Patricia endeavored to engage and shape young minds as a Spanish teacher and an assistant principal at Barnstable High School. Additionally, she is an accomplished presenter at workshops and conferences geared toward educators—having presented her energizing lessons, passion for the material, and commitment to the students all over the country.

Patricia is not only an educator but is also a lifelong learner. Though she has an undergraduate degree from Stonehill College and a Master's degree from Bridgewater State University, she has continued her education and is working toward completing her dissertation for a PhD from Lesley University. Her curiosity and passion for learning is a model for her students, and most importantly, is unparalleled.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in honoring Patricia Fry for achieving this prestigious recognition. I know all my colleagues in the House join me in congratulating her and wishing her nothing but success in the future.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF JESÚS RAMOS RECIPIENT OF THE 2015 ST. MADELEINE SOPHIE AWARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the recipients of the sixteenth annual St. Madeleine Sophie

Awards, given by Sacred Heart Schools (SHS), Atherton, California. The recipients of this prestigious and highly regarded recognition are individuals in the SHS community who have made a sustained and significant contribution to the Schools and embody the Goals and Criteria of a Sacred Heart education. Their commitment to the mission of a Sacred Heart education is a source of great inspiration to our entire community. This awards celebration will be held on September 23, 2015, in the Eileen Sullivan Connolly Auditorium in the Campbell Center for the Performing Arts at Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton.

This year's award recipient, Jesús Ramos, has given generously of his time, talent, and devotion to the Mission of the Society of the Sacred Heart.

Jesús Ramos is a Spanish instructor and coordinator of the Senior Honors Independent Study Program at Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton, California. In his 25 years as an educator in several independent schools, Jesús has worked in a wide range of school positions and functions: middle school academic dean; middle and high school Spanish teacher; World Languages department head; college counselor; founder of an office of Diversity and Inclusion; middle and high school admissions committees; coach; dorm faculty member; peer mentor and evaluator; and campus ministry. In these capacities he has gained invaluable collaborative, communication, problem-solving, and strategic planning fluencies: mediating between teachers, parents and students; directing curriculum design; overseeing the hiring and evaluation of new and returning teachers; working with faculty, students, the Admissions Office and the Head of Schools on issues of equity, justice and multiculturalism; counseling students and their families through the college application process; and equally exercising his duties as coach, faculty resident and classroom teacher. Jesús earned his B.A. in Theology and Spanish Literature and his M.A. in Spanish Literature from the University of Notre Dame. He resides in Menlo Park, California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the extraordinary work and contributions of Jesús Ramos and congratulate him on being honored with the St. Madeleine Sophie Award.

FLORIDA INVENTORS HALL OF FAME

HON. GUS M. BILIRAKIS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 13 inventors who have been recognized as the Inductees of the Florida Inventors

Hall of Fame since its founding. In order to be named as an Inductee, these men and women were nominated by their peers and have undergone the scrutiny of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame Selection Committee. Each of their innovations is deemed to have made a significant impact on quality of life, economic development, and welfare of society for the citizens of Florida and the United States.

The Florida Inventors Hall of Fame was founded in 2013 by Paul R. Sanberg, Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Economic Development, and Judy Genshaft, President, at the University of South Florida. It was recognized by the Florida Senate with Senate Resolution 1756, adopted at the request of Florida Senator Jeff Brandes (22nd district), on April 30, 2014. By commending the incredible scientific work that has been, and continues to be, accomplished in Florida by its citizens, the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame's mission is to encourage individuals of all ages and backgrounds to strive toward the betterment of Florida and society through continuous, groundbreaking innovation.

Nomination to the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame is open to all Florida inventors (living or dead) who are, or who have been, residents of Florida and whose connection to the State has informed their inventive work. The nominee must be a named inventor on a patent issued by the United States Patent and Trademark Office. The impact of the inventor and his or her invention should be significant to society as a whole, and the invention should have been commercialized, utilized, or led to important innovations.

The 2014 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are: Thomas Edison (1847–1931), the most prolific inventor in U.S. history and longtime resident of Fort Myers; Robert Cade (1927–2007), University of Florida professor, who developed the hydrating sports drink Gatorade, Gainesville; William Glenn (1926–2013), Florida Atlantic University professor, who invented the high-definition camera for NASA, Boca Raton; John Gorrie (1803–1855), physician and the father of refrigeration and air conditioning, Apalachicola; Shyam Mohapatra, University of South Florida professor and pioneer of applied biomedical nanotechnology, Tampa; and Shin-Tson Wu, University of Central Florida professor, whose liquid crystal research has impacted display technology worldwide, Orlando.

The 2015 Inductees of the Florida Inventors Hall of Fame are: Henry Ford (1863–1947), automotive technology pioneer and Fort Myers resident, who advanced industrial manufacturing and contributed to experimental botanical research; Robert Howard Grubbs, University of Florida graduate, professor at the California Institute of Technology, and recipient of the 2005 Nobel Prize in Chemistry, whose contributions led to new materials in medicine and plastics, Gainesville; Robert Holton, Florida State University professor, who invented

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the chemical synthesis of Taxol, a widely utilized and highly effective anti-cancer drug, Tallahassee; Jerry Pratt, scientist at the Florida Institute for Human and Machine Cognition, for his revolutionary work in walking robotics, Pensacola; Paul R. Sanberg, professor, and Senior Vice President for Research, Innovation and Economic Development at the University of South Florida, for discovery of novel approaches to drug and cell therapies to treat stroke, brain injuries and diseases, and for founding the National Academy of Inventors, Tampa; Nan-Yao Su, University of Florida professor, who invented Sentricon®, which revolutionized termite control, Gainesville and Fort Lauderdale; and Janet Yamamoto, University of Florida professor, who discovered the deadly feline immunodeficiency virus (FIV), created the FIV vaccine, and furthered research on HIV, Gainesville.

The contributions made to society through innovation and invention are significant and life changing. I commend these individuals and the organizations and institutions that have supported them for the work they have done to benefit the world in which we live. In contemplating the work of these inventors, may future generations be encouraged to strive to emulate these honorees and their dedication to the ideal of innovation.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF
DR. SANFORD L. JONES

HON. ANDY BARR

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding individual, Dr. Sanford L. Jones, of Richmond, Kentucky. Dr. Jones, a part of the Greatest Generation, answered his nation's call to service during World War II. Following the war, he had a distinguished career as an educator. Today, on his ninetieth birthday, it is my honor to recognize him before the House of Representatives.

Dr. Jones was born in Lost Creek, in Perry County, Kentucky. The oldest of seven children, his father worked as a coal miner and his mother taught school. When he was a senior in high school, Dr. Jones was drafted into the United States Army. He served as a Staff Sergeant in the U.S. Army 15th Air Force, 304th Bombardment Wing, 455th Bombardment Group from 1944–1945. Dr. Jones was assigned as a nose turret gunner on a B–24 Liberator bomber. He completed 35 missions over Europe, with targets in Italy, Yugoslavia, Austria, and Germany. He was awarded the Air Medal, with three Oak Leaf Clusters to the Air Medal, for his outstanding service.

Dr. Jones flew many important missions, but one stands out in particular. On March 23rd, 1944, 157 Liberators flew a raid on the Saint Valentine tank factory north of Linz, Austria. The anti-aircraft flak by the Germans was rough. In the words of Dr. Jones, "I never saw flak burst so close and so much at one time. There were flashes of fire everywhere." His plane was badly damaged. After the pilot miraculously landed the plane, crew members counted over one hundred holes in the plane.

Seven Liberators were lost on this mission, the most harrowing one of Dr. Jones' service.

Following the war, Jones completed high school and went on to earn a bachelor's degree from Eastern Kentucky State College. He taught high school in Perry County before receiving a master's degree from the University of Kentucky and a doctorate from the University of Tennessee Memphis. Dr. Jones served on the faculty of Eastern Kentucky University from 1961–1992, serving as Chairman of the Department of Biological Sciences for 13 years. Over his many years in education, he has affected hundreds of young lives. His dedication to the education field is admirable.

The bravery of Dr. Sanford and his fellow men and women of the United States Army is heroic. Because of his courage and the courage of individuals from all across Kentucky and our great nation, our freedoms have been preserved for our generation and for future generations. He is truly an outstanding American, a patriot, and a hero to us all.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE NEW
BEDFORD WHALING MUSEUM
AND THE WILLIAM M. WOOD
FOUNDATION

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the New Bedford Whaling Museum and the William M. Wood Foundation for their collaboration in celebrating the history of Cape Verdean and Azorean culture in Southeastern Massachusetts.

Our nations' histories are forever interwoven, as the ancestors of today's Azorean and Cape Verdean American families remain an integral part of Massachusetts' economic prosperity. Many of these immigrants were first drawn to New England's ports on whaling and fishing vessels in the early nineteenth century, often finding work in the region's nearby cranberry bogs. Cape Cod and Southeastern Massachusetts are home to the fastest growing Cape Verdean and Azorean communities in the United States.

Today, it is estimated that over 40% of the southeastern Massachusetts population are of Portuguese descent. The strong influence that the Cape Verdean and Azorean cultures have had on our local community cannot be understated, and it is essential that we honor and celebrate this important part of Southeastern Massachusetts culture.

In keeping with this spirit the William M. Wood Foundation has generously approved a \$300,000 grant to support the initiatives at the New Bedford Whaling Museum geared toward preserving the history of Azorean and Cape Verdean communities in Southeastern Massachusetts. Among other things, this grant will support a major traveling exhibit detailing the lives of Azorean and Cape Verdean whalers that will make an appearance at various coastal communities throughout New England. Additional community events will be supported by this funding, including an international symposium on the history of Azorean and Cape

Verdean immigration in Massachusetts that will be held at the Museum.

In order to ensure that Cape Verdean and Azorean culture is not only preserved but celebrated in Southeastern Massachusetts, I have worked closely with many local and international officials, including Cape Verdean President Jorge Carlos Fonseca, Cape Verdean Prime Minister Jose Maria Neves, and President of the Regional Government of the Azores Vasco Cordeiro. It gives me great pride to work with these individuals and to see such strong support for honoring Azorean and Cape Verdean culture in Southeastern Massachusetts. The funding given by the William M. Wood Foundation will establish a strong base as we move forward, and we envision many more opportunities for collaboration in the future.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in recognizing the New Bedford Whaling Museum and the William M. Wood Foundation as they join together to celebrate the history of Azorean and Cape Verdean culture in Southeastern Massachusetts. I thank my colleagues for joining me in recognition of these organizations for celebrating such an important aspect of Massachusetts history.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF MARGARET BELTRAMO RECIPIENT
OF THE 2015 ST. MADELEINE
SOPHIE AWARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the recipients of the sixteenth annual St. Madeleine Sophie Awards, given by Sacred Heart Schools (SHS), Atherton, California. The recipients of this prestigious and highly regarded recognition are individuals in the SHS community who have made a sustained and significant contribution to the Schools and embody the Goals and Criteria of a Sacred Heart education. Their commitment to the mission of a Sacred Heart education is a source of great inspiration to our entire community. This awards celebration will be held on September 23, 2015, in the Eileen Sullivan Connolly Auditorium in the Campbell Center for the Performing Arts at Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton.

Margaret Beltramo has given generously of her time, considerable talents, and devotion to the Mission of the Society of the Sacred Heart.

Margaret was born in South San Francisco, California, and moved to Portola Valley when she was three months old. She attended local schools, including Portola Valley Elementary School, Notre Dame High School, and University of Notre Dame de Namur, Belmont. She and her husband Dan, who met at a New Year's Eve dinner-dance in Menlo Park in 1964, have been married since 1966. They have two children, Dan, Jr. and Diana and four beautiful grandchildren, Lisa, Sara, Emily, and Thomas.

Margaret serves her community in many capacities, and was instrumental in founding

Families in Transition, an organization that served the people of East Palo Alto. She has left an indelible mark on the SHS campus, beginning with the Mothers' Club, which she was President of. In the late 1970's, she assisted the Director of Schools in a search for a new Montessori Director which brought Mary Gebhart to the position, strengthening the Montessori school immeasurably.

In 1980, she joined the School's first Capital Campaign Committee which raised over \$3.5 million to build the new McGanney Gymnasium and Sports Center in 1984. As a member of the Board of Trustees from 1981 to 1989, Margaret was involved with the painful decision to close the Boarding School and the challenging decision to make the school co-educational. These were exciting times for Sacred Heart, but what Margaret Beltramo is best remembered for is the establishment of the Sacred Heart Auction, a critical component of SHS's fund raising efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I have known and admired Margaret Beltramo for more than four decades and I am blessed to call her my friend. As the mothers of children who grew up together and were educated by the Religious of the Sacred Heart, I saw first-hand how her organizational skills and dedication helped to expand SHS and build for a sound future. That's why Margaret Beltramo's talents and contributions on behalf of SHS are worthy of the St. Madeleine Sophie Award.

I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the extraordinary work and contributions of Margaret Beltramo and congratulate her on being honored with the 2015 St. Madeleine Sophie Award. She has bettered our community and strengthened our country with all she has accomplished.

IT'S TIME TO STOP TAXPAYER FUNDING OF PLANNED PARENT- HOOD

HON. BILL SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 14th, 2015 pro-life activists with the group Center for Medical Progress released a video of a Planned Parenthood official discussing the sale of fetal body parts. There have been many other videos released since, and each one has revealed more terrible details about the reprehensible activities of this organization. When the first Planned Parenthood video was made public, I called it horrific and inhumane, and called for an immediate investigation. Sadly, we have discovered over the last few months that this was just the beginning. With each passing day, more information comes to light illustrating that the sale and profit from fetal body parts is central to Planned Parenthood's business model, as is the performance of abortions. The American taxpayer should not be forced to pay for this. It is time to defund Planned Parenthood, and bring a stop to these barbaric practices. This is not a Republican vs. Democrat issue. This is about protecting life and taking a stand against an inhumane activity that the people of

this country are being forced to subsidize. Enough is enough. I am proud to support the Defund Planned Parenthood Act to put a moratorium on both mandatory and discretionary funding while Congress continues its investigation, and to have been a leader on the issue of protecting life and stopping these evil practices. It is time to act, and I am hopeful that we stand for life, and end this once and for all.

RECOGNIZING THE NEW BEDFORD SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA FOR ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. WILLIAM R. KEATING

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 100th Anniversary of the New Bedford Symphony Orchestra and in celebration of a century of music, entertainment and education in the arts to the public.

The New Bedford Symphony Orchestra owes its establishment to Clarence Arey, a Fairhaven music teacher who founded the then-New Bedford Philharmonic Orchestra to provide quality performances of classical music for his community. It is recognized as the third oldest symphonic group in Massachusetts and one of the first twenty established in the nation.

Today, the Orchestra performs six symphonic concerts, six chamber music concerts and a holiday Pops every year. These widely attended events are renowned as a pillar and celebration of the arts from the South Coast and beyond. Their performances enrich the lives of adults and children alike through the power of music and exposure to the fine arts.

When Clarence Arey founded the New Bedford Symphony Orchestra, he did so with a very specific goal in mind—providing his students with a place to continue practicing and growing their talents and abilities after they left the school. It is in that spirit that the Orchestra continues to offer a free music education to over 30,000 students annually. The Orchestra does this in coordination with schools in the region at all age groups—from organizing its signature programs for pre-school, elementary, and adolescent programs, including Symphony Tales, Music in the Morning, Youth Orchestras and the Strings Program. Designed to ignite a passion for music in future generations, the Orchestra also works with music teachers to establish and collaborate on education frameworks, and provides resources to assist in teaching their students.

Mr. Speaker, the 100th Anniversary of the New Bedford Symphony Orchestra provides us with an opportunity to reflect on the significance of the fine arts in Massachusetts—and our nation's—history. May this historic Orchestra continue to enrich our lives with the power of music for years to come.

H.R. 3134 AND H.R. 3504

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, today, the United States House of Representatives votes on two important pieces of legislation that offer us the opportunity to take a strong stance supporting life—H.R. 3134, the Defund Planned Parenthood Act of 2015 and H.R. 3504, the Born-Alive Survivors Protection Act of 2015. We must demand that all human beings be treated equally, with the dignity that each human life deserves.

The right to life is one of the most fundamental and precious rights we enjoy as Americans. We must protect it with a degree of strength that equals its significance. Time and time again over my years in Congress, I have stood on the side of life, and I am proud to do so again today. I urge my colleagues, in the strongest terms, to do the same—to stand on the side of life.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF MARIE VAUDELL RECIPIENT OF THE 2015 ST. MADELEINE SOPHIE AWARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the recipients of the sixteenth annual St. Madeleine Sophie Awards, given by Sacred Heart Schools (SHS), Atherton, California. The recipients of this prestigious and highly regarded recognition are individuals in the SHS community who have made a sustained and significant contribution to the Schools and embody the Goals and Criteria of a Sacred Heart education. Their commitment to the mission of a Sacred Heart education is a source of great inspiration to our entire community. This awards celebration will be held on September 23, 2015, in the Eileen Sullivan Connolly Auditorium in the Campbell Center for the Performing Arts at Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton.

This year's award recipient, Marie VauDell, has given generously of her time, talent, and devotion to the Mission of the Society of the Sacred Heart.

Marie VauDell was born in Redwood City to Edward and Josephine Imlach, and continues to live there today with her husband Doug and son Tyler. She attended St. Pius Elementary School; St. Francis High School in Mountain View; and earned her bachelor's degree in accounting from Santa Clara University, where she played on the women's softball team. After graduation, Marie obtained her Certified Public Accounting license. While working for Pearson, Del Prete & Co., LLP she was given the assignment of auditing Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton. This led Marie to depart her private sector accounting and become the school's Controller.

Marie is a woman of many talents. She has inspired children to dance through her teaching of tap and jazz. She has hiked mountains

and traversed forests as a member of the San Mateo County Sheriff's Search and Rescue Explorer Team. Marie has helped her local business community by serving as Vice President of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, and promoted sports by sitting on the Little League Board. She enjoys travel, reading and sports, but what means the most to Marie and brings her the greatest joy is her family, especially seeing her son Tyler transition into adulthood.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the extraordinary work and contributions of Marie VauDell and congratulate her on being honored with the 2015 St. Madeleine Sophie Award.

SAFE PLAY ACT

HON. BILL PASCRELL, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the first Children's Cardiomyopathy Awareness Month this month.

The Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation, or CCF, is a non-profit group dedicated to raising awareness for the risk of sudden cardiac arrest in the young and helping to prevent tragic deaths.

The Children's Cardiomyopathy Foundation works to raise awareness for serious cardiac conditions and provides resources and supports to families struggling with the impossible reality of discovering that their young children have critical conditions. CCF's work to bring attention to this issue and encourage better detection, prevention, and treatment for patients is important, and I thank them for these efforts. I invite my colleagues to join me in congratulating this organization's lifesaving work.

I invite my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 829, the Supporting Athletes, Families and Educators to Protect the Lives of Athletic Young Act, known as the SAFE PLAY Act. This legislation will provide school systems with resources to raise awareness for youth athlete safety, encourage the development of best practices to prevent, report, and address injuries, and educate teachers, students, and coaches on the risks of cardiomyopathy and other critical cardiac conditions. It will also allow students to learn CPR and how to use an automated external defibrillator, or AED, to help prevent death in the event of sudden cardiac arrest. This legislation will increase school safety and help reduce the number of deaths from this condition on school property.

RECOGNIZING THE CALL TO ACTION FOR WALKING AND WALKABLE COMMUNITIES

HON. RON KIND

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the United States Surgeon General

Vivek Murthy's Step It Up! call to action to promote walking and walkable communities.

Walking is a simple and effective way to increase physical activity in the lives of everyday Americans, and it can help significantly reduce the risk of heart disease and diabetes. An average of just 22 minutes a day of physical activity can significantly mitigate many potential long term health issues. Fewer than half of all U.S. adults, and only a quarter of high school students, get enough physical activity to reduce their risk of chronic diseases associated with an inactive lifestyle.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has found that three out of every ten Americans do not have access to sidewalks along streets in their neighborhood. I am here today to support the Surgeon General's call on local leaders, law enforcement, and public health managers to create safe sidewalks, curbs, and crosswalks within local communities. We need to step up as a country to ensure that citizens can walk within their own communities and feel safe when they do. This call to action both encourages a shared sense of community among residents and is an effective way to mitigate many of our nation's health care concerns and costs.

As the co-chair of the Fitness Caucus, the Youth Sports Caucus, and the Taskforce on Childhood Obesity, I am proud to support the Surgeon General in his call to action for walking and walkable communities.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF WILLIAM V. CAMPBELL RECIPIENT OF THE 2015 ST. MADELEINE SOPHIE AWARD

HON. ANNA G. ESHOO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the recipients of the sixteenth annual St. Madeleine Sophie Awards, given by Sacred Heart Schools (SHS), Atherton, California. The recipients of this prestigious and highly regarded recognition are individuals in the SHS community who have made a sustained and significant contribution to the Schools and embody the Goals and Criteria of a Sacred Heart education. Their commitment to the mission of a Sacred Heart education is a source of great inspiration to our entire community. This awards celebration will be held on September 23, 2015, in the Eileen Sullivan Connolly Auditorium in the Campbell Center for the Performing Arts at Sacred Heart Schools in Atherton.

This year's award recipient, William V. Campbell, has given generously of his time, considerable talents, and deep devotion to the Mission of the Society of the Sacred Heart.

Bill Campbell is Chair Emeritus of Columbia University's Trustees and is the Chair of the Board of Intuit Corporation. He has served as Intuit's President and CEO (1994–2000), and formerly was President and CEO of GO Corporation; Founder, President and Chief Executive Officer of Claris Corporation; and Executive Vice-President of Apple Computer. Mr.

Campbell joined Apple Computer from Kodak in 1983 where he was General Manager of consumer products for Kodak Europe. Prior to joining Kodak, Bill was Vice President of J. Walter Thompson in New York. He recently retired from the Board of Directors of Apple, Inc. after 17 years of service. Bill served as a Trustee of Columbia University for 12 years, 9 as Chair of the Board. He has been Co-Chair of the Campaign Volunteer Leadership Committee, where he served on the Executive Steering Committee, and Co-Chair for Athletics. He was a founder of the Columbia Alumni Association and a member of the advisory group of the Columbia Entrepreneurship initiative. Bill served as the head football coach at Columbia from 1974 to 1979 and is a director of the National Football Foundation and College Hall of Fame. In addition to Bill's college football career, he has been the Head Coach for the Sacred Heart Middle School's powder puff football team which is a highlight for the eighth grade students. He has two children, James and Margaret and lives in Palo Alto, California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the entire House of Representatives to join me in honoring the extraordinary work and contributions of Bill Campbell and congratulate him on being honored with the 2015 St. Madeleine Sophie Award.

VIRGINIA EPISCOPAL SCHOOL

HON. BOB GOODLATTE

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 110 years ago, a church leader in Staunton, Virginia envisioned a secondary school to be operated by the Episcopal Diocese of Southern Virginia. The Rev. Robert Carter Jett, who was the first Rector of Emmanuel Episcopal Church in Staunton, said he wanted the school to provide "leadership in the matter of education" for students from all means and backgrounds, with special consideration for the children of the clergy. Thanks to the work of Rev. Jett, on February 4, 1914, Virginia Episcopal School in Lynchburg, Virginia was incorporated.

With the help of other individuals over the following year-and-a-half, Virginia Episcopal School opened on a 160-acre campus in Lynchburg on September 25, 1916. There were 63 young men enrolled in that first school year, the vast majority of them coming from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Rev. Jett was the school's first Rector and was joined by five faculty members. A single building held classrooms, a chapel, a dining room, and a dormitory.

In the century since Virginia Episcopal School was created, more than 4,000 young men and women have received their high school diplomas from this institution. As Rev. Jett put it, this is work that brought them "Toward Full Stature" in their moral, intellectual, spiritual, and physical lives. Those students have gone on to contribute to our society in a variety of ways—as business leaders, educators, government officials, lawyers, doctors and nurses, and of course, the clergy.

From its single Georgian Revival building designed by noted architect Frederick H. Brooke, Virginia Episcopal School has grown to include 15 buildings on campus and eight athletic fields. Of historic note, Virginia Episcopal School became the South's first private prep school to integrate in 1967. In 1986, the school became one of the first all-male prep schools in the South to accept females as students.

There are 230 students enrolled for the 2015–16 academic year at Virginia Episcopal School. They come from a much wider area than those young men from Virginia who first walked through the doors of the original school in Lynchburg. Today's students have their homes in 20 states and foreign countries. As an important institution of learning in Virginia's Sixth Congressional District, I commend Virginia Episcopal School as it celebrates 100 years of work in developing students "Toward Full Stature," and I wish the school and its leaders much continued success in their worthy mission.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. AIRBORNE RECONNAISSANCE MISSION INTO BERLIN, GERMANY

HON. DEVIN NUNES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Mr. NUNES. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, September 29th marks the 25th anniversary of the last covert U.S. airborne reconnaissance mission flown into Berlin, Germany, by the U.S. Air Force aircrews affectionately known as the "Berlin for Lunch Bunch." From the beginning of the Cold War, these aircrews flew combat reconnaissance missions within the Russian-controlled airspace of the Berlin access cor-

ridors and the Berlin Control Zone. From 1946 to 1990, these Airmen conducted over fifteen thousand unarmed reconnaissance flights, monitoring the massed forces of the Group Soviet Forces in Germany and the East German military. The highly modified aircraft flew low and slow over the many Soviet and East German military facilities, collecting photographic and other intelligence that provided NATO the indications and warning information necessary to prepare for a Central European war. Their accomplishments are truly part of our proud American and allied intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance history, and it is my honor to acknowledge their sacrifices for all of us.

Thank you, and well done "Berlin for Lunch Bunch!"

JOHN GERMANY

HON. KATHY CASTOR

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 22, 2015

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of an extraordinary leader of the Tampa Bay community, John Germany. His remarkable career in public service and his many contributions to our community are worthy of recognition by all.

John Germany was born in 1923 in Plant City, Florida. As a young man, John Germany served his country in the U.S. Army as a tank commander during World War II. During the war, he led his platoon to the gates of the Ebensee concentration camp in Austria and helped liberate the camp. After the war, he graduated from Harvard Law School and returned to Florida to begin practicing law.

John Germany served as the Chief Legal Advisor for Legislative Affairs to Florida Governor LeRoy Collins. During his tenure, he

was an early and important supporter of establishing the University of South Florida and would later go on to serve as the Board of Trustees President. John Germany's critical role in founding the University of South Florida earned him the University Medallion for Community Service in 1966 and the President's Fellow Medallion in 2012. Today, the University of South Florida is an economic engine in our community and top research institution in the nation.

Not only has John Germany impacted the Tampa Bay community with this dedication to the law, he has also strengthened our community through his support of local organizations and his dedication to educating youth. In 1961, he was elected President of the Friends of the Library of Tampa-Hillsborough County. As President of the organization, he spearheaded efforts to fund and build a library in downtown Tampa which opened in 1966. In recognition of his role in founding the library, in 1999 it was named "The John F. Germany Library." His excellence in his legal work and commitment to community service earned him the 2006 Outstanding Lawyer Award by the Hillsborough County Bar Association, an award given to those who excel in the areas of law and community service. Even after learning of his cancer, John Germany donated \$100,000 to the library system that will continue to fund the John Germany Youth Reading Initiative into the future.

John Germany will be forever remembered as a leader in the Tampa Bay community who was passionate about the law and the advancing youth education. Born into the Greatest Generation and a leader in shaping our great City of Tampa, he was a true pillar in our community. On August 26th, 2015, he passed away at the age of 94. Mr. Speaker, I join the Tampa Bay community in honoring John Germany for his lifelong service to the State of Florida.